

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 444 885

SO 031 163

AUTHOR Hahn, Carole L.; Dilworth, Paulette Patterson; Hughes, Michael

TITLE IEA Civic Education Project Phase I: The United States, Volume I. Review of the Literature.

SPONS AGENCY National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 1998-09-00

NOTE 81p.; For Volumes II and III, see SO 031 164-165.

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; \*Citizenship; \*Citizenship Education; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; Public Schools; Social Studies; Student Needs

IDENTIFIERS International Assn Evaluation Educ Achievement

## ABSTRACT

This review of literature is the first of four documents prepared for phase I of the Civic Education Study, under the auspices of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). The more than 20 countries that participated in Phase 1 of the IEA Civic Education Study were asked to review the literature in their particular country with respect to 14 sets of questions. The table of contents includes: (1) "Status of Civic Education"; (2) "Priorities in Civic Education"; (3) "Organization of Civic Education"; (4) "Civic Identity Development"; (5) "Intergroup Relations"; (6) "Criteria for Excellence"; (7) "Conceptions of Citizenship"; (8) "Preparation for Rights and Responsibilities"; (9) "Gender Differences"; (10) "Social Class"; (11) "Teachers Views and Classroom Climate"; (12) "Pedagogy and Classroom Practice"; (13) "Teacher Preparation: Pre-Service and In-Service"; and (14) "School Organization." (Contains 177 references.) (BT)

**IEA CIVIC EDUCATION PROJECT  
PHASE I: THE UNITED STATES  
Volume I**

**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

**Carole L. Hahn  
Paulette Patterson Dilworth  
Michael Hughes**

September 1998

SO 031 163

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.

**IEA CIVIC EDUCATION PROJECT**  
**PHASE I: THE UNITED STATES**  
**Volume I**

**REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE**

Carole L. Hahn  
Paulette Patterson Dilworth  
Michael Hughes

September 1998

## Preface

This Review of Literature is the first of four documents prepared for Phase I of the Civic Education Study, under the auspices of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA). The more than 20 countries that participated in Phase I of the IEA Civic Education Study were asked to review the literature in their particular country with respect to 14 particular sets of questions. The questions had been posed by the international planning committee, chaired by Judith Torney-Purta at the University of Maryland.

In order to identify relevant literature in the United States, Dr. Carole Hahn, the National Project Representative, and project staff at Emory University used a variety of sources. We began by reviewing relevant chapters in the Handbook of Research in Social Studies Teaching and Learning, edited by James P. Shaver (1991) and identifying key sources for examination. We conducted computer searches of the ERIC/CIJE data base, and in some cases PSYLIT and Dissertation Abstracts International, for the 20 year period since the last IEA civic education study. We sent initial drafts of the review to members of our National Expert Panel, who recommended additional sources for our review.

We wish to thank members of the National Expert Panel for their assistance in locating sources, and to Trisha Sen and Lois Wolfe for their assistance. Thanks also to the National Center for Educational Statistics of the United States Office of Education for funding the project.

C. L. Hahn

P. P. Dilworth

M. Hughes

September, 1998

## National Expert Panel

Dr. Patricia Avery	University of Minnesota
Dr. Margaret Branson	Center for Civic Education
Dr. Gloria Contreras	University of North Texas
Dr. Carole Hahn	Emory University
Dr. Gloria Ladson-Billings	University of Wisconsin
Dr. Sheilah Mann	American Political Science Association
Dr. Pat Nickell	Fayette County Public Schools, Lexington, KY
Dr. Richard Niemi	University of Rochester
Dr. Valerie Pang	San Diego State University
Dr. Walter Parker	University of Washington
Dr. John Patrick	Indiana University
Mr. Richard Sirvint	South Middle School, Hartford, CT
Dr. Gordon Ambach, Ex Officio	Council of Chief State School Officers

## Literature Review

### Table of Contents

1. Status of Civic Education	1
Agents of Socialization: Family, Media, School	
Family	2
Media	3
School	3
2. Priorities in Civic Education	5
Curriculum Analyses	5
Cognitive, Attitudinal, and Behavioral Objectives	7
Discussion of Essential Knowledge	8
3. Organization of Civic Education	10
Differing Curricular Emphases	10
Extracurricular Activities	11
4. Civic Identity Development	13
National Identity	13
Sub-National Identity Development (Ethnic Diversity)	14
Supra-National Identity Development (Global Education)	15
5. Intergroup Relations	17
Intergroup Relations and Tension Reduction	18
Improving Tolerance	20

Racial Attitudes	20
6. Criteria for Excellence	23
National Standards	24
Assessment	25
7. Conceptions of Citizenship	27
Student Achievement: Knowledge	29
Student Attitudes and Beliefs	30
8. Preparation for Rights and Responsibilities	31
9. Gender Differences	33
Conceptions of Citizenship	33
Political Knowledge and Interest	34
Political Trust, Efficacy, Confidence, and Participation	36
Attitudes Toward Women Politicians	37
Experiences: Interaction, Textbooks, and Extracurricular Activities:	38
10. Social Class	40
11. Teachers Views and Classroom Climate	44
12. Pedagogy and Classroom Practice	46
13. Teacher Preparation: Pre-Service and In-Service	49

14. School Organization 55

References 59



1. What is the status of citizenship education as an explicit goal for schools? (Include any research that deals with the role or effectiveness of the school relative to other social institutions (family, media, religious institutions, peer groups--agents of socialization.)

From Thomas Jefferson in 1785, Horace Mann in 1846, John Dewey in 1916 to leading scholars such as Amy Guttmann, Benjamin Barber, and Harry Boyte today, educating citizens for democracy has been recognized as a primary goal--if not the primary goal--for public schools in the United States (Butts, 1979; Parker, 1996a). In a recent Gallup Poll (Elam, Rose, & Gallup, 1996) when the public was asked about the purpose of schools, "preparing students to be responsible citizens," was identified as the most important goal--above preparing youth to be economically self-sufficient, promoting cultural unity, or improving social conditions. The high priority given to citizenship education as a goal for schools can be seen in recent reports. Indeed, virtually all of the educational reform reports of the 1980s recommended that students receive instruction to prepare them for their role as citizens (Patrick & Hoge, 1991). The civic mission of education in the United States was further reaffirmed recently in the National Education Goals included in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994 (Center for Civic Education, 1994). In particular, goal three, Student Achievement and Citizenship, specified that by the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including civics and government. Goal six, Adult Literacy and Lifelong Learning, mandated that by the year 2000, every adult American will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

All subjects and the general ethos of the school carry some responsibility for citizenship preparation (Butts, 1979; Parker & Kaltsounis, 1986; Shaver, 1977). Additionally, in the United States social studies has been recognized as the subject in the curriculum that carries a particular responsibility for preparing citizens. Within social studies, courses in government, civics, and United States history are especially relevant.

In an extensive study of the history of the social studies in the United States, Hertzberg

(1981) emphasized that citizenship education has been the primary goal for social studies throughout this century. Although not everyone has agreed on the core content and appropriate methods for teaching social studies, most have rested their case for a particular kind of history, social studies, or social science on a view of citizenship education. That is, various factions have argued for emphasizing history, the social sciences, a problems approach, a global or international perspective, or law-related education as the best preparation for citizenship. However, few argue with the fundamental assumption that one purpose among several, if not the central purpose, for social studies in the curriculum of schools in the United States is to prepare youth for their role as citizens in a democracy. Perhaps indicative of the general public's expectations in this area, 62% of respondents in the 1994 Gallup Poll said they would like more emphasis given to history/U.S. Government while 31% wanted the same emphasis that is given now to history and government. Only 77% wanted less emphasis. That compared to more than 75% who wanted more emphasis on mathematics, English, and science while close to 20% wanted less emphasis on those subjects (Elam, Rose & Gallup, 1994).

### Agents of Socialization

Family. A longitudinal study by Moore, Lare, and Wagner (1985) is one of the few studies recently to consider the role of the family in political socialization. The researchers interviewed children in five suburban school districts annually from kindergarten until the children completed the fourth grade. The researchers concluded that during the first years of elementary school, the family had the most influence on political interest and information. The young children were primarily influenced by parental comments about candidates, issues, and governmental processes. The researchers noted that although parents passed on their political consciousness, they generally avoided discussions of political tensions and conflicts with young children (Moore, Lare, & Wagner, 1985).

Several researchers studying samples of adolescents in the 1960s and 1970s found modest positive correlations between parental political beliefs and those of their children, suggesting that

the family had an indirect influence. Adolescents often agreed with their parents' general political orientation--conservative or liberal--and political party identification, but they disagreed with their beliefs about specific issues. Interestingly, the students who were most likely to engage in political action were those who came from homes where open discussion of political ideas was encouraged (Szymanski Sunal, 1991). Additionally, "the greater the amount of discussion in the home, the more likely that the adolescents were highly informed and accepted civic responsibility" (Szymanski Sunal, 1991, p. 295). Parents talking to their children about politics has also been found to relate to student beliefs that they are likely to be politically active adults. Additionally, discussion in the home and anticipated behavior predict later adult participation, according to one longitudinal study (Miller & Kimmel, 1997). The influence of the family in political socialization is most evident in studies that conclude student political knowledge, attitudes, and participation behaviors are influenced by level of parental education and socioeconomic status (Ehman, 1980; Ferguson, 1991; Jennings & Niemi, 1974; Miller, 1985; Miller & Kimmel, 1997; National Assessment, 1990; National Center for Education Statistics, 1995).

Media. In his review of political socialization research, Ehman (1980) noted that up to grade 6, students reported that their main source of political information was the television. Through the 1970s researchers also found that for American adolescents, the mass media, particularly television, were either more important or equally important as school in creating political knowledge and awareness (Ehman, 1980). More recently, Hepburn argued that because television and other aspects of media, such as "talk radio" and the Internet are so pervasive in the United States, political socialization models should depict the media as influencing family, peers, teachers, political figures, and social and religious groups which in turn influence student perceptions as well as indicating the direct influence media have on youth (Hepburn, 1997).

School. Numerous researchers have attempted to determine whether the school's efforts in general and the social studies curriculum in particular have any effect on student civic learning. In an extensive survey of political socialization literature and research on the effects of social studies instruction, Ehman (1980) concluded that from grade 6 to 12, the school is an important source of

political information for American students. In one study students in grades 4 to 6 reported they were more likely to discuss politics and news with teachers than family members. Several researchers found that for students in the 6th- to the 9th-grades, schools were the primary agent transmitting political information. Numerous studies report a positive correlation between students' knowledge and their having had high school courses in civics or government (Ehman, 1980; Patrick & Hoge, 1991). Examining data from the 1988 National Assessment of Educational Progress in Civics, researchers concluded that for students in grades 4,8, and 12, there was a positive relationship between students' average civics proficiency and the amount and frequency of instruction they received in social studies at grade 4 or civics and American government at grades 8 and 12 (National Assessment, 1990; Niemi & Junn, 1998).

When it comes to the development of democratic attitudes and behaviors, as opposed to knowledge, the school tends to be less influential than other sources (Ehman, 1980). For example, in one frequently cited study of a nationally representative sample of high school seniors, researchers concluded that socioeconomic status had more impact than school-related factors on students' political attitudes (Jennings & Niemi, 1974). Other researchers found that school sometimes has an influence on attitudes such as political interest, efficacy, and trust for students from low income families, but not for middle-class students. That was explained by a redundancy hypothesis, which posited that the school simply reinforced messages that middle-class students acquired at home. Although in a few studies of special experimental curriculum, minor effects on participatory attitudes were detectable, for the most part the school curriculum was found to have little or no impact on political attitudes of American youth (Ehman, 1980). The exceptions to this generalization occurred when researchers attended to the variables of classroom climate and school environment, factors that will be discussed in connection with a later question in this review.

2. What are the priorities within formal education programs that attempt to provide preparation for citizenship? (Include here analyses of curriculum concerning the emphasis on political or governmental issues, or on topics such as economics, or on more general moral and social values, or lessons to be gained from history concerning civic virtues. Has there been debate in the literature on the relative importance of goals which are cognitive, attitudinal, or behavioral in nature? Within the cognitive domain, has there been written discussion of knowledge thought to be essential in preparation for citizenship?)

### Curriculum Analyses

In looking at what is taught in social studies at particular grade levels in different school districts and states across the country, several researchers identified the predominance of courses designed to prepare citizens. Looking at a national survey of school districts, a major review of social studies research, and case studies of social studies instruction, researchers reported in 1980 "a virtual national curriculum" (Superka, Hawke, & Morrisett, 1980). In grades 1, 2, and 3, students usually studied families, neighborhoods, and communities. In such instruction, the emphasis was on preparing students to be "good citizens" at the local level. In the 5th-, 8th-, and 11th-grades, students usually studied United States history. In ninth grade they often had a course in civics. Economics and government courses tended to be taught at the 12th-grade, sometimes as electives. The purpose of civics, United States history, and economics courses was most often described as preparing citizens who have an understanding of the principles on which their society rests.

From surveys sent to state and local district social studies supervisors in 1975 and 1983 Gross (1977) and Hahn (1985) found that for grades 7-12, the most widely taught course was United States history and the second most widely taught course was United States government. Indeed, in the 1983 survey, 38 (76%) of the 50 state social studies coordinators said that United States history was a required course, and 31 (62%) said United States government/civics/citizenship was a required course (Hahn, 1985). In 1987, Eckenrod found that government or

civics was required for graduation from high school in about 70% of the states. Furthermore, Eckenrod found that electives in civics or government tended to be offered in the school districts of states that did not require such courses for graduation. Although government and civics are often spoken of together, it appeared that while the 12th grade government course remained in place in most states, civics had fallen from the prominent place it held in grades 7-9 in earlier periods in history (Gross, 1977). By 1987, fewer than 40% of students in grades 7-9 were enrolled annually in civics courses (Eckenrod, 1987). In 1995 government or civics was required in 60% of the states responding to a survey (Czarra, 1995).

