DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 416 124 SO 027 614

AUTHOR Obenchain, Kathryn M.
TITLE The NCSS Ethical Standards and Citizenship Education: A Fifth Grade Classroom Example.
PUB DATE 1996-11-22
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, DC, November 22, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship; *Citizenship Education; Civics; *Codes of Ethics; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Grade 5; Intermediate Grades; Moral Development; Moral Values; *Professional Associations; *Social Studies
IDENTIFIERS *National Council for the Social Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the ethical principles of the social studies profession in light of the daily routine of an elementary classroom. This pilot study was begun in the spring of 1996 when the researcher spent time in an elementary classroom in the midwest observing the life and culture of a fifth grade classroom. Data collected appeared to showcase the ethical principles adopted by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) in its code of ethics. The balance of the paper includes the NCSS' "A Code of Ethics," a discussion of social studies and relevant literature, the pilot study, classroom examples of certain ethical principles from the code, and a conclusion that a focus on ethics should be continual and deliberate and that social studies teachers and supervisors, and social studies professors spend more time with these principles as they work with their faculty and their university students. (Contains 25 references.) (EH)

"The NCSS Ethical Standards and Citizenship Education: A Fifth Grade Classroom Example"

Presented at
NSSSA
National Council for the Social Studies
Washington, DC
November 22, 1996

Kathryn M. Obenchain
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Purdue University
1442 Liberal Arts and Education Building
West Lafayette, Indiana 47907
317/494-9552
e-mail: kmo@vm.cc.purdue.edu

"The N.C.S.S. Ethical Standards and Citizenship Education: A Fifth Grade Classroom Example"

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to hold up the ethical principles of the social studies profession to the daily routine in an elementary classroom. In the spring of 1996, the author began the pilot study of a larger research study and spent time in an elementary school classroom in the midwest observing the life and culture of a fifth grade classroom. Unexpectedly, a portion of the data from that pilot study appeared to showcase the ethical principles adopted by the National Council for the Social Studies in its code of ethics. The balance of this paper will include the National Council for the Social Studies "A Code of Ethics," a discussion of social studies and relevant literature, the pilot study, classroom examples of ethical principles "two," "three" and "four" in practice, and a conclusion.

Introduction

"Ethics" is a word that has been thrown about in the past several months as the United States has prepared for an election season. Whether a candidate does or does not possess ethics has been the topic of much speculation and inquiry on the campaign trail and in the media. For most social studies educators, however, their professional behavior is not often held up to a professional code of ethics in the morning headlines or on a nightly newscast. It may be prudent to pause and look at the mix that occurs when the goals of social studies education, the professional ethics of the field, and a classroom teacher merge. What does a teacher displaying the professional ethics of a social studies educator really look like in the classroom?

"A Code of Ethics"

In 1980, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) adopted "A Code of Ethics for the Social Studies Profession" (National Council for the Social Studies). This code of ethics was developed because the profession deemed it necessary to make

"...explicit the ethical principles by which the profession is guided..." and to "...explain, interpret, and justify those principles to the society served" (National Council for the Social Studies). The six separate principles contained within the document are:

1. "It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to set forth, maintain, model, and safeguard standards of instructional competence suited to the achievement of the broad goals of the social studies.
2. It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to provide to every student, in so far as possible, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to function as an effective citizen.
3. It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to foster the understanding and exercise of the rights guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution of the United States and of the responsibilities implicit in those rights.
4. It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to cultivate and maintain an instructional environment in which the free contest of ideas is prized.
5. It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to adhere to the highest standards of scholarship in the development, production, distribution, or use of social studies materials.
6. It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to concern themselves with the conditions of the school and community with which they are associated" (National Council for the Social Studies).

Each of these separate principles includes sub-points to provide further explanation and guidance. Although this code was developed over 15 years ago, the principles continue to reflect the goals and beliefs about the role of the social studies educator because of their grounding in the foundations of the field. Parker and Jarolimek (1984) state that

> "Social studies educators should strive to be the kind of citizens they say they aim to create. They should strive to be informed, skillful citizens who are committed to democratic values and beliefs, and who are willing, able, and feel obliged to participate in social, economic, and political processes."

