DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 112 95 SO 011 126

TITLE Citizen Education Behavior Variables: Final Report. Part B: Colloquium Transcript.

INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.

SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 31 Jul 78

NOTE 209p.; For related documents, see SO 011 124-130; Not available in hard copy from EDRS due to poor ink density in original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS Affective Objectives; Behavior; Behavioral Objectives; *Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; *Civics; Cognitive Objectives; Conference Reports; Cultural Pluralism; Educational Environment; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Psychology; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Approach; Individual Needs; Political Science; *Political Socialization; Program Descriptions; Psychology; Skill Development; Social Influences; Socialization; Values

IDENTIFIERS *Citizenship Education

ABSTRACT

This document contains papers and proceedings from a colloquium in May, 1978, on citizen education objectives. The first paper, by Judith V. Torney, stresses the need to relate global concepts to citizenship and to objectives for citizen education. Torney also suggests that a citizenship education program should consider average ages at which children have various kinds of skills and abilities. Comments on Torney's paper by colloquium participants emphasize the need to relate psychological studies of citizen education to political science and sociological literature. The second paper, by Byron G. Massialas, analyzes definitions of citizen education and describes a high school program to involve students in decision making. Discussion of Massialas' paper focuses on problems of making models for citizen education programs on the basis of one case study and the need to differentiate types of political participation. The discussion concludes with the recommendation that citizen education programs be developed in concordance with value systems at home and school and that they consider individual and social needs. (Author/DB)

CITIZEN EDUCATION BEHAVIOR VARIABLES: FINAL REPORT

PART B: COLLOQUIUM TRANSCRIPT

Submitted to

National Institute of Education

by

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Suite 1700/1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

July 31, 1978

RESEARCH FOR BETTER SCHOOLS, INC.

COLLOQUIUM

on

BEHAVIOR VARIABLES
RELATED TO CITIZEN EDUCATION OBJECTIVES

May 11-12, 1978
Philadelphia, Pa.

Papers presented by:

JUDITH V. TORNEY
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois

BYRON G. MASSIALAS
College of Education
Florida State University

THURSDAY EVENING, MAY 11, 1978, 7:45 P.M.

(The Colloquium was convened by Russell Hill, who reviewed the material in the kits.)

R. HILL: At this point I would like to call on the Director of the Division, Lou Maguire.

L. MAGUIRE: For the second time I would like to thank all of you on behalf of RBS for your attendance at the meeting. By way of quick background, RBS is a private nonprofit corporation that has been in existence since 1966. We get most of our funding right now from the National Institute of Education, and this meeting is being conducted with funds that have been provided us from the National Institute.

The majority of our work right now and in the immediate future is specifically focused on helping the states and particularly the state departments in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware with their own (what we label) statewide improvement efforts. We have three thrusts, one of which is represented at this meeting, citizen education. Another thrust is dealing with basic skills student outcomes, and a third thrust deals with career preparation student outcomes.

The topic of the colloquium or symposium

tonight and tomorrow -- those variables that are related to citizen education outcomes -- is right on target both with the particular efforts that we are assisting the states with and with a long-term evolvement of school improvement models for all the school districts in the tri-state area that we are serving.

Joan Wallace, who has been responsible for a lot of the details, was introduced to you during the dinner, and now I would like to thank Russ and Barbara for convening such a distinguished panel of presenters and reviewers for this symposium. I look forward to what will happen over the next day and a half.

R. HILL: Thanks, Lou.

At this point I would like to call on the person who directs the Citizen Education Program at Research for Better Schools, Barbara Presseisen, to say a few words about what we're doing.

B. PRESSEISEN: Thank you, Russ.

Again, welcome. Our particular component, one of the three main components in RBS, has a staff of seven full-time professionals, several part-time people who are staff asspciates, and we are represented here this evening by six of us. We also have representatives from

two of the states. Each of the states we deal with in this tri-state region has a committee, a planning committee for Citizen Education, which directs the efforts that we work on collaboratively.

Connie O'Dea and Skip Guerriero have come to represent New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Our work with the states is directed at not only changing the knowledge that does exist in this field -- and you are very much contributing to it this day and a half, but working with practitioners, going out into the districts and schools of the three states and working on developing programs with students and teachers and members of the community, programs that relate, as those states request it, to Citizen Education.

As you know, Citizen Education covers a whole host of areas: law-related, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic.. some of the areas you are interested in and many of the public are. We are at the request of the states working on the development of programs in their own schools. Starting next September we'll be at sites in our three states, and probably our greatest task will be translating and putting into action many of the ideas about the knowledge in the area which you and others like you are generating.

We are building materials and a document collection at RBS and will be using a lot of that as we work with practitioners. Our world is a Janus kind of situation. We face the academic world in one way and the practitioners world in another, and we're trying to bring them together. We thank you for putting out effort for us in this area today and tomorrow.

R. HILL: Thanks, Barbara.

I would like to go on to my part of the proceedings, which is a discussion of the format. We've used this format once before with a group of historians, where we asked them to review past Citizen Education efforts and to develop papers that look at what has been done in this area from three different perspectives. In that case it was a liberal point of view, a revisionist point of view, and a radical point of view. The papers came in and we expected a lot of fun and we had a lot of fun at that meeting. The reviewers were also divided across different perspectives and we had quite an excellent interchange.

The format moves something like this. First, a brief introduction. Then the presenter had an opportunity to make comments about the paper that had been

distributed and read. That was rather interesting because often we got another paper. Even the presenters found that quite interesting. The reviewers had an opportunity then to respond for five minutes, and I asked them to really stick to that five minutes; we moved around the group until everybody had a chance to respond to that paper. Following that we had an open discussion, where we invited the audience to join in, to raise questions and discuss. That lasted for about 15-20 minutes, and we moved then to the next paper.

When we completed all three papers we began to generalize and look across the whole experience, and develop suggestions, caveats, and recommendations.

We assumed that we would use the same format here and we plan to do so, but as a person who has been responsible for organizing this I feel somewhat of a difference. As I read the papers and understand them, they don't particularly address the question that we set out. I'm not sure why. The first assumption that I operate on is that I don't understand the papers and if that's the case then I hope the presenters will better help me understand them.

The second assumption that might operate is

that it's a wrong-headed question and issue, and the third assumption might be that the data is really not there and it really needs some kind of commentary; and we need to examine this from a different point of view.

Let me step back now for a minute. I mean no blame. I am not being critical in any sense. This is an intellectual activity. All people, as far as I am concerned, are extremely committed here and engaged in what we're trying to do, and we at RBS, as Barbara has said, are trying to be that bridging agent or linking agent between what happens and might happen in the schools and the academic research community.

I would like to propose a slight variation in the format, and that is to spend some time initially examining what question we thought we were asking when we wrote to the writers of the papers, and to declare open season on the question and the people who asked the question. Perhaps it's a wrong-headed question.

That question was: We have developed -- educators and lay people -- a definition of Citizen Education in our language and we need help in translating that into behavioral science language. By that we mean sociology, political socialization, psychology and the various

fields within psychology.

We see this activity of defining what should be Citizen Education as a public prerogative, as a political activity. Indeed as we move into schools we will systematically within each school site involve not only the teachers and the principals and the administrators, but we will reach out into the community on almost a formula basis if we can and pull representatives in to say what should be the objectives of the Citizen Education program. They will use the kind of language which is, of course, lay persons' language, etc. and we hope to help them achieve those objectives. But to do so we must be able to translate this into these terms over here, and begin to understand how to organize the research and data in this field. That was our hope in doing this.

Certainly this is in the papers that have been presented, but I would ask for help in doing this. I might say that from this we will not only try to develop programs which impact these variables that are defined, but we hope to mount research programs, and finance them, that will look and go further in these areas.

I stand open for questions concerning the question that we've asked or are asking your help in defining

Our objective ultimately is to get some kind of focus so that we can organize research and development in this area, and conceptualize it.

Is our question a wrong-headed question? Is it a reasonable question?

R. SIGEL: There are two things that bother me about the way the question is put. In the first place, if you assume that it is still open as to what the goals of Citizen Education should be -- you are going to take community and parental direction -- then I find it difficult to see whether at this moment the behavioral sciences or the consequence of behavior science can be of that much help to you.

Let me cite one example. Suppose I'm a parent and I don't like kids to get any of that new-fangled stuff. I want them to be disciplined, to mind, and to keep their traps shut.

Certainly the kinds of behavioral concepts that you would want to draw on are different than if I were to say to you "I want my child to be critical, to examine, to inquire, to challenge." The basic principles of behavior, if you want to call it that, may be the same, but the only request I have right now is the way your

arrows go, the way you're asking these two people too early.

I don't object to asking parents what their goals are or what they want of Citizen Education, but that's another story. That is probably your charge and your privilege. But I keep wondering if you haven't asked these two very learned young people too early in the game.

W. McGUIRE: I don't agree. It seems to me that is an appropriate sequence and it's important to lay out the different concepts of what Citizen Education might be in the minds of different constituencies in the society. Some might think of it as educating people so they can serve the present society, conform to the system as it now exists; others might say that, on the contrary, it is to educate change agents who can produce society more in tune with the needs of individuals that are not now being met.

Whichever it is, I think the important thing is to lay them all out because whichever it is the behavioral science box could say that we have a little bit to offer on how to get people to conform to the needs or how to get people to become effective change agents, etc., leaving to other constituencies to decide which of these

bodies of knowledge would be exploited and in what proportion. The danger is not laying out the first box first so that we only look at certain behavioral science mechanisms.

R. HILL: Any other comments? Are we clear? Are we able to see that? Let me add one thing. I think there is a dynamic thing in here that I was very glad to see in the papers, that as we pick up concepts from the behavioral sciences there are possibilities that there should be interaction not only in terms of the actual language but in the areas.

I don't want to steal your thunder, Judy, but in your paper you picked up the emphasis that we should be concerned about international education; that RBS's definition is not the target area, but it should be larger.

J. TORNEY: Let me ask this question. How fixed is this definition?

R. HILL: It's a working definition to get us to begin to focus in that area. It's very fluid.

B. MASSIALAS: How did it come about?

R. HILL: I think our staff sat down and chewed on it for about six months and read a lot of things

and then decided what was in and what was out.

B. MASSIALAS: It doesn't include the public?

R. HILL: No, it doesn't represent the public. However, Carl, it is not too far off from your experience, is it?

C. GUERRIERO: No, not too much.

R. HILL: Carl works across the state of Pennsylvania, meeting people in the state, working on goals and schools, and so on.

B. MASSIALAS: It's like the Bible. You can't deny anything in there.

J. TORNEY: For myself, once I develop some kind of definition and it satisfies me as organizing knowledge I become very annoyed if people monkey with it unless they have a good reason, or if they ignore it. That makes me more annoyed. To what extent is that the case with this definition?

R. HILL: I think we're still fluid, but we could be annoyed.

W. McGUIRE: Does the definition come in part from those 40 or so state departments of education statements of what Citizen Education is?

R. HILL: They are certainly not in conflict

in most cases. It's certainly an extension of many of them. We have surveyed the state goal statements, as Nick has said, and tried to look at what they say and get some ideas of a congruence. We also looked at philosophy. Our historians critiqued it. I think every time we type it, about once every two weeks, it gets changed.

J. TORNEY: By the typist?

R. HILL: We're not always sure!

Let's move ahead. I hope we'll be informal tomorrow; it's not necessarily a day for ties, at least for the men: I hope we'll be able to carry on the conversation which will go beyond certainly nine o'clock tonight and continues at the meal times.

If we can accept this focus we need your help in trying to relate this. We have a sensational opportunity. We have some money to try to do this job and try to mobilize work in this area. We have the support of the states about us and they are anxious for help. We are asking for help from people in the research world, and we're delighted to have this opportunity to invite you here.

Judy, please.

J. TORNEY: About how long do you want me

to go on?

R. HILL: How long would you want to talk? I thought about 20-25 minutes.

J. TORNEY: Let me say first of all that I want to react to your comment about how cooperative we all are. I am always impressed with the fact that I need to keep constant track of how kids see the ideas which we all throw around -- definitions or whatever they are. My daughter came back the other day from the seventh grade with an assignment to write a composition on obedience and cooperation -- obviously because the teacher felt her class had failed in these important characteristics.

She began her composition as follows: "Obedience is a concept we usually associate with dogs. Sometimes we also associate it with being in the army."

I often wonder whether the teacher really read those compositions. It was such a marvelous way of seeing that particular problem. So I hope we will all be cooperative and obedient tonight so that you will not have to treat us either as dogs or members of the army.

R. HILL: I hadn't thought of obedience, but sometimes that's pretty nice.

J. TORNEY: I am pleased at the set of reactors

who are here because they are people whose opinions I respect and I think it's time some psychologists got into this particular business. I think it's an important time to make some of those links.

I'd like to quote my early life also. My kindergarten teacher really did have certain information about how Citizen Education ought to be seen in a sense, and I think we're coming back in many ways and seeing it as more than simply a relationship to the specifically governmental kind of system.

I think the role of a definition or a set of objectives, or whatever you want to call it, is to call people's attention to the various things which they may not have thought of as being important. I think that's the reason for having a definition that takes up a page rather than a definition that takes up only a sentence or two. I would like to make one more plug for including something about global and international problems in this definition. I think it is shortsighted to fail to do that.

Although I promised not to become too annoyed I do find that the conceptual framework which has been developed -- not by myself, but in a variety of meetings and conferences -- first applicable to the global

system, as a matter of fact, and then projected back onto the domestic, rather than the other way around -- I find that satisfies me and reflects what seem to me to be the findings of a number of empirical studies. It's also important to me to move back and forth between the conceptual and empirical questions. That's the important part. I think the concepts are important, but the relationships between the behavioral science concepts are still more important in identifying the important empirical questions to be asked, identifying the important assumptions which people make in the process of doing things in education which they may not realize they're making and which in many cases are subject to empirical test.

Bob says I should construct a rejoinder to my paper and that was an interesting prospect, but only given half an hour to do it in I didn't --

R. HILL: If you want to stand on your paper and speak only five minutes, you can say that's it.

J. TORNEY: I think I'll take a little bit more than that. I have done a little thinking since I wrote the paper. I would be interested and I would like to find out later why it is that the paper did not identify the kinds of concepts you were looking for. I was a little

startled by that piece of information a couple of minutes ago and I'm not sure I understand.

I spoke very much really from the perspective of the developmental psychologist. I miss Irv Sigel, who I thought was going to be here to serve as an ally in this effort. I think some very important and exciting things are going in developmental psychology, particularly in social involvement of kids and in the study of social development of kids; and I think that linking those up with Citizen Education is terribly important.

In particular I think a life span approach to developmental is the only way to go. Just as the global dimension cannot be ignored we cannot continue to believe that at the age of 15 or 16 everything stops that is important to know about development. I will have some comments on your paper tomorrow, Byron, in that regard too in terms of generations and the meanings of various kinds of analysis that needs to be done.

I think the other thing developmental psychology helps us to do is pinpoint certain ages when important things are happening that we really ignore at the peril of Citizen Education. I am becoming more and more convinced that middle childhood in the elementary

school years are absolutely critically important and it is really true that the same educational program or effort, or whatever you want to call it -- the same intervention -- applied at one age does not necessarily have the same effect as that same educational program applied in another age.

There is a very good cartoon to that effect which has a picture of a psychoanalyst and a man on a couch, and the man on the couch says, "All right, Doctor, so I'm spoiled rotten. What can I do about it?" And the next frame has the psychoanalyst saying, "I know how to treat that problem," and he kicks the man off the couch and starts spanking him.

Some of my students in developmental don't really understand why that's funny, why it is that the same action for an adult and a child is different. Yet I think that's the major lesson that we draw. Whether we believe in stage development, stages of moral development, or whatever we believe about developmental psychology, that is kind of core and almost all developmental psychologists would agree to that particular point.

Beyond that you get into areas where thoughtful people do differ about precisely what the important

issues are. It seems to me that in childhood if we want to look at the various influences on Citizen Education, childhood cognitive development is exceedingly rapid. Things change quickly and as a result in many cases they are more amenable to some kind of influence -- sometimes intervention, sometimes acceleration -- than they are at a later period.

However, the explicit Citizen Education curriculum of the elementary school tends to be focused on those kinds of things which are only recently coming to be thought of as part of Citizen Education and beyond that it's kind of nationalism and obeying your local policeman kinds of curriculum in many places. I think that fails to stimulate the kind of advances which would be possible given what we know about the importance of this period.

Once adolescence comes there is a fair amount of evidence that a whole lot of things become more rigid at that particular time period. Cognitive development certainly becomes slower, and various aspects of the implicit curriculum of the school take on particular importance. The unfortunate thing about adolescence is that at that particular time we keep teaching them in many Citizen Education courses the same things we've been

teaching them from the beginning on, lessons which have been overlearned -- so it becomes boring, redundant, repetitive. We teach it as if we didn't trust the fact that we had already taught those lessons. We think that more is better, that if you've done it before you should do the same thing all over again.

I think the developmental point of view can have an important role to play in defining what those kinds of experiences ought to be. I think we ought to have more trust in the kinds of experiences we provide, and that if we provided them earlier in childhood we don't need to provide them all over again.

Beyond that it seems to me that the concepts out of Piaget's theory, which has not been sufficiently applied in this area, are certainly some ideas of stage, although I would hesitate a long time before I tried to develop a stage theory of citizenship. But I think the point that development is directional, sequential, qualitatively different at different periods is important, so without necessarily tying ourselves into stages of citizenship I think that is an important idea.

Likewise I think the idea of schema has a great deal of possibility for understanding kids' points

of view, because it does not make what I often find a difficult distinction, which is between cognitive and attitudinal. Heaven knows I've done enough survey research on cognitive and attitudinal aspects of children's civil and political action, and I swear frequently in public I will never collect any more. The distinction between them for me recently often tends to become a blurred one.

If I start to talk about kids' perspectives on some thing that has cognitive aspects and it has attitudinal aspects, and I cannot make that kind of knowledge versus skills versus disposition kind of distinction. I think that perhaps the reason we don't think we're making as much progress in this area as we ought to be is precisely because we get ourselves tied into that particular set of thoughts; also because we find it so much more easy to assess or evaluate knowledge than we do any of these other things.

We even get into arguments about what a good attitude is, and so we get ourselves tied up in kinds of artificial arguments in that particular distinction. Again, if it takes a concept like schema to break us out of that, maybe it does take that sort of new concept and maybe we can break out of that particular box without

having to call it something which is a little jargony and a little difficult to apply in those situations; but I just think we should break out of the box nevertheless.

I am becoming more and more convinced that where the last decades may have been the decades of moral education and moral development, I really believe the next decade is going to be perspective-taking decade -- if I can make a prediction. For me that is a concept around which I can organize a great deal of what I know about developmental psychology, what I believe about Citizen Education, what I think about social development.

Again, this is an area of study where maybe Kohlberg's work was five years ago. In other words, there are not very many studies which map its growth -- that is, the average ages at which kids have various kinds of perspective taking skills and abilities, what kinds of things influence it. I've read some of the work my students are doing on the effects of bilingualism on perspective taking, and on the effects of various kinds of parent procedures and the various kind of school experiences they have on perspective taking. I think that is terribly important and that the three or four or maybe five studies which indicate that it's possible to optimize children's

ability in this area represent an absolutely crucial aspect of whatever you're going to call Citizen Education.

I believe that it's true because if you look simply at the failures of Citizen Education -- kids that are delinquent, for example -- I'm convinced that one of the things delinquent kids can't do (and there is some evidence of this) is see the world from the victim's point of view. They victimize people without being able to take that particular perspective.

I think one of the reasons people ignore the injustices and a variety of evils in the world is that they do not see the world from somebody else's point of view. Part of our failure as an international education is that we do not see the world from the point of view of somebody else -- a country or a culture which is different from our own.

For me that is a kind of important organizing principle. Selman's work is important, although I would argue that I don't think it is quite as neatly staged as he makes it out to be. But I think this whole area is a terribly, terribly important one and I think that we have been too sloppy recently and for a long time in talking about empathy and good feeling when we could be much more

specific and talk about perspective taking, conjugated down to its component parts, and trace their development and see how we might help kids do this in a more effective way.

What interests me about Furth's work is basically the same thing. What is egocentrism with regard to such institutions. What does it mean to understand an institution, to deal with it from the same perspective as someone who is a member of an institution?

You've done so much work in moral education in this organization that I hesitate to spend very much time at all on that. I think what Kohlberg did for us a number of years ago is important. He has certainly made more people sensitive to the cognitive developmental point of view than any other single individual. I think it is too bad if we get stuck in that box, however. There are too many problems of the relationship between judgment and behavior which are still to be resolved. It doesn't say that that is not an important thing to teach people about, that it is not an important perspective to bring to bear, but I don't think the answers lie there.

I am stimulated -- I am not fully persuaded by Elliot Turiel's argument about the difference between

moral and social conventional kinds of behavior, but I am persuaded that too many things have been taken under the rubric of moral development and moral judgment which don't necessarily belong there and as a result of putting them in that box we have lost some important distinctions. I think Turiel brings those to our attention and demonstrates in really what is to me a very persuasive way that if young kids, kids as young as preschool, can make those kinds of distinctions, that they agree as much as they do with the judgments that adults make about those kinds of things -- that strikes me as a rather basic kind of distinction if it happens that early.

