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A Note From the Editor:

We now have received 33 manuscripts. We expect this issue to be published in November. We are making a considerable effort to publish the journal on schedule.

As you may notice, we have rearranged some of the descriptive material that is usually included in TRSE. With this issue we have provided the addresses of members of the Editorial Board, and the addresses of authors. We want to encourage communication among readers. We received a letter responding to a book review; we invite letters and comments such as that described below.

We have received many articles dealing with economic education. Such articles are usually sent to at least one person involved with economic education. There is an Institute for Economic Analysis at NYU. Wassily Leontief, who was awarded the Nobel Prize in 1973 for creating the "input-output" approach to economics, was its director for many years. He recently published, with Faye Duchin, the present director of the Institute for Economic Analysis, The Future Impact of Automation on Workers (1988). Their book reports on analysis of employment, manufacturing, office work, education and health care. We thought it would be of some interest to have an economic education article reviewed by an economist. We sent an article for review to Faye Duchin. We received a thoughtful review. We asked her if she would like to expand the review, and sent to her the two articles dealing with economic education that are published in this issue. We asked her to comment on all three articles. We have included her comment.

Millard Clements
Editor, TRSE.
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Letters

900 Shows a Year

I feel that I owe Professor Grambs a note of apology. As evidenced by her review (TRSE, Spring 1988), reading my book must have been terribly distressing for her. I regret that my writing has caused her so much pain.

Professor Grambs was apparently so upset that she neglected to mention the purpose of the research, its scope, design, or conclusions. 900 Shows does not pretend to be a balanced view of a typical high school. As explained in the book, it does not represent a view of teaching that was held by all of the teachers, the students, or administrators. However, I argued that the book presents a fair account of the perspective shared by most of the faculty. Teachers discussed the research with me; they read drafts of the book; and they commented on the book's authenticity, characterizations, and conclusions.

It is unfortunate that I could not present a more comforting view of the school, but I am hardly alone among those who looked at high school teaching in the past five years and came away with less than sanguine conclusions.

Written from a teacher's perspective, the book is admittedly supportive of teachers. From her review, it seems that Ms. Grambs is more sensitive to the book's negative portrayal of administrators than she is to the problems faced by the faculty. No mention is made of the difficulty of teachers' daily work, their powerlessness in the school's bureaucracy, and their frustrating inability to control the conditions of their working lives.

The reviewer is apparently more disturbed by "racy vignettes" and reports of administrators who use "locker room language" than she is by the problems of teaching. Denouncing the emphasis on the "colorful" and the "shocking," the reviewer is so overwhelmed by the book's mild ribaldry that she fails to mention the ways in which teachers talk about their job, the school's staff development program, the adequacy of their undergraduate preparation, or the value of their education courses.

Professor Grambs seems offended by the humor, sexuality, and sexism that I reported as central elements of life in the high school. I am sorry. The book was not designed to be off-putting to her or anyone else. I tried to report the language and other behaviors of my subjects and explain why they spoke and behaved as they did.

I am also sorry that Professor Grambs sees the book as a self-serving tribute to my "innovative teaching." That conclusion, however, is pure invention by the reviewer. The book reports numerous descriptions of my errors of judgment and examples of my classroom inadequacies and outright failures. Professor Grambs has either disregarded these accounts or she has invested the concept of educational innovation with fresh meaning.

The book has had its favorable reviews by sympathetic reviewers. I could
try to defend the book or cite critics who liked the writing. But rather than
drag this out, permit me to suggest another tack. Let me encourage readers
to take the book into public high schools and ask teachers—especially
teachers of social studies—to evaluate its reporting and conclusions. Find
out from them the extent to which this two-year field study reflects the
working lives and concerns of classroom teachers. Be sure to warn them of
the book's potential side effects: Reading this book may be upsetting. In at
least one instance it has been shown to produce unwarranted vituperation
and petulance. Parental guidance suggested.

Stuart B. Palonsky
University of Missouri-Columbia
Curriculum and Instruction
212 Townsend Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

Jean Grambs replies:

Unfortunately, Mr. Palonsky's response to my review shows the same
problem as his book; he misses the point of my criticism just as he misses
the point about what an ethnography is supposed to communicate. He says,
"In ethnographic research, explanations of behavior are made contextually;
the phenomena are viewed not as isolated variables, but as part of complex
interrelationships that may be hidden from outsiders but are readily
understood by insiders" (p. 193). This is a good working definition; it is too
bad he did not follow it.

What disturbed me was not that he was enamored with locker room
language, the innovative charm of his own teaching or the ineptness of ad-
ministrators, but that he does not relate these to any kind of context; he did
not provide us with an ethnography. There is no explication of the pro-
cesses, the network, or values and perceptions which make up the workings
of an institution. The descriptions are not embedded in a meaningful web of
relationships, rituals, rules, expectations; the trees and the underbrush ap-
pear in colorful detail, but he comes nowhere close to showing us the
ecological system which creates a forest. It is not that he should have
reported happy fulfilled teachers if none existed in that school, but he
should have helped us understand why the teachers he described, including
himself, were so defeated. This he does not do. He has given us a peep show
when he promised a work of thoughtful scholarship.

Jean D. Grambs
The University of Maryland
College of Education
Institute for Child Study
College Park, MD 20742
“We’re Leading America”*: The Changing Organization and Form of High School Cheerleading

Nancy Lesko
Adelphi University

Abstract

This essay examines the “professionalization” of high school cheerleading, a movement spawned by national cheerleading organizations whose rhetoric emphasizes cheerleaders’ enhanced status and skill. An investigation of one national organization’s impact on cheerleaders in a southern high school shows that increased status and skill included a bureaucratization of cheerleading and greater control by the national organization. The selection of cheerleaders was no longer made by students and teachers, but by outside experts according to objective, skill-based standards which ignored the relation of the cheerleaders to the student body. Associated with this rationalization of the selection, was a distinctive style of cheering that emphasized straight, clipped movements executed with great speed and precision, like a military drill team. Thus, the announced higher status and skill of cheerleaders is associated with the loss of popular selection, centralization of standards, and tighter control of the body. The rhetoric of increased status, or professionalization, for high school cheerleaders is accompanied by the usurpation of control by a technical, bureaucratic rationality of experts.

Although empirical investigation of the form and content of curricular learning is now recognized as an important and legitimate pursuit (e.g. Apple, 1982; Carlson, 1982; McNeil, 1983; Kliebard, 1977; Bullough, Goldstein, & Holt, 1984; Wexler, 1976; Cornbleth, 1985), school extracurricular activities remain largely unexamined. The common sense, “official” understanding of extracurricular activities as builders of community participation reigns (Peshkin, 1978), occasionally countered by the view of them as extensions of the social control of schools (Spring, 1972). Generally, researchers discuss whether or not they facilitate or subvert official school aims.

When social educators have considered extracurricular activities, it has been in the context of how they relate to other interests. Associations be-

*Correspondence: Nancy Lesko, Adelphi University, Institute for Teaching and Education Studies, Harvey Hall, Garden City, NY 11530.
tween extracurricular involvement and increased political knowledge, skills, and pro-social attitudes (e.g. Ziblatt, 1965; Eyler, 1982; Barker & Gump, 1964) have been investigated. Ethnographic studies of secondary school students have added some interactional detail. Studies of British secondary schools demonstrate the importance of peer interactions for broadening school attitudes (Willis, 1977), and those peer interactions have freest reign on the playing fields (Hargreaves, 1967; Woods, 1979). Despite such clues to the importance of extracurricular activities in social learning, little has been done to look at student participation in extracurricular activities in order to examine the social learning that occurs. Extracurricular activities are glimpsed only in passing.

In contrast to this shunning by educational researchers, many high school students view extracurricular involvement and learning as of greater value and relevance than formal academic lessons (Willis, 1977; Woods, 1979; Hargreaves, 1967; Lesko, 1988). Coleman (1961) demonstrated that extracurricular activities, particularly athletics, conferred far more status than academic achievements in each of ten high schools. If we accept these findings without judging them good or bad, it makes sense to proceed with investigations of what students learn from these prized extracurricular activities.

If social educators are to remain relevant to contemporary social and organizational life, we must broaden existing assumptions of what constitutes social education. We must be willing to listen to young people and to acknowledge how social meanings are constructed even when those meanings do not agree with what used to be or what ought to be.

In order to study youth in general, and young women in particular, it is useful to focus upon the commonplace, upon popular culture, and upon activities in which young women create meaning (Wexler, 1988; Roman and Christian-Smith, 1988; McRobbie, 1978; McLaren, 1986). Cheerleading is a commonplace of schools and a realm of significance for many teenage girls. In the South it is often considered a sport and arouses a devotion akin to that of football. Cheerleading is in a state of change. There is a movement underway to “professionalize” it. National cheerleader organizations are the central actors in the movement. Their stated aim is to enhance the status and skill of cheerleaders; their method for accomplishing this involves changes in selection proceedings and in the physical style of cheerleading routines. I chose to examine cheerleading in a southern high school at a time when varsity tryouts were re-organized in accordance with national guidelines.

In this article I will compare the rhetoric and practices of one of the largest cheerleader organizations, which I call the American Association of Cheerleaders (AAC), with the traditional knowledge and practices of cheerleaders in this high school. I will consider the claims of the AAC concerning enhanced status and leadership in light of the actual results from
changes in the selection of cheerleaders. I will then examine the AAC model of cheerleading for the ways the female body is and is not moved, and the body type that successfully fits this style. I will suggest that the definition of what a cheerleader's body should do, at what speed, and its moral and entertainment values are parts of an evolving "discipline." In conclusion, I will speculate on the link between technical-rational control at the organizational level and associated techniques of disciplining young women's bodies. That is, I will connect changes in the social organization of cheerleading—a move toward greater centralization, hierarchy, and uniformity—with changes in the physical style of cheerleading—a move toward tight control, quick pace, and efficiency. By linking the two parts of the change in cheerleading, I outline general forms of control exercised on young women at this time.

The Re-Organization of Cheerleading Tryouts

While visiting Pine High School, I happened upon a school assembly to elect cheerleaders. Despite the existence of high school athletics for girls, cheerleading remains a high-status activity especially in the south. I became intrigued with this popular election of cheerleaders and asked for permission to study cheerleader selection at Southern High School in an adjacent city, Browndale. I was already acquainted with the school advisor for the cheerleaders, with whom I had worked in supervising student teachers. She willingly granted an interview. I learned that the selection process was about to change. She gave me her perspective on the changes and permitted me to visit and videotape the tryouts. I subsequently interviewed a number of the girls who made the squad and some who did not. I interviewed two cheerleaders advisors at Southern and several parents of cheerleaders. I subsequently observed one day at an AAC cheerleading camp and informally interviewed participants. Finally, I interviewed the founder of the AAC and some of his staff members and scrutinized many of their publications.

The tradition at Southern and Pine High was that the varsity cheerleading squad was popularly elected in the spring of each year. The whole school convened in the gym; each of the 20 to 30 candidates performed a number of cheers with the students and teachers comprising the cheering audience; the girls (a boy had never tried out in these schools) who received the highest number of votes formed the squad.

The popular election of cheerleaders appeared to pose problems for school administrators. In the course of conversations with the cheerleader advisor, it became clear that one motivation for the change in tryout format was to avoid the spate of complaint calls from parents which had followed the popular election of cheerleaders in previous years. Each spring the advisor received numerous complaints from "parents" about the fairness of the popular election and how devastated a daughter had been when she was
not elected. Although the term "parents" was used, it became clear in further conversations that mothers made these phone calls. Nor was this the only such reaction. Prior to my experiences at Southern, while discussing possible studies of girls with a junior high school principal in Browndale, I was admonished to "stay away from cheerleaders." He briefly recounted his difficulties with cheerleaders and their mothers who, in his opinion, invested this activity with too much importance. I interpreted his words to mean that cheerleaders somehow caused him problems that he wished to dispense with, an interpretation supported by subsequent conversations about cheerleaders with other school principals.

