DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 604 SO 021 731

AUTHOR Harwood, Angela M.
TITLE The Difference between "Democracy Sucks" and "I May Become a Politician": Views from Three High School Civics Classes.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991). Faint type at bottom of may pages.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizen Participation; *Citizenship Education; *Civics; *Classroom Environment; *Classroom Research; Educational Research; High Schools; Political Attitudes; Social Studies; *Student Attitudes; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This report presents a research project in which three high school civics classes composed of a total of 85 students were studied in order to assess the importance of classroom climate in the development of high school students' political attitudes. The differences in climate were expressed in daily teaching procedures and students' perceptions of politics. Student questionnaires as well as in-depth interviews were employed. The findings suggested that classes rated as "open" or "closed" by the students who attended them also differed in important qualitative ways. The findings also suggested that while classroom climate variables were related to political attitudes, they were probably not the most salient factor in determining students' political interest or involvement. Finally, the qualitative findings from this study suggested that individual teaching style may be governed by teachers' philosophies toward teaching and by their training. A 77-item list of references is included, as are a number of the instruments used in the study. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341604

The Difference Between "Democracy Sucks" and "I May Become a Politician": Views From Three High School Civics Classes

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ANGELA M. HARWOOD
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Angela M. Harwood
Division of Educational Studies
Emory University
Atlanta, GA 30322

A paper presented at the 1991 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 3-7, Chicago, Illinois.

SO 021 731

Comments or questions concerning this manuscript should be directed to:

Dr. Angela M Harwood
1019 15th Street
Bellingham, Washington 98225

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The success of our democratic system rests on the active participation of a politically educated citizenry. One longstanding goal of social studies educators is to instill the values of democratic participation in their students. Educators seek to improve their students' attitudes toward politics and government, and to encourage their participation in the political arena. Successful methods of increasing interest in the political process, and helping young people to develop the skills they will need to effectively participate continue to be explored by social studies researchers.

To encourage participation, it is necessary that individuals develop positive attitudes toward our political system and the requisite participatory skills that will enable them to perform their duties as citizens. Social studies classes have long been regarded as the domain in which to develop these attitudes and skills. Yet findings from past research on the effects of schooling in general, and government and civics classes in particular, indicate that schools have relatively little impact on the formation of students' political beliefs or behaviors. Schooling is more closely linked with political knowledge acquisition than with the shaping of political attitudes and participatory behaviors (Ehman, 1980; Grossman, 1974); and the number of social studies courses taken is apparently unrelated to political attitudes or participation (Langton & Jennings, 1968).

Furthermore, a number of social educators are currently decrying a crisis in civic education that they say is characterized by increasing dropout rates, an escalation of violent crimes committed by youth, and resurgent racism on high school and college campuses. A recurrent theme in the writings of these contemporary educational philosophers is a lack of community spirit, engendered by increasing individualism. In order to restore a sense of community, they assert, it is necessary to refocus civic education on the public, rather than private sphere (Beyer, 1988; Boyer, 1989; Green, 1985; Parker, 1989). The key to reestablishing a strong democracy, in which students have a heightened sense of civic duty, is identified by many of these writers as the development of public talk (Barber, 1989). Public talk is the collective deliberation over shared problems and prospects (Wood, 1988); consideration of problems in the "public space" (Green, 1985); and speaking, listening, and reflecting on public issues (Barber, 1989). For social studies educators to create in their classrooms the type of discourse implied by these writers, it is critical that they understand how their own conduct helps to create the climate for that discussion.

Researchers who have explored the relationships between the climate of social studies classes and desired civic outcomes suggest that teachers may have a substantial impact on the socialization of their students. In the existing body of research on schooling and students' political attitudes and behaviors, classroom climate has emerged as a variable of importance--the manner in which individual social studies classes are conducted is shown to relate to students' attitudes and political participation. Open classroom climates have consistently been shown to correlate with positive democratic attitudes. This body of research suggests that the social studies classes can, indeed, provide stimulation for the development of active citizens.

In establishing the consistent association of open classroom climates and positive political attitudes, however, researchers have relied primarily on survey data. Consequently, social studies classrooms remain a black box, with little known about what distinguishes open from closed classroom climates in actual practice or how teacher beliefs and attitudes lead to different classroom climates. It is therefore necessary that future research move toward providing a description of social studies classes that will guide social studies educators in making important instructional and curricular decisions.

The purpose of this study is to explore how and why social studies classes fail or succeed in the transmission of positive political attitudes and active democratic behavioral orientations. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative research methods to assess the attitudes of high school students and teachers toward social studies and politics in general, and to provide a holistic description of social studies classes that are perceived as "open" and "closed" by the students who attend them. What are students basic attitudes toward government and politics? How do students' attitudes change during the course of formal civics instruction? In what ways do classes which are perceived as open by students differ from those which are perceived as closed? How are students' perceptions of their social studies classroom climate related to changes in political attitudes? Through building on past research on classroom climate, and by using a variety of methods, this study addresses these questions.

Review of Related Research

Helping students become informed, participating citizens has been a central goal for educators since the founding of the public education system in the United States. Social studies educators and researchers continually strive to define the necessary elements of pedagogy and curriculum to ensure that students are equipped to actively participate in defining and solving the political and social problems faced by our nation. For over 20 years, social studies researchers have shown an interest in the study of classroom climates; educational researchers from other fields have been exploring climate for considerably longer than that.

The Concept of Classroom Climate

The study of classroom climate has not been limited only to those interested in social studies education. Early interest in the effects of classroom environments has been traced to social psychological researchers in the late 1920s (Anderson, 1982; Chavez, 1984; Randhawa & Fu, 1973). As interest in describing classroom phenomena grew, two traditions of research, each with a focus on classroom interactions, gained preeminence in educational literature. The two traditions, each precursors to classroom climate research in the social studies, were derived separately from theoretical models described by Getzels and Thelen (1960) and Murray (1938).

Social studies educators have long been concerned with providing classroom climates to facilitate democratic learning. Dewey (1916) asserted that the environment was a potent element of education, and proposed that intellectual freedom and exchange should be central elements of civic education. Kohlberg (1975), who modernized Dewey's ideas, held that moral development would be facilitated when students actively participated in the governance of their school communities and were challenged to consider others' points of view through role-playing and discussions. As measures of classroom climate were being developed by a broad range of educational researchers during the 1950s and '60s, social studies educators were also beginning to focus attention on its definitions and measurement.

The contemporary definition of classroom climate in social studies literature describes a construct designed to measure "the intersection of teacher behavior and classroom curriculum factors" (Ehman, 1980). The term climate thus refers to how teaching is carried out. Ehman (1980) provides the following distinction between open and closed classroom climates:

> "When students have an opportunity to engage freely in making suggestions for structuring the classroom environment, and when they have opportunities to discuss all sides of controversial topics, the classroom climate is deemed 'open.' When these conditions do not prevail,

and when the teacher uses authoritarian classroom tactics, it is considered 'closed.'" (p. 108)

The definition of classroom climate found in the social studies literature is therefore quite similar to those found in the broader educational research literature. The behavior of the teacher, and the manner in which teachers handle classroom interactions, are the central definitional characteristics of climate found in each of these perspectives. Although this definition set forth by Ehman is generally accepted by social studies researchers, a review of the literature indicates that a variety of methods have been employed to study classroom climate.

Empirical Investigations of Classroom Climate Variables

A number of social studies researchers have explored the relationship between classroom climate variables and many different attitudinal or achievement measures. Much of the research reflects the status accorded discussions as a teaching method in social studies (Ehman, 1969, 1970, 1972, 1977, 1980b; Grossman, 1975; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Levenson, 1972; Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975). For this reason, research in the social studies literature shares a focus on classroom interaction with traditional research on classroom climate, but many of the investigations focus more closely on describing the types of discourse or teaching behaviors that were postulated to have particular relevance for social studies instruction. In adopting these alternate foci, researchers have defined classroom climate in slightly different ways.

Findings from this body of research which defined classroom climate primarily on the basis of discussion are mixed. Various researchers have concluded that the amount of discussion (Ehman, 1970; Grossman, 1975; Hahn & Tocci, 1990) may be an important consideration; Ehman's (1972) findings support that conclusion, but Levenson's (1972) findings do not. Findings also indicate that the type of discussion may be important (Ehman, 1970; Grossman, 1975; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Landress 1989). The differences in findings for this group of studies is probably also related to the broad range of political attitudes used as outcome measures--from efficacy, interest, trust, and confidence to attitudes toward economics or the toleration of dissent. Further research is needed to clarify the relationships between classroom climate, the frequency or types of discussions, and each of these attitudes.

Another strain of research on classroom climate focused more closely on specific behaviors of teachers and how they contribute to the development of student attitudes (Long &Long, 1975; Rossell and Hawley, 1981). The evidence presented in these two studies, does not clearly demonstrate the importance of students' perceptions of their teachers' behaviors in predicting political attitudes. They do, however, raise a potentially interesting area for further exploration. It is possible that modelled behaviors, as perceived by students, affect the way they feel about politics.

The extent to which students are involved in classroom participation has also been evaluated for its potential effects on political attitudes. Several researchers employed various types of interaction analysis to assess the degree of student involvement in classroom discussions (Button, 1972; Ponder & Button, 1975; Zevin, 1983).

Two recent investigations (Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1986; Blankenship, 1990) have employed qualitative as well as quantitative measures to assess the impact of open classroom climate on students' global knowledge and attitudes. The qualitative data reported in each gives additional insight into students' perceptions of their classrooms.

Summary

The variety of research methods used in the studies of classroom climate, combined with the wide variety of outcome measures with which climate has been

associated, makes it difficult to summarize the literature as a whole. An assessment of how various elements of classroom climate affect political attitudes, as reported in these studies, presents a decidedly mixed picture.

The most positive findings are those focusing on the relationships between climate variables and political interest, which are shown to be positively and moderately correlated (Ehman, 1977; 1980; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Long & Long, 1975). The findings for the relationship between climate and efficacy are similarly encouraging. Scaled measures of climate are moderately correlated with efficacy (Blankenship, 1990; Ehman, 1972; Hahn & Tocci, 1990), as are student initiation and participation (Glenn, 1972, Ponder & Button, 1975; Zevin, 1983). One moderate negative relationship was reported (Long & Long, 1975). The correlations between climate and political confidence has also been quite consistent: Ehman (1977), Hahn & Tocci (1990), and Blankenship (1990) have all found positive correlations. Recently, consistent positive and moderate correlations between climate and global attitudes have also been reported (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta and Lansdale, 1988).

A more complex set of findings has been obtained by researchers addressing the relationship between climate and cynicism. Increases in cynicism have been related to increased discussion (Ehman, 1970; Long & Long, 1975) and higher proportions of student talk (Zevin, 1983), but decreases in cynicism have also been related to student talk (Ponder & Button, 1975) and scaled measures of classroom climate (Blankenship, 1989; Hahn & Tocci, 1990). More research is needed to further explore this relationship.

Research evaluating the relationships between elements of classroom climate and political knowledge or behavior has been less extensive. Positive relationships, however, have been found both between climate and knowledge (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1988) and climate and participation (Ehman, 1969; Long & Long, 1975). This suggests that climate may affect more than just attitudes.

Limitations of the Studies

Although the bulk of evidence seems to suggest that open classroom climates are associated with positive outcomes, methodological issues raised by a critical examination of the literature must be addressed before that claim can be firmly substantiated. There are clearly a number of elements in the literature that need clarification to further our knowledge of the effects of classroom climate.

A majority of the studies on classroom climate in social studies has focused on discussions--specifically students' perceptions of their content and frequency. Given the widely acknowledged role of discussion in social studies pedagogy, this focus has been appropriate. Both empirical and theoretical literature on classroom climate indicates, however, that there may be many other variables that play a role in classroom climate. An examination of that literature suggests that dimensionalizing climate constructs beyond the focus on discussion would better enable researchers to describe the relationship between climate and political socialization.

The existing studies of classroom climate in the social studies literature are also limited by the methods that have been used to address research questions. The methodological approaches taken by researchers in each of the two traditions of climate literature (Getzels & Thelen, 1960; Trickett & Moos, 1973; Withall, 1969), and those taken by social studies researchers, all provide useful pieces of information in the study of classroom climate. Those pieces, however, provide only a fragmented view of a complicated phenomena. With only two exceptions (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1988), in conducting the studies included in this review, individual researchers have used methods from one research paradigm in trying to unravel the complex elements or effects of classroom climate.

Based on a review of research on classroom climate, this study builds on previous research in social studies by expanding the definition of classroom climate to incorporate climate measures found in a wide range of educational research. This study also compared the attitudinal and behavioral outcomes of students who perceived their classes as open with those who perceived their classes as closed. It was hypothesized that students who perceived their social studies classes to be open would report higher levels of political interest, political efficacy, and political confidence than would students who perceived their classes to be closed.

In addition to testing these hypotheses, data from this research was used to address a number of exploratory research questions, including the following:

1. What actually happens in secondary social studies classes on a daily basis?
2. How do students and teachers view social studies classes? From their perspectives, what is the purpose of social studies?
3. How might social studies instruction, as defined by teachers and students, and as observed in classrooms, relate to the development of positive political attitudes and behaviors?
5. What are students' attitudes toward politics? What are students' perceptions of the political world? How have student perceptions been shaped by schooling and social studies classes (or by other factors, that they might identify)?

Methodology

Qualitative and quantitative methods of measurement were combined to address the research questions. Quantitative measures were used to assess the status of students' political attitudes and behavior, to test the hypotheses of the study, and to provide objective measures of student attitudes comparable to those collected by other researchers. Qualitative methods were used to provide in-depth descriptions of social studies classrooms and students' and teachers' perceptions to address the exploratory research questions, and to add a depth of understanding to and explore possible explanations for the quantitative data. This combination of both research paradigms was designed to reduce the potential for bias inherent in each (Cook & Reichardt, 1987) and allow the investigator to address the research questions with the strengths of both. Table 1 presents a summary chart of the data sources used for this study.

Sample

The sample for this study was drawn from two school systems in a southeastern state. Four civics teachers, two from Addison[1] County and two from Belmont County, were asked to participate in this study. The teachers were identified based on student responses to a 30-item political attitudes questionnaire. The questionnaire, which was completed by students in social studies classes at the end of the winter quarter in both of these school systems, contains nine items from classroom climate scales previously used by Harwood (1990) and Blankenship (1990), and, as distractors, three to five items from each political attitude scale used in those studies.

The questionnaires were administered in all Addison County schools in which two civics teachers would be teaching during the spring quarter, in an attempt to identify a pair of contrasting classroom styles within a single school. Data were gathered from 281 students taught by nine different teachers in five schools. Unfortunately, the data indicated that no single school offered a pair of teachers with contrasting classroom climate scores, indicating dramatically different teaching styles. There were, however, several teachers with exceptionally high open-classroom climate ratings. The two

[1] The names of counties, schools, teachers and students are pseudonyms

teachers with the highest classroom climate ratings. Ms. Danials (M = 4.903, SD = .702) and Mr. Woodlawn (M=4.896, SD = .940), both from one school, were invited to participate in the study. These two teachers, and the students who were enrolled in their 11-week Political Science 200 classes during the spring quarter of 1990 were the open classroom subjects in this study. Each teacher taught two periods of Political Science; a total of 26 students, 13 females and 13 males from Mr. Woodlawn's classes, and 30 students, 17 females and 13 males from Ms. Danials classes completed questionnaires.