That brings me to the area of modeling and social learning theory, and since I wrote the paper I have become persuaded that one of the areas that I can send my graduate students to next is an attempt to really generate a developmental theory with modeling. It strikes me that you could really call Bandura's recent book SOCI. COGNITIVE LEARNING THEORY, and if you could stick "Cognitive" in there why not also stick "Developmental" in there. That may sound like an arbitrary use of concepts, but what I really mean by this is that I don't really think that Bandura in his most recent statement of what social learning theory is

is all that far away from a developmental point of view.

As soon as you get as many different attentional and retentional, motivational processes involved as he has, I don't think you can continue ever to beat Piaget and developmental theory over the head, as he tends to in that book. I think it's going to become clear eventually that some of these processes which he thinks are terribly important are processes which have strong developmental components. I don't think that has gotten the focus of attention it should have yet, and I am convinced that that is one of the more important ways in which schools in particular can influence kids in terms of modeling.

I was sitting next to Howard Mellinger at a conference recently talking about this and he said, "Good God, we'll go back to requiring that teachers not smoke or drink and wearing certain kinds of clothes so that they can serve as appropriate models for children." I don't know. Maybe that's where it will all end up. But in certain kinds of areas it seems to me that the process of modeling is a very important one, but it is not necessarily one that has to be set off as opposed to cognitive development.

Moving from that into altruistic, pro-social

behavior, I had a conversation about a month ago with Paul Mussen, who has done some political socialization research recently and, of course, has written this ROOTS OF CARING, SHARING AND HELPING book, which is about altruistic behavior, and he seems really not to put the two together. Again, I think that is almost symptomatic of part of the problem in Citizen Education. We haven't put those two aspects together sufficiently as yet. We have reference to cooperation and one thing and another, but we look at them as two separate domains and I'm not sure they are.

I think the whole area of altruistic, prosocial behavior is important and it's important in a way that goes beyond the psychological laboratory. These processes are studied and it's important to study them in controlled experimental situations. But it's also important to realize that when we move into an applied setting -- to use a school, for example, though it doesn't have to be a school --we are not so concerned with keeping all of these separate processes really separate. We are concerned with having an effect, and if modeling is one of the way we can have an effect, if helping children to label and rationalize their behavior can go on at the same time, and if we can help them learn something about perspective

taking all at once, we're not in the process of Citizen Education and we're not actually separating whether modeling is more important than something else. We're interested in getting the most effective possible combination of these psychological processes.

It seems to me that some of the hangups which have characterized some of the psychological research in this area we have to be cognizant of, but we don't have to be dissuaded from using these kinds of processes because of those particular hangups. We are interested in doing some kind of basic research on these these processes, but we're also interested in finding out how they might be used most effectively in classrooms or other kinds of situations.

I think that's what I want to highlight from my paper. I expect that everybody has read it, so I'm looking forward to comments.

R. HILL: I certainly enjoyed your comments and it helped me. After working in moral education for a while I think the key is perspective taking. Certainly we try to emphasize that in our educational programs. I am very interested in modeling. I think it's very powerful. I read the research and I don't know how to think

about it in those terms, but I can see some ways of engineering it in the schools.

Thank you for your comments and now I would ask the reviewers to make comments -- either to volunteer or have me call on you. I do ask you to hold to five or six minutes, so that then we can have a general discussion.

Let me change that. Would you like to ask some clarifying questions first?

K. DAWSON: I don't have the paper in front of me, but I was interested, Judy, particularly in your framework that you developed. I thought it was quite good -- your ability to draw from both the domestic and the international. I think that more work on that needs to be done.

Under "political community," which I think is your first heading and I don't remember exactly what you said, on international you had an appreciation of cultural diversity. I was wondering why that wasn't equally as appropriate under the domestic political community.

J. TORNEY: It could be, of course.

K. DAWSON: My next question is maybe one of clarification, and it's in the developmental area. One

of the components you mentioned was that of participation and as a political scientist I am most aware of some of the issues and conceptual problems in dealing with that, especially in the area of Citizen Education. Do you want to elaborate on that?

J. TORNEY: I feel the need to serve as a balance to the political scientists who have made participation the only important part of citizenship. That may be unfair in a sense, but I think that too many political scientists have made that the be-all and end-all, without exercising appropriate judgment about what kind of participation. to what end, in what way, motivated by what motivations, related to what organizations, and so on.

K DAWSON: I agree with all that. I just wondered why you didn't bring up some of those issues, and I think those are all pertinent issues, including the fact that for the most part we measure what is referred to in the sociological literature as conventional participation. And especially when you get into the area of international realtions you get into Red Brigade and other organizations that are certainly what you would call unconventional participation, and to assume that participation itself is a positive goal -- I think basically this

is the issue: what kind of participation. Obviously not all participation is equally valid.

J. TORNEY: Yet for many years I think we assumed that if we could get everybody active things would get better.

R. HILL: I would like to ask the reviewers to comment now. Professor Sjoberg, would you begin.

G. SJOBERG: As the odd person here I hesitate to begin the commentary. I am the only sociologist sitting around the table.

First a few comments upon that little diagram. As I read social science literature there are a number of kinds of behavioral scientists, so-called scientific social scientists (that I've heard discussed around the table) and there are others, namely, those with a critical orientation; and the third, a group that has received very modest attention except perhaps in political science and economics, are those who are interested in constructing or modifying existing arrangements in society.

I would submit that those individuals -- and I think you have only to look at the economic advisors -- begin to break fairly markedly from their data when they are faced with reality. You cannot assume that the past

is the basis for the future. The future is not a fact. Most social scientists have assumed that the future is going to replicate the past, and if we have known anything (we may not know very much) we certainly know that is false.

Moreover, in that particular diagram, if you're truly interested in constructing the future, either constructing new and alternative arrangements or modifying existing arrangements, then you're going to have to think about a different kind of behavioral science than I see incorporated in these papers, though there are suggestions to that effect.

More specifically with respect to the paper under discussion, I am certainly sympathetic to the issue of human rights, though I see some discontinuities between the sections. Part of this discontinuity arises from the fact that there is an assumption that there is going to be agreement on human rights. Certainly the east and west don't agree. The libertarian tradition of the west versus the collective tradition of the east on human rights is a fairly marked point of contention at the present time, and I don't see enough attention to that issue.

Another source of great concern -- and I'll keep playing this record throughout the discussion -- is

that there is no sociological context. When I speak of sociological context I would place great emphasis upon the fact that most children are educated within highly bureaucratized schools by teachers who are socialized into bureaucratic learning procedures even though they think they are free. In fact, I get a little worried when I hear that juvenile delinquents can't take the perspective of others; from their point of view they may do damn well. I'm not saying that's the only perspective, but they may be very, very smart. They may be Robin Hoods from their perspective, and you're defending the system and that troubles me.

The whole bureaucratization of the school system is the context in which this political socialization takes place. Also, you have a fragmentation of family life up and down the social ladder, and a fragmentation as well of the value system in American society, especially among the privileged groups; and within that context I am somewhat left at a loss as to how you're going to implement all this. The empirical studies from my point of view have almost nothing to say about the issues of bureaucracy, the fragmentation of family, the fragmentation of the value and belief system; and those are where the

issues and the actions are as far as I'm concerned.

Thank you.

R. HILL: Thank you. Very exciting.

Bob.

R. HOGAN: I thought the paper was a good summary of the materials in the state of the art in developmental psychology with reference to Citizen Education. I want to make that point perfectly clear. A number of critical thoughts occurred to me, but because of limits of time and the constraints we have here I'll make just one point and I'll make it several different ways.

These discussions of Citizen Education are shot through with social class biases. I have just finished a paper on the degree to which there are social class influences running through all sorts of social theory, so the subject is very key in my mind.

Citizenship education should tailor its message to its intended audience. Who is the audience? Most of the people in the world are not college graduates. Most of the people in America are not Ph.D.'s, as hard as some of my colleagues at Johns Hopkins may find that to believe. A physics professor told us that George McGovern was going to win the election because he talked to the

entire junior faculty in the physics department and they were all going to vote for George McGovern.

A hobby of mine is talking to working class people. I do that everywhere I go and I do it all the time, and what I find is that most people in America are deeply suspicious of politicians, deeply suspicious of the way this country is run, and deeply suspicious of where we're all going. Yet at the same time they are patriots, and that's a term that turns middle class blood cold. My father-in-law, for example, puts the American flag out every Sunday. Nonetheless he is deeply distrustful of what is going on in Washington.

Furthermore, I think there are good reasons for those working class people to be suspicious of those who hold the reins of government. So unless Citizen Education says something about this division, this obvious separation between the institutions of government that command patriotism on the part of working class people, you run the risk of discrediting your program from the outset.

The second point I would like to make is that this emphasis on social participation is certainly very important, particularly if you belong to the Kiwanis Club of Chestnut Hill, Pennsylvania, but it is not a very

important issue if you work at Sparrows Point or in the United States Steel in Pittsburgh. Disaffection from public participation may reflect an accurate perception of one's power to change the system rather than personal pathology.

My next door neighbor went down to register voters in Oakland, California in 1966. It was marvelous, but the only problem, though, was that most of the people she was trying to register had prison records and after a day of trying to register former prisoners she came back and said, "Not everyone is going to Berkeley."

A third point I would like to make is that cognitive developmental theory may not be the structure on which to build a model of Citizen Education, and for several reasons. It's a theory of the development of theoretical views, and as a result little attention is given to the actual behavior -- the way you appear moral or smart or rational or advanced in cognitive developmental theory is to be bright and articulate. The more articulate you are, the more moral sounding and smart. So it's a systematic bias built into cognitive developmental theory against working class children. I can document that with my own research, but we don't have time for that now.

That's the first reason. The second is that cognitive developmental theory endorses the Platonic hypothesis from Plato that that which is highest in the realm of abstraction is highest in the realm of being, and that which is highest in the realm of being is highest in the realm of value. There is no logical, empirical, or historical reason for adopting that assumption. That is just a particular bias which seems to run right through academic psychology.

There is absolutely no reason to prefer the abstract over the concrete. It's a middle class prejudice. Aside from the grave problems entailed in trying to define what abstract might possibly mean, consider the context of human evolution. My favorite example is from Roger Brown. Think of the primal father walking down the forest primeval with his family and here comes a tiger. What's he going to say? "Out?" That's a very abstract term. Or is he going to say, "Get the hell out of here. Run. Split." In other words, what is the viable response in the real world. Abstraction is a middle class bias.

In order to engage in formal operations or level 6 reasoning you have to have slaves -- people who pick up the garbage or wash dishes for you -- and you have

to have plenty of leisure time.

My third reason for objecting to cognitive developmental theory is the assumption that later is better may not be valid. I don't mean to be a Rousseau romanticist here, but just to say that maybe children are far more capable than we think they are -- that their problem is in performance and that they can't tell you what they know - although they know it.

I used to work as a probation officer and I found it extraordinarily difficult to fool or to lie or to shock little kids. A five-year old frequently knows exactly what you're up to. The problem is they can't articulate the nature of their suspicion. They know you're lying, but they can't tell you why.

And why is later not necessarily better? Take the study of friendship or how friendships evolve. Little children are very competent at striking up friendships, much more competent than most of the people in this room because of our inhibitions and biases and prejudices and guilts and fears, etc. If you want to watch pros at making friends watch little kids. That's an example of why later is not necessarily better.

Another example is the concept of fairness.

Little children understand the concept of fairness very well. And they'll yell "that's not fair" when they're watching television or watching cartoons. Adults are fairly jaundiced and fairly biased and are not nearly as keen on the concept of fairness.

Finally, this is a very liberal view, liberal in the socioeconomic sense -- that is to say, that development always inevitably equals progress. Development doesn't equal progress. Development can equal retrograde motion as well as it can progress.

The last point I would like to make about liberal biases running through Citizen Education is this view, this notion that conformity is pathological. That claims that people who comply with the law are somehow sick or are not very bright. It's a standard liberal prejudice, at least a hundred years old and probably more. It's really pernicious. You have to be an entrepreneur or a white collar criminal to be opposed to compliance. Society couldn't run if those poor old garbage men didn't go out to pick up your trash at seven o'clock in the morning, and it's only creative innovative scientists, real estate agents, and used car salesmen who can afford to be free-wheeling on the subject of conformance.

R. SIGEL: I don't know whether I should react to the two reactors.

R. HILL: Later. Now react to the paper.

R. SIGEL: The point of Judy's paper, which I found, by the way, very thorough, very up-to-date, and conceptually very well organized -- the point that intrigued me the most (she didn't highlight it today because she felt we had read the 58 pages, and quite rightly) and the one point that you already mentioned in your emphasis on global and on human rights -- first of all, I can't read my notes because I did them on the train and the train shook more than I had anticipated and, secondly, maybe I didn't realize there were going to be so many psychologists here and they can handle the psychological and developmental stuff better than I, so let me talk about the one or two things that maybe as a political scientist I should contribute.

You mentioned somewhere in your paper that we shouldn't just address ourselves to the explicit and formal curriculum, but also to the hidden one, and I think that's a very good point. I quite agree with the sociologists -- and on this political scientists are to blame, but so are psychologists for that matter -- that we have

not looked -- yes, we have looked, so I disagree with you there -- at the school as a social structure. I think there is lots of it in the literature about the hierarchy in the social structure in the school and all that. But I think we have not looked at some of the practices and some of the climates which contribute, I think, to what I would call bad citizenship training.

For instance, everybody has said that student government is poor, that it's mickeymouse, and all that. First of all, I agree with that and, second, the saddest part is that the kids know it.

The part that I find bad about some of the school practices which are pseudo-democracy is that I have data to show that the kids with the most leadership ability don't really go into student government and, secondly, that the kids who serve in student government have no better comprehension of democracy and are not better able to apply democratic concepts in dilemma situations.

The more serious thing is that if democracy is a worthwhile concept -- and even that is debatable -- then you shouldn't try to fool the people. I think when you say to kids "you can have your student government, but you can't make any decisions -- you can only ratify what

the principal lets you do" you create a sense of cynicism and hypocrisy which they're going to learn anyway and you don't need to institutionalize it as a good.

The second thing is that the schools in many of their practices violate the same things that the teacher in the classroom does. They talk about freedom of speech, they talk about freedom of religion, they talk about the right to privacy, freedom of the press, and then what do they do? They censor the school paper. The kids make a nasty comment about the basketball coach and the English advisor says, "That can't go in."

They make catty comments like, "You Catholics have another holiday. It must be good to be a Catholic."

These are practices which I think violate what they're trying to teach. Then I think there is an old, old study to refer to what you said abour replication. I think the two-track class system is still in existence. The one point I would make as a political scientist would be this one about the structure of the school, and I would argue that there are some things that kids can take control over and it would be much better, just as it would be in universities, if we would simply say that there are some issues in which they are not going to practice

democracy. "The state has rules here and for the time being we're going to live with it." Or the principal has rules, or the capricious teacher, or what-have-you.

I object to the idea of saying we're all very democratic. Just say where we can be democratic and say where we can't be. I think this is much better.

I notice you're looking at your watch, but I want to say that I strongly disagree with what you say about not necessarily the correctness of perspective-taking altruism -- and I would be perfectly willing tomorrow to elaborate on this if you want me to -- but I don't think citizenship training should be training for altruism. Citizenship training should be training for politics, and I don't mean just for government. It can be community training. It can be anything. Politics is conflict. Politics is who gets what when and how, and therefore it is not altruism.

The function of citizenship training is to make clear to kids what there is in politics through which they can actualize legitimate goals and how to do it. The reason that your working class people are cynical -- first of all, that's nothing new. You said they were deeply distrustful of government. We have data that Americans

have never trusted politicians, and that that has always been a dirty word. Only when they are dead do they become good.

One of the reasons is that our schools do not teach why government is relevant. We just teach that it is sort of an obligation for us to be good citizens, to maintain the system or to maintain the nation. We don't teach them what every corporation president, every labor union president does: the government can do something for me. I think that is a function of citizenship education. That is not being unpatriotic. That is simply saying government is there for you and that relevancy hasn't been made clear. Altruism doesn't help there, because if I take perspective in that sense I can say I can understand how Mr. Bakke feels that he wasn't accepted to medical school.

Perspective-taking can be very dysfunctional, and that's all I'm going to say right now.

W. McGUIRE: I liked both Judith's and Byron's papers and found myself writing comments and exclamation points and questionmarks in the margins all over the place. I would like to go over all the little points, but rather than that I'll try to concentrate on one main

thing. I'd like to go over your social learning thing, and whether or not teachers perhaps should wear more spiffy things, or certainly not have programs against smoking while a coach or a teacher or a principal smokes in the school.

I was also, like Karen, bothered by the diversity element just being on the international level, whereas if it's really a burning issue she could train people for consensus or for maintaining and appreciating diversity.

The point I want to concentrate on in connection with Judith's paper is her cognitive development, Piaget kind of emphasis, which did seem to me to be the biggest single section. The implication it has for me is that we should think perhaps of training children in the lower morality, sort of lowering their standards of social responsibility, morality, citizenship, and so on; that the problem now (to put it in the most pejorative term I can think of that wouldn't be unfair) is that children are priggish in their morality, aesthetically bothersome but still not any basic reason to change except that that priggishness makes them very vulnerable to terrible disillusionment that is almost inevitable and mostly they

pick up the pieces and work it out some way, but in bad cases cause either an apathy syndrome or a terrorist kind of syndrome.

You will remember that the problem with early stages of cognitive development according to Piaget and one's mother and everyone else is that children cen-- trate and they emphasize the main things and ignore everything else; that they are very egocentric and have difficulty seeing things in any perspective other than their own. We usually talk about these things for about age 10 and assume that by secondary school and college one is over this, but this is talking about the physical reality. When we talk about the political/social reality there has been less opportunity to manipulate and deal with that kind of domain of experience and I think these characteristics carry over.

The Berkeley revolting students weren't alternating generations with their parents, but actually were ones who had parents with the ideal that they are actually carrying out, but carrying out in ways that because they have such a high morality they don't see. People are imperfect -- they have to compromise, and so on.

What it means for curriculum, it seems to me, to teach the lower morality that is necessary to avoid

catastrophic disillusionment -- in specific social responsibility training there is the literature that Judith was talking about on training, on dealing with moral dilemmas -- what happens if a friend steals and you see him or her, and so on -- the counter attitudinal role-playing experiences would be part of this, to try and teach the other perspective as well as to see the shades of gray in moral issues.

Throughout the curriculum it seems to me we should throw in much more on the mixed morality in life, which we can do with some fear and trembling, but can do on the positive and show that Washington maybe beat his horse, or something like that, and understand that people do get frustrated occasionally and do that. More extreme is to teach heinous things. The worst thing I can think of at the moment is the Holocaust and you say, "You have to understand what went on there." This is very hard to do, and yet if people have this priggish morality they're up for a fall if they don't realize the other side in a moral issue isn't necessarily scoundrel. You have to sort of bring in a Hannah Arendt and a Stanley Milgram understanding of the Holocaust. The problem is that if you don't, if they haven't been immunized against inevitable

disillusionment, they're going to be hurt.

Most of us survive -- we're hurt all the time -- and build up a new morality and move out to the suburbs and quietly live our life, but some do become dropouts, get involved in drugs, etc. and others become arsonists and terrorists of various kinds. They may be creative, so I'm not ruling it out.

Then we have to teach or train children to become better change agents -- things aren't perfect all the time; have a whole curriculum on teaching children to induce social change. I would suggest some emphases like these.

R. ZAJONC: I was very much impressed with Judy's paper to learn how much there is really in psychology that could be useful in this area. I didn't think that psychologists had that much to contribute, but maybe it's because of my ignorance of developmental psychology and educational psychology. I was really very happy to see this, and prompted by this impression I tried to see just what the general problem of citizenship participation and citizenship education is -- what there is in the literature that one can look at to make some conjectures about the role of citizen education, general

education, and political action.

Since I am at the Institute for Social Research I was just going to another floor to get some data about this, and I have some here for you to look at. First of all, if one wants to take a look at the most effective aspect of political participation in voting, education certainly is a very major factor in the turnout. Here are some data on the last two Presidential elections on the turnout.

College-educated population votes to the tune of about 87% -- at least they report they do, whereas the grade school educated people vote only to about 57%. This is in the last two elections. That is very heartening, and the first conjecture from this kind of data is that if you want to increase political participation you simply want to increase the number of people going to college. That actually has happened, because the number of people going to college has increased markedly. Here are the changes in the college population over these Presidential elections.

Over the last seven Presidential elections from '52 to '76 you can see the number of people of voting age who went to college has increased from 15% to about

35-36%, whereas the people having only grade school education has decreased from 40% to 20%. So we have achieved that.

With these two figures -- first, that people who go to college are more likely to vote and, secondly, that the number of people who have a college degree has increased among the voting population -- we predict that the number of people voting in the United States should have increased over the last several elections. That is certainly not true. In fact, over the last several elections there has been a general decline in the turnout and from 1960 to 1976 there has been a very dramatic drop in the political participation, certainly in the voting.

If one were to calculate the turnout on the basis of the rise of college population among the voters, we should have nearly 85% of the people voting rather than 70%, as it was in 1976. Obviously, then, just providing general education and raising the educational level of the population is not a sufficient condition to increase this sort of political participation. One of the reasons, of course, is that the voting population has changed. There are many more younger people voting now than before, and young people are not as likely to vote as others. Secondly,

there has been a decline in the trust in government and there has been an increase in the doubt that one's vote counts, and things of this sort, and as a consequence the vote has declined.

However, one has to appreciate the fact that the turnout has declined in spite of the fact that the educational level of the electorate has increased tremendously over the last seven elections. This means that the negative forces working against political participation are much more powerful than the educational factors which are assumed here to work towards increased political participation or towards voting.