The most recent data on this come from an analysis of transcripts of a representative sample of high school graduates (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997). The percentages of graduates who had at least a semester of civics or government in 1982, 1987, 1990, and 1994, respectively, were 62%, 72%, 77%, and 78%. Data from the same study indicate that in 1982, 1987, 1990, and 1994, 82%, 90%, 91%, and 95% of graduates had at least one year of United States history. With regard to a semester course in economics, 27% in 1982, 34% in 1987, 47% in 1990, and 44% of 1994 graduates had such a course.

In the 1983 survey of state social studies coordinators, respondents reported that the highest priority within the curricular area of social studies was citizenship education (Hahn, 1985). The second highest priority they cited was economics education. Other goals for social studies cited by the coordinators in 1983, in priority order, were: critical thinking and problem solving, law-related education, global perspectives, map and globe skills, understanding current events, career education, and ethnic studies. State coordinators in nine states reported that their states required a course in economics before high school graduation. In another study six years later, the state coordinators in 28 states said that some form of instruction in economics was mandated, with 16 states requiring a semester long course in economics for high school graduation (Schug & Walstad, 1991). Other researchers found that infusion into all social studies courses, rather than the teaching of specific economics courses, was the dominant method for including economics in the curriculum (Schug & Walstad, 1991).

### Relative Importance of Cognitive, Attitudinal, and Behavioral Objectives

Throughout the history of social studies in the United States there has been debate about the relative importance of cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral objectives in preparing citizens. At differing times, advocates of one or another position seemed to gain the upper hand. For example, after World War II there was much attention to the development of critical thinking so that citizens would not be vulnerable to propaganda. In the 1970s the National Council for the Social Studies' (NCSS) Curriculum Guidelines asserted that the purpose of social studies was to prepare students to be active, participating, humane citizens in a world that was increasingly interdependent. Toward that end, the NCSS said that the social studies curriculum ought to give attention to four areas: (a) knowledge from the social sciences and other disciplines; (b) abilities, which included critical thinking and problem solving; (c) valuing, which emphasized the weighing of values and instilling the values of rationality and human dignity; and (d) social participation, or the development of behaviors for civic action (National Council for the Social Studies, 1979). In essence, NCSS was saying that the cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral dimensions were all essential.

In recent years, there have been advocates for one dimension over another. Leming (1986) argued that schools should focus on the cognitive domain and leave the attitudinal and behavioral domains to families and other institutions in society. In describing debates over the goals for citizenship preparation, Parker (1996a) noted that political conservatives want students to grasp (cognitively and affectively) the ideas of the founders of the nation. Parker argued that conservative critics such as Alan Bloom, William Bennett, Diane Ravitch, and Chester Finn sought greater attention to the cognitive domain because they were troubled by what students in the United States did not know about national history and core ideas. Mathews (1996) argued that the Center for Civic Education's CIVITAS project, by emphasizing the acquisition of historical knowledge and knowledge about how governments work and what politicians do, also emphasizes cognitive goals for civic education.



Advocates for the current character education movement, on the other hand, emphasize the attitudinal dimension (Lickona, 1991,1993). They call for greater attention to fundamental values such as honesty and respect. Similarly, those who advocate service learning emphasize attitudes and behaviors as they seek to restore what they perceive to be an eroded sense of community (Howard, 1993; Woehrle, 1993) . Critical theorists emphasize the development of attitudes and behaviors that would enable students to critique the existing power arrangements and transform society (Armento, 1991).

There has been no recent survey of intended or implemented curriculum that would verify the proportion of time and attention that is given to any one of the three domains. Individuals speaking and writing about civic education, however, generally assume that attention to the cognitive domain dominates, with some attention to the development of attitudes, and little attention to behaviors.

### Discussion about Essential Knowledge

In the 1970s the United States Department of Education sponsored a series of publications on competencies for civic education. Several of those papers addressed what was considered essential knowledge (Farquar & Dawson, 1979). In the 1980s the Foundation for Teaching Economics sponsored a conference in which experts were asked to make recommendations for citizenship education for the 21st century. The publication from that conference contains recommendations from the perspectives of individuals focusing on political science, economics, sociology, law, the media, political and economic socialization, and citizenship education (Callahan & Banaszak, 1991). The chapter on legal content in the civics curriculum is an example of an argument for knowledge thought to be essential in the cognitive domain. The author, Campbell (1991), argued that students should learn about law and legal processes, including the nature of law, its social functions, its limits, its interrelation with other social ordering resources and social change. Another publication, CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education, produced by the Center for Civic Education (CCE), is a source book of information for use in civic education



programs (Quigley, Buchanan, & Bahmueller, 1991).

Recently the Center for Civic Education directed a major project to develop National Standards for Civics and Government (Center for Civic Education, 1994). Over a period of three years, individuals and groups across the country gave input in writing and in oral testimony. The resulting consensus document contains recommendations for essential knowledge in five domains. Those domains are: (a) civic life, politics, and government; (b) foundations of the American political system; (c) purposes, values, and principles of American democracy as embodied in our constitutional government; (d) relationship of the United States to other nations and to world affairs; and (e) the roles of the citizen in American democracy.

The National Council for the Social Studies' (1994) Curriculum Standards for Social Studies also offers recommendations for essential knowledge for citizenship, as well as for knowledge in other areas such as historic and global learning. Geography for Life (Geography Education Standards Project, 1994) and the National Standards for History (National Center for History in the Schools, 1996) further recommend essential knowledge in social studies that is related to the preparation of citizens. The history standards were the subject of much national debate as political leaders, educators, and the public argued over whose history should be taught to young citizens (Education Week, April 10, 1996; Social Education, January, 1996). Most recently, associations of economics educators (National Council on Economic Education, 1997) and global educators (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1996) have developed standards for essential knowledge from their perspectives. These standards have implications for the preparation of citizens.

3. How are programs of civic education organized? (Is citizenship education addressed through subjects such as history or literature, through more interdisciplinary programs such as social studies or social science, through courses focused on conduct such as moral or character education, or through specific courses in citizenship or civic education? To what extent are the school or community thought of as places in which the student should study and practice citizenship skills, e.g. by participating in student government or in community activities or service?)

As noted in response to question 2, surveys of curriculum across states and school districts, have concluded that in the first three grades of school, students usually have social studies instruction which focuses on families, the neighborhood, and communities (Superka et al., 1980). Students learn about "community helpers" such as fire and police workers and about being "good citizens." They are also taught that good behavior is characteristic of "good citizens" and often report cards have included a place for "citizenship" that reflected student behavior in class (Superka et al., 1980).

### Differing Emphases

Although there has been general agreement in the United States that schools have a responsibility for citizenship education there has been disagreement as to what form it should take. While many people through the years have argued that teaching national history and civics/government (some would add economics) is the best preparation for citizenship, others have called for practice in the analysis of public problems (Hertzberg, 1981). As early as 1916 the influential Committee on the Social Studies recommended that in preparation for citizenship, students should not only study American history, but they should also take courses in community civics and problems in democracy (POD) (Hertzberg, 1981; Parker, 1996a). The new courses would give students practice in investigating social problems, deliberating about alternative courses of action, making decisions about the best solutions, and when possible, taking action in local

situations. In the 1930s and 1940s programs in such practical democracy and a problems approach were advocated by followers of Dewey, Rugg, and Hanna. In the 1950s and 1960s Hunt and Metcalf argued that the best preparation for democratic citizenship was investigation into the closed areas or controversial issues of society. In the period of the 1960s to the 1980s, Oliver and Shaver developed an approach for the study of public policy issues, Newmann designed programs to prepare youth for civic action, Kohlberg advocated democratic dialogue to foster "just communities" in schools, and Engle and Ochoa argued for designing curriculum in counter socialization (Hahn, 1996a; Parker, 1996a). Although this tradition of preparation for active citizenship by way of investigation into and discussion about public issues has long been a theme in social studies education in the United States, most researchers have concluded that few classrooms actually implement such an approach (Evans, 1989). Rather, social studies instruction--much of it ostensibly for citizenship education--tends to be characterized by reliance on a textbook, teacher talk, and student recitation (Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979; Superka et al., 1980).

In the 1980s the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) tried to tackle the question of scope and sequence in social studies. After hearing a diversity of views, the NCSS Task Force on Scope and Sequence published a report in which five alternative organizational approaches were offered as possibilities for local schools to consider (Social Education, 1986). A few years later the task force on curriculum of the National Commission on the Social Studies (1989) issued another report, Charting a Course in which yet another sequence was illustrated. That, too, had supporters and critics. Then in the 1990s, the series of national standards for social studies, civics and government, geography, and history, all had implications for modifications in the ways that social studies courses are organized.

### Extra Curricular Activities

In addition to the varied emphasis in content and processes for social studies education, the general ethos of the school and opportunities for student participation and decision making

contribute to civic education (Ehman, 1980; Hepburn, 1983). The American high school has characteristically had an extensive extra curricular program. It is assumed that by providing youth an opportunity for a rich associational life in secondary school, they will be prepared for later civic life. In one study that used a nationally representative sample of high school seniors, 82 % of students reported being involved in at least one activity, such as athletics, subject matter clubs, student government, or the school newspaper (Damico, Conway, & Damico, 1996).

Additionally, recent movements for character education (Lickona, 1991, 1993) and service learning (Howard, 1993; Woehrle, 1993) address the whole school's role in citizenship education. In the 1996 Gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public school, 66 % of the respondents said they favored a requirement for high school graduation that all students perform some kind of community service (Elam, et al., 1996). Researchers have found that when community-service experiences accompany systematic study of relevant issues, beneficial civic outcomes occur (Wade & Saxe, 1996).

4. To what extent is formal education addressing civic identity development in students, including national identity, sub-national identities, and supranational identities? (Studies of national identity and patriotic feeling among children and youth are relevant here. In addition, how are the identities of diverse ethnic or linguistic groups recognized and depicted in teaching programs? To what extent is students' learning about supranational units or identities an issue? Include studies of the extent or effectiveness of global or international education.)

#### Studies of National Identity and Patriotic Feeling

Early political socialization researchers, such as Hess and Torney (1967), reported that most young children in the United States hold positive feelings toward their country and its system of government before they have much detailed knowledge about the government or civic heritage. Similar findings have been reported by researchers since then (Patrick & Hoge, 1991). High school students of today, although more cynical than younger students about government and politics, also tend to have positive general feelings toward their country and its system of government. They are likely to agree that a "good citizen" can disagree with or dislike government leaders and policies, yet still be loyal to the United States (Patrick & Hoge, 1991, p. 431).

In a recent study of middle school students' (grades 5-8) perceptions of historical significance, researchers identified several indications of national identity development (Barton & Levstik, 1997). Fourteen groups of students were asked to select from a set of 14 pictures with captions the most important ones to include on a timeline of the past 500 years. For the most part, students chose pictures and gave explanations that focused on the origin and development of the United States. All of the groups selected the American Revolution as significant, using pronouns such as "our" and "we," regardless of their own ethnic background, gender, or recency of their families' immigration to the United States. Students had internalized that the American Revolution was where "we" began. Additionally, all groups chose the Bill of Rights, saying such things as "it gave us all of our freedoms and rights." Students emphasized especially protections of speech, press, and religion. Further, many students reported that the Bill of Rights set "us" apart from

other nations. Twelve out of the 14 groups chose the picture depicting the Emancipation Proclamation, ten chose the one related to civil rights, and seven chose the one about women's suffrage, explaining their selections in terms of the extension of rights and freedoms already enjoyed by other Americans. The researchers noted that the progressive development and extension of American freedom and rights was the most frequently mentioned theme in students' responses--regardless of age, gender, or racial and ethnic background (Barton & Levstik, 1997, p. 13). Students also associated technological progress with the history of their country. Dissent and oppression were "flattened" in their perceptions; "rights were given not wrested from a resistant society" (p. 20). These students' national identity appeared to be rooted in a sense of their nations' progress and historic commitment to freedom and individual rights.

#### Subnational Identities (Ethnic Diversity)

The identities of diverse ethnic groups are conveyed to students in social studies textbooks. In a 1980 review of studies on the status of the social studies, it was reported that textbooks of the late 1970s depicted a more racially and ethnically pluralistic society than had those 20 years earlier (Superka et al., 1980, p. 366). In a review of literature on teaching government, civics, and law, Patrick and Hoge (1991) noted that textbooks of the 1980s were more likely to reflect the ethnic and racial diversity and social pluralism in the United States than had earlier textbooks. Indeed, by 1990, some critics complained that textbooks were excessive in their emphasis on social pluralism and cultural diversity and deficient in their treatment of national unity and the common good (Patrick & Hoge, 1991).

Within the context of developing national and ethnic identities in a pluralistic society, students' attitudes towards the principles of diversity and unity are important. In one recent study of students in India and Canada as well as the United States, students were asked if they thought that cultural diversity was a strength or a problem in society (Dash & Niemi, 1992). In the sample of convenience of 11th-graders in six American high schools (urban, suburban, small town, and rural), 37% said that diversity was a source of cultural strength, 48% said that there could be unity

in diversity if the common aspects of United States culture were emphasized, and 14% said diversity leads to disunity and conflict in the nation. It is not known whether the students' views in this study are representative of those held by most American youth of that age.