These principles were further supported by Michael Hartoonian (1988) and his belief that

> "The education that enhances and enriches the reservoir of virtue must directly address the basic principles of the republic -- of democracy and capitalism ... This education must deal with the nature of knowledge, truth, and how we think about knowledge and truth."

More recently the National Council for the Social Studies issued a Position Statement on "Powerful Teaching and Learning" (1992). Although this document does not directly address the code of ethics, it attends to the need for quality professionals, quality methods, and quality materials. The 1992 Position Statement is an example of the code of ethics in practice as it is directed toward the improvement of the profession and its professionals.

Social Studies Education

The Field

The field of social studies, and its primary goal of citizenship education grew out of the Progressive movement and was heavily influenced by the philosophies of John Dewey. Active participation by the citizens of a democratic society was promoted by Dewey, as was his belief that education in such a society must give its citizens a personal stake in their society and the "habits of mind" to affect necessary social change (Dewey, 1916/1944, p. 99). Social Studies has been charged with the primary responsibility of educating effective democratic citizens (National Council for the Social Studies, 1992; Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977). Effective democratic citizens (i.e. good citizens) are defined as citizens who are not just patriotic and law-obeying, but also those who are informed critics of the nation and participate in its improvement (Engle & Ochoa). While voting, knowing the Pledge of Allegiance and obeying the laws of the nation and community are all important, the democratic form of government requires for its success the reasoned, rational and educated participation of its citizens. According to George Wood (1988, p. 169), democracy is, in essence, "...a way of living in which we

collectively deliberate over our shared problems and prospects." In preparation for this deliberation and participation, students must have access not only to content knowledge, but opportunities to critically evaluate and use that knowledge and actively practice citizenship skills. Understanding the goals of social studies helps in understanding the motivation for the creation and acceptance of the code of professional ethics for all social studies educators.

Citizenship Knowledge, Skills and Values

Citizenship education calls for a variety of foci in the classroom. One area of focus concerns the knowledge necessary to function effectively in a democratic society. This includes the study of both academic disciplines and democratic values such as justice, equality, patriotism and the common good. Competency in these areas is an imperative in order for citizens to make informed decisions (Wade, 1995; Butts, 1988; Parker & Kaltsounis, 1986; Oppenheim & Torney, 1974). The effective and appropriate use of this knowledge and these democratic values, as displayed in student behaviors, is a necessary and companion focus for citizenship education (Kaltsounis, 1994; Parker & Kaltsounis; Oppenheim & Torney). The intent is that the knowledge students possess about the workings of their nation and community and its problems, paired with the students' necessary and active role while still children/adolescents, will promote their adult civic participation.

Democratic behaviors are often evidenced by the use of particular skills which are practiced in the daily environment of the classroom. Ehman in 1980 (as cited in Angell, p. 242), Parker and Kaltsounis, and Hepburn (1983) have all focused attention on the

significant role of the classroom climate/culture in developing the civic character or personality of a student. According to Parker and Kaltsounis, this climate consists of decision-making procedures, student participation, discussion of controversial issues, and teacher and student responses to student opinions. Hepburn's look at the research also attends to the importance of the teacher and school in providing a climate open to student participation and decision making. Additional research reported the importance of student participation in decisions directly reflecting their lives at school (Kubelick, 1982; Kohlberg, Lieberman, Power, Higgins, and Codding, 1981; Power, 1981; Reimer, 1981). This participation contributes to the development of prosocial behavior, high level moral reasoning, and a sense of community among students. This focus on knowledge and skills also directly reflects the second principle in the social studies code of ethics which states, in part, "...provide to every student...the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary..." (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980).

Role of the Classroom Teacher

The specific role of the teacher in an affective sense in the democratic classroom may also be significant. While there has been research on the teacher and his or her influence in the academic realm, additional research is needed regarding the teacher's influence in the affective development of students (National Council for the Social Studies, 1992; Solomon, Watson, Delucchi, Schaps, Battistich, 1988). Dynneson and Gross (1991) have completed field studies which affirm the vital importance of the teacher, along with parents and friends, in the citizenship education process of students. This process is often mentioned as part of a so-called hidden curriculum, and educators would

agree that teacher behavior and modeling can influence student attitudes and behaviors. What may be called for is to remove this modeling from a hidden curriculum to a conscious "curriculum of justice" (Power, Higgins, Kohlberg, with Reimer, 1989, p. 24) in which the teacher and students deal with real issues relevant to the students in a fair, respectful and equitable manner. Kohlberg (Power, et al) felt that if students are asked to understand justice and to act justly, they must be treated justly in the classroom. If teachers want students to take a more active role in their communities, then teachers may need to consciously provide opportunities for student to take that role.