It seems, then, that at least these days if citizenship education is to take place it somehow must take the form not so much with respect to the traditional political values, but perhaps has to be more directed towards the idea that participation might have some effect, if indeed it has some effect and makes some difference for the individual.

This leads me to believe perhaps that it is not so much that we must teach attitudes first, expecting that the actions will follow, but perhaps we have to teach the actions first, expecting that the attitudes will

follow; that perhaps the first thing to do is to somehow make individual citizens believe that there are things they can do, like write to the Drain Commissioner and expect that things might be done, or go to a township meeting and find that something can be done. Maybe children in high school or in grammar schoool might have some project or some action that they decide on, and try to influence some small action within their community to see that in fact there is some effectiveness. It really doesn't matter what this action is and it really doesn't matter what their attitudes are in the beginning, as long as they have the trust that their action will have some political consequence. Later on with greater judgment and maturity they might develop the attitudes which are valued by the community.

It seems to me that perhaps the teaching of citizenship earlier should concentrate much more on the logistics and mechanics of political action than on the values and the attitudes and the beliefs in democracy and other abstract entities, which may not really have sufficient meaning to prompt any individual to concerted effort such as is required in going to the polls and pressing a few levers.

R. SIGEL: Could I just say something about voting. I am not quarreling with the charts you distributed, but there is one little thing missing (and that's because Michigan people -- and I don't mean you -- like not to talk about that): and that is that people with much more education, regardless of whether it's now or umpteen years ago, do exactly what you suggested in the participatory skill. The Michigan study concentrates so much on voting and not on communal and other political activities, and I think there is where education has a very high correlation: the better educated the person, the more organizations he belongs to, the more active he is, the more courage he or she tries to exercise.

I one hundred percent agree with you that the overemphasis on voting as the method, because of the well-financed every-four-year Presidential study, has created a lopsided impression.

R. ZAJONC: No. This is in agreement with the data, that educational level does help in participation in all spheres, voting and these other activities. However, over the last several years there has been a decline in all kinds of participation, political participation.

R. SIGEL: Not in organizational.

J. TORNEY: Most of the Michigan studies do not assess that.

R. ZAJONC: I understand that other forms of participation also have declined -- contributions and so on.

R. SIGEL: No. To the parties, yes. If you're talking about the parties, yes, but if you're talking about others, no. And, besides, voting participation is a very cyclical thing. Historically there has been high participation followed by low participation. But I just wanted to make that one point.

R. HIL: I would like to make a comment. I am impressed by both the quality and the variety of the comments, and I find them very valuable, but at this point I believe Judy must have some things she would like to say.

J. TORNEY: I thought you'd never ask!

On the point of cultural diversity and its role in the national and the international, I have done some work in that area, so that's why I was caught short for a minute when that was said to me. I thought: Why did I miss that? And then I realized that the way I look at this those two domains are separate in the sense that I am most concerned with getting American kids to start to project some of the international back into the domestic.

I have, I guess, in many ways viewed cultural pluralism and those sorts of issues in American education as helping kids to learn about the world, and those being kind of a projection of the international into the domestic realm. I am sure we could include that in this on the other side.

B. MASSIALAS: Would you put that as intercultural?

J. TORNEY: Yes. Intercultural and international to me so much link up..

My answer to your original point is that, yes, it could be included and perhaps it belongs there as an important basis of political community in this country as well.

K. DAWSON: Multi-ethnic.

W. McGUIRE: The diversity needn't be ethnic only -- like having your gender identity.

J. TORNEY: It's a whole other topic which Roberta has raised and which she can discuss another time. It is my belief that in the domestic area of American citizenship we stress consensus far too much. We stress that everybody agrees, that there is no conflict, that diversity is a bad thing, whereas in teaching kids about the inter-

national we do almost the opposite. We stress all war, all argument, all difference.

Kids get this strange kind of bifurcation of one as the domain of consensus and the other as the domain of conflict. I think we need to stress more of the conflict in the domestic system and the consensus in the international system. From my point of view that would be a better thing to do, but that's a whole other set of topics. Those have a very complex relationship to each other.

One could almost project still another dimension which dealt with conflict in each of those realms, that is, conflict in the sense of domestic loyalties, conflict in terms of international loyalties, conflict in terms of participation of different kinds.

I think you can make at least a three-dimensional or perhaps an N-dimensional space for that particular topology. For me it allows me to organize things in another way because I have become so disillusioned about laundry lists of objectives which are not organized.

I think in many ways Roberta raised the most critical issue: Do we believe that Citizen Education deals only with children's relationships to policy or to

policy from conflict, however that is understood? Or do we believe that the dispositions that are listed here having to do with respect and caring for others, and so on, are an important part of Citizen Education. If we can't give that question a yes or no answer, I think we certainly have to jump one way or the other on that question because I think that is a basic question. I believe one way -- you believe another, but I think that's a question which we ought to place high on our agenda for discussion. Otherwise you're going to end up with a murky framework, and you have to be able to justify either including those elements or not including them.

On perspective taking I would like to have it understood that I am not saying that after taking everybody's perspective you don't come down with an opinion of your own -- which I felt is what you were saying. I don't think there is anything wrong with understanding someone else s perspective and then making your own decision about the veracity of your own. But I think it's important to help people understand the other point of view.

R. SIGEL: I remember years ago when UNESCO was first founded a woman said that we always thought the reason the Russians and we did not get along

was because we didn't understand each other, but it's exactly the opposite. Once we did understand each other we realized that we didn't want to get along with each other.

J. TORNEY: It's that we didn't want to take that perspective to the exclusion of our own, and I think that's a good example.

I would like to know a little more about exactly how an appreciation of the social context, from the first set of comments, would really modify either the citizen -- this is another important issue we need to discuss -- how does the social context make a real difference.

I had a high degree of geographic mobility and I lived in the kind of suburb where the average resident lives there 18 months, so there is that kind of difficulty in building any kind of local sense of community in that sort of setting. If there is another dimension, we need to project onto both of the definitions we've had with those sorts of issues in mind.

Your reactions on the developmental bias are interesting. I also believe that higher is not necessarily better. Just because somebody shows an H trend up

doesn't necessarily mean that it's more valuable to be high than low in whatever that particular characteristic is.

I have a lot of questions about Kohlberg, too. I don't think that the moral education point of view necessarily constrains or contains all of the aspects of developmental, and I think from our discussion before dinner we may have more agreement than disagreement in this particular area.

Although we do disagree with the Russians on many subjects and there is a certain body of international human rights which are accepted by governments and are represented in internationally agreed-upon documents, at least there is a basis for discussion on certain universal rights and things which people are doing in almost all or all of the countries of the world are important. But that also is a whole other discussion.

R. HILL: At this point I would like to throw the discussion open for at least a brief period of time to anyone who would like to make some comments or raise some questions.

K. DAWSON: I would just like to comment about the point made about voting participation. When the 18-year olds were given the right to vote you increased

the pool. Voting participation tends to be age-related and there is a major jump after about 25 in terms of voting participation. You bring in the 18-year olds and increase the pool and the percentage goes down.

R. ZAJONC: Yes. I said that one of the reasons that the turnout has declined is that there has been a change in the composition of the electorate, but this change has occured simultaneously with a very dramatic increase in the educational level of the voting population -- which means that whatever forces in this change of the composition of the electorate existed, they overcame entirely the vast change in the educational level of the population, which has more than doubled at the college level. From '52 to '76 the number of college educated voters has more than doubled. That's a very, very large increase and a very large change in the population as well.

At the same time it's true that the young members of the population have been added to the population and they do not vote as much. It's difficult to determine just how much there has been a decline in voting associated with just a change of the composition of the population by adding the young vote and how much has been

due to erosion of trust in the efficacy of one's vote. That's a difficult thing. But for any age group and for any socioeconomic group the vote has been declining -- for all of them, not just the 18-year olds. The vote has been declining for 65-year olds and the vote has been declining for 40-year olds. It has been declining for everybody really, and perhaps the addition of the 18 and 19 year olds has produced a very dramatic change. You're right.

K. DAWSON: Also, party identification is a strong motivation to bring out the vote, and today more people have declared themselves Independents than Republicans. It gets into the meaning of voting and how meaningful that particular form of participation is and what that indicates. There is, I think, just the wide range of subtle and oftentimes not very well measured participation, and I think that's an area where very much more research needs to be done than just talking over the backyard fence.

There is a range of levels of participation that is never measured by survey instruments. Letters to Congressmen have gone up. There are certain kinds of participation that have shown increase, like organizational

membership, letters to Congressmen, etc. It's a question of what kind of meaning you want to put on that participation. I think that's a relevant question.

R. ZAJONC: I am simply seeking to establish the association between education and political action, and whether there is the assumed validity to the supposition that indeed you might increase political action, political awareness, political participation by educational campaigns and educational method. There is a tacit assumption in the United States and in many other western countries too that in order to remedy some social ill the first thing you do is to educate people -- that in order to rid our country of prejudice you have an educational campaign; that in order to do away with poverty or labor unrest you have an educational campaign.

I am asking how much truth there is to this assumption and how much evidence there is to support it.

R. SIGEL: Then I don't think we understood your question. There I am with you. I do think we misunderstood your question; at least I did.

W. McGUIRE: Isn't it a sort of straw person that you're knocking down, Bob? I don't think it has been the idea behind this meeting that one way of handling the

problem of social responsibility is to throw more education at it, like throwing more money at the South Bronx, or something like that. Rather the question is: For the given amount of education how could therebe better education for increased social responsibility? It hasn't been that sort of quantitative solution that we've been looking to.

B. PRESSEISEN: That raises a point I was going to raise with Judy earlier and I think it's something we certainly have dealt with at RBS. I am personally very excited by a cognitive developmental approach to citizenship. We've been trying to do something with Piaget for six years in social education. But I am also bothered by what this may tie to, and that is the Piaget framework or the cognitive developmental may be a very useful description of what happens or what does affect the child in the development of many things, including social development and orientation. The problem when you get to education and where we have run into difficulties is that a description is not sufficient.

You mentioned that you were not willing at this point to develop a sequence of sorts of what are the building blocks and when do they happen and what should be

the experience to build around those. At least insofar as the development of teachers and training of faculty, and so on, it isn't a descriptive approach. It's good to look at children through a new frame of reference and to listen and to hear their questions, and what-have-you. There is much more a prescriptive question asked: What do we do? Why? And how do we implement it?

To some extent the cognitive developmental approach in the sciences has been successful because there those questions and concepts and building blocks are very well known. The kinds of things you are raising with regard to voter participation or any other social development are not very well known. To go to Russ's original question, what are the concepts that come in the behavioral sciences -- that might be a timely question to ask. Can we really find these things, these concepts, out of cognitive developmental theory, and put them into a pedagogical kind of approach? Or what problems do we run into?

Very much the first one you run into is the cognitive and the affective intermingling. We hear at state meetings that it's fine to talk about minology -- we can name all the knowledges that are important -- we can talk about skills -- but when we get down to the relationship

of those and dispositions or even the affect from which you come, then you run into the kinds of things you were talking about that aren't successful in schools, where real issues can't be used for a variety of reasons.

I don't want to get to a position where you can't really use a theory that teaches people to think, or can we really use a theory that can be used to get youngsters to think and criticize. Maybe that's what we're here to get more information on. What experiences can we really relate to curriculum? What experiences are valid?

R. HILL: I think Judy asked you a direct question, to talk a little bit about the relevance of social context to learning. Would you be interested in responding?

G. SJOBERG: Let me pick that up tomorrow. I think this will probably come up in a number of things I'll discuss at that time.

R. HILL: Fine. Then I would like to exert the prerogative of a chairman and say that I have a couple of duties. First of all I would certainly like to thank Judy for her paper and thank the reviewers for the variety of points of view and for the questions raised that will keep us busy not only through tomorrow, but for several years to come.

One of my most immediate duties as chairman is to pick up the phone and call the desk and say "set up the bar in the library." There will be a slight delay after we leave here, but we would ask that if you want a drink to please leave a dollar on the bar, and this will help defray some of the costs of this evening. The government is not paying for the drinks and the arrangements are a little bit of a strain for us.

("Is that altruism or cooperation?")

Tomorrow we will have a second paper and then I will ask you to help as a whole group to brainstorm some items to be included in this area of behavioral sciences and ways of defining possible objectives. Certainly we'll want to get back and hammer at some of these issues that were raised. And then I'd like to end with a statement or discussion of possible research areas, and ways of getting at that, and, finally, as we work in schools ways of dealing with that.

We have to go ahead now and we want to go ahead now and make sense out of what is the most worthwhile use of very limited resources -- what are the most key questions that we might perceive as we proceed in the next three or four months in the schools.

We'll reconvene here at 8:30 tomorrow morning.

(The colloquium was recessed at 9:30 p.m.)

MAY 12, 1978, 8:30 A.M.

(Housekeeping announcements)

R. HILL: We would now like to begin and use somewhat the same format as last night. I began yesterday with, I think, a statement saying that the papers didn't do what I thought we asked for. I have heard from at least one author -- actually I've heard from both authors on that saying, "You didn't give us guidance on this and, furthermore, we think we have addressed some of the issues anyway. We think we've done more than you asked."

I think that's what these meetings are about. Certainly I plead guilty to not being as clear four or five months ago as to what we would like to have as we are now. So there is a dynamic operating there. I hope there is no feeling of blame or of criticism of the individual, but simply a statement. And let me go one step further. We need help in trying to do this kind of job, and if you don't think the kind of thing we're asking for or hoping for in this meeting is right, please feel free to tell us.

We're feeling the pressure of action in the field. We have to look at some instrumentation very shortly, for example, and I'll be telling you about that.

later. We have to say what will go into that instrumentation, and we need help to develop that kind of instrumentation that will form the basis for Citizen Education programs. We'll talk some more about that later. But we're changing in our point of view and I see this as an opportunity to talk with you.

Byron, you can go ahead now.

B. MASSIALAS: Russ and some of the others said that the purpose of your agency is to sort of mediate between the academic community and the practitioners in the school districts. I also see my role as doing that too. I am listed there as a member of the College of Education and I'm in the College of Arts and Sciences, and I look at my role as a person who relates the academic community and the research and teaching to the people in the classroom, where the action is.

So I look at this enterprise and I look at my task from that very perspective, which in some respects is on target with what you want to do -- to relate what is happening in research with what needs to happen in the classroom.

Let me begin by saying that I looked at your definition (which was the first task on the list that you

gave us) and I thought that it was a pretty good definition of a role, but like many definitions of citizenship it's just too broad to be meaningful. In some sense what you're saying here about Citizen Education or citizen education objectives is coterminus with objectives of all education, not necessarily Citizen Education. So if a definition does not really differentiate between education in general and Citizen Education in particular, then there is something wrong about it.

The problem of specificity of behaviors, specificity of objectives is a crucial one, and I think that is the one we have to deal with before we proceed to identify types of research and areas of research that we need to engage in.

When you turn to research itself, the research literature -- and I have looked at the political socialization literature and I have looked at the social studies education literature -- you find, again, that the behaviors are too narrowly defined -- there is only one behavior at a time that is discussed; and virtually in all cases the people who have done this type of research relate the behaviors to the functioning of the political system. If the behavior is supportive of the system, then

the agency that is influencing or generating that behavior is doing a good, not doing a bad job.

I think this stems from the preoccupation of political scientists primarily with the Eastonian model and systems theory which forges this relationship between education and the political system -- with conversion mechanisms and going through the system and exiting as decisions. The schools, for example, as they relate to the political system, one way of relationship is through political socialization, to socialize youth to support or reject the system. They socialize youth to impart demands of the system or impart support for the system. Usually schools impart support for the system and compliance with the system. This theoretical model, the systems model, has guided all the research that has been done in political socialization, and only systems-related questions were asked and there were systems-related answers.

We have not moved away from that, and in my paper I discuss the possibilities, which I have not really articulated. They are not within my field. Judy Torney talked about the cognitive developmental model and there are other models that would perhaps be more meaningful. At this time, however, for lack of a better theoretical

model, I would say that research that is conducted currently would still have to anchor itself to the Eastonian systems model, and the influence factors that they discuss. I have used the things that Jack Dennis uses in his book on Political Socialization to narrow it down.

For example, the personality of the actors interacting with people who are becoming citizens. They don't look at the teacher's personality. They don't look at major events. They don't look at what we call catastrophic events and their impact. They don't look at the classroom milieu, the classroom setting. So we have such difficulties in the literature.

[illegible] to discuss briefly, and perhaps that will help us to pinpoint the behaviors we're after and also see what the field can do in the way of program development, research and field work -- I want to discuss the following. I've been working for the past two or three years with a Title IV-C innovative project in Talahassee, Florida, where we are trying to define citizen behaviors, and given those behaviors to develop an intervention system in the schools that would strengthen and maximize those behaviors.

In so doing we draw from democratic theory.

We develop a conception of the school trying to create the active citizen, the school trying to create a civic culture which is consistent with democratic theory. We talk about the citizen as against the subject. The citizen is the one who participates in decisions that affect him or her as opposed to the subject who accepts the things that are made for him or her.

We operate under the democratic theory and we have developed, following Bloom's tables of specifications, a table of specs (on page 3 of the paper). We need not concern ourselves with the substantive domain, but the behavioral, which identifies basically three domains. I agree with Judy that you cannot separate them, that they overlap, but for the purposes of specificity and for the purposes of research I think we have to do that.

We identified three sets of skills or behaviors. We have the cognitive, and the cognitive skills are the skills that traditionally schools have attempted to impart, and they deal with understanding, with knowledge, with ability to hypothesize about relations, ability to test hypotheses, and so on. Educators talk about problem-solving.

The second area -- I think this is our area

of contribution, and maybe we are not dealing with generic skills but nevertheless we call them skills -- the second area are what we call participatory skills. Those are the skills that Roberta mentioned yesterday to be very important in a system where you are trying to influence decisions and you are trying to influence those decisions that affect you as a person, as a member of a group, as a member of a community.

These are the key skills that would enable one to understand how the system operates and begin to develop some knowhow, some expertise in participating in that system. These skills are observing, supporting, proposing, mobilizing, organizing. We have one here called cost-benefit analysis, which is an unfortunate term and turns people off. What we meant to say there is in a situation where decisions are made and there is an exchange whether the student can understand the net profit or loss of a transaction and what does he have to give up in order to gain something.

And then there is bargaining and negotiating, which only means that one can bargain and negotiate. We have something there called rule-making, and this comes from the classroom. Those of us who visit schools day in

and day out know that kids sometimes, either through instruction or independently, come to terms with their teacher or their principal or their peers, but somehow they cannot articulate, cannot formalize, cannot institutionalize their agreements. If there is such a way that you can teach them or provide the conditions for them to learn how you develop rules that are binding and are implicitly acceptable by all, that would be very important.

And then, of course, there is the traditional voting, which we think would be an important behavior for all people.

I should hasten to say that politics in our thinking is not the narrow process of trying to influence government or the structure. Politics in our concept is a very broad concept which connotes transactions between two or more people which seek to bring about a decision and a determination about how resources should be distributed. The transaction can take place in a small group, can take place in a classroom, can take place in a community; so politics or the political process is a process of human interaction for valued objects authoritatively allocated, in any situation -- not just things having to do with formal government.

Unfortunately, some of the political scientists who have conducted their research have a very narrow conception of politics, associating politics with formal government. There is a lot of politics going on in the classroom. There's a lot of politics going on in the family. There's a lot of politics going on in groups such as ours. There are transactions that issue in authoritative decisions.

The last category in my table of specs is "affective" and we divided this into three areas. The first of these areas is evaluative -- the ability of kids to identify issues and take defensible positions on those issues, provide groundsfor those issues. I know that dealing with issues is not the same thing as dealing with natural phenomena. And this comes from Almond and Verba, where they do have a cateogry called "evaluative." And then we have "normative" and "attitudinal."

The normative I think is a very crucial dimension. Judy yesterday talked about perspective taking. I don't know whether empathizing is part of it, putting yourself in somebody else's shoes.

J. TORNEY: There are some technical differences.

B. MASSIALAS: The normative is the dimension which provides individuals some standards of behavior. We're not saying that those are the standards of behavior for those within a democratic framework, although they would probably be acceptable. We're saying we're training kids to participate, to influence decisions, to manipulate the system if you will, to try to get the best deal for them; but we also want them when they do that to be guided by some ethical and moral standards.

We don't want to produce little Machiavellis who manipulate the teacher and everybody else regardless of the consequences to the others. That's why it is very crucial and I think that's why we're departing a little bit from Indiana University -- over there it's understanding the system, manipulating the system to your advantage, and you get the personal benefit or the group benefit.

However you define the moral/ethical standards I think you ought to apply them to your participatory behavior.

In "attitudinal" are the areas that the political socialization people have emphasized. They say that formal training, non-formal training should issue in higher political interest, social interest, more trustful

and less cynical, more efficacious, more having a sense of internal control. We think that students going through a program which I am going to describe briefly ought to have those attitudes, those orientations towards their environment strengthened.

We have cross-cultural awareness in here (I don't know if that's the right place for it) meaning that you become sensitive to other cultures, to other ethnic groups, and you begin to understand them and empathize with them.