### Supranational Identity Development (Global Education)

Lambert and Klineberg (1967) conducted a study of children's perceptions of their own and other countries. This study included a sample from the United States. By age 14, the American students in the sample were less open to positive views of foreign nations than were students at age 6 and 10. A decade later, Pike and Barrows (1976) conducted a survey to investigate how children in the United States viewed foreign nations and peoples. They found that students in the fourth grade held a "we-they" orientation, viewing the United States as the most desirable, richest, strongest, and largest country. The 8th- and 12th-graders in the study, however, saw the United States as more a part of the world, sharing characteristics with other countries.

Several researchers have examined whether particular instructional programs can influence students' attitudes toward other cultures, peoples, and nations and develop in students a global perspective toward issues. In reviews of that research, Leming (1992) and Massialas (1991) concluded that the programs had no effects or trivial effects. However, Hahn (1996a) emphasized that when one considers the ways in which programs are taught, it appears that global education programs can make a difference. Hahn reported that increased global knowledge, positive attitudes toward others, and a concern for global issues are found when global education programs are characterized by a combination of: (a) issues-centered content; (b) pedagogy in which students explore alternative positions; and (c) a climate in which students are comfortable expressing their views.

Textbook content is an aspect of the social studies curriculum that has received attention by researchers interested in what students learn about other people and cultures. Researchers reviewing textbook studies reported that social studies textbooks of the 1970s were less

chauvinistic and narrowly nationalistic than textbooks had been in the 1950s (Superka et al., 1980). The newer social studies textbooks were more likely to include information about peoples outside of the United States and to stress the interdependence of peoples around the world than had their earlier counterparts.



5. *To what extent is civic education intended to contribute to the resolution of inter-group conflicts and tensions?* (What research has been conducted on internal tensions as they affect children and youth, for example between ethnic, linguistic, and religious groups, or related to immigration? What role are programs of civic education trying to play in improving tolerance and are there programs whose evaluations have been encouraging on this topic?)

Literature on social studies as citizenship education and on multicultural education are relevant here. Citizenship education and multicultural education have developed as two distinct topics, literatures, and professional communities that influence social studies (Parker, 1997). In a discussion on the tension between unity and diversity, Parker argued that multicultural educators have worked for inclusion while paying too little attention to the nature of the public space where inclusion is sought. At the same time, citizenship education has ignored the idea that social and cultural diversity does exist, and has assumed that a public space exists that allows inclusion. Consequently, there is a tension within and between the two movements of citizenship education and multicultural education. As noted by Gay (1997), Parker (1997), and Kaltsounis (1997), a common ground does exist between multicultural education and citizenship education. Further both perspectives have at different times addressed the resolution of intergroup conflict and tensions through the social studies curriculum.

A central theme of much philosophical and conceptual discourse about social studies and citizenship education has been what and how to teach for cross-cultural understanding and pluralistic democracy. Additionally, a relatively small body of research has addressed the linkages between social studies and what youth learn about groups of people who see themselves as having less power than dominant groups (Banks, 1994).

Alternative views of how one prepares youth for citizenship are heard in the discourse about inclusion and perspectives regarding intergroup relations and reduction of tensions. There is no consensus among researchers and educators concerning the kind of information students should learn about other groups in social studies classes. However, there is ample evidence about the

negative effect that mismatches in teaching styles of teachers and the learning styles of students can have on the academic achievement of culturally different students (Gay, 1991).

Problems of omission and perspective that affect civic education have been a concern in multicultural education. Powerless groups in America have often been excluded from the curriculum or viewed through the perspectives of dominant groups (Anyon, 1979; Banks, 1988; Ladson-Billings, 1992b; McIntosh, 1989). The practice of exclusion and narrow perspective has fueled debate among researchers and educators. The central theme of this debate is centered on whose perspective and experiences should be included in the social studies curriculum (Banks, 1991). Banks (1991) noted that a major purpose of multicultural education is to reform educational institutions so that students from diverse racial, ethnic, religious, and social class groups will experience educational equality. In contrast, critics argue that inclusion and perspective-taking defeat the purpose of democracy and hinder the development of a common American identity (Bloom, 1987; Schlesinger, Jr., 1991). Ravitch (1990), argued that diversity has received too much attention. She argued that more attention should be given to those factors that unite Americans as citizens than to those factors that divide Americans. Researchers who support inclusion and multiple perspectives argued on the basis of motive and the accuracy of knowledge (Ladson-Billings, 1992a). Multiculturalists theorized that conservative forces have expended great energy in the struggle to maintain control over larger social and political agendas (Banks, 1994; Giroux, 1993)

### Intergroup Relations and Tension Reduction

Banks (1991) noted that, during the 1940s and 1950s, national education organizations--including the Progressive Education Association, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the American Council on Education--actively supported school efforts to foster positive intergroup relations. Banks argued that past educational reform movements, such as the intergroup and cultural pluralism movements, were doomed to fail because they were never fully integrated into school curricula or teacher education. Further, he contended that the justification for the inclusion

of multicultural content in the social studies is not supported by empirical evidence of the effects of such material on student behavior or attitudes. Banks went on to suggest that the call for multicultural content in social studies education is based on the fundamental principles of truth in historical knowledge and a commitment to democratic principles. Banks posited that mainstream educators did not embrace the goals of the intergroup education movement and cultural pluralism because the movements were viewed as marginal and not important to the central goals of American schools. Another important theme of Banks's argument was the idea that the intergroup relations reform movement was viewed as relevant only to regions or schools affected by racial conflict. Banks concluded that permanent change was not achieved by the intergroup and cultural pluralism movement because the reforms were not embraced by educators who believed that the emphasis should be on assimilating all Americans into a common culture.

More than 40 years ago, Taba (1955) suggested that social studies education was an area where the consistency in topics, sequences, course titles, and textbook contents offered promise for teaching cross cultural understanding. However, since the 1950s, schools have made little progress toward implementing programs to address intergroup relations and conflict resolution (Banks, 1994).

There is, in sum, evidence in the literature to support, and evidence to refute, the goal of citizenship education as a way to foster intergroup relations and reduce tensions. There is additional evidence to suggest that what youth learn about minority groups through their schooling experiences may be limited by questions of inclusion and perspective. Much of the research is theoretical and philosophical, and most of the studies focus on kindergarten and elementary school children. Consequently, very little is known about what 13- to 15-year-olds may be learning about minority groups. The problem is further highlighted by the polarized nature of the current debate about the extent to which the historical experiences and cultures of people of color should be included in the curriculum.

### Improving Tolerance

Banks (1994) reviewed research on the various types of attitude modification studies that examined the effects of materials and other curricular experiences related to race. Most of the studies reviewed by Banks were conducted on preschool, kindergarten, and elementary children. Research evidence that describes the results of interventions designed to change adolescent students' racial attitudes is noticeably absent in the literature. Banks confirmed this lack of research with his observation that little empirical research has been done on the nature of citizenship education programs that address the racial attitudes and tolerance for diversity of youths 13-15 years old.

### Racial Attitudes

Researchers have investigated the characteristics of children's racial attitudes since the 1920s (Banks, 1994). Since the intergroup education movement of the 1940s and 1950s, a number of investigators have designed interventions to help students develop more positive racial attitudes and values (Avery, 1992; Taba, 1955; Trager & Yarrow, 1952). Jackson (1944) and Agnes (1947), for example, used reading materials to examine the racial attitudes of children. These authors both concluded that reading materials about African Americans helped students develop more positive racial attitudes. Banks (1991) noted, however, that many of the early studies were limited by serious problems with precision and methodology. Trager and Yarrow's (1952) study is viewed as an exception, and is credited by Banks as being well designed. Trager and Yarrow found that a democratic curriculum had a positive effect on the racial attitudes of students. Children who participated in the intervention curriculum expressed more positive racial attitudes and behaviors than the students who participated in a curriculum that taught the dominant views and attitudes of United States society.

Proshansky (1966) and Stephan (1985) reviewed studies of the modification of adults' racial attitudes; Cook (1947) and Katz (1976) summarized research on this topic related to children. Consistent findings of the reviews of the research with adults and the studies with

children were the absence, in the original studies, of clarity and detail about interventions and a failure to address long-term effects. Stephan (1985) noted that little of the intervention research in educational settings addressed alternative approaches to improving racial tolerance. Stephan concluded that, because most of the studies were conducted with black and white samples, findings cannot be generalized to other racial or ethnic groups.

Cusick (1991) conducted a more recent review of descriptive evidence related to student groups and the influence of these groups on what students learn in school about citizenship. Based on these studies, Cusick reported that it is unlikely adolescents will learn to think of “larger social and political structures as ‘a community’ and themselves as members of the community.” He argued that students learn to limit their personal interest and involvement in large school based social structures. Cusick said that students who feel that they have a stake in their own small community or other social institutions are more likely to participate actively in this small setting than in larger whole school institutions. This preference for engagement with peer group institutions over whole school institutions may, Cuisick concluded, indeed influence what students learn about citizenship. Cusick further suggested that this isolation from large social structures is retained when these individuals leave school, and so continues to influence perceptions of citizenship.

Based on the research reviewed in this section, it may be reasonable to conclude that children and adolescents do bring misconceptions about people of different ethnicities to their schooling experiences. The evidence also indicates that students’ racial attitudes can be modified to be more democratic. Because much of the research has been conducted on young children, there is more evidence to suggest that the attitudes of children, as compared to adolescents and adults, can be changed (Katz, 1976). There is general agreement among educators and researchers that the lack of an agreed purpose and cohesiveness has prevented social studies from providing an adequate framework for addressing intergroup relations and tensions. As a result, intergroup relations were never fully integrated into the social studies curriculum in the United States. Such programs were often superficially treated as part of a special holiday or ritualized exercise. Race,

ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion, and social class make intergroup relations in the United States complex and complicate the role of civic education in teaching about and for a diverse society.

6. To what extent is there agreement about appropriate criteria for excellence and the nature of exemplary practice in civic education programs? (What has been written about educational standards in this area for best practice and for outcomes at the regional or national level? How has their achievement been evaluated? Has there been any kind of national assessment in this area? Have there been any studies of schools where citizenship education is exemplary, and what distinguishes these schools?)

Although no studies were identified that document the extent to which there is agreement about criteria for excellence in civic education, there have been reports of major initiatives to identify and build support for high quality civic education. For example, in the late 1970s, the citizen education staff of the United States Office of Education, with input from scholars and activists in civic education, prepared a series of publications to promote the development of civic competencies (Farquar & Dawson, 1979). At about the same time, the National Council for the Social Studies published the bulletin Democratic Education in Schools and Classrooms (Hepburn, 1983) which contained the NCSS position statement on Democratization of Schools, recommendations for making civic education more democratic, and illustrations of exemplary practice.

In the fall of 1988, the Foundation for Teaching Economics and the Constitutional Rights Foundation convened a national conference for the purpose of conceptualizing a civics curriculum that would build on new scholarship in political science, law, economics, sociology, learning theory, and media studies. Citizenship Education for the 21st Century (Callahan & Banaszak, 1991), the publication from that conference, contains recommendations for instruction and desired outcomes in civic education to meet the anticipated needs of students and society in the 21st century.

In recent years, the Center for Civic Education has played a leading role in developing criteria for excellence and assessment of standards in civic education. Their publication CIVITAS: A Framework for Civic Education (Quigley, Buchanan, & Bahmueller, 1991) is a compendium of

information designed “to outline the content and core of knowledge defining the values, concepts, and principles underlying the American politically organized community and democratic constitutional order.” (p. xix). Sections on civic virtue, civic participation, and civic knowledge contain implications for what students should learn and be able to do. That publication was widely distributed by the National Council for the Social Studies, as well as the Center for Civic Education.

### National Standards

The Center for Civic Education also directed the project responding to the call for national standards in the area of civics to implement the Goals 2000: Education America Act. The resulting publication National Standards for Civics and Government (Center for Civic Education, 1994) was developed with input from individuals all over the country, in a deliberate effort to build consensus about criteria for excellence in civic education. The Standards are illustrated with examples of good practice at primary, middle, and high school levels. Standards at each grade level are organized around the following five thematic questions: (a) What is government and what should it do? (b) What are the basic values and principles of American democracy? (c) How does the government established by the Constitution embody the purposes, values, and principles of American democracy? (d) What is the relationship of the United States to other nations and to world affairs? and (e) What are the roles of the citizen in American democracy? The voluntary standards are intended to provide a basis for curricular revision at the state and local level. In a survey of the states, Czarra (1995) found that: (a) more than 95% of the 36 individuals responsible for social studies or curriculum and assessment at the state level reported that the National Standards for Civics and Government would be useful in the development of state curriculum frameworks; and (b) 92% of the respondents estimated that the Standards would be useful in the development of curriculum frameworks by local education agencies.

The National Standards for Civics and Government are not the only national standards that have been developed to provide guidance to curriculum developers in the area of civic education.



The National Council for the Social Studies' (1994) Curriculum Standards for Social Studies also contain recommendations for exemplary practice in civic education. Although the ten themes that run through the standards are to be used together in an integration of knowledge from multiple disciplines to develop competent citizens, two themes in particular provide criteria for excellence in civic education. They are Theme 6: Power and Authority, and Theme 10: Civic Ideals. Other sets of standards and guidelines that focus on geography, history, economics, and global perspectives also contain recommendations that are applicable to criteria for excellence in civic education (Collins, Czarra, & Smith, 1996; Geography Education Standards Project, 1994; National Center for History in the Schools, 1994; National Council on Economic Education, 1997). Research is not yet available, however, on the level of implementation of the various standards documents. Thus, it is not possible to ascertain the degree of consensus at the school level on criteria for excellence as represented in standards documents.