The re-organization of cheerleading described below occurs within a context in which female cheerleaders and their mothers seem to have become problems for school administrators. This is testimony to the fact that cheerleading is important to southern women; young women and their mothers were open about their complaints, demands, and frustrations. Apparently, male administrators and a female advisor found these female complaints noxious enough to jettison the traditional selection process.

In spring 1985 the popular election was replaced by the selection of the squad by three "qualified, anonymous" judges provided by AAC. Instead of a natural cheering situation in which the cheerleaders would interact with the student body, the tryouts were held in an empty, silent gymnasium, with the girls making eye contact with three unknown women, rather than several hundred peers.

The girls chafed at a number of the aspects of the new tryouts. Amy, a tall blond, commented:

It was real different, because the judges, they don't know you. They don't know your personality; they don't know how you are.

Amy continued that the judges could not know whether a particular girl had maintained interest and energy for cheerleading across a school year, whereas students had that information and could vote for those with records of sustained enthusiasm.

Vicky: This year I didn't like tryouts. I think that some girls should have made it who didn't make it. Everybody was upset about that.

For example, she continued, the judges decided to have six juniors and six seniors. Since the previous year's squad had been three seniors and nine juniors, some of those juniors were going to be eliminated. Vicky complained that the judges made those decisions and the girls had not been able to anticipate these changes or prepare for them.

Clearly what we see in these comments is the struggle of girls who are used to one pattern of organization and treatment to adjust to another. These girls feel powerless about an activity that has great importance for
them and their entire school year. Girls complained about the indifference of the judges. Susie noted that the judges arrived 40 minutes late for the tryouts and never told them why or apologized. Glenna summarized, "The judges act[ed] like they could care less." The judges rearranged the order of the tryouts making it easier for the judges but harder for the girls who had to perform the group cheers and then the individual cheers without a break to regain breath and energy. The girls were aware of and clearly articulated complaints about their diminished control over the organization of tryouts with the anonymous, expert judges.

The anonymity, impartiality, and de-contextualization of the new tryouts are characteristics associated with a movement toward bureaucratization (Weber, 1946). As the AAC expands its role as selectors and trainers, control over cheerleading will become increasingly centralized. The empty gym is a more controlled context where objective expertise can be exercised in lieu of subjective judgments of students. The new tryouts are easier for school officials and, thereby, more efficient; importantly, the sponsor received no phone calls from parents after the re-organized cheerleader tryouts.

Student election of the cheerleaders was criticized by some faculty members as "just a popularity contest" but the girls argued that students know each cheerleader, know how they are, know their personality. The judges didn't know them at all, didn't know if they had been good at cheering. The girls wanted their whole selves judged; the evaluation of bodily skills alone ignored the importance of sustained enthusiasm or interest, which they thought mattered, too.

There was, potentially at least, a distancing of the cheerleaders from the students in the development of impartial, anonymous, physical skill-based criteria for selection. The emphasis on skill alone, rather than the cheerleader as a whole person, is a view of cheerleading as a performance—self-contained, and provided as entertainment—rather than an interaction with the crowd, as "leaders of cheering."

The "Leader" in Cheerleader

The principal of Southern High spoke of the cheerleaders as school leaders. Accordingly, the girls selected for the junior varsity squad as entering sophomores at Southern were automatically members of the student council, a school organization which is viewed as involving leadership. Teachers saw cheerleaders as natural leaders in their classrooms. If there is a tendency away from leading students in cheering, what did the constant reference to leadership mean?

For national cheerleading organizations, such as the AAC, increased leadership for cheerleaders is a central aim. They communicate their intentions with slogans such as "Let's put the 'leader' back in cheerleader."
one of many recent books on cheerleading, the changes are described as follows:

In those days [when cheerleading began] all a cheerleader had to do was direct a crowd in a simple recitation, such as Sissss . . . Boom . . . Baahh . . . . Today, cheerleading is a strenuous sport demanding physical fitness and skill. In this age of specialization, it requires long, hard hours of commitment and entails important responsibilities. Cheerleaders are expected, for example, to build school support and spirit for athletic teams, plus set standards of behavior and scholarship for the student body. They also have an obligation to exercise sound judgment at all times. The impression they make must always be a good one. After all, it's a privilege to represent one's school, friends, and community.

These days, being a cheerleader is not easy. Channeling the enthusiasm of others in the proper direction takes someone who is liked and respected and whose behavior, appearance, and attitude are above reproach. It takes a person who can cooperate and communicate with administrators, sponsors, coaches, squad members, students, spirit club members, and fans—upon whom the success of any sports program depends. Not everyone can relate well to a vast number of people.4

The national organizations claim they have improved the status of cheerleaders in secondary and post-secondary schools.4 The cheerleaders' image has been neated and domesticated; they have become respectable persons rather than the "'hooligans'" they were at one time.4

After election, each cheerleader paid about $400.00 for the basic uniform, and made a deposit for four days at an AAC cheerleading camp during August. I asked the founder and director of AAC what girls learned in the camps. He said that they learned about a dozen cheers, a number of pom-pon routines, and got ideas for planning pep assemblies and fund-raising events. "Leadership courses" taught the young people how to get along better with each other, about group dynamics, and, finally, how to "get along better with the student body, how to sell yourself to the student body."

We tell the kids little things like between all of you on the squad you should know everyone in the school, that's the ideal situation. Because then if someone sitting there knows one of you, you're going to have a captive audience. They're going to be looking at you . . . So every time you pass somebody in the hallway, they know who you are 'cause they see you two or three times a week. So you say 'hi there, how are you, good to see you, hope you come to the game!' You speak to them . . . That's how you build your crowd by being genuinely
friendly to everybody in the student body and show them that you're genuinely interested in them from the highest to the lowest, that you're just not real egotistical and you're so impressed with yourself because you’re a cheerleader and you can turn the crowd off just like that (snaps fingers). And you can’t function unless the crowd gives you their support."

In both this statement and the one cited earlier on the responsibilities of cheerleaders, the relation of the cheerleaders to others is stressed. The cheerleaders are to "set standards of behavior and scholarship"; "exercise sound judgment"; have "behavior, appearance, and attitude above reproach"; be "genuinely friendly" to everyone; and garner the crowd's support by this friendliness. Given these emphases on relations between cheerleaders and others, the re-organization of Southern's tryouts was odd. If the personal relation between audience and the cheerleaders is crucial, then selection by expert judges is likely to undermine it, or at least not to foster it.

Another quality of leadership as seen by the AAC was visible at the camps: boundless enthusiasm whipped up almost to a frenzy. Throughout the AAC books, enthusiasm is promoted as essential equipment. "Enthusiasm is one of the keys and is a contagious thing that transmits to others." The source of the word enthusiasm is the Greek *entheos* meaning "inspired by god." Enthusiasm originally meant religious fanaticism, passion, the overmastering of reason by feelings. At cheerleading camp, enthusiasm took the form of cheering wildly for anything. The head cheerleader at the camp wanted the participants to be "really fired up all week long." Enthusiasm was to be exaggerated. One of the AAC trainers explained that she had been with a group of girls in Ohio the previous week, who only "clapped politely" when the AAC cheerleaders came out onto the floor yelling. "They didn't know how to play the game," she explained. Playing the game was being wildly enthusiastic, screaming at the top of their lungs when lunch, a state, a school, or a birth date was mentioned.

When the school and AAC said "leadership," they meant that cheerleaders were known by many students, that they performed out in front of the student body, that they had high status because of being known. Yet girls on the squad pointed toward inconsistencies: although they were called leaders, their weekly activities consisted in making posters for the upcoming game and pep rally, planning the rally, decorating the lockers of the team members before each game, and giving each player a present, usually candy, before each game. Aside from planning rallies, the leadership involved in their activities is difficult to discern. Further, the tryouts run by the AAC made no provisions for information about the ability of girls to work cooperatively with peers or adults and failed to include leadership or academic criteria in the selection procedure. The leadership in cheerleading seems more rhetoric than reality.
The Price of Leadership

The girls individually bore the total cost of their uniforms and expenses. I asked the head of AAC about school financial support for cheerleaders and he said that although many parents questioned the policy, he opposed school support. He told parents that the training their children were getting in skills such as organizing, planning ahead, and working cooperatively with others was valuable and well worth the financial investment in uniforms.

However, he acknowledged to business people a different motivation for the girls paying for uniforms. A Forbes article about the founder of the AAC (date withheld for anonymity), referred to as "Mr. Cheerleader," emphasized his very successful cheerleading supply company. On his business, the director of AAC said:

Cheerling is wonderful, colorful—and depression-proof. Think about it. You're the parent of one of six little girls in a whole high school chosen to be a cheerleader. No matter how bad times are, are you going to tell your little girl she can't have her sweater and skirt and pom-poms? Hell, you'll sell the boat before you have to tell her that.

In interviews, the cheerleaders complained extensively and consistently about their status in the school. On the one hand they acknowledged how much fun it was to be in cheerleading and all the activities with which one was automatically involved. They emphasized that cheerleading placed them automatically in a broad array of activities and set of friends. But they also repeatedly criticized the school for inadequately supporting their efforts.

When I asked about the cost of being a cheerleader, comments tumbled out one after another.

Vicky: It costs a bunch. I'll bet I paid at least $1000 in ninth grade, having to do [decorate] football lockers and give 'em [players] candy every week.

Glenna: We don't get that much credit.

Jennifer: I don't think it's fair because football players don't have to buy their uniforms; they don't have to pay anything. And they get the scholarships. And cheerleaders pay all the money and don't get much. You never hear about cheerleaders getting scholarships.

Vicky: Cheerleaders are just there. We're nothing. Football players are everything and we're sitting there paying all this money. . . .

Glenna: Football players get all the credit.

Jennifer: It seems . . . if the school wants leaders, the school would help [pay the costs of cheerleaders].

In general, "female leadership" in this southern high school was unpaid, voluntary leadership, consisting of relatively routine weekly tasks, and in-
volving considerable cost to the individuals. Indeed, the leadership smacks more of economic elitism than ability to organize assemblies. This leadership was disposed toward nurturance of the coaches and the athletes, and toward playing the game of boundless enthusiasm. Although cheerleaders are on the game field, they are only on its periphery. The lack of institutional financing for their activities confirms their marginality to the school in one sense, but establishes them as wealthy girls, and, as such, important to the school’s reputation among Browndale’s elites.

The putative leadership of cheerleaders may be a mechanism to funnel the resources of elite girls into cheerleading equipment and also to control their behavior. The girls were certainly aware that any serious wrongdoing would result in their removal from the squad. The statement quoted earlier on the changes in cheerleading clearly connects a code of conduct with cheerleaders, whose “behavior, appearance, and attitude are [to be] above reproach.” From this analysis it seems that the cheerleader status is built upon disposable family wealth, supporting male athletes and coaches, the over-mastering of reason by feelings, and performing in front of the student body and thereby being known by most people in the school. In this light, cheerleaders functioned more as mascots than as school leaders.

If the reality of “female leadership” is the control of female elites, the selection and management of elites through the norms for behavior is complemented, or subsumed, by the control inherent in the discipline of the body. The next section looks at the AAC style of cheering to examine the technical control of the body.