Subsequently, two teachers from the Belmont County school, who were identified by their social studies coordinators as likely candidates, were evaluated for participation in the study. Students who were in these two teachers' classes during the winter semester were given the same 30-item political attitude questionnaire, and the mean classroom climate scores were 4.343 (SD = .421) for Ms. Jefferies classes and 4.363 (SD .823) for Mr. Phillips' classes. These two teachers were then asked to participate; although the second teacher and his students initially participated, they were later dropped from the study due to incomplete data. Ms. Jefferies, and the students enrolled in her 13-week Citizenship classes during spring semester of 1990 were the closed classroom subjects for this study. A total of 29 students, 13 females and 16 males from her fifth- and sixth-period classes completed questionnaires.

To ensure that the data sample would adequately represent contrasting classroom climates, an analysis of variance was used to compare the mean scores of the three teachers' classes at the end of winter quarter. The analysis indicated that Ms. Jefferies classes were more closed than both Mr. Woodlawn's F, (1, 164) = 8.56, p = .004) and Ms. Danials' F, (1, 164) = 14.77, p ≤ .000) classes.

Definitions

Classroom climate in this study is enlarged beyond the traditional definitions of climate found in the social studies literature, and reflects dimensions identified by a wide variety of educational researchers. Classroom climate is the general atmosphere of the classroom, and was measured by four dimensions of a classroom climate scale on a student questionnaire: (a) *classroom activities* are the activities that occur in social studies classes; (b) *teacher characteristics* are the personal attributes that students ascribe to their teachers' behaviors; (c) *student involvement* is students' perceptions of their involvement in making decisions in the classroom and participating in classroom activities; and (d) *social atmosphere* is students' perceptions of student-to-student interactions that occur in their social studies classes.

Political attitudes are the feelings students have toward political institutions, public officials, and political processes, and were measured by a questionnaire containing five scales: (a) *Political Interest* is a general interest in political matters. (b) *Political Efficacy* is the belief that citizens can influence decisions made by the government, and that the political system is responsive to citizens. (c) *Political Confidence* is the feeling that one can personally influence decision making. (d) *Political Trust* is defined as the feeling that government is trustworthy and efficient. *Political participation* will be defined as actual involvement in formal political activity, or student participation in quasi-political school activities, and will be measured by the Political Participation Index.

Quantitative Methods

A pretest-posttest design was used for the quantitative aspect of this study. Questionnaires designed to measure students' political attitudes and their involvement in politics were administered at the beginning of the Political Science 200 and Citizenship classes, and again at their conclusions. The questionnaire therefore provided a

preliminary measure of students' attitudes and behaviors before they received formal civics training, and another measure following their classes.

Political Attitudes Questionnaire. The Political Attitudes Questionnaire used in this study contains 61 statements designed to measure students' attitudes about themselves as political participants, about government and about their classrooms. Students responded on a six-point Likert Scale, signaling their agreement or disagreement with each item. The political attitudes scales were used on both the pretest and posttest student questionnaires.

The attitude scales used in this investigation were used in two previous studies in the metropolitan Atlanta area (Blankenship, 1990; Harwood, 1990). An item analysis conducted on the scales yielded Cronbach Alphas of .85 and .87 for political interest, .73 and .78 for political efficacy, .83 and .88 for political confidence, and .73 and .74 for political trust, respectively. These reliability coefficients are improvements over those that were obtained in past research, and the scales used in this project have been further refined. Based on examination of the factor and item analyses of these two previous studies, six of the weakest items from the questionnaire were dropped for this investigation.

The scales developed by Harwood (1990) that were used in this study were based on the work of several previous researchers. The Political Interest and Political Confidence scales were based on measures developed by Ehman and Gillespie (1975), and those used in several other studies (Hahn & Avery, 1985; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Harper, 1987). The Political Efficacy scale contains items used by Hahn & Tocci (1990), which incorporated some items used frequently in earlier socialization studies (Campbell, Converse, Miller, & Stokes, 1960; Easton & Dennis, 1969; Ehman, 1972; Hess & Torney, 1967; Jennings & Niemi, 1974).

The Efficacy scale used by Harwood (1990) reflected a substantial reconceptualization of the construct: based on suggestions put forth by Stentz and Lambert (1977) and Ehman and Gillespie (1975), former measures of efficacy were separated into two scales. One scale--Political Confidence, as distinguished by Ehman and Gillespie (1975)--deals with individual's perception of their personal ability to affect political decisions. The other construct--Political Efficacy--deals with a more general feeling that the citizenry can influence political decisions. The Political Trust Scale was also adapted from one used by Hahn & Tocci (1990). Additional items drawn from the work of Agger, Goldstein, and Pearl (1961) and Ehman (1969) were included.

Classroom climate measurement. A multi-dimensional measure of classroom climate was added to the Political Attitudes and Behavior Index as part of the posttest measurement. Based on field testing that occurred during the spring of 1990, four subscales of Classroom climate were designed for use in this instrument. The Teacher Characteristics subscale contains 15 items, drawn from the work of Harwood (1990) and others (Grossman, 1975; Long & Long, 1975; Rossell & Hawley, 1981). The Student Involvement subscale contains seven items, and is based on previous work by Glenn, 1972; Rossell & Hawley, 1981; and Trickett & Moos, 1971. The Social Atmosphere subscale contains 8 items found in previous research (Grossman, 1975; Trickett & Moos, 1971; Walberg, 1968). The final classroom climate indicator to be used in this study is a Classroom Activities Index, which will measure the frequency of various types of educational activities, using measures found in the traditional social studies classroom climate literature (Ehman, 1970; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Harwood, 1990).

Demographic indicators. Part Three of the posttest questionnaire also asked students to provide information about their grades, employment, age, race, the social studies classes they have taken, and their parents. Information from this section of the questionnaire was used to provide a demographic portrait of students. Along with the climate measure, this was administered at the end of the quarter only.

Analysis. Quantitative data generated from pretest and posttest questionnaires were analyzed in several ways. The strength of the political attitude scales and classroom climate scales were evaluated through the application of factor analysis and reliability analysis; these analyses were then used to determine which items would be included in the scaled measures of political attitudes and classroom climate. Analysis of variance was used to determine any possible initial differences between classroom groups, and analysis of covariance, using pretest scores and race as covariates, were used to assess changes in students' political attitudes and participation from the beginning to the end of the civics/citizenship course.

Qualitative Methods

Case studies of the three teachers and their classrooms were conducted. Qualitative methods included student and teacher interviews and field observation. These data were collected in an effort to provide a comprehensive description of the social studies classes participating in this study.

Teacher Interviews. Teachers were formally interviewed about a wide range of issues in social studies education at the beginning of the study. Their professional preparation, their rationale for teaching social studies, their perceived focus for social studies instruction, and the teaching methods they preferred were among the topics explored. Formal interviews were also conducted at the end of the study, wherein teachers were asked to reflect upon their teaching and their students. Data regarding teachers' feelings about their classes and students were also gathered during informal interviews and after- or before-school conversations.

Student Interviews. Semi-structured interviews (Bogden & Bicklen, 1982) were conducted with students from participating classes to ensure that data collection followed an emic perspective--capturing the meanings of the participants. To obtain comparable data across subjects, an interview protocol was designed for this element of the investigation. All interviews were conducted by the author, and they took place in areas familiar to the students, such as classrooms, libraries, and offices in the respective schools. Each interview lasted from 15 to 30 minutes. In all, 51 students were interviewed; 15 from Mr. Woodlawn's classes (4 males and 9 females), 10 from Ms. Danials classes (4 males and 6 females), and 26 from Ms. Jefferies classes (14 males and 12 females). Mr. Woodlawns' and Ms. Danials' students were all interviewed before school or during lunch; in addition to lunch and after school interviews with Ms. Jefferies students, several students were allowed to leave class to be interviewed. This increased access to students' time enabled the researcher to interview all but three students in Ms. Jefferies' classes. Students from the other two classes were purposefully sampled to represent students who were observed to be active participants in classroom activities, and those who were non-participants.

Most of the students were interviewed in pairs, although one group of three and three individual interviews were also conducted. All interviews were taped with the permission of the participants, and were later transcribed verbatim for coding and analysis. During the interviews students were asked a variety of questions about their schools, their citizenship/political science classes, and government and politics. A copy of the interview schedule is contained in Appendix A.

Classroom Observations. Systematic field observations were conducted throughout the 13- and 11-week courses in the three teachers' classrooms. These observations were designed to provide what qualitative researchers term a "thick description" of what actually happens in high school social studies classes. During each classroom observation, the events and interactions that unfolded in the classroom were noted. The fieldnotes, as raw data, provide a running description of each observed class session. Special attention was paid to the classroom interactions that took place, and the teaching methods and materials that were used. The duration and frequency of classroom

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

activities, as well as selected verbatim comments made by the teachers and students, were noted.

In all, observations of 135 classroom sessions were conducted. The observational data on the open classrooms includes 20 observations of the first period class of Ms. Danials; 26 observations of the second and 21 observations of the third period classes of Mr. Woodlawn. The closed climate teacher, M Jefferies, was observed during 37 lessons in her fifth period class and 31 lessons during her sixth period class.

Analysis. Qualitative data, including field notes and interview notes, were analyzed using the constant comparison method defined by Strauss (1987). In the constant comparison method, analysis begins with the first observations and interviews made in the field. As information is gathered, the researcher begins to look for patterns, and to formulate hypotheses that are then tested as new information is added. The researcher is thus constantly comparing information gathered in the inquiry, and is enabled to generate theory that is grounded in evidence. Following the qualitative strategy of inductive analysis, all interviews and field notes were coded based on categories that were generated from within the data gathered.

The final, formal analysis of the interview data began after all the interviews had been completed. A form of analytic induction (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984) which involved scanning the data for categories or themes, was applied to the data. The analysis of interview data began during the transcription of the tape-recorded interviews. As individual interviews were transcribed, several themes began to emerge from students' comments. These themes were noted, and used in later analysis. The transcribed interviews were then read; throughout the reading additional codes for the data began to emerge and were recorded.

Several coding divisions were based on the themes inherent in the interview schedule. All students were asked questions that fell into the basic categories of reactions to their class and teacher, descriptions of their school, thoughts about politics and politicians, and their personal plans after high school. Four broad coding categories relating to each of these topics were used as the first basis for analyzing the data. Under each of these general categories, subcategories were generated as individual interview transcripts were coded. Subcategories were therefore generated for each of these major categories; and as the analysis continued some of these subcategories were eliminated or combined as the data dictated. During this process the categorization of data was refined and a coding schema was produced. A sample of the coding categories used for interview data may be found in Appendix B.

The interview data of each of the three teachers' students were then treated separately, and were disaggregated for further analysis. The data from individual interviews were divided into a three separate data arrays (one for each teachers' students) based on the coded subcategories, which included comments pertinent to each subcategory made by all participants. The resulting groups of individuals' comments were examined for general trends, and through this process, overall consistencies of student responses were assessed. The processes of analysis for qualitative data are summarized in Figure 1.

FIGURE 1: SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW ANALYSIS

COLLECTION OF INTERVIEW DATA	**TRANSCRIPTION OF TAPED INTERVIEWS:**	**READING INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS:**	**RE-READING INTERVIEWS AND SCHEMA APPLICATION**
	EMERGING THEMES NOTED	INITIAL SCHEMA GENERATION	SCHEMA REFINEMENT
CODING OF INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS:	**DATA ARRAY:**	**RE-READING OF DATA ARRAY:**	**FINAL REPORT WRITING**
ALL DATA GIVEN CODED NUMERALS	ALL DATA DISPLAYED UNDER EACH CODED CATEGORY	CONFIRMATION OF FINAL THEMES	

The analysis of the observational data began when the fieldnotes were transcribed from their handwritten form into word-processed data files. Four overarching coding categories, Interaction Codes, Activity Codes, Behavior Codes, and Teacher Philosophies emerged as the data were being transcribed. As the fieldnotes from each teachers' classes were transcribed, subcategories under each of these overarching categories were generated. During this phase of the analysis differences between how the three teachers handled their classes, and the types of interactions that occurred in them began to emerge. Classroom observation transcripts were then coded based on the types of interactions that took place, teachers' use of discussions, stated teaching philosophies, and their use of current events in class.

Limitations of the Study

This research project was necessarily limited in its scope due to the time demands of collecting qualitative data. Because the sample consisted of three teachers' classrooms, the generalizations that can be made from the findings will be limited. The wealth of information provided by a combination of research methods and sources, however, provided a richness of description unattainable through the use of quantitative methods alone. The project was also limited to a relatively short length of time, given that these citizenship/political science classes themselves only lasted from 11 to 13 weeks. It was unlikely that radical changes in political attitudes or behaviors would take place over a three-month period of time; for this reason, particular attention was placed on determining substantive differences in students' attitudes or behaviors (which may or may not be statistically significant). The collection of qualitative data greatly aided in this endeavor.

Quantitative Findings

The results of factor and reliability analyses for the political attitude and classroom climate scales are reported below. Comparative statistics, analyses of changes in political attitudes, and correlational data are also presented.

Scale Reliabilities.

The results of a confirmatory factor analysis of the political attitude scales were not as strong as expected. The Political Interest Scale made the strongest showing, with six items for which the underlying dimension accounted for over 50% of the variance; the Political Trust component explained over 50% of the variance for four of its projected items. The Political Confidence and Efficacy components were the least well-defined, with many items cross-loading on both scales. Items that most clearly loaded on only one of these two scales were used to define the constructs. The Political Efficacy construct accounted for between 15 and 87% of the variance for the five items used in the scale, and the Political Confidence construct accounted for 23-56% of the variance for each of its five items.

The item analyses showed that the reliabilities for these four scales were somewhat lower than those reported in recent investigations (Blankenship, 1990; Harwood, 1990). The Cronbach Alphas for the scales were: .79 for Political Interest; .67 for Political Trust; .68 for Political Efficacy; and .61 for Political Confidence. Appendix C presents the political attitude items used for each scale, along with their corresponding factor loadings.

Classroom Climate Measures. The 26 items from the posttest questionnaire that were designed to measure classroom climate were also factor analyzed (N = 198). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine if the three a priori constructs--Teacher Characteristics, Student Involvement, and Social Atmosphere--would clearly emerge. The factor analysis defined only two of these three constructs. The Teacher Characteristics construct contained 14 items; over 50% of the variance was accounted for in 11 of these. The Student Involvement construct contained four items, for which

51-66% of the variance was explained. There was no clear definition of a Social Atmosphere construct. The five items that were expected to load together to form the construct did not clearly load on any of the three factors defined in the factor analysis.

Item analyses of the Teacher Characteristics and Student Involvement scale were also conducted. The 14-item Teacher Characteristics scale attained a Cronbach Alpha of .91, and the four-item Student Involvement Scale attained a Cronbach Alpha of .75.

Comparative Statistics

Several statistical comparisons between the open and closed climate classrooms were made. Analysis of variance was used to determine if any initial differences existed between the students in closed and open classrooms.