### Assessment

With regard to assessment of generally agreed upon goals in civic education, the major national efforts have been those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Past NAEP assessments of civics and citizenship were conducted for citizenship in 1969-70, social studies (including citizenship) in 1971-72, social studies (including citizenship) in 1975-76, citizenship and social studies 1981-82, and civics, United States government, and politics in 1988. (See next question for further detail).

The most recent national assessment was done in Spring 1998. Toward that end, the NAEP Civics Consensus Project (1996) developed a framework using criteria in the areas of civic knowledge, intellectual skills, participatory skills, and civic dispositions. The framework draws heavily on the National Standards for Civics and Government. In addition to this national effort, assessments at the state level use criteria and instruments developed by state groups and commercial companies.

Finally organizations such as the National Council for the Social Studies and the National

Council on Economic Education give awards for outstanding school programs that foster civic purposes. However, no studies were identified that analyze the characteristics of programs that are considered to be “exemplary.”

7. How do students or young adults view and understand citizenship, and to what extent do they reach the levels of achievement or skills desired in this area? (Here empirical research on political socialization, on youth studies of attitudes, and from national assessments will be especially important.)

Branson (1988) reported that Americans of all ages believe that America is unique among nations and “seek to strengthen their self described uniqueness” (p.14). Branson said that Americans’ pride in country develops in early childhood and persists into adolescence, resulting in secondary school students who are a “fundamentally loyal and supportive--but not rabidly patriotic--group of citizens” (p.7). Americans of all ages, said Branson, “express a degree of patriotism that is remarkable when compared to other industrial societies” (p.4). In 1985, Branson stated that even when they have hostile feelings towards how the government is run, young people in the United States still view the system as a whole in a positive light.

Johnson (1986) conducted a study in three Northeastern high schools to determine the attitudes of the students toward freedoms guaranteed by the United States Constitution. Johnson reported that 72 % of the participants in the study believed that the most important components of good citizenship are respect for authority and obedience to the law.

In Democracy’s Next Generation: A Study of Youth and Teachers, People for the American Way (1989) presented the results of a nationwide telephone survey of 1006 young people 15 to 24 years of age and 405 social studies teachers, 100 hour-long interviews with young people, and two focus groups of social studies teachers. People for the American Way reported that young people focus on the privileges of American citizenship, notably freedom, while down playing the responsibilities of citizenship. The group said that most young people equate good citizenship with being a good person rather than being engaged in the political process or community action. Young people consider “professional success, family life, and personal happiness far more important than community involvement and public life” (p. 28). People for the American Way also reported that teachers and young people agreed that this “elevation of the

individual over the collective interest is more pronounced among current youth than in years past” (p. 28).

Social studies educators and researchers appear to agree on what knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors are needed to prepare young people to successfully fill the role of citizen in the United States of America. The knowledge domain of citizenship includes: (a) democratic principles and the purpose of government; (b) structure and functions of government; (c) political processes; (d) international affairs; and (e) constitutional rights, responsibilities, and the law. The skills necessary for effective citizenship include the ability to: (a) develop questions that serve to guide inquiry into civic issues; (b) generate multiple options for civic action; (c) interpret political information presented in graphs, tables, or text; (d) distinguish between statements of fact and statements of opinion; and (e) analyze, evaluate and make decisions about civic issues. Attitudes identified as important to citizenship include: (a) understanding that loyalty to the nation and its Constitution does not exclude opposition of political leaders and/or policies; (b) belief in the value of the Constitution, the system of government, and the nation; (c) support for majority rule and minority rights; (d) appreciation of the importance of political participation; (e) belief in the importance of each individual’s vote; (f) concern for the well being and dignity of others; (g) rejection of discrimination against individuals on the basis of race, gender, socioeconomic status, religious beliefs, or political opinions; (h) development of interest in political and civic issues; and (i) possession of positive political and civic self-efficacy. Behaviors associated with preparing young people for future citizenship center around participation in school-based activities, such as student government, clubs, and athletics, and involvement in local politics and civics (Ehman, 1980; National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1976; Patrick & Hoge, 1991).

The overarching impression from the literature is that the levels of preparation for future citizenship of young people in the United States is declining. The problem is most pronounced in the domain of knowledge, while the picture is more hopeful with respect to attitudes and beliefs. Skills and behavior are discussed under question 8.

### Student Achievement: Knowledge

- Fifth amendment rights are not widely understood by adolescents (NAEP, 1976).
- Many students do not understand: (a) how the federal and state governments are organized; (b) the different roles and responsibilities of the three branches of government; nor (c) the system of checks and balances (NAEP, 1978).
- Knowledge of: (a) the structure and function of government; (b) political processes; and (c) international affairs declined in the 1970s (Ehman, 1980).
- Knowledge of: (a) the structures and functions of particular institutions; (b) the responsibilities of different levels of government; and (c) the rights and responsibilities of citizens declined significantly for 17-year-olds in 1988 compared to previous NAEP assessments, but remained constant, or even improved, for 13-year-olds (NAEP, 1990).
- Students are unfamiliar with the founding documents of the United States (NAEP, 1990).
- Many young people do not understand the specifics of government structures and functions; even fewer exhibit broad and multifaceted understanding of the institutions of government (NAEP, 1990).
- Many students are either unfamiliar with the detailed powers and responsibilities of the president, or are limited in their ability to express what they know in writing (NAEP, 1990).
- Relatively few students understand the system of checks and balances and the separation of powers (NAEP, 1990).
- Most high school students lack detailed knowledge and understanding of institutions, principles, and processes of government, law, and politics. A majority of students misunderstand the powers and duties of the President and the federal judiciary, and have shallow or confounded conceptions of core principles, such as constitutionalism, democracy, and federalism (Patrick & Hoge, 1991).
- A large majority of 17-year-olds (over 80%) can give acceptable definitions of democracy

(NAEP, 1990).

- A majority of 8th-grade students (60%) understand the nature of political institutions and the relationship between citizens and government. In particular, these students are aware of ways to influence government, including the right to vote (NAEP, 1990)
- Students who have had courses in civics or government are more knowledgeable about government and politics than students without such instruction (NAEP, 1990; Niemi & Junn, 1998).
- Students--particularly at the elementary and middle school levels--who participate in law-related education programs are more knowledgeable about law related concepts and processes than they were prior to instruction and as compared to students who do not experience such instruction (Giese, 1997; Johnson & Hunter, 1997; Skeel, 1991).

#### Student Attitudes and Beliefs

- Young people have favorable attitudes towards the Constitution, the American system of government, and the nation (Patrick & Hoge, 1991).
- Students express positive feelings about constitutional democracy. However, they hold simplistic conceptions that do not account for the inevitable tensions between majority rule and minority rights. They tend to understand and value majority-rule more than minority-rights. Support for the latter declines when applied to unpopular groups or individuals. (Patrick & Hoge, 1991).
- Students' attitudes related to racial issues, and their awareness of conflict resolution as an alternative to conflict, have improved slightly (Ehman, 1980).

8. *For what rights and responsibilities of participation are students being prepared in their own political system or society, and how much does their experience acquaint them with broader perspectives not limited to those of their own ethnic group or nation?* (Here also empirical research on political socialization, on youth studies especially peer group participation, and on attitudes towards law and authority will be important.)

The literature makes it clear that a crucial goal of the citizenship component of social studies education is to prepare students to participate in the political processes of the nation by influencing, evaluating, responding to, and implementing civic decisions (Angell, 1991; Patrick & Hoge, 1991). Angell stated that civic education should equip students with the desires and abilities to participate in the transformation of society and to reject complacent acquiescence to the status quo. Patrick and Hoge noted, however, that textbooks, especially at the elementary level, focus on “statements about civic traditions, norms, patriotic rituals, conformity to rules and laws, and other facets of dutiful social behavior” (p.429) with banal prescriptions for good citizenship being emphasized to the point of redundancy. They complained that textbooks: (a) do not offer critical or alternative views of government and civic traditions; (b) are too supportive of the status quo; and (c) pay little attention to “political processes, ideas, and issues” (p.430). Patrick and Hoge concluded that textbooks fail to emphasize the importance of political participation in a democracy.

Bickmore (1993) said that societal conflict is inevitable. Furthermore, this conflict is an important agent of change in a pluralistic democracy, according to Bickmore. Therefore, she argued, young people need the information and skills to handle the conflicts that arise in society if they are to be incorporated into society as effective citizens.

Parker, McDaniel, and Valencia (1991) reported that middle school students can be prepared to clarify, analyze, and apply information learned through the study of history to “recurrent public problems and legal-ethical dilemmas pertinent to the general welfare in democratic societies” (p.41). Parker, Mueller, and Wending (1989) stated that “high school students generally can construct dialectical models of public controversies ... and are capable of taking and

interrogating a position on a civic issue” (p.22). Both studies by Parker and his colleagues, while reporting that students possess these capabilities, implied that typical middle and high school social studies curriculum do little to encourage their development and application.

Although not linking the issue to the preparation of students for political participation, Patrick and Hoge (1991) stated that textbooks of the 1980s did a better job of reflecting the diversity of the American people than the textbooks of the 1960s. They cautioned, however, that recent textbooks have been criticized for an overemphasis on cultural diversity and social pluralism at the expense of consideration of national unity and the common good.

Results of national assessments described in response to the previous question shed some light on how effectively students are being prepared for their rights and responsibilities as citizens. Further, research on service learning indicates that when service learning opportunities are offered in the context of systematic study, then students acquire knowledge, abilities, and attitudes that may lead to later adult community participation (Wade & Saxe, 1996). Finally, research on female participation in community and political activities indicates that females who participated in extra-curricular activities in high school are more likely than non participating peers to be community and political activists as adults (Damico, Damico, & Conway, 1998).



9. *Do male and female students develop different conceptions of citizenship and do they develop different roles in the political process? (Political socialization research concerning whether male and female students do in fact see the civic culture and citizenship differently, whether these differences influence their knowledge and behavior, and to what extent this appears to be a result of their experience of citizenship education will be relevant.)*

### Conceptions of Citizenship

To capture female as well as male experiences, several scholars have recommended that civic educators stress citizenship in a broad context that includes membership in families and communities in addition to the traditional consideration of state and national politics (Bernard-Powers, 1996; Noddings, 1992; Rettinger, V. S. 1993; Stone, 1996). However, only two studies were identified that examined gender differences in student perceptions of citizenship and of issues related to citizenship.

In the first study, Rettinger (1993) extended Gilligan's (1982) work on gender differences in perceptions of justice to an analysis of student interviews about justice and citizenship. In her interviews with sixth grade students, Rettinger found that female students viewed law, justice, and civic action differently than did male students. Both boys and girls in the study were concerned about laws that treated people unequally. The girls, but not the boys, were concerned that such laws would cause suffering and destabilize networks of personal relationships. The girls were especially aware of ways in which women have been treated unfairly, and seemed determined to change society.

Most of the girls in Rettinger's (1993) study said that they would wield political power differently than did the boys. The girls' ideas were consistent with a conception of politics that emphasized people connecting with others to speak out and act. In contrast, the boys emphasized the importance of hierarchy in power relationships. Rettinger speculated that the difference in boys' and girls' views of political power may explain why boys tend to do better than girls on test items about the structure--that is, the hierarchies--of government.

The second study to provide insight to this question was a case study of two ninth-grade civics classes conducted by Hahn (1996b). The 14- to 15-year-old male and female students in this study tended to define "good citizenship" as voting and being a good neighbor. Only a few students of either gender expressed any interest in politics or government. The girls, however, did indicate an interest in a greater number of social issues than did the boys. The female students expressed strong opinions about abortion, the death penalty, and environmental issues. Several girls also said they were interested in education, school prayer, drugs, drinking, marriage, dating, and the school dress code, and a few mentioned international issues they had discussed in their civics class. Fewer male than female participants expressed interest in issues, and the issues they identified were fewer in number--America's role in the world, the national deficit, the death penalty, and some international events--than those named by the girls. However, neither boys nor girls in the study necessarily equated issues that interested them with the political arena. When asked, "what comes to mind when you think of politics, government, or current events," most respondents, irrespective of gender, named male political leaders.

Overall, the students in Hahn's (1996b) case study seemed to distinguish between the roles of citizens and politicians, and female students' interest in a range of social issues did not appear to be linked with politics. Unfortunately, larger studies using representative samples that explored gender differences in conceptions of citizenship were not found; most of the available research focused on gender differences in political knowledge and attitudes.

### Political Knowledge and Interest

Greenstein's 1961 study of elementary school children established the tradition of asking pupils about their knowledge of political leaders, virtually all of whom were male, and about structures and processes of government (Hahn, 1996b). Since that time, political socialization researchers in the United States have repeatedly concluded that male students know more about the political arena than do female students. By defining "political" in narrow terms, researchers may have missed the meanings that many students hold of citizenship in a community context. Moore,

Lare, and Wagner (1985) speculated that "children learn in school about Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, but they rarely hear anything about Susan B. Anthony and Jane Addams. The schools, as well as parents, perpetuate, perhaps unknowingly, the notion that political activity and public service is the province of men by continuing the long-standing emphasis on the traditional political heroes--virtually all of them male" (p. 130). Ironically, Moore and colleagues did not ask about female figures or issues that might interest girls.