We have taken those under this Title IV-C project, which we have had now for the third year, and we have gone to a new school in Tallahassee and we have tried to develop a system in the school which would use the school as a place which provides natural settings for participation in decisions. The school is the natural place for decisions because all kinds of decisions are made. It happens the minute you enter the school bus as a kid with all the rules on the school bus that you have to abide with, and you have no say how those rules are constructed, no appeal mechanism usually -- to the minute you arrive in school -- to the minute you walk through past the principal's office -- to the time you open your locker

to get your books (you might have two or three kids sharing the locker at the same time) -- to the time you go to the classroom -- to the time that you are seated and where you are seated -- to the time that the teacher decides to recognize you -- to the time that the teacher decides to let you go to the bathroom -- to the time that you are given an assignment --to the time you go to the cafeteria -- to the time you go through the line: there are thousands of decisions in the daily life of the students in school in which they have no access, in which they cannot participate.

They cannot participate, I think, because they just have not internalized the concept of participation, the notion that they can participate, the notion that those decisions are man-made; that those decisions are not unchangeable, that those decisions can be controlled, that those decisions can be changed, that you can have an input in those decisions.

With our program we have tried to develop, as I said, the system of modules that would attempt some of the key decisions that are made in schools and some of the key decisions that are made in the classroom -- for example, assignments, selection of textbooks, seating

arrangements, rewards and punishments, decisions about who goes to the front office, who selects certain activities, who selects certain programs. We have developed modules. These are curriculum modules that provide the teacher and the students the entry point into the decision-making apparatus in the school, and those modules try to do two things.

They try to show the kids either through case studies or through real happenings how the decisions are made, how one goes about to identify the gatekeepers, how the gatekeepers operate. Once we have identified the decision-making process in their own situation, then we try to provide the kids the skills to input into those decisions.

That is how the program was conceptualized. The departure from the Indiana University project is that that project picks the students at the 12th grade level -- and according to Judith Torney and other authorities maybe that is too late for developing a sense of participation, for creating the active as opposed to the passive citizen, because as you grow older you need to have more and more powerful environments to change base for orientation.

Not only do they do it at the 12th grade level, but they only do it in social studies. Just to do it in one subject one hour a day and disregard all the other things that are happening, all the other decisions, is absolutely of no value. In study after study, all the other people who have studied the relationship between formal civics courses and any of those indices have found virtually no difference between those who had civics and those who had one or two courses or had none.

We think of the whole school as a laboratory for participation and training for real life experiences, and we don't just look upon the social studies teacher who was traditionally thought to be the main agent of civic education. We don't think just of the social studies teacher, but we think of all the teachers. We think of all the school actors. We think of the teacher aides. We think of parents who are involved with schools. We think of the administrators certainly. We think of the peers, of all the students. We think of all of these people that would participate in this decision-making model.

We started this two years ago. We still don't have results because we took the middle school, which starts with 6th, 7th, and 8th. Since this is the

second year we are in the 7th grade with those who were in the 6th grade last year. If we get the funding we'll go for another year to see what happens within these three years. Some of the preliminary results tell me or the quantitative measures that we have show me there is a significant increase on those variables that are crucial, but also that the subjective accounts of teachers, principals, guidance counselors in terms of how the students behave, how they feel, what they say in the classroom -- that that can certainly be overwhelming.

I don't know whether that is the effect of the new program, the newness of it, or whether it's the actual effect of the participatory model that we introduced. Certainly in going back to the literature we have found differences in some areas. We have studied the school and the family and we have found, for example, that the family basically imparts partisanship. The modeling of the teacher maybe has something to do with it, reinforces passivity among students.

We have looked at what is, but we have not really looked at what can be or can happen. To go back to Robert Sigel again and some of the discussion here: How do we know what is good in the direction if we agree

on the objectives? Here is where we need to have some intervention systems and experimental designs, and here is where the psychologists come in, and here is where we need not only design but also theory.

Let me quote from a very good book that you may be familiar with: Schwartz and Schwartz, NEW DIRECTIONS IN POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION. They give some new directions and I want to close with reading some excerpts from here:

> First, we believe that the individual being socialized plays a far more direct dynamic and important role in political socialization than has been recognized. The traditional model for the socialization process poses a one-way flow, flow of information and transfers from the socialization agency to the individual. The socializee thus becomes a passive recipient for their socializing stimuli.
>
> We argue that this view too largely ignores human motivation, the attitudinal context in which a socialization stimulus is perceived and interpreted, and a wide area of individual characteristics that influence people's willingness and capacity to respond to socializing influences.

Second, we are arguing for a greater emphasis on process rather than on what attitudes are learned. A process focus concentrates attention on how, when, and under what conditions political attitudes are acquired and relates variations of these operative processes to variations on the impact of evaluatives.

We therefore argue for greater emphasis in socialization research on dynamic models explaining rather than describing what attitudes are acquired under what circumstances and in what effect.

Then they say: We further suggest that our conceptualization of the process of socialization can and should be made more rigorous by applying a variety of well developed process models from psychology and elsewhere, including a variety of learning theories, human development models, and (?) process models.

Third, we urge the broadening of research topics beyond the traditional age groups and socializing agencies. We need to study younger and older age groups to develop a more comprehensive picture of socialization patterns. We need to move also beyond the family

and school and occasionally the press and the peer group to identify other sources of potential socialization stimuli. Particularly important here are socializing agencies that may be characterized by non-consentual values. Actions within the political system itself can influence socialization.

They argue for a series of dynamic interactions.

R. HILL: Thank you.

I'd like to make a couple comments, first on the work you are doing in the schools. I think that the conceptualization and a lot of the hard work that you are actually doing, you and your associates in Tallahassee, are what we consider a model for direction and we would like to explore whether or not it would actually in the long run have effect. We don't know. But to think of the schools, the whole social system, the citizen education as something much more than simply what happens in a social studies class is the way we want to go. We think we're receiving a great deal of support for this, support from states. We're getting support from community people and from school people. They see social growth, learning.

They see it as a broad thing.

They're willing to look at their discipline systems. They're willing to try to involve parents. They're willing to try to involve -- for example, we've been talking with the schools about the fact that research teams indicate that some kind of authentic social roles is one of the most powerful socializing factors for kids, and can we create more authentic social roles. We're getting that kind of response, so it's much broader than you're doing it.

One of the things we want to do is look at what you're doing and what other groups are doing and try to re-engineer and maybe research them building on the models and the prototypes that you've done. So we certainly welcome you and your work on that basis.

I do have some questions myself and I invite others to raise clarifying questions on the paper. I would like to begin the questioning by simply asking for some help on the left hand dimensions. I'm not sure what happens on the intersection here. Take power, for example. What happens when I go across to supporting or mobilizing? Mobilizing makes sense, however.

B. MASSIALAS: This stems from Ben Bloom.

He has come up with a position that instruction and learning can be presented in a two-dimensional matrix and in one direction are the behaviors (that we might call skills) and in the other is the substantive dimension or the content. The content dimension can be math or can be science or whatever. Because it relates to participation and the political system I chose to use this as an example. If you take the Eastonian conceptualization of different systems you have an ecological system, you have a biological system, and you have an intersocietal system, and you have an economic system.

It is the intersection of those two dimensions, the cells, that generates a whole sequence of instruction. The intersections generate objectives and they generate units of instruction and they generate curriculum and they generate methods and they generate evaluation.

You said power -- political scientists talk about how power is allocated and assumed and distributed in a society -- when you look at the cognitive domain, at making distinctions or hypothesizing about power relations in a society, your objective would be if you are looking at that cell 4-E for the teacher to generate an objective

that the lesson ought to create a condition so that the kids will understand or will begin to hypothesize how power relations occur in society, how power is related.

With that objective the teacher can proceed to develop a sequence, or lesson; can proceed to provide springboards of material; can provide an instrument to evaluate whether that objective was realized.

I think I don't do an injustice to Bloom when I say that, that that's the way the system works. It's the intersection of the content of instruction with the behaviors that are sought to be taught in connection with that content.

R. HILL: Now let's take proposing and citizen participation. What would that look like?

B. MASSIALAS: Let's say you're proposing a new rule or you are proposing a new means of participating in a decision of changing an unfair teacher or punishing an unfair teacher. You are coming up with a proposal. It's harder to do it in the participatory than in the cognitive.

R. HILL: Any other questions of information? Any clarifying questions? If not, we'll start with Zajonc.

R. ZAJONC: In reading both of these papers,

and especially the last one, I was struck with the level of generality and inclusiveness that characterized them. I went back to look at the definition of Citizen Education to find the reason for this, and indeed it seemed to me that these papers did address themselves to the level of generality in which the definition of educational objectives in Citizen Education were given.

Byron said that Citizen Education is like education in general. He really was addressing himself very explicityly to the statement on this yellow page of the definition, and some of these things are really so general that one wonders if we need to have more than some constraint about producing intelligent, honest, concerned people, and that perhaps may be the goal of general education.

In the area of skills, for example, it says "inquiry skills, which enable learners to select, organize, evaluate, and use information, with special, but not exclusive, reference to problem-solving and decision-making." That is a fairly general objective, It has certainly no special significance for political participation on any sort of national, international, or domestic level. It is a necessary condition to be an intelligent, well-informed

citizen, but that's good to be whether one is a good citizen or not. This is also good for crooks and embezzlers and all kinds of other people who have certain goals and want to go about their business efficiently. And the same is true with interpersonal skills and action skills.

It seemed to me that perhaps there is some problem, some ambiguity in the objective, because if we really want to think about means and ways of producing educational opportunities and methods and systems, then we have to be very clear what the end product is that we desire. What is the ideal citizen that we want? What is it that we want to produce by this education? What does a person that is the most desirable citizen look like? That is not clear. We are not entirely sure that we know that.

Why don't we know it? Perhaps there is a reason why the ambiguity is almost forced upon this definition. It seems to me from reading some of these papers and statements of purposes and some other statements of this group that Citizen Education is like sex education to a large extent. In sex education we like to give enough information and skills and abilities and concerns to prevent sexual difficulties of various kinds later on, but we don't want to change sexual morality; so we have a very

careful and sort of gingerly walking the tightrope between giving information which is just sufficient to avoid all these nasty difficulties, but not have a community in which teenagers are exploring various forms of new activities.

With Citizen Education perhaps there is some similar component there. For example, does the group or the class or the population that is in power or major part of the population -- is this group really interested in spreading political sophistication to all the groups in the community? Do we all want everybody in the community, in the society, to have access to political knowhow and have knowledge about how to influence governmental and civic groups, and so on?

Again, we would like to have some form of education which enables people to participate nicely, but we don't want education which would promote rocking the boat by some groups. Some groups may use the sophistication to subvert the government, to change the system, to modify certain aspects of our political life.

There is a question here, which arises in my mind at least, that if there is a concern with Citizen Education there may be some units, some parts which are common and acceptable to all groups, but then there is a

question about responsibility for this education. Where should it rest? Who should have this responsibility with regard to some particular interest groups? These interest groups may want to keep responsibility for some forms or some aspects of Citizen Education -- certain values, certain forms of political influence. It is not a foregone conclusion that this kind of education should be distributed equally or provided by the community as a whole. At least one has to be aware of the fact that we cannot impose -- or perhaps this is a strong word -- the educational system which might arise to promote Citizen Education may not be acceptable to the society or to all groups of the society.

It would also seem to me that we really are not talking about learning so much. I think we are talking about relearning. I think people have Citizen Education. They have concepts of political systems. They have notions of the government. Even young children have some theories about what constitutes political influence. It is really a matter of changing them rather than building new ones. They are not totally ignorant.

In order to change them one has to know what they are, so perhaps some form of research should take precedence here, namely, to establish or determine

what are these implicit theories of political action that people carry around in their heads, just like there are some theories of economic behavior or economics that people carry around in their heads. They have some idea of what produces unemployment or inflation, and so on, and they may be wrong. So perhaps that might be some form of a beginning for research, and once this is known perhaps a more intelligent program can be developed about which aspects of it might be changed.

W. McGUIRE: Bob was mentioning implicit political theory in the heads of children and other people connecting it with implicit economic theory, with the hidden agenda being implicit personality theory as being very flamboyant right now. It reminds me that Katonah has dealt with implicit economic theory of economists and of people, and finds out they're very different, so supposedly the economic metric model hasn't been working terribly well over the last six years. It says that with inflation you should run out and spend, but actually the people's economic theory says quite the reverse. So possibly that would be a good approach.

Both of the papers struck me as very good tours of the horizon. There were two or three themes in

in Byron's very provocative paper that I felt I wanted to talk about, but I doubt if I'll have time to say much even about one of them. One would be the agenda-setting function of Citizen Education and another would be Citizen Education as training as change agents rather than as people who can fit into the system and, thirdly, the intrinsic conflicts within society and the necessity of dealing with that.

On the agenda-setting function, I was left with a feeling of negative outcomes from some of the data you were reviewing -- effects of curriclum and of other things -- political generation, hypothesis, and so on. It seems to me there is an analogy to the mass media effects in the political domain, where ever since Gladesfeld and those other people in the '40s dealt with the impact of mass media, face to face communication in the political domain and their findings were zilch. The newer look in the effects of the mass media (in other attempts to get money to support research on the topic) is that maybe mass media don't change anybody on any issue, but they change what issues people take into account when they make their political decisions.

It seems to me that the evaluation of the

citizenship programs should go into that dependent variable measure, not whether anybody's stand on issues changed if you asked them where do they stand on that issue but rather what issue do they make their decision on the basis of. So granted from fathers to sons (to use the Turgenev sexist title) there isn't much change or there isn't an alternation of generation hypothesis (as Carl Monheim, or somebody, said) and yet the generation of the '40s (1840s in his case) or the Eisenhower generation does seem to have different attitudes.

If you actually give them an attitudinal inventory it turns out they have about the same distribution, with perhaps a few percentage points difference from the preceding or following decade. But if you ask more open-ended questions perhaps, you would begin to elicit differences in what issues are responded to.

I think, then, that in the evaluation program in addition to having structured attitude questions you probably should say "what I think of power" or whatever particular key concepts are in.

On the change agent business it seems to me that however much we pontificate -- with Carl Popper's open society and Don Campbell's experimenting society --

we are trying to produce change agents. When you come down to evaluating Citizen Education programs I think there must be a tendency in the system to measure whether people learn the right thing about what to do if they find five dollars in the street. We should really be a little more open on that, as to whether or not we are going to train people with skills to change values.

Here I think you have to teach not only a willingness to be a change agent -- which is a bit of a problem because I do think children are overly conservative -- but also to have them have the skills and the success experience at being change agents. If the curriculum modules give them some experience on how you identify unfair teachers, what they learn is it doesn't make any difference because you can't do anything about it, and it would be an extinction trial rather than a learning trial.

The school has to be willing (though no school I was ever in would have anything to do with this) to let the children change things when they have these modules of how to change.

J. TORNEY: I would like to ask one clarifying question. Would you care to pick an optimal proportion of children for functioning in the next generation who

ought to be trained to be change agents? Certainly you are not suggesting that 100% of the next generation should be changing, are you?

W. McGUIRE: Byron says that in a sense if you train diffuse acceptance of the system you are perhaps training people to make decisions for the system against their own personal interest. I don't think so. Actually I think what you may be doing is, in Freudian terms, doing reality principle or Michellian delay of gratification. You're not teaching them to sacrifice their own interests for the system, but to recognize that stability is a value to learn, that by sacrificing temporarily they will keep the system stable and make gains.

On the other side, that change is good, you have Byron Meinhoff on youthful terrorists -- we don't even know what they want -- and Marcuse, for an elderly child -- they deliberately insist they do not want to define what the future is, except that they want change -- to clear away the old and leave room for the new to grow. That sounds beautiful, but I wouldn't want too many of my colleagues (Marcuse was enough all by himself) to be that way.

I think possibly we are living in a more

disturbed time, although the ordinary state of society is more stable. Popper points out there have been like 111 years in the 6,000 years since He created the world that have been open to change. So rather than the problem being how to teach people to conform, I think, the constant press should be -- I wouldn't want to give a number -- to encourage people to be change agents, to let them see that they have some effectiveness; and therefore avert the two terrors of apathy, dropping out, drugs, etc. on the one hand, and mindless disturbance to get kicks or to leave room for the new to grow on the other hand.

B. MASSIALAS: What about being highly cynical and turning off from the system?

W. McGUIRE: That's the big middle field.

B. MASSIALAS: They don't take the opportunity to just participate in anything.

W. McGUIRE: Denying cynicism is what Dr. Goodaw terms a move to suburbia and looking after your own garden.

R. HILL: This refers back to the point made previously that maybe the people in society want that and leaders don't want the kind of education we're beginning to suggest for change agents or active political activism.

I think it was recently quoted in The New York Times or one of the major papers that some commission made the point that there is too much participation and that we've got to reduce this. That may become international policy of our democratic governments at this point. It was clearly and strongly voiced.

B. MASSIALAS: What was?

R. HILL: That we have too much participation in the democratic process, that we want less participation by people.

B. MASSIALAS: Participation in government-related institutions?

R. HILL: That's correct.

B. MASSIALAS: We are talking about participation in a broader sense.

R. HILL: In all things really.

R. SIGEL: Let me just pick on a few things in the paper. I think it's a very thorough and very good review of the literature, although I think I ought to fault you a little bit -- or maybe it is not your fault -- because some of your criticism, which was very well taken, has been taken care of but they haven't put the studies in book form yet. The transmission valve that you so aptly

criticized -- in other words, that kids are like an open vessel and the teacher pours stuff in -- I think that has been challenged quite severely. And here I would like to make for a minute a somewhat practical solution.

I think children and young people teach old people. We only have to look at how differently we look at sexual mores now, hair styles, and all kinds of other things than we did 20-30 years ago. One of the things I would suggest if I were in your boat and had to suggest Citizen Education programs would be for teachers to permit themselves to be influenced. In other words, for this to become a two-way transmission belt (if you want to use that term), teacher training needs to be very, very different because theysort of feel very much (and I hear this coming through here) that they are one of the representatives and guardians of certain community values and standards and we almost threaten teachers when we say, "Keep an open ear to what the kids are telling you -- that maybe working hard and getting to the top is not the epitome of success."

Sure, teachers have all the verbiage, but the idea of letting yourself be influenced -- that is one of the things that has to be part of any experimental program or laboratory program in any school system. I

would work much harder on the teachers than on the students. Being a parent myself I don't have an idealistic image about the little dears -- it might be little savages, but so are teachers; and I would spend a lot of time on that.

I quite agree with you that the school is a total laboratory, not just a civics classroom. You talk about keeping the kids from being cynical and distrustful. I can substitute two different words. I can say that being political cynical is assuring healthy skepticism, and being trustful is being gullible. We tell a kid when he buys a used car not to trust the car dealer, and when he goes into a store to count his change. We've done a tremendous amount of consumerism trying in the schools and other areas to educate people to be smart and skeptical and not to believe the message.

I think the one thing that school systems are afraid of, what commissions of education are afraid of is that they will make a bunch of wild-eyed, Red Brigade radicals if you make them cynical or skeptical. I think basically most people are "patriots" or nationalists. We don't have to worry about making them un-American, but what we have to worry much more about is that they expect too much of government.

I think one of the things we say to teachers is that if kids question this or that it's good, but that the teachers should discuss with them why this may be so and how it can be changed. And that is one of the hardest things. I've worked a lot in connection with my book with students. Students are very, very critical. Of 20 things there are only one or two that the majority think the United States is doing a good job on. So you can say, "Oh, my God." But when we ask them "Are you proud to be an American?" of course they say yes; and that's a kind of dumb question for a political scientist to ask.

When we ask them to value where the United States stands with regard to certain achievements these kids know. They will say that on some of these things we are better than others and on some we are worse and on some we are like others.

I am not questioning whether the gentleman is right or wrong. What I am saying is why are we so afraid of alienation, of lack of patriotism in the schools. Why can we not say that kids can be and should be, if they want later on to become effective citizens, cynical, suspicious, and critical? The fear that teachers have of criticizing the government -- I've had schools that didn't

want me to write up the results for fear that the Board of Education will say that they've educated a bunch of commies, or wild-eyed this or that. I think we should not, if we set up programs, feed into that. We should feed into showing the relationship between being pro-American, if you want to use that term, and at the same time critical.

I think one of the reasons the whole Watergate thing left us with such a distaste and shows how low in affect the whole population is is because we expected too much. When we found out that our President didn't act any more morally than the President of General Motors or of the Teamsters Union it was horrible. I don't think they should act like this, but I'm saying that we should not expect either of them to act as if they were in Sunday School.

Let me make one more point. I think your point about the terrible tie-ups in the Eastonian system is absolutely right, and the problem is they are blaming educators and psychologists. You should never let political scientists struggle with the subject of political socialization because, unfortunately, most of those who did it -- that is not the case any more, but most of those who did it came out of the Chicago school. Easton does not

have the standing in our own field than he has with psychologists and educators who have adopted him.

QUESTION: Who is Easton?

R. SIGEL: David Easton. He is a political scientist. He is a weak adaptation of Parsons.

As a result of that emphasis political scientists have asked dumb questions. I mean the questions we've asked like "What do you think of the President?" or "What do you think of a policeman?"

I would like to say one thing about your paper and then I will stop because I have a lot more practical things to say. I am wholeheartedly in favor of what you and Judy say about global research and generational research and all that. And, by the way, a lot of that is being done. Some of what you say, for instance, about sex differences no longer holds. There is new data that do show that there is a difference between boys and girls that is diminishing very rapidly.

The problem with some of the global cross-national research is that methodologically it's very, very difficult. For instance, you talk about partisan identification in the United States as well. Partisan identification abroad means identification of the social class very

often in some countries. So even when we use the same analogous terms we are not dealing with the same animal, and while I am all in favor of cross-national research I think we have a validity problem that we ought not to overlook.