Political Attitudes. Only three pre-existing differences were found when political attitudes were compared. No statistically significant differences were found between students in Ms. Jefferies and Ms. Danials classes. Students in Mr. Woodlawn's classes, however, reported significantly higher feelings of Political Efficacy F, (1, 80) = 9.541, p = .003), and Political Interest F, (1, 80) = 7.361, p = .008) than did students in Ms. Jefferies classes. In addition, these two groups also differed significantly on one political behavior measure--Anticipated Future Participation F, (1, 80) = 4.816, p = .030) . No significant differences between the student groups on measures of family political participation were found.

Demographic differences between the two student groups were also assessed. The two groups were found to differ significantly in race F, (1, 77) = 8.19, p = .005). All of the students from the open climate classrooms were African-Americans. In contrast, 44% of the students from the closed climate classrooms were African-Americans, 30% were Asian, 19% were Caucasian, and 7% were hispanic. No differences in measures of fathers' or mothers' education, or whether or not students were college-bound or employed were found.

Climate Comparisons. Using posttest data, student responses on the two classroom climate scales were compared using an analysis of variance. Students in Ms. Jefferies classes reported the lowest scores on the Teacher Characteristics and Student Involvement measures, signifying that they perceived their classes to be more closed. Students in both Mr. Woodlawn's and Ms. Danials classes reported higher scores on these two measures, signifying that classes taught by these two teachers were perceived by students as more open. Comparisons between the closed and each of the open classes showed that the differences on these two measures were statistically significant. The mean scores on these measures, and the results of the analysis of variance that compared them are presented in Table 2.

Analysis of Change

Analysis of covariance was used to determine if there was a change in students political attitudes or anticipated future political participation that might be attributed to their teachers and the differences between open and closed classroom climates. In each of these analyses, the pretest measure, teacher, and race were used as covariates. This allowed for statistical control of the pretest differences found between the open and closed classroom students.

Contrary to the hypotheses of this study, no differences between the two groups indicating a change in political attitudes that might be attributable to classroom climate were found. The students from open and closed classroom climates did not significantly differ on measures of political interest, political confidence, political efficacy, or political trust. In addition, no differences were found for measures of student media use, discussion of political issues, or anticipated future political participation.

Correlations

A Pearson Correlation matrix was computed to determine the strength of relationships between teacher characteristics, student involvement, and posttest measures of political attitudes and participation. Significant positive correlations between teacher characteristics and students' reported political efficacy, interest, and involvement in discussions were found. Student involvement was also positively correlated with political efficacy, interest and involvement in political discussions. The correlation matrix is presented in Table 3.

Qualitative Findings

The qualitative data collected for this project yielded rich findings. Comparisons of the daily activities and the nature of interactions in each classroom as reflected in the field notes confirms the climate differences indicated by the quantitative measures. An examination of teacher philosophies, and their handling of discussions and current events in class reveals important differences in their approaches to civics instruction. Student perceptions of the three teachers and the civics classes are also instructive. The students in each of the three teachers' classes were forthright with praise or condemnation for their classes, and their insights into the world of politics are very interesting.

Three Approaches to Teaching: The Civic Servant, The Social Worker, and the Democratic Philosopher

Each teacher who participated in this project was a dedicated practitioner--they were all concerned for the welfare of their students, and each hoped that students would become "good citizens" after taking the citizenship/political science classes they were teaching. Each teacher, however, had different philosophical motivations reflected in their interactional styles, and each approached the teaching of civics with different methods. A review of the teachers' backgrounds and philosophies, as well as descriptions of their classroom behavior is contained in the following sections.

Lorraine Jefferies--Teacher as Civic Servant. Lorraine Jefferies started her career in teaching late in life. She had raised two daughters who were in high school before she went back to school to get a teaching certificate and a master's degree in history. Her family background influenced her decision to teach social studies. As she explained it:

> I come from a family that is very much into genealogy and history and my family were colonial dames and DAR and all that stuff, my mother was into that. And so I grew up understanding that I had a responsibility to this country and that I was supposed to be of service here somehow. And I had a love of US history, I like history anyway.

Lorraine became a teacher after being a housewife and mother who was also garden club president, Jr. D.A.R. member, and Girl Scout Leader. She learned through these experiences that she had a love of young people, and she felt that she had some insight, understanding, and aptitude for working with them. Her decision to teach was also financially motivated--she wanted to ensure college educations for her two daughters.

Although Lorraine had taught for 19 years, this was her first time teaching a citizenship course, and it was quite a change for her from her usual course load of U.S. History and Advanced Placement U. S. History. She had a few qualms about teaching a new preparation and a new age level, even though she accepted her assignment to teach the course as "fair." She was concerned that she would be able to aim at the proper academic level for her students, and she also felt that her advanced history degree "overqualified"

her for teaching such a course. Lorraine was also concerned with the state-mandated social studies curriculum, which includes one quarter each of citizenship, economics, and geography at the 10th grade level. She felt that these "three little ticky courses" would not serve students well:

> I don't really think that as hard as I try that I'm going to make much of a difference in one citizenship course in the tenth grade. . . I don't really think that we are going to accomplish a whole lot in here. And that's one whole year that has courses in it that I don't, I don't think will make much of a difference in the lives of these children.

In spite of these misgivings, Ms. Jefferies expressed hope that her students would come away from her course better citizens. Her personal goal was to "make voters" out of her students--she hoped they would become "concerned citizens with an understanding of what their part [in government] is." She wanted students to know that it was important that they become involved in government, and that they had the power to change things. She described good citizens as "good person[s]" who would try to "build the community. . .making it a better place" as well as "being supportive of a democratic government." The academic objectives for her citizenship course included:

> 1) demonstrating a knowledge of the framework of the U. S. government; 2) identifying and understanding the principles of individual rights and liberties as guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution; and 3) applying problem-solving and critical thinking skills to issues in law-related areas

Ms. Jefferies hoped to reach these goals through a well-structured classroom, and through a variety of teaching methods and activities.

Constituted Authority in a Quality Classroom. Two general themes emerged from the classrooms of Lorraine Jefferies: the importance of following rules, and the idea of creating a "quality classroom." These two themes rose singly and in concert to guide the everyday behavior of students in her classes. They shaped student behavior, and eventually served to limit the amount and type of interactions that occurred in class.

Lorraine Jefferies demanded the attention of students in her classroom. Although diminutive at five foot two inches, the set of her squared shoulders and the proud and perhaps defiant lift of her chin assured students that she would be in control of all situations. Ms. Jefferies prided herself on running a structured classroom. She claimed never to have had a problem with discipline, and had in fact been cited for her skills in classroom management. She noted that "They [the school administration] have brought people in to observe the fact that I manage classrooms well," and she enjoyed a reputation with students and other faculty of being a strict disciplinarian. In spite of her past successes with classroom management, the two citizenship classes proved greatly challenging as students constantly tested the behavior codes Ms. Jefferies established.

The "quality classroom" theme was introduced on the first day of class, and it was reiterated consistently throughout the semester. At the sound of the bell, Ms. Jefferies called the class to attention, as she did every day after, with a curt "May I have your attention please?". She then proceeded to explain the concept of quality classrooms as follows:

> You are privileged to be in a quality school--in a quality school standards are high. Sometimes, rarely, I get someone who doesn't understand high standards, so listen carefully. A quality school will make it so you have

> the skills--not only academic but behaviors, attitudes, and habits to make it in the world of work. This is what you want, and this is what I want, so listen carefully. Be in your seat when the bell rings. Be quiet. Do not waste class time, waste no time. Be seated, get paper, pen, pencil, book, be ready to take instructions.

This theme was repeatedly invoked throughout the semester as a shaping force for student behavior. Ms. Jefferies' daily classes were punctuated by overt behavior structures and reminders of the proper deportation for students in a quality classroom. Students were admonished to sit up in their desks, remove their hands from their mouths, speak courteously, follow directions cooperatively, and remove papers from the floor to ensure that theirs would be a classroom of high standards.

The second theme, constituted authority, most often arose when students challenged behavior structures made in the classroom. These challenges, unfortunately, were frequent, and in observing them one could sense students sometimes purposely baiting the teacher for a response. Several chronic misbehavers in each class continued to challenge the authority of the teacher, and after a certain point it became a game with the students to see how far they could push her. Ms. Jefferies' responses to student misbehavior was often to invoke her powers, the powers of school, or the powers of county authorities to ensure that students followed proper procedures. She also informed the students early in the semester that she would make a habit of calling parents of uncooperative students to solicit their help in correcting misbehavior, and she was quick to assign detention for students who acted out in class.

Examples of these student challenges to Ms. Jefferies authority abound in the recorded field notes. A few excerpts are illustrative:

> LJ: You will learn that in the upper levels of high school you will sit quietly. Put your hands down from your mouth please--that's something you don't do. And sit up straight. You're not to talk.
> Jerry: (sarcastically) Oh, I forgot I was in a *quality* classroom.
> LJ: Do you want me to call your parents next? (3/8/90)
> - - - -
> Rachel: My mom says I can put my hands by my mouth if I want to.
> LJ: I'll be glad to talk to you after class as to why you can't. One thing you will learn is constituted authority. The school has a legal authority. (3/12/90)
> - - - -
> Rachel: What is this on #1? (asking a question about a worksheet)
> LJ: (to other students who are making noise) Excuse me! I'll listen to my student as you others are quiet.
> Rachel: What's the-
> LJ: You have to believe that I am serious. You will be quiet or there will be consequences. George, you know it's not right to sing in class, you know what is right. Keep pushing and I'll get ya! (she is pointing with a piece of chalk to the detention list on the board).
> George: (very sarcastically) Right, with your chalk!
> LJ: With the chalk and a phone call.
> George: (mutters something under his breath). (5/2/90)
> ---

On a few occasions, these student challenges became almost unbearable for Ms. Jefferies, and she and the students engaged in verbal one-ups-manship that served to increase the tension to almost ridiculous heights. One particularly trying day, students refused to remain quiet. Their behavior had degenerated to the point that a few boys began to tap rhythmically on their desks to distract others, while another student made clucking

noises with his tongue, and students talked across the room to one another. The tension exploded during a momentary lull, when I sneezed:

> Maria: God bless you!
> LJ: Be quiet! You do not do that in a high school classroom!
> (students laugh at this)
> George: Why?
> Will: you're insane!
> LJ: Because if you are in the middle of a thought-
> Rachel: so we don't say "bless you?"
> LJ: You will not in this classroom.
> George: You just love power, don't you?
> LJ: Yes. It's mine. I do. (4/9/90)

The notion of constituted authority was presented not only to guide classroom behavior, but also as a component of students lives as citizens. Ms. Jefferies was quick to remind them that rules were needed to guide behavior in the classroom, as well as in society. One example is provided by her reminder that students should not write on desks:

> One of the things that's expected of us as citizens is that there are rules. Human beings decide they need government, and certain things have evolved. One is that you should improve on things, not tear them down. So, again, your desks have been cleaned, and I expect them to stay that way. (4/9)

Only a few such explicit references to rule-abiding as a requirement of good citizenship were made. Ms. Jefferies was more concerned that students follow proper procedures in her class toward developing positive habits they would need later, particularly to prepare them for work. She emphasized that students needed to follow classroom procedures "so that when [they] got into the real world, further schooling, working, or work study, [they would] understand how to act correctly" in those situations. Several similar reminders occurred throughout the semester.

Classroom Interactions. The instructional strategies adopted by Ms. Jefferies, and the frequency of student misbehavior served to limit the types of academic interactions that occurred in Ms. Jefferies' classes. The students were given worksheets that they completed individually at their desks virtually every day of the semester. The worksheets, which were Ms. Jefferies constructed daily, generally consisted of one to fifteen questions that followed reading assignments in the textbook. The worksheets typically contained a number of words to be defined, and often directed students to generate lists (e.g. list things a state can do; list powers given to Congress by the Constitution; write a list of important facts about state government) or to identify facts (e.g. how long is the term of a Senator/Representative; how many members are there in the electoral college). The worksheets also occasionally included "discussion" questions such as: "Discuss the government of the United States"; "What reasons can you suggest for a decline in voter participation"; or "How important do you think it is to have people selected for a jury from the defendant's community?" that were designed to stimulate student reflection and writing.

The worksheets were the most consistent pedagogical approach adopted in Ms. Jefferies' classes. On a few rare occasions she lectured from a podium; on those occasions she generally had a textbook open in front of her and skimmed the material, reporting important facts or reading aloud from the text. She also used filmstrips to augment the book studies, that were accompanied by sheets of questions for students to

answer. During one lesson on consumer rights, three students engaged in a role play. Two students were asked to play a married couple who were conferring with a sales manager about purchasing a new television set.

Discussions were rarely attempted in Ms. Jefferies' classes. Typically when discussions occurred they were short in duration, and student contributions were not probed. The worksheet questions, when they were discussed in class, were sometimes used as a springboard for discussion. The following example, in which students were asked to list "the most important rights of citizens" is typical:

1:50 LJ: All right, Rachel, which did you list?
Rachel: the right to privacy.
LJ: How many listed the right to privacy? (8 students raise their hands). What else?
Rachel: the right to free religion, and speech
Gary: the right to vote influences all of those.
LJ: Korby, what did you list? (she hands out a worksheet as he reads his list).
LJ: What did you have, Tony?
Tony: (is interrupted by another student)
LJ: Sam, make plans for 30 minutes detention before school tomorrow. I'll see you right here.
Tony: freedom of speech, religion, and vote. Without free speech, press and religion won't work.
1:52 LJ: very good. Please get out your notebooks. (work on the new worksheet commences). (3/12/90)

This discussion is typical in that students were not asked to justify their answers, and very little student-to-student interaction took place. Even during this short discussion differences in student opinion were expressed, yet they remained unexplored in this superficial interaction.

There were a few notable exceptions to this general trend. One occurred when the class discussed a textbook case about shipwrecked sailors who turned cannibalistic. Students discussed what the punishment should be and they made statements to support their views. Another example was a ten-minute debate about capital punishment, a short excerpt of which follows:

LJ: If you oppose capital punishment, what do you think is the strongest argument?
Korby: Its in the Bible - thou shalt not kill.
LJ: That is very clear. Anyone else?
Darwin: The same reason. Its totally against my religion.
LJ: Another one with religion, that makes it very clear. Are there any others? (no response) How about if you favor it?
Gary: It would help prevent jail overcrowding.
LJ: That would settle that.
Rachel: That's not a good reason
Darwin: Its shallow!
Gary: Well, we don't have enough facilities.
Darwin: Do you value money more than life?
Will: What about those who mutilate, etcetera. We ought to get them off the earth. They don't belong here.
Jerry: I'd like to see them fry.
Will: I wouldn't.
LJ: Anyone else who opposes it?

Rachel: I do, but its in my head. I can't say why. (5/2/90)

This type of discussion, during which alternate views were solicited by the teacher, and students responded to one another's contributions, occurred infrequently--only two or three times during the observations--in Ms. Jefferies citizenship classes. More typical were terse discussions in which students expressed an opinion that was not then further explored.