Other researchers looked at secondary as well as elementary school students, with most concluding that boys tended to be more knowledgeable than girls about the political arena. In the 1970s, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) researchers, working with nationally representative samples, reported that although there were no apparent gender differences in social studies knowledge for nine-year-old students, at ages 13 and 17 girls did less well than boys on items measuring knowledge of facts about government, the law, and international problems (Education Commission of the States, 1971, 1973, 1974). Similarly in the 1976, 1982, and 1988 civics assessments, the mean for female achievement at both ages 13 and 17 was lower than that of males (National Assessment, 1990). The difference was greatest for the older students and for students achieving the highest proficiency levels.

In the 1980s, NAEP researchers once again concluded that 11th-grade female students scored lower than male students on factual knowledge of United States history. The largest gender differences were found in areas dealing with World War II, foreign policy, territorial expansion, chronology, and maps. Items requiring knowledge of document contents and social and economic history, yielded smaller differences, leading the authors to hypothesize that gender differences in knowledge were attributable to different interests of male and female students (Applebee, Langer, & Mullis, 1987).

At about the same time, another researcher hypothesized that gender differences on tests of historical and political knowledge were attributable to differing interests in the content of test questions (Kneedler, 1988). On California's statewide assessment, males scored higher than females on 81 of 136 questions related to citizenship and government. However, looking at results

by item revealed an interesting pattern. The boys did better on questions related to the structure of government, wars, documents, and geography; the girls did better on questions about democratic processes, rights, and responsibilities, and on items in which the subject was a woman (Kneedler, 1988).

Further, in a longitudinal study that followed a nationally representative sample of eighth graders, females scored lower than males at both the 8th and 10th grade in the area of history/citizenship/geography (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995). Unfortunately results were not analyzed by item type.

Not all researchers found these systematic gender differences. Using smaller, and for the most part non-representative samples, contradictory results were obtained. On the one hand, several researchers concluded male students were more knowledgeable about and interested in politics than female students (Harper, 1987; Owen & Dennis, 1988). On the other hand, several researchers found no gender differences in civic knowledge or interest (Avery & Hahn, 1985; Blankenship, 1990; Hahn, 1996b; Hepburn & Napier, 1982-83; Orum, Cohen, Grasmuck, & Orum, 1977; Segall, 1975). Moreover, in one study, 8th-grade girls reported more positive political attitudes than did boys (Hepburn & Napier, 1982-83).

#### Political Trust, Efficacy, Confidence, and Participation

With only a few exceptions, most researchers found no gender differences in political trust, efficacy, and confidence. Although Orum and colleagues (Orum, et al., 1977) found elementary school girls to be more trusting of political leaders than were boys, they found no gender differences in political trust for high school students. Similarly, Jennings and Niemi (1974) found no gender differences in political trust among a national sample of high school seniors. Other researchers using small non-representative samples of high school students also found no gender differences in trust levels (Avery & Hahn, 1985; Blankenship, 1990; Hahn, 1998; Harper, 1987).

With regard to political efficacy, those researchers who used a national probability sample

of high school seniors found no gender differences (Jennings & Niemi, 1974). Similar findings were obtained by others using smaller, non representative samples (Blankenship, 1990; Hahn, 1998; Owen & Dennis, 1988).

There has been little research on gender and political confidence--the perception of one's personal influence in decision-making situations. That which exists is inconclusive. Whereas the female subjects in one study reported lower levels of confidence than did male subjects (Avery & Hahn, 1985), no gender differences in political confidence were identified in another study (Hahn, 1998).

In the Longitudinal Study of American Youth, which followed the seventh grade class of 1987, 7th-grade females scored slightly lower than boys on a measure of their expectations of political participation ( Miller & Kimmel, 1997). However, by the 12th grade, girls were no less likely than boys to say they were likely to vote, keep up with political news, or to be a political or community activist.

#### Attitudes toward Women Politicians

In their 1971 study, IEA researchers found that young people were not very supportive of women holding political office. At the time, a mere 27% of the American 14-year-old students strongly agreed that "women should run for political office and take part in government much the same as men do" (Torney, Oppenheim, & Farnen, 1975). However, American females were more likely than males to support such rights (Torney et al., 1975).

Studies conducted in the 1980s and 1990s concluded that students who observed more female candidates than had their counterparts in earlier generations were becoming more supportive of women in government (Gillespie & Spohn 1987, 1990; Hahn, 1998). However, American male adolescents still tended to be less supportive of women holding political office than were their female counterparts (Hahn, 1998).

### Experiences: Classroom Interaction, Textbooks, and Extra-curricular Activities

Although several researchers speculated that the content of social studies classes might contribute to gender differences in political attitudes and to future voters' support of women in political office, remarkably little research is available testing that belief. A few researchers found that male students received more attention and were more likely to take risks in trying to answer questions in social studies classes than were female students, but this was not examined vis a vis political outcomes (Hedrick & Chance, 1977; Wilen & White, 1991).

In the case study of two civics classes described earlier, no gender differences in classroom interaction were observed (Hahn, 1996b). In those classes both female and male students were given the same covert message that politics is a man's world. They studied about many more male than female political leaders, and topics related to gender and politics were not discussed.

Because textbooks dominate much social studies instruction in the United States (Goodlad, 1984; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979), their treatment of gender may contribute to student attitudes. McLeod and Silverman (1973) found that women were under represented in index listings, examples, and quotations in eight frequently used civics and government textbooks. Additionally, when women were included in illustrations, they were shown in subservient and passive roles, often as recipients of their husband's ideas. The books also contained male terminology and sexist cartoons.

The civics textbook used in the classes of the case study previously mentioned used non sexist language, there was a balanced representation of males and females in photos and anecdotes, and women were presented in roles such as judge and police officer (Hahn, 1996b). However, the sections of the book that featured women as political leaders and as involved in a variety of political issues were not mentioned in the classes studied. It is not known whether the practices used in the two classes are typical of those experienced by many students.

Finally, participation in high school extra-curricular activities has been found to be an important predictor of political participation for female adults (Damico, Damico, & Conway, 1998). However, Eyler (1982) cautioned that students who become involved in extra-curricular

activities are more politically interested to begin with than those who do not participate.

In summary, although there is a sizable literature on gender differences in student political knowledge and attitudes in the United States, it rests on narrow measures of citizenship-related knowledge and attitudes. Little is yet known about possible gender differences in conceptions of citizenship broadly defined. Moreover, despite much speculation, little empirical evidence is available linking particular citizenship experiences in school and other settings with the gender differences in attitudes and knowledge that have been identified.

10. Are there social class differences in the way civics education is experienced by students or in their knowledge, attitudes, and conceptions? (Research in political socialization and civic education from youth studies can suggest whether important social class differences exist in how students approach citizenship.)

Education in the United States is not a singular, unified process that is available to every child in the same way. Scholars have argued that public schools in complex industrial societies like the United States provide different types of schooling experiences and curriculum knowledge to students in different social classes (Anyon, 1980). Children of different social classes are likely to attend different types of schools, receive different types of instruction, study different curricula, and to leave school at different rates and times (Persell, 1993). Thus, when children leave school, they are more different from each other than they were when they arrived, and these differences may be viewed as creating the unequal positions individuals face in their adult lives (Banks & Banks, 1993).

Social class is a powerful variable in the schooling experiences of children in the United States. The nature and meaning of social class is the subject of much debate by social scientists (Knapp & Woolverton, 1995). A relatively small body of research has examined the relationship between social class as it relates to schooling and social studies education (Anyon, 1980; Banks, 1995; Knapp & Woolverton, 1995). The purpose of this section of the review is to focus on the nature of social class as it pertains to schooling and social studies education.

Knapp and Woolverton (1995) explored conceptions of social class and schooling and noted that “reasonable” scholars have posited a variety of definitions for social class. Sociologists view stratification as having three dimensions on which social class is based—wealth, power, and prestige. Although theorists and researchers have assigned a variety of definitions to social class, Anyon (1981) defined social class as the way the individual “relates to the process in society by which goods, services, and culture are produced” (p.258). Comparatively, Knapp and Woolverton (1995) noted that sociologists operate from a positional view of three to six distinct



social classes. Also, these two researchers noted that much of the empirical research is done with a positional definition of classes using lower-middle class, middle class or high, middle, and low positions on some scale of socioeconomic status (SES). According to Knapp and Woolverton (1995), social classes and one's own position within them are socially constructed, and reconstructed, reflecting changing conditions within society and changing views of the way society works.

Despite the various ways that social class has been conceptualized by researchers and theorists, it remains a powerful factor in the schooling experiences of children and youth in the United States. Researchers have demonstrated how inequality in the life chances of children growing up in different socioeconomic environments is evident in the schools they attend (Kozol, 1991; Orfield & Reardon, 1992). Children and youth from middle-class families are likely to attend suburban schools with an advanced curriculum supported by a stable tax base. In contrast children in the inner city, who come from low-income backgrounds are likely to attend schools that lack basic supplies because of limited fiscal and physical resources. As a result, inequity exists in student access to knowledge and to instruction (Darling-Hammond, 1994). Many children of color and low SES youth are assigned to general education tracks with low academic expectations, whereas students from middle-class families are enrolled in college preparatory programs (Oakes, 1992). These trends are likely to affect the civics education that students in the United States receive.

Social studies education begins at home and continues throughout the child's elementary and secondary schooling experience (Szymanski Sunal, 1991). Although parental background characteristics associated with social class appear to affect the political socialization of children and youth, little is known about how that occurs (Szymanski Sunal, 1991). For example, knowledge of history/citizenship/geography was found to be clearly related to social class in the National Educational Longitudinal Study that followed a nationally representative sample of eighth graders (National Center for Education Statistics, 1995). At both the 8th and 10th grades students in each SES quartile scored lower on the achievement tests than did students at higher SES quartiles.

Similarly in the 1988 national assessment of civics at grades 4,8, and 12, students' levels of proficiency were related to their parents' highest levels of education (National Assessment,1990). In reviewing research on political socialization and family influences Szymanski Sunal (1991) noted that much of the research on political socialization has lacked qualitative details which might be instructive.

The background of students, teaching practices, and student achievement have been investigated at the elementary and secondary school levels (Anyon, 1980; Goodlad, 1984; Metz, 1978; Oakes, 1987; Rist, 1970). A consistent finding of this body of research is that teachers make meaning of the students' SES through culturally constructed beliefs. Consequently, teachers expectations of what students are capable of achieving are then converted into teacher actions. The result of teacher actions in response to perceived student SES then leads to different schooling experiences for many youth. Anyon (1980) showed how the informal dynamics of schools perpetuate the inequality in society. Anyon argued that there is a "hidden curriculum" in school work that has profound implications for social studies education. Anyon observed teachers in working class, middle class, affluent professional, and executive elite schools. Her evidence suggested that as the level of income increased in each of the class of schools, "there was an increase in the variety and quantity of teaching materials in the classroom; increased time reported spent by teachers on preparation; higher social class background and more prestigious educational institutions attended by teachers and administrators; higher expectations of student ability on the part of parents, teachers and administrators; and increased cultural congruence between school and community" (p.275).

In sum, the theory and supporting evidence on social class background and equality of educational opportunity indicate that selection, cultural transmission, and socialization result in differing effects depending more on social status than merit. Social class is replicated through public versus private schooling, through tracking and ability grouping, and through the home environment characteristics that students bring to school. Despite the claim that schools in the United States make provisions for equal opportunity for all children to develop their abilities, social

class is a major dynamic in the lives of today's youth that appears to have consequences for civics education.

11. How do teachers view citizenship education? (Studies where teachers are asked for their view may not exist but studies of the everyday practices teachers use in dealing with their students and the classroom climate which they encourage may be available. Any studies of how teachers may feel constrained in this subject area, either by tests students must pass, by the opinions of parents, or by the explicit goals of national or religious unity can be included. However, if there is a great deal of research on these issues, the report should be limited to summary statements and the most relevant statements.)

Although research was not identified on teachers' views of citizenship education per se, a few studies have examined teacher beliefs about social studies subject matter. Goodman and Adler (1985) explored the perspectives of elementary school teachers and reported a lack of consensus about the goals and status of social studies education. An important finding of Goodman and Adler's study was that elementary-level student teachers' beliefs about social studies curriculum were different from, and likely unrelated to, their exposure to professional experiences in teacher education programs.

Studies of secondary level social studies teachers indicated that teacher beliefs about the purpose of social studies courses influenced classroom practices. Research conducted by Thornton (1988) illustrated that teaching is influenced by the beliefs teachers hold about social studies. Thornton studied three high school teachers who taught United States history at the same school using the same textbook. He found that the three teachers held very different goals for their students. Wilson and Wineburg (1988) also studied United States history teachers in secondary schools. Their findings supported Thornton's research. Wilson and Wineburg noted that the four high school United States history teachers in their study held very different beliefs about the goals of the subject-matter they were assigned to teach. In another study of secondary level United States history teachers, Evans (1988) found that the teachers in his study taught history in distinctly different ways from each other. Evans related the different teaching methods to the teachers' experiences with previous teachers, and to their home environments. A major conclusion

of these three studies was that teachers' beliefs about the social studies subject matter varied and it influenced how and what they taught in the classroom.

Reviewing research on the history of social studies teaching in the United States, Cuban (1991) reported that teachers' beliefs about content, appropriate teaching practice, and how students learn are important to teaching in the social studies. Cuban further suggested that teachers' beliefs reflect uncertainty about appropriate social studies scope, sequence, and status.

