DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 719 SO 008 558

AUTHOR Bailey, Kenneth D.
TITLE Political Environment, Issue Saliency, and Systemic Support among Children: Pre-Watergate/Post-pardon.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association (33rd, Chicago, Illinois, May 1-3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Cognitive Development; Current Events; Elementary Secondary Education; Political Attitudes; Political Influences; *Political Issues; *Political Science; *Political Socialization; Social Science Research; Speeches; *Student Alienation; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

The impact of social and political events on the development of political attitudes in children is examined. Political learning is seen as an invariant sequence of developmental stages dependent upon physical and intellectual growth, and current events. The data consist of interviews with children at the third through the ninth grade levels. The data are further stratified along an urban/rural dimension for purposes of sociocultural comparisons. Results indicate that there is a relationship between stages of cognitive development and the evolution of political orientations in children. There is an association between age level of the children and the degree to which they support or have confidence in the government. Opinion samples taken before and after the Nixon resignation and pardon indicate a decrease in the degree of government support and confidence. The author concludes that the present distrust in government is therefore due to situational factors. (Author/DE)

POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT, ISSUE SALIENCY, AND SYSTEMIC SUPPORT AMONG CHILDREN: PRE-WATERGATE/POST-PARDON

by

Kenneth D. Bailey

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

Prepared for delivery at the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association Pick-Congress Hotel, Chicago, IL., May 1-3, 1975.

POLITICAL ENVIRONMENT, ISSUE SALIENCY, AND SYSTEMIC SUPPORT AMONG CHILDREN: PRE-WATERGATE/POST-PARDON

Empirical research over the past decade and a half has demonstrated an increasing interest in the age-old question, "How are we socialized to politics?" Within the past two years politically relevant events have accentuated research into systemic support, frequently expressed as regime-supportive idealization of the president during childhood, and has brought to question several fundamental premises underlying earlier findings of highly positive orientations of children toward the presidency.[1] The impact of a dynamic political environment has punctuated Sigel's statement that

> learning does not take place in a vacuum but can be greatly affected by the social setting in which it happens. The political environment is but one of such settings . . . one of the important variables that affect the course of political socialization.[2]

Accepting this as a point of departure from the more popular approaches to the study of political behavior, we will examine political learning as an invariant sequence of developmental stages dependent upon physical and intellectual growth.[3]

The Nixon debacle,[4] regardless of how history eventually interprets it, has provided political socialization researchers with an excellent opportunity to reexamine the processes by which children acquire evaluative postures toward political figures. This is especially so with investigators who were in

the process of studying the development of political orientations in children when "Watergate" broke as a viable issue.[5] For example, research conducted before- during- and after-Nixon could possibly help to determine whether children are able to distinguish between the role-occupant (president) and the institution (presidency). Recent research seems to suggest that emphasis should be placed on the processes of political maturation of the young as well as upon the substance of youthful attitudes. Any differences found in pre- and post-Nixon measurements might reasonably be interpreted as a form of differential learning.[6]

Again, we need to reflect on Sigel's reference to the possible impact of the sociopolitical environment on the degree and rate of political maturation of children in a dynamic society. As we shall see, maturation, i.e., development by growth and experience, is by definition dynamic and a process orientation could possibly predict the "fluidity of youthful political attitudes."[7]

Adopting this orientation, then, we define political socialization along lines suggested by Merelman: political socialization incorporates the processes by which political orientations become established and internalized in childhood and adolescence.[8]

In sum, the purpose of this study is to ascertain the relevance of the concept political socialization as an acquisition process for the learning of political values and behavior.[9] Although the primary focus of the larger study[10] is aimed at the

individual (micro) level of analysis, i.e., the internalization of values, beliefs, and attitudes about things political, there are system (macro) level implications which can equally be inferred from the data. For example, emphasis on a macro level of analysis forces us to ask such questions as: What is the impact of political socialization on the political system? How does a system maintain itself and manage to persist in the face of threats to its existence? What variables are central to long-term stability or instability of a (any) political system? while a micro level orientation turns our focus to such questions as: How are one's values, beliefs, and attitudes interrelated? How and when are political orientations formed? What impact do social and political events (environment) have on the development of political attitudes in children, that is, how and under what circumstances do they change? And, finally, we can combine our foci by asking: What is the process of socialization of the young to politics (e.g., agents, forces, information sources, etc.) which influences individual behavior, and what impact does it have for the society at large and the political culture it fosters?

Most, if not all, of these questions have been examined by political and behavioral scientists alike. However, our theoretical framework for analysis and our somewhat unique data collection technique require a reexamination of some of the most basic, and widely accepted, findings of the so-called "first generation" political socialization investigators. For example, much previous

research has shown that for children the president, as the most visible symbol of authority, has provided both a cognitive and an affective stimulus for early development of political orientations in children.[11] During these early years it is assumed that the child begins to acquire knowledge of the political system, and, as he matures, he begins "to map out the political universe around him and to discover where he fits into it."[12] Placed in a developmental context, it can be said that the child begins growth processes from which evolve "cognitive structures." The term cognitive structures refers, basically, to the mental organizations or abilities possessed by children.[13]

Before explication of the theoretical framework and the presentation of relevant developmental findings, it should be noted that the educator, too, is interested in orienting the young toward accepted societal values, norms and attitudes. This is evidenced by the fact that political indoctrination of the young is commonplace in many nations, including those we label "democracies." The importance of the process of indoctrinating the young is apparent by the praise (and blame) educators receive for their efforts to socialize the young both cognitively and affectively. For example, the continuing controversies over textbooks[14] and the development of new programs in civic education, e.g., programs which give stress to the virtues of democracy and which encourage civic duty and participation, are cases in point.

Likewise, political leaders themselves regard childhood

socialization programs as effective means for producing loyalty and support for the existing political system.[15] This is not to imply that concern for "political" education is a new or innovative technique. Plato, in The Republic, has Socrates admonishing Glaucon to heed closely the relationship between the character of a people and its political system:

> Well then, . . . you know there must be as many kinds of men as constitutions. You don't suppose the constitutions grow out of a tree or stone; no, they grow out of men's manners in the cities, whichever manners tip the scales down, so to speak, and draw the other after them.[16]

Thereafter, Plato develops his "degenerative" theory of political systems, illustrating how deficiencies in the political or "character" education of both children and adults leads to the decline of societies from aristocracy through timocracy, oligarchy, and democracy to tryanny.

In similar fashion, Aristotle, concerned especially with conflict, change, and revolution, analyzes the relationship between the peoples' character and the political system. He was particularly sensitive to the function of education in shaping one's character:

> The citizen should be moulded to suit the form of government under which he lives. For each government has a peculiar character which originally formed and which continues to preserve it. The character of democracy creates democracy, and the character of oligarchy creates oligarchy. . . .[17]

It is evident, even from these selected examples, that early political philosophers were very much concerned with the relation-

ship between personality or character development and the culture -- including political culture. They were particularly aware of the role of character education in the maintenance or changing of political systems.

Beyond this, perhaps contemporary emphasis on political education can more clearly be seen as being rooted in the social revolution of the 18th century. For example, Rousseau, recognizing that social order depended as much on the moods and the manners of the public as on inscribed laws or prescribed behavior, declared that the social order rests upon a law which is

> graven neither on marble nor on brass, but in the hearts of the citizens; a law which creates the real constitution of the state, which acquires new strength daily, which, when other laws grow obsolete or pass away, revives them or supplies their place, preserves a people in the spirit of their institutions, and imperceptibly substitutes the force of habit for that of authority. I speak of manner, customs, and above all of opinion.[18]

Rousseau also insisted that the young be affectively socialized. By this he meant that "intensification of social sentiment," was the goal to be pursued. The citizens, he said, ". . . all have equally a need for guidance. . . .They must be taught what it is they will. From this increase of public knowledge would result . . . harmony . . . and the highest power of the whole."[19] On numerous occasions he emphasized that it was education of the young that provided the foundation of social life. Specifically, he declared that "It is education that must give souls a national formation, and direct their opinions and tastes in such a way

that they will be patriotic by inclination, by passion, by necessity."[20]

Other modern theorists, including Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke, have been concerned with the interaction of human nature and the political system. That is, they were concerned with the political indoctrination of the young toward the maintenance of the system. For example, Hobbes and Locke discussed at length the structure of authority within the family with specific reference to the significance of power within families for politics in civil society.[21]

Even more contemporary, philosopher-educator John Dewey, as is evident by many of his writings, was well aware of the critical relationship between cultural inculcation and system effects.[22] During the early 1930's, Dewey was joined in the endeavor to stress the need for civic education in the public school systems by Charles E. Merriam, a political scientist at the University of Chicago. Merriam was one of the first in the discipline to emphasize the desirability of direct study of individual political participation, including children. Nearly fifty years ago he reminded us that "every modern state develops a far-reaching program designed to maintain the morale of its constituent members at a point where their activities will fit in with and perform the functional activities for group survival."[23] What Merriam was saying is that all political systems evolve programs to prepare their citizens for participation in political life.