Secondly, we have not only the validity problem, but we have another problem. I've talked at the University of Berlin and Heidelburg about affirmative action and women and the law, and all these women sat there and nodded their heads (it was all wonderful) until towards the end (and that shows you how insensitive we are as researchers) we realized that what they meant by affirmative action is the legal status of women -- the right to vote, the right to divorce, and so on -- and they had no idea what we meant by affirmative action.

I think we've got to be very, very careful when we talk about that.

The third and last point I want to make is that none of you have addressed yourselves to the discontinuity in what the school can do about the value system at home and in the school. There is a tremendous discontinuity in many, many areas based on religion, based on ethnicity, based on economic circumstances. How o you

solve that in a school system which allegedly is responsive to and supported by the taxpayers, where the parents more and more are beginning to think they own the schools. And I am not talking about textbook controversies. It's when you teach the kids one thing at home and teach the kids another thing at school.

Most teachers don't even know that these kids listen and give back the answers that they want to hear on a multiple choice question which is in conflict with their values. I think that is something you ought to address yourselves to in Citizen Education.

R. HILL: Thank you. I'd like to respond to your last point. One of the investments we're making this year is in an ethnographic study of community experience of children and in school, to really see what is happening -- what the attitudes really are of children, what the leeway is, what their perceptions are, and what is happening in the home.

R. SIGEL: May I give one little illustration. This is an experience of one of my colleagues, Sandy Schwartz, in a college which is supposed to cater to not only minorities but to urban kids. It has 20% minorities and the rest are very largely ethnic, first generation

college. She asked them to write a political socialization autobiography and she was flabbergasted. The largest group of the white ethnic kids made the central theme of their autobiography their feelings about liberalism and race, saying that they knew that the college emphasized lack of prejudice, and they knew that the chic thing was to be accepting of differences, and that they had learned to adopt a protective discoloration -- that's not the word I mean, but they didn't say anything classic, kept quiet, but mentally they carried on long discourses with the instructor and, as they said, with the overtly liberal kids.

This is what I am arguing.

R. HILL: That's what we have to begin to get at and won't know about.

R. SIGEL: This is our radical college that wants to name itself Paul Robeson College, and this is what the students think.

R. HOGAN: First I want to compliment Professor Massialas on his paper, which I thought was a very well written, systematic, nonpartisan, almost non-ideological overview of the literature on political socialization as it applies to Citizenship Education. I thought it was

great and I essentially agree with his major conclusions. I really found very little to criticize in the paper or comment about it, but what it did do was force me to think a good while on the whole business of Citizenship Education.

There was a theme that kept occurring to me. I've done a fair amount of reading on this on my own as a hobby, and it seems to me there is an ingredient missing from most of these discussions of Citizenship Education which is worth mentioning because, on the one hand, it represents something one can do in a practical way in terms of doing Citizenship Education, and it also represents a methodological purchase point in the sense that you can assess.

The problem is the element of ideology, of large scale political analysis, of justifying what we do and when we do it. Any adequate theory of anything has to be able to account for its own (?) theory and Citizenship Education often turns on the theory of democracy by trying to account for its own (?) theory.

When I was in high school it was the time when Eisenhower was talking with Khrushchev, and Khrushchev said to Eisenhower one time, "The problem with you Americans is that you don't have a theory to support your politica

system and Eisenhower said (and he said this in public and I've thought about it a great deal), "I think that's right." It wasn't because he was dumb that he couldn't answer the question. Actually we don't, and there are all sorts of historical reasons why we don't. There is a very low level of political debate, it seems to me, even in The New York Times.

There are a number of issues that could be raised in classrooms and issues that could be assessed by researchers. We rarely ask what's the point of having a government in the first place. You could ask kids that and you might get some interesting responses. I think you could legitimately address that issue, and it's not at all obvious what the answers are. I think if we were to go around this room with that question there would be a substantial amount of disagreement. There would be very little agreement, I think, on a simple question like that.

The second point one could deal with is the nature of the relationship between the individual and society. What is the nature of that relationship? That really does get at the heart of the political assumptions, and, once again, I doubt if there would be much consistency in this room.

The third issue that one could get at that runs through all these studies of political socialization is that democracy is somehow preferable to its alternatives. How are we going to legitimize that claim? Why not have some discussion about how to legitimize that claim?

That I think is really a problematical point. I am not raising it gratuitously. What are the principles to which we're going to appeal and how valid are they when you try to justify democratic political ideals?

Given a world of increasing scarcity, diminishing energy supplies, increasing population, a number of writers are saying that all of us, good liberals that we are, sooner or later are going to have to come to terms with a new definition of authority. And I'll bet that's true.

A fourth issue that can be raised for discussion and used as a tool for assessment is the nature of political authority: Where did it come from? Does political authority come out of the gun barrel?

Let me tell you about something which happened at about the end of the student revolution. We have at Hopkins a major quadrangle where there are some old elm trees which are dying of Dutch Elm Disease. The University

hired a fellow to come out there with a big Diesel-driven pump and he was spraying these trees with insecticide. If you knew what was going on you could understand why they were doing it, but one very freaky looking student thought that this workman, who was obviously blue collar and workingclass and a boob, didn't understand the problems of environment and pollution and so he went out there and tried to stop him. He gave this guy a long discussion on environment and ecology, and so on, and the workman just kept right on spraying the trees. The kid harangued and harangued and finally went over and turned off the pump.

There were several people watching this incident. As the kid reached over to turn off the pump the workman turned the nozzle on him. I thought it was very funny; everyone else was appalled. Right there was a question about the basis of authority for your actions. The kid was outraged. He thought he had sufficient moral outrage to legitimize what he did in a physical way, but what he didn't understand was that this lower-class guy didn't share his biases. You could see the clear discontinuity of values.

The fifth issue has to do with human nature, the views of human nature and the political system. If we

as self-conscious social scientists know anything about human nature, then we ought to be able to say something about the kind of political system that is best adapted to constructive human nature. That's the kind of thing you can talk about in class. Kids like to talk about that.

Finally, you can have some discussion on the nature of human rights. We talked a fair amount about human rights last night here. People really seem to adopt some variant of the natural law theory that there are inalienable rights, and so on. But there are alternatives to that perspective. I personally don't adopt that view. I don't even undertand it. But you can have discussions around that.

All of these seem to me to be proper areas of concern for citizenship education. I think they can be discussed more often than is done. They can be discussed in a non-ideological fashion.

Kids work better if you give them the big principles first and then give them the details.

G. SJOBERG: Let me pick up on what I was clarifying last night. I have no quarrel with the analysis of the material within the framework within which it was cast. I would like to open up the framework a good deal

more and say a little bit more about bureaucracy, which is an area that moves me.

I take it for granted that most teachers work in a bureaucratic setting, that most students work in a bureaucratic setting, and within that bureaucracy teachers are expected to do what they are told to do; and they pass that on to the students.

I think we've got a considerable amount of evidence also that within this hierarchical system we delegate, as Victor Thompson is prone to say, blameability under the guide of responsibility, so that students are supposed to be responsible but they're the ones to be blamed. One consequence of this is that those persons who do not fit the rules, do not conform, are blamed. Those students who know how to manipulate the rules are rewarded.

I've always been curious all the way from grade school to college level, especially in the social sciences where we do not have nice neat ways of determining knowledge, whether or not we are rewarding students for knowledge or whether they're being rewarded for skills on how to beat the system. Certainly early-on children learn how to beat the system. They learn how to keep their mouths shut, how to bow and scrape and be good little boys

and girls, and then they are rewarded for that.

That does not mean, however, that they are always good little kiddies. In fact, they at an early stage develop hypocrisy and it's almost a necessary "evil" for survival, because teachers talk about certain ideals and in practice they violate them. I had a bit of trouble yesterday evening when we talked about the lower morality. I think we educate people to a lower morality. I think the John Deans and the Erlichmans and the Nixons were really a product of American education, and if that's what we want as Citizen Education you've got it.

I was very, very struck by that. In fact, I think the Berkeley students were in effect saying "Look at this hypocritical system" and then they were raising questions about it. Free speech. I kind of like that. They were early-on opposed to the Viet Nam war. I think there was a lot of hypocrisy in the Viet Nam war, and a lot of the faculty members at Berkeley opposed those students from the data that we have, and I think that was locked into -- not totally -- a bureaucratic world.

Put another way, the teachers are often pressured and pushed into a rule-oriented society and one way that students can cope with that is to learn how to

manipulate it. It's not only the schools in which we see this. We have a considerable amount of data to see that prisoners survive because they can beat the system; that mental health patients survive because they can beat the system. I don't that often see a great deal of difference between students and mental health patients and prisoners (and I use that as an extreme metaphor) in the total institutions.

It's in this context that I find it difficult, for example, to figure out ways in which to teach altruism. I happen to believe in altruism, but I think you've got to look at that powerful, powerful bureaucratic organization. The elite are able to escape that bureaucratic organization, but not the disadvantaged; and participation has to be seen in the context of that powerful bureaucratic organization where the teachers are often just pawns and where often the kind of materials that pass for education are a means by which people bend the rules and sort of slip in this information on the side.

It is that which concerns me. The question was raised last night and I am only picking up one facet of a very complicated problem of this social context. Just everything I read about most school systems is that the

movement towards bureaucratization continues. Maybe it's because I am at the University of Texas and it's a highly bureaucratized world, but I don't think that is unusual.

One final point. In this situation the privileged can go around it. They can beat the system. They can use their influence with the principal or they can use their influence with the Board and they're excused because they come from good families. Many of their acts are overlooked, but as you move down that ladder the blameability becomes transferred into being labeled as "they're just rotten folk down there." The data for that are relatively overwhelming and it's that kind of context that I was talking about. I could add to this considerably, but I'll stop here.

R. HILL: Last night we gave the authors a chance to respond to selective points, but now I would like to intervene and say we'll take a break first for about 15 minutes.

RECESS

R. HILL: Byron, would you like to react now to the points that have been made?

B. MASSIALAS: Yes, and I have several points

and don't know which to take up first. But I'll respond first to Roberta's caveat that we have to train people to be cynical or to give them the reality. I certainly don't object to telling them (and that is part of the system that we are introducing) exactly what it is rather than just introducing a Pollyanna approach to civic education -- that everything is rosy and that the system is responsive to your wishes.

On the other hand, though cynicism is good where it is warranted when you impart the attitude that all politicians are crooks and the kids have internalized that attitude that deprives them of a major source of influencing people at levels where decisions are made. The sense of being cynical and being turned off from the system deprives you of all the opportunities you have to work through the system -- knowing the channels, knowing what are the propitious times to enter the system, and what skills you need to have in order to change or influence decisions.

If we allow this condition to prevail in schools, where kids grow up thinking that you can be cynical, that everything is controlled and that you are a peon and it doesn't make any difference, then I think we are doing

an injustice to ourselves as educators and we are doing an injustice to the kids that we are supposed to educate. I don't think it's an either/or situation. I think certainly they ought to face life realistically and know what is out there and understand how it operates. By the same token, they should have a sense of efficacy, a sense that they can control their own lives, a sense that the environment is manipulable -- not in the sense, as was said before, that you can manipulate without any sense of norms and morality, but the fact that you can control your own destiny.

I don't think you said that we ought to create or provide conditions for cynical individuals --

R. SIGEL: For healthy skepticism.

B. MASSIALAS: If you're too skeptical, you don't have the drive or the power to participate.

On the negative outcomes, maybe it can be explained in terms of our measuring instruments not measuring the impact or that there is no impact because they are wrong things that we're doing, and I think they are wrong things probably that we are doing in schools. And we are suggesting alternatives. We do have from research a little bit of information (it could be dated now) -- we

do have from the Almond and Verba studies that participation in family and well as school decisions relates to what is called a high sense of citizen competence or political efficacy. If you participate, you develop an attitude that influences you to understand the system.

I think there were some studies at Johns Hopkins of participation in decisions in the school and the sense of efficacy from this participation.

Teachers, and the problem with teacher training and teacher education and the people who work in the departments of education and work with teachers throughout the states -- how do you even get teachers to accept the idea that there are certain decisions that can be shared and to have themselves a high sense of efficacy?

Some of you are probably familiar with Ziegler's studies in Oregon where there was a sense of threat from the community, or perceived threat, that would prevent teachers from dealing with social issues or controversial issues. The threat I think was more imaginary than real, but interestingly, though, the threat did not come from the community in that study. It came from within the school -- the principal, the other teachers.

In order to change the school environment,

the conditions, you need to reach the teacher and how do you do that? Our traditional means of reaching teachers have failed, and our traditional means have been some sort of inservice training programs, where they come for a few weeks to the campus and then go back and readily forget the good things and get back into their routine.

Now on the teacher and ideology. You are saying that Americans are devoid of or don't deal with ideology, that they are not ideological as they say the French or Italians or Greeks are, and that you would like to see that happen in the classroom and to even debate the basic elements of democratic theory. More and more teachers deal with issues, and they deal with issues somewhat systematically. There is this whole movement of evaluative education. The problem with ideology (again going back to the problem of teachers and who the teacher is and what does he or she do with what he or she commands) is what role do you expect the teacher to take.

Probably what is happening in the majority of classrooms is that routinely the teacher goes in and routinely assigns lessons from the textbook and routinely grades papers and routinely goes on with what is there and available, as opposed to the teacher who is an indoctrinator

strictly who has a point of view or is ideologically committed to a position and he or she tries to impart that and accepts no alternatives. You have that, and that has been really the problem with moral education or ethics in the classroom and the community, pressures from parents.

Then you have the position of ethical neutrality of the teacher, where the teacher says "I take no position. I elicit all positions and all points of view, have everybody express their views."

The position that we support is the position of defensible partiality, which looks at the teacher as another actor in those interchanges in the milieu that exists in the classroom, and the teacher accepts the notion that all claims to knowledge or all points of view or propositions ought to be publicly expressed, that all points of view should be defended by communicable language and that everyone in that classroom is a member of the group and that everybody has a right to present his or her own opinion. And then the question is the defensibility of those assertions and claims to knowledge.

We take that position and we think that position does create a community of participants, does create a sense of belonging, a sense of dissent, a sense

of alternatives, a sense of internal control. But that is really a very critical question, especially with regard to citizenship, which is so emotion-laden and there is so much conflict about it, especially now with all the controversy about back to basics and the post-Watergate situation.

R. HILL: I don't want to take away your opportunity, but I am sure as we begin talking others of you will perhaps want to respond to other things that were previously said. Certainly I do. Now I'd like to open it up to the audience. Let's look across the two papers now and look at the whole issue, and perhaps the issues raised by looking at the two papers together. I would like to invite your comments or questions.

K. DAWSON: I would like to raise what I see as some of the issues and controversy in the research, in the data, that I think have a great deal to do with what questions are asked. I feel that there is much more controversy and conflict and certainly less consensus and conclusions than perhaps is indicated in both papers. I don't think we really know all that much about some of these processes that we're talking about here. Let me give a couple of examples and a couple of pertinent studies that reinforce these statements.

I think the whole question, for example, of the role of the family is one there isn't a lot of consensus on-- what role parents do play and to what extent attitudes and values are transmitted. There are different versions, especially newer versions about that, that families and parents are perhaps less important.

Tedin did an article recently, in '75, in which he came up with what I thought was a very interesting conclusion. Looking at a series of issues -- smoking marijuana, for example -- he found that many of the issues just weren't discussed in the home. The children didn't know what their parents' feelings about these issues were. This whole question of transmission of values between parents and children -- there is an inconsistency here, and also such questions as how strongly you feel about it and whether it's discussed in the home.

There is a whole area about parents as educators of children, especially in the area of citizenship education, that perhaps really hasn't been looked at: how conscious parents are of this role and to what extent they consider this an important role, as compared to sex role identification or perhaps even career encouragement.

There is another area that Judy mentioned

that I think could have gone much further. She talked about undermaturation -- this whole primacy-recency controversy: at what stage is political socialization most important. As Judy suggested, there is a whole other new area of a middle ground of the great childhood. Particularly Edelson and O'Neil have written cross-nationally about looking at the 11-13 age period as being very important, going up to 15, with things that happen after 15 being more redundant than particularly new.

Bob Weisberg in a book on political learning, political choice in democratic citizenship, developed a series of graphs which I find very interesting and able to bring together a lot of conflicting data in this area. Byron used the Almond and Verba data to a great extent, and they are the recency arguments: that the early socialization that takes place cannot provide the kind of experiences and information that are really going to be relevant for the adult who is an active participant in the political system. So it's the transient issues that come up that are very important to the socialization process.

Most of the early research in political socialization assumes the primacy argument -- that what takes place early is most important and also structured

on. That's why political scientists are interested in young children. It's not really because they're interested in young children, but they say this has some meaning for later working in the political system.

I'd like to use the board now to make certain points.

R. HILL: Karen has been working at this full time for almost a year, or more than that.

K. DAWSON: These graphs I think are very suggestive of a way to deal with what I see as some of the real conflicts in the literature.

Looking at the three arguments basically and the different research that supports the different arguments -- whether the important period for political socialization is the early years, the primacy argument, which then structures later behavior, early orientations that will determine later participation; whether through the recency notion of what takes place last is most important -- that adults have ongoing experiences and it's more the transient issues and voting for candidates and current events that dictate a lot of political attitudes and political positions; or the intermediate argument which I think falls nicely in the cognitive development learning

theory area-- that it's really at really a certain stage of maturation or development that children are able to put more of the information on some of the early values and attitudes that they have.

An eight-year old might say "I'm a Democrat," and at 13 they might have some sense of what that really means and have a way of articulating that better.

Weisberg says that it's not really an either/or situation or an either/or/or situation, but rather it depends to a great extent on what kind of orientations or predispositions you're looking at and what kinds of questions you're asking. You might come up with different answers depending on the question.

In the primacy argument it's the idea that high level of learning takes place here (illustrating) and then tapers off and adults don't really learn very much. That's why we're interested in young children rather than adults.

This one is that there is a peak somewhere in the middle, in late childhood. And here it's only that when people are active participants and the information is more relevant, in a more relevant form that they're going to be able to pick it up and use it and act upon it.

Then he develops another chart which puts them together and suggests that much of it depends on what kinds of orientations you're talking about, and here you're talking about some broad basic orientations that take place in early childhood; that children between the ages of three and five do pick up such notions as "I'm black" or "I'm poor" or "I'm Catholic" or "I'm American." It doesn't have perhaps much meaning, but they are basically defining themselves and they are defining themselves socially and they're defining themselves in many ways, including, in a sense, a political connotation.

Later on in the middle period is when they put much more of the factual information into it. They are able to have a higher order of reasoning. They go from the concrete to more abstract levels. This becomes then a more important period for learning a lot of basic information and understanding of these earlier feelings, more of the affective area.

Then still later on they have the kinds of issues that really are only important to adults: what is happening to the school tax bond issue; what candidate is going to win in an election. They soon determine that they have stakes in issues like this.

Anyway, this is just a way, I think, of trying to bridge the gap between what is on the surface and what are some real conflicts in the data -- what things are important and what sorts of things are formed at different points. I think for education some of these issues are critical because different agents of socialization are going to be important at different points in these sorts of graphs.

In the primacy chart obviously it's the family that is going to be very critical. They get first bids on the child. Oftentimes a lot of these early orientations are established before they ever get to school.

The intermediate area is probably where the school is going to be of primary importance , and then later on voluntary group association. Probably peer groups are important all the way through.

Anyway, this is a way of at least trying to say what happens and what is important in the various points and what political socialization might be critical.

R. HILL: This really helps me snap in on a problem. We're trying to look at potential outcomes and measures of desirable behaviors from a survey point of view and that really helps organize the problem that we're

having of how to look at this.

B. MASSIALAS: Are you saying that these outcomes, these orientations should change with the different areas?

J. TORNEY: I think it has to be cast in the frame of this as a cumulative process. Those graphs simply indicate the rate at which the information, or whatever the outcome, is acquired. That does not say that what is acquired, for instance, at the intermediate phase later goes away.

B. MASSIALAS: You gave an example for the very early period, like saying "I'm black," but you didn't follow this through. What do they say later?

K. DAWSON: Let me just finish this up. When you put them together you get something like this. In the early childhood it's probably broad and basic orientations that are mostly formed. As you get down to adulthood it's a specific kind of data, a specific issue, a specific candidate, the kinds of transient things that change in current events that individuals as citizens have to relate to. Their opinions might determine to a great extent where they are on the occupational ladder, what their income is, who their present associates are, who the reference points

are generally, in terms of how they're going to respond to it.

I think the assumption in the literature generally is that the primacy argument is still terribly convincing; that there are some early things that happen that do seem to have continuing influence. But I think the argument basically says: Let's not completely forget about adults and the fact that socialization is not completed at the age of 5 or 13, but is an ongoing process, and that perhaps different things take place at different points in the life span.

I would argue that I don't think teachers are terribly aware what happens to children and part of their problem in dealing in this area is just a lack of information. Washburn did an article on children in post-Watergate in which he did some interviewing with teachers on the political socialization data, and found that teachers really didn't think much about this area. So perhaps some consciousness-raising is called for, which I think goes back to what you suggested.

B. MASSIALAS: Yes, and what I was leading to was that when we think of citizenship we think of adult citizens and adult values and adult norms and adult behaviors

and this is what we see in the literature: that young children are not citizens and middle school kids are not citizens, but we're training them for citizenship which is going to occur 20 or 30 years hence, and that that is really citizenship.