Techniques of the Body

Foucault’s (1979) “bio-power” is a conception of social power as inscribed on the human body in the techniques of movement, diet, sexuality, exercise, etc. (Turner, 1984). Bio-power operates through discipline of the body in the same way that technical-rational control is exercised through organizational structures and routines. Discipline does not replace other forms of social control. Foucault says discipline (or bio-power) colonizes other forms of power, linking them together, extending their hold, honing their efficiency, and “above all making it possible to bring the effects of power to the most minute and distant elements” (Foucault, 1979, p. 216.)

How does bio-power work? Generally, the body is divided into parts, for example, the legs and arms. Each part is examined separately and precisely trained. The aim is control and efficiency of operation that incorporates attention to the smallest elements. At the same time, the meaning dimension of bodily movements is ignored or minimized. Human beings are treated as objects to be molded, as body parts to be trained, rather than as active agents to be consulted. The personal meaning of the body and its movements becomes peripheral to the division into parts, specialized training of the parts, and the greater speed and efficiency of the parts (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1983).
The historical moment of the disciplines was the moment when an art of the human body was born, which was directed not only at the growth of its skills, nor at the intensification of its subjection, but at the formation of a relation that in the mechanism itself makes it more obedient as it becomes more useful, and conversely... The human body was entering a machinery of power that explores it, breaks it down and rearranges it... Discipline produces... docile bodies... [It produces] an increased aptitude and an increased domination. (Foucault, 1979, pp. 137-138).

Kinds of Movements

Cheerleading routines now draw their style from gymnastics, synchronized dance, and military drill teams. There is an AAC style of cheering, immediately recognizable in its short, clipped movements. At camp, girls were admonished to "make the motions sharp, really sharp." At tryouts, both words and motions burst out of the girls, at high speed, starting like a shot and ending abruptly. Exuberant, quick starts—an almost amphetamine-induced quickness—distinguished those who made the squad. High energy that starts quickly and ends sharply characterized many of the successful girls. One would never use the word graceful to describe these movements; they are precise, with a staccato tempo, great speed, and definite starts and stops. Between cheers, some girls relaxed a little, let their bodies go slightly limp. But the more pronounced pattern was to stand at attention between cheers, with no perceptible body movement. This combination of strong, controlled, quick movements, bursting forth and stopping as suddenly, alternating with being at attention required immense bodily control and enormous energy.

One of the cheers in the tryouts was a dance routine to rock music that was the girls' own creation. The movements during that portion of the tryouts involved the movement of shoulders, hips, pelvis, and head from side to side. There were limp wrists and hands with spread apart fingers, rather than the tight fists displayed in the AAC manual. The AAC cheerleading style omitted movements of the human trunk, keeping it upright, concentrating on movements of the legs and arms. The pelvis moved only to accommodate leg movements (Soileau, 1980). The dance routine with its freer body movements highlighted the narrow repertoire of body movements in the AAC style.

If there can be "disposition" in body movements, the AAC style suggests a rapid pace, power controlled in quick starts and stops, intensive use of energy, high control over the body, and movements involving arms and legs but keeping the trunk, head, shoulders immobile.

Bodily Shapes

Certain shapes predominated in the cheering patterns of individuals and of groups. For individuals the movement in the arms and legs tended to be
in straight lines or arms bent at elbows and legs at knees to form 90 degree angles. At camp and in the books, pyramids and other partner stunts always cohered into straight lines, diagonals, and perpendicular lines. Curves, bentness (e.g. wrists), and looseness were all to be avoided. Straightness, not curves, predominated.

The bodies that were best designed for the quickness, the speed, the tautness were small, thin, wiry bodies. Indeed, few full-figured females appeared in the training books, among the teachers at camp, or among the final varsity squad members.

The Face

The AAC Guide connects enthusiasm with the face. "Make sure your face reflects your enthusiasm all along." The faces of the successful girls at tryouts wore smiles that never varied, and very wide eyes. In the empty gym, these wide-awake, very alert, very energetic faces had a fakeness, as did the smiles on girls executing strenuous movements, when the smile was so stretched as to be distorted.

The Voice

Over and over at camp, the teachers stressed that words should be "short and sharp" in order not to "put the crowd to sleep." At camp, there was constant cheering as loud as possible. During the tryouts, the girls who made the squad were really loud, not just loud. They were overly loud for the empty gym, but enthusiasm needed to be shown in volume.

The bodily movements in the AAC style of cheerleading included loudness, exaggerated smile and wide eyes, exaggerated enthusiasm, and cheers that emphasized quickness, sharply defined motions brought to quick stops, suggesting a tautness to the whole body, as if highly strung. Bodies alone and together emphasized straight and diagonal lines and perpendiculars. The trunk remained upright through most of the actions. Hands were always tight, out straight or in a fist.

This set of techniques of the body seemed to stifle sensuality as it exaggerated machine-like synchronization. An industrialized pace assumed and reinforced short attention-spans and maximum motion outputs. The girls' bodies simulated the stiffness and control of military drill teams, and, perhaps, the attitude toward all knowledge and behaviors as properly quick, precise, and definite.

Although my interviews with the cheerleaders produced extensive comments on the organization of cheerleading, no girl criticized the style of cheerleading. Only the advisor for the squad, a teacher at Southern, noted that since all the girls chosen for the next year's squad were of one body type, small and wiry, she could foresee that it would be difficult for the squad to perform stunts such as pyramids. Pyramids required large, strong people for the base, to hold up two levels of girls on their shoulders. Previous squads had larger girls who provided solid supports for multi-
leveled stunts. In the new squad selected by the AAC experts, there were no large, strong girls. In the AAC style of cheerleading portrayed in books and at the cheerleading camps, a minority of male cheerleaders provided the strength for the base of pyramids. Thus, the AAC style of cheerleading also had a gendered division of labor; however, at Southern High only girls were cheerleaders and may have been at a disadvantage with only smaller girls on the squad.

The silence of the girls on the physical expectations of the AAC style of cheerleading is intriguing. It is possible that this silence supports Foucault's assertion that social control written on the body is the most imperceptible form of power. This can only be speculation, since there is inadequate data in this small study to support such a conclusion. A study of cheerleaders over time as they first encounter the AAC style would be necessary to say with assurance that they were acquiescing to the bodily demands. The cheers that they made up themselves were a mixture of standard cheering movements, rock and roll dance movements, and the AAC style. A longitudinal study could document the somatic adaptations as they are created, discussed, and discarded during cheerleading practices.

Summary and Conclusions

In this essay I have sketched a movement toward centralization and bureaucratization of high school cheerleading in a southern high school. A national cheerleader organization has established the development of objective, skill-based standards for selection of cheerleaders, diminishing the relational dimension of cheerleading. The AAC also promotes a distinctive style of cheering that emphasizes a tightly controlled, well-defined body, with an emphasis on straight, clipped movements executed with speed, rather than looser, slower, curvaceous moves. Associated with these changes in organization and form is a rhetoric that emphasizes cheerleaders' enhanced status and skill often couched in the language of leadership.

Taken together, these developments can be seen as a "professionalization" of cheerleading. Cheerleading seems to be undergoing a rationalization and professionalization akin to those undergone by the school curriculum and by teachers (Kliebard, 1977; Apple, 1982; Bullough et al., 1984; Carlson, 1982). While greater efficiency and status are heralded, more centralized control and the creation of elite experts appear to be the most significant consequences. This analysis suggests that the movement toward technical-rational, bureaucratic control is expanding into the extracurriculum. In this move toward professionalization, we see the limitations, rationality, and de-personalization associated with the move toward greater bureaucratization in which efficiency, control, uniform order are "written" on every movement of the arms and legs, on the static expression of the face, and in the unfettered and de-contextualized enthusiasm. At the same time a moral gloss is added: cheerleaders need to have behavior, ap-
pearance, and attitudes “above reproach.” This moral dimension extends the school’s limitations on behavior to all times, in and out of school, on and off the playing fields.

In this way, we see the human face, the human cost of rationalization—in its excessive enthusiasm, its artificial face with exaggerated smile, its taut body which is never at ease. Bodily performance is quick, precise, and definite, down to the way the hands are held and words enunciated. When the body is accustomed to such performances, the mind may easily follow the expectation for speed, precision, and definition regardless of the task or issue. The connection of the physical and social organizational dimensions provides a feel for what rationalization and efficiency do to one’s body and to the relationship among bodies when based upon speed and straight lines.

Finally, we must remember that we are considering the management of an organization primarily for young women. The control of the AAC model, at least in its ideal form, is total; the AAC model seeks to control teenage girls organizationally, physically, and morally. In this, it seems to be emulating total institutions (Goffman, 1961). One wonders whether teenage girls are so scary to the patriarchy that all these layers of control are deemed necessary or whether power for its own sake is being promoted (Foucault, 1979), with teenage girls the delightful, and profitable, objects of control.

This examination of a movement to “professionalize” cheerleading suggests two major areas for thought and action among social educators. First, it suggests caution in the promotion of professionalization, whether of teachers’ or students’ activities. The purported higher status of professionals appears to be offset by greater bureaucratic control and rationalization of activities, as well as by the demand for more uniformity. Educators should be aware of the pluses and minuses of any move toward professionalization.

Second, social educators and secondary school educators should recognize that where students place significance is where social learning is occurring. Although we need not capitulate to these interests, we need to acknowledge them and learn from them. The low status of extracurricular activities in researchers’ eyes may be amplified when the activities in question are primarily those of girls. Just as female activities in schools are marginalized, except when they serve the school’s aims (Davies, 1984), so are female activities likely to be marginalized in educational research. School activities which are traditionally female are especially likely to be considered trivial. When one gets beyond such a bias, the potential for leadership and creativity by young women can be acknowledged. Thus, secondary school educators could consider reorganizing extracurricular activities such as cheerleading to foster real leadership and authentic decision-making among girls. In order for such a movement to occur, educators must cease to marginalize and trivialize extracurricular activities. Through the study of extracurricular activities, social educators have the opportunity to be con-
nected to authentic social activities that hold significance for young people, rather than remaining stuck in a traditional, male-centered view of what counts as arenas for social learning.

Endnotes

1. This is the title of a song and cheering routine developed by and used at AAC cheerleading camps.
2. This claim is not supported by research. The significance of cheerleaders for teenage girls has been supported through personal testimony among colleagues, researchers, and female students.
3. All proper nouns are pseudonyms. Southern High School is located in Browndale, a booming city of 200,000 between two larger urban areas. The city is composed of lower middle and middle class Anglo residents. The city is in the Bible Belt and influenced by Baptist and fundamentalist orientations. I had continuing contacts with teachers and students at Southern across a two year period through supervision of student teachers. The data upon which this analysis is based were collected only in the Spring, 1985.
4. In order to retain anonymity, I omit some information on the sources of my direct quotes; I omit the authors' names and change the titles of texts. This quote is from a text I call Cheerleading, NY: Delacorte, 1981: pps. 1–2.
5. Through numerous regional and national competitions, cheerleading squads do in fact gain recognition and rewards. Cheerleaders at Southern High liked to compete whenever an opportunity arose; that was a big part of the fun of cheerleading. In being a sponsor of these competitions, AAC did raise the status and public awareness of cheerleaders, evidenced in the TV coverage of national competitions.
6. The director of AAC characterized the changes in cheerleading in this way in an interview in May, 1985.
7. From my taped interview with the director of AAC in May, 1985.
8. See Endnote 4.
9. Elmtown’s Youth (Hollingshead, 1949) has an excellent portrayal of how the high school is run to please the wealthy community members.
10. This term comes from Mauss (1934) and means “the ways in which human beings know how to use their bodies.”
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Abstract

The effect of instruction in economics on ninth-grade students' attitudes toward topics in economics was examined through a quasi-experiment. An original measure of attitudes toward economic issues was used to measure the pre- and posttest views of two groups of students: 803 students undergoing economics instruction, and 654 students, drawn from the same schools, not undergoing economics instruction. While there were no statistically significant pretreatment differences between the groups, as measured on the eight attitude scales, analysis of covariance at the posttest showed modest but statistically significant differences between the groups on five scales. The results support the hypothesis that instruction affects attitudes and lend qualified support to the hypothesis that the effects of instruction are in the same direction as developmental changes in attitudes.