These "learning" programs, he stressed, could be formal or informal, planned or unplanned. At the end of his review of civic training in several countries, Merriam noted that in the modern world (of the 1930's) "increasing attention is given to the systematic and conscious development of elaborate mechanisms of civic training, and less reliance is placed upon unorganized drift."[24] As early as 1925, he had predicted that "the examination of the rise and development of the political ideation and the political behavior of the child has in store for us much of value in the scientific understanding of the adult ideal and conduct."[25] Harold Lasswell, (a student of Merriam's) recognized the dearth of understanding on the "psychology of voting" -- a primary focus of most early studies on adult political behavior -- and urged the continuing study of political orientations at all age levels. For example, Lasswell argued that insufficient cognitive and moral development among the young constituted a continuing threat to democracy.[26]

With this background, political socialization investigators have taken up the quest for empirically supported answers to the historically relevant question (as originally posed by Lasswell and paraphrased by Greenstein in his New Haven study): Who learns what from whom under what circumstances with what effects?[27]

Methods and Procedures

During the first decade of political socialization research investigation was guided, basically, by one of two orientations. The first, Hyman's sociological perspective,[28] has been said to have had the unfortunate side-effect of orienting researchers toward the measurement

> of youthful political preferences, rather than [illuminating] psychological processes by which socialization agencies operated. . . . [Thus] research became the study of political preferences at particular points in childhood and adolescence, rather than the longitudinal study of political maturation.[29]

The second early orientation, emerging from the Chicago school of thought mentioned above, was guided by Easton's systems analytic framework, particularly his concept of "diffuse support" as a mechanism for the development of political orientations in children.[30]

In other words, early political socialization studies focused on children's learning about "things" political; that is, the focus was on the child's generalized affect for the political system per se or for the system as represented by its institutions, such as the presidency, and development of support for these structures of authority. More specifically, as Sigel and Brooks have so aptly pointed out,[31] many researchers were inquiring into the depth of the child's attachment to the political system (Easton's diffuse support, above), but were ignoring the child's evaluation of or support for public officials and/or their practices or policies (Easton's specific support).[32] Most of the studies found that

generalized affect was high across all age groups and seemed to appear early in life, long before substantive information was acquired. These studies also found that although navie idealization, as characterized by the young, dropped with age and gave way to increased realism, confidence in the competence of government and its officials remained high.[33]

Since the "renaissance" of interest into how children form political attitudes, researchers and critics alike have enumerated basic limitations and have raised numerous questions regarding data collection techniques and theoretical orientations as applied by political socialization investigators. Included in these criticisms are such methodologically relevant questions as: Is adult behavior ultimately shaped by orientations acquired during childhood? Has research not been time-bound? that is, Can we really talk about the "development of political behavior" by employing cross-sectional designs which study children at relatively close age intervals for the purpose of observing "year-by-year shifts in political orientations?"[34] What role does changes in the political environment -- particularly occurances of the magnitude and frequency of those since 1963 -- have on early childhood socialization? Is research not only time-bound, but system specific? that is, Has research been culturally-bound in that we have focused primarily on the "American" culture (and the "dominate" culture, at that) to the exclusion of cross-cultural analysis? Do children, or adults, for that matter, really have opinions and form attitudes about government and politics? if so, How stable are they? These are only a

few of the many questions that have been raised during the past decade concerning political socialization research.[35]

We, of course, cannot -- nor do we intend to -- approach all of the questions raised. The present study is limited to: a description of a data collection technique by which, essentially, the same children were interviewed over a given period of time; an exploration of the possible impact of recent political events (environment) on the development of political orientations in children; and the explication and applicability of a cognitive-developmental framework for the analysis of political socialization data.

Data Collection: Since the first empirical study[36] of the formation of political attitudes in children, students of political socialization have talked about the "desirability of longitudinal research" designs as necessary for the identification of developmental patterns of political behavior. With few exceptions,[37] most political socialization investigators have dealt with the "developmental" problem by examining children at different grade levels at one point in time. This has frequently been labeled a "longitudinal perspective" or a "quasi-longitudinal" design.[38] The basic assumption was that any differences found between children in the lower grades were differences which constituted developmental patterns. It was also assumed that by examing patterns of childhood development we might better explain adult political behavior, if, in fact, youthful orientations do persist to affect later political action (or inaction). Jaros, among others, has challenged this approach as making an unsubstantiated inferential leap. He has

further stated that the key to whether childhood orientations have any affect on adult political behavior requires comparative research -- not necessarily comparisons between nations or across cultures,

> but comparisons of the same individuals over time. Put simply, we need to measure people's political orientations while they are children [and as adolescents] and then again when they are adults. If there are relationships between the . . . sets of measurements, we are justified in inferring that the childhood orientations persist. If there are no relationships, it appears that childhood socialization is not relevant for adult political behavior and that research in this area is a waste of time.[39]

Recognizing some of the limitations listed above and the need for some type of longitudinal design, this study represents a multi-stage project on the development of political orientations of children in an area of the United States which encompasses a geographically recognized subculture. The project is in no way meant to be a definitive study of the developmental stages of political orientations from child to adulthood. However, by combining the study of individuals over a period of time and at successive stages with the more traditional cross-sectional methods of survey research, we have "telescoped" a considerable time-span into a relatively short period of time. The project, as initiated, required the administration of paper-and-pencil questionnaires to students in the third, sixth, and ninth grades followed by a second "wave" of interviews with essentially the same children at the fourth, seventh, and tenth grades, and finally, a third "wave" of interviews with the students as fifth, eighth, and eleventh graders. The final phase was to include in-depth personal interviews (employing some of Greenstein's semi-projective "hypothetical" stories)[40] with a specifically selected

random sample of the students at the last three grade levels. The cross-sectional nature of the first stage was aimed at making the study more efficient by utilizing the primary interviews as an "hypotheses-seeking" study which had as its primary goal the generation of hypotheses about the processes of political development. The follow-up interviews -- at twelve month intervals -- were guided by suggestions from the cross-sectional study and the interview schedule modified by the addition and deletion of items. Where possible, the survey data were supplemented with additional information obtained from school officials and student files.[41]

TABLE : EXAMPLE TABLE — "Telescoped Longitudinal" Frequency and Central Tendency Comparisons

("Exact wording of the question. . . .")

RESPONSE	GRADE	URBAN 1973	URBAN 1974	URBAN 1975	RURAL 1973	RURAL 1974	RURAL 1975
Responses to above question -- with some responses collapsed for statistical purposes,	3	%-- grade-across-time --%			%-- grade-across-time --%		
	4		%			%	
	5			%			%
	6	%-- "	"	--	%-- "	"	--
	7		%			%	
	8			%			%
	9	%-- "	"	--	%-- "	"	--
	10		%			%	
	11			%			%
Responses. . . .	3	%			%		
	4		%			%	
	5			%			%
	6	%			%		
	7		%			%	
	8			%			%
	9	%			%		
	10		%			%	
	11			%			%
Responses. . . .	3	%			%		
	4		%			%	
	5			%			%
	6	%			%		
	7		%			%	
	8			%			%
	9	%			%		
	10		%			%	
	11			%			%

NOTE: Data for CEQ I and CEQ II were collected during March 1973 and March 1974, respectively. Data for CEQ III were collected during late February and early March 1975. Since the questionnaires were evaluated and modified each year, some of the questions that were included on CEQ II and CEQ III were not on CEQ I. However, it should be noted that at least 40 items were retained on all three questionnaires thereby permitting item and index comparisons longitudinally. **Grade-across-time data apply to 3rd, 6th and 9th grades for 1973 and 1975 only.** Additional comparisons are possible by reading down the table for cross-sectional data as well as across and diagonally.

As indicated earlier, Sigel has raised the question of the possible influence of the social and political environment on the degree and rate of political maturation of children. Sears, in his review of three major political socialization works, questions whether individual attitudes remain constant regardless of political change. He states that

> Whatever political constancy across the individual's life that does exist may be due as much to environmental continuities as to the persisting psychological effects of early socialization. . . .It may be that changes in the political environment of the magnitude of those occurring since 1963 have been sufficient to produce major changes in the "political self," early socialization and maturational stages be damned.[42]

Other students of political socialization seem to have reached the same conclusion and have gone back either to reinterview samples from populations previously used in research or have attempted to interview the same children, or, at least, the same grades in schools included in previous research efforts.[43] The point is, of course, that we can only identify developmental (learning) patterns by examining the same people or a sample of the same population over a specified period of time. Thus, "longitudinality" (or "tracking" in the latter case) is said to permit the analysis of "gross" (individual) as well as "net" (marginal) change in samples or populations, and is said to have the "added power of inference, derived from repeated measurements on the same responsents" or samples of the same population.[44] The relative absence of longitudinal research, particularly on the acquisition of political orientations by children remains one of the critical problem areas in the develop-

ment of socialization theory. It is unrealistic, however, to expect extensive longitudinal research efforts on how we are socialized to politics. Longitudinal studies are difficult to conduct in that they are more costly than cross-sectional research, the length of time required for completion is considerably longer, and the researcher is frequently unable to control for attrition in the original survey group when administering subsequent interviews.[45]

There seems to be no question, however, about the importance and potential value of a longitudinal approach. In spite of known technical difficulties, almost all researchers on human behavior -- as well as their critics -- agree on the basic need for such research.[46]

Here we define longitudinality as the "study of individuals over a period of time or at successive stages."[47] Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the longitudinal approach is a method which allows us to study trends or the effects (impact?) of stimuli, formal and/or informal training, naturalistic events, and experience with "before" and "after" observations of essentially the same group of students. More specifically, longitudinality consists of repeated measurements of one or more aspects of behavior in the same individuals over a given period of time. The purpose of the measurements, of course, is an attempt to detect elements of change, development, consistency and inconsistency during the specified time span. In sum, longitudinality conotes the study of the same individuals overtime and does not, of necessity, demand that these individuals be comparable on a one-to-one bases.[48]

Environmental Setting: Previous research has all but ignored the impact of political events upon the development of political attitudes in children. Sigel has stated that the early research orientations focused on changes associated with progression in school and attributed them to "growing cognitive maturity" as though the child grew and developed oblivious of the political world or as though the political world was static.[49] Contrary to Schaie's position (see footnote 48, supra), social scientists concerned with developmental aspects of human behavior frequently depend upon uncontrolled "environmental impact" which is uniquely determined by the status of the environment during the historical time period under study. Students of political socialization cannot assume environmental stability, and therefore, must assume some effect of any unspecified environmental stimuli upon their subjects. When there is a fairly clearly defined phenomenon which occurs during the course of study, the researcher must give this phenomenon due consideration in evaluating cognitive and/or affective effects in regard to his sample.[50] In other words, we must realize that frequently the investigator has no control[51] over the stimuli or the impact of environmental changes; we must assume that the researcher is cognizant of these changes and that they are taken into consideration during interpretation and analysis. This is especially so in regard to socio-cultural differences which are of paramount importance to researchers in child development.