The role of the teacher in his or her classroom is the core of the ethical principles under discussion. Principles three and four specifically deal with the type and quality of the instructional environment provided to social studies students (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980). This environment includes the ability of students to exercise their Constitutional rights and responsibilities in a safe setting which promotes the exchange of ideas. The importance of modeling the appropriate behavior of a citizen in a democracy should occur not only in the classroom during discussions but also in the school and larger community. Principles one and six attend more specifically to the teacher as citizen (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980). Both of these principles call for the involvement of the teacher in his or her community, working to create a better learning and living environment.

The Pilot Study

The original purpose of this pilot study was to look at one self-contained fifth grade elementary classroom which embraces experiential democratic citizenship. The

classroom was holistically observed in order to determine and describe the potentially unique qualities and characteristics in the classroom environment that promote motivation for civic participation. Particular attention was focused on the culture of this democratic classroom. Although the original purpose of the pilot study did not focus on the professional ethical principles of the teacher, evidence of these principles in practice emerged almost immediately. A more detailed description of the setting follows.

Setting and Participants

The setting for this pilot study was a fifth grade self-contained classroom located in the new Charles Lindbergh Elementary School on the south side of a small mid-western city. The school serves grades kindergarten through fifth with four classes of grades kindergarten through three and two classes of grades four and five. The participating class contained 29 predominately Anglo fifth grade students working at an average third-grade reading level (two students are African American and the one Hispanic student speaks English as a second language). One student was identified as MiMH and attended a resource room regularly for assistance in reading, spelling, English and handwriting. Another student was identified as learning disabled, but received no resource room assistance. Four other students in Mrs. Rush's class were identified as either A.D.D. or A.D.H.D.; three of them were on prescription medication. Another student was described as emotionally handicapped. The very exuberant and passionate teacher, Mrs. Rush, was in her thirteenth year of teaching, all of that time in grades four and five. She was a longtime resident of the area and a graduate of the nearby university with a Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education and a Master's degree in Educational Psychology/Gifted

Education. She had stated on several occasions to parents, students and colleagues that her passion (in terms of academic subjects) was social studies.

This research site was chosen for specific reasons. The researcher met Mrs. Rush in the summer of 1995 at a teachers institute on citizenship education and had several conversations with her over the following months about her teaching and classroom. From these conversations, and a recommendation of the researcher's major professor, who also knew Mrs. Rush, this teacher was chosen because it was believed that her classroom contained many democratic characteristics, as defined earlier in this paper. Professional ethics, as a goal of the research, was not a consideration at the time. Mrs. Rush and her principal were both agreeable and welcomed the opportunity to participate in this study. Informed consent forms were also sent home with each student prior to conducting of any interviews or collecting of any student artifacts. All but two students participated in the study.

The researcher spent six and one-half days in Mrs. Rush's classroom over a three week period in February, 1996. Classes began at 8:20 a.m. and ended at 2:45 p.m. This amounted to approximately 27 hours in the classroom with the students.

Data Collection

Field Notes

Field notes were taken describing the daily occurrences of Mrs. Rush's classroom and her students. Attempts were made to note as much as possible about the physical setting, student, teacher, and researcher conversations and interactions, lessons and researcher comments and questions. In some specific cases, entire conversations were

detailed. These field notes were jotted down in a notebook that the researcher carried throughout the day. As recommended by Emerson, Fretz and Shaw (1995), field notes were transferred and transcribed into full field notes as soon as possible after each day in the classroom. This transcription time was really the first opportunity to review field note data, and often additional information was recorded as the process of transcribing seemed to jog memories of the day. It was also an appropriate time to insert initial comments and questions posed by the researcher.