This article reports on the second part of a two-phase research project. In the first phase, a measure of economic attitudes and values—the Economics Values Inventory (EVI)—was developed. In the second phase, the EVI was used to measure and interpret attitude changes following economics instruction in the ninth grade.

There is substantial evidence that introductory economics can be successfully learned in early adolescence (Davis, 1985; Banaszak, 1985) and economics curricula have increasingly been developed for the junior high or middle school, especially eighth and ninth grades (NASSP, 1981). However, the relationship between knowledge and attitudes in economics learning has seldom been studied for this age group.

The most studied aspect of economic socialization has been the develop-
ment of economic reasoning, both in and outside of school (Sutton, 1962; Jahoda, 1979, 1981; Berti & Bombi, 1979, 1981, 1982; Burris, 1983; Leiser, 1983; Schug, 1983; Schug & Birkey, 1985). However, some affective domain research has been conducted, chiefly with high school and college students. Jackstadt and Brennan (1983) investigated economic attitudes of Hawaiian secondary school students; the Economic Attitude Sophistication scale of Walstad and Soper (1983) quantifies the degree of attitudinal agreement between high school economics students and the consensus view of professional economists; and Whitehead's (1986) Economics Attitude Scale (EAS) has been used to investigate attitude change toward economic issues among English secondary school students enrolled in economics. At the university level several studies, usually employing small, local samples of students who have elected introductory economics, suggest that economics knowledge and values are not independent (Luker, 1972; Rothman & Scott, 1975; Riddle, 1978; Sosin & McConnell, 1979; Luker & Proctor, 1981; Jackstadt, Brennan, & Thompson, 1985). Such studies have often suggested that economics instruction produces politically conservative attitudes among students.

Recent cognitive-development research (Leiser, 1983; Ng, 1983; Furnham & Thomas, 1984; Furnham, 1986) underscores the importance of adolescence as the period in which fragmentary economic knowledge and attitudes become more complete and consistent, and come to approach an adult level of integration and sophistication.

Attitudinal findings from the first (developmental) phase of research with the EVI confirmed the incipient and incomplete structure of economic attitudes in early adolescence. Research subjects were students in grades 7, 8, 9, and 12. Consistency of response (and clarity of factor structures) was markedly associated with higher grade level. Our findings revealed three kinds of relationship between knowledge and attitudes: (1) Sometimes knowledge seemed the prerequisite to having an attitude (for example, older students, but not younger, tended to have attitudes about automation); (2) strong attitudes sometimes were held toward concepts (for example, inflation) that appeared to be at best poorly understood; (3) attitudes were relatively uncrystallized for some themes that were comparatively easy to comprehend, but remote from the direct experience of adolescents (for example, government regulation of the economy). In addition, we found that economic attitudes varied (in a systematic and statistically significant way, when EVI scale scores were related to economics test scores) by extent of economic understanding.

This study had two purposes. The first was to measure the affective impact of economics instruction in a sample of ninth graders. The second (and perforce somewhat speculative) goal was to interpret observed changes. We hypothesized that economics instruction would influence attitudes. This could be expected because understanding is often prerequisite to attitude formation. Even when valuation precedes understanding, new knowledge
may modify that valuation. Finally, attitudes may crystallize in areas remote from personal experience when, through curricular intervention, experience is extended vicariously. However, transmission of knowledge is only one of the routes through which instruction can affect attitudes. A further question is therefore the degree to which the attitudinal effects of instruction are wholly or in part attributable to the transmission of economic understanding. Consequently the study design also called for a two-way analysis of instruction and knowledge effects, to determine to what extent EVI score differences associated with instruction corresponded with differences associated with greater economic understanding (as measured by test scores).

We also predicted that posttest attitude changes for the instruction group would mirror differences associated with greater cognitive maturity. That is, we hypothesized that instruction produces changes in attitudes in the same direction as changes that would later occur in the absence of instruction. Generally, research suggests that adolescents become more supportive of the economic status quo—more supportive of equity and efficiency-incentive considerations—and less egalitarian over time (Stacey, 1982, p. 168, p. 172; Cummings & Taebel, 1978; Leahy, 1983, p. 106).

In addition, political socialization studies suggest that adolescents become less trusting of societal institutions (such as government) with increasing age (Jennings & Niemi, 1974, pp. 274–275). It may be asked whether this generalization can be extended to economic institutions, such as business. Our earlier EVI research with students from grades 7 to 12, while not based on national probability samples, suggests that trust in business (EVI Scale 2) normally decreases with age (O'Brien & Ingels, 1984, p. 32). The work of Jackstadt and Brennan (1983, p. 7) also suggests that students become increasingly cynical about business institutions as they grow older.3

While generalizations from the developmental literature provided one means of predicting the probable direction of post-instruction attitude change, a second hypothetical predictor was variation in EVI-scale scores at the pretest associated with difference in extent of economic knowledge as measured on an economics knowledge test (an abbreviated version of Schur, 1973).

Essentially the same tendencies suggested by the adolescent socialization literature—greater system support, lesser egalitarianism, institutional cynicism—may also be discerned in the pattern of EVI-scale score differences between economically more and less knowledgeable pretest respondents (Ingels & O'Brien, 1985, Table 3).

Method

The Sample

A fairly homogeneous sample was sought that would minimize non-instructional sources of attitude variation across comparison groups. Respondents were limited to the same grade (9) thus restricting age range (modal
age = 14 years). However, care was taken to preserve a degree of heterogeneity with respect to race, sex, and socioeconomic status (SES). By utilizing the entire population of ninth graders in the public schools in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Durango, Colorado, a comprehensive cross-section of SES was obtained. A total of 1,457 students participated, of whom 803 were enrolled in economics and 654 were not.

The Research Design

The quasi-experiment consisted of a pretest of students' economic attitudes as measured on the EVI scales, followed by a semester of instruction and a posttest of the same youths' economic attitudes.

The comparison groups were users of the text, Our Economy: How It Works (Clawson, 1984) and students not undergoing economics instruction. Each school with classrooms receiving instruction with the text also contributed classrooms with no economics instruction. Distribution of students into one or the other group reflected no systematic process.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) contrasting the pretest EVI scale means of the treatment and control groups was employed to determine whether their pretest attitudes were essentially equivalent. No systematic or statistically significant differences were found (see Table 1 below).

The Research Instrument

The Economics Values Inventory (EVI) consists of eight scales containing a total of 44 economic attitude items.

Scale 1 measures support for the prevailing American economic system. The scale emphasizes the economy in its production and efficiency functions, and affirms profits, proper use of limited resources, hard work, oc-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.608</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>5.574</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.770</td>
<td>1.029</td>
<td>4.747</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.851</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>2.885</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.982</td>
<td>1.047</td>
<td>4.967</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.998</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>4.054</td>
<td>1.793</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.521</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>4.624</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.418</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>3.382</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td>1.142</td>
<td>4.786</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
cupational freedom, competition, division of labor, and savings. It contains items such as "Profits are essential to our country's economic health," "If workers want higher wages, they must work harder and produce more," and "Competition between businesses makes for the lowest prices."

**Scale 2** focuses on the image of American business. Its contents project a "Trust in Business" value. The scale contains items such as "Most businesses won't sell products they think are unsafe," "Government should listen more to what the business community has to say," and "Advertising helps consumers to make intelligent choices."

**Scale 3** is psychological in orientation. It consists of statements that reflect economic alienation and powerlessness and is thus, inversely, a measure of feelings of individual economic efficacy. It contains items such as "It's no use worrying about the economy; I can't do anything about it anyway," and "Getting ahead is mostly a matter of luck."

**Scale 4** asserts that government is responsible for social welfare. Interestingly, while strongly supportive of the American economic system both at pretest and posttest, students saw no conflict between an economy in which private capital has a large role, and a system in which the state provides a safety net for the unfortunate.

**Scale 5** items are directed against a government role in price setting. **Scale 6** items express negative views toward powerful labor unions. Items voicing concern with whether workers receive fair treatment in our economy make up **Scale 7**. **Scale 8** items reflect concern with the fate of the average person and the economy in its distributive aspect.

**Findings**

Does a term of economics instruction affect the economic attitudes of ninth grade students? The analysis used posttest scores adjusted for the pretest scores as the main technique for exploring differences. This analysis of covariance technique takes into account differences between groups on the pretest; in this respect, it is similar to an analysis of change scores. The analysis of covariance procedure is preferable to analysis of change scores because simple change scores are often very unreliable. Table 2 depicts posttest attitudinal differences between the two groups. Statistically significant differences appear on five of the eight scales: 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8.

Students exposed to a term of economics instruction are more supportive of the American economic system (Scale 1); show more trust in business (Scale 2); express more emphatic rejection of alienation items (Scale 3); are more likely to feel that workers' treatment is fair (Scale 7); and are less likely to be critical of the distributive status quo (Scale 8). No statistically significant difference is seen between the two groups on Scale 4 (government responsibility for social welfare) or on Scales 5 and 6 (price controls and unions, topics little touched upon by the text).

These effects, though not large in absolute magnitude, seem impressive as
Table 2
Analysis of Covariance: Adjusted Posttest EVI Scale Means of Ninth Grade Students Undergoing Versus Not Undergoing Economics Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values Scale</th>
<th>Economics Yes</th>
<th>Economics No</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>S.D. *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support for American Economic System</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>29.329</td>
<td>&lt; .000</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trust in Business</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>10.309</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Economic Alienation and Powerlessness</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>4.342</td>
<td>&lt; .037</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Government is Responsible for Social Welfare</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Against Government Role in Price-Setting</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Against Powerful Unions</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Workers Receive Fair Treatment</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.064</td>
<td>&lt; .014</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Against Distributive Status Quo</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.885</td>
<td>&lt; .049</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly disagree  7 = Strongly agree with scale values
n.s. = not statistically significant (p = > .05)

*Pooled Standard Deviation based on residual from the ANCOVA.
outcomes of a single term of instruction with a text that eschews value recommendations and confines itself to accepted economic interpretations and consensus theory. If one seeks evidence that students are rational and open enough to be affectively influenced by economics learning, these results may be reassuring. If, however, one posits strong normative goals for economics instruction, such as substantially increasing support for the prevailing economic system, such outcomes may seem of trivial import. Significance also may be regarded as a matter of duration as well as degree. This research provides no answer to the question of whether changes were long-lasting or ephemeral.

Regardless of one’s view of their practical significance, these results largely support, for a large and diverse junior high school sample, the general conclusion that Jackstadt and Brennan derived from their study of older adolescents: “high school economics courses were found to be an effective means of increasing economic knowledge, thereby bringing about positive changes in students’ attitudes toward the American economic system, business, and labor unions” (1983, p. 14), but with the qualification, “no relationship is found...between knowledge and attitudes toward labor unions,” (p. 7).

One possible explanation for the observed attitude change is that cognitive outcomes of instruction influence attitudes. However, instruction may affect attitudes in noncognitive ways as well. Thus, we sought to discover whether extent of factual knowledge, so reliable a predictor of attitudinal differences, explained the whole, or only a part, of instruction’s attitudinal impact. This question was explored through a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) that simultaneously depicted instructional effects (posttest EVI scale scores of the treatment and control groups) and extent of economic knowledge (EVI scale scores of students with different levels of economic understanding). If instruction has its effect through increased understanding alone, one should see no statistically significant scale differences between experimental and control respondents, when comparing these two groups within any of the four specified levels of economic knowledge.