In regard to politics, information on the impact of historical events on children's political thinking and on the interaction of the changing individual with the changing political system is sparse. Perhaps the question to be proffered is: Are children impervious to "crises" type sociopolitical events which have surrounded them on a regularized basis over the past decade? -- regularized in the sense that since the early nineteen sixties, politically relevant events, such as, rioting in many of our large cities, United States involvement in Vietnam, three political assassinations, aggressive reaction by adults to the busing of children for purposes of integration (all violent events brought into our homes via television), the resignation of a Vice-President under duress, and finally, Watergate and all of its ramifications, including the resignation of a President of the United States under the threat of impeachment, have appeared with a great deal of frequency.

Another, and possibly more readily accepted, environmental aspect that must be taken into consideration is the sociocultural dimensions within which a study takes place. Obviously, there is no absolute, irrevocable definition of environment -- or, for that matter, of "environmental impact." However, in regard to childhood socialization we must, at a minimum, consider the following dimensions:

1. The generally accepted ways of behaving within the effective culture (school, community, and, loosely, nation); and the limits beyond which behavior is not permitted.

> 2. The sex of the [students].
> 3. Chronological, mental, and physical age. Society holds different expectations of an 18 year old than of a [10] year old; of a youth with 150 IQ than one with a 75 IQ; of an early maturing boy or girl than of a late bloomer.
> 4. Socioeconomic class, at least along the broad dimensions of advantaged and disadvanted.[52]

Any further explication of environment or environmental impact should most likely be considered in relation to our conceptual framework for analysis.

Developmental Framework - An Overview: Any exploration of Jean Piaget's concepts of the development of cognitive and affective thinking in children (and adolescents) must begin with a caveat; that is, it should be noted at the outset that it is doubtful whether, in regard to politics, individuals ever develop cognitive structures (mental organizations and operations) of the same magnitude as with other social and, particularly, physical objects and events. However, a Piagetian framework for analysis is most enlightning in regards to other aspects of the development of political orientations in children. For example, a developmental framework can help us understand the "stability/instability" questions raised by several political socialization investigators; it helps explain the "time-lag" frequently found between the development of political concepts in different ethnic groups; and, because of its hierarchical nature, it can be useful in explaining human inflexibility (or perhaps, reversibility) in accepting undesirable political stimuli.

To begin with, there are a variety of theories from related disciplines -- particularly sociology and psychology -- used to describe how people learn. Generally speaking, these can be broken down into three approaches which subsume the basic theories of socialization: the psychoanalytic (Freudian); the social-learning; and the cognitive-developmental.[53] We are, of course, interested in the developmental view as originally presented by Piaget and his associates and further explicated and extended by Kohlberg.[54] Assuming a developmental framework, we have already defined political socialization as the processes by which political orientations become established and internalized in childhood and adolescence. Likewise, we have already stated that by "orientations" be meant to imply all the perceptions (cognitions, knowledge), affect (feelings, attitudes), and evaluations (values, norms) through which a person relates himself to social objects (see footnote 30, supra). In effect, our definition implies the existence of levels or stages of development toward differential levels of political objects.

In regard to cognitive and affective thinking in children, Piaget considers "affects" to be emotional aspects of behavior, while he considers "cognitions" as intellectual activities of the mind. Piaget has often stated that cognitions and affects do not cause one another, but, instead, they interact in the development of higher (mental) structures. Piaget and Barbel

Inhelder have written:

> There is no behavior pattern, however intellectual, which does not involve affective factors as motives; but, reciprocally, there can be no affective state without the intervention of perceptions or comprehensions which constitute their cognitive structure. . . .The two aspects, affective and cognitive, are at the same time inseparable and irreducible.[55]

Andrain has asserted that although present in human behavior, as concepts, cognitive and affective aspects of intellectual growth "can be separated" for analytical purposes.[56] Merelman, expounding on what other investigators have merely alluded to, has developed a framework for analysis adopting a cognitive-developmental approach applicable to the development of childhood orientations to politics.[57] Before proceeding with an overview of Piaget's "stages" of intellectual growth and development, we should examine some central themes posited by Piaget.

There seem to be at least four basic themes or principles to Piaget's theory of intellectual (mental) development:

> 1. Intelligence is conceived of as the possession of operations or rules of transformation.
> 2. Development is seen as an invariant passage from one stage of operations to the next.
> 3. Passage from one stage to the next is considered a function of both experience and maturation.
> 4. The operations that are part of intelligence and which change with one's development are logical structures that are neither dependent on nor derivative of language, per se.[58]

Assuming these basic principles, Piaget tries to account for how children develop cognitive and affective thinking.

To elaborate briefly, we should note that a distinction should be made between one's "capacity for intelligence" or thought processes, and one's possession of "knowledge or information systems" (cognitive structures). The possession of knowledge is not the same as one's capacity for knowing. Instead, a child's intellectual growth is directly related to his awareness of "constancies" in society (both the social and physical worlds).[59] To discover these constancies, however, the child "must learn to distinguish between reality and appearance, between how things look and how they really are."[60] In this sense, Piaget is arguing that there exists an "action-thought" continuum, which, with time, one "interiorizes." That is, he is saying that knowledge about reality is not attributable entirely to experience -- the action of things upon us -- but also to reason -- our mental actions upon things (e.g., actions upon objects, themes, or symbols). Likewise, Piaget claims that children progress from perception to images to operations along this action-thought continuum. He states that the adaptive characteristics of the child are based on intellectual structures which utilize three basic concepts at all stages of development. These three concepts -- assimilation, accommodation, and equilibration -- all are tied in with the child's mental operations and cognitive structures which are called "schematas."[61] With the increasing age of the child, the complexity of the schematas are reflective of more sophisticated mental structures.

For Piaget, the modes for knowing are termed assimilation and accommodation and are considered to be invariant and occur at all age levels and at all levels of mental development. Equilibration can be considered a higher order adaptive process which governs the relationship between assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation, which is considered the basic mode of knowing, transforms all incoming information (stimuli) so that it can fit into existing forms of knowledge (schematas). Elkind gives a "higher level" example of assimilation whereby adults often read newspaper columnists or listen to news commentators who reflect their own opinions. He states that "material consistent with one's own point of view is easily assimilated."[62]

Accommodation occurs when existing structures are changed to incorporate new information. In effect, the accommodative mode of knowing indicates a failure of one's ability to assimilate new information, thereby, requiring the alteration of existing schematas or the development of new mental images. As already indicated, equilibration governs the relationship between assimilation and accommodation. Equilibration leads to expanded forms of thought and broader ranges of assimilation. All of this is brought about by the action-thought process which is assumed to be the medium of exchange between the individual and his environment. This adaptation assumes the existence of cognitive structures which evolve with age into new structures.[63]

For Piaget, the modes for knowing are termed assimilation and accommodation and are considered to be invariant and occur at all age levels and at all levels of mental development. Equilibration can be considered a higher order adaptive process which governs the relationship between assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation, which is considered the basic mode of knowing, transforms all incoming information (stimuli) so that it can fit into existing forms of knowledge (schematas). Elkind gives a "higher level" example of assimilation whereby adults often read newspaper columnists or listen to news commentators who reflect their own opinions. He states that "material consistent with one's own point of view is easily assimilated."[62]

Accommodation occurs when existing structures are changed to incorporate new information. In effect, the accommodative mode of knowing indicates a failure of one's ability to assimilate new information, thereby, requiring the alteration of existing schematas or the development of new mental images. As already indicated, equilibration governs the relationship between assimilation and accommodation. Equilibration leads to expanded forms of thought and broader ranges of assimilation. All of this is brought about by the action-thought process which is assumed to be the medium of exchange between the individual and his environment. This adaptation assumes the existence of cognitive structures which evolve with age into new structures.[63]

A major concept or basic tenet of Piagetian theory is that knowledge is not a reflection of reality but the result of active interaction between the subject and its environment. The key to the understanding of developmental mechanisms is, in this approach, to be found in the gradual change in modes of interaction.

When Piaget talks about a child being at a certain level of intellectual growth, he is merely saying that the child has developed a unique set of mental abilities that distinguish him from younger children. Elkind sums up these functions by stating that "assimilation and accommodation operate through and with cognitive structures and can be considered their motive power."[64] Thus, the significance of Piaget's work stems from the fact that he has provided us with a comprehensive, stage-dependent, conceptual framework within which cognitive functioning can be readily studied; and Piaget, himself, has studied the "organism's adaptation to the environment via intelligence" from the child's first year of life to adolescence. Briefly, what are these "stages" of cognitive development and what is their potential application to more general social-psychological phenomena, such as, the formation of perceptual constancies, stable attitude-value systems, and/or interpersonal perceptions?[65]

Piaget proposes that mental growth -- adaptive thinking

and action -- progresses through sequential, unified stages of intellectual growth. This progression, as stated above, moves from perception to images to operations of things, objects, etc., along the action-thought continuum. At a minimum, Piaget posits that there are four basic stages of development (sensorimotor, preoperational, concrete operational thought, and formal operational thought) each of which are related to age. In addition, each of the stages are considered to have evolved from each lower stage by the processes described above, that is, by way of forming or assimilating mental images of perceived things, objects, etc.; by accommodating new perceptions that contradict existing images; and by equilibration, which functions as the corrective apparatus for the imbalance created by the conflicting processes of assimilation and accommodation.[66] In sum, then, each stage consists of new mental abilities which set the limits and determine the character of what can be learned during that period. It should be noted, however, that the ages at which different individuals reach a particular level of mental growth vary. For example, a socio-cultural environment in which there is a great deal of "action" (take, for instance, busing in Boston, the textbook controversy in West Virginia, or other "hot beds" of sociopolitical conflict) the stages might be accelerated, whereas, under other circumstances, these stages may be retarded. Several previous studies have identified this retardation or

"time-lag" effect in what has frequently been called "sub-cultures."[67]

From these and other examples we might generalize that stage development, in regard to political orientations, is dependent on the frequency and impact of the political environment (e.g., situations, events, crises, etc.). Furthermore, this differential development demonstrates that stages are not purely a question of the maturation of the "nervous system," but that they are also dependent upon one's interaction with his environment and with experience in general.[68]

In this context, then, we hypothesize: that there is a relationship between the stages of cognitive development and the evolution of political orientations in children; that there is an association between the age-level (grade, at this time) of the children and the degree of system support (or cynicism) expressed; that, in the longitudinal context, there will be a relationship between the degree of system support and the import of the immediate (historical event) environment; and, that there is a signi icant difference between systemic support given by the rural (subcultural) respondents as opposed to those in the urban sample.