Student Interviews

Near the end of the time in the field, the researcher conducted four separate interviews with students, lasting approximately 15 minutes each. These interviews were done near the end of the data collection phase because it was felt that once students became aware of the types of questions being asked, their behaviors in the presence of the researcher might change. Because of the ethnographic nature of the study, it was felt that unstructured or semi-structured formats would be the most appropriate interview methods (Fontana and Frey, 1994). Although all of these interviews were formal in the sense that the researcher and participants went to a new setting and an audio-tape recorder was present, questions were very open-ended. This was particularly true in the first set of unstructured interviews in which the students were simply asked, "Can you tell me what it is like in Room 23?" Follow up questions were asked depending upon answers given, while still keeping in mind the overall goal of the pilot study. The semi-structured interview questions were based on the research questions of the pilot study regarding experiential citizenship and, in part, on the information gathered during the unstructured

interviews. Because of the structure of these questions, keeping the conversation on target was somewhat easier. It was this specific strategy of using unstructured and semi-structured interview techniques which allowed data about the professional ethics of Mrs. Rush to emerge. As students described life in Room 23, the immense influence of Mrs. Rush on the development of citizens in her classroom became apparent.

Teacher Interview

During the course of classroom observations, the researcher had many informal conversations with Mrs. Rush. These conversations usually took place during the special classes the researcher and teacher did not attend, during lunch or after school. These conversations were noted in the field notes. A separate in-depth semi-structured interview was held with Mrs. Rush on March 28, 1996. Her philosophy regarding her role in the classroom also speaks to her professional ethics.

Artifacts

Several artifacts were also collected from Room 23. These included copies of student essays, assignments and posters. From Mrs. Rush, copies of classroom rules and policies, weekly plan sheets, her resume and a vision statement for the school were also collected. The student work copied was seen as representing democratic and/or citizenship attitudes, which provided additional examples of several ethical principles, specifically principles two and three.

Initial Data Analysis

As with most qualitative studies, analysis was done inductively with no preset patterns or hypotheses to test (Patton, 1990). Initial analysis of all of the data described in

the preceding paragraphs was to read and reread the transcriptions and artifacts several times without making any written comments or notations on the pages. During two subsequent readings, notes were made in the margins of interesting comments and important ideas were noted. These notations then assisted the researcher in seeing the emergence of four main categories as related to the democratic nature of the classroom. These categories were: 1) teacher behaviors/mannerisms/attitudes, 2) student behaviors/attitudes, 3) overall classroom environment, and 4) school attitude/support. As described earlier in this paper, the democratic nature (i.e. climate) is described by Parker and Kaltsounis as consisting of decision-making procedures, student participation, discussion of controversial issues, and teacher and student response to student opinions.

One of the first things to emerge was the influence of the teacher's behaviors and mannerisms in dealing with the class as a whole and with individual students, and its effects on the democratic nature of the classroom. This category was defined as things the teacher did, or students perceived her doing which contributed to the description set out by Parker and Kaltsounis. The emergence of this broad category of teacher influence highlighted the ethical practices of Mrs. Rush, and became the focus of this paper.

The Classroom Examples

Principle Two

"It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to provide to every student, in so far as possible, the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to function as an effective citizen" (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980).

The first sub-point of this principle calls for the types of instruction which will help students to develop their commitment to the democratic values of the United States. Two

specific classroom projects from Mrs. Rush's room illustrate a commitment to this principle.

1. Value Shields - Upon entry to Mrs. Rush's room, one notices the display of seven "shields" created on poster board by the students and displayed on the doors of the coat closets. Each of the seven shields represents a specific democratic value. These core democratic values have been culled by citizenship education and political science scholars such as R. Freeman Butts (1988) from the early writings of the founders of the United States. These values include diversity, justice, patriotism, equality of opportunity, truth, individual rights and common good. The lesson plan followed to develop these shields called first for a discussion of each of these values as central to democratic citizenship. Once Mrs. Rush was comfortable with student understanding, students then worked in groups to create the seven shields, each one representing a democratic value. The parts of the shield were set up as follows:

Democratic Value: Definition

Synonym	Antonym
Picture or Illustration	Symbol

Although this was just one particular lesson completed during the first few weeks of the school year, these shields remained a constant presence and reference in the room throughout the year (classroom artifacts collection). Mrs. Rush referred to these values during both formal and informal lessons (fieldnotes 2/9/96, 2/12/96). An example of her

use of these shields can be found later in this paper in the transcript of a class discussion following a school fire drill.