The two-way analysis of the treatment and control groups showed that extent of economic knowledge was a powerful predictor of statistically significant attitude differences on all eight scales. Instruction, however, also had a strong independent effect on some scales (1,2,7,8) though not on others (namely the psychological scale, 3; and the scales that registered no significant attitude difference between the two groups at the posttest—4,5,6). Thus, as compared to control group respondents having the same ranking in economic knowledge, those who had undergone economics instruction were significantly more likely to: strongly support the American economic system (Scale 1), affirm trust in business items (Scale 2), and feel that workers’ treatment is fair (Scale 7). They were less likely to agree with
items attacking the economic status quo for distributive unfairness (Scale 8). These results suggest that some of the impact of instruction is not entirely mediated by factual knowledge. Especially notable is the result for Scale 2 (Trust in Business) where the effect of instruction dampens the knowledge-associated tendency toward distrust.

Our main hypothesis was that instruction would influence students’ economic attitudes. Posttest results are consistent with this hypothesis. The extent to which instruction has this effect through cognitive means is uncertain.

Our subsidiary hypothesis was that instructional impacts would be in the same direction as changes associated with greater cognitive maturity. If instruction indeed accelerates developmental trends we should expect egalitarian-distributive scale scores to go down, scores on production-efficiency scales to go up, and trust in business scores to decline. In general, the impact of instruction assorts comfortably with the age-related attitudinal trends.

The exception is Scale 2 (Trust in Business). The economics instruction group showed (at the posttest) more trust in business than did the control group. This suggests that instruction diminishes institutional cynicism. This outcome should be compared to the parallel findings of Jackstadt and Brennan (1983, p. 7), who concluded that economic knowledge and course-taking mitigated age-related cynicism toward economic institutions.

### Table 3

#### Two-way ANOVA on Economic Knowledge × Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>F ratios</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Instruction × Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.781**</td>
<td>28.620**</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.126**</td>
<td>11.621**</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38.822**</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>1.747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.246*</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.190**</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>2.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.897**</td>
<td>3.748</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.455**</td>
<td>4.817*</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.792**</td>
<td>4.216*</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < 0.05

**P < 0.001

---
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Conclusions

Our central finding is that economics instruction has a measurable impact on students’ economic attitudes. In part, that impact apparently reinforces developmental trends—greater commitment to the system of economic pro-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Cell Means for EVI Scales With Significant Instructional Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale 1 SUPPORT FOR AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM - Cell Means</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Knowledge</td>
<td>Economic Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Scale 2 TRUST IN BUSINESS - Cell Means</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Knowledge</th>
<th>Economic Instruction</th>
<th>No Economic Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = strongest disagreement with scale values
7 = strongest agreement with scale values
I = lowest economic knowledge
IV = highest economic knowledge

<p>| <strong>Scale 7 WORKERS RECEIVE FAIR TREATMENT - Cell Means</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Knowledge</th>
<th>Economic Instruction</th>
<th>No Economic Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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duction and somewhat diminished support for egalitarian distribution. At the same time instruction counteracts institutional cynicism.

These conclusions bear uncertain implications for the question of the nature and proper purposes of economics education. If instruction reinforces developmental trends, it is of interest to know whether those trends reflect invariant logical sequences of cognitive maturation, or something very different—for example, the capacity of the American economic order to culturally reproduce itself. If the latter, some may see economics education as, like civics, a discipline that properly has a value orientation and role in system maintenance (Leming, 1987). From a different political perspective (Cummings & Taebel, 1978; Romanish, 1983, 1984) a curriculum that reinforces such developmental trends may seem a form of ideological indoctrination.

To the extent that instructional effects counteract developmental trends, as may be the case for attitudes of institutional cynicism, it is of particular interest to know by what mechanism such effects are produced. Our results raise anew such questions without offering a basis for settling them.

We therefore suggest that additional research—including both replication of this study using alternative curriculum materials, and a serious effort to measure long term attitudinal effects of economics instruction—should be undertaken. In addition, in order to increase our understanding of developmental tendencies, and to obtain a national norm that would permit cross-cohort comparisons over time, economic attitude items should be incorporated into national longitudinal probability samples of adolescents, such as the panel studies sponsored by the Longitudinal Studies Branch of the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics.

Table 4 (Cont.)

Scale 8 AGAINST THE DISTRIBUTIVE STATUS QUO - Cell Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Knowledge</th>
<th>Economic Instruction</th>
<th>No Economic Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = strongest disagreement with scale values
7 = strongest agreement with scale values
I = lowest economic knowledge
IV = highest economic knowledge
Endnotes

1. This research was conducted by NORC, A Social Science Research Center at the University of Chicago, and was sponsored by the Foundation for Teaching Economics. Details of the research appear in a technical report (Ingels & O’Brien, 1985); this article is a shortened version of a paper presented at the 1987 American Educational Research Association meetings (Ingels & O’Brien, 1987).

2. Economics Values Inventory (EVI) copyright 1984, Foundation for Teaching Economics. For permission to use the EVI and to obtain a copy of the instrument in a form suitable for classroom use, please contact FTE, 550 Kearny Street, San Francisco, CA 94108. Reliability and validity data for the EVI are reported in O’Brien & Ingels, 1984 and 1987. EVI results for a British sample are reported in Furnham, 1987.

3. Jackstadt and Brennan also found age-related cynicism toward the American economic system. However, their “American economic system” scale is different in content from ours. The EVI American economic system scale emphasizes the economy in its productive rather than institutional aspects; the Jackstadt-Brennan scale contains other than production elements (including distributive items) that, in our factor analyses, distributed themselves across several of the EVI scales.

4. In both phases of the research, a number of variables (including SES, gender, political party affiliation, and race) were associated with systematic and interpretable attitude differences. Differing personal characteristics were randomly distributed in the experimental and control groups. Thus they were in principle precluded from confounding the analysis of instructional effects and are not reported here. For data on the relationship between EVI scale scores and theoretically related variables see O’Brien & Ingels, 1984 and Ingels & O’Brien, 1985.
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**Appendix: The Economics Values Inventory**

**Scale 1: Support for American Economic System**

1. Resources are always limited, and we must make hard choices about the best way to use them.
2. Profits are essential to our country's economic health.
3. Our society owes much to the contributions of business.
4. If workers want higher wages, they must work harder and produce more.
5. People who blame other people or society for their problems are just coping out.
6. My freedom to choose my own occupation is very important to me.
7. It's the duty of people to do their jobs the best they can.
8. Competition between businesses makes for the lowest prices.
9. A company deserves its profits when they come as the result of doing the best job for less money.
10. If you have a valuable skill, you'll get ahead in our society.
11. Groups of individuals with specialized skills, working together, can produce better products than individuals working alone.
12. Our economy needs more people who are willing to save to the future.

**Scale 2: Trust in Business**

13. Most businesses won't sell products they think are unsafe.
14. Government should listen more to what the business community has to say.
15. Businesses could provide more jobs, goods, and services if they didn't have to pay so much in taxes.
16. Advertising helps consumers to make intelligent choices.
17. Most people like their jobs.
Scale 3: Economic Alienation and Powerlessness
18. It's no use worrying about the economy; I can't do anything about it anyway.
19. Getting ahead is mostly a matter of luck.
20. It's foolish to do more than you have to in a job.
21. Having the freedom to start my own business really means having the freedom to take advantage of others.
22. Being in business means taking unfair advantage of others.
23. Profit is a sign that someone is being taken advantage of.
24. The way our economic system is set up, nobody has a chance to get ahead any more.

Scale 4: Government is Responsible for Social Welfare
25. It's the responsibility of the government to take care of people who can't take care of themselves.
26. The poor and the ill have a right to help from the government.
27. A person who cannot find a job has only himself to blame.*
28. It should be the duty of government to be sure that everyone has a secure job and a decent standard of living.
29. The unemployed shouldn't blame themselves for their situation; it's the fault of the economic system.
30. Taking care of the poor and the sick is the job of families and churches, not the job of the government.*

Scale 5: Against Government Role in Price Setting
31. Companies should only be allowed to charge a government-controlled price for their products.*
32. It's not the business of the government to control prices.

Scale 6: Against Powerful Unions
33. Unions are too powerful.
34. We'd all be better off if labor unions were stronger.*
35. Employers should have the right to hire non-union workers if they want to.

Scale 7: Workers Receive Fair Treatment
36. The average worker today is getting his or her fair share.
37. The average worker is getting less than his or her fair share.*
38. Most companies don't give employees a fair share of what the company earns.*
39. Most companies give employees a fair share of what the company earns.

*Indicates reverse scoring item.
Scale 8: Against Distributive Status Quo

40. America's wealth is far too unequally shared.

41. The situation of the average person is getting worse, not better.

42. There are few real opportunities for the average person to start a business in America today.

43. We need a way to make incomes more equal in this country.

44. One of the bad things about our economic system is that the person at the bottom gets less help and has less security than in some other systems.
Economic Attitudes of High School Students: New Norms for the *Survey on Economic Attitudes*

John C. Soper and William B. Walstad

Abstract

This paper reopens the question of the reliability and validity of an affective domain instrument, the *Survey on Economic Attitudes*, by providing new norms and a full discussion of the properties of the national high school sample used. The study also presents current information about the economic attitudes of American high school students, and raises some important questions about the affective orientation of social education.

Reliable and valid measures are necessary for empirical research in social education. Reliable instruments enable researchers to measure a construct under study with a certain degree of consistency. Valid instruments give researchers confidence that they are actually able to measure a construct or property of interest. Over the years, a number of reliable and valid instruments have been developed for use in social education to investigate research questions in both the cognitive and affective domains.

Few psychometric studies, however, are ever conducted of our research measures after they are published in the research literature. This practice is unfortunate, for reliability and validity properties are sample-dependent and may be subject to change over time. Commercial publishers of popular cognitive tests in the social studies have an economic incentive (as well as an educational responsibility) to provide new information on the reliability and validity of their tests as they periodically revise or renorm tests for classroom use. But there appear to be few rewards to individual test developers to undertake any subsequent study of cognitive or affective measures, or even much concern about re-examining the technical properties of a measure. Neglecting this type of study raises doubts about the stability of our research measures, and may reduce the quality of empirical work in social education.

Correspondence: John C. Soper, Cleveland Center for Economic Education, John Carroll University, Cleveland, OH 44118; William B. Walstad, Center for Economic Education, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68588.
education (cf. Fraenkel, 1987). This problem is particularly acute with attitude measures developed primarily for research rather than commercial purposes.

This study presents new evidence on the measurement properties of the Survey on Economic Attitudes (SEA) (Walstad & Soper, 1983). The SEA is reproduced in the Appendix. The SEA assesses two dimensions of economics attitudes. The first subscale, the “Attitude Towards Economics” (ATE), measures student attitudes towards the subject of economics as a discipline or course of study. The second subscale, the “Economic Attitude Sophistication” (EAS) scale, measures student attitudes towards selected economic issues, or the extent to which student views on economic issues are in agreement with the consensus views of the economics profession. The measure consists of a total of 28 Likert-type items, 14 for each subscale.

Instrument Validity

In the process of developing the SEA, careful attention was paid to the validity and reliability of the two subscales (as we reported in Soper and Walstad, 1983). The ATE subscale was adopted, with very minor revision, from the instrument developed earlier by Hodgin and Manahan (1979). The initial validity and reliability information for the ATE had been published by Hodgin and Manahan, and was deemed acceptable by the development committee for the SEA.