Current Events. During the first few days of the semester, Ms. Jefferies explained to her students the importance of following current events. She told them she expected them to read the paper, listen to the radio, talk to people, or watch t.v. to find out what was happening. She explained that:

> If you are going to understand your government, you'll need to have to be able to compare it with what's going on in the world. We do have problems, but as compared to the rest of the world we are so lucky. You need to keep up on the news to realize that. (3/6/90)

In spite of this early indication that current events would be a part of the citizenship class, news items were rarely dealt with in the observed classes. The next mention of current events came nearly three weeks into the semester, when Ms. Jefferies asked one student what the news was. He replied "The Oscars" and the class was off into a three minute discussion of who the winners were and if the honors were deserved. A few weeks later a current events quiz that had been provided by a local news station was read orally to the class, and students marked their responses to multiple choice questions on papers that were later turned in. The questions and answers were not discussed in class, nor did the quiz count for a grade.

On one occasion, current events were substantively discussed in class. Students had been asked to bring newspaper articles to class. Although not one of them had brought in an article, Ms. Jefferies was able to spark their interest by bringing up a random murder that had happened in a local mall. The students subsequently engaged in a discussion of gun control and the merits of waiting periods and gun registration.

During the last few weeks of the semester current events were incorporated into the curriculum through individual written assignments. During four different lessons students received photocopies of newspaper articles that they were asked to summarize as part of their worksheet assignments. The topics of the articles did not necessarily correspond with the topics students were then studying in class. One set dealt with visitors from the Soviet Union, another with the deaths of Sammy Davis Jr. and Jim Henson, and a third with a local occurrence of ethnically-related grave vandalism. The fourth article covered gubernatorial candidates, and students were asked to list the name, a key position, and an accomplishment of each. Although no formal discussion was held about the candidates, several students did ask questions which generated responses from the teacher or other students.

When Democracy Sucks: The Students' Views. Ms. Jefferies' students expressed many concerns about her and how she handled their citizenship classes. Although many said the topics they were studying were very interesting, they were bored with the daily worksheets, and distracted by the behavioral focus of the daily interactions.

When students were asked for feedback about Ms.Jefferies' citizenship classes, they most often said classes were "boring" or "easy." Other students thought the class was "frustrating", "stupid", "moving kind of slow", or "a joke." The following comments were echoed by several other students:

George: Questions. She always does questions and that's about it, ain't it? All she does every day is give a sheet of questions and then give a test on the questions.

Andrew: I'm not real keen on the way certain teachers teach. . .You know in here you have your dittos, work on your dittos, turn them in the next day, get your dittos, turn them in the next day. (sigh)

In addition to describing the worksheets as boring, students said that they were too elementary. These students, as others, felt they were never challenged in citizenship class:

Amy: You write down everything that is already in the book
Rachel: and all you do is
Amy: She's got her questions in order, too!
Rachel: And most people are like "Shew! I'm glad its like this, you don't have to work hard!" And her questions are so--elementary, you know? So small. I mean she'll ask a question "define this, define that" or she'll ask a question all you need to do is keep going in order in the book and you'll find the answer.

The students generally thought that the worksheets were repetitive, and they complained that the same questions were sometimes included on more than one worksheet.

Most of the students perceived the worksheets to be of little value, and they had suggestions for alternate activities they thought might prove more useful. Some students thought that guest speakers, movies, presenting material other than that that was in the book, or simply going over some of the work in class would help them to learn more. Many students mentioned that they would like to have more discussions in class, and said that they thought they learned more from teachers who did use discussions. The following comment is representative of how students feel about worksheets and discussions:

Cynthia: I just wish she'd have more discussions instead of passing out all of the dittos. I like having discussions, cause I can get into a discussion. . .but we don't, we just like, she'll talk about something, and then she'll pass out a ditto, and I don't like doing those dittos. They're so, they're so long and so, just doing the same question over and over again don't get nothing out of me, because I'll just look up the answer again and forget it after I write it down. But if I have a discussion about something I'll always remember it.

Many of the students mentioned that they had discussions in other classes, particularly in English classes. The students said that they liked having discussions, because discussing things helped them to get involved and interested. These two students explained how that works:

Rory: You can take what you're doing and make it relate to what's happening now.
Tad: You can make it sound better.
Rory: It makes it not as boring.
Tad: Yeah. Paper is boring, you gotta write. When you write you don't think, you think about other things, but you just write.
Rory: Yeah, just get it out of the book and put it on paper.
Tad: But when you're talking somebody always wants to raise up their hand because they want to say something. "Ooo! Me! I'll say something - I know this, I know that."

Rory: You always have different opinions from different people.
Tad: Yeah, and it leads to controversy. And then there is a teacher who settles it. That's the good thing about it. That's what I like.

One of their peers focused on how discussions helped him to see things differently:

Tom: I kind of like those [discussions or debates], cause you know the whole class gets into them and says what they want to say and everybody does their different little thing. Gives you a lot of, I like--a lot of people like to sit there and look at things straight on the way they want to look at it? They don't look at different points? I like to look at it all the way around. You know, look at it from this direction, look at it from that direction. A lot of people just want to look at it from one view. That's a good way to get other peoples' opinions and to look at it in a different way. It gives you a different outlook.

Quite a few students noted that Ms. Jefferies was not very accepting of discussions in class. One student said "I've noticed that her idea of a discussion is her on you in class" while others said "Ms. Jefferies just won't let you say what you're thinking" and "you really just can't talk to her." The students were often frustrated by her refusal to allow discussions. As one student told me:

Danial: Discussion, I mean, that's all politics is about, you know, is just to discuss what your feelings are about an issue, or why you think something's wrong, or what you think is right, um, and also when you ask people their personal opinions, you start getting them involved.

Other students also said that discussion seemed to them to be a natural part of politics. Perhaps the best example of how students reacted when discussion was thwarted occurred in class about midway through the semester. The students had been asked to think about what they thought was the worst crime that could be committed. Having given students a few moments to ponder this question, Ms. Jefferies began to go up and down the rows of students, and she allowed each to give one response. As they gave responses, other students began to want to interject their ideas, and the following interchanges occurred:

LJ: Let's take it one at a time. We'll go down the rows and each name the worst crime.
Marvin: drug dealing
Perry: drug dealing
Korby: drug dealing
Sue: DUI
(other students protest)
LJ: Everyone has an opinion! Stop talking.
Will: It's a toss up--murder and rape. Murder.
Gerry: Drugs
(students have started to talk to one another, are exchanging ideas informally, and sometimes heatedly)
LJ: Look here! STOP TALKING!!! (she moves toward the board with the chalk in her hand, points to her detention list)
Korby: Let's have more opinions! You teach us freedom of speech in this book-
LJ: You're freedom is restricted.
Will: Where's the freedom at? You never let us say anything.
LJ: Hopefully you'll learn more about it in other classes.
Will: Well if this is what democracy is all about, then democracy sucks!

This example shows how these students, like several of their peers, clearly viewed their citizenship class as a domain in which to explore political ideas and issues. Unfortunately, even though many topics that would have been appropriate for discussion were raised in Ms. Jefferies classes, the students were rarely afforded the opportunity to hear one another's ideas.

In addition to having suggestions about how Ms. Jefferies might improve her teaching, her students made several comments on how the discipline in her classes could be improved. Almost all of the interviewed students thought that discipline was a problem, noting that "she took too much time trying to discipline kids in class", "she should not get angry so fast", or "it's not what she teaches, it's mostly what she wants the class to act like" that became the focus of the class. The students felt Ms. Jefferies "resolved everything with detentions" and that she would be a more effective teacher if she "didn't always have to fuss with the students." Several students thought she was too quick to react to misbehavior, and many of them saw her behavioral admonitions as disruptive to class work. This student's words are reflective of many others':

> Steve: She goes on about not having your hands on your chin and stuff--that kind of stuff I think has nothing to do with learning in class. . .I mean she wants us to learn, but it's like she focuses more on people that aren't doing that, like sleeping. I think that some day if someone is sleeping I don't think she should just hound 'em the whole period about that, cause then that stops everybody else from learning. Like, when she's talking and she goes off and starts yelling at C., that's like wasted time there because she spends like half the period yelling at him and then it takes her the other half to yell and say what she wants, and we don't have no time to do any of our work. It kind of takes my mind off it. . .

Although most of the students thought the topics that were covered in their citizenship class were interesting, only a few of the interviewed students made positive comments about the teacher or her teaching style. Out of the 38 students interviewed, only two said that they liked what Ms. Jefferies did in her classes. This pair of students contradicted almost all of the points made by their peers. They said Ms. Jefferies had good control of her classroom, that the worksheets really helped them to learn, and that she was an "excellent" teacher. Many of the students who were dissatisfied with Ms. Jefferies' teaching nonetheless felt that she had a good command of the subject matter. The two most prevalent themes that emerged from student responses, however, were negative. Students in Ms. Jefferies classes most often mentioned the reliance on worksheets and problems with discipline as distinguishing factors in her classroom.

Janice Danials--Teacher as Social Worker. Ms. Danials was completing her 13th year as a teacher when she participated in this project. Like Ms. Jefferies, this was her first year teaching political science, and the first in "a long while" teaching ninth-graders. She is a World History specialist who said that "history is mostly what I'm into, but I like political science as well." She was moving into teaching political science due to the retirement of a teacher who had previously taught those classes.

Janice began teaching immediately after receiving a college degree in history education. She had originally wanted to become a social worker, but her older brother warned her that she would "have to go in the field and be exposed to all of these different things that uh, you know, that will not be safe!" She did not regret her decision to go into education; she loves working with students and watching their development. She saw her role as a teacher as encompassing not only academics, but as also providing broad support and encouragement for her students. As she explained it:

> I love working with the kids, and I love what I can give to them you know. Hopefully its more than the academics, as I said. I hope that I can touch their lives in some other way and that's what I strive to do, not only the academics but the other parts, too. And I think that's important for a teacher. . . You know, it takes something more than just giving them the information, the academic part.

The "something more" for Janice included providing direction and support, as well as individual attention to her students. She noted that most of her students were "good students" who just needed help to ensure development:

> Its just a matter of a constant type of struggle with them. As a teacher you just got to stay with them on you know, "this is good, you need to do this, I don't expect to see you in the office". So you have to take on more of, just, not just being the teacher, and giving them the academics and more letting them take on the role of also kind of being their mother or father and tell them you're watching them, even though you're not in my class I'm still watching what's going on.

It was not an unusual sight to see Janice Danials meeting with students before or after class or before school. Her charges would seek out her individual attention and talk about personal matters varying from disagreements with parents or boy- and girlfriends to the upcoming class elections. Ms. Danials was dedicated to providing such student support, and she perceived that the majority of her faculty peers were also very supportive of their students. She acknowledged that serving a surrogate parent role could "sometimes get overwhelming, too, because when you show that kind of attention you know, here they are all the time." Nonetheless, she felt that her extra efforts in this regard were worth it.

Ms. Danials, like Ms. Jefferies, approached her political science classes with the goal of making students better citizens. She explained to her students that even though everyone might not go into politics actively, each had "not only a privilege but a responsibility to begin to be a good citizen." Being a good citizen, from Ms. Danials' perspective, involves voting, being patriotic, and keeping abreast of what's going on in society so they could make the right choices in selecting their representatives. Under her definition, good citizenship also includes becoming a law-abiding member of society:

> For me, and for the kids here, I'm finding that a lot of them are exposed to a lot of violence as teenagers, so my main point now is law-abiding. Because we talk about some of the crimes that have been committed by teenagers. . .and that sometimes as teenagers and as young adults they don't think about what they are doing. So that's, that's for me the major thing, that they think about their actions and the ramifications of their actions on themselves, as well as other people in our society.

Ms. Danials felt it was important for students to examine what was happening in society around them, to help them become respectful of other people, and also to learn to respect themselves.

Ms. Danials established the academic and behavioral expectations for the class at the beginning of the quarter, through a review of her course syllabus. The syllabus indicated that "the course is designed to give students a working knowledge of American politics and to help them become active participants in the political process." Among the course objectives are defining concepts such as political ideology, political institutions and political decision-making; explaining the organization, operation, and role of political parties in America; drawing conclusions about the citizen's right to criticize the government; and differentiating between value judgments and factual information.

The course syllabus also contained a brief list of "class rules". Ms. Danials noted that she "tries not to overwhelm them [students] with a lot of rules and regulations" and she "just tells them that we have limits." She said she preferred to use the term "limits" rather than "rules" , and pointed out to students that society is full of limits on behavior, and "they basically can do anything they want to do, as long as it doesn't violate me or another student." The syllabus contained only four rules specifically for her classroom: that students will not talk when either another student or the teacher is talking; that students will come to class prepared with texts, paper and writing instruments; that students will not eat in the classroom; and that students will be on time to class.

Graded Participation and Making It Relevant. Two characteristics of Ms. Danials' classroom stand out--her system for generating student involvement, and her attempts to draw students into their subject matter through the use of contemporary examples. Through both of these approaches she hoped to generate excitement in her classroom and make students participants in their learning.

Ms. Danials used a graded system of participation to generate student involvement in her class. As students made contributions in class, giving an answer or making a comment relevant to the subject matter, she would note their contribution by their names on the seating chart. At the end of each week, these contributions were added to their daily grade, and a cumulative participation score, which counted for one major test grade, was figured for each student at the end of the semester. Ms. Danials said she found that using her system motivates students to participate, "even the ones that normally won't" and it also helped her to equalize the flow of participation by reducing the contributions from aggressive students and encouraging those from quiet or shy ones.

Another major focus for Ms. Danials' teaching was making topics studied relevant to students' lives. One of her goals in her daily approach to classes was to help students connect with the meaning of the topics they were studying. As she expressed it:

> I would be exciting as an instructor every day, and that whatever I had to say to them would be meaningful. Um, I could be exciting in terms of making it relevant to the student, in terms of how it would apply to them, because they always say "why history, why political science - we don't need them, we're not going to do anything with this!"

She hoped that she would be able to help "students to visualize what was going on" and to see how the subjects they were studying could be related to their personal futures as well as as to current events.

Many examples of how Ms. Danials tried to make the subject matter relevant were evident during my observations. A broad range of concepts were tied into the students' experiences. During one lesson Ms. Danials explained how the Magna Carta limited what monarches could do to their subjects, similar to the way in which written school regulations protected students through the provision of due process. Another example can be drawn from a discussion of the compromises that occurred during the Constitutional Convention. The students had carefully outlined the positions of the large and small state plans for representation, and they were deciding how to resolve the differences:

> JD: Ok, so we argue and we can't come to a decision. What can we do?
> Curtis: eliminate an option
> JD: I heard somebody say it. . .
> Jan: take a vote?
> JD: Somebody said something else. . .
> Chas: combine them?

> JD: Ok, Ok. Do you all ever compromise? (she gives an example of a teen negotiating about doing chores around the house to be allowed to go out). So what does this compromise mean?
> Dary: to come to a general agreement that both of you are pleased with.
> JD: Exactly. Just like yesterday we had a compromise about your shorts - at least you might have a chance to wear them. Let's say you can wear them after spring break, but only if they are down below your knees. That's a compromise. (4/10/90)

Through relating the concept under study to the students' everyday life, in this instance and others, Ms. Danials hoped her students would gain a stronger understanding of their daily work. Other examples include a discussion of Teddy Roosevelt as a party man with strong views on conservation that evolved into a discussion of current environmental concern; a discussion of mandatory drug testing and the obscenities in the music of LL Cool Gang during a lesson on the Bill of Rights; and discussions of drug abuse and smoking bans and how they fell within the purview of governmental regulation.