R. SIGEL: I don't think she said that.

B. MASSIALAS: She didn't say that, but I'm saying that a lot of people are saying that, and instead of preparing programs and measuring them on their own merit at that point in time, when it happens -- whatever the kid says, whatever he does -- we always keep thinking of how we're going to relate that. This is not what you said, I know, but it just strikes me that that is a very important issue -- that when we say training for citizenship we mean training for adult citizen roles rather than accepting that citizenship occurs at the time in the classroom and that it's not preparation for life but life itself.

I disassociate with that.

W. McGUIRE: Could I add a footnote to that middle formulation, the critical period notion. As it is formulated there it sort of retains the cultural myopia of psychoanalytic influence and the ecological influence, that if there are critical periods they are relatively early --

that psychoanalytic view that authoritarianism is laid down from ages 3 to 6 or, in the ecological, that ducks marry whatever they follow from 20 hours to 48 hours, not earlier or later. As we go through the life cycle kind of personality development that both papers dealt with to some extent we realize that there might be critical periods later on for other things.

Granted Ericson's early periods with somewhat more stress and basic trust, nevertheless for ideological integration he would say that comes much, much later. Or Dan Levinson's work on male mid-life crisis -- that there are critical periods for other kinds of ideology. The middle model is somewhat more complicated and might look very much like the third one if you cut off at age 25, because some of these things don't happen until 43.

R. SIGEL: There are discontinuities and the discontinuities come up because certain values learned in school and in church and in the experience of working in a sweat shop are so discontinuous that you have to have a reordering and a reintegration, and that is a very complicated thing. We are just now beginning to pay attention to that.

Political socialization has studied political

attitudes towards ideas or objects and I think that is nonsense. If you want to have a developmental model (I'm dubious about that anyway) the more important things are underlying value structures. I think what you call altruism or attitudes towards generosity, towards welfare, and so on, I think may be much more organizing principles for how I later on feel about housing for the poor or medical care for the elderly than any specific ideology.

One of the things I would study is the social values that children acquire and how they modify them and whether there is continuity between these basic values and policy adoption. I think that's where many of our conflicts come in later on when they're adults.

W. McGUIRE: For those who aren't aware of the information source, there is an invisible college information exchange center on the adult socialization and later personality development in the Social Science Research Council. The committee headed by Bert Brimm collects data on who is doing what on adult socialization.

G. SJOBERG: A couple of caveats or footnotes. I worry about a couple of things. Although we do have the nuclear family system, which I have no question is still the ideal, we have had a good deal of fragmentation

in family life and it's not just in the privileged group. It has always been true of the poverty group, where desertion is the poor man's or poor woman's divorce. When you begin introducing this idea of family into that model, what family, what kind of family -- there is an enormous amount of instability there and sometimes you have two or three or four kinds of family life that co-exist side by side in the same person's head. That does trouble me and again it comes back to the fact that people are trying to study political socialization outside of the social structure -- not just the bureaucracy, but the family life.

Added to that, I am not as convinced as some of you seem to be that values and belief systems are as consistent as would be portrayed by this discussion. I think that from early-on a number of people carry around an awful lot of conflicting values in their head, and it may be quite functional. With this idea that here is a nice consistent value system, some of you strike me as being good Parsonians.

I haven't heard any discussion so far about the inconsistent value and belief system that people acquire at a fairly early age and they draw upon that in different situations, and particularly in a complex society

where at an early age children, young adults and adults are expected to follow fairly inconsistent roles or where there are inconsistent demands placed upon them in the same situation.

R. ZAJONC: Isn't it true that whether their values are inconsistent or not is a matter of value itself? This is not an objective observation -- one could make a decision --

G. SJOBERG: What do you mean by that?

R. ZAJONC: The fact that the two values may be in conflict with each other may be logically inconsistent, but that is not at all significant.

W. McGUIRE: There is another problem, I believe, that besides being inconsistent they're disconnected and this happens in the area in which I work -- the lack of any integrating principles is actually in a way more disconcerting when you ask people than the fact that they can hold what seems to you to be inconsistent beliefs.

R. SIGEL: Shouldn't that be the one major function of education -- not to change your values, but to point out where you compartmentalize basically inconsistent values you can still go ahead and keep them, but you should point out that there is stress and conflict in values. I

think one of the major functions of education is to bring out the underlying unconscious tension.

W. McGUIRE: We in the attitude change area are no longer working on changing the attitudes by introducing new information. We are changing attitudes by asking questions, the Socratic method. So the people who work with me ask people a series of questions and change their attitudes that way, bringing out the implicit beliefs they already have.

What do you do, though, when the Michigan political science studies ask people what are the three most important issues in the Presidential election, how do Ford and Carter stand on each one and how they stand on each one, and then you find the person in perfect agreement with Ford and against Carter on the three issues that they elected as the most important, and they happen to be on the Carter side in all three, and you say "that's peculiar" and they say "what's peculiar?" This is a real problem. I don't know how to handle that, where when you point out what seems a blatant inconsistency, short of doing some Levy Straus kind of assumption, they don't even feel it.

R. ZAJONC: If one doesn't have full information it may look entirely inconsistent. For example, there

are other results from the same institution. When you ask people about their opinions on public services given by various agencies, such as police, or welfare, everybody says they are terrible, that they absolutely can't get any information and never get any help, that they are absolutely cynical in their approach to human beings and they disregard the person, that the police you can't trust, and so on. Then if you ask during the same interview, "What sorts of experiences have you had with them?" the majority say they had good experiences: that the people were helpful, that they get service, that they got consideration. If you ask 'how come they had good experiences" the answer is "I know how to get around these guys."

So the public aggregate attitudes about public service are completely different from the set of experiences they list themselves. They don't see any inconsitency between those two things.

W. McGUIRE: You certainly can change attitudes by asking questions where people have to appeal to their own values. People in selling have always known this. The very successful salesman says that you should never answer any question, but you should always ask a question as to why they ask that, or something, and then the people

convince themselves that they really agree with you in the first place.

N. SANDERS: I am interested in the number of times we turn to the issue of the outcomes -- what will be the good citizen, what kinds of characteristics we're going to look for. I guess when Karen Dawson was presenting Weisberg's work it became clear again that to understand those graphs you really have to know what is on the ordinate, and that is what I gather Weisberg was saying. If you take a general picture like this with age on the abscissa you need to know what you're talking about as being the evidence of the socialization in order to know whether recency, primacy or some interpretation or orientation is correct.

I am trying to take the list that we are proposing, the definition of citizen education and the items of knowledge, attitude, skill and dispositional outcome, and I am trying to pair with those through some kinds of interpretation criterion measures, outcome measures. It seems to me that over half of the discussion here has been about whether we have the right kinds of outcomes -- not so much how we ought to go about teaching, or whatever, but underlying this has been what are the outcomes that one

would really like to see.

I am trying to wrestle with those particular outcomes, using those as a sort of working process, trying to relate to those. I am especially interested in the kinds of comments you have about particular ones, about particular items there. One of the problems that always bothers me is one that was in the section on knowledge: do we have sufficient knowledge of the kinds of things in the future that are likely to occur that we need to be preparing people to participate in and know about. Is that a reasonable kind of objective to have? Could we conceivably ever think of building a test, building some kind of measure of that insofar as that future projection?

W. McGUIRE: I've been assuming in this discussion that we are more, because of the kinds of people called together, more on the technician side than the nature of the outcomes, and that we are sort of assuming that people in Trenton or Washington, or wherever, know what good citizenship outcome is and the question is how do you design a curriculum, and so on, for that.

I feel I'm sounding like an Adolph Eichmann in saying this, but you call together the clergy or the politicians or other higher forms of life to decide what

outcome you want and that our professional expertise is somewhat more on this, except that, as Karen points out, you can't completely answer the questions independently because for some kind of outcomes a little different kind of curriculum placement and type is needed. But it's still hypothetical when you say if you're dealing with that, the best procedure is this. But we're not saying whether you should be dealing with that as an outcome or with some other outcome.

I personally, of course, have my opinions like everybody else, about our professional expertise here.

R. HILL: Let me respond. I think part of what you say is the reason for coming together we see on the technical side, but we know that we can't get into this process without a discussion of the substance of what should be. We assume that social scientists have a great deal to say about that and we are interested in that, but here we are not so much interested in what the curricula will be. That's the next step -- another kind of discussion that we could focus on.

We're interested in trying to take what we think the public wants or what should be from our reading and interpret it in social science concepts in some way, so

we can make sense out of it. That may be a little narrow. You can't do that without thinking about curriculum and projecting that out either, but we're coming back to that idea of how do we state objectives in ways that make sense. For example, I would turn to Roberta and say, "You want healthy skepticism. I need help in defining that, in measurable terms, objective terms, so not only could I write it at this level of abstraction but for the next level of specificity." That's what we need some help on.

G. SJOBERG: What it comes back to is the issue I tried to raise yesterday about the role of social science: one being the technical expertise, the other being the critical orientation, and another to think about alternatives and the construction of alternatives and how do you begin to orient children and at what age do you think about alternative ways of looking at the world.

That is why I say in that behavioral science little box over there that there are a few social scientists who do think that the function of social science is to construct and think about alternatives, not just to describe what is but the construction of alternative futures.

The very discussion of human rights, for

example, and altruism is construction of an alternative future -- not cast in those terms, but that is exactly what is being said. I think that's a very difficult step because I think most people are not oriented, particularly in social science, to begin thinking in terms of alternatives. They just think of what is and say that what is will be. That I think has all kinds of problems imbedded in it.

R. HILL: I guess that would be a substantive discussion and, as I said, that is open, but we need your expertise. I don't want to rule it out. It's great. I think we should be able to see alternative futures and help us see them, but we also need help in dealing with the specifics.

B. MASSIALAS: You said something to me during the break about the instruments we have used and providing a little more specificity about those. I would be happy to send you that.

R. HILL: Describe the instruments you have used.

B. MASSIALAS: First are the basic instruments that have been used over and over again on the political trust issue. Judy has perhaps more up to date instruments. We have the participatory instruments that

we have constructed there that don't have validity and reliability in them, but there is a first run to see whether -- it's basically being used for feedback, evaluation with our modules, to see to what extent they do all the things we say they do. I will be happy to send you both the modules we use, about 16 or 17 modules, and the instruments: the teacher self records, the observation schedules, questionnaires, interview schedule -- a set of instruments.

R. HILL: And they fit into this kind of scheme?

B. MASSIALAS: Right. I will be happy to send them to you for a small fee for postage.

R. HILL: We're coming to the time when we have to check out. I sense there are some more issues to be raised. I sense that from both Barbara and Karen, so I invite the two of you to be prepared, as well as the rest of you, to start the meeting again at one o'clock in this room. Following that, at a certain point I'd like to ask you to attend a real case situation that we're facing in our work scope, where we have to go out and work with schools in an applied situation. I'd like to describe that to you and ask for your response off the top of your heads.

I would like to have you reflect on it and maybe help us with some answers and some ideas. I think that's the contribution that the kind of thing we're doing can make to the scientific field in which we are engaged. I'll describe that case when we return, or maybe starting at about two o'clock.

For the immediate work I must do I've gained a great deal this morning. Thank you. I do appreciate it, though, of course, the frustration is how much more do I need to know.

Let's break for lunch now.

LUNCH RECESS

R. HILL: We would like to hear some more comments from Karen and perhaps Barbara and others who might want to speak. I'd like to give about a half hour to that and then perhaps I can begin to talk about a case situation or the situation we're facing.

Barbara, would you like to kick off?

B. PRESSEISEN: Yes. I was very struck by the differences in the two papers that have been presented and some of the discussion. It struck me that Byron's

charts of the various behaviors and subject material, content material, raise a question for implementation, for teaching and curriculum. In our experience with social studies curriculum development it would be very difficult to present all those cells. I do want to see what you have done and what comes from the Tallahassee material, but it is very difficult to present it to teachers and say this is where you want to go and develop the things you want, to fill those cells without more direction from the disciplines or from the behavioral sciences in some way.

That's what got me back to the same question I raised last night for Judy. Isn't there something in terms of the developmental sequence about those things that are important in Citizen Education where you do relate the subject content to the process? Are there some important building blocks on some of these behaviors? It would get to what Karen was raising, that there are some things learned in early childhood in pre-operational terms that lay the groundwork for where you want to go in middle childhood and then in formal operation. And if so, what are they? What are those variables and how do they impinge upon curriculum development, strategies of teaching, and all the things that go with that? That was one of the

questions.

The other thing is really a comment, and it strikes me in terms of where the "disciplines" are that are represented here that there is a divergence of two forms of psychology. I am not in the political socialization literature as many of you are, but it does strike me that it stands almost as a monolith. There is a lot going on it, but not many bridges out to the psychologists (although they are not completely absent) and not very many bridges to teacher education.

If we take Roberta's point that we should stress teacher education or what we are going to be doing with teachers about this, then it seems to me somewhere someone has to build that literature out. We are not talking about discrete things, but things that are related and the real question is, again, what are those relationships.

Getting back again to the variables, it seems to me they deal with those relationships to some extent and we need to fathom more in terms of doing the kinds of things that you're going to raise, Russ. That is our immediate concern. Those are long-range concerns except that we ought to get direction from a conference like this. It would make our short-range job a little

easier if we know in fact where we're going.

K. DAWSON: I won't go through my whole agenda, but there were several other areas that I think need to be raised because of the relevancy for education and also in terms of trying to pull together what is in the research literature.

The first one is the role of the environment and current events generally. Most political socialization work was done during an era of good feeling, basically the Eisenhower-Kennedy years, and some of the more recent work looking at the effect of post-Watergate was an attempt to see to what extent the environment and current events affect children's attitudes. The emphasis was, again, the President as the prime focus of an early political concept.

There is a lack of literature coming out of this, but one of the relevant pieces for the people here an article that Greenstein did looking at children post-Watergate. That was in the American Political Science Association Review in 1975. In looking at children -- and I think it was the usualy second through eighth grade -- there was an age-related difference, with the very young children still seeing the President in a very benevolent concept, in a very positive way. Older children were able

to differentiate between the office and the holder. In other words, the office of President was not seen in a negative way, but it was understood that there could be a bad President.

I think that is the kind of distinction that is important in the area of Citizenship Education, that it is not an either/or -- that we teach patriotism and everything is good and leaders are always benevolent or that we teach reality and everything necessarily is bad. I think children do have the ability perhaps in an early age to reject some of those differences, but I think as they get older there is an ability to differentiate between the officeholder and the office.

Another point that I wanted to make, which was suggested in the papers but again I think the literature suggests some ramifications that need more development -- another point is the different groups, the subgroups or national variations, especially looking at minority groups and lower class and women and older adults -- that their socialization experience seems to be different. Some of it is simply class-related, with education probably being the most important variable. In the case of women it seems to be something other than class, and the difference seems to

be much more in terms of expectations and socialization.

Again, the implication for education might be different, depending on what kind of groups you're dealing with. I think it's a fallacy to just group them together even in an age-related way. There might be other factors at work here that we should be cognizant of.

Lastly I would like to clean up the question of participation and to what extent this is seen as panacea -- and this gets into the whole area of goals in Citizenship Education, and one that I hope we'll spend some time looking at. Certainly the OEO program at the federal level in the early '60s was seen as a way of involving poor people in a participatory mechanism with the idea that their experiences would be transferrable to making good decisionmakers in their homes and active political participants in civic public life. That was not necessarily the case. Those programs were not panaceas and, if anything, there was a lot of negative fallout from them.

I think we have to be aware of that whole area -- what kinds of goals we want to come out of programs. I think this area is one that has been touched upon, but maybe we need to bring these issues more to the surface and look at them.

R. HILL: Any reactions or comments?

G. SJOBERG: I still keep coming back to my issue about alternatives. Throughout the discussion as I hear it you have the empirical studies and then you have the hidden agenda: what are the alternatives toward which we should strive. On the one hand, I tend to be more of a tortured optimist than some, some who wish to have a lower morality and not get people's expectations too high. I think those issues of alternatives are really not being taught very much, very extensively, in schools as I see it.

The question of what are alternatives to the present deals with teachers. Then there is the question also of how effectively can students understand alternatives to their own world, and also what are alternatives with respect to the community.

I bring this up because at least on the community level -- and I think one can do it with the others -- those concepts of variables really bother me a bit in the construction of social reality. I don't know how to even construct variables. I don't think variables mean much to Congresspersons or others who are out there to restructure the world and to build alternative arrangements because they have to work out compromises and talk

about it in a limited sense. But I don't think that's going to mean very much to anyone who goes out into the community and says: We're going to construct here. We're going to work for some kind of alternative arrangement in terms of Citizen Education where you have a whole group of people with different perspectives and where you have people who are going to have to work out compromises among them.

I think the idea of X and Y variables on some kind of chart is a highly misleading way of looking at the world. In fact, it's not a way in which you can think about alternatives. You don't think about alternatives in terms of X and Y and one variable influencing another variable within, because that locks you into the present. If that's the way you want to think that's fine, but I also see hidden behind much of the discussion "let's tone down the alternatives. The OEO program had negative effects." From one point of view, yes; from another point of view, no.

I could argue very strongly that the OEO program was evaluated according to certain kinds of criteria which inevitably made them negative; that is, the very process of evaluating the OEO program from the standards

of the system doomed it to failure to begin with, and thus it was the very conservative perspective of the social scientists and using the existing order as the basis of criteria which made it "inoperative." So many kinds of experimental programs are doomed to be viewed as unsuccessful because of the very methodological perspectives which take the present and the ongoing organization as the standard and basis for evaluation. Thus the social scientists are locked into a mechanism where they are doomed to determine the fate of the underprivileged when they're participating to be no good, or if you're going to construct a somewhat better world that's no good either because the present system is right.

It troubles me no end to listen to that kind of rhetoric.

K. DAWSON: A quick response. The problem seems to be that when the program did not work well in terms of some of the values, real meaningful participation -- groups seemed to be coopted into the existing system, and when it was successful it caused such political outrage that basically it was dismantled because of its success.

Still to set up participation as a panacea is wrong because I think the realities are that sometimes

it works and sometimes it doesn't, and sometimes it's meaningful and sometimes it's not meaningful. But one can't assume that it is necessarily always good and that if you have a lot of participation you necessarily come out with something better in a real sense than if you don't have a lot of participation.

I think it's unrealistic to encourage children that that necessarily should be the end-all. Participation for what kind of questions?

R. HILL: I am aware that I don't understand the significance of what you're saying for what we're doing because I'm obviously caught in this approach very much. I know that you've spoken on it, but perhaps someone else can help me understand the kind of way we're talking about evaluation not generating alternatives.

G. SJOBERG: The best I can do is to take a look at my chapter in the Handbook of Evaluation, which is the only off-beat chapter in that whole handbook. I am concerned about this matter of alternatives. All the other people are locked into traditional categories. I don't want to give here an hour or two lecture -- I am just not going to do that -- but my concern with methodology is that most methodologists are locked into a situation where they

are going to define experimental programs, those that diverge from the existing order, as bad because they are going to evaluate them by the standards of the system and by the standards of the system anything that deviates is going to be deviant. That's one point I'm making.

The other point I was making (and this is something I'm going to have to address myself to more extensively) is this whole question of talking about variables. Social scientists have been socked into the idea of variable X and variable Y, but when you go out into a community where you have ten groups of people having, say, ten different realities and where they have to be massaged so that they can talk together among each other -- if you're going to be talking in terms of variables to those people, I would predict right here and now that you're going to be an absolute failure in that situation.

I can only draw upon my secondary experience working with a social agency in San Antonio, where I was a community organizer of the first order. You don't begin to talk about variables in that kind of world. In fact, that social science lingo is going to get you in trouble. You're going to have to develop other kinds of rhetoric and you're going to have to try to compromise divergent

realities. For one thing, some of those realities are overlapping. Or you may have to construct in your own mind's eye as an organizer linkages among those realities. The word "variables" doesn't even make sense in that situation.

I could go into some details about how that situation is constructed, but you are constructing something other than what exists and you're not going to be able to talk in terms of variables in that kind of situation and make any sense to the people or to yourself, because you're locked into a social science lingo that is just not fitted to the construction of alternative realities out there in that social world.

R. HILL: I'll have to read it again and read it again.

G. SJOBERG: I have nothing in that handbook where it talks about the problem of how do you build these realities. There are two things that you're faced with -- but I am now preempting the floor in ways I don't want to.

R. HILL: This is very valuable to me, and I would like to hear more.

G. SJOBERG: One is that you have multiple

realities when you go into any community.

R. HILL: I'm very aware of that.

G. SJOBERG: They don't even think of the word "variable." That's one dimension. If we follow up on what was said earlier, they have values that may be disjointed, internally and externally. So to draw a nice little curve out there, the greater the X the greater the Y -- if you begin to talk in that lingo to those people who have one multiple reality, some of which overlap and some of which do not, and then when people come in (skilled organizers have learned how to do this for a long time and politicians have to do this all the time) they are able to make translations among the multiple realities and those translations are not variables because they pick up a little here and choose a little here and try to meld these in ways where they can get some partial consensus. Using the language of the social scientists in that situation is death and taxes.

R. HILL: Let me ask for a reaction. Carl, do you want to describe a little of your experience? I think this is what you have been struggling with for several years, isn't it?

C. GUERRIERO: Essentially. For those of you

who aren't from Pennsylvania let me say that we have goals for education as every other state does. They are essentially the seven cardinal principles plus three, so we have a metric dozen.