Classroom climate has been examined in another body of research relevant to teachers' beliefs about citizenship. Ehman (1980) defined classroom climate as "the intersection of teacher behavior and classroom curriculum factors" (p.108). In the social studies literature, classroom climate is concerned with how teaching occurs in the classroom, with a focus on the extent to which controversial issues are discussed. Reviewers have consistently concluded that in "open" classroom climates, in which students are encouraged to express their views in a supportive atmosphere, students are more likely to hold participatory political attitudes (Ehman, 1980; Hahn, 1991; 1996a). Despite frequently stated claims that classroom climates are often "closed", the data available to support that contention are limited and the reasons for it are explained differently (Goodlad, 1984; Hahn, 1991; McNeil, 1986; Onosko, 1991).

In one study of classroom environments (as distinct from classroom climate) and student attitudes, Fouts (1987) noted that there is a common view, among high school students, that social studies classes are boring and present irrelevant subject matter. Moreover, he found little engagement or active learning on the part of students. Based on a review of the literature, Fouts concluded that students' attitudes toward social studies are related to certain teacher and classroom environment variables. Haladyna, Shaughnessy, and Redsun (1982) examined student attitudes to social studies in grades 4, 7, and 9. They reported that the classroom environment accounted for the most variation in student attitudes toward social studies, with the teacher variable becoming more important in grades 7 and 9. Haladyna and colleagues suggested that social studies educators should pay close attention to those variables that have the potential to influence students' attitudes toward social studies and over which they, the teachers, have control.

12. How do teachers deal with citizenship in their teaching and what is the influence of different types of pedagogy and classroom practices in civic education? (The actual pedagogy or strategies teachers employ or are urged to employ when they teach courses with civic content should be summarized. Are there studies of how discussion is encouraged and how conflicting beliefs are handled or topics considered too sensitive or divisive to be discussed? How are differences in student's ethnic, religious, national, or linguistic background dealt with? How do teachers deal with problems of student motivation or alienation; how do they incorporate or deal with images of civic culture from outside the school which may conflict with the curriculum, for example from the media or community groups? Again, if the research base is large, limit to a select set of important studies.)

Few studies have examined how teachers deal with citizenship in their teaching, and even fewer have examined the influence of different classroom practices on civic education. Having reviewed the research, Thornton (1991) said that social studies instruction has been dominated by textbook-based, large-group, teacher-controlled lectures and recitations. McNeil (1986) conducted ethnographic research on four American high schools. She identified a variety of curricular-instructional goals held by the teachers she studied. However, McNeil found very little difference in how the teachers taught. McNeil defined what she observed as teachers engaged in a "defensive" approach to teaching. She said that teachers deliberately simplified the curriculum content and lowered their demands on students in exchange for classroom order and compliance. Further, teachers often fragmented and simplified content into bits and lists, thereby eliminating complexity, relationships, and conflicting messages. According to McNeil, pedagogical techniques were based on teachers' perceived need to exercise control. The pedagogy to which teachers turned, especially in the secondary grades, involved survival techniques that Goodlad (1984) surmised were learned from experienced teachers during the student teaching portion of their teacher education programs. Contrary to the approaches described above, which are used by many social studies teachers, some teachers do encourage students to explore controversial issues.

In a review of research on issues-centered social studies, Hahn (1996a) concluded that there may be benefits in terms of higher order thinking skills and attitudes supportive of political participation and tolerance when issues content, pedagogy, and climate are combined.

Parker (1990) noted that some social studies teachers have supported curriculum reform emphasizing discovery, inquiry, and a focus on social problems. Parker explained this support as a result of research results that endorse the use of these methods as effective for reaching the goals of citizenship education. The extent to which civic learning will occur is likely to be associated with the quality of the content and pedagogy to which students are exposed. Parker and Kaltsounsis (1996) noted that the civic knowledge of elementary and secondary school students increased through direct classroom instruction. Parker and Kaltsounsis found that student level of civic knowledge was related to the number of courses taken, the regularity of well-organized, detailed activities they engaged in, and the amount of time spent on lessons in school and at home. The more engaged in discussion or other activities, the more likely students were to increase their civic knowledge. Recent research on discussion, however, indicates that teachers hold diverse views as to its meaning (Larson, 1997a, 1997b; Miller, 1997).

In general, the research on teaching and learning in the social studies has supported the claim that democratic classrooms foster desirable citizenship learning. Hawley and Eyer (1983) conducted a study of 2000 5th-grade students to determine the impact of teacher behavior on students' political values. They concluded that teachers' modeling of behavior may be more important than the manifest content of instruction to student learning of political values. The inclusion of students from diverse backgrounds in the process of becoming active, democratic citizens has been a goal of social studies education, but teachers have different views of how to reach that goal. Even when teachers have implemented the same curricular guidelines, they have practiced such methods differently, thus reflecting their own interpretations of what is essential to citizenship education (Bickmore, 1993).

One recent study examined the characteristics and behaviors that distinguish "effective" from "non-effective" high school social studies teachers. After observing high school social

studies classes in two schools over a three-month period, and interviewing teachers and students, Fraenkel (1994) concluded that regardless of subject taught-- world history, United States history, government, or economics--"effective" teachers exhibited similar behaviors. Fraenkel defined effective teachers as those in whose classes students learned actively, attended regularly, did their homework, and when interviewed said they liked both the teacher and the subject taught. He found that effective teachers, in contrast to ineffective ones, had high expectations for their students, stressed depth rather than coverage, gave clear explanations, were good listeners, were both patient and energetic, varied instructional activities, displayed a considerable command of their subject matter, and were able to relate the subject to a variety of daily life examples. Interestingly, Fraenkel reported that the effective teachers exhibited similar behaviors regardless of student abilities or ethnic background. They did, however, try to listen and understand a students' perspective so that they could connect to student perceptions and experiences.



13. *How well does the education of teachers prepare them to deal with the different facets of civic education? (Are teachers primarily specialized in this area teaching the courses with civic education content, or are those who have prepared to teach another subject all together pressed in to service as teachers of civic education? Are there studies of the effectiveness of pre-service or in-service training pertaining to subjects in which civic education is a component?)*

Surprisingly, the available research is less conclusive than one might expect to answer this particular set of questions on initial teacher preparation and certification. Additionally, there is little relevant research on inservice education (Adler, 1991; Armento, 1996).

Dumas and Weible (1986) conducted an evaluation of the social studies aspects of elementary teacher education and certification. They found that although all states specified minimums in general education and required course work in social science, there were variations among state requirements. In an earlier study Dumas and Weible (1984) reported that only 17 states required instruction in methods and materials in teaching social studies for elementary teacher certification. These authors noted that during the decade preceding their study, there was a steady decrease in the time and emphasis given to social studies in the curricula of elementary schools nationwide. They suggested that greater emphasis on social studies within teacher preparation programs might bring about desired changes in social studies curriculum and instruction in schools (Dumas & Weible, 1986).

Dumas and Weible (1986) identified national standards established by various key professional associations for the preparation and certification of teachers. They reported that at the time of their study neither the guidelines of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, nor those of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education provided clear statements requiring specific instruction in social studies. For elementary teachers the 1981 standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) did require that at least one-third of each prospective teacher's program be designated for general studies, including behavioral sciences and humanities. However, this left open the

question of whether this was to be interpreted as requiring social studies. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS, 1992) recommended that elementary teachers complete 15 % of their program in social sciences.

In their new Standards for Social Studies Teachers, NCSS (1997) recommends that middle school level teachers seeking licensure to teach social studies as a broad field should include subject matter content of no less than 30% of their total four-year or extended preparation program, with an area of concentration in history or a social science discipline. Those seeking broad field social studies certification at the secondary level should have no less than 40% of a total four year or extended preparation program in history and the social sciences, including a concentration in one discipline. Secondary teachers seeking certifications in single disciplines such as history, civics/government/political science, economics, or behavioral science should have 30% of their program in their major discipline and additional course work in the other areas. Additionally, both middle and secondary level teachers seeking either broad field social studies or single discipline certification should demonstrate that they possess the knowledge, capabilities, and dispositions to organize and provide instruction at the appropriate school level for the ten thematic standards in the NCSS Curriculum Standards for Social Studies (1994). The standards that are particularly relevant to the focus of the IEA civic education project are the study of: (2) Time, Continuity, and Change, (6) Power, Authority, and Governance, (7) Production, Distribution, and Consumption of Goods and Services, and (10) Civic Ideals and Practices.

In April of 1988, the American Bar Association's Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship conducted an invitational conference on "Preservice Preparation for Teaching Law Related Education." The published papers from that conference contain many recommendations for preservice education that authors draw from their experiences in identifying the knowledge and abilities that effective law-related educators need (Anderson & Naylor, 1991). However, none of the authors were able to point to actual research that existed on preservice education.

The one study that looked at teachers' particular preparation for teaching about government and politics is now 20 years old, but the findings may still be applicable today. Hepburn (1976)

surveyed teachers in grades 5, 6, and 7 in a representative sample of schools in three school districts. She concluded that the middle grade teachers had very limited formal training in government and politics. Although 75% of the teachers had one course in American government, very few had studied in areas such as state and local government, political theory, comparative or international politics. Twenty percent of the middle school teachers reported they had taken no political science course at all in their undergraduate program. Hepburn emphasized that because the sample of teachers surveyed taught in districts reputed to pay more and have higher standards for hiring and retention than in other parts of the state, middle grade teachers from the rest of the state might be even less prepared to achieve the civic education objectives of the social studies curriculum (Hepburn, 1976).

With regard to preparation for teaching history in the context of civic education, recent research has focused on teachers' conceptions of history. Pre-service social studies teachers appear to vary widely in their content knowledge of history, their perspectives of historical knowledge, and their ability to generate instructional representations of historic subject-matter (Armento, 1996). Moreover, it is clear that teachers' domain-specific conceptions, such as those they have of historical knowledge, are important to how they teach. It is likely that the principle holds with respect to teachers' knowledge of and teaching about social cohesion and diversity as well as national identity and political institutions. However, no studies were identified that validate that. Rather, in one review of research on teacher education, Adler (1991) identified two studies--by Bennett in 1979 and Carlson in 1986--describing treatments to include attention to cultural and racial diversity in social studies teacher education. Armento (1996) noted the extensive evaluation reported by Bennett, Niggle, and Stage in 1990 of the multicultural component of one teacher education program. They concluded that the more open a prospective teacher is, the more knowledge about diversity the person has at the beginning and at the end of the program. Further, they found degree of openness was inversely related to social distance from person's different from oneself (Bennett et al, 1990, cited in Armento, 1996).

The aspect of teacher preparation for which there appears to be the most information is

economic education. In reviewing teacher education related to economics, Schug and Walstad (1991) use as a starting point the 1985 Joint Council on Economic Education's recommendations that all elementary school teachers be required to take one basic course in economics and that all secondary social studies teachers be required to take at least nine semester hours (three courses) in economics. The evidence indicated that most have considerably less background than what was recommended. Half of the elementary teachers have had no courses in economics. Among secondary teachers, about 10% to 20% had no course, about 25% had taken one course, and about 30% had taken two courses, according to evidence gathered from several different surveys. Without more coursework in economics, it is not surprising, perhaps that in his study of Texas elementary and secondary social studies teachers' scores on the Test of Economic Literacy, Diem (1981, as cited in Adler, 1991) found evidence of inadequate preparation in economics.

In contrast to the general trend of researchers bemoaning a weak content background among social studies teachers, Wendling, Merritt, Beal, Olstad, and Kaltsounis (1986, as cited in Adler, 1991) were more optimistic in their study of student teachers in one university's teacher preparation program. They found that for a sample of student teachers, scores on the National Teachers Examination indicated the pre-service teachers were adequately prepared in the various social sciences, even when they majored in single disciplines, such as history.

Not only is the research inconclusive as to whether teachers are adequately prepared to teach the content needed in civic education, but there are also differing reports as to whether perceived weaknesses in content or pedagogy are of greater importance. Whereas elementary teachers in Atwoods' (1986) study perceived inadequate preparation in the social science disciplines, Goodlad (1984) concluded that teacher preparation programs for secondary as well as elementary teachers were more inadequate with regard to pedagogy than content. That premise was supported by three studies. In surveying social studies supervisors, Berryman and Schneider (1984) found that supervisors thought that beginning teachers tended to have weaknesses in both content and pedagogy, but "the most serious deficiencies" identified were those that would fall into the "methods" portion of teacher preparation programs. In a study of more than 400 classroom

teachers, Weaver, Jantz, Farrell, and Cirrincione (1985, as cited in Armento, 1996) reported that teachers claimed their teacher preparation programs failed to teach them how to use inquiry techniques and that their methods instructors were less practical than theoretical in their attention to inquiry. Kickbusch (1987) found that social studies student teachers exhibited only a narrow range of pedagogical skills to implement civic education goals. In particular, the student teachers' lessons he observed did not promote critical decision-making, value analysis, or other means of engaging students in a consideration of current public issues. The observer's record was "replete with missed opportunity and inadequate teaching skills" (Kickbusch, 1987, p.180). Discourses of management and control and of citizenship transmission prevailed in the student teachers' settings.

With regard to in-service education, more evidence is available related to economic education than to other facets of civic education. Schug and Walstad (1991) reviewed nine studies of in-service education in economics. Most conclude that in service workshops have a positive impact on teachers' economic knowledge and a positive impact on the economics achievement and economics attitudes of their students, but without the reporting of effect sizes "the real magnitude of these findings is unclear" (Schug & Walstad, 1991).

In addition to the studies of in service education with an economics emphasis there is a limited amount of literature on in-service education with a law related or civic education emphasis. Several scholars concluded that in-service law-related education (LRE) programs were effective in increasing teacher knowledge, confidence in teaching LRE content, and reflection on classroom outcomes (Johnson & Hunter, 1997, pp 30-31). Arbetman (1991) argued that for LRE in-service education to be effective, however, it must be more than a "dog and pony show at conferences and workshops."