To develop a new subscale to measure “attitude sophistication,” we followed Mann and Fusfeld (1970), who wrote:

Attitude sophistication means that opinions are consistent with the current state of knowledge. Although economists may differ about economic goals and the means of attaining them, there is a body of economic knowledge with which most members of the discipline agree. . . . Such opinions reflect a high degree of knowledge and a rational analysis of the problem and can correctly be termed sophisticated.

We therefore chose to develop an EAS subscale which would measure the extent to which student views are congruent with the consensus views of the economics professions. The initial validity assessment of the EAS subscale (the more critical of the two parts of the SEA) was completed by a very small, select panel of 13 economists. To check further the content validity of the EAS subscale, all 231 economic education council and center directors were surveyed. All were affiliated with the Joint Council on Economic Education. They were mailed a 20-item questionnaire, containing a random mix of the 14 normed EAS items and 6 items previously rejected by the original validation panel of 13 economists. The respondents were asked to check the questionnaire items for whether they agreed, disagreed, or found
them unacceptable for a response. Table 1 presents the results from this national validity survey.

The expected result from this national survey would be a clear consensus (agreement or disagreement greater than 70%) on the 14 items and no clear consensus on the 6 previously rejected items. The survey results demonstrated the fulfillment of these expectations. A response rate of 64.5% (149 out of 231) provided a sample of high credibility for this national validity survey. As expected, a clear consensus was expressed on the 14 items, with the percentage agreement or disagreement ranging from 70.3% to 99.3%. The mean for all 14 items was 85.8%. For the 6 "distractor" items, the agreement or disagreement ranged from 25.2% to 67.8%.

**Recent Uses of the SEA**

Since the SEA was developed, examples of its use can be found in a number of research studies. Walstad and Soper (1982) used the SEA in a national investigation of factors affecting economic understanding and attitudes among high school students. Schober (1984) administered the ATE subscale in a study of the impact of inservice training on high school teachers and students. Walstad (1984) evaluated a masters degree program for teachers with the SEA. Randall and Carr (1986) chose the SEA for an assessment of a film series on economics for high school students. Fizel and Johnson (1986) selected the measure to study the impact of micro/macro course sequencing on the economic understanding and attitudes of college students. Fizel and Fiedler (1986) measured economics attitudes with the ATE in a disaggregated study of student characteristics in an introductory economics course. Duff and Hopkins (1986) used the SEA in a study of an economics education program for employees.

Given this growing interest in the SEA, more recent psychometric documentation should be of value to researchers studying economic attitudes. In addition, as Fraenkel (1987, p. 205) has stated, "replication of studies is more the rare example than standard practice." In this study, we attempt to show the value of replication and of supplying detailed information on the reliability and validity of the instrument under examination. At the same time, this study gives the social educator significant new information about the economic attitudes of U.S. high school students.

The original study was based on the administration of the measure in May, 1979, to a national sample of 1,747 high school students. Small-sample information was also developed on the use of the instrument with college students and teachers. The current study is based on a large national subsample of the 8,205 students, drawn from 213 high schools across the country, who were participating in the May, 1986, national norming of the second edition of the *Test of Economic Literacy* (Soper & Walstad, 1987). This invitational sample is representative of juniors and seniors enrolled in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>U.S. labor unions are too strong.</em></td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Government should control the price of gasoline.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Inflation is caused by greedy business and union leaders.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Business makes too much profit.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Government should guarantee an income for all people.</em></td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People should not have to pay taxes.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Free medical care should be provided for all Americans.</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Banks should not charge interest on loans to customers.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>We should save our natural resources for future use.</em></td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most people who don't have jobs are too lazy to work.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>When a business gets big, it should be controlled by government.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>New factories are not needed.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>*Everyone who wants to work should be provided with a job.</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>People should not be told how to spend their money.</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>If everybody had more money, we'd all be better off.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Profits should not be regulated by government.</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>*A clean environment is not more important than economic growth.</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Most unemployed people are lazy.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>When a strike occurs, government should step in and settle the dispute.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>*Government should not provide food stamps for the poor.</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Distractor items

American high schools in the spring of 1986. The sample has been fully analyzed in two recent publications (Soper & Walstad, 1988; Walstad & Soper, 1988). Data from this larger and more comprehensive sample permit comparisons of the measurement properties of the SEA over time, allow norms to be re-established, and make breakdowns possible across major student characteristics at the high school level.

Comparisons: 1979 and 1986

Table 2 displays the results of the new administration of the SEA in 1986, with 7,181 students completing the ATE scale and 6,109 students completing the EAS scale. Also included in Table 2 are the comparable statistics from the original 1979 norming of the SEA. As an overall measure of internal consistency, the Cronbach alphas are reported for both subscales: 0.87 for the ATE and 0.67 for the EAS, in the 1986 administration. These estimates of internal consistency are virtually identical to those obtained in the 1979 norming and provide good evidence of the stability of the SEA's internal consistency over time.

Table 2 also reveals the fact that students with economics instruction scored 3.65 points higher on the ATE than did students without economics instruction. On the EAS, students with economics scored 1.76 points higher than did students without economics. These group differences indicate that

---

Table 2

Aggregate Statistics for the SEA Norm Samples, 1986 and 1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument:</th>
<th>ATE Scale</th>
<th>EAS Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample:</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of students</td>
<td>7,181</td>
<td>1,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach alpha</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. error of measurement</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per cent with economics</td>
<td>71.72</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean overall</td>
<td>43.64</td>
<td>46.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.29)*</td>
<td>(9.26)</td>
<td>(6.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean with economics</td>
<td>44.68</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9.29)</td>
<td>(6.93)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean without economics</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8.77)</td>
<td>(6.53)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations.

SOURCE: For 1979 statistics, see (Soper & Walstad, 1983); 1986 statistics are from the national norming of the Test of Economic Literacy, 2nd, ed. (Soper & Walstad, 1987).
the two subscales of the SEA possess construct validity, in that student scores are responsive to economics instruction.

Table 3 provides a breakdown of the ATE scale results by students with and without economics instruction, while Table 4 provides the same breakdown for the EAS scale. These breakdown tables provide substantially more detailed information about the characteristics of our norming samples than is usually available (cf. Wallen & Fraenkel, 1988). The subcategory cells for Tables 3 and 4 are student sex, grade level, IQ level, race/ethnic origin, type of community, census region, family income level, and course type. The IQ level was generated by administering the Quick Word Test (Borgatta & Corsini, 1978) to subsamples of 3,874 students for the ATE and 3,170 students for the EAS. The QWT correlates highly with longer, more comprehensive IQ measures and is relatively easy to administer in a short period of time. In this application, the QWT raw scores were reduced to three IQ categories (high, medium, low) based on the norming tables for grades 9–12 in the QWT Manual (Borgatta & Corsini, 1964, p. 9.)¹ This breakdown produces three IQ groups of sufficient size to make possible some reasonable comparisons. The results show differences in both ATE and EAS by level of intelligence. However, they also indicate that exposure to economics instruction makes a difference in both ATE and EAS at each intelligence level, and in the appropriate direction. These findings provide additional evidence of the construct validity of the SEA: The subscales are not merely proxy measures of intelligence.

The race/ethnic origin breakdown was self-reported by 6,604 students on the ATE (92% of the total ATE sample) and 5,582 students on the EAS (91.4% of the total EAS sample). For course type, we used teacher-reported classification into economics, consumer economics, or social studies groups. Estimates of average household income for students were obtained from the teachers administering the SEA.³ In general, the breakdowns by race/ethnic origin, by type of course, and by household income estimate all yield results in the expected direction. Moreover, examination of the data in Tables 3 and 4 reveals that students with economics score higher than students without economics in all but one breakdown categories. These breakdowns should increase the utility of the new norms, and provide further evidence on the construct validity of the subscales of the SEA.

New percentile norms for the ATE and EAS are presented in Table 5, broken down by students with and without economics instruction. The ATE norms are based on a 7,181 student sample and the EAS on a 6,109 student sample, 87% and 74% subsets, respectively, of the 8,205 student sample drawn to norm the revised Test of Economic Literacy. The subsamples are, in turn, congruent with the overall TEL sample. These sample sizes are more than 4 times larger than the original ATE sample (more than 3.5 times larger for the EAS) and make the development of national norms possible. We have not subdivided the norms by grade level because a large percentage
Table 3
Descriptive Statistics for Various Groups within the Norming Sample
SEA—Attitudes Towards Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>With Economics</th>
<th>Without Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By student sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>43.55</td>
<td>9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>45.79</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By grade level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>44.70</td>
<td>9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By IQ level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>42.62</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>44.21</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46.79</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Race/Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>9.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>44.69</td>
<td>8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44.98</td>
<td>8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By type of community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>45.33</td>
<td>9.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By region</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>44.04</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>43.23</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td>40.94</td>
<td>8.54</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central</td>
<td>44.88</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>2,132</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>41.23</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By income level</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>44.29</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>41.55</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td>1,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>9.23</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>42.78</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By course type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>45.06</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>3,967</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Economics</td>
<td>42.88</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>41.93</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| All students         | 44.67 | 9.29  | 5,150 | 41.03 | 8.77  | 2,031 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Descriptive Statistics for Various Groups within the Norming Sample</th>
<th>SEA—Economic Attitude Sophistication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Economics</td>
<td>Without Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By student sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>47.52</td>
<td>7.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By grade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td>46.93</td>
<td>6.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>47.65</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By IQ level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>44.77</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>47.48</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Race/Origin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47.94</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>46.02</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>45.87</td>
<td>7.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>45.50</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>By type of community</td>
<td>By region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Northeast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46.06 6.96 754</td>
<td>47.84 6.64 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.30 6.70 1,910</td>
<td>46.89 6.85 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47.73 6.99 1,206</td>
<td>47.81 7.00 1,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.03 7.09 710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of both samples are twelfth graders (71.5% for the ATE sample, and 72.8% for the EAS).

The re-norming of the SEA involved the administration of several different instruments. Construct validity was probed by asking how these diverse measures are correlated with one another. The answer is provided by the correlation matrix in Table 6.

The "separability" of the two subscales (ATE and EAS) can be established by looking at the correlation of scores on the two subscales. This correlation is 0.27, a positive but relatively low number, indicating that the two subscales measure substantially different constructs.

Using the statistics contained in Table 6, we can also gain some insight into the "separability" of the SEA subscales from the cognitive domain. For example, we can examine the intercorrelations between the ATE and EAS subscales and the QWT, a cognitive-domain measure. In Table 6, the ATE-QWT correlation is 0.16 and the EAS-QWT correlation is 0.34. These relatively low intercorrelations suggest that the SEA subscales would be poor IQ proxies and that the subscales are substantially different from most IQ measures. Note that the TEL/QWT correlations are as much as 3.5 times higher, indicating that TEL scores are much more highly correlated with IQ, a measure which is much more related to the cognitive than the affective domain.

Scores on the ATE and EAS may also be related to scores on the revised Test of Economic Literacy, a cognitive-domain achievement test. The correlations are 0.36 between the ATE and the TEL Form A and 0.37 between the ATE and the TEL Form B. For the EAS, the correlations are 0.45 with Form A of the TEL and 0.40 with Form B of the TEL. Although positive and significant, these correlations are moderate, at best. They suggest that

---

Table 5

Percentile Norms for the SEA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Attitude Towards Economics</th>
<th>Economic Attitude Sophistication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Economics (N = 5,150)</td>
<td>Without Economics (N = 2,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Percentile Norms for the SEA *(Cont.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Attitude Towards Economics</th>
<th>Economic Attitude Sophistication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Economics (N = 5,150)</td>
<td>Without Economics (N = 2,031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>With Economics (N = 4,436)</td>
<td>Without Economics (N = 1,673)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The ATE and EAS scales are measuring things quite different than those measured by the cognitive measure, the TEL. Elsewhere (Walstad and Soper, 1982), we have argued that cognitive achievement in economics is a significant determinant of attitudes (or affective-domain outputs) in economics education.