One of them talks about having some attitudes related to good citizenship, so what we are measuring is what students say they would do in certain situations that might be classified as being good citizens. So it's what they say they would do: no knowledge, no reason for the behaviors on developmental scales. And it has gotten us actually in a lot of hot water. The social studies teachers want to test knowledge because that's what they're teaching, and the Mennonites and some other religious organizations don't want us to teach anything except obedience to law and God.

I have been accused of taking the Bible out of the schools and I didn't have anything to do with that; and prayer out of the schools, which I didn't have anything to do with either. Some of the very conservative groups -- John Birchers, I suspect, although we don't know for sure -- feel that they want to do all of that indoctrination at home and that schools shouldn't be involved with it. So we have a dilemma.

We did revise the tests. We are now measuring knowledge as well as behaviors. We are not measuring reasons for behaviors yet. A typical item is a situation where a student might walk out of school and go downtown and there is a protest or a riot going on. We ask the student if under certain conditions -- and we list those conditions -- would he or she throw rocks during the protest. They say yes or no, and a large majority of them would, but you don't know why they would; and if you go into developmental theories you can be at stage two and say "yes, I'd throw rocks" and in the back of your mind you think "when no one is looking I'll get a television set."

Or you could be at a higher level, I suspect, and say "I think the protest does have some validity. There are some things that need attention drawn to them, so I'll throw rocks." But it's for a different reason.

Maybe we should be looking at reasons rather than behaviors, but the legislature doesn't want to hear about that. Most of the law-and-order people we have say, "I don't care what the reason is. They won't do it."

R. HILL: These are multiple reality problems -- the situation you're talking about?

G. SJOBERG: That's part of it, and one of the things that I suspect you resort to is some degree of ambiguity and that's one of the things that social scientists don't like. But you have to resort to. You have to resort to ambiguity. Ambiguity is a way out, and that is not what those people sit down and measure because measuring that ambiguity is the last thing in the world that a social scientist wants to do. With most sociometric tests you end up with: that's awfully ambiguous. You can't get through graduate school that way. Certainly you're not going to get a paper published in the American Sociological Review when you emphasize ambiguity.

My own argument (and it has been heavily influenced by a colleague of mine) is that ultimately a much more effective way of going about it would be to resort to a great deal more qualitative analysis, where you allow that ambiguity to show itself and thus allow these different perspectives to take hold. By forcing these categories on people you can't give those reasons.

R. HILL: That's very helpful. You gave a strategy.

G. SJOBERG: And this is not my own. It's my colleague Roy Latrell's who argues in terms of policy

that you go for qualitative orientations, that you don't try to push, because fundamentally what we have is that most measurement instruments are preconceived by social scientists who sit in their labs and then they impose them on the world out there. All you have to do is read The New York Review of Books to see what happened to the mathematician who argued so severely against the Lipset Lab examination of the attitudes and behavior patterns so-called of the professoriate. And he is right because the elite will never accept the imposition of the social sciences. He was simply accepting what we know about the elite.

You don't go up to the head of General Motors and say, "Fill in the blanks." You've got to be kidding. He or she is going to want to say "I want to tell you how it's done." Why not give that opportunity to the Mennonites and to the other people in the pluralistic world? Why don't you give them that chance?

R. HILL: I appreciate your points and I would now like to ask you and the rest of the people to apply your point of view to our case situation.

G. SJOBERG: I didn't mean to hold the floor so long.

R. HILL: I'm delighted you did. You described

a political situation that Carl has faced and you described one of the approaches that they've used and certainly you are anticipating the problems we're going to have.

I'd like to have your attention for a few minutes and I'd like to describe where we may be going in the next year, where we're planning to go. As I listened to you I think we're going into the fiery furnace -- no question about it. We may not survive because we're going to try to get specific. We have some very definite assumptions about how schools might change. There is not a great deal of evidence about this. There is evidence about what doesn't work and there are some new theories and new approaches. We're committed in one direction.

First of all, one of the assumptions is that the unit is the school. The principal tends to be a very influential person with respect to what happens in that school and you're also combining community. So that is, if you will, the unit that we are addressing and what we are planning to do in Citizen Education.

Another assumption is that we have to involve the staff and community in the process, for two reasons really. We think that this is one of the ethics that we are certainly presenting and the process here should reflect

that ethic? Also, our empirical research suggests that you can't come in and impose, that you must involve, must build, must develop with people.

A third value for us is that in this process we expect to learn a lot more about what the teachers and the principals and the parents do know about the process already. There has been some success in doing this at the schools.

We have an objective orientation. The term comes out of educational technology. I don't mean the idea of projectors or things like this, but I mean the way of organizing your knowledge toward objectives, trying to develop intervention programs, seeing that you get effects and revamping the program and trying to be in a sense accountable to impacting those objectives or changing the objectives if necessary.

Data based. We are committed to collecting data and sharing it with the teachers and the community. We see that as a skill and a kind of literacy that we're going to try to induce or develop with the teachers and principals.

We would like to think that sooner or later we would have some kind of literacy with respect to

Citizen Educating, and testing data related to it, that teachers now have with reading and mathematics, if that's possible.

There is an assumption about the process -- that we go to a school and we get a kind of general agreement among the decisionmakers -- the School Board, the principal, some of the leaders in the school, some parents. We go to them and we say something like: We want to do something in Citizen Education and this is generally what we mean -- and it's in global terms.

Secondly, we agree on the process to be followed, the ground rules that we would work with people under. We suggest that we get an agreement that they are willing to invest the time and effort and develop what we might call a school improvement theme. These are things that have been tried in some other areas where we have had some success. So there is a standing model.

The first step with that process is to define goals and objectives. We would predict based on our experience of doing this with groups repeatedly -- we're influencing and we're certainly proactive, but I think we would predict that there is a language, a general ethos that people get in -- one guy is heavy for obedience and

another is heavy for something else, but they begin talking to each other.

"Do you mean obedience without thinking?"

"No."

You begin talking and you come up with a statement which begins to approach the one that we have in front of us. At least we've seen it happen a couple of times, that kind of prediction. Certainly some things might be left off or some language might be different, but that process happens or can happen. Ultimately you define it.

Then we begin to try to collect data from students in that school with respect to those goals and objectives. Then we identify deficits determined from this data, where these kids are weak, what is missing, etc. We develop treatment programs and we evaluate those, cycle that through, and then we maintain the program.

We are at the point now where we have funding for a year. We're getting general agreement, or we are working on a proposal and we think we will get general agreement. We think we'll get agreement on the process. We think that we will be able to work through this matter of defining goals and objectives. As a matter of fact,

one of the things that Gideon described happens. When there is disagreement we push it to a little higher level of abstraction, or there are other kinds of strategies that we follow in this kind of thing. But whatever happens we begin to get a general statement and a consensus about some kind of language about the level of generality that you are looking at on that page, about that.

Our next step is to go out and measure it and, as you point out, that goes, bing, right down on the level of specificity. How do we do that? What are the indices? As I say, this means instrumentation or some kind of procedure. It means focus on school and community. We want to know what is happening in the kid's life -- other kinds of indices. We want to know something about the outside with the kids.

We want to know what kinds of instruments. You began to address that really. The question should be not only what kind of instruments, but what kinds of assessments. And you are saying much more qualitative, maybe ethnographic descriptions of what is happening in that school, in that child's culture. What are the indices and how do they differ by elementary, middle, and high school? How should we conceptualize the relationships?

Our problem now is that this is where we're at and this is what I would like to ask the social scientists to reflect on. What kinds of instruments or measurement techniques should we have? We want to go out into industrial towns, for example, say about 55,000 people. We'll be working with a senior high school, a junior high school, and an elementary school. We'll be working in rural communities as well, probably at least six or seven different schools.

Help us. What would be your strategy? What would you look for?

R. SIGEL: What are the indices for? That's where I have my problem. Are you interested in the state of their knowledge? Are you interested in behavioral indices, what they do? Instruments would also in part depend on what you want to know about these kids. We have found that when we ask about democracy being the best form of government we can agreement even from the most remote corners of the earth. When we ask students how they would explain to a student on a foreign planet (or some dumb question like that) what democracy is, even in senior high school very few kids can answer that. Yet when they get to democratic slogans, into dilemma situations, they can

pick out the democratic answer.

We come back to this question of quality. I think you would get more answers from these people if you could specify first what you want to measure.

R. HILL: This yellow sheet.

W. McGUIRE: I can think of five or six suggestions I would make which sound mutually canceling, but they are rather not. One of them is to have more open-ended questions, both very open-ended and also open-ended by asking why, so that you get the underlying delusional system by asking why and by asking the completely open-ended question you get a salience measure as to what is in their head.

A second kind of thing that should be undertaken simultaneously is to exploit the existing social data archives. I am thinking of, for example, the Roper Center, where you have a time series not connected with the particular towns you're intervening in, but often nationwide sampler or Middle Atlantic States or whatever -- just to find out on what concepts we do have some longitudinal data so that in your control group you can see how now and here you can use that as a time series by your own control group currently to appraise the effect. And in that case

you want to bring in some of the specific items on which there are good time series into your instrument so that you can make comparisons and see some ramifications.

A third thing is following up something that Barbara raised and we didn't get a chance to address. Byron gave us long shopping lists and Judith complained about shopping lists and then gave us her own -- plus which you put them into matrices and Barbara was saying something else is needed, namely, what kind of measuring procedure would fill each cell. I think even more than that we need some kind of priority system: which of these columns are more important than others, and priorities would be established in two ways. One is on social science principles: What are the fundamental cognitive processes underlying the long shopping list so that some should be stressed more than others? The other is a policy issue of what kind of Citizen Education goals are even more important than others so that you can set up priorities. You aren't going to be able to fill in those goals and sit down and write a module for every one.

I think to get the priority setting I would prescribe the exact opposite to what I started saying about open-ended questions. This would be a highly structured,

nonmetric, multi-variant kind of thing, where you can give teachers and students and Members of the Assembly, or whoever, the difficult task of: Which two of these eight goals are most alike? This is a relatively finite task where you can analyze by the new (?) programs to see what the underlying dimensions are and which are the purest representatives of them. Then perhaps you can pick and choose what to give priority to, but you would get extremely simpleminded responses, things which would make you throw up with your wanting to take a lower profile. Here you would be giving a very mechanical task to people, just simply saying which two goals are more similar.

Let me stop at this point.

R. HILL: That's very helpful. Let me now react to Roberta. Abstracting what you said I guess we do want to answer a question like the one you stated. Can you explain what democracy is? Incidentally, I think politically that would be quite interesting to the people in that community and the teachers, and as they became committed to the objectives the idea is they would be committed to teaching them. Whether or not they will we don't know -- I know you've had some negative experience with that -- but at least maybe we can build a support

system for doing that.

Are there any other things like that?

R. ZAJONC: I would like to come back to the sort of things I mentioned very briefly yesterday -- some concern with the mechanics of political life, teaching those, just direct contact with a council or with writing a congressman or writing a petition, or a contribution, or campaigning. There are many, many activities in which children can be engaged and doing community chores. These things cannot be tested by a literacy test of the sort you describe or by asking questions. They have to be tested over a long period of time to see what happens to the school population in situations which could be described as test situations.

For example, someone comes into the school selling government bonds for 50¢ apiece. How many kids buy them? That might be an index of citizenship. Or something of this sort.

There are really no good tests for conduct that can be carried out in a school system, so it would simply be an inventory of the past achievements of a given school community in some politically-related activity. If there is a good deal of involvement one can see that. I

am taking as a model here the English school. This is not the only country with this concern. The English public school and also the private school has a very active training in this area. They send kids to a thing called Oxdam, which is a sort of welfare agency. That does a number of things. Kids perform certain tasks voluntarily, and one can see within any school system how many child hours are spent on this kind of community activity. And they do other things.

There is another society where Citizen Education is rampant and that is in the socialist countries, where I am sure terrific effort must have been spent to discover exactly at what age and what items must be taught. I am not advocating that we adopt the whole system including the content, but there must be some experience there both in structure and in evaluation of the outcome. I haven't seen anything of that in the papers. I would not be a bit surprised that there is such information in the Soviet Union and other countries.

R. SIGEL: Or China.

B. MASSIALAS: Over there they are working on the principle of reinforcing agents. They have the pioneer palaces reinforcing school and family. There is

more unity of purpose. It's a very powerful environment.

R. ZAJONC: The question arises whether in a diverse ideological environment similar methods are applicable or not. That's a question one wants to discuss, but one should not reject it immediately at face value just because the ideological end goals are somewhat different.

W. McGUIRE: Constance Brenner even has rather sensational data on this account in terms of moral judgments of Soviet children and Israeli children and of Soviet children who move to Israel. So you can see to what extent that one year of very intensive socialized training they get when they go to Israel influences their basic moral judgment.

I think it hasn't actually been published, but there is a terrible ambiguity in it, in that these are not comparable to other Soviet kids, the ones that move to Israel. They don't select random samples. But they are wonderful data in a sense anyway, if only you could go back and get the appropriate control group you'd be in business.

R. HILL: Gideon, when you look at the problem and the activity what would you suggest we do when we go into the schools?

G. SJOBERG: I don't wish to be totally against instrumentation, but I do think that these open-ended questions -- giving people some opportunity to express themselves all the way up and down that ladder -- is going to in the long run not only be advantageous from a social science point of view, but advantageous politically -- when you give everybody a hearing. How to interpret that is going to be the tough one, and here again if you are not going to be run out of town and plan to be around for a while I would strongly urge you to be much more sensitive and tolerant of ambiguity with respect to the data as well as with respect to the individuals.

Ambiguity, as I said before, has important bases for building at least a tentative consensus. Politicians don't write vague or ambiguous laws just for nothing. They resort to ambiguity.

R. HILL: I've resorted to ambiguity many times.

G. SJOBERG: I suspect you're a very good politician, and this is not a pejorative comment. I think it's important that you allow for that ambiguity not only within the data themselves, but the interpretations also.

K. ZAJONC: I'm not sure I understand you.

Are you suggesting that the information one has or collects about an ambiguous situation should be just as ambiguous as the situation itself?

G. SJOBERG: My own hunch is that if you had a question on democracy and there was a nice neat consensus I would not be opposed to say "okay, there is a consensus." But I would strongly suspect that if you ask questions about democracy in a particular community you would have overlaps among subgroups on how they define that world, and therefore to say "X group strongly disagrees with Y group" you might wish to glide over that with a little bit of an ambiguous statement because that might be the only way you're going to sustain your own presence inthat community.

R. ZAJONC: But we have precise methods, very good methods of talking about ambiguity and distributions and aggregate -- things like statistical concepts on the normal curve and standardizations to describe how certain responses or attitudes are reflected in the community. There are many other measures now, very sophisticated statistical procedures.

G. SJOBERG: Do you really feel those sophisticated measures are going to make sense to the people

in that community?

R. ZAJONC: No. It's not for the people in the community.

G. SJOBERG: But you've got to be able to talk their language. And a lot of those sophisticated measures I would say have questions about their efficacy in terms of policy. I think we have some data emerging that the more sophisticated the measures, the less meaningful they are for policy.

R. SIGEL: I am disturbed about some of what has been said right now. I think there has to be a distinction made (I think you are driving at that right now) between the quality of the work that you perform for a school system and the way in which you disseminate it. It didn't even occur to me until you raised the question. I really don't know many social scientists, but there must be some (or you wouldn't have said that) who go out into the community and sell a program on the basis of digression analyses and fancy Piaget concepts. But a clinical psychologist or a political scientist who wants to work in the community, if he doesn't learn to talk the language of the community shouldn't be in that business.

On the other hand, the quality of the data

that we want to give to a school system or the department of education has to be such that we can stand behind it as social scientists. One of my problems with Mr. Kohlberg and occasionally with Mr. Bronfenbrenner is that they don't let you see their coding system and they change from one day to another and you don't know how good the data is that they have.

If you want to help the school system we have to be able to talk to the educational psychologists, to Carl, and to the other people.

To come back to the question of democracy, and so on. I also would not hang myself up right now and say "this is the definition of democracy, and if kids in this community don't answer that they only get a score of 73%."

To cite my own work, we found that there were two levels of answers: those who give a very simple answer, like democracy is freedom; those who could relate certain principles but couldn't see the interrelation of these principles: and those who could see. It's on that level that I want to get an assessment of where the kids are at a given grade.

The next thing I want to see is what good

does it do to have this in their head when I present them with this specific problem. Does it make understanding democracy better? Does it make them more efficient in solving certain problems?

I have a great deal of sympathy with Carl. I know the kind of flack you get when you go into the Amish community. The only school system I wasn't allowed in is one of our neighboring ones where the Birch Society was very active. But you have to talk about this level of generality -- I like that better than ambiguity -- so as to cloak the goal which you are going in to enforce that is socially acceptable to everybody, and then you have to take your community along with you.

I would argue, for instance, that if what Judy said is correct (and I have no doubt about it -- I am not a psychologist and I can only take what you people say as right) -- if it is true that young kids don't deal with abstractions too well but are more authority oriented, then I would let very young school children do tasks and act them out behaviorally. When they get to senior high school and can deal with abstractions (unlike you I do think abstraction is higher than concreteness) then you try to develop the principles that should later on guide

them as adults in their behavior.

In a steel community, where let's say two-thirds of the fathers are unemployed, let the kids say who is working and who is not working. Where does the money come from right now in the house? Who is the welfare lady? Where does the money from the welfare lady come from? You bring the content into something that is close to the kids.

I was horrified when my kid was in third grade or whenever they studied the community. All the schools were closed because of a terrible snowstorm for a few days, and when my son came home from school the first day back I said to him, "Tom, what did you talk about today? Did you talk about what it took to get the snow plow out, and so on?" "No," he said, "we talked about the Indians."

The Indians. But they had the first snow disaster right under their noses.

B. MASSIALAS: I'm trying to understand what you're saying, Gideon. Maybe you're drawing a distinction between disciplinary research and policy research. Disciplinary research is the research that academics do to find out about what is and to understand relationships. Policy research is directed to the world of action. In

education we talk about action. Basically what you are interested in is finding out how things work, but you are also interested in changing behavior as you yourself interact. As a researcher you are interacting with the people that you are researching or looking at or whose behavior you are concerned about.

G. SJOBERG: That's part of my distinction.

B. PASSIALAS: It's a process of feedback evaluation.

G. SJOBERG: And the other is the emphasis on alternatives, or thinking in terms of alternatives. This is something I don't think Coleman put any emphasis on particularly. I can live with that distinction of action and policy research as opposed to what is, but this seems to me to be very much action research and you have to begin making that distinction. You're not writing for an academic audience, and even when you're writing for the State Board of Education you're not writing for an academic audience. That's a political document and it is a political document that is constructed by social scientists with a particular purpose in mind -- to satisfy the Board of Education.

Anybody who says that that nice, neat, objective data is somehow collected with "science" in

the back of their head is just pulling the wool over my eyes, and I just don't believe it. A great deal of social science data about the what is, is actually policy research and is constructed with a certain purpose in mind, and I have no objection to that. I just would like people to say "that's what I'm doing and I know what I'm doing." You don't tell falsehoods, but you massage it a little bit to fit the categories of the education agency.

R. HILL: Ideally the way we would operate is that we would be taking the people in the school community into partnership in developing that policy research, what questions should be asked. We will come in with experience and a set of questions, but we want to be sensitive to that and we would hope there would be some interaction about this.

One of the major ideas is to create some kind of ownership on the part of the people and then leave, and have this as a way they can operate -- data-based orientation, based on their decisions. That's the ideal.

G. SJOBERG: I'm all for it. I think you'll learn a lot. It's a very difficult enterprise.

R. HILL: I think you're right.

M. McGUIRE: In looking at the instruments

and indices I would like to correct a possible false consensus between what Gideon is saying and what I was saying. He said he is in favor of open-ended questions, to give people space to respond, and that was my first recommendation in instrumentation. It might seem that we are agreed, but we are really not since he is sort of sounding one note and I thought of this as part of an all-court press. If it were going to be one note that is not the note I would sound.

I am in favor of saying "Democracy is a good thing: yes; no." That is a highly structured item and the amount of information we get out of a response is proportionate to the degree of freedom a person has." That's the least degree of freedom. We can tell what proportion of the people say democracy is a good thing. That's not terribly much information. Everybody agrees it's a good thing, everybody except young people. Young people rate democracy as less than a good thing. But practically everybody rates it a good thing.

If instead we say "Democracy is when everybody gets about the same as everybody else" or "Democracy is when everybody has an equal chance" -- very different equalizing means and equalizing ends to show that the

salience of this difference is from people who have had one curriculum or another or in one period of our history or another. This is very interesting, but I have collected data now two years ago -- very open-ended -- about alternatives -- "tell us about the future for children from 6 to 18" and so on. This summer I am hoping to get to the step before when I will analyze that question. So the terrible thing about open-ended stuff is that there is a lot of information but it takes a long time to track it down. I am meanwhile putting in a machine-compatible language for the answers to the foreseeable future from children of different ages and different curricula.

I have tenure, so I can afford to do that, but I can also afford to do it because I also have these structured questionnaires. But I think in the meantime you have to collect data on things that have a faster turnout rate.

R. HILL: Kohlberg gets a tremendous amount of information. That's one of the problems.

W. McGUIRE: You collect both kinds of data. Somebody asks what does it mean when you get the answer yes and you say, "Wait a minute. We did ask them why and as soon as we get enough money to analyze the why

responses we'll tell you."

R. SIGEL: And after you put it into the machine you still go back to the protocol. I spent four weeks after everything had been put in. It's time-consuming and, as you say, you need money and tenure.