Classroom Interactions. The daily flow of classroom instruction took many forms in Ms. Danials' class. Each class period began with a quick review of the topics covered the previous day, generally accomplished through oral quizzing of the students. The end of nearly every class featured a summary of the day's study, either given by the teacher or one or two of the students. The activities that occurred between these daily structures, however, varied greatly. Daily classes were a mixture of silent or oral text reading, occasional worksheets and filmstrips, teacher lectures, and classroom discussions of the material students were studying or current events. Regardless of the teaching methodology employed, during any given day in Ms. Danials' class students interacted with one another and with the teacher in a mutual processing of information.

The interactive nature of the classroom and the extensive use of discussions were purposefully cultivated by Ms. Danials. She explained that she did not like to lecture for an entire class period, instead preferring to use a variety of techniques. She saw interaction as an essential part of the learning process:

> I try to discuss and have interaction between my students and myself. I don't want to have them to think that this is me, I mean that this is my classroom and I'm doing the whole show. I want us to be able to talk back and forth, I want them to be able to think. . .I want to hear their thoughts on it. I want them to relate, for example in political science to what's going on.

Ms. Danials felt that through listening to students' contributions to discussions she could better assess whether or not they were applying the concepts they were learning. She stressed that she didn't want her students to think they "just had to know the definitions."

Ms. Danials carefully controlled the discussions that happened in her classroom, often directing questions at various students to solicit their views. She was also careful of protecting the students' right to speak, as she was during the following discussion of legal working ages:

> JD: So in [this state] you can get your worker's permit at age 15. I was going to say - is 15 a good age?
> Curtis: I don't think so. It should be 17. If you take on a job at 15, your parents may try to take on
> (several students interrupt what he is saying at this point)
> JD: Now, let him speak. He may have something profound for us.

Curtis: I was saying that your parents might push too much responsibility on to you.
JD: He says at 17 you are more mature. I knew when I opened my mouth what I was getting in to - but let's listen to Curtis and see what else he has to say. (4/24/90)

Ms. Danials also frequently used oral question and answer sessions either to introduce new material, or to review material already covered. When introducing new chapters of study from the textbook, Ms. Danials generally began by having the students interpret the colorful pictures that headed up each new section. For example, students were asked to make generalizations about a picture of Congress at the beginning of a chapter on congressional organization. After student contributions were solicited and summarized, Ms. Danials drew on their comments in a discussion of the qualification requirements for senators and representatives. Similar techniques were often used after a period of silent or oral text work, as Ms. Danials used questions to draw attention to key points from the reading.

Current Events. In her efforts to make political science material meaningful to her students, Ms. Danials often integrated current events into the daily classroom activities. In addition to this, current events were a part of the formal instruction in the classroom. During the third week of class, Ms. Danials introduced a current events system to the class: each student was required to complete four current events assignments by the end of the semester. These assignments were to be written summaries of a current news story reported in the print media or on television or the radio. Each student was expected to present two of their summaries orally in class on designated "current events Fridays" that occurred roughly every other week. The students were not allowed to write about sports stories or editorials. For the first few current events reports students were allowed to choose any article they deemed to be of political importance; for those thereafter Ms. Danials assigned topics (e.g. Congress, political parties, the executive branch) that corresponded with the text topics they were studying that week.

Typically, when students presented their oral reports, the teacher and/or other students would raise questions about the issue covered. Often, as is represented in the following short excerpt, the issues presented were tied back into things the students had studied in class. This discussion occurred following one students' report of an article on soviet economic reforms:

JD: Now, what kind of system would you find in the Soviet Union?
choral: communism!
JD: what does that mean?
Curtis: that the state owns most of the property
Charla: and that they basically control the economic system
JD: it sounds like, from what Jana presented, that system is in trouble. What do you think about the political system? Is it working?
Dary: NO!
JD: Who says no? Dary, why?
Dary: because all of the people seem so unhappy
JD: Does anyone agree with Dary, that it is not working? (3/26/90)

During the discussion from which this excerpt was taken, as during others, Ms. Danials related the topic to things the students had studied (the system of communism), and solicited contrasting views from several students.

Student Views of a "Nice" Teacher. The students who were interviewed from Ms. Danials class were quite positive about her as a teacher. When describing their teacher and political science course students most often said that it was "nice." They said Ms.

Danials was a "good" o. "excellent" teacher who had a knack for explaining things so that they could understand them.

Some of Ms. Danials' students perceived that the things they were learning in class would be useful to them in the future. As one student described it:

> Noreen: It's a nice class. To talk about the political system, and like the government, what's going on with the government. That's nice cause I think we need to know before we get to the age of time we're voting and all that--bein' that we will understand what they are talking about.

A few of her peers agreed with this comment, as did the following student:

> Devon: It's a real informational class, and it lets you in on a whole bunch of things that you might want to know just in case you are interested in getting involved in politics.

A few other students, however, disagreed. One student commented that even though she thought the class was interesting, and that the things they were studying were "good for me to learn" she took the class only because it was a requirement--she definitely did not want to become involved in politics. Another student said that some of the things they were studying, like Congress, just didn't seem that important. "Because when I grow up to do something," she said, "I'm not going to be in Congress, so its just like, its not interesting." In general, however, the students said they found the class informative, interesting, and potentially beneficial for their future roles as citizens.

The students were also quite positive about the teaching style of Ms. Danials. They described her as a "good" teacher, most often noting her ability to explain things so that they could understand them. The comments of these two students were typical:

> Latitia: We're studying the Constitution now, and you know just to read it out of the book, you know we don't hardly read out the book, but you know when we do read she just explains, and summarizes, and makes it easy for us to understand. Cause when you readin' out the book you be like "hunh?" you know. But you know, she makes it understandable.

> Charla: She um, she uses examples. Like when we studied the First Amendment how she was saying how you can protest for certain things. Or how the amendments were changed, like when they had the death penalty and then they brought it back, and the example of that man, so she kind of brings a lot of examples into it to help us understand it better.

Other students echoed these comments, noting that Ms. Danials "lets us know the information in a way that we can understand it", "she breaks it down and explains it to us", or "she'll give us examples of different things." Another student noted that Ms. Danials' pacing in class made it easier for him to learn:

> Chas: Other teachers, sometimes they don't go over the whole subject, and Ms. D she take her time and you know she teaches one thing at a time. Uh, she's clearer and stuff where other teachers kind of skim through and go fast and like that. I like teachers to slow down so you can really understand.

Several of the interviewed students also mentioned the discussions they had in class. They appreciated having the chance to talk about what they were studying, and they felt comfortable with the discussions. This student's comments are representative:

> Chas: It's a nice class where you can laugh, you know, talk about different issues, current events. It's nice, it's great to talk about it cause she discuss it in a way that we can have a good time.

In addition to enjoying the discussions, students felt they learned from them. This student explained how discussions aided in the learning process:

> Noreen: I don't know. It's like, it seems like you can remember when you talk, I mean, when you're talking about it instead of writing it. Sometimes when, even though they say writing helps you to remember--but to me it isn't. Seems like you can remember more about it when you're talking about it. Sometimes. Sometimes I don't have it in my mind. But you can remember. In that class, having conversations, that's to me it's just more easier. It helps.

Overall, students made very positive remarks about Ms. Danials' class. When asked what they would tell her to do to improve her teaching, students had very few suggestions. Most gave responses like "I don't know", "I can't think of anything", or "I'd tell her to stay the same". One student suggested that more planning, or letting the students know what was coming up next in class would be helpful, but that student was the only one who suggested that changes were necessary. The students emphasized Ms. Danials' ability to explain concepts and provide examples, as well as the classroom discussions as the most positive aspects of the class.

Ben Woodlawn--Teacher as Political Philosopher. Ben Woodlawn came from a southern farming background. The son of a Baptist preacher, he was the 15th of 16 children. Ben completed a bachelor's degree in political science, with a minor in English, and then decided to attend law school. He began teaching as a temporary job to earn the money to support his legal studies although he was well acquainted with the profession:

> I have about eight brothers and sisters who are school teachers from level one through the collegiate level. So I had always been around the teaching environment. I knew a great deal about teaching and teaching techniques, and the enjoyment of teaching that one could get. Certainly not--I knew about the pitfalls, and I knew that the financial state of teaching is not the best, so I did it as a temporary job, to earn money.

At the time of this project, Mr. Woodlawn had been teaching for eight years and greatly enjoyed the challenges of teaching. He had completed his law degree at night school while teaching under a provisional certificate. He then completed the education courses required by the state and became a certified teacher.

Given his undergraduate degree in political science, Mr. Woodlawn felt he was strongly rooted in his subject area, and one of his primary goals was to provide his students with a strong understanding of their government. He had personally been fascinated with social studies from an early age, and was greatly influenced by the assassinations of Martin Luther King and President Kennedy. As he related it:

> When Martin King was assassinated my parents had to make me go to bed. Because I stayed up and listened to every report about everything, because to me that was the epitome of the religious--which is my family's background, my father being a preacher--and political person, which is as we know now as enlightened political scientists, there is supposedly a complete separation of the two, but in the black environment it has never been so.

As an African-American male, Ben had originally approached the Belmont school system "because he thought perhaps he would be more effective there." He emphasized his subject-matter approach as being especially important for his students because he felt

"knowing how to approach the governmental structure" had particularly "been a problem in the black community".

Mr. Woodlawn therefore sought to give his students a solid understanding of how their system of government worked. He explained why he thought this was important:

> First you've got to get a foundation of government. If you understand your own government and other governmental structures, you will probably feel better about your government and you'll know what it is that you can speak and deal with your government about, and what it is that you cannot. And you will be better, let me say, politically motivated, if you know how to approach your governmental structure.

He felt that this type of an approach would better enable students to effectively interact with their government than would the civic duty approach of "when you are 18 you have a responsibility to vote." He felt that students needed to fully understand the workings of American government so they would know what to do "when the government oversteps its bounds so as a citizen you can whip it back into shape" as well as knowing what their own duties and responsibilities were. He wanted his students to understand "that there is a cooperative working relationship between government and its citizens, which is the ideal state" of political life.

The specific academic objectives of Mr. Woodlawn's course were presented to the class during the first class meeting, and were listed on the course syllabus. The 24 numbered objectives covered a wide range of subject specific items, including: defining government and the societal needs it serves; examining the foundation of the American Government; describing the structures, roles, and powers of the judiciary, executive, and legislative branches; and defining citizenship and specifying the rights and responsibilities that accompany citizenship in a democratic society. In addition to these subject-specific objectives, seven skill-based objectives were also listed on the syllabus. These included items such as identifying main ideas, acquiring, classifying and drawing inferences and generalizations from information, and interpreting and analyzing materials from several sources for written or oral interpretation. Mr. Woodlawn let his students know that he was serious about addressing these objectives, and he listed the objectives to be addressed and the instructional activities each day on the blackboard at the beginning of class.

Mr. Woodlawn further outlined his approach to his citizenship class through providing a list of "classroom regulations" as a part of the syllabus. He explained that his classroom was governed by rules that "have proved to be reasonable" to him through his years of teaching, and that he established these rules and the penalties for their violation on the first day so that students would know what to expect. He believed in letting students know "what's going to happen, right straight up front" and found that approach helpful in curbing misbehavior. In addition to rules pertaining to tardiness, litter, eating and drinking in class and staying in assigned seats, Mr. Woodlawn's syllabus contains some interesting rules for student interaction, some of which are listed below:

> D. There will be no talking unless you have raised your hand and have been given the teacher's permission to do so. You are encouraged, however, to take part in orderly class discussions and to challenge the teacher if you disagree with him, the book, or part of the lesson.
>
> . . .
>
> G. Please learn to respect the rights of other students. You are encouraged to share ideas freely and to challenge each other, but you are required to be diplomatic and tolerant.
>
> . . .

> H. Learn to ask questions of the teacher. Do not allow yourself to remain confused. Remember, this is your education. Your use of the socratic [sic] method will also help to keep me "on my toes."

Ben Woodlawn's academic focus on subject matter strength and student skill-building, his philosophical reasons for teaching, and his strong interest in the world of politics combined to guide his classroom behavior. As he led students through an examination of their government, his interest in the philosophies of democracy and in creating scholarly students strongly emerged.

Creating Holistic Students and Democratic Philosophies. Mr. Woodlawn was concerned not only that his students become better citizens, but that they also become better people. He perceived that one of the best things he did with students was what he called "affective teaching"--during which he concentrated on preparing students to be better scholars. As he explained it:

> The students here need [affective teaching] sometimes more than they need anything else. Because if we can get them to do, to understand the purpose for being here, that they need to study, that they need to work extremely hard, that they need to do all these things to be successful--if I can get that across, then all the academic matter will come thereafter without problem.

One of the major themes that emerged from Ben Woodlawn's classroom centered on this notion of "affective teaching." For Ben, teaching was more than just imparting academic knowledge. It was also building students up to become scholars. His approach, which was evident in the classroom, was

> To help those students become holistic students. I think that a kid should be well-rounded, well versed, well-read, uh, I, for that matter I think like the Greeks in that sense, even healthwise, physically you should be at least in good shape. . .because I think that's going to be a better person, a better citizen, a better student, and everything else.

Mr. Woodlawn said that even though he enjoyed the subject matter he taught a great deal. he thought this affective teaching was what he "probably enjoyed the most."

Consistent with this philosophical tenet, Mr. Woodlawn often shared his views of what it took to become a strong student, and he, more than the other two teachers in this study, incorporated academic skill-building into his classes. He did this by setting high academic expectations, and through teaching his students various organizational and analytical techniques. Helping students to organize their approach to study, to write more clearly, and to analyze and interpret information were heavy concentrations in Mr. Woodlawn's classes.

One example of how Mr. Woodlawn taught organizational skills was through his notebook system. Students in Mr. Woodlawn's classes were required to keep looseleaf notebooks containing class notes, assignments, and handouts. These notebooks were handed in for grading four times during the quarter. The students were to date each notebook entry, and to indicate which objective from the syllabus that the entry addressed. Mr. Woodlawn explained to students that there were three reasons to keep their notebooks: to learn to organize information; to improve their content knowledge through an orderly presentation of materials; and as part of the learning process via writing.

A second example of how Mr. Woodlawn helped students build their organizational skills was his use of Ven diagrams. These diagrams, which consist of two intersecting circles, are often used to help main students understand set theory. Mr. Woodlawn,

however, used them as tools to help students organize information about social studies. The students' first introduction to Ven diagrams was during a lesson on the Constitutional Convention. The students used diagrams to explore what the different positions were on the Great Compromise and the Three-Fifths Compromise. They were instructed to use the text as a resource, and to list, point for point, the positions of each side in these compromises on opposite sides of the Ven diagram. The points of compromise were then listed in the intersection of the two circles. Ven diagrams were also used later in the quarter when the students were studying the differentiation of state and federal powers. They listed the exclusive powers of each level of government on opposite sides of the diagram, and the concurrent powers in the intersection of the two circles. Through the use of these diagrams Mr. Woodlawn provided students with a visual way in which to organize and compare information from various sources.