The data presented here update and extend the information on the measurement qualities of the ATE and EAS scales that were originally reported in the two 1983 studies. The two parts of the SEA are reliable measures of student attitudes, and they appear to be stable over time. The results from the 1986 administrations provide new validity evidence on the ability of the SEA measures to detect "attitudes towards economics as a subject" and "economic attitude sophistication" because there are clear differences between those students with and without economics instruction across various breakdown categories. And these differences are in the expected direction: Those students with economics instruction show more positive attitudes toward the subject, and they possess a higher degree of economic attitude sophistication than do those students without economics instruction.

However, the news is not all good. We must acknowledge that the data indicate minimal impact on student affect as a result of exposure to economics instruction, even though the effect sizes (0.42 for the ATE and 0.27 for the EAS) are more impressive. On the ATE, students with economics score only 8.9% higher than do students without economics. And on the EAS, the results are even thinner: Students with economics score a mere 3.8% higher than do students without such exposure. There are at least three possible explanations for these slight changes: The SEA is not sensitive enough to pick up significant changes in student affect; attitudinal change is not an objective of the average economics course; or attitudes are not subject to significant change in a short time period. Although we cannot rule out the first possibility, we would argue that the latter two reasons are

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>TEL/SEA Norming Data, Spring, 1986</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TEL A</td>
<td>TEL B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATE POST</td>
<td>.3605</td>
<td>.3713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,756)</td>
<td>(3,430)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAS POST</td>
<td>.4504</td>
<td>.4037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3,294)</td>
<td>(2,821)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QWT</td>
<td>.5881</td>
<td>.5652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,158)</td>
<td>(2,112)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number in parentheses is number of valid cases.
more likely. That is, changes in student affect are not in the forefront of teacher objectives for their high school economics courses. If this is, in fact, the case, perhaps more study of this question is called for. For instance, should teachers make affective learning an explicit course objective? If so, how wide is the agreement on the affective goals to be achieved? Can (or should) these affective objectives be sharpened and made operational? If affective learning is accepted as a legitimate goal of economics instruction in the high schools, more investigation into the possibilities of attitudinal change may be called for. For instance, over what period of time are significant changes in attitudes likely to appear?

In conclusion, the SEA can continue to be regarded as a valid and reliable measure for use in assessing economic attitudes in high school. This feature is of special interest to teachers and researchers. Affect may be as important as cognition in explaining the mysteries of the economics learning process, but without solid measurement instruments, we will be unable to solve the mysteries. The SEA, in combination with good cognitive instruments, should be a useful device for studying the level of economics achievement and attitudes, and the changes in achievement and attitude over time.

Endnotes

1. The QWT score can range from 1 to 100. A QWT score of 53 or less was classified as low. A score of 54 to 68 was classified as middle. A QWT score of 69 or above was classified as a high IQ score.

2. The course titles that were given for economics courses were: economics; free enterprise; applied economics; economic history; economics/government; and comparative economic systems. Course titles used for the consumer economics designation were: consumer economics; marketing/sales management; business economics; home economics; agricultural economics; business math; and law. For the social studies designation, course titles were: U.S. history; world history; government; social studies; geography; psychology; contemporary America; local history; and social problems.

3. Household income estimates were based upon teacher responses to the following question: Is the household income level for students in this class predominantly: _ high income _ middle income _ low income. This income estimate provides only a rough approximation of the income levels of students in a class. However, these income breakdowns correspond to a priori notions about differential performance on the two subscales. For example, on both the ATE and the EAS, high income students score higher than middle income students; and middle income students score higher than low income students (except for students without economics on the ATE).

4. The sole exception is on the EAS, where the with and without economics groups in the other race/ethnic origin category are virtually identical, but the without economics students score marginally higher than those with economics.
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**Appendix: Survey on Economic Attitudes**

This survey contains 28 items designed to measure how you feel about economics (items 1–14) and your attitude toward some economic issues (items 15–28). Please answer by marking the circles on the answer sheet as follows:

Mark **A** if you strongly agree with the statement.
Mark **B** if you agree with the statement.
Mark **C** if you are undecided or neutral.
Mark **D** if you disagree with the statement.
Mark **E** if you strongly disagree with the statement.

1. I enjoy reading articles about economic topics.
2. I hate economics.
3. Economics is easy for me to understand.
4. Economics is dull.
5. I enjoy economics.
6. Studying economics is a waste of time.
7. Economics is one of my most dreaded subjects.
9. I would be willing to attend a lecture by an economist.
10. Economics is a very difficult subject for me.
11. Economics is one of my favorite subjects.
12. I use economic concepts to analyze situations.
13. Economics is practical.
14. Economic ideas are dumb.
15. Government should control the price of gasoline.
16. Inflation is caused by greedy business and union leaders.
17. Business makes too much profit.
18. People should not have to pay taxes.
19. Free medical care should be provided for all Americans.
20. Banks should not charge interest on loans to customers.
21. Most people who don’t have jobs are too lazy to work.
22. When a business gets big, it should be controlled by government.
23. New factories are not needed.
24. People should not be told how to spend their money.
25. If everybody had more money, we’d all be better off.
26. Profits should not be regulated by government.
27. Most unemployed people are lazy.
28. When a strike occurs, government should step in and settle the dispute.
Comment

Faye Duchin

The editor has sent me several recent articles on the teaching of economics submitted to this journal, most of which have been or will be published, for my comment. Rather than discuss them individually, I prefer to address what seem to be the common elements of concern—and the common omissions—in evaluating pre-college economics education.

Surely the evaluation criteria for all teaching materials must include attractive product characteristics, student focus, and pedagogical suitability, and materials that contain inaccuracies or weak logic need to be ruled out. But the first-order consideration is the content of what is taught, and the analysis of content in these articles ranges from completely absent to inadequate. Only one of the articles gives any indication that there may be some controversy as to appropriate content.

The main measures of success proposed in these articles seem to be that pupils who have taken an economics course 1) “like” economics more and 2) share the free market, free enterprise ethic associated with American academic economists more than students who have not had a course in economics. Unfortunately, these objectives are more relevant for preparing pupils for the existing university economics curriculum than for the real world in which all of them will work (if they are fortunate), consume, and participate in a rapidly changing global economic system.

The U.S. economy, driven by the commitment in principle to free markets unregulated by government and by the pursuit of personal profit, has dominated the world economy for four decades and is still extremely powerful. However, our relative economic strength within the global system is now in transition as other countries also master the absorption into their economies of modern management techniques and new technologies—notably computer-based automation—within social frameworks characterized by other sets of values. In addition, the nature and extent of intensive economic production and consumption have produced environmental side-effects (e.g., toxic waste, ozone layer depletion, accumulation of municipal solid waste) whose consequences we are slowly beginning to address in terms of assessing their economic costs and evaluating the use of less polluting technological alternatives within our economy. Economists create the conceptual framework (i.e., theory) and analytic tools (i.e., mathematical models, statistical techniques) and collect the information (i.e.,
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data) required to describe and analyze different aspects of these phenomena and of the present and potential future inter-relationships among them.

I believe that this brief sketch outlines the scope of the appropriate curriculum content for a first exposure to economics. Such a conceptual framework is compatible with teaching conventional topics like the role of government (not only in principle but especially in specific situations); the motivation for and effects of international trade; the interaction between prices and the choice of technology, between productivity and employment. It also frankly addresses some of the most important economic problems facing the U.S. today, emphasizes the interdependencies among the pieces (e.g., production, pollution, costs, jobs), and should challenge pupils to identify a realistic and productive role for themselves in the economy of the future. Of course, pupils who are exposed to these ideas in middle school or earlier are likely to insist on more realism in the university economics curriculum than their predecessors. This can only be salutary for academic economics.
Book Reviews


Reviewed by Charles Chamberlin, Department of Elementary Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 2G5

In 1986 Benjamin Duke published The Japanese School: Lessons for Industrial America. Duke began his book by presenting numerous tables showing that the Japanese economy is increasingly more successful than the American economy. The Japanese trade surplus with the U.S. grew from $1.69 billion in 1975 to approximately $50 billion in 1985. A general economic growth index using U.S. performance as 100 showed Japan’s index 1960–73 was 289.5, and 1974–80 was 248.7. In 1951 Japan’s gross national product was 4% of U.S. GNP, but in 1983 it had grown to 33%. In 1981 Japan took out 218,216 patents against the U.S. total of 106,413. Duke continued a review of Japanese gains in microchip production, auto manufacturing, grand piano and trumpet making, and on and on. Duke then pointed to the role of the school in Japan’s rising economic growth, and concluded:

But if we are ever to understand our foremost industrial competitors, the Japanese, we must look to the Japanese school for lessons in producing a loyal, literate, competent worker. (p. 24)

After extensively describing the methods, curriculum, and hidden curriculum of Japanese schools Duke concluded with a section titled “Lessons for the United States from Japan.” Duke advised first, that schools must have a seriousness of purpose not only in sports but in academic preparation. Second, since robots are replacing workers, the labor force must be strong in language and math to handle more mentally demanding responsibilities. Duke notes that Japanese students score higher on math and language tests than U.S. students. Third, Duke points to the culture-wide expectation of competence in graduates, including industrial leaders who “expect the school to produce a person who can function effectively in the factory or the office” (p. 185). Fourth, concern about much higher levels of school violence, drug use, teen pregnancy, theft, vandalism, and absenteeism in U.S. schools leads to Duke’s insistence on far more demanding expectations for discipline in schools. Fifth, Duke turns to loyalty of the individual to the group. He argues that we “must work toward this goal—the voluntary commitment of oneself, the loyalty that implies sacrifice to the welfare of the group—in order to promote the well-being of our industries and the well-being of society” (p. 193). Last, Duke sees a need for schools
to match the Japanese emphasis on competition, noting the constant posting of exam results showing the ranking of every student in the class, and the in-school sports events so that throughout the day "one competition follows another" (p. 197.)

Duke's recommendations need to be examined thoughtfully by social studies teachers, for they raise basic questions about the goals and methods teachers should follow in their classrooms. Implicit in Duke's analysis is a constant focus on the hidden curriculum of the school, the conception of the good person and the good society, and the citizenship roles of people in a democratic society. Social studies teachers need to ask what price should be paid in return for producing "loyal, literate, competent workers"; whether good citizenship is primarily characterized as being orderly, polite, and well-disciplined; and whether democracy is well served when competition for grades is so intense that schools must primarily emphasize retaining facts. These questions focus largely on the hidden curriculum of the school, which has been of growing concern in social studies where responsibility for citizenship education has been increasingly emphasized.

The Hidden Curriculum of Citizenship Education

Engle and Ochoa in their *Education for Democratic Citizenship* (1988) argue strongly that the role of social studies is citizenship education, or "to enable the young citizen to participate in the process of improving the society" (p. 8). Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977) reviewed alternative conceptions of social studies a decade ago, and stated that all alternative positions "have gone on record as endorsing citizenship as the goal" (p. 70). Further, there is reason to believe that citizenship behavior is more related to the roles students take in school than to the content they study. This is the hidden curriculum, which Cummings (1980) defines as "lessons that are learned through the structure of schools, the rhythm students are put through, the manner in which they are rewarded, the example teachers set" (pp. 105-6).

Bowles (1976) contended that the hidden curriculum carries the affective content of schools, and is a better indicator of what students learn than is the formal curriculum.

The affective content of schooling—the values, expectations, and patterns of behavior which schools encourage—is conveyed primarily by the social relations of the schooling process itself, rather than explicitly in the curriculum. Whether established relations among the students are competitive or cooperative, whether relations between students and teachers are democratic or authoritarian, and whether relations between students and their work are creative or alienated, are a better measure of what is taught in schools than would be revealed by a study of texts or curricula (pp. 68-9).