Since what is present here are initial findings across time, our emphasis will be placed on percentage differences, mean comparisons, composite scores, and associations between variables. More comprehensive analysis is underway.

Findings

This data consists of interviews with children at the third, sixth and ninth, the fourth and seventh, and the fifth and eighth grades (see EXAMPLE TABLE, p. 13, for further details; it should be noted, however, that grades ten and eleven have been omitted from this analysis) administered at approximately twelve month intervals. The data are further stratified along an urban/rural dimension for purposes of socio-cultural comparisons. As we have already noted, one advantage of the developmental approach is that social, cultural and political environment can be (and most likely, should be) taken into account as intervening variables.[69]

Although there are eighty-nine variables contained on CEQ III -- at least forty of them in the identical form as on CEQ I and CEQ II -- we are primarily interested in those variables which reflect a relationship between issue orientation or political environment and a change in children's attitudes. Within our framework of analysis, this may be expressed in the form of stability/instability across-time (longitudinally), cross-sectionally, or by comparison of "grades-across-time." Only CEQ III contained open-ended "cognitive" questions, which for the purpose of this study were coded for accuracy of response (i.e., whether the responses given were relevant or irrelevant). It is significant to note that qualitative analysis of these

written "knowledge" questions is considerably more enlightning and supportive of our developmental framework than the quantitative results (accuracy of response) presented here. For example, by examining the written statements of the children on the open-ended questions it is possible to identify the "level" or stage of development within which children have formulated adequate cognitive structures (mental "images") of the political world and have the ability to assimilate more complex political phenomena. Take the question, What is "Watergate?" for instance. We were quite surprised at how many of the younger children (primarily third graders; but also some fifth graders) answered "a building," "bugging," or "trouble in government"; while the older children were more apt to interrelate a number of "Watergate events," such as, "a scandal about the president by covering up facts about the break-in," "a disregard for the law by the president," or "a thing that happened (an) Republicans were getting information from the Democrats."[70]

Perhaps the best way to begin our analysis is with a challenge to Hess and Torney's conclusion that "a young child's image of the national government is confined mainly to the President."[71] We do not mean to imply that children are not aware of the President and presidential actions (see Table 2); however, by examining Table 1, we are able to observe that, in some cases, there is a dramatic shift in children's attitudes toward political issues.[72]

One difficulty with Table 1, of course, goes back to the discussion of Schaie's critique of the longitudinal method and what amount of the variation can be attributed to maturation and what amount to environmental impact. It is obvious that as the child gets older he/she develops more complex schemata and therefore is able to assimilate more complex phenomena (the action-thought continuum whereby the older person is able to "interrelate" situations, objects, events, etc.). For example, is the increased concern with unemployment ("people out of work") due to our present economic situation, or merely due to increased "maturity" of the children? With the exception of the ninth graders (the grade in which Arkansas law requires that each individual take a course in "civics") we would have to conclude that environmental impact has as much influence (if not more) on changing attitudes toward unemployment as maturation. Although the decrease is minimal, we would also conclude that concern for "Vietnam" and "Watergate" is also situational.[73] Examples of issues which seem to have "emerged" during the past two years, however conjectural, are, in addition to unemployment: inflation and the energy crises. The following responses to "what is the most important problem in the country today?" tend to support this contention. For convenience of presenting the data we have collapsed several "problems" into a single category, social problems -- crime, drugs, etc.[74]

	Urban 5th	8th	Rural 5th	8th
Inflation	41.5%	50.0%	48.2%	55.9%
Energy Crisis	16.7	19.1	22.7	20.7
Pollution	5.8	5.6	5.0	4.1
Govt/Corruption	11.1	4.7	7.1	3.4
Social Problems	12.4	11.8	4.9	6.9
Other	7.0	2.4	3.5	4.1
Not Sure	5.6	6.3	8.5	4.8

Table 2 points up several factors of interest in regard to the application of the cognitive developmental model. Of primary importance is probably the obvious "time-lag" or so-called cultural lag that has been identified by Jaros, Williams, Hirsch, Greenberg, and others in regard to political awareness in a subculture.[75] A number of studies in child development have identified cultural differences among children of the same age groups. However, of more significance to behavioral scientists are the studies which demonstrate that acceleration in learning abilities is possible only to a point -- that is, studies, including studies on politically oriented civics courses, have shown that the deprived child is more likely to "catch-up" with the norm than is the so-called "normal" child to advance with the additional instruction. Piaget, Inhelder, Kohlberg, and others have found this to be particularly so in regard to IQ and advancement in physical abilities.[76] It should be noted that this factor has been a constant point of contention between many American child developmentalists and Piagetian's and between cognitive developmentalists (generally) and social learning theorists.[77]

The last two tables are probably of more interest because of their "political" nature than they are to adding substantially to the cognitive developmental model as proposed here. However, again the subcultural factor seems to be apparent (this distrust, too, has been identified by others. See footnote 35 supra for some relevant references). The evidence of "cynicism" can more readily be observed by collapsing the positive and negative columns:

	3rd	5th	6th	8th	9th
Positive (Urban)	55.6%	28.6%	28.4%	27.2%	23.6%
Negative (Urban)	44.4	71.7	71.6	72.8	66.4
Positive (Rural)	51.5%	28.6%	29.0%	18.6%	18.0%
Negative (Rural)	48.5	71.4	71.0	81.4	82.0

We would like to think that this increase in distrust in the government[78] is due to situational factors and not merely a reflection of the maturation process. Many factors must be taken into consideration in attempting to explain the development of political orientations in children. However, it is evident that the political socialization studies of the late 1950's and early 1960's were unable to "forecast" the behavior of that particular generation. And we do not think that the approach offered here is a panacea; but to reiterate our quote by Sears above, "It may be that changes in the political environment of the magnitude of those occuring since 1963 have been sufficient to produce major changes in the "political self," early socialization and maturational stages be damned."[79]

TABLE 2: Percent of Children with Relevant Responses
(Cross-sectional data for CEQ III open-ended questions)

QUESTION:	URBAN 5th	URBAN 8th	URBAN 9th	RURAL 5th	RURAL 8th	RURAL 9th
What does the Government do?	51%	66%	72%	42%	35%	52%
What is Watergate	40	57	66	11	39	41
What is Impeachment?	48	75	78	21	55	73
What does it mean when the President "pardons" someone?	34	60	65	14	39	62
(Identify EACH Person)[a]						
Spiro Agnew	33%	57%	59%	10%	46%	58%
John Mitchell	30	43	47	14	47	43
John Sirica	32	31	33	10	45	28
Richard Nixon	84	89	91	76	85	86
John Erhlichman	29	34	40	7	42	38
Nelson Rockefeller	48	76	76	38	54	48
John Dean	28	42	47	13	46	40
H.R. Haldeman	25	32	37	5	32	37
Gerald Ford	80	84	86	65	79	79
(Mac Davis)[b]	(84)	(77)	(77)	(74)	(82)	(84)
David Pryor	51	61	59	21	58	55
Total N's =	224	443	310	141	145	128

[a](Question): Finally, following are a few names which we would like to have you identify. Please attempt to identify EACH person, even if it means you have to guess.

[b]Mac Davis was added to the list at this position for the purpose of checking to see if the student actually read through the list (at the upper grades). We assumed, of course, that most of the students would know who Mac Davis was!

TABLE 3: INDEX OF POLITICAL TRUST -- By GRADE Controlled for Urban/Rural
(Cross-sectional data for CEQ III only)

RESPONSE: [a]	URBAN 3rd	URBAN 5th	URBAN 6th	URBAN 8th	URBAN 9th	RURAL 3rd	RURAL 5th	RURAL 6th	RURAL 8th	RURAL 9th
POSITIVE +	8.2%	1.5%	3.3%	4.3%	4.0%	10.5%	8.6%	5.3%	1.4%	0.8%
Positive	47.4	26.9	25.1	22.9	19.6	41.0	20.0	23.7	17.2	17.2
Negative	38.4	51.8	46.1	49.3	44.3	38.1	35.7	44.7	42.8	42.2
NEGATIVE -	6.0	19.9	25.5	23.5	22.1	10.4	35.7	26.3	38.6	39.8
N's =	232	224	272	443	310	106	141	114	145	128

[a]Question wording with position (number) in the questionnaire:

22. How much of the time do you think you can trust the government in Washington to do what is right -- just about always, most of the time, some of the time, or not at all?
69. How much trust and confidence would you say you have in the people who run our government -- a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?
70. If you were to rate our government according to each of the following, how would you rate it?

Honesty -- excellent, good, fair, poor
Fairness to others -- excellent, good, fair, poor
Justice -- excellent, good, fair, poor

000035

TABLE 4: TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN GOVERNMENT -- By GRADE Controlled for Urban/Rural
(Longitudinal data from CEQ II and CEQ III, only)

RESPONSE:	URBAN 4th (1974)	URBAN 5th (1975)	URBAN 7th (1974)	URBAN 8th (1975)	RURAL 4th (1974)	RURAL 5th (1975)	RURAL 7th (1974)	RURAL 8th (1975)
Just about always	12.5%	13.2%	11.2%	12.5%	23.8%	12.1%	14.2	18.6%
Most of the time	32.8	23.4	41.1	40.6	17.2	19.1	33.1	42.8
Some of the time	45.7	43.0	40.8	32.4	42.4	34.0	43.2	24.1
None at all	9.1	20.5	6.9	14.5	16.6	34.8	9.5	14.5
N's =	239	224	309	443	152	141	156	145

Unfortunately, this question was not included on CEQ I -- the "pre-Watergate" data.