Mr. Woodlawn also put his study of and previous teaching experience in English to good use in his social studies classes. During the first week of the quarter, he reviewed the "SQ3R" method of text analysis with his students, and he referred to it in subsequent lessons when students were asked to read their texts either in class or for homework. Improving students' writing was also a major emphasis of Mr. Woodlawn's. He frequently had students write short essays in class, and each of his tests contained essay questions that were carefully graded. Before each writing assignment, students were instructed to read materials and create "jot lists" of information that they might incorporate into their reports. Mr. Woodlawn also spent time in class discussing the mechanics of writing, such as building paragraphs and using transitions. He encouraged students to evaluate not only their own writing, but the writing of others. During one lesson he had volunteers read paragraphs they had written on the functions of government aloud to the class. The readings were then critiqued by students and the teacher, and the strengths and weaknesses of how they were written were discussed. Throughout the quarter Mr. Woodlawn continued to focus on building his students' writing skills and emphasizing the important part such skills would play in their future studies or work.

Through his emphasis on building organizational and writing skills, Mr. Woodlawn also focused on helping students to analyze and interpret information. This was accomplished not only through the exercises noted above, but also through daily classroom work. Examples include oral interpretations of charts and graphs from the textbook, skimming the text for salient information, and using contextual information to decipher difficult words. Through his reinforcement of students' academic skills and provision of tools for organizing, analyzing, interpreting, and writing about information, Mr. Woodlawn made creating holistic students a major focus of his political science classes.

A second emergent theme in Mr. Woodlawn's teaching was a concentration on democratic philosophies. As he explored the foundations of American government with his students, he emphasized the roles that various philosophers, such as Locke, Rousseau, Hobbes, and Montesque played in our system's development. Students in his class also closely studied the ideas of the Federalists and the Antifederalists. As various elements of government and politics were studied throughout the quarter, the names and theories of these philosophers were brought to bear. Two of the principles most often discussed were the adaptability or changeability of the American system, and the importance of the power of the people in democratic governments. The idea of a government that developed and changed was introduced during the first study of the Constitution, and also later as the Bill of Rights and other amendments were considered. Students also explored how government has changed when they considered how various laws had evolved over time. An example of how Mr. Woodlawn approached the subject were his comments on criticisms Thurgood Marshall had leveled against the Constitution:

BW: He basically said that while it is good, some things and some people were missing. Lots [of people] took it [the criticism] as a desecration, as though it [the Constitution] is sacred. It is a living, flexible document. It can change when it needs to be changed, its not like a Bible on a shelf. Its a living what?
choral: document
BW: That's right. When it needs to change it needs to change. (3/30/90)

This notion of a government that changes was often closely tied to the second major democratic philosophy often discussed in class: popular sovereignty. This concept was discussed so often that the mnemonics "PS" or "PP" (people power) were used as quick reference to the concept. Throughout the course of the semester Mr. Woodlawn explored the importance of this idea with his students. At various times he discussed how government structures were regulated by the people, how popular sovereignty was a part of the social contract, and how electoral politics were responsive to voters' power. The following discussion took place while students were interpreting the values to be found in the Declaration of Independence:

BW: Now remember, the people have the power- we can't do without PS.
Jamel: Popular Sovereignty!
BW: What happens if the government is not right?
Chauncey: it can change!
BW: Who said that, what philosopher?
choral: John Locke!
BW: and who was his sidekick?
choral: various guesses
BW: No, Thomas. . .
choral: guesses - Jefferson, Edison
BW: "H"! - Hobbes. Now, we have safeguards if the government doesn't do the job. How do we help ourselves to get rid of the government?
choral: vote!
BW: Right!. I call that PEOPLE POWER - the vote. That's why it's important for you to vote and become participating people. (4/12/90)

This interchange, exemplary of many others, shows how these two democratic philosophies were heavily emphasized in class.

Classroom Interactions. Ben Woodlawn's love of the subject of political science was evident in his classroom presentations. His instruction was enthusiastic. As he taught political concepts to his students he leaned his powerful six-foot-two-inch frame forward, his facial expressions accentuated important points, and arm gestures and voice inflections punctuated his delivery. Every element of his body language communicated his interest and his belief that the material under consideration was of great importance.

The daily flow of instruction in Mr. Woodlawn's class contained a variety of pedagogical approaches. Students sometimes worked individually at their desks on writing and reading assignments or text analysis. Worksheets were only used when a substitute teacher taught the class. The technique Mr. Woodlawn most often employed was what he termed "lecture/stimulation"--a combination of his lecturing students on new material and reinforcing, through drill, their previous knowledge. In addition to the interaction stimulated by teacher lectures, students in Mr. Woodlawn's class also worked in small groups for two different assignments in the course of the quarter.

Mr. Woodlawn said that he liked to use different methods of teaching in his classroom, and that he felt "lecturing should not be one of the things which is done a great deal." Yet he also recognized that lecturing was needed, particularly when "time

was of the essence" and when he had to "get the basic material focused." He also saw his lectures as instrumental in student skill development:

> Although I try to stay away from the lecture method as much as possible. . .I must get the student to understand that this is the way its going to be for those of you who are college-bound, when you move on. Although its not going to be this way just a little bit, its going to be that way most of the time.

Mr. Woodlawn preferred to use his brand of lecturing--"lecture stimulation"--rather than giving information to the students outright. During lecture/stimulation he interspersed questioning into his presentation of the materials. Mr. Woodlawn used questions to "get students thinking, to keep them with me, also as a technique to check with the students to see where they are." He carefully observed students during these lecture sessions to make sure they were responding and taking notes. If he felt they were not with him he would occasionally stop a lesson.

The questions were sometimes answered in choral response, and often individual students would be called on. The questions generally required factual answers, and were more or less oral fill-in-the-blanks. The following is typical of the interchanges that occurred during lecture-stimulation:

> BW: Let's look at the House of Representatives. Those of you who don't have the notes, you'll get them from each other. The House of Reps. - you already know about it, its the lower house of?
> choral: Congress
> BW: Our national?
> choral: Legislature
> BW: They represent whom?
> choral: The people.
> BW: The people from their state, their own particular districts. Look at the map on page 100 - how many are there from each state? (He explains how the number 435 was established and hasn't changed since 1910.) So its based on the what? the pop-u-what? -lation!. (He further explains how the population shifts and the census count fit into all of this). -(5/21/90)

Mr. Woodlawn also asked a good number of questions designed to help students analyze or interpret the information they were hearing. In the following excerpt the Constitutional Convention was the topic of his lecture:

> BW: We know the convention almost broke down because of some hot heads there. The issues were very probing. All of the participants knew there would be compromises - let's name some we know
> chorals: The Great, the 3/5ths, the slave compromise
> BW: And some issues that were not in the text, such as those dealing with farms, etc. So, understand that the convention was holistic. It dealt with concerns from all walks of life. What had the FF's done they shouldn't have done, or not aught to have done? Lashawn? What were their names? DD-FFF. . .
> choral recitation: Delegates, Deputies, Framers, Founding Fathers.
> BW: They were given the charge to revise the Articles - they did something more than they had been granted to do. If you've done something someone's not given you charge to do, what do you need to do?
> Lashawn: bribe them, or persuade them!
> BW: So you have to convince them what you've done is the right thing - that's ratification! Get this down. . . . .(4/30/90)

In a few instances, Mr. Woodlawn added kinetics during his use of lecture-stimulation, to excite the students, and to help them to visualize concepts. To help them review various structures of government, he used this exercise:

> BW: (enters the room at the bell and strides to the front of class). STAND UP!! On your desk in the chairs. Stand UP!
> Students: laugh as they comply and rise to stand in their chairs.
> BW: (sits down in a desk at the front of the class in a chair). What form of government is this? Federal? State?
> Nikki: Confederation
> BW: Right! Why? who's stronger?
> choral: the states
> BW: who am I?
> choral: the central government.
> BW: who are you?
> choral: the states.
> BW: Now, sit down. (he stands on his chair at the front). What form of government?
> choral: Federal.
> BW: Who's more powerful?
> choral: the national government.
> BW: Excellent. Pull out your books and your diagrams. . . . .(4/26/90)

In addition to the interaction that occurred between teacher and students during lecture-stimulation, the students in Mr. Woodlawn's class had the opportunity to interact with each other during two different group projects, each of which lasted several days. For the first group project, students were divided into four groups, each of which was assigned a type of political system. The students were asked to work together using their texts and other materials that Mr. Woodlawn made available to define their particular system, find out who held the power and authority in it, and how authority was maintained. Each group wrote their answers on one sheet of paper; these answers were then distributed to the other groups.

The second group exercise was more extensive than the first, and students worked on it intermittently for over two weeks. The class was once again divided into four groups. Each group was assigned two of the "eight great principles" of the U.S. Constitution: popular sovereignty and the rule of law were assigned to the first group; Constitutional supremacy and judicial review to the second; limited government and federalism to the third; and separation of powers and checks and balances to the fourth. Each group was charged with defining their principle, making some sort of design, picture, or diagram as an illustration, and teaching the principle to their class members in a formal presentation. The students were encouraged to think of modern-day examples to explain their principles, and during presentations class members were encouraged to ask one another questions about the concept. Mr. Woodlawn actively worked with each group during their preparation, providing them with many sources in addition to their textbooks, and helping them to articulate their answers. During the presentations he used questions to ensure that each group covered the material they were teaching.

Current Events. Although Mr. Woodlawn considered following the news a requirement for students in his political science classes, discussion of current events was not a formal part of his instruction. He often incorporated current events as examples of how political philosophy or governmental structures worked in our society, but there was rarely much discussion of students' ideas about events that were happening around them.

On a few occasions, such as when controversies over Reverend Abernathy's book about the civil rights movement or a lieutenant governor's racist campaign ads occurred, Mr. Woodlawn brought special current events topics up in class. When he mentioned the former Mr. Woodlawn simply explained what the nature of the controversy; the latter was discussed as an example of free speech, which had been studied in class weeks earlier. The primary use of current events, however, was as exemplars of topics students were studying. In this manner, state and federal responses to Hurricane Hugo became examples of protecting the general welfare; the Supreme Court nominations of Bork and Kennedy became examples of checks and balances; flag burning and the ERA were addressed as examples of Constitutional Amendments; and a current court case involving religious snake handlers was discussed as pertaining to the establishment clause of the First Amendment.

Being Challenged by an Expert: The Students' Views. The students who were interviewed from Mr. Woodlawn's classes made a variety of comments about him as a teacher and about his class. They generally viewed Mr. Woodlawn as a good, and somewhat unusual teacher; they felt the class was interesting but challenging; and they appreciated the "outside" knowledge he brought to his teaching.

Many of the interviewed students said that Mr. Woodlawn was an "unusual" teacher, and they noted several characteristics that made him different from other teachers. Some students felt that he was unusually dedicated to his work, as the following remarks indicate:

> Mara: I could feel that he puts more into his work. I could say he puts in a lot of time. When he goes home, he takes a book with him. Other teachers, they probably just, set aside maybe two hours, work on their class. . .and then just go on. But I can see how Mr. W, he lives his work. I can tell that. So that's why he's different.

Another student added that she thought Mr. Woodlawn must really believe in teaching because "he went so far, and he is a lawyer, 'cause he's a member of the Bar Association, and he decided to teach!" To the students, another good example of his dedication to teaching happened about two-thirds of the way through the quarter: Mr. Woodlawn showed up for class with his arm in a sling, having pulled his rotator cuff at the gym the evening before. The students were amazed to see him in class, and one student exclaimed "Boy, you sure are a loyal teacher! No one else would be here like that," while her peers nodded and cheered their approval.

Mr. Woodlawn's perceived dedication as a teacher was not his only badge of distinction. His students also said that he was more thorough in covering material than their other teachers were. They appreciated the fact that he "doesn't just assign us the work, he talks to us about it" and that he carefully explained things by "taking little parts of it so you can understand." As one student expressed it:

> Baranda: Mr. W is a good teacher, someone that just basically explains it, so I can understand, or so the class can understand. Cause you just can't give a person work and just expect them to you know learn it. So he just, I like really you know how he breaks it down so you can understand much better and gives examples.

Other students also mentioned Mr. Woodlawn's use of modern-day examples as very helpful, and several others similarly commented that his use of details and his ability to break concepts down so the students could understand them were extraordinary.

Students in Mr. Woodlawn's classes also appreciated the store of knowledge they felt he brought to the classroom. They were impressed by his experience in and knowledge of politics, and they liked how he was able to "go beyond the book" in presenting his materials. They noted that his class was unusual because he would "go

into a lesson" and explain it, instead of giving students "the usual bookwork" or "worksheets" they did in other social studies classes. One student commented that his ability to explain lessons more fully "makes politics interesting by making us think about how it works."

The students felt very challenged by the educational approaches Mr. Woodlawn used. There were several comments about the difficulty of the class: students were challenged by Mr. Woodlawn's teaching "more like a professor" and they noted that "you had to pay careful attention", "be a good listener", and "take especially good notes" in order to keep up with the materials being covered. Several students thought the course was much like a college course, and one student noted "You can't depend on other people, you can't depend on the book, because he really doesn't go by the book" but that you had to stay on top of things in class in order to do well. Students noted that participation and involvement were important in Mr. Woodlawn's classes. The following comment was typical:

> Maurice: Well I think the class is really exciting cause he gets up and talks, and he explains the work in more detail, then plus he gets you involved in the class.
> Int: How does he do that?
> Maurice: He gives a couple of examples, then he asks you questions, then cause if you don't know the question then that makes you want to study.

Some of the students enjoyed this stimulation, and the added responsibility they had to assume in the class, while others thought maybe the course was too challenging. Not all of the students liked the lecture orientation of the course. Several commented that the constant note-taking "got a little tiring" and they would lose interest in the topics, or that the course could become boring "you know when he gets into a deep deep lecture."

Mr. Woodlawn's students also made many comments about the group work "projects" they had done on defining the principles of the Constitution. Many of them said they thought the projects were "really fun" and that doing them "made it easier to learn."

Overall, students made very positive comments about Mr. Woodlawn's classes and his teaching. When asked what he could do to improve his teaching, about half of the students said he "was doing fine now" or that they had no advice; others suggested he should give fewer notes and have students do more projects or have discussions. They viewed him as an unusually dedicated teacher who was very knowledgeable about the subject matter and able to explain it in a way they could easily understand.

Student's Views of Politics and Politicians. During their interviews, students were asked to share their perceptions of typical politicians. They were also asked to assess their own feelings of political interest, and to indicate if they ever had been, or thought they ever would be, involved in politics. Analysis of the students' questionnaire responses indicated no statistically significant differences in students' feelings of political interest, trust, or efficacy between students in the three teachers' classes. Similarly, no qualitative differences were discovered when the views students expressed in interviews were considered by class: roughly the same proportion of students indicated they were interested or not interested in politics in each class. In addition, students from all three classes used very similar language in describing politicians; in fact the most resounding of the attitudinal themes is found in their descriptions. Because there was virtually no difference in attitudes that could be attributed to the different teaching styles of these three teachers, the students' responses to questions concerning politics will be considered as a whole, rather than by classes.