One example of an effective in-service education program in civic education that was extensive in nature is that described by Hepburn and Napier (1984). The Improving Citizenship Education (ICE) project in one metropolitan Atlanta school system contained five components: (1) a 45-hour staff development or in-service teacher education program on teaching strategies and content for citizenship education, (2) administrative support through meetings with principals, (3)

specific student learning objectives to guide teacher planning and instruction, (4) provision of varied instructional materials to support the objectives, and (5) a listing of community resources to extend classroom learning. A sample of teachers and their students in project schools were compared with a control group of teachers and their students to determine the programs effects. At both the elementary and secondary level, students in project schools did considerably better than students in control group schools on a knowledge test; they did slightly better on a measure of attitudes toward government and politics. Additionally, project teachers reported that the objectives and materials were "very helpful." There was less consensus as to the perception of principals' support. Overall, the evaluation indicated that a multifaceted in-service education can make a difference in civic education.

Finally, Leming (1991, cited in Armento, 1996) asked, "Is there a set of teacher characteristics that differentiate traditional teachers from those who incorporate democratic climates and controversial issues in their classes?" Oliver and Shaver's research in the 1960s and '70s on jurisprudential teachers and Newmann's research in the 1980s and '90s of teachers who promote thoughtfulness suggest the importance of : tolerance of ambiguity, open-mindedness, intellectual flexibility, risk taking, and a provisional view of truth. Whether teacher education programs can develop these traits or whether they should select candidates for their programs who already possess those traits are factors that might affect whether teachers are able to effectively deliver civic education.

14. How does the way in which schools are organized influence students' civic education? (The size of schools and the opportunities they provide for meaningful participation, self government, and respect for rights are all potentially important factors influencing students' attitudes and behaviors, and in some countries studies of these factors will exist. Data on the extent to which school organizational characteristics and climate influence students' civic development should be reviewed here.)

The literature identifies four characteristics of schools that impact on students' civic education. These characteristics are: (a) school climate; (b) classroom climate; (c) emphasis on extracurricular activities; and (d) school size.

A number of authors reported that a democratic school environment is necessary for developing democratic ideals in students. Ehman and Gillespie (1974) illustrated this point with their observation that "the underlying characteristics of schools...seem to make a difference in the attitudes of students towards political participation and their political environment...students, like everyone else, need to share in the responsibilities and activities of an institution in order to establish important political attitudes which will support active citizenship" (pp.49-50). Metzger and Barr (1978) concluded that "a number of studies have found a positive relationship between school political participation and (student) political attitudes" (p.51). They also stated that different political systems can be observed within schools, and that these produce different political attitudes among students. Metzger and Barr reported that students have a high likelihood of developing positive political attitudes in schools where they have a voice in how the school is run. They concluded that "to meet their instructional goals relating to citizenship education, it appears educators must consider the reorganization of school environments in order to encourage increased student participation in decision making" (p.74).

In a review of prior research, Ehman (1980) reported considerable, though not conclusive, evidence of a correlation between school participation and political attitudes. Participatory schools were associated with students' enhanced political efficacy, trust, and social integration.



Hepburn (1983) stated that student political activity and trust in the political system is fostered by schools that encourage student participation in decision making. Hepburn added that “political attitudes formed from school experiences are generalized outward to the larger society” (p.13). Patrick and Hoge (1991) further supported this position with their statement that schools that are less authoritarian and that encourage participation are more effective at developing positive democratic political attitudes among students than are those schools characterized as authoritarian and non participatory.

Angell (1991) reported significantly less alienation among middle school students in schools where students participated in making the rules and establishing the goals than in schools without such characteristics. Angell added that “student participation--especially participation in making decisions that have a direct bearing on the quality of life at school--contributes to the development of pro-sociality, high level moral reasoning, and a sense of community among the students” (p.255).

Ehman (1980) noted that in authoritarian schools, student activists tend to use confrontational tactics to bring about change; in contrast, students in more permissive schools use negotiation. Hepburn (1983) reported lower levels of school violence in schools where students perceived themselves as having a voice in determining rules and policy than in schools where students felt less influential. Patrick and Hoge (1991) presented an opposing position. They cautioned that there is a growing body of research that looks at school level effects from a different perspective. This research suggests that schools “in which adults authoritatively and unambiguously support core values of the community as standards for responsible behavior in the schools” (p.434) are effective in achieving democratic citizenship goals.

In considering effects at the level of the classroom, Ehman (1980) stated that open classroom climates are associated with positive political attitudes, including high levels of political efficacy and low levels of political alienation. Angell (1991) reported that “positive social and political attitudes, higher levels of moral reasoning, pro-social behavior, and a sense of community in elementary classrooms have been empirically associated with certain climate attributes: (a)



democratic leadership, (b) peer interaction in cooperative activities, (c) free expression and respect for diverse viewpoints, and (d) student participation in democratic deliberations” (p.256).

Hepburn (1983) claimed that democratic political attitudes are enhanced among students who participate in extracurricular activities. Patrick and Hoge (1991) reported a general acceptance of the proposition that student involvement in extracurricular activities is positively related to the development of high levels of political efficacy and involvement in civic activities in contexts other than the school. Damico, Conway, and Damico (1996), using data that tracked the life cycle of students in the senior class of 1972 from high school through their mid 30s, reported a “consistent relationship between participation in extracurricular activities, valuing democratic processes, and community and political activism” (p.11), and that the relationship is even stronger for those who exercised leadership in the extracurricular activities than for those who did not have leadership positions. The authors added that two years after graduation, those who participated in extracurricular activities reported that democracy “matters to them in ways that it does not for those who failed to participate” (p.11). They noted that curriculum tracks are well known to mirror socioeconomic markers, with high socioeconomic status students being placed disproportionately in the academic, as opposed to general and/or vocational, track. Damico and colleagues cautioned that not all students share in the benefits of participation, noting that extracurricular activities are dominated by students in the academic track. However, an earlier study (Eyler, 1982) that used path analysis to show that students with higher levels of political interest and efficacy are more likely to become involved in student activities than other students, raised questions about which variable is the precursor, participation or political interest and efficacy.

Metzger and Barr (1978) reported that an inverse relationship exists between school size and the level of student political activity. In his review of research on American high schools, Ehman (1980) stated that small schools foster political efficacy and reduce student alienation. Hepburn (1983) reported that small high schools, or semi-autonomous units within large schools, generate more positive political attitudes by providing greater opportunity for student participation in extra-curricular activities and school governance.

Newmann and Rutter (1986), reported that there are a limited number of studies supporting the contention that community service programs in schools have a positive impact on students. Marks (1994) concurred, and specified that the positive impact included increased citizen efficacy compared to students who did not participate in such programs. When the community service activities accompany the systematic study of relevant issues, beneficial outcomes are more likely to occur (Wade & Saxe, 1996).

## References

- Adler, S.A. (1991). The education of social studies teachers. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 210-221). New York: Macmillan.
- Agnes, M. (1947). Influences of reading on the racial attitudes of adolescent girls. Catholic Educational Review, 45, 415-420.
- Anderson, C.C., & Naylor, D.T. (Eds.). (1991). Law -related education and the preservice teacher. Chicago: American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.
- Angell, A.V. (1991). Democratic climates in elementary classrooms: A review of theory and research. Theory and Research in Social Education, 19, 241-266.
- Anyon, J. (1979). Ideology and United States history textbooks. Harvard Educational Review, 49, 361-386.
- Anyon, J. (1980). Social class and the hidden curriculum of work. Journal of Education, 162, 69-92.
- Anyon, J. (1981). Social class and school knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11(1), 3-42.
- Applebee, A. N., Langer, J. A., & Mullis, I. (1987). Literature & U.S. history: The instructional experience and factual knowledge of high school juniors. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service. Report no. 17-HL-01.
- Arbetman, L. (1991). Lessons from teacher training. In C. C. Anderson & D. T. Naylor (Eds.) Law -related education and the preservice teacher. Chicago: American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.
- Armento, B. J. (1991). Changing conceptions of research on the teaching of social studies. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.) Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. (pp. 185-196). New York: Macmillan.
- Armento, B. J. (1996). The professional development of social studies educators. In J.

- Sikula (Ed.), Handbook of research in teacher education. (pp. 485-502). New York: Macmillan.
- Atwood, V.A. (1986). Elementary social studies: Cornerstone or crumbling mortar? In V.A. Atwood (Ed.), Elementary school social studies: Research as a guide to practice (pp. 1-13). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Avery, P.G. (1992, April). Do all of the people have all of the rights all of the time? Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting.
- Avery, P., & Hahn, C. L. (1985, April). Students' political attitudes: Are gender and race important variables? Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Banks, J.A. (1988). Multiethnic education (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Banks, J.A. (1991). Multicultural education: Its effects on student's racial and gender role attitudes. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 459-469). New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J. (Ed.). (1994). Handbook of research on multicultural education. New York: Macmillan.
- Banks, J.A., & Banks, C.A. (Eds.). (1993). Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (1998). It wasn't a good part of history. Teachers College Record, 99, 478-513.
- Bernard-Powers, J. (1996). The woman question in citizenship education. In W.C. Parker (Ed.) Educating the democratic mind. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Berryman, C., & Schneider, D. (1984). Social studies teacher education: More academic content and less teaching methodology? Social Education, 48, 507-509.
- Bickmore, K. (1993). Learning inclusion/inclusion in learning: Citizenship education for a pluralistic society. Theory and Research in Social Education, 21, 341-384.
- Blankenship, G. (1990). Classroom climate, global knowledge, global attitudes, and political action. Theory and Research in Social Education, 18, 363-386.

Bloom, A. (1987). The closing of the American mind. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Branson, M.S. (1985, April). American youth: Their socio-civic beliefs, values, and behavior. Paper presented at the Conference on the Development of Civic Competence and Civic Responsibility among Youth. Irsee, West Germany.

Branson, M.S. (1988, October). The social and civic attitudes, beliefs and values of American youth. Paper delivered to the International Conference on the Development of Civic Responsibility Among Youth, The University of Urbino, Urbino, Italy.

Butts, R.F. (1979). The revival of civic learning. Social Education, 43, 359-363.

Callahan, W.T., & Banaszak, R.A. (1991). Citizenship for the 21st century. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.

Campbell, A.B. (1991). Legal content in the civics curriculum. In W.T. Callahan & R.A. Banaszak (Eds.), Citizenship for the 21st century (pp. 69-88). Bloomington, In.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies / Social Science Education.

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

Collins, H. T., Czarra, F., & Smith, A. F. (1996, June/July). Guidelines for global and international studies education. Issues in Global Education, 3-8, 16-17.

Cook, L.A. (1947). Intergroup education. Review of Educational Research, 17, 266-278.

Cuban, L. (1991). History of teaching in social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 197-209). New York: Macmillan.

Cusick, P.A. (1991). Student groups and school structure. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 276-289). New York: Macmillan.

Czarra, F. (1995). Civics and government standards usability survey. Washington, D. C.: Council of Chief State School Officers.

Damico, A.J., Conway, M.M., & Damico, S.B. (1996). Democratic education: The associational life of African-American and white high school students. Paper presented at the

annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Damico, A.J., Damico, S.B., & Conway, M.M. (1998). The democratic education of women: High school and beyond. Women and Politics, 19 (2), 1-31.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. Banks (Ed.) Handbook of research on multicultural education. (pp. 465-483). New York: Macmillan.

Dash, S., & Niemi, R.G. (1992). Democratic attitudes in multicultural settings: A cross national assessment of political socialization. Youth and Society, 23, 313-334.

Dumas, W., & Weible, T. (1984). Standards for elementary teacher certification: A fifty-state study. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 177-183.

Dumas, W., & Weible, T. (1986). Elementary teacher education and certification. In V.A. Atwood (Ed.), Elementary school social studies: Research as a guide to practice (NCSS Bulletin No. 79, pp. 137-145). Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Eckenrod, J.S. (1987). Our democracy: How America works: Program marketing research. San Francisco: Foundation for Teaching Economics.

Education Commission of the States. (1971). Citizenship: group results for sex, region and size of community. National Assessment of Educational Progress Report No. 16. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Education Commission of the States. (1973). Political knowledge and attitudes. National Assessment of Educational Progress Report No. 16. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Education Commission of the States. (1974). The first social studies assessment: An overview. National Assessment of Educational Progress Report No. 16. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office.

Education Week, April 10, 1996.

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

Ehman, L.H., & Gillespie, J.A. (1974, November). Political life in the hidden curriculum:

Does it make a difference? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, Chicago.

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1994). The 26th annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 76, 41-59.

Elam, S.M., Rose, L.C., & Gallup, A.M. (1996). The 28th Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll of the public's attitude toward the public schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 78, 41-56.

Evans, R.W. (1988). Lessons from history: Teacher and student conceptions of the meaning of history. Theory and Research in Social Education, 16, 203-225.

Evans, R.W. (1989). A dream unrealized: A brief look at the history of issue-centered approaches. The Social Studies, 80, 178-184.

Eyler, J. (1982). A test of a model relating political attitudes to participation in high school activities. Theory and Research in Social Education, X(1), 43-62.

Farquar, E. C., & Dawson, K. S. (1979). Citizen education today: Developing civic competencies. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Ferguson, P. (1991). Impacts on social and political participation. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning. (pp. 383-399). New York: MacMillan.

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

Fraenkel, J. R. (1994). Characteristics and behaviors of effective social studies teachers. School of Education Review (San Francisco State University), 6, 22-31.