ATTACHMENT

INFLATION (ECONOMY) REPLACES THE "ENERGY CRISIS" AS MOST IMPORTANT PROBLEM!!

Following are the responses to two questions asked of the 436 north and west Arkansas residents on what they think is the MOST and SECOND MOST important problem confronting the American public today:

	Apr. 74	Jan. 74	Nov. 73	Apr. 74	Jan. 74	Nov. 73
+Inflation	38%	10	9%	24%	19%	16%
Watergate	20	21	45	18	27	28
Energy Crisis	12	54	24	21	22	23
Trust/Confidence in Government	6	*	*	9	*	*
Morality (Religion)	6	4	2	2	2	2
Drugs	3	*	*	4	*	*
People who do not Support President	2	*	2	3	2	1
International problems	1	*	5	2	2	12
Other	9	8	4	9	14	6
Don't Know	3	4	7	8	12	10

*No measureable response at this time
+For example, 24% of those who did not think that "Inflation" was the MOST important problem facing the American public did think it was the SECOND most important problem.

Approval/Disapproval of the way Mr. Nixon is handlinging his job as President is about even according to area residents. ASKED: "Do you approve or disapprove of the way Mr. Nixon is handling his job as President," 44% replied approve and 46% said disapprove, with 10% having "no opinion."

A follow-up question, "How strongly would you say you approve (disapprove)," was then asked.

	Apr 74	Jan 74		Apr 74	Jan 74
APPROVE	(44%)	(38%)	DISAPPROVE	(46%)	(56%)
Strongly	15%	16%	Strongly	25%	39%
Not so	24	21	Not so	17	17
No opinion	5	1	No opinion	4	1

Several questions have been repeated in every "political events" poll since May 1973.

One such question has shown a dramatic decline in the amount of trust and confidence Arkansans have in the national government. In each survey, the respondents were asked: "Do you think that recent events have seriously reduced the amount of trust and confidence Americans like yourself have in our government?" The results over the past year are:

	Reduced	Not Reduced	DK
Apr. 74	76%	19%	5%
Jan. 74	81	15	4
Nov. 73	77	19	4
Oct. 73	67	19	14
May 73	56	36	8

Two additional questions asked more than once include: "Several groups have recently suggested that Mr. Nixon should resign from office. Do you think he should resign?"

	Apr 74	Jan 74	Nov 73
Yes	29%	36%	38%
No	65	56	52
Don't know	6	8	10

1. The earlier findings begin with an overview of existing studies in social psychology by Herbert H. Hyman, Political Socialization: A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior (New York: The Free Press, 1959); and continue with the first empirical findings by political scientists including, Robert D. Hess and David Easton, "The Child's Changing Image of the President," Public Opinion Quartery, 24 (Winter 1960), 632-644; Easton and Hess, "The Child's Political World," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6 (August 1962), 229-246; Easton and Hess, "Youth and the Political System," in Seymour M. Lipset and L. Lowenthal (eds.), Culture and Social Character (New York: The Free Press, 1961), 226-251; Easton and Jack Dennis, Children in the Political System: Origins of Political Legitimacy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969); and other works by Easton and Associates. See also, Fred I. Greenstein, "The Benevolent Leader: Children's Images of Political Authority," American Political Science Review, 54 (December 1960), 934-943; Greenstein, "More on Children's Images of the President," Public Opinion Quarterly, 25 (Winter 1961), 648-654; Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965); and other works by Greenstein and Greenstein and Associates; Robert Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967); Dean Jaros, "Children's Orientations Toward the President: Some Additional Theoretical Considerations and Data," Journal of Politics, 29 (May 1967), 368-387; Roberta S. Sigel, "Image of a President: Some Insights into the Political Views of School Children," American Political Science Review, 62 (March 1968), 216-226; and Sigel, "Image of the American Presidency -- Part II of an Exploration into Popular Views of Presidential Power," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 11 (February 1966), 123-137; among others.

2. Roberta S. Sigel (ed.), Learning about Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization (New York: Random House, Inc., 1970), 13. My emphasis.

3. We will present an overview of the "cognitive-developmental" approach in the "Methods and Procedures" portion of this paper. However, for a more comprehensive presentation of the approach by this author, see Kenneth D. Bailey, "Cognitive Structures, Political Environment, and Increased Political Awareness in Children: A Developmental Approach." Paper presented at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975.

4. In view of a most recent Federal District Court ruling by Judge Noel Fox, sitting in President Ford's hometown, the term "debacle" is not inappropriate. Judge Fox, ruling that Mr. Ford's pardon of former President Richard M. Nixon was constitutional, said that "Nixon was a 'putative rebel leader' whose administration was engaged in 'an insurrection and rebellion against constitutional government itself.'" Judge Fox continued by saying that "because Nixon and his aides were in rebellion and the United States Supreme Court decisions give the president vast leeway in handing out pardons, Mr. Ford's pardon was not only constitutional, but a 'prudent public policy judgment.'" It is interesting to note that Judge Fox's decision was based in part on Federalist Paper No. 74, written by Alexander Hamilton in 1788 in support of the ratification of the United States Constitution. In this article Hamilton argued that "the president's pardoning power should be unrestricted because 'in seasons of

insurrection or rebellion, there are often critical moments when a well-timed offer of a pardon to the insurgents or rebels may restore the tranquility of the commonwealth.'" According to Judge Fox, the period from the Watergate break-in in June 1972 until Nixon's resignation in August 1974 was a "season of insurrection or rebellion by many actually in the government." Judge Fox wrote that "various top officials of the Nixon administration violated the civil liberties of individual citizens and violated campaign laws to preserve and expand their own and Nixon's personal power beyond constitutional limits." The Judge also said "Nixon administration officials formed and executed a criminal conspiracy to obstruct justice." Arkansas Gazette, Sunday edition, March 30, 1975, 3. My emphasis throughout. At the time of this writing the original source of the opinion is not available for citation.

5. The "pre-Watergate" data for this study was not collected until February-March 1973. However, we assert that this can be classified as "pre" since, according to Jeb Stuart Magruder, Watergate was not a viable issue to either the Nixon Administration personnel or a majority of the American public until after President Nixon's address to the nation April 30, 1973. Magruder statement made on NBC's "Meet-the-Press," January 19, 1975. For a complete and thorough chronology of all Watergate related events see, Watergate: Chronology of a Crisis, Vol. 1 and 2 (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1974).

6. The present study began as a pilot project for a proposal submitted to the National Institution of Education for a three-year longitudinal research project. Although NIE/HEW did not fund the project, the author believed that political "happenings" necessitated the continuation of the project even at the expense of some methodological rigor and considerations. For a statement of a similar belief, see John Shoemaker and Dean Jaros, "The Malevolent Unindicted Co-Conspirator: Children, Watergate, and the Polity." Paper prepared for the 29th Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975.

7. Richard M. Merelman, "The Adolescence of Political Socialization," Sociology of Education, 45 (Spring 1972), 153.

8. Ibid., 156.

9. In addition to Merelman, Ibid.; see, Roberta S. Sigel, "Political Socialization: Some Reflections on Current Approaches and Conceptualizations." Prepared for delivery at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, New York, September 6-10, 1966. For reviews of much of the literature of political socialization, see Richard E. Dawson, "Political Socialization," in James A. Robinson (ed.), Political Science Annual, 1966, Vol. 1 (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill Publishing Company, 1966), 1-84; Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt, Political Socialization: An Analytic Study (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1969); Dean Jaros, Socialization to Politics (New York: Praeger Publishers, Inc., 1973); and footnote 1, supra. Critiques of political socialization methods and procedures are covered below, and therefore, are not cited here.

10. For analysis of the data from which this study was taken, see Kenneth D. Bailey, The Impact of Political Environment on the Development of Political Orientations in Children: A Cognitive-Developmental Approach (Piaget/Kohlberg). Unpublished dissertation, University of Maryland, 1975.

11. For many of the previous works, see footnote 1, supra.

12. Dawson and Prewitt, Political Socialization, op. cit., 43.

13. The methodological framework for this study is set forth below. However, we would like to note at the outset that any definition proffered for "cognitive structures" is tenuous at best. Piaget himself states that we can only assume by observing behavioral patterns that mental structures exist since

> the structures are unconscious. They are expressed in regular forms of responses that we believe are discovering in the subject's behavior. We also believe that if the underlying structures did not exist we would not be able to explain such behavior. But the subject himself is not aware of these structures. . . . He simply uses them.

Jean Piaget, "The Theory of Stages in Cognitive Development," in Donald R. Green, Marguerite P. Ford, and George B. Flamer (eds.), Measurement and Piaget (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), 3. The term as referred to in this paper is based on David Elkind, Children and Adolescents: Interpretive Essays on Jean Piaget (New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1974), esp., chapter 7. For a more definitive explication by this author, see Bailey, "Cognitive Structures, . . . A Developmental Approach," loc. cit.

14. For example, review the violent controversy over the introduction of new and "innovative" textbooks to the school districts of Kanawha County, West Virgina; and the Texas Textbook Evaluation Board controversy over "role reversal" pictures in new state adopted textbooks. Opponents in the latter case contend, for example, that pictures of a girl helping her father and a boy doing "house-hold" chores lead to "sexual perversion" among the children. For the most recent study of the Kanawha County controversy (and citations for other contemporary controversies), see Penny Peach, "Public School Textbooks as the Subject of Church-State Controversy." Prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Hilton Palacio del Rio, San Antonio, Texas, March 27-29, 1975.