2. Democratic Values in our Communities - Another assignment centering on the democratic values took the knowledge the students already possessed and required that they find examples of the values in practice in three communities to which the students belonged. The communities they examined were the classroom, their city and the nation. As with the shield assignment, students were placed into groups and assigned a value. They prepared a poster which included: the democratic value, a definition of that value in their own words, at least three examples of that value at work in their classroom, three examples of that value in their city, and three examples of that value in the nation. Students used the local newspaper to find the city and national examples. One group of students working on the "truth" poster had a discussion on whether or not a "lost and found" notice about a cat that had been found in the community would be a good example of truth. After much discussion, they decide that it was an example because the person who found the cat could have just kept it, being untruthful. However, the person who placed the ad was displaying the value of truth by saying (through the ad) they had a cat that belonged to someone else (fieldnotes, 2/14/96, p. 14). Another group, working on the value of "justice" put the following comments on their poster about examples of justice in the classroom: "The Justice Commity listened to people's problems and tries to come to an agreement" and "Every preson in this classroom has a chance to say their own opinion to a problem or at any time." [errors in original text]

Mrs. Rush also encouraged the development of democratic attitudes and skills through modeling what she would like to see. In many cases, this consisted of Mrs. Rush saying "Thank you" and "I appreciate your courtesy" (field notes, 2/9/96, p. 3; 2/19/96, p. 24; 2/23/96, p. 28; 2/26/96, p. 33). Mrs. Rush also modeled appropriate behavior by asking the students permission in certain instances. In one example, she wanted to show some of the work the students had done to a group of teachers and university faculty. Before taking the work, Mrs. Rush told the students she would like to do this, but would only do so if they gave their permission first. The students quickly and enthusiastically gave their consent (field notes, 2/14/96, p. 15). This behavior was something that the students also seemed to note - not the "thank you", but the considerate behavior. In five of the six interviews with the students, they made mention of what a good teacher Mrs. Rush, how nice she was, and how much they liked her. This statement was probed to find out what made her a good teacher in their minds. In the semi-structured group interview, this was a definite topic of interest for the four students. Both Leann and Nate specifically stated that Mrs. Rush treats everyone equal (student interview, 2/26/96, p. 18).

Another skill modeled by Mrs. Rush was that she provided a rationale to her students on many of the decisions she made, whether they were on assignments or daily routine changes. This skill is illustrative of a democratic environment as student comments and questions are taken into consideration. One example of this was Mrs. Rush's use of the Weekly Plan Sheet ("WPS"). The WPS was passed out each Monday morning and contained all of the activities and topics for the week, both academic and social. Time was then taken by Mrs. Rush to go over the WPS, explain what was going

on and why certain things were occurring. Students then had the opportunity to ask questions. Additionally, Mrs. Rush was observed on a variety of occasions giving a rationale for a decision or choice of assignment. In one instance, students were asked to complete a mid-unit review in math, with the explanation that as she had been grading their assignments, she felt additional practice was needed (field notes, 2/9/96, p. 10). Not only did Mrs. Rush model this, she expected the same for her students. Students were required to justify and defend their choices during class discussions (fieldnotes, 2/9/96, p. 1; 2/12/96, p. 8; 2/23/9, p. 27).

Students also practiced the skills of citizenship by evaluating their behavior and thinking critically about decisions. One particular event witnessed was a school fire drill and the subsequent evaluation of Room 23's performance by the class. After the all clear signal had been given and the class returned to the room, Mrs. Rush said a critique of their performance was necessary. As hands went up for comments, the discussion followed:

Audrey:	"[We did] better than last time.
Mrs. Rush:	Is that good enough...were there any problems with our class?
Kara:	Some of us slowed down (others followed with similar comments).
Mrs. Rush:	When we slowed, we clumped up and began to talk...what do we do to correct it?
Tina:	If you have the urge to talk, put your hands over your mouth.
Karen:	If we can't stay quiet when we line up, do we need a punishment?
Several:	No -- shouldn't have to be punished -- we're fifth graders, we should know better.
?:	Should our class have a practice fire drill?
Ron:	No, people will think we're nuts.
Mrs. Rush:	Does that matter to you?
Ron:	Yes.
?:	Isn't safety more important?
Kara:	If others have to tell you to be quiet, you're risking their safety.