W. McGUIRE: Something that Carl said I also want to throw in. He reminded me that some people think it's a zero sum game and the more you teach democracy the less you teach arithmetic; that the evaluation procedure should also make sure that it measures the three R's.

R. HILL: Nick, I would like to identify you as the person who may be charged with this task and you will certainly be involved. Our world has no tenure and we always have the threat of no money. Anyway, Nick, here is an opportunity, assuming you have this kind of task, to ask questions.

N. SANDERS: I have some specific questions. Because of what Judy has said I have a question for her, but she is not here and that's unfortunate. It has to do with her belief that the distinction between attitudinal or affective kinds of measurement as separate from cognitive is inappropriate, and that perhaps one new way to go about this would be to conceive of certain outcomes in

terms of schema. I would have liked to have had that further explored. That came to mind readily, and if anybody else wants to address it, fine.

As I said before lunch, one of my tasks at the moment is to try to map relationships between currently available measures and the set of outcomes or objectives that are listed in the Citizen Education definition that Russ included in the folder to you. That has been an enlightening kind of procedure and I think it clarifies the definitions of objectives when you begin to try to define measures for them. Things have to be defined further.

I guess this process that I am really responsible to follow and to complete is at the same time, as I understand Gideon's main point, one that will easily launch me into a great deal of trouble. One of the ways I read this is that if you have a set of numbers, numbers will be read as being much more definitive. They gain in importance. If you have a measure that turns up with a rather unequivocal mean, and even if you throw in a range that indicates dispersion it's going to mean trouble because we don't want to be as defined about these.

I see you're shaking your head.

G. SJOBERG: I think you're correct. Some situations are very highly delicate situations.

N. SANDERS: Bill, I think you made this comment and I want to be sure that one needs to follow a variety of orientations. We do have in addition to what Russ has indicated here other approaches. Also, as Russ has indicated, we would like to do ethnographic kinds of research, to go in parallel with the more quantitative outcome-oriented measures; so we will have it in perspective and there will be perhaps enough generality or ambiguity.

W. McGUIRE: I might suggest that in your mix you should have highly structured and very open-ended items -- both, instead of condemning one and praising the other. If you believe in Charles's law it doesn't mean you have to fight Boyle's law; they're both perhaps important.

And besides having very manageable, structured questions and open-ended informative background questions you should also do certain other things, such as the multi-variant analysis. You can go to schools of management and business for advice since they're used to dealing with that sort of data. Paul Green at the University of Pennsylvania is a very useful person in that

area. And you should do the archival data secondary analysis of opinion data that goes back 30 years and is very nicely machine-coded to see how feelings have been changing on this.

M. SANDERS: But you are not suggesting or I haven't heard you say anything yet about non-quantitative. I think of an ethnographic work as being not necessarily nonquantitative, but certainly a substantial part of that is a narrative.

W. McGUIRE: I'm the kind of person that Gideon claims can't think in these abstract terms, in terms of my own origins. I find that we speak in terms of variables, only we don't use that term admittedly, and the elite policymaker comes in and thinks that the South Bronx is a very complex situation actually in terms of an ethnographic total situation. The community person like me that he talks to says, "How many jobs are in it for us this year?" He is interested in the bottom line, namely, a variable. And the answer is, "We'll get to that, but it's really not all that important." But, of course, that's the only thing he thinks is important, that people in the community are variable-oriented, though they don't call it that, and they're not about to do ethnographic reports.

B. MASSIALAS: I don't know whether you have read a book by Sarazen, THE CULTURE OF THE SCHOOL, and also Jackson's LIFE IN THE CLASSROOM, and also Jill Henry. You look at the people and how they interact and you record, and you use your best insight; and when I read Sarazen I get a lot of insight, though not as a substitute for the other.

Research for Better Schools has a history of observation schedules and you have published one or two volumes --

R. HILL: More like 20, of various kinds.

B. MASSIALAS: I am concerned about the nonverbal communication that takes place among people which we never have even when you ask open-ended questions. There is a lot of that that through observation can be tapped, and maybe that would also give good data, qualitative.

R. ZAJONC: I don't want to be skeptical about this sort of approach and I think it's very important to have qualitative observational data --

B. MASSIALAS: Not as a substitute for the other.

R. ZAJONC: I think, however, from a tactical

point of view to collect good ethnographic data one needs much, much more training and experience than to collect the sort of data that Bill has described -- not only to collect, but to understand and interpret ethnographic data. There are very few people that can do this well and there is so much room for misinterpretation and misrepresentation that one would need an entire complex machinery to introduce safeguards.

I am not suggesting that one should abandon the hope altogether, but it seems to me that if this is to be a major part of the information base or some significant part of it --

R. HILL: You raise an important question. Let me make a distinction and then get your reaction to it. We have an applied process. We are working with schools to try to help them do something. Parallel to that we have a research effort. We're committed to an investment in ethnographic research which would not necessarily be used and would not be fed back to the public. We will have knowledgeable, professional, published people working with us on that and we assume it will be of professional research quality.

Is there a point, however, where after you

get some research and you begin to get hold of it from an ethnographic point of view that then you can do a more applied approach? I mean an approach where you're not going in totally open as an ethnographic person and trying to come up with variables, but you have then some variables in mind when you go in and you check them. Would that be a different process? Would there be as much risk in it?

W. McGUIRE: The precedent for that I think is the case study approach as opposed, say, to the Oscar Lewis big-book approach -- more the Terkl approach, where you col[illegible] a lot of data and then do a human relations area analysis or a Harvard case study analysis or the law analysis. You need an awful lot to start with. I don't think you get anything like that. You have to pick meaningful case studies that can be used, if not to communicate, to train people. You would have to know in advance which are the critical ones and I think you would end up with a small yield, but over the years I suppose if you publish enough of these ethnographic studies people then could have a set of case studies for using in their teacher education. It's a long way down the pike, though.

B. PRESSEISEN: Could I ask Bob to go [illegible] to the safeguard question. You seemed to have some

guards in mind that you were ready to state and I would like to push you on it if you do have them.

R. ZAJONC: I really don't. I simply mentioned them because that type of data collection process is much more open to the contribution of any kind of biases that the observer may have. If the data were collected by the school system which is responsible for the instruction they would certainly want it to look good. One somehow has to think about the possibility, whereas in other forms one does not.

B. MASSIALAS: Do you think a historian writing history doesn't have the same biases?

R. ZAJONC: Yes, but there are several historians writing the same history. If you have just one school official collecting ethnographic data for his own school you might have a problem.

B. MASSIALAS: Then you have a team approach.

R. ZAJONC: I am not saying this is necessary. I am just saying this is one element that one has to recognize because the data are open to bias.

B. MASSIALAS: But the advantage of that is you have direct insight into the situation, where your other instruments would not give you any sequence of events.

They would only give you what happened at one point in time.

R. ZAJONC: Personally I think the effort is not worth the trouble or the payoff is not worth the trouble. Opinions differ as to how much information you get out of this kind of long-term thing, either for a specific case or the general case.

B. PRESSEISEN: I just want to underline the fact that the ethnographic effort is not going to be the only effort by any means. It's a complementary effort. There are other forms of data collection.

R. HILL: Carl, do you want to ask some questions based on your experience? I don't think you're shy, but I want to press you a little bit because I think you have some insight and some bloody experience.

C. GUERRIERO: I am really away from most of the discussion. I understand the measurement business a little after five or six years in this area of what we call Citizenship Behavior. We really would like to do something better than what we are doing. We've played around with a little bit of Kohlberg's dilemmas, but the problem is trying to determine if anything positive has happened after using it for a year or two.

We have 35 condition variables we collect data on in the schools, such as economic background of the kids, the type of community they live in -- rural, urban, suburban; class size; teacher education; and all those sorts of things. We have gotten some very interesting correlations between some of those data. It seems that in high socioeconomic areas student behaviors are, at least as indicated by their attitudes on these scales, are not as high as they are in some of the rural areas. I suppose it's a reflection of the liberalism of the high socio-economic areas.

It's a wide open ball game. The legislatures are pushing to get things done and they are pushing us, and we don't feel we're doing a very good job of it. All the help we can get will be appreciated.

R. SIGEL: Carl, I'd like to ask you a question. You come from Harrisburg. How do you, for instance, act when, say, a team of university people gets into the school system -- let's take Bradford, Pennsylvania, or some place like that. The School Board is very, very concerned and tries to thwart the superintendent, tries to thwart your efforts. This has been my experience in western New York and Pennsylvania. A principal of a school

calls me up and says, "Come and help me -- this is impossible -- we're living in the 17th century" and I come in and the School Board virtually drives me out.

What do you do? I know the things you want to know.

C. GUERRIERO: Our program is mandated for three years, and we forced ourselves into 504 of 505 school districts. There is one we haven't gotten into and I don't think we ever will. We've got a little leverage there because they get most of their finances from the state and you can always threaten to cut it off, although I don't think that has ever been done in the couple hundred years the state has been in existence.

We are now back on a voluntary cycle, which means that schools request this assessment, and about two-thirds of the schools do. Most of them are still primarily concerned with basic skills or at least they say they are, and that's another interesting point. Once they get the data back it's up to the school district to decide what they want to do. We can't force them into doing anything about any of the goals, but we can make them recognize where weaknesses have occurred, whether it's basic skills, or citizenship behaviors, or self-esteem, or whatever.

If they plan to do nothing about a weakness, then they're supposed to indicate why. A justifiable reason is "our public does not support that goal." How do you find out if the public supports that goal or not? I devised a little scale (a survey sort of thing) where I have four statements for each of the ten goals, which gives me 40 statements. When you survey people, even very conservative people, using this sort of thing, -- where the average man on the street can read a statement and say "yes, I believe that's important" and the students can do that, or say "I don't believe that's important" -- it's really an operational definition of the goals.

Invariably the two goals that end up with the highest priority are self-esteem and citizenship. They alternate one and two. People seem to be saying when you nail them to the wall "I think it's important that my child can read and write, but first I want him to feel good about himself and, secondly, I want him to be a good citizen."

Some of them shake their heads when they're finished with that priority ranking and they say "I thought I was a back-to-basic conservative and here I am saying that citizenship and self-esteem are more important to me than reading and writing."

R. SIGEL: That's fascinating. When you get that from the community can you or do you have the guts to go in and say "if you want self-esteem, then permitting a teacher to hit a kid is counterproductive"? Can you go in and confront people with what they ask the school to do and what they really want?

C. GUERRIERO: We can confront them. It's a matter of whether they're going to do anything about it. One of the items on the self-esteem battery says something to the effect of "I often feel put down by my teacher" -- a fifth grade item. Statewide about one-third of the fifth graders say that that is generally the case, that they often feel put down by their teachers. That's as bad as or worse than corporal punishment, I suppose, but the problem is how do you change the teacher's behavior. You can show the teachers that item and they don't tell you right out but I'm sure they're thinking that it's the teacher down the hall the kids are referring to.

I suspect they don't follow that up, and after you leave they go back to teaching reading and writing and forget about the self-esteem. It's a real problem. They want help; at least the administration says "come in and help us improve the citizenship behavior," but

there is not a whole lot we know about it yet.

W. McGUIRE: Suppose you test out one of these people and give them an immoral dilemma and say "Would you rather your child be very good at arithmetic and think she doesn't know nearly as much as she should, or would you rather she be an idiot in arithmetic and feel she knows just as much as she should? Which would you rather your child be?"

C. GUERRIERO: That would be interesting. I have not done that.

R. HILL: At this point I would like to ask those who haven't spoken regarding this case situation if they would like to offer some observations. (No response) If not, I would like to close this section of the colloquium by pointing out that there are some exciting things happening and there is even some readiness, a possible basis of support for real action and help in these areas; and we hope to respond to this.

Building on the situation that Carl has described in his state there are school districts now with low scores who want help and want people to come in and help them think through what can be done in individual schools. We want to help the state by seeking out those

districts and begin to develop model programs. This will be our strategy because we want to perceive Citizen Education as much more than just a social studies classroom -- rather the whole social ethos, if you will, of that school situation. Can we do it? We certainly will misfire. We certainly will have all kinds of problems. If we don't get run out of town once or twice we probably have tried to do the job well enough. We have to keep that in mind.

But this is what we hope to do and in doing it we hope to follow this kind of procedure, where we involve the staff and hopefully some parents and community people as agents, if you will, in the whole activity. We hope to have them data-oriented and collect data about it in a way that is inoffensive and useful and is based on some kind of concern.

You just heard Carl mention a very simple way of sampling attitudes and helping people, the general public, make some discriminations. We hope to build on the technology that the state has worked out. Also, New Jersey has some excellent intervention programs -- not statewide in application, but they have some excellent model programs. New Jersey is also developing statewide measurement programs.

So there are pieces. There are things that can happen. You heard about Dr. Massialas's work in Tallahassee and the models there. That's the kind of thing we hope to do.

K. DAWSON: I have a question of clarification. When you talk about the community who are you talking about? You mentioned representative agents in the community. That becomes oftentimes one of the most difficult questions. If you like, I could relate at least one study that we partly underwrote where we tried to get at the community involvement aspect of the problem.

R. HILL: I feel that I am probably unsophisticated concerning the questions. I know there is literature on this and I would defer to your description, but let my unsophisticated answer, though. Certainly the community would involve the parents of the children, and if there is a geographical boundary of some kind it would involve a geographical boundary. If that particular school is related to some larger group, a larger geographical political unit such as a neighborhood being within a city, it would probably include some representative from that larger group if possible.

How successful we would be on that I don't

know. I do know there is a whole literature on that. We have some people trying to think through how that happens and what the problems are and the trade-offs in doing that and the cost in getting too many people into the act and trying to deal with that.

K. DAWSON: I don't know if you are familiar with the study that Nancy Winer was engaged in in Cambridge, Massachusetts. This was an attempt to develop a community dialog on citizenship education. The process was really much more interesting than the results she obtained. Part of the process was her difficulty in getting in and getting acceptance. She tried to work through school systems and found that that really didn't seem to be possible because she had to develop priorities a year or two years or three years in advance, or there were some other structural difficulties.

She ended up trying to get what she called community representatives, and it ended up with some teachers and principals and street crossing guards, a lawyer, a City Councilman, people working in social services. I think probably the most interesting person at that Cambridge meeting was a juvenile police officer.

There were three meetings over a month or

six-week period, in which this same group of ten or fifteen people met. We got transcripts of the meeting and she did a major write-up for us.

What was interesting in it was they started with their conceptions of citizenship education and they went through many of the kinds of things that I think have shown up in the process of the work that Carl mentioned. There was a real concern with caring and for the people-to-people definition, interpersonal relationships. They were very involved in their representative role dealing with children: the street crossing guard and her contact with children on a day to day basis; the principal and the teacher. They were very much involved in the caring notion of citizenship education.

The police officer finally stood up and called them all phonies. He said he didn't know why he was there and he didn't understand what they were talking about. He said he had to deal with kids in a real way, kids who had nowhere to go at night, never went to school. The whole dialog got very much involved with the fact that it's so difficult to handle the problems of citizenship education when you're looking at it in terms of one piece, and that there are so many other factors involved that you

really have trouble grasping or dealing with; that there were lots of other problems that had nothing to do with the schools per se.

At the end of the third dialog the people were saying "this has really been interesting, a kind of personal catharsis, and I have an idea that if I have a problem in this area I know someone I can call." That was the most positive thing that came out of it. There wasn't that much concrete; they hadn't moved far enough. It was a tremendously long and difficult process.

These are the people Nancy was able to get to commit themselves to come to the meeting. There were a number of other people that she approached who wanted nothing to do with it. If the police officer hadn't been there I'm not sure if they would have raised some of the major issues or questions. There was an eye-level consensus. They all would have felt they were for the right values and good things, and they would have gone out patting each other on the back. I think he raised some of the real questions which made them stand back and say, "What can we or what can we not do?" It made them discuss what the problems really are.

I just suggest that the whole area of defining

the community is terribly important in terms of what you come out with.

R. HILL: Wow!

Any closing comments from anybody?

B. MASSIALAS: I was involved with two of the schools that Kohlberg did. One was in Cambridge, the Latin School, and the other one was -- I forget where.

R. HILL: Brookline.

B. MASSIALAS: The first one only had part of the school participate in those sessions where they were really dealing with some basic problems -- runaways from school and such issues. The rest of the school was not involved and I don't know what that kind of situation does to the rest of the people.

Then I went to the other school, and the other school had just forgotten about it more or less. That was before we started the project in Tallahassee and I was very skeptical. The way Kohlberg was describing it to me, and the others too, they were so enthusiastic about it, and then when I visited the schools it was not working the way they had conceptualized it. So I came back a little disheartened that we start with grandiose and beautiful ideas and then we go back and find out that the schools do not

implement them.

The moral of all this is, number one, that you need to have a more realistic assessment of what is feasible and what you can do; and, number two, you need to have enough endurance and/or enough people that would go along with you over a period of time. That's how the second school lost out -- the teachers who started with them just dropped out one by one. There was no commitment there, and the idea was never put into practice as far as I'm concerned.

I haven't seen Kohlberg since that time to ask him about it.

R. HILL: It's a problem with all educational interventions. What you have just described to me has happened again and again in different kinds of programs, everything from reading to environmental programs, and so on. There are all kinds of dynamics that operate. If you get a very excellent program and it becomes known, the staff is promoted to all kinds of things. They get doctorates.

B. MASSIALAS: I am thinking of the open classroom idea, with modifications, and I am thinking of the new math and social science. There was some continuity and still is, and some ideas gain momentum. That's the

point. Why is it that some ideas gain momentum and are accepted, and others are not?

R. HILL: There is a literature on research and development, and certainly our approach is based on some of that literature. We know certain factors really support it. For example, if you have the backing of the state, the state can influence curriculum to some extent. It can influence what is happening. State legislators pass laws and, as a matter of fact, that does change things, surprisingly enough; maybe not in quality, but certainly to some degree.

W. McGUIRE: Isn't there implied here a Utopian notion where we can intervene and everyone live happily ever after and, if not, it's a failure? To me to make an intervention that lasts four and a half years boggles the mind. There is a controversy on Machiavelli -- was he being sarcastic or giving directions for leadership. Towards the end he mentions that Cesare Borgia, after his father died, Alexander IV, it was three whole months before the people of Campagna rose up and overthrew him. They were obviously being sarcastic.

If you have a notion that life is like a rope with one end staked into a cliff and you throw the other

end out and you run across and see how far you can get before you fall down, three months to his world was an astounding thing.

I think in the schools, too, if you can show an effect after three years that's pretty good. Meanwhile other interventions hopefully are being cooked up in other parts of the constituencies.

R. SIGEL: I was just thinking of the measurement question. Many of the citizenship education studies show that there are at least two different goals. One is what I call the virtuous citizen -- good neighbor and all this kind of stuff; and the other one is what you might call a more active citizen.

When it comes to the first goal, the good human being, that probably is the most difficult to measure and in many ways also is the most difficult to teach. And there I would think I would share some of your misgivings about is it worth gathering data.

When it comes to the informed rational participant, or whatever you want to call the second model of the citizen -- the public one, if you would in your guidance to the school restrict yourself to some cognitive and some behavioral outcomes instead of trying to cover the

waterfront, and be very specific and work out with the schools the rationale of why this would be important, and then have a before-measure, and introduce treatment variables by which you give kids a chance to practice some of the principles that you want to get across, and then an after-measure, and then convince the schools to do this over four years (or whatever period), by narrowing the goal in (a) ambition and (b) into things that are really measurable you might not only yourself have more satisfaction but you might give the school system more satisfaction.

Nothing is nicer for a school system than to think they have done something that paid off. There is nothing worse than being told after four years that the average score has gone up by .0001. The reaction to that is "What the hell do we need it for?"

R. HILL: Your point is well taken. We will have to be specific. One of the things that has come out of the conference from my point of view is some ideas about priorities. For example, we heard Judy Torney being very heavy about perspective taking. That would be one example of priorities. Then some conceptualization ideas and other things we might look at. We need to be much more

delimited in working with the schools.

Any other final statements?

There are many people out there in front of us. We don't see ourselves as pioneers in any sense. There are other good projects. While Kohlberg's two Boston schools (I think he has three or four now) seem to be diminishing in vitality (or at least one of them is), the banner in his case has been picked up by Fenton, who is very powerful and able and a person who has added several additional strengths and dimensions and has conceptualized the idea further. Maybe that's how things move, too, and we would like to draw on those kinds of attempts.

I would like to thank you for coming, all of you, and for lasting through to this seemingly late hour, although it's not quite three o'clock. I particularly appreciated the last hour or so. I have heard several perspectives that will, I think, be helpful to me and I hope to our staff. We would like to remain in correspondence with you and send position papers and reports as we go along. If you have some time and would be willing to reflect on them and send us a letter from time to time and give us hell about some things or point out or suggest, we would be most appreciative.

Have I let you say everything you wanted to say?

W. McGUIRE: I was a little surprised that the questions you asked us almost all seem on measuring the effects of the program, and you didn't ask us very much on opinions about what the program should be, or what kinds of interventions.

R. HILL: I think that's right, but we will invite some papers and do some literature research analysis on what are the most effective interventions. I guess I have a linear mind, and am compartmentalized a little too much.

W. McGUIRE: It just seems the wrong sequence, that first you should decide what you want to do and then how you measure how effectively you've done it, rather than in general to ask how shall we measure how effective the program is, and then decide what the program should be.

R. HILL: But in order to decide what we want to do we have to look at what we can measure.

Thank you all.

(The colloquium was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.)