15. For some of the earlier works dealing with the "loyalty/patriotism" issue, see Eugene L. Horowitz, "Some Aspects of the Development of Patriotism in Children," Sociometry, 3 (October 1940), 329-341; a replication of this theme was conducted by Edwin Lawson, "The Development of Patriotism in Children: A Second Look," Journal of Psychology, 55 (April 1963), 279-286; see also, Jean Piaget and A. M. Weil, "The Development in Children of the Idea of the Homeland and of Relations with Other Countries," International Social Science Bulletin, 3 (1951), 561-578; and G. Jahoda, "Children's Concepts of Nationality: A Critical Study of Piaget's Stages," Child Development, 35 (1964), 1081-1092; Jahoda, "The

Development of Children's Ideas about Country and Nationality, Part I: The Conceptual Framework," and "The Development of Children's Ideas about Country and Nationality; Part II: National Symbols and Themes," British Journal of Educational Psychology, 33 (February 1963), 47-60 and (June 1963), 143-153; among others.

16. W. H. D. Rouse, trans., Great Dialogues of Plato (New York: The New American Library, 1956), 342.

17. Benjamin Jowett, trans., Aristotle's Politics (New York: Modern Library, 1943), 320; see, Books V and VII, especially, for his assessment of the interactions of personality, political systems, and political change.

18. As quoted in Dawson and Prewitt, op. cit., vii. No original source cited by the authors.

19. Charles Frankel, trans., Jean-Jacques Rousseau, The Social Contract (New York: Mafner Publishing Company, 1947), 35; as disscused in Dean Jaros, Socialization to Politics, op. cit., 11-12.

20. Jaros, loc. cit.,; original source, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, "Considerations of the Government of Poland," in Frederick Watkins (ed.), Rousseau: Political Writings (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953), 176.

21. See, Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (Oxford: Blackwell Book Company, 1955), 130-132; and John Locke, Two Treaties of Government (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, 1947), 10-60, as cited in Greenstein, Children and Politics, op. cit., 3.

22. For examples, see John Dewey, Character and Events: Popular Essays in Social and Political Philosophy (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1929); The Child and the Curriculum, and The School and Society, with an introduction by Leonard Carmichael (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956); Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916); Freedom and Culture (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939); Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: H. Holt and Company, 1917); The Quest for Certainty: A Study of Relation of Knowledge (New York: Minton, Balch and Company, 1922); and finally, The Public and Its Problems (Denver: Alan Swallow, 1927). The stated assumption, i.e., Dewey's awareness of the critical relationship between cultural inculcation and system effects, is based on an undergraduate research project by this author, "John Dewey: Political Philosopher or Educator?" course in American Political Theory, Midwestern University (University of Texas at Wichita Falls, Texas), summer 1964.

23. Charles E. Merriam, The Making of Citizens: A Comparative Study of Methods of Civic Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), 139. In addition to the United States and England, comparisons were made with western European countries.

24. Ibid., 360.

25. Charles E. Merriam, New Aspects of Politics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1925); see also his Civic Education in the United States (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934).

26. See Harold D. Lasswell, "Psychopathology and Politics," and "Democratic Character," in The Political Writings of Harold Lasswell (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), 465-525; Power and Personality (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1948); and "The Selective Effect of Personality on Political Participation," in Richard Cristie and Marie Jahoda (eds.), Studies in the Scope and Methods of "The Authoritarian Personality" (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954), 197-225. For a more recent discussion of these same problems, see Fred I. Greenstein, "Personality and Political Socialization: The Theories of Authoritarian and Democratic Character," The Annals, 361 (September 1965), 81-95.

27. Greenstein, Children and Politics, op. cit., 12; and Fred I. Greenstein, "Political Socialization," in International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, 14 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1968), 552-553. As noted, the question is basically a restatement of Lasswell's classic formulation of the general process of communication. See, Harold D. Lasswell, Politics: Who Gets What, When, How (New York: Meridan Press, 1958). Similarly, Kenneth Langton posits political socialization as a continuous social and psychological process composed of four basic elements: "(1) an interaction-acquisition process, (2) between the individual being socialized, (3) the agency which acts as the vehicle of socialization, and (4) the political behavior patterns, perceptions and attitudes which he learns." Kenneth P. Langton, Political Socialization (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), 8.

28. Hyman, Political Socialization, loc. cit.; and Greenstein, Children and Politics, loc. cit. Both of these are considered to be "Freudian" approaches to the study of political behavior.

29. Merelman, "The Adolescence of Political Socialization," op. cit., 136. My emphasis. Merelman's critique of the present state of political socialization research is one of the best -- among many -- critiques to be published during the past few years.

30. See David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965), especially chapters 16 - 20. For the overall analysis of political socialization placed in a systems framework, see Easton and Dennis, Children in the Political System, op. cit.; particularly the chapter on "The Theoretical Relevance of Political Socialization." According to Easton, orientations are defined as "all perceptions (cognitions and knowledge), affect (feelings and attitudes), and evaluations (values and norms) through which a person" relates himself in social space. These political orientations are directed toward three major objects or analytic levels of the political system: (1) the political community, defined as a group of persons who have agreed to solve their common disputes through a shared political structure; (2) the regime, or that part of the political system which includes its constitutional order, the "rules of the game," and governmental institutions and decision-making processes; and (3) the authority, or government, which refers

to the role-occupants or decision-makers who formulate and administer the day-to-day decisions for a society.

31. See, Roberta S. Sigel and Marilyn Brooks, "Becoming Critical about Politics," in Richard G. Niemi and Associates, The Politics of Future Citizens (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), 103-125. As we shall see, Sigel is one of the few political socialization investigators who has combined methods similar to this study, i.e., cross-sectional, longitudinal, and what she calls "grade-across-time" interviews.

32. For a discussion of Easton's "specific" support, see Easton, A Systems Analysis, op. cit., especially chapter 17. With few exceptions, such as case studies or "psychohistories" or studies of the affects of the assassination of President Kennedy, emphasis on political figures has only recently become a major focus of political socialization research. Some research has begun in the policy oriented or "specific" support area. It should be noted that this research is aimed at a different level of analysis (Easton's objects, footnote 30, supra) than the political "events" studies such as Roberta S. Sigel, "An Exploration into Some Aspects of Political Socialization: School Children's Reactions to the Death of a President," in M. Wolfenstein and G. Kliman (eds.), Children and the Death of a President (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965). For policy oriented studies see, Richard M. Merelman, "The Development of Policy Thinking in Adolescence," American Political Science Review, 65 (December 1971), 1033-1047; Merelman, "The Structure of Policy Thinking in Adolescence: A Research Note," American Political Science Review, 67 (March 1973), 160-165; and Robert L. Savage and Rebecca Webster, "Images of Poverty: A Developmental Study of the Structure of Policy Thinking of American Citizens." Prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Political Science Association, Hilton Palacio del Rio, San Antonio, Texas, March 27-29, 1975. All three studies focus on a single issue -- poverty; however, the Savage study employes a Q-sort technique for identifying "thought dimensions," while Merelman relies strictly on in-depth personal intervews with a limited number of students and an elaborate coding system. See also, James W. Lamare, Rudolph O. de la Graza, and Mary Steffey Hovel, "Public Policy and Political Socialization: The Impact of Housing Policy on Chicano Political Orientations." Prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975.

33. See footnote 1, supra, for some basic sources.

34. Easton and Dennis, Children in the Political System, op. cit., 421; see also, Greenstein, Children and Politics, op. cit., 163.

35. Relatively recent research orientations have begun to rectify some of the limitations. For example, in regard to blacks as a subculture see, Dean Jaros, "Children's Orientations Toward Political Authority: A Detroit Study." Unpublished dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1966. Edward S. Greenberg, "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Comparison of Black and White Children." Unpublished dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1969; and the resulting articles by Greenberg in, Midwest Journal of Political Science, 14 (1970), 249-275; Social Science Quarterly, 51 (1971), 561-571;

Public Opinion Quarterly, 34 (1970), 333-345; and Canadian Journal of Political Science, 2 (1969), 471-492. See also, Thomas J. Williams, "Racial Differences in Southern Children's Attitudes Toward Presidential Authority," Georgia Political Science Association Journal, 2 (Spring 1974), 89-121; for a review of the literature and some empirical studies on the level of political efficacy and political trust in black children, see Schley R. Lyons, "The Political Socialization of Ghetto Children: Efficacy and Cynicism," Journal of Politics, 32 (May 1970), 288-304; Paul R. Abramson, "Political Efficacy and Political Trust Among Black Schoolchildren: Two Explanations," Journal of Politics, 34 (November 1972), 1243-1269; Harrell R. Rodgers, Jr., "Toward Explanation of the Political Efficacy and Political Cynicism of Black Adolescents: An Exploratory Study," American Journal of Political Science, 18 (May 1974), 257-282. Other subcultural and ethnic oriented research includes, Shoemaker and Jaros, "The Malevolent Unindicted Co-Conspirator," op. cit.; Jaros, Herbert Hirsch, and Frederic J. Fleron, Jr., "The Malevolent Leader: Political Socialization in an American Sub-Culture," American Political Science Review, 62 (June 1968), 564-575; Alfred S. Arkley, "Urban Elementary Students' Political Orientation and Behavior: Comparing Black, White and Chicano Fifth-Graders," prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975; A. Jay Stevens and M. Margaret Conway, "Ethnic Children's View of the President and the Police: The Influence of the Family and the Mass-Media," Ibid. This latter study combines both regional differences (Maryland and California) and ethnicity (black, white, chicano, and oriental). For other studies dealing with chicano's, see F. Chris Garcia, The Political Socialization of Chicano Children (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), and resulting articles based on Garcia's dissertation research. Cross-national research has also begun to appear in the past few years; for example, see William Kiley and Richard C. Remy, "A Cross-National Analysis of the Relationship of Political Structure and Political Learning," prepared for delivery at the 1975 Southwestern Political Science Association, Hilton Palaciodel Rio, San Antonio, Texas, March 27-29, 1975, and their references.