Mrs. Rush: Why do we need to be quiet? (she directs their attention to the value shields posted in the room)
?: Being quiet is being a good citizen.
Mrs. Rush: Why?
Several: It is for the common good so everyone can hear instructions -- also need to know if it is a real fire -- hear the all clear signal" (fieldnotes, 2/9/96, pp. 4-5).

What should also be noted is that this class behaved very well during the fire drill. Of the fourth and fifth grade classes observed during the drill, Mrs. Rush's class was the most quiet and orderly. At no time in this exchange did any of the students remark that their performance was better than other classes. They were critiquing solely on their performance. This exchange provided not only the opportunity for students to have a civil discussion and to think critically about their behavior, as related to the second ethical principle, it also attends to the fourth ethical principle. Principle four calls for an environment in which students and teacher are encouraged to inquire freely (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980). Although the intent of the principle may have been more academic in nature, the above scenario should illustrate the existence of an appropriate environment for that contest of ideas.

Principle Three

"It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to foster the understanding and exercise of the rights guaranteed to all citizens under the Constitution of the United States and of the responsibilities implicit in those rights" (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980).

The first sub-point under this principle requires that social studies teachers make their students aware of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship in the United States (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980). One way that Mrs. Rush did this was

through the classroom mini-economy she established. Her rationale for the use of the mini-economy focused on the need for students to have an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of consumers in our society. Students applied for specific classroom jobs which included completing an application, going through an interview, and having at least one of their references called. The jobs were real and provided assistance to Mrs. Rush in the daily management of the classroom. Jobs included paper passers, door closers, telephone message takers, materials manager, recycler, errand runner, as well as many others. Students were paid with classroom money for these jobs (a payroll clerk wrote and signed all paychecks - another job); they also paid rent, utilities and taxes from their salary (utility payments collected by a utility clerk - another job). There was a class bank (two more jobs for tellers) and students had checking accounts. They learned how to write checks and make deposits, how to budget their money, and they learned that when a job is performed well, a pay raise is forthcoming.

Developing a sense of responsibility to one's community was also fostered by Mrs. Rush as she made a point of referring to the classroom as a community. Students were reminded to keep their community clean (fieldnotes, 2/9/96, p.6; 2/23/96, p.30), to help others in their community (fieldnotes, 2/9/96, p.3; 2/26/96, p.31) and support other members of their community in their endeavors (fieldnotes, 2/23/96, p.27).

Participation in service-learning projects also fostered a sense of responsibility to one's community. During the school year, students in Mrs. Rush's class participated in several service-learning projects. The one most remembered by the students was an "Almond Angel" project. One student in Mrs. Rush's room had been hospitalized and

upon his return to class told his classmates that one of the worst things about being in the hospital was being lonely and bored. With guidance from Mrs. Rush, students decided that they should find a way to help children in the hospital. After class discussion and some phone calls by Mrs. Rush, the class decided to make cheer bags containing a bag of almonds, crayons, a coloring book (provided by the California Almond Angel Project), and original stories by the students. Students then took a field trip to one of the local hospitals to deliver the bags and read their original stories to the hospitalized children. Although this project was done in the fall of the school year, in February students were still talking about the experience. In one interview, Barry was asked about when and where he had been a good citizen. He replied: "...like we did this almond angel thing and we went to a hospital and made these bags and gave them to kids so then they could feel better." When asked why they did this project, Barry replied, "Well, we wanted to do good citizenship and we thought that was part of being a good citizen - helping your community" (student interview, 2/23/96). Another student, Amy, also brought up the almond angel project in her interview as she talked about the fun activities they did in class. She said the almond angel project was a "neat thing to cheer them [the sick kids] up with" (student interview, 2/26/96). When asked how cheering people up and citizenship go together, Amy replied, "citizenship is like being nice and helping people - so we were helping people..." (student interview, 2/26/96).

Principle Four

"It is the ethical responsibility of social studies professionals to cultivate and maintain an instructional environment in which the free contest of ideas is prized" (National Council for the Social Studies, 1980).

Keeping in mind the age of fifth grade students, Mrs. Rush has as one of her professional goals, the tenets of this principle. During her interview, one of the questions focused on the democratic environment Mrs. Rush was attempting to create in her classroom.