Broken Election Promises: The Typical Politician. The most striking theme that emerged from this data came from students' descriptions of a "typical politician." A few

students, when asked to describe what they thought a typical politician was like, named politicians who were familiar to them--Ronald Reagan, George Bush, Jesse Jackson, and Andrew Young among them. Another few students named characteristics they thought politicians would possess, such as "aggression," or "intelligence"; a few others gave physical descriptions such as "a guy with a suit and a briefcase, who walks around giving speeches all the time." In the most common description, however, politicians became men who would say anything to get elected, then would forget the promises that they made. The comments of the following students were typical:

> Jan: It's like they'll promise you anything, then they get into office and then they're like, going for the upper class people. I think it doesn't matter once they get into power.
> - - -
> Francis: Just what she's saying - I think its just that they will talk a lot of stuff to the point where
> Shari: for an election
> Francis: you believe em and you will vote for them and when they win the election, all of that just goes away.
> Shari: umhm, just goes out the window.
> Int: where do you think it goes?
> Francis: It was just a front. In the first place. That's what I think.
> Ned: 'Cause in the election you see 'em up there making promises, talking to the people, and then when he gets elected you don't see him out there
> Shari: It's just like, you know, it's their point to get elected.
> - - -
> Danial: Fake. Yup. Cause they always making promises and don't make good on 'em. They just, they lie to get into office, that's what I think.

As this theme continued to emerge from student interviews, I began to ask students where their perceptions came from. Several of them responded with examples from the Bush administration, such as "Bush promised he'd reduce the deficit, and what's it doin? It's goin' up!" or noting his failure to clean up the drug scene: "he's not really doing anything because drugs are still coming in every day." The most common example students provided, however, was Bush having campaigned on a promise of "no new taxes"--a promise he was being forced to reconsider during the weeks many students were interviewed. Several students mentioned that their perceptions had come from things they had heard on the news, which indicates that news consumption may be a very viable force in shaping young peoples' opinions.

Many other students expressed a variety of negative opinions about politicians. Several noted that politicians were "dishonest", "greedy", "corrupt", or looking out for their own self-interest. As one student expressed it "The typical one that's in office now is looking to have a little bit in his back pocket."

Not all of the students had completely negative views of politicians. Some students tempered their initial responses by indicating that they didn't think *all* politicians were bad, or by saying they thought politicians usually really tried. A few students made comments of these sorts:

> Cynthia: A typical politician, I guess he tries, he tries to do what he says he is going to do, and he gets half of it done.
> - - -
> Emiel: They uh, really strive to do things and get it right, uh. They make promises, they try to fulfill those promises. And uh, they try to do their best in politics.

And others had mixed feelings about politicians as a group, as did the following student:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> Steve: I don't know. Some good and some bad, I guess. Seems like that's the way it seems like to me. Half of them are all screwed up, and half of em, the good half keeps all them screwed up ones straight. Seems like to me.

Another quite striking consistency is to be noted in this data: whenever students described politicians to me in these interviews, they used male pronouns. There was not one reference to a female politician made by any of the 51 students interviewed. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the paucity of female elected officials in the state in which this project was conducted, as well as that at the national level.

The students interviewed for this project had primarily negative views of politicians in general. Only a few students expressed beliefs that politicians really tried to do what was best for the people; their opinions were far outweighed by the more common belief that politicians were men who merely espoused views in order to secure their elections. These overall views of politicians, as further explored in the interviews, were found to be quite closely related to the students' feelings of political trust.

As might be expected given the students' descriptions of typical politicians, they were somewhat wary of trusting elected officials, and gave decidedly mixed responses when asked if they thought politicians could be trusted. A handful of students gave decisive answers: several of these adamantly declared that politicians were not to be trusted at all; slightly fewer said they felt politicians were trustworthy. Most students qualified their responses to this question. Many did so with well-reasoned opinions of how you knew when a politician could be trusted. One student indicated that it "depended on their personal record" while another noted that "the kind of politicians you can trust are the kind that are active in the community before they run for office or something." Other students indicated that you had to be careful about what politicians said, because "they can talk on TV and say anything they want in front of a TV camera"; it would therefore be more important to look at what they did once they got elected to office.

Political Interest, Participation, and Family Influence. I also asked students to assess their political interest during the interview. The interview analyses indicates that only about a third of the interviewed students said they had an interest in politics. Their peers claimed to be "bored" by politics, or failed to see how it would be relevant to their future studies. I asked students who were interested in politics to describe how someone might tell they were interested; I also asked them to tell me what sparked their interest. Their answers indicate that students who claim to be politically interested act on their interests through political involvement, and that interest in specific issues and familial interest in politics played important roles in stimulating their interest.

Many of the students who said they were interested in politics acted on their interest by engaging in a variety of political activities. The students who said they were very interested shared several characteristics, which contrasted sharply with those possessed by their peers: they actively followed political news either on television or through reading the papers; they talked about politics with friends; and many of them had been involved in school politics. One of the very interested students had served as an intern at the State Legislature, and two others had worked on local campaigns. A couple of the students mentioned specific issues--the environment and the military--which had spurred their interest in politics in general. Another shared characteristic of the very interested students was the political interest of their parents--several of the students said that they talked about politics or watched the news and discussed it with either their mothers or fathers. A small number of students said that their parents worked for the government, in jobs as different as assisting the State Speaker of the House to working as an air traffic controller, and that their parents therefore encouraged them to take an active interest in politics or government. Only one

politically interested student, from Mr. Woodlawn's class, indicated that her citizenship class had sparked her interest.

In summary, the students interviewed for this project had primarily negative views about politics. They generally viewed politicians as purveyors of broken promises and were highly wary of trusting them. Most of the students said they were simply not interested in politics. Those students who did express an interest tended to be students who had been involved in politics at the local or school level, who talked about politics with their peers, and who had parents who took a particular interest in politics.

Discussion

This study combined both qualitative and quantitative research methods to further explore the importance of classroom climate in the development of high school students' political attitudes, the differences in climate as expressed in daily teaching procedures, and students' perceptions of politics. The findings suggest that classes which are rated quantitatively as open or closed by the students who attend them differ also in important qualitative ways. The findings also suggest that while classroom climate variables are related to political attitudes, they are probably not the most salient factor in determining students political interest or involvement. Finally, the qualitative findings from this study suggest that individual teaching style may be governed by teachers' philosophies toward teaching, and by their training. Each of these findings is considered below.

Climate Differences. The quantitative comparisons of classroom climate variables in this study showed that two teachers were perceived as having open classrooms, and one was perceived as having a closed classroom. The student ratings on the questionnaires were further explored in interviews, and the resulting data indicate that students noted substantive differences in teaching styles between the two types of teachers. These differences, and their correspondence with the negative attitudes toward social studies expressed by closed climate students and more positive attitudes toward social studies expressed by open climate students are important.

The students in the close classroom expressed general dissatisfaction with their teacher, and described their class as being too easy, boring, or frustrating. They emphasized that daily worksheets and silent desk work were the instructional techniques most often used, and they said that the teacher seemed unwilling to allow discussions in class. Many of the students noted that the class could be improved if there was more verbal interaction, either in the form of teacher explanations of assignments or concepts, or in discussions of materials. In contrast, the students in the open climate classrooms in this study made positive remarks about how their classes were handled. They appreciated the thoughtful treatment subject matter was given through their teachers' explanations and use of examples. They were also pleased to engage in classroom discussions and group work which enabled them to interact with other students and the teacher in class.

The differences in classroom climate clearly affected students' attitudes toward social studies and their teachers. Similar to the findings for the closed classroom in this study, many other researchers have reported negative feelings high school students have toward social studies (Fernandez, Massey, & Dornbusch, 1976; Fraser, 1981; Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). Other researchers have shown that teacher-controlled variables are of importance in determining students' attitudes toward social studies. Haladyna, Shaughnessy & Redsun (1982) found that teacher characteristics such as enthusiasm, willingness to help students, and fairness, as well as teacher quality, were related to more positive attitudes toward social studies. Similarly, teacher confidence, commitment to learning, and organization have also been shown to relate to positive attitudes toward social studies (McGowan, Sutton & Smith, 1990). The data from this

study reinforce those findings: the students in open classrooms, who had more positive attitudes toward social studies, described their teachers as possessing many of these same traits. The data also support the findings of Fouts (1978; 1989) who found students attitudes were related to teaching environments and were based primarily on the amount of teacher support, student involvement and diversity of teaching strategies perceived by students.

Not surprisingly, the students in both the open and closed classes expressed their preferences for more active modes of learning, and they particularly focused on perceived benefits of discussions. Students perceived that discussions enabled them to more thoughtfully address the issues they were studying. Past researchers have noted a relationship between more open climates and knowledge variables (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Landsdale, 1988). The climate-knowledge relationship is further shown to be a function of teacher goals and instructional strategies. Ben Woodlawn, one of the open climate teachers in this study, made promoting thinking and analytical skills one of his primary goals--one which he hoped to attain through Socratic interaction with his students. Recent research from the National Center for Effective Secondary Schools indicates teachers who view content as a means to exercise thinking skills are more likely to promote thoughtful classroom discourse and higher order thinking skills in their students (Onosko, 1989). Unfortunately, no measures of knowledge were employed in this study to test the differences between knowledge gain and climate which might have existed in this study. Social studies educators would benefit from future research on the roles discussion plays in cognitive development.

Climate and Political Attitudes. The findings of this study reinforce findings from past research on classroom climate and political attitudes. The correlational data from this project show that students' political attitudes are related to both measures of classroom climate used in this study. The positive correlations between teacher characteristics and student involvement and political interest evident in this data are similar to those found by previous researchers (Ehman, 1977, 1980; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Long & Long, 1975). Similarly, the correlations between each climate variable and political efficacy have also been noted by prior researchers (Blankenship, 1990; Ehman, 1972; Glenn, 1972; Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Ponder & Button, 1975; Zevin, 1983). The strength of these relationships, however, as is indicated by both the qualitative and quantitative data from this project, is relatively weak: students in neither the open nor closed classrooms in this study significantly changed their attitudes toward politics and politicians.

There may be several reasons for the observed stability of students' political attitudes. One explanation is undoubtedly the length of time during which this study was conducted--it is unlikely that an underlying belief or attitude would change during a 11- or 13-week course in civics. Such changes would necessarily be gradual, and must therefore be a focus of the entire social studies curriculum, rather than remaining the purview of civics teachers alone. Nonetheless, improving students' attitudes toward government and politics has been traditionally, and remains, a central goal for civics educators.

Another reason the variations of classroom climate may not make much difference in changing attitudes could be due to their relatively weak stature among other socializing agents. The students in this project indicated that many of their views of politics and politicians came from media images they had seen. As the media painted pictures of politicians as promise-makers and -breakers, the students expressed acceptance of this view. The role parents played in formulating student opinions was also emphasized by students in this project: the parental role seems especially salient for engendering students' political interest. Additional qualitative research that addresses the formulation of political attitudes and considers a wide variety of potential

socializing agents is needed to help social studies educators reassess their role in this venue. Such additional descriptive work will help us to further isolate what might be the most important variables in attitude development.

Teaching Style. The three teachers who participated in this project had distinctive teaching styles. The philosophies expressed by each teacher who participated in this project served to guide their approaches to teaching civics. Ms. Jefferies, who was concerned that her students learn the proper deportment for the world of work, focused on teaching them constituted authority; Ms. Danials, who felt it was important that her students know what was happening in the world around them incorporated formal current events lessons; and Mr. Woodlawn, who was concerned with creating holistic students focused on skill-building and analytical skills with his students. Other researchers have noted the importance of understanding teachers' backgrounds and philosophies as keys to their classroom behavior (Adler, 1984; Carter, 1990; Cornett, 1990; Johnston, 1990). The role of teachers' attitudes toward the subject matter they are teaching, and how their overall teaching philosophy guides their classroom decisions is fertile ground for further research.

Additional research into the training of social studies teachers would help us to understand how well-prepared they are to handle the challenge of making social studies relevant and exciting for their students: are social studies teachers trained how to handle discussions effectively? How do effective social studies teachers help their students to make connections between what they are studying and the political world around them? What role does subject-matter knowledge play in the effectiveness of social studies teachers? Thoughtful research into each of these questions would help us improve the training of future teachers.

There is currently strong agreement in the field of social studies that citizenship training must include providing students with tools with which to assess the political world around them. One central characteristic of democratic forms of government is the open discussion of public policy issues. In order to prepare students to actively join in public discussions, we must teach them to find information about issues in the press (and in other sources), analyze and interpret this information, and then formulate opinions and express them in the public marketplace of ideas. This means that teachers must first teach their students the necessary analytical skills, and then allow them to explore a range of ideas through open discussion. As Barber (1989) has suggested, we need to structure classes to allow students to engage in "public talk." Teachers must therefore be able discussion leaders, and they must also learn how to effectively integrate current events into the social studies curriculum to help their students see the relevance of the topics they are studying. Further research on how to best prepare teachers to assume these roles is needed.

REFERENCES

Abravanel, M. D., & Busch, R. J. (1975). Political competence, political trust and the action orientation of university students. The Journal of Politics, 37, 57-82.

Adler, S. (1984). A field study of selected student teacher perspectives toward social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 12:1, 13-30.

Agger, R.E., Goldstein, M.N., & Roper, E. (1961). Political activity of American citizens. American Political Science Review, 23, 477-506.

Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1963). The civic culture. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, C.S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52:3, 368-420.

Armento, B. (1985). Research on teaching social studies. In M. C. Wittrock, (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching.

Barber, B. R. (1989). Public talk and civic action: Education for participation in a strong democracy. Social Education, 56:6, 355-356; 370.

Beyer, L. E. (1988). Schooling for the culture of democracy. In Beyer, L. E., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.), The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Blankenship, G. (1990). Classroom climate, global knowledge, global attitudes, political action. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18:4, 363-386.

Boyer, E.L. (1989). Creating a civic climate in the schools. Citizenship Education News, 8:1, 6-7.

Button, C. (1972). The development of experimental curriculum to effect the political socialization of anglo, black, and Mexican-American adolescents. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 066 399).

Campbell, A., Converse, P., Miller, W., & Stokes, D. (1960 & 1964). The American voter. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W.E. (1952). The voter decides. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson and Company.

Carter, D. S. G. (1990). Knowledge transmitter, social scientist or reflective thinker: Three images of the practitioner in western Australian high schools. Theory and Research in Social Education,18:3, 274-317.

Chavez, C. R. (1984). The use of high-inference measures to study classroom climates: A review. Review of Educational Research, 54:2, 237-261.

Cook, T.D. & Reichardt, C.S. (1979). Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Cornett, J. (1990). Teacher thinking about curriculum and instruction: A case study of a secondary social studies teacher. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18:3, 248-273.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press.

Easton, D., & Dennis, J. (1969). Children in the political system: Origins of political legitimacy. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ehman, L. H. (1969). An analysis of the relationships of selected educational variables with the political socialization of high school students. American Educational Research Journal, 6:4, 559-580.

Ehman, L. H. (1970, November). Normative discourse and attitude change in the social studies classroom. The High School Journal, 76-83.

Ehman, L. H. (1972). Political efficacy and the high school social studies curriculum. In B. G. Massialas (Ed.) Political youth, traditional schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Ehman, L. H. (1977, November). Social studies and secondary students' political attitudes toward society and school: A two-year longitudinal study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C.