36. Greenstein, Children and Politics, loc. cit.

37. The best know "longitudinal" study is probably Theodore M. Newcomb, "Attitude Development as a Function of Reference Groups: The Bennington Study," in E. Maccoby, et. al. (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 3rd ed., 1958); and Newcomb, et. al., Persistence and Change: Bennington College and Its Students After Twenty-five Years (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967). Most longitudinal studies have been one of two types: either of the Newcomb type where people are interviewed at two widely separated points in time or the studies that are carried out with only a few individuals, thereby, in effect converting the observations into mere collections of "case studies" or "histories" which may be valuable in themselves, but invalid as statistical works for developing scientific generalizations. However, a very energetic project is underway in California, see Stanley W. Moore, Kenneth A. Wagner, James Lare, and D. Stephen McHargue II, "The Civic Awareness of Five and Six Year Olds," prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975.

38. See M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, The Political Character of Adolescence: The Influence of Families and Schools (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), particularly, section IV, "Longitudinal Prespectives." The authors here compare their data with other survey research data from the Inter-University Consortium's Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan. For an excellent work on the availability and manipulation of "secondary" data, see Herbert Hyman, Secondary Analysis of Survey Data (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967). Two studies employing secondary analysis of survey data (public opinion polls, data banks, such as the Roper Public Opinion Research Center, the Inter-University Consortium for Political Research, etc.) are, Donald J. Devine, The Political Culture of the United States: The Influence of Member Values on Regime Maintenance (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972); and Devine, The Attentive Public: Polyarchical Democracy (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970). The term "quasi-longitudinal" has been applied to cross-sectional designs which cover a number of grades. For example, see F. Chris Garcia, Political Socialization of Chicano Children: A Comparative Study with Anglos in California Schools (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973).

39. Jaros, Socialization to Politics, op. cit., 22.

40. See Fred I. Greenstein and Sidney Tarrow, "Comparative Political Socialization: Explorations with a Semi-Projective Procedure" (San Francisco: Sage Publications in Comparative Politics, 01-009, 1970). One note of interest, however, is that experimentalist (including Piaget) have found that when they use hypothetical stories responses differ in children more than if they are asked about real persons, objects, events, or things. See David Elkind, "Children's Discovery of the Conservation of Mass, Weight, and Volume: Piaget Replication Study II," in Irving E. Sigel and Frank H. Hooper (eds.), Logical Thinking in Children: Research Based on Piaget's Theory (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), 11-13.

41. No single school would permit the use of IQ scores. However, one elementary school employes a "tracking" system whereby we have been able to follow the same students from the third to the fourth and fifth grades. Hopefully, we will be able to interview them again as sixth graders before we loose them in the "influx" of students to the junior high schools (see footnote 44 below)

42. David O. Sears, "Book Reviews," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 15 (February 1971), 154-160.

43. See F. Christopher Arterton, "The Impact of Watergate on Children's Attitudes toward Political Authority," Political Science Quarterly, 89 (June 1974), 269-287; Shoemaker and Jaros, loc. cit.; and Michael Lupfer and Charles Kenny, "Children's Reactions to the President: Pre- and Post-Watergate Findings," prepared for delivery at the 1974 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Palmer House, Chicago, Il., August 29-September 2, 1974; and Harold M. Barger, "Images of the President and Policeman Among Black, Mexican-American and Anglo School Children: Considerations on Watergate," Ibid. Professors Lupfer and Barger are continuing their research efforts into 1975. Personal communications with Michael Lupfer and Hal Barger.

44. Robert G. Lehen and Gary G. Koch, "Analyzing Panel Data with Uncontrolled Attrition," Public Opinion Quarterly, 38 (Spring 1974), 41. See especially their discussion on the "supplemented marginals approach to incomplete panel data," 41-51. Interesting enough, our study has a slightly different problem. Instead of "attrition" (except for the University City) we have an "influx" problem; that is, our longitudinal design has to take into consideration the advance of the students to the junior and senior high schools and the influx of students from schools not originally included in the initial design. This is particularly so in the "consolidated" school districts.

45. Ibid.

46. For some of the problems of political socialization research see David O. Sears, review of Hess and Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, in Harvard Educational Review, 38 (Summer 1968), 571-578; Fred I. Greenstein, review of Easton and Dennis, Children in the Political System, in Political Science Quarterly, 87 (1972), 98-102; and Greenstein and Tarrow, Comparative Political Socialization, loc. cit. David Marsh has indicated that the assumption that early acquisition of political values and orientations remains stable over time is not based on sound empirical research, see David Marsh, "Political Socialization: The Implicit Assumptions Questioned," British Journal of Political Science, 1 (April 1971). Longitudinal studies needed to test this assumption are notably lacking. Ambrecht points out that what evidence that does exist does not suggest that basic personality traits nor attitudes remain very stable during the individual's life cycle. In this respect, she says, it is clear that "the constancy of early socialized attitudes and behavior over the lifetime of an individual must be treated as a researchable question rather than as a premise." Biliana C. S. Ambrecht, "The Work Organization and Adult Political Socialization," prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington, March 20-22, 1975. Somewhat alone this same line of criticism is Pauline M. Vaillancourt, "Stability of Children's Survey Responses," Public Opinion Quarterly, 37 (Fall 1973), 373-387. For references concerning the "attitude/non-attitude" dialogue, see Bailey, "Cognitive Structures," op. cit., especially, footnote 7. Other critiques of political socialization research include Merelman, "The Adolescence of Political Socialization," loc. cit.; William Shonfeld, "The Focus of Political Socialization Research: An Evaluation," World Politics, 23 (April 1971); Fred I. Greenstein, "A Note on the Ambiguity of 'Political Socialization': Definitions, Criticisms, and Strategies of Inquiry," Journal of Politics, 32 (1970); Thomas J. Cook and Frank P. Scioli, Jr., "Political Socialization Research in the United States: A Review," in Dan D. Nimmo and Charles M. Bonjean (eds.), Political Attitudes and Public Opinion (New York: David McKay Company, 1972), 154-174; and Donald D. Searing, Joel J. Schwartz, and Alden E. Lind, "The Structuring Principle: Political Socialization and Belief Systems," American Political Science Review, 62 (June 1973), 415-432; and Jack Dennis, "Major Problems of Political Socialization Research," Midwest Journal of Political Science, 12 (February 1968), 85-114; among others.

47. George A. and Achilles G. Theodorson, A Modern Dictionary of Sociology (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969), 236.

48. Study of the same individual(s) over time (or at significant stages of one's life) is desirable, of course, since it permits an appraisal of the processes involved in one'e interactions and transactions with other persons as well as the resultant behavior and personality. Dr. Milton Senn of the Yale University Child Study Center succinctly portrays the "ideal" longitudinal study as one in which we have

> a series of observations so spaced as to discover as many of the variabilities as possible occurring during critical periods in the life of an individual so that ultimately predictions of change are possible and correlations between measurements at successive ages are valid. Of course, all things being equal, the meaningfulness and generality of such a study is in proportion to the number [and nature] of the individuals so observed.

in Alan A. Stone and Gloria Cochrane Onque (eds.), Longitudinal Studies of Child Personality: Abstracts with Index (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, for The Commonwealth Fund, 1959), forward, viii. For a good dialogue concerning the uses, scope and limitations of the longitudinal method as applied to the study of human development, see K. Warner Schaie, "Can the Longitudinal Method Be Applied to Psychological Studies of Human Development?" in F. J. Monks, Willard W. Hartup and Jan de Wit (eds.), Determinants of Development (New York: Academic Press, 1972), 3-22; and C. B. Hindley, "The Place of Longitudinal Methods in the Study of Development," Ibid., 23-49. Schaie advocates the use of a "mixed research model which [permits] the study of interactions between age level, experimental treatment effects, and naturalistic treatment effects." By this he means that a simple (?) longitudinal approach cannot take into consideration changes in one's "socio-cultural environment" (which, he claims, must not change but remain "totally stable"), and distinguish the results from that of age level. For Schaie, "age level" is not a "functionally independent variable. Instead, age is directly dependent upon the points in time at which an organism enters the environment and at which it is measured." In lieu of the longitudinal method Schaie advocates one of three approaches (or a combination thereof) which are extensions of the "traditional longitudinal method." One method, "cohort-sequential" permits "unconfounding developmental change from temporally unique environmental input," and "consists of following two or more successive cohorts drawn from the same population over equivalent age ranges, in which case age changes can be differentiated from differences between cohorts." A second supplemental approach -- one which is similar in design to this "telescoped" longitudinal approach -- is called "the cross-sequential method," and is one in which "two or more successive cohorts are followed over equivalent time periods," and "permits differentiation of . . . differences from nonspecific environmental input characteristics for [particular points] in time." Schaie believes that "the first approach requires the assumption that there are no differences in unique temporal input while the second requires the assumption of the absence of maturational change" -- a contention this author disagrees with. His third method, "the time-sequential"

approach, operates under "the assumption of no generation differences," and "can separate temporally unique input from maturational variance, but is not feasible for repeated measurement data since it requires data on all ages at all times of measurement." References at 4, 6, 8-10, respectively. Hindley disagrees with Schaie on the applicability of the longitudinal approach and states that, in general, "the term [longitudinal] is used for studies over [relatively long] periods of time, which in humans are likely to be measured in months and years rather than in minutes, hours, or days." Hindley is emphatic about two points: that the "data provided by a longitudinal study . . . consist of a series of successive assessments of the same individuals." His major argument with Schaie is that "the study of developmental trends in [individuals], and of individual differences in such trends, demands a longitudinal approach, and cannot be obtained by any other means." References at 23 and 29 respectively. Emphasis in all instances is theirs.

One other work in this volume that is of particular interest to the conceptual framework of this study is, Elsa Schmid-Kitsikis, "Exploratory Studies in Cognitive Development," Ibid., 51-63. This work characterizes Piaget's conceptualization of research in terms of three specific steps:

> First, the researcher seeks to establish facts of a certain level of generality -- even laws. But a law does not explain anything; it only establishes the generality of observed phenomena. Therefore a second step must be taken: a deductive construct is formulated which is then tested experimentally. An "explanatory level" is attained when, in a system of laws, one law can be constructed or reconconstructed from others. The final step consists in the construction of a model (real and not only formal) which can be used for new deductions and whose different links can be explored.