Researcher: "Is there anything ... you see as creating a democratic environment ... that you do deliberately?"

Mrs. Rush: "I encourage the students to have a voice and exercise their voice. There are times and places for expressing yourself and you do have to learn that there comes a time when a discussion has to be ended, even if there are still stories that some people want to share. But I do encourage them to ask questions, to share stories that they think may be relevant to what we're talking about. And I encourage them to ask questions that would challenge me and not just automatically accept what I say as being so, just because I am the teacher.

Researcher: Is that a difficult position for them to be in?

Mrs. Rush: Very difficult. Very difficult. They have been taught that you never question authority, that you always do what the teacher says. 'Don't ask why, just do.' And so a lot of them are real uncomfortable with the notion that they can and should ask the teacher to give a reason for something. There are times when I will deliberately say something this is so patently absurd that they have got to question it! To provoke them into it - and still it is amazing the number of students who just won't - who will just blindly accept whatever they're told" (teacher interview, March 28, 1996, p. 2).

As can be inferred from this passage, Mrs. Rush worked diligently to create an environment in which questioning was valued. This was further reinforced by the "Classroom Policies" that Mrs. Rush posted in the room. These policies included statements such as "It's good to have a mind of your own" and "If you don't understand, ASK! If you still don't understand, ASK AGAIN!" (classroom artifacts collection).

In addition, students discussed and voted on what music to listen to, how partners would be chosen for special projects, how they wished to proceed with certain

assignments, how and where to display Valentine's Day bags, etc. Many assignments also included some form of discussion, and students appeared to feel very comfortable in disagreeing with one another on specific points. In some cases making a decision did not always entail a group discussion, but Mrs. Rush could be overheard encouraging individual students to "use your own judgment" (field notes, 2/16/96, p. 21) in making decisions.

Although these examples only focus on three of the ethical principles, the other principles were, and continue to be present. Mrs. Rush is a very competent and experienced teacher and has received numerous awards for her teaching (Principle One). Mrs. Rush also takes a large portion of her personal time to increase her knowledge and improve her teaching. She attends workshops and conferences when she can, presenting at many of them. When this is impossible, she continues to read and study on her own. Using her new knowledge from these and other experiences, she also works to create and implement the highest quality of instructional materials possible (Principle Five). Mrs. Rush also has a devotion to the field of social studies, and specifically to the topic of citizenship education. In the last two years, she participated in a state funded project on citizenship education, was appointed as lead teacher in social studies at her school, and has taken the job as faculty sponsor for the school's Spirit Club, which has a citizenship focus. She also participates in a variety of community activities, and models this participation for her students by encouraging discussions of life outside of the classroom (Principle Six).

What is also evident is the overlapping of these principles in the day to day life of a classroom teacher. Any one the examples detailed here could have appeared very credibly

under one or more of the other principles. And, one would suspect that a teacher which exhibits one or two principles, would likely exhibit others. These six principles are strongly interwoven to describe a complete social studies professional. While Mrs. Rush is certainly not an oddity in the profession, there are many outstanding teachers like her, a look at her may provide a "real" example of an ethical social studies professional as he or she lives life in the classroom.

Conclusion

As stated early in this paper, this pilot study was a part of a larger research study which is ongoing. Data is still being collected in the field and analysis is superficial at this time. Also, this look at concrete examples of the ethical principles in practice was never an intention of the original research study, and never directly addressed in the research questions. Consequently, any assertions would be inappropriate. However, there may be some things that are of interest in an examination of the ethical principles and these snippets of time in this fifth-grade classroom.

It may be time for the National Council for the Social Studies to revisit the 1980 Position Statement which set forth the code of ethics for the profession. Even though the Position Statement is as timely today as it was 16 years ago, and certainly reflects current attitudes and beliefs in the field, attention on the topic may be needed. A focus on ethics should be continual and deliberate. A revision or just a revisitation may help to garner the attention to these ethical principles in the forefront of our minds.

It may also behoove social studies teachers and supervisors, and social studies professors to spend more time with these principles as they work with their faculty and

their university students. It would seem appropriate to insure that this code of ethics is available and discussed with our current and future colleagues. Most professions have a code of ethics by which members measure themselves. By setting these standards for ourselves, our colleagues and our students, and striving to meet them, we can only improve the profession. And, with the social studies professional goal of democratic citizenship education, a strong code of ethics should be paramount.