Gay, G. (1991). Culturally diverse students and social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 144-156). New York: Macmillan.

Gay, G. (1997). The relationship between multicultural and democratic education. The

Social Studies, 88, 5-9.

Geography Education Standards Project (1994). Geography for life: National geography standards. Washington, D. C.: National Geographic Research Exploration.

Giese, J. R. (1997). A descriptive review of LRE reserach . In Compendium of research supporting law related education (pp.79-95). Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Gillespie, D., & Spohn, C. (1987). Adolescents' attitudes toward women in politics: The effects of gender and race. Gender & Society, 1, 208-218.

Gillespie, D., & Spohn, C. (1990). Adolescents' attitudes toward women in politics: A follow-up study. Women & Politics, 10 (1), 1-16.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice.: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Giroux, H.A. (1993). Living dangerously: Multiculturalism and the politics of difference. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Goodlad, J.I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goodman, J., & Adler, S. (1985). Becoming an elementary social studies teacher: A study in perspectives. Theory and Research in Social Education, 13(2), 1-20.

Gross, R.E. (1977). The status of the social studies in the public schools of the United States: Facts and impressions of a national survey. Social Education, 41, 194-205.

Hahn, C.L. (1985). The status of the social studies in the public schools of the United States: Another look. Social Education, 49, 220-223.

Hahn, C.L. (1991). Controversial issues in social studies. In Shaver, J. (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp.470-482). New York: Macmillan.

Hahn, C.L. (1996a). Research on issues centered social studies. In Evans, R. & Saxe, D.W. (Eds.), Handbook on issues centered social studies, (pp. 22-41) Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Hahn, C.L. (1996b). Gender and political learning. Theory and Research in Social



Education, 24, 8-35.

Hahn, C.L (1998). Becoming political: Comparative perspectives on citizenship education. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

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

Harper, N. (1987). The effect of controversial issues discussions on the development of political and economic attitudes in secondary social studies classrooms. Unpublished Diploma in Advanced Study in Teaching thesis, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Hawley, W.D., & Eyler, J. (1983). Teacher behavior and interest in the ideas of others: A demonstration of the influence of teachers on students' democratic values (preliminary report). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal.

Hedrick, T. E., & Chance, J. E. (1977). Sex differences in assertive achievement patterns. Sex roles, 3, 129-139.

Hepburn, M. A. (1976). Are middle school teachers prepared to teach civics? The Clearing House, 50, 151-156.

Hepburn, M.A. (1983). Can school teachers and administrators make a difference? The research evidence. In M.A. Hepburn (Ed.), Democratic education in schools and classrooms. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Hepburn, M.A. (1997, June). The power of the electronic media in the socialization of young Americans. A paper presented to a meeting of the Social Science Education Consortium, Asilomar, CA.

Hepburn, M. A., & Napier, J. D. (1982-83, Winter). Patterns of student attitudes toward political institutions and participation. Teaching Political Science, 10, 77-78.

Hepburn, M. A., & Napier, J. D. (1984). Evaluation of a local improvement-oriented project for citizenship education. Journal of Educational Research, 77, 158-165.

Hertzberg, H.W. (1981). Social studies reform - 1880-1980. A report of Project SPAN.

Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

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

Howard, M.B. (1993, November). Service Learning: Character education applied. Educational Leadership, 51(3), 42-43.

Jackson, E.P. (1944). Effects of reading upon attitudes toward the Negro race. The Library Quarterly, 14, 47-54.

Johnson, G., & Hunter, R. (1997). Law related education as a delinquency prevention strategy: A three year evaluation of the impact of LRE on students. In Compendium of research supporting law-related education (pp. 3-42). Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Johnson, V.M. (1986). Anti-democratic attitudes of high school students. Dissertation Abstracts International: 48-01A: 0098.

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

Kaltsounis, T. (1997). Multicultural education and citizenship education at a crossroad: Searching for common ground. The Social Studies, 88, 18-22.

Katz, P.A. (Ed.). (1976). Towards the elimination of racism. New York: Pergamon.

Kickbusch, K.W. (1987). Civic education and preservice educators: Extending the boundaries of discourse. Theory and Research in Social Education, 15, 173-188.

Knapp, M.S., & Woolverton, S. (1995). Social class and schooling: Inequality and access to knowledge. In J. Banks (Ed.) Handbook of research on multicultural education. (pp. 548-569) New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Kneedler, P. E. (1988). Differences between boys and girls on California's new statewide assessments in history-social science. Social Studies Review, 27, 96-124.

Kozol, J. (1991). Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992a). The multicultural mission: Unity and diversity. Social

Education, 56, 308-311.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992b). Through the looking glass: Politics and the social studies curriculum. Theory and Research In Social Education, 20, 84-92.

Lambert, W.E., & Klineberg, O. (1967). Children's views of foreign peoples. NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Larson, B. E. (1997a). Social studies teachers' conceptions of discussion: A grounded theory study. Theory and Research in Social Education, 25, 113-136.

Larson, B. E. (1997b). A rejoinder to Miller. Theory and Research in Social Education, 25, 207-09.

Leming, J.S. (1986). Rethinking social studies research and the goals of social education. Theory and Research in Social Education, 14, 139-152.

Leming, J.S. (1992). The influence of contemporary issues curricula on school aged youth. Review of Research in Education, 18, 112-162.

Lickona, T. (1991). Educating for character. New York, N.Y: Bantam Books.

Lickona, T. (1993, November). The return of character education. Educational Leadership, 51(3), 6-11.

Marks. H.M. (1994). The effect of participation in school-sponsored community service programs on student attitudes towards social responsibility. Dissertation Abstracts International. 55-04A: 0926.

Massialas, B.G. (1991). Education for international understanding. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research in social studies teaching and learning, (pp. 448-458). New York: Macmillan.

Mathews, D. (1996). Reviewing and previewing civics. In W.C. Parker (Ed.), Educating the democratic mind (pp. 265-286). Albany N.Y.: SUNY Press.

McIntosh, P. (1989, July/August). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Peace and Freedom. 10-12.

McLeod, J. S., & Silverman, S. T. (1973). You won't do: What textbooks on U.S.

government teach high school girls. Pittsburgh, PA: Know, Inc.

McNeil, L.M. (1986). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York: Routledge.

Metz, M. H. (1978). Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley: University of California Press.

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

Miller, J.D. (1985). The influence of high school social studies courses on political participation by young adults. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Reproduction Service Document No. ED 265 086)

Miller, J.D., & Kimmel, L. (1997, June). The education of 21st century citizens: Crossing the bridges to participation. Paper presented to the Social Science Education consortium, Asilomar, CA.

Miller, S. M. (1997). Language, democracy, and teachers' conceptions of "discussion." Theory and Research in Social Education, 25, 196-206.

Moore, S., Lare, J., & Wagner, K. (1985). The child's political world: A longitudinal perspective. New York: Praeger.

NAEP Civics Consensus Project. (1996). NAEP Civics. Washington D.C.: National Assessment Governing Board.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1976). Education for citizenship: A bicentennial survey. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1978). Citizenship: An overview, 1975-76. Denver: Education Commission of the States.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1990). The civics report card: Trends in achievement from 1976 to 1988 at ages 13 and 17; Achievement in 1988 at grades 4, 8 and 12. Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1995, September). Two years later: Cognitive gains and school transitions of NELS: 88 eighth graders. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). 1994 high school transcripts study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for History in the Schools. (1994). National standards for history. Los Angeles, CA: Author.

National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools. (1989). Charting a course: Social studies for the 21st century. Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1979). Revision of the NCSS social studies curriculum guidelines. Social Education, 56, 271-273.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1992). Standards for the preparation of social studies teachers. Social Education, 48, 357-361.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). Curriculum standards for social studies. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1997). Standards for social studies teachers. Washington, D.C.: Author.

National Council on Economic Education. (1997). Voluntary national content standards in economics. Author.

Newmann, F.M., & Rutter, R.A. (1986). A profile of high school community service programs. Educational Leadership, 43(4), 64-71.

Niemi, R.G., & Junn, J. (1998). Civic education: What makes students learn. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). Social studies and feminism. Theory and Research in Social Education, 20, 230-241.

Oakes, J. (1987). Tracking in secondary schools: A contextual perspective. Educational Psychologist, 22, 129-154.

Oakes J. (1992). Can tracking research inform practice? Technical, normative, and political considerations. Educational Researcher, 21(4), 12-21.

Onosko, J.J. (1991). Barriers to the promotion of higher order thinking in social studies. Theory and Research in Social Education, 19, 341-366.

Orum, A.M., Cohen, R.S., Grasmuck, S., & Orum, A.W. (1977). Sex socialization and politics. In M. Githen, and J.L. Prestage (Eds.). A portrait of marginality (pp. 17-37). New York: David McKay, Co.

Owen, D., & Dennis, J. (1988). Gender differences in the politicization of American children. Women & Politics, 8, 65-82.

Parker, W.C. (1990). A final response: Searching for the middle. Social Education, 55, 27-28, 65.

Parker, W.C. (1996a). Schools as laboratories of democracy. In W.C. Parker (Ed.), Educating the democratic mind (pp. 1-22). Albany, N.Y.: SUNY Press.

Parker, W.C. (1996b). Curriculum for democracy. In R.Soder (Ed.), Democracy, education, and the schools (pp. 182-210). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Parker, W. C. (1997). Navigating the unity/diversity tension in education for democracy. The Social Studies, 88, 12-17.

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.

Parker, W.C., McDaniel, J.E., & Valencia, S.W. (1991). Helping students think about public issues: Instruction versus prompting. Social Education, 41, 41-44, 67.

Parker, W.C., Mueller, M., & Wending, L. (1989). Critical reasoning on civic issues. Theory and Research in Social Education, 17, 7-32.

Patrick, J.J., & Hoge, J.D. (1991). Teaching government, civics, and law. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 427-436). New York: Macmillan.

People for the American Way. (1989). Democracy's next generation: A study of youth and teachers. Washington D.C.: Author.

Persell, C.H. (1993). Social class and educational equality. In J.Banks and C.A. McGee Banks (Eds.), Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives (2nd ed, pp.71-89).

Pike, L.W., & Barrows, T.W. (1976). Other nations, other peoples: A survey of student interests and knowledge, attitudes and perceptions. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Preparation of early childhood teachers. (1983). Washington, DC: Association for Childhood Education International.

Proshansky, H. (1966). The development of intergroup attitudes. In I.W. Hoffman and M.L. Hoffman (Eds.), Review of Child Development Research 2 (pp. 311-371). New York: R. Sage Foundation.

Quigley, C.N., Buchanan, J.H., & Bahmueller, C.F. (1991). CIVITAS. Calabasas, CA: Center for Civic Education.

Ravitch, D. (1990, Summer). Multiculturalism. American Scholar, 337-354.

Rettinger, V. S. (1993). The moral and political consciousness of preadolescents. Moral Education Forum, 18 (4), 2-35.

Rist, R.C. (1970). Student social class and teacher expectations: The self fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 411-451.

Schlesinger, A., Jr. (1991). The disuniting of America. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.

Schug, M.C., & Walstad, W.B. (1991). Teaching and learning economics. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning, (pp. 411-419). New York: Macmillan.

Segall, A. L. (1975). Gender related differences in the political socialization of high school seniors. Dissertation Abstracts International, 36, 3996A.

Shaver, J.P. (1977). A critical view of the social studies profession. Social Education, 41, 300-307.

Shaver, J. P., Davis, O. L., Jr., & Helburn, S. W. (1979). The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies. Social Education, 43, 150-153.

Skeel, D. J. (1991). Law related education research: Curriculum, teaching, and learning. In C.C. Anderson & D. T. Naylor (Eds.) Law related education and the pre-service teacher (pp.63-68). Chicago: American Bar Association, Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship.

Social Education. (1986, November/December). Special issue on Scope and Sequence. 50.

Social Education. (1996, January). Point of view: The history standards. 60, 44-57.

Standards for accreditation of teacher education. (1981). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educators.

Stephan, W.G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The handbook of social psychology (pp. 599-658). New York: Random House.

Stone, L. (1996). Feminist political theory. Theory and Research in Social Education, 24, 36-53.

Superka, D.P., Hawke, S., & Morrissett, I. (1980). The current and future status of the social studies. Social Education, 44, 362-369.

Szymanski Sunal, C. (1991). The influence of the home on social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning, (pp. 290-299). New York: Macmillan.

Taba, H. (1955). Curriculum intergroup relations: Case studies in instruction. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Thornton, S.J. (1988). Curriculum consonance in United States history classrooms. Journal of Curriculum and Supervision, 3, 308-320.

Thornton, S.J. (1991). Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 237-248). New York: Macmillan.



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

Trager, H.G., & Yarrow, M.R. (1952). They learn what they live: Prejudice in young children. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Wade, R.C., & Saxe, D.W. (1996). Community service learning in the social studies: Historical roots, empirical evidence, critical issues. Theory and Research in Social Education, 24, 331-359.

White, J.J. (1985). An ethnographic approach. In C. Cornbleth (Ed.), Invitation to Research in Social Education (pp. 51-77). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Wilén, W.W., & White, J.J. (1991). Interaction and discourse in social studies classrooms. In J.P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning (pp. 483-495). New York: Macmillan.

Wilson, S.M., & Wineburg, S.S. (1988). Peering at history from different lenses: The role of disciplinary perspectives in the teaching of American history. Teachers College Record, 89, 525-539.

Woehrle, T. (1993, November). Growing up responsible. Educational Leadership, 51(3), 40-43.



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



## NOTICE

### Reproduction Basis



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)