Ehman, L. H. (1979, November). Social education by example: A social organizational perspective on student learning. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Portland, OR.

Ehman, L. H. (1980a). The American school in the political socialization process. Review of Educational Research, 50:1, 99-119.

Ehman, L. H. (1980b). Change in high school students' political attitudes as a function of social studies classroom climate. American Educational Research Journal, 17:2, 253-265.

Ehman, L. H., & Gillespie, J. (1975). The school as a political system. (Final Report) Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education (Grant NE-G-00-3-063).

Fernandez, C., Massey, C. M. & Dornbusch, S. M. (1976). High school students' perceptions of social studies. The Social Studies, 66:2, 51-57.

Flanders, N. A. (1964). Some relationships among teacher influence, pupil attitudes, and achievement. In B. J. Biddle & W. J. Ellena (Eds.) Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (pp. 196-231). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fouts, J. (1987). high school social studies classroom environments and attitudes: A cluster analysis approach. Theory and Research in Social Education, 15:2, 105-114.

Fouts, J. (1989). Classroom environments and student views of social studies: The middle grades. Theory and Research in Social Education, 17:2, 136-147.

Fraser, B. J. (1981). Deterioration in high school students' attitudes toward social studies. The Social Studies, 72:2, 65-68.

Fraser, J. (1970). The mistrustful-efficacious hypothesis and political participation. The Journal of Politics, 32, 444-449.

Getzels, J. W., & Thelen, H. A. (1960). The classroom as a unique social system. In N. B. Henry (Ed.) National society for the study of education yearbook, 75:1. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Glenn, A. D. (1972). Elementary school children's attitudes toward politics. In B. G. Massialas (Ed.) Political youth, traditional schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Green, M. (1985, fall). Public education and the public space. Kettering Review.

Grossman, D. L. (1974, April). Educational climates and attitudes toward dissent: A study of political socialization of conflict norms in adolescents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Hahn, C. L., & Avery, P. G. (1985). Effect of value analysis discussions on students' political attitudes and reading comprehension. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13:2, 47-60.

Hahn, C. L., & Tocci, C. (1990). Classroom climate and controversial issues discussions: A five nation study. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18:4, 344-362.

Haladyna, T., Shaughness, J., & Redsun, A. (1982). Correlates of attitudes toward social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 10:1, 1-26.

Harwood, A.M. (April, 1990). The effects of participation in Close Up on high school students' political attitudes. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. ED 320 846.

Harper, N. (1987). The effect of controversial issues discussions on the development of political and economic attitudes in secondary social studies classrooms. Unpublished D.A.S.T. project. Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Hawkins, B.W., Marando, U. L., & Taylor, G.A. (1971). Efficacy, mistrust, and political participation: Findings from additional data and indicators. The Journal of Politics, 33, 1130-1136.

Hess, R. D., & Torney, J. V. (1967). The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Hepburn, M.A., & Napier, J. D. (1980). Development and initial validation of an instrument to measure political attitudes. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 1131-1139.

Hunt, M. P., & Metcalf, L. E. (1968). Teaching high school social studies. New York: Harper and Row.

Jennings, M.K., & Niemi, R. G. (1974). The political character of adolescence. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Johnston, M. (1990). Teachers' backgrounds and beliefs: Influences on learning to teach in the social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18:3, 207-233.

Jones, R. S. (1974). Changing student attitudes: The impact of community participation. Social Science Quarterly, 55, 439-450.

Kohlberg, L. (1975). The Just Community School: The theory and the Cambridge Cluster School experiment. In Collected Papers from the Center for Moral Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 223 511).

Langton, K.P., & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum in the United States. American Political Science Review, 62, 852-867.

Levenson, G. B. (1972). The school's contribution to the learning of participatory responsibility. In B. G. Massialas (Ed.) Political youth, traditional schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Long, S., & Long, R. (1975). Controversy in the classroom: Student viewpoint and educational outcome. Teaching Political Science, 2:3, 275-299.

McGowan, T. M, Sutton, A. M., & Smith, P. G. (1990). Instructional elements influencing elementary student attitudes toward social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18:1, 37-52.

Metzger, D.J., & Barr, R.D. (1978). The impact of school political systems on student political attitudes. Theory and Research in Social Education, 6, 48-79.

Meixel, C. A., & Haller, E. J. (1973). Classroom practices and the development of political efficacy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 785).

Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Newmann, F. M., & Oliver, D. W. (1970). Clarifying public controversy: An approach to teaching social studies. Boston, MA: Little Brown and Company.

Onosko, J. (1989). Comparing teachers' thinking about promoting students' thinking. Theory and Research in Social Education, 17:3, 174-195.

Oliver, D. W., & Shaver, J. P. (1966). Teaching public issues in the high school. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Parker, W.C. (1989). Participatory citizenship: Civics in the strong sense. Social Education, 56:6, 353-354.

Patrick, J. J. (1967). Political socialization of American youth: A review of research with implications for secondary school social studies. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 010 835).

Patrick, J. J. (1969). Implications of political socialization research for the reform of civic education. Social Education, 33, 15-21.

Ponder, G. A, & Button, C. (1975). Student classroom initiations and political attitudes: Relationships between behavior and attitudes. Contemporary Education, 46:3, 221-228.

Randhawa, B. S., & Fu, L. L.W. (1973). Assessment and effect of some classroom environment variables. Review of Educational Research, 43, 403-323.

Rossell, C. H., & Hawley, W. D. (1981). The relationship between teacher behavior toward students and student political attitudes: The development of political cynicism. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 439).

Shaugnessy, J. M. & Haladyna, T. M. (1985). Research on student attitude toward social studies. Research in Social Studies Edcuation, 49, 692-695.

Strauss, A. L. (1987). Qualitative analysis for social scientists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stentz, M. (1974). Educating for responsible, active citizenship in the "Watergate" Era". Unpublished manuscript.

Stentz, M., & Lambert, (1977). An empirical reformulation of political efficacy. Theory and Research in Social Education, 5, 61-85.

Torney, J., Oppenhiem, A. N., & Farnen, R. F. (1975). Civic education in ten countries. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Torney-Purta, J., & Lansdale, D. (1986, April). Classroom climate and process in international studies: Qualitative and quantitative evidence from the American schools and the world project. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting, San Francisco, CA.

Trickett, E. J., & Moos, R. H. (1973). Social environment of junior high and high school classrooms. Journal of Educational Psychology, 65, 93-102.

Withall, J. (1969). Evaluation of classroom climate. Childhood Education, 45:7, 403-408.

Wood, G. W. (1988). Democracy and the curriculum. In Beyer, L. E., & Apple, M. W. (Eds.), The curriculum: Problems, politics, and possibilities. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Woodward, J. L., & Roper, E. (1950) Political activity of American citizens. American Political Science Review, 44, 872-885.

Zevin, J. (1983). Future citizens: Children and politics. Social Education, 10:3, 119-126.

Appendix A: Student Interview Schedule

Students were first thanked for participating in the interviews, and asked for permission to tape their comments. They were assured that all comments were confidential, and that their teachers would not have access to their comments. Each student was then told that there were two main topics for the interview--their citizenship (or political science) class, and politics in general. They were given a choice of which topic they would like to begin with. The interviews were conducted fairly informally: a conversational tone was set, and the probing questions used with each student, as well as the overall direction of the interview were set by the students' responses to preliminary questions. The following guidelines were used to solicit comparable information from each student:

Citizenship/Political Science Class:

Tell me what you think about your citizenship/political science class.

If you were to describe a typical day in that class, say you had a friend who was going to take this class next year, what would you tell them they could expect?

What do you think of the things you are studying in that class?
Are there topics you would like to be studying that you can think of?

How does (teacher's name) compare to other teachers you have had?
Is there something that this teacher does that is different from what your other teachers do?
How would you rate (teacher's name) as a teacher?

If you could give (teacher's name) some advice on how to improve his/her class, what would you tell him/her to do?

When you think about teachers in general, what do you think makes a good teacher?

Politics:

Tell me what you think about politics.
Even when I just say that term, "politics" what comes to your mind?

If you were to describe a typical politician for me, what would you say they are like?
probe: I'm curious about why you say that - tell me more.
Do you think most politicians can be trusted? Why or why not.

How interested do you consider yourself to be in politics?
If I were to hang out with you for a day and watch you, how might I know you were interested in politics?
One of the things I would really like to know is how people get to be interested in politics. What made you get interested?

How much do you follow the news to learn about politics?

Have you ever been involved in politics? If so, how, and when.
What about your family - is anyone at your house interested or involved in politics?

Do you see yourself taking any kinds of political action in the future?

One last question: if you have thought about it, what do you have planned for after high school?

When time permitted in the interviews, students were also asked to tell me a little bit about their schools:

Coming here for this project is really the first time I have been in your school. Tell me a little bit about it.
Probes: the teachers, the students
Is there anything else you think I should know to help me understand what your school is like?

Each interview was then ended by asking students if they could think of anything else they thought I should know about what they thought about politics or their classes, and then each student was given the opportunity to ask me any questions they wanted to ask.

Appendix B: Student Interview Coding Categories

The following are selected examples of the types of codes which were used for interview analysis. Additional subcategories, and the corresponding coding numerals which were assigned to all categories are not shown. This simplified version is intended to give readers an idea of how the data were arranged during qualitative analyses.

1. Reactions to Class and Teacher
    - Class
        - What they learned in class
        - Topics of Interest
        - Learning Activities
            - Visual Aids
            - Discussions
            - Tests
            - Worksheets
            - Groupwork
            - Lectures
            - Textbook Use
            - Role Play/Simulation
    - Teacher
        - Teacher Rating/Comparison With Others
        - Positive Aspects of Teacher
        - Discipline in Class
        - Advice for Better Teaching
        - Description of Good Teaching

2. Politics and Politicians
    - Description of Typical Politicians
        - physical descriptions
        - characteristics
        - promises
        - elections
    - Political Attitudes
        - Political Interest
        - Political Efficacy
        - Political Trust
    - Political Participation
        - School Politics
        - News/Media
        - Future Particiation
            - vote
            - campaign
            - government work
            - run for office
        - Family Participation

3. Descriptions of Schools
    - Building
    - Students
    - Teachers

4. Personal Descriptions
    - Themselves as students
    - Plans after high school
        - college
        - professional
        - trade
        - politically related

Appendix C: Attitude Scales

Items marked with an asterisk were reversed for analyses. Students responded to these items based on a six-point Likert scale, where 1=strongly disagree, and 6=strongly agree. The factor loadings are shown for each scale item.

Political Confidence Scale (Cronbach alpha = .60)

loading:

.528 RPC2 I am not able to influence decisions in groups.*
.324 PC3 I can usually persuade others to agree with my opinions about political issues.
.556 RPC6 I am not the kind of person who can influence how other people decide to vote in elections.*
.395 PC7 I sometimes take leadership roles in decision- making situations.
.237 PC8 I can convince others to support candidates I'm supporting for elections.

Political Interest Scale (Cronbach alpha = .786)

.706 PC1 I would enjoy having lessons where politics and government are discussed.
.675 PC2 I am usually curious about political matters.
.588 PC3 I would like to know more about how political parties work.
.601 PC4 I would like to be on a committee nominating candidates for political office.
.638 PC6 I am interested in following political campaigns.
.658 PC8 I think it would be interesting to run for a political office.

Political Trust Scale (Cronbach alpha = .663)

.608 PC1 We can usually trust people who are in government to do what is right for the country.
.573 PC2 People running the government are honest.
.500 PC3 People running the government are smart and usually know what they are doing.
.648 PC8 People in government care about what all of us think.

Political Efficacy Scale (Cronbach alpha = .676)

.274 PE5 Citizens can influence decisions made in government by joining a demonstration to protest policies they don't like.
.870 PE7 A Government policy can be changed if enough people tell government officials they disagree with it.
.148 RPE8 If a citizens write letters to their representatives, they can influence the decisions made in government.*
.330 PE10 Public officials listen to citizens, because if they don't they'll be voted out of office.
.212 PE13 People can influence government by attending community meetings to talk with government officials.

Classroom Climate Subscales

Teacher Characteristics (Cronbach alpha = .909)

.544	TCC1	In our social studies classes, our teachers respect our opinions.
.581	TCC2	In social studies class our teacher encourages us to make up own minds about issues.
.518	TCC4	My social studies teacher tries to encourage students to express their views on issues in class.
.574	TCC9	My social studies teacher usually presents more than one side to an issue when explaining it in class.
.125	TCC11	Our social studies teacher usually doesn't take one side or the other in political discussions in class.
.361	TCC12	Our teacher allows students in our social studies class to express their opinions, no matter how radical they might seem.
.546	[illegible]8	Our social studies teacher is interested in students' ideas about politics and government, and likes to hear what we have to say.
.515	TC9	Our social studies teacher treats students fairly in class.
.679	TC10	Our social studies teacher is willing to allow discussions of controversial issues in class.
.746	TC14	My social studies teacher knows a lot about the topics we study.
.713	TC15	My social studies teacher really explains the topics we study.
.695	TC11	My social studies teacher really likes the topic s/he is teaching.
.686	TC12	My social studies teacher listens to what students have to say.
.478	TC13	Students in social studies feel free to express their opinions, even when the teacher disagrees with them.

Student Involvement (Cronbach alpha = .749)

.511	SI1	Students get actively involved in our social studies class.
.661	SI5	Students generally pay attention to what is going on in political science class.
.597	RSI6	No one cares about what happens in social studies class.*
.652	SI8	Students join in expressing ideas in class discussions.

Table 1

Data Sources

DATA TYPES	Ms. Jefferies (closed)	Ms. Danials (open)	Mr. Woodlawn (open)
Questionnaires (N = 85)			
completed pre- and posttest matches			
males	16	13	13
females	13	17	13
Student Interviews (N=51)			
	5th period	1st period	2nd period
males	8	4	2
females	4	6	6
	6th period		3rd period
males	7		2
females	7		5
Classroom Observations (N=135)			
	5th period	1st period	2nd period
	37	20	26
	6th period		3rd period
	31		21
Teacher Interviews	pre/post conversations	pre/post conversations	post conversations

Table 2

Results of Classroom Climate ANOVAS

Teacher Characteristics	**Mr. Woodlawn** (open)	**Ms. Daniels** (open)
	M = 4.97 sd = .735	M = 4.683 sd = .986
Ms. Jefferies (closed)		
M = 4.00 sd = 1.16	F = 15.78 p ≤ .00	F = 8.53 p ≤ .00

Student Involvement	**Mr. Woodlawn**	**Ms. Daniels**
	M = 4.526 sd = .770	M = 4.14 sd = 1.03
Ms. Jefferies		
M = 3.66 sd =	F = 10.02 p ≤ .00	F = 3.24 p = .05

Table 3

Pearson Correlation Matrix of Political Attitudes and Behavior with Climate Variables (N = 99)

	Teacher Characteristics	Student Involvement
Political Efficacy	.513*	.482*
Political Interest	.160*	.272*
Political Trust	.059	.042
Political Confidence	.014	-.060
Media Use	-.030	-.123*
Political Discussion	.157*	.205*
Anticipated Future Pol. Participation	-.085	.041

*indicates $p \leq .05$