References

Angell, A. V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary classrooms: A review of theory and research. Theory and Research in Social Education, 19(3), 241-266.

Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1977). Defining the social studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Butts, R. F. (1988). The morality of democratic citizenship: Goals for civic education in the republic's third century. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Dewey, J. (1916/1944). Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press.

Dynneson, T. L. & Gross, R. E. (1991). The educational perspective: Citizenship in American Society. In R. E. Gross & T. L. Dynneson (Eds.), Social Science Perspectives in Citizenship Education. (pp. 1-42). New York: Teachers College Press.

Emerson, R. M.; Fretz, R. I.; Shaw, L. L. (1995). Writing ethnographic fieldnotes. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Engle, S. H. & Ochoa, A. (1988). Education for democratic citizenship. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fontana, A. & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The are of science. In N. K. Denzin Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hartoonian, M. (1988). Ethical and philosophical foundations of democratic citizenship (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 3024)

Hepburn, M. A. (1983). Can schools, teachers, and administrators make a difference? The research evidence. In M. A. Hepburn (Ed.), Democratic Education in Schools and Classrooms. (pp. 5-30). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. Bulletin No. 70.

Kaltsounis, T. (1994). Democracy's challenge as the foundation for social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22(2), 176-193.

Kohlberg, L. Lieberman, M., Power, C. & Higgins, A. with Codding, J. (1981). Evaluating Scarsdale's "just community school" and its curriculum: Implications for the future. Moral Education Forum, 6, pp. 31-42.

Kubelick, C. (1982). Building a just community in the elementary school. In L. W. Rosenzweig (Ed.). Developmental Perspectives on the Social Studies. (pp. 15-29). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies. Bulletin No. 66.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1980). A code of ethics for the social studies profession. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1992). A vision of powerful teaching and learning in social studies: Building social understanding and civic efficacy. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement.

Oppenheim, A. N. & Torney, J. (1974). The measurement of children's civic attitudes in different nations. International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. IEA Monograph Studies No. 2. New York: Halstead Press.

Parker, W. C. & Jarolimek, J. (1984). Citizenship and the critical role of the social studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin No. 72.

Parker, W. C. & Kaltsounis, T. (1986). Citizenship and law-related education. In V.A. Atwood (Ed.). Elementary School Social Studies: Research as a Guide to Practice. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies Bulletin No. 79, pp. 14-33.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Power, C. (1981). Moral education through the development of the moral atmosphere of the school. The Journal of Educational Thought, 15, 4-19.

Power, F. C., Higgins, A., Kohlberg, L., with Reimer, J. (1989). Lawrence Kohlberg's approach to moral education. New York: Columbia University Press.

Reimer, J. (1981). Moral education: The just community approach. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 485-487.

Solomon, D., Watson, M. S., Delucchi, K. L., Schaps, E. & Battistich, V. (1988). Enhancing children's prosocial behavior in the classroom. American Educational Research Journal, 25(4), 527-554.

Wade, R. (1995). Civic ideals into practice: Democracy in the elementary school. Social Studies and the Young Learner, 8(1), 16-18.

Wood, G. H. (1988). Democracy & the curriculum. In Beyer, L. E. & Apple, M. W. (Eds.). The Curriculum: Problems, Politics, and Possibilities. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The N.C.S.S. Ethical Standards and Citizenship Education: A Fifth Grade Classroom Example	
Author(s): Kathryn M. Obenchain	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following two options and sign at the bottom of the page.

☑ **Check here**
For Level 1 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Level 2

☐ **Check here**
For Level 2 Release:
Permitting reproduction in microfiche (4" x 6" film) or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic or optical), but *not* in paper copy.

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Sign here→ please	Signature: Kathryn M Obenchain	Printed Name/Position/Title: Kathryn M. Obenchain Graduate Student	
	Organization/Address: Purdue University 1442 L.A.E.B. West Lafayette, IN 47907	Telephone: 317/494-9552	FAX:
		E-Mail Address: kmo@vm.cc.purdue.edu	Date: 1/3/97