Reference at 54. More on Piaget's conceptualization follows in our discussion of a framework for analysis.

49. Sigel and Brooks, op. cit., 104; see also Kenneth D. Bailey, "Political Interest, Issue Salience, and Increased Awareness Among Children: An Exploration into the Impact of History-Making Political Events." Prepared for delivery at the 1975 Annual Meeting of the Arkansas Political Science Association, Sam Peck Hotel, Little Rock, Arkansas, February 21-22, 1975.

50. A poignant example to this author is the administration of the Civic Education Questionnaire (CEQ III) for 1975. Our initial interviews were conducted during late February and early March, 1975; however, in regard to the larger study (results not reported in this study) an issue not considered relevant by two-thirds of the students at that time has reemerged as a most important issue. That issue, of course, is Vietnam specifically, and Southeast Asia generally.

51. The author does not care to take credit or blame for the "political happenings" of the past couple of years. However, he does feel fortunate to have been conducting the type of research he was at the time these "naturalistic stimuli" were taking place.

52. See Boyd R. McCandless, Adolescents: Behavior and Development (Hinsdale, Ill.: The Dryden Press, Inc., 1970), 353. During this particular period of "national social development in the United States," it is most probable that a fifth dimension, race, should be added to the list. McCandless believes, however, that "economic, political, and educational factors -- and not race -- are the important determiners of behavior." He states that "such factors, do operate differentially for different races. However, when they are controlled, racial differences partially or totally disappear." Ibid. Although this author believes that race is an important variable and is taken into consideration in the larger study -- which includes one school which is 95% black and another which has a black to white ratio of 70% to 30% -- it is not a variable of consequence for the present study. Less than one percent of the children in the urban school districts (and absolutely none in the rural sample) was black. My emphasis above.

53. For a good succinct presentation of the three categories, see Sheilah R. Koeppen, "Children and Compliance: A Comparative Analysis of Socialization Studies," Law and Society Review, 4 (May 1970), 545-551. The Koeppen article also contains an excellent reference section dealing primarily with socialization studies concerning legal compliance and the development of moral judgment in children. Ibid., 561-564.

54. The works by and on Piaget are almost endless. However, for some basic references see especially, Jean Piaget, The Origins of Intelligence in Children (New York: W.W. Norton, 1952); Piaget, The Construction of Reality in the Child (New York: Basic Books, 1954); Piaget, The Moral Judgment of the Child (New York: The Free Press, 1969); Piaget and Barbel Inhelder, The Psychology of the Child (New York: Basic Books, 1969). See also, J.H. Flavell, The Developmental Psychology of Jean Piaget (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969); Inhelder and Piaget, The Growth of Logical Thinking from Childhood to Adolescence (New York: Basic Books, 1958); David Elkind and J.H. Flavell (eds.), Studies in Cognitive Development: Essays in Honor of Jean Piaget (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969); and Herbert Ginsburg and Sylvia Opper, Piaget's Theory of Intellectual Development: An Introduction (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969).

Lawrence Kohlberg states that most research of this nature is not guided by a theory, but by an approach labeled "cognitive-developmental." He says that the label refers to "a set of assumptions and research strategies common to a variety of specific theories of social and cognitive development." See, Lawrence Kohlberg, "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization," in David A. Goslin (ed.), Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing, Company, 1969), 347. For other works by Kohlberg, see Koeppen, footnote 53, supra.

55. Inhelder and Piaget, The Growth of Logical Thinking, op. cit., 338.

56. See Charles F. Andrain, Children and Civic Awareness: A Study of Political Education (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1971), 59-62.

57. Richard M. Merelman, "The Development of Political Ideology: A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization," American Political Science Review, 63 (September 1969), 750-767.

58. J. McV. Hunt, "The Impact and Limitations of the Giant of Developmental Psychology," in Elkind and Flavell, op. cit., 3-66. Again, this article is an excellent, and more comprehensive, overview (than Koeppen's) of Piaget's basic principles and a comparison of Piaget with several other giants in the field. For another good application of Piaget to the development of political orientations see Wilbur L. Johnston, Jr., "Children in the World: Their Images of Selected Foreign Policy Issues and Their Preceptions of Various Aspects of the International Political System." Unpublished dissertation, University of Maryland, 1973.

59. David Elkind, Children and Adolescents: Interpretive Essays on Jean Piaget (New York: Oxford University Press, 2nd ed., 1974), 4.

60. Ibid.

61. A "schemata" is defined as a temporary structure which emerges as a consequence of repeated actions (or thoughts). Ibid., 10.

62. Ibid., 6.

63. Johnston, op. cit., 46-50; and Elkind, op. cit., 7.

64. Elkind, op. cit., 11; see also, Inhelder, "The Concept of Stages in Child Development," in Paul M. Mussen, et. al., Trends and Issues in Developmental Psychology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), 4.

65. Inhelder, loc. cit.

66. See Piaget, "The Theory of Stages. . .," in Green, Ford and Flamer, op. cit., 7. A note should be added here in regard to this article by Piaget on the theory of stages in cognitive development and the interpretation of the concept by some psychologists and political scientists alike. One specific instance in which a political scientist has apparently misinterpreted Piaget's concept of "stages," is, Dan D. Nimmo, Popular Images of Politics (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974); particularly his ch. 3, "Adopting Political Images." Nimmo, basing his analysis on works by Piaget and Kohlberg, states that "A fundamental notion of developmental theory is that a person learns by passing through a series of psychological periods, or

stages." (emphasis omitted). However, in his discussion of the "stages of development," Nimmo speaks "of four stages that are . . . important to . . . . how people develop political images. These stages are infancy, assimilation, accommodation, and adaptation." My emphasis. In Piagetian terms, however, these "stages" are functions which take place during all stages of development and are not considered levels or stages in and of themselves. Briefly, the stages of cognitive development for Piaget are: sensorimotor, which occur before the advent of language (usually between 0 and 2 years); the period of "pre-operational thought," whereby the child is capable of having representational thought by means of symbolic function (usually 2 to approximately 7 years); the period of "operational thought," which is a period characterized by the internalization of "concrete operations" which permits the child to do in his head what he would have had to do by actual manipulation during the earlier stage (usually 7 or 8 to 13 or 14 years); and "formal operational thought," whereby newly acquired operations permit the adolescent "to think about his thoughts." By this, Piaget means that the operations are no longer applied solely to the manipulation of concrete objects, but now cover "hypotheses and propositions that the child can use as abstractly and from which he can reach deductions by formal or logical means." For an overview by this author, see Bailey, "Cognitive Structures," loc. cit.. Two good works, both dealing with the application of Piagetian concepts to political development, see Johnston, loc. cit., and Merelman, "The Development of Political Ideology," loc. cit. In addition, see Elkind, Children and Adolescence, loc. cit.

67. See footnote 35, supra. It is impossible, of course, to present a comprehensible overview which adequately covers only a few of the concepts incorporated in the Piagetian approach, let alone attempt to cover other related concepts, e.g., egocentrism, reciprocity (reversibility), and relativity, which are also considered touchstones of "sociocentric" thought. See Elkind, Children and Adolescents, op. cit., esp. chs. 5 and 6. However, in regard to an earlier statement concerning the question of "stability" in children's responses, it should be noted that Kofsky has stated

> that performance on comparable tasks is susceptible to variations due to subtle differences in experimental procedures [and environmental settings]. . . This difficulty is compounded by the relative unreliability of children's performance. Young [students] are often less aware of the need to be consistent and are more likely to perform in a random fashing [than older children and] adults.

See, Ellin Kofsky, "A Scalogram Study of Classificatory Development," in Sigel and Hooper, op. cit., 222. In response to Vaillancourt, "Stability of Children's Survey Responses," loc. cit., this author contends that she would have found a similar degree of instability in the responses to the attitude questions whether they were taken next day or at three month intervals. The problem is one of "imbalance" between existing schemata and the inability of the children to accommodate new mental images.

68. Green, Ford and Flamer, Measurement and Piaget, op. cit., 7.,

69. It should be noted that grade is used as a surrogate for age throughout this paper. For others who have used grade, see Easton and Dennis, Children in the Political System; and Hess and Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes.

70. In addition, it should be noted that the younger children were more apt to answer the open-ended questions "don't know" and then respond to the follow-up question by saying that they learned about it from television. This, in itself, indicated to us that the children were perhaps aware of the "issue" but did not know how to express it (or were not literally able to express it).

71. Hess and Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes, op. cit., 35. For similar questions of much of the earlier work see Freda Rebelsky, Cheryl Conover, and Patricia Chafetz, "The Development of Political Attitudes in Young Children," The Journal of Psychology, 73 (1969), 141-146.

72. Statistical procedures for this presentation have been deliberately limited. Because of the nature of the "purposive" sample, tests of statistical significance can be used as only a rough indicator of an significant differences among groups. However, it should be noted that the author has made extensive use of SPSS version 6 -- particularly subprograms CROSSTABS, BREAKDOWN, and FACTOR -- in the analysis of the data to be submitted for publication. Of particular importance has been the use of the principal components method of factor analysis with varimax rotation. The author agrees with Herbert Jacob that the application of "standardized" items for the development of scales and indices is questionable. Therefore, we have factored the data for all three surveys by totals, subtotals (urban/rural), and for each grade. See Herbert Jacob, "Problems of Scale Equivalency in Measuring Attitudes in American Subcultures," Social Science Quarterly, 52 (June 1971), 61-75.

73. It is obvious that after the return of the POW's in January 1973, Vietnam subsided as a relevant issue for both the young and the old. (See the Gallup Index and the attached surveys by Opinion Survey and Research Corporation. OSRC has conducted surveys since May 1973 on the adult population of the same area as the political socialization questionnaires were administered).

74. See attached OSRC results.

75. See footnote 35 supra.

76. See footnote 54 supra.

77. See Koeppen, op. cit., for references.

78. See attached OSRC results

79. Sears, loc. cit.