Bowles suggests the hidden curriculum is a powerful form of learning which
takes place as a result of experiencing the school and classroom culture, the 
unstated roles and relationships expected of students, the daily lived 
experience repeated over and over 200 days each year. Students learn to think 
of themselves in particular ways as a result of the rules imposed, the means 
used to maintain these rules, and the form their daily participation in the 
school takes.

What should our students learn about the good citizen from this hidden 
curriculum? What do Japanese students learn about themselves and their 
citizen roles? Is that what our students should learn about their roles in a 
democratic society?

Aspects of the Hidden Curriculum in Japan

Elements of Duke's Japanese school's hidden curriculum include (1) 
heavy dependance on the nationally approved textbooks, uncritically ac-
cepting the view of the world presented; (2) heavy use of teacher and school 
exams which encourage students to passively accept what authorities 
(teacher and text) present; (3) developing an external locus of control where 
the teacher, with texts and tests, controls the daily life in the classroom; and 
(4) developing loyalty and conformity to group norms, with reduced in-
dependence.

Texts and Tests

Duke described the common approach to teaching in Japan as follows:

Teaching in Japan is a continual process of memorization, repetition, 
drilling, and testing. Memorize, repeat, drill, and test. The higher a stu-
dent goes in a school, the more the student, every student, memorizes, 
repeats, drills, and takes tests. There are no secrets in teaching methods 
in Japan. They are the traditional methods. (p. 64)

Cummings (1980) concurs, noting that, "The basic pattern of teaching in-
volves lecture, directions, and questions from the teacher to the students 
with relatively little interaction initiated by the students" (p. 125).

A major reason for this emphasis on memorizing information presented 
in text, teacher lecture, maps, and teacher handouts is the system of en-
trance exams to the universities. Beauchamp (1982) explained:

Pressures on students to pass the entrance exams to prestigious 
universities distort lower levels of education. High school teachers drill 
their students incessantly in order to increase the number going on to 
prestigious universities. Junior high teachers take their cue from the 
high school teachers and become similarly absorbed. It is not unheard 
of for primary school teachers to conduct mock examinations to pre-
pare their students for the system of examinations. Cognitive learning is 
emphasized at the expense of affective and socialization concerns 
(p. 31).
What is the hidden curriculum reflected in these roles and in the relationships among teachers, text, and students? Analyses by western educators of their schools seem also to apply to these Japanese classrooms. Bernstein (1977) concluded that students learn norms and values appropriate for preparing good industrial workers: respect for authority, docility, and conformity. Aronowitz (1973) suggested that students also learn about "the hierarchy of power" where "the teacher is the authoritative person in the classroom" but is subject to the principal and curriculum, while "school impresses students as a whole with their powerlessness" (p. 75). Bowles and Gintis (1976) examined the relationships among grades, attitudes and behaviors, and concluded that "Students are rewarded for exhibiting discipline, subordinancy, intellectually as opposed to emotionally oriented behavior, and hard work independent from intrinsic task motivation" (p. 40). Reviewing Bowles and Gintis' conclusions, Giroux and Penna (1979) discussed the impact on students:

Viewed from the student's perspective, the classroom becomes a miniature workplace in which time, space, content, and structure are fixed by others. Rewards are extrinsic, and all social interaction between teachers and students are mediated by hierarchically organized structures. The underlying message learned in this context points less to schools helping students to think critically about the world in which they live than it does to schools acting as agents of social control (pp. 31-2).

The normal conception of good citizen in a democratic society is strikingly different from the effects of the hidden curriculum noted by Bernstein, Aronowitz, Bowles and Gintis, and Giroux and Penna. Rather than passively accepting information to be memorized solely for answering test questions, democracy often is assumed to need citizens who are inclined to critically examine purported facts, to seek knowledge for use in understanding social issues, and to actively participate in the direction of social change. These citizenship behaviors require development of a sense of political efficacy, a belief that it is both desirable and possible to play an active role in social evolution. Also needed is development of an internal locus of control, the feeling that one can exert influence on the events in one's life. Yet the classroom roles, relationships, and norms described by Duke, Beauchamp, Cummings and others who've studied Japanese schools more closely fit the authoritarian model described by Bernstein, Aronowitz, Bowles and Gintis, and Giroux and Penna.

Rohlen (1983) suggested that there are major differences between the Japanese and Western conceptions of good citizen. In Japan, "A citizen's duties are to behave properly and to vote" while in the west, "grass roots democracy encourages citizens to scrutinize government and to initiate political change. . . . The popular base of most Japanese political parties is
narrow, and the degree of participation in local decision making is limited” (p. 317). We must ask what unintended consequences result from the hidden curriculum embedded in Duke’s recommendations summarized as the introduction of this review.

**Respect for Authority, Powerlessness**

Carol Bowman Stocking (1986) reported results of comparative studies done in 1980 of several thousand U.S. and Japanese high school seniors which found that 80% of U.S. and 28% of Japanese students reported being satisfied with themselves. For the statement, “At times I think I’m no good.” 51% of U.S. girls and 41% of U.S. boys agreed, while 71% and 49% of Japanese girls and boys agreed. However, two years later a follow-up study of these students, now independent of high school, found 80% of U.S. and Japanese were satisfied with themselves, while 40% of U.S. and Japanese agree that “I’m no good.” Stocking concluded that:

Being a student in Japan fosters feelings of powerlessness and low self-esteem. Leaving secondary school seems to have had a remarkable effect on the Japanese students’ psychological scale scores but virtually no effect on the scores of American students (p. 142).

Stocking’s findings make one wonder whether other researchers have found similar evidence and what kinds of experiences generate a hidden curriculum of powerlessness and low self-esteem. Rohlen’s (1983) findings are useful. Rohlen spent a year observing five schools in Kobe. He described classrooms in which teachers maintained their authority by lecturing and testing. Interspersed with the lectures were questions posed to specific students, often those appearing not to be attentive. Rohlen described the effects of this teaching style on Japanese students:

They may resent the authority of teachers, but they learn to respect them and not to challenge authority. They learn that teachers retain dignity by being serious and by not lowering themselves to their subordinates or trying to be entertaining. . . . Respectfulness is the way to avoid trouble. All of these qualities are highly valued, both in school and in Japanese society in general (p. 146).

Rohlen summarized the effect of such pedagogy saying, “In sum, the lecture format in Japanese high schools teaches patient listening. It underlines the authority of the teacher as the superior in learning” (p. 245).

This emphasis on a classroom environment which is rigidly hierarchical, with the teacher’s power secured through exams which test lecture content and keep students subservient, would not seem well suited to participatory grassroots democracy. Rather, it seems likely to socialize students to accept such hierarchical organizational structures. Rohlen stated that Japanese schools:
... are not training grounds for democracy. Rather they are best understood as shaping generations of disciplined workers for a techno-meritocratic system that requires highly socialized individuals capable of performing reliably in a rigorous, hierarchical, and finely tuned organizational environment (p. 209).

The examples cited by Rohlen are supported by Duke (1986), Beauchamp (1982), and Cummings (1986).

Japanese elementary schools offer a much richer variety of classroom activities, with considerable use of small group discussion, group reports, debates over where to site a new steel mill, how to improve labor conditions in a roof tile factory visited by a class, and how to reduce American hostility to Japanese exports, for example. However, as the pressure of exams increases in the upper grades, the emphasis on teacher lecture grows, teacher authority is exerted through the lecture-question-exam sequence, and the subservient student role is firmly established. Given this shift, Stocking's conclusion that Japanese schools foster feelings of powerlessness and low self-esteem antithetical to democratic participation seems accurate. We must ask whether this hidden curriculum and these effects are appropriate for our students, and whether Duke's recommendations are consistent with social studies' role in developing citizenship for a democratic society.

Conform to Group Norms

Duke pointed out that the Japanese student "soon learns that he cannot stand out too much from the group," for, as the Japanese saying goes, "The nail that sticks out gets knocked down" (p. 29). Duke explained at length that the Japanese teachers work hard at developing loyalty to the classroom group (kumi). In the elementary school that normally involves the teacher remaining with a class for two years. It also involves planned class outings; competitions among kumi; taking turns serving the kumi lunch; eating as a group which includes the teacher in the classroom; taking turns cleaning the classroom each day; commonly wearing military-style school uniforms; and other activities to build esprit de corps. Duke concluded that the dominant aspect of Japanese schools is the development of this classroom group loyalty and the constraining of individuality:

. . . the remarkable characteristic of Japanese schools is evidenced in the high degree of loyalty to the kumi and in the general acceptance of its influence over the child's personal attitudes. . . . The least idealistic aspect of the Japanese kumi to some critics both foreign and Japanese concerns the potential of the kumi for stifling individuality and personal creativity. Although creativity and individuality are not easily measured, innumerable observations indicate that there is substance in this concern (p. 33).

Rohlen (1983) also sees the Japanese schools as curbing individual in-
dependence. When asked if he would like his children to be educated in Japanese schools, Rohlen unhesitatingly said no because he attached so much importance to independence. He went on to base his harshest criticism on this factor:

The well-intended teachers and well-behaved students put their efforts to purposes that are ultimately shallow and uninspired. The nation benefits economically. Society is well run. But it is a system without much heart (p. 320).

Rohlen concluded his book by advising that “We should not try to emulate Japanese institutions” but rather strive for the achievement of human potential, for “individualism and freedom in any other context are sad illusions . . . ” (p. 326).

The conflict between conforming to the norms of the kumi and encouraging individualism and development of individual forms of self-expression reflect key differences in Japanese and Western cultures, and their conceptions of democracy. The Japanese see pluralism and the co-existence of competing ideals as indicative of a failure to reach consensus, a key to their view of group life. Independence and strong commitment to personal ideals, rather than conforming to those of the larger group, cause problems in achieving consensus, which teachers seek to avoid. Duke noted that “kumi decisions should be made in a consensus-like procedure in order to achieve harmony. This behavior forms the very basis of the decision-making process in Japan” (p. 30).

Harmony is less prized where pluralism is seen as desirable, enabling contrasting ideas to co-exist and compete, and for individuals to remain committed to personal or minority ideals. In pluralistic North America, with its wealth of minority cultures, traditions, and beliefs all competing in the world of ideas, the Japanese emphasis on loyalty, conformity, and consensus would seem difficult to achieve, if desired.

Duke forces social studies teachers concerned about citizenship education in a democratic society to re-examine basic questions of purpose and method. If schooling and social studies are to be primarily concerned with “producing a loyal, literate, competent worker,” then perhaps it’s appropriate to employ heavy emphasis on textbook-lecture-examination teaching with its autocratic and hierarchical hidden curriculum. Perhaps for those limited goals it’s appropriate to nurture unquestioning loyalty to the group, to emphasize mastery learning of memorizable facts, to insist on consensus and harmony, to stress knowledge about rather than critique of, and to practice disempowerment and external locus of control rather than empowerment and internal locus of control.

Social studies teachers in democratic countries need to operate with some conception of the good person in the good society. Social studies teachers must choose between the vision of a good society in which decision making
is widely shared and a society in which hierarchical control is peacefully accepted. Each teacher must consider the choice between a pluralistic society with vigorous competition among diverse beliefs, ideologies, and goals, and one in which conformity, consensus, and harmony are more highly prized.

Examining other cultures and their institutionalized schooling helps us to think about our own more critically and more appreciatively. Social studies teachers need to reflect carefully on the hidden curriculum in Japanese schools before accepting the recommendations Duke and other observers of Japanese schools have proposed.
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