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Editorial

The articles in this issue include a spirited defense of history as the core of social studies education; a detailed description of six teacher education programs designed to prepare social studies teachers to teach with a global perspective; and a lengthy review of classroom climate and civic education in secondary social studies research. The first article should provoke some considerable debate among members of the profession; the second should give researchers some ideas about the state of teacher preparation programs in global education; and the third should provide researchers with a fine companion piece to Angell’s excellent review of democratic climates in elementary school classrooms that was published in Volume XIX(4). All three represent the kind of solid work that we want to publish in TRSE, and we hope to have more manuscripts of such quality to publish in the future.

To date, we have received a total of 76 submissions, of which 15 have been accepted for publication. This constitutes a 20 percent acceptance rate, and speaks well for the quality of manuscripts being submitted to our journal. We encourage authors to submit their work to TRSE, and stress again our commitment to publishing manuscripts of quality which discuss various aspects of social studies education from a variety of perspectives.

A special word about book reviews. In this issue, we present a lengthy review of a recent work on critical thinking, followed by the author’s reaction to this review. The exchange between the reviewers and the author is the sort of comment and discussion that we hope to present more of in upcoming issues.

Finally, a word about letters to the editor. Send us your reactions to the articles in this, or other, issues, as well as any proposals or ideas you’d like to discuss or to which you’d like a reaction. We’ll reply, and hopefully, so will other members of our profession.

Jack R. Fraenkel
January, 1992
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HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES:
A RESPONSE TO THE CRITICS

Michael Whelan
Columbia University

Abstract
The recommendation of both the Bradley Commission and the National Commission on Social Studies that the study of history should form the core of the social studies curriculum has intensified the long-standing debate among educators about the nature of social studies education. This article is a response to three of the sharpest critiques of recommendation: first, that a history-centered curriculum is an ideologically conservative idea; second, that history's claim to a central place in the curriculum is not supported by empirical evidence; and third, that an integrated study of social problems is the proper focus of social studies education.

Introduction
The nature of social studies education has been debated for decades (Hertzberg, 1981; Jenness, 1990; Lybarger, 1991). Since social studies emerged as a school subject early in the twentieth century, consensus about its rationale, purposes, and curricular organization has been rare. In fact, the only issue generally agreed upon has been that social studies has a special responsibility for citizenship education. Almost everything else has been continually disputed.

Recently, the Bradley Commission (1988, 1989) and the National Commission on Social Studies (1989) have heightened the intensity of this long-standing debate by recommending that the study of history become the core of social studies education. Supporters of this recommendation have founded organizations such as the National
Council for History Education to promote its adoption, but opponents have vigorously criticized the recommendation for a variety of reasons. The substance of their criticism may be divided into three categories: that history as the core of social studies education is ideologically conservative (Evans, 1989a, 1989c; Garcia, 1990; Nelson, 1990); that its claim to a central place in the social studies curriculum is not supported by empirical evidence (Gross, 1988; Thornton, 1990); and that the interdisciplinary study of social problems is the proper focus of social studies education (Engle and Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 1989a, 1989b, 1989c).1

The purpose of this article is to respond to these criticisms. Some have more merit than others and will be considered accordingly, but all raise questions that need to be addressed. As an advocate of a history-centered curriculum for the secondary school grades, I am not disinterested; nevertheless, I hope this commentary contributes to a more constructive and less contentious discussion of history's place in the curriculum. Thus far, the opposite has been the case: groups on both sides of this issue have staked out positions, and, for the most part, their debate has settled little. Such rigidity serves no one well, least of all the students and teachers in schools whom both groups want to help.

An Ideologically Conservative Idea

Perhaps the most common, yet least deserved criticism of history as the core of social studies education is that it is an ideologically conservative idea (Evans, 1989a, 1989c; Garcia, 1990; Nelson, 1990). This criticism is usually expressed in one (or a combination) of three ways: first, that a history-centered curriculum is conservative because the commissions that recommended it were established and wrote their reports during the conservative administrations of Presidents Reagan and Bush; second, that it is a proposal supported by conservative educational activists such as William Bennett; and third, that the study of history is associated with a conservative, jingoistic nationalism, a Eurocentric perspective of the world, and an almost exclusive attention to white males of European descent.

Such criticism may have rhetorical value, but its analytical value is negligible. This is especially true of the references to Reagan, Bush and Bennett. In fact, the arguments based on these references are largely fallacious. The first is an example of the fallacy of cross grouping (i.e., the characterization of one group or policy by reference to another), and the second an example of a fallacious generalization stemming from a faulty statistical sample (Fischer, pp. 236-240, pp. 104-109).
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With regard to Reagan and Bush, the fact that they were in office when the commissions wrote their reports is merely a coincidence and far from conclusive proof that the commissions’ recommendations are conservative. Neither commission had any affiliation with either president, and neither has given any indication that its recommendations were influenced by the educational preferences of the presidents. Also, to allege without offering any evidence that the presidents set a climate of opinion that subtly affected commission policies is questionable. Such logic leads one to conclude that the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* was conservative because President Eisenhower was generally conservative with regard to civil rights issues. Moreover, this is not an isolated example of the faultiness of this logic. Many of the most progressive movements in American history--Bellamy’s Nationalist Clubs during the Gilded Age and LaFollette’s Wisconsin Plan during the 1920s, for example--were prominent during some of the most conservative presidential administrations.

The advocacy of William Bennett is also inconclusive. His support is a statistical sample too small and too biased to substantiate any generalization about the commissions' recommendation. Even if one includes the support of other prominent conservatives, such as Lynne Cheney, Chester Finn, and Diane Ravitch, the argument still ignores the support of many people such as Eric Foner, Hazel Hertzberg, and Theodore Sizer who consider themselves liberal or progressive (American Federation of Teachers, 1987; National Council for History Education, 1990). In other words, the commissions' recommendation cuts across political ideologies. In this sense, it is similar to the opposition to President Bush's military policies during the Persian Gulf crisis. Such opposition came from the left and the right, and cannot fairly or reliably be labeled one or the other. Nor can the recommendation to make the study of history the core of social studies education be so categorized.

History’s association with a jingoistic nationalism, a Eurocentric perspective, and a disproportionate attention to the achievements of white males is a more reasonable objection. An analysis of history textbooks written for primary and secondary school students through the years supports this charge (FitzGerald, 1979; Gagnon 1987, 1989). Students reading these texts, as Jack L. Nelson (1990) forcefully explains, have rarely "engage[d] the idea that the shared values of the past were often imposed upon people, especially those of 'diverse' minority or lower social class backgrounds" (p. 436). Nor, as Jesus Garcia (1990) adds, have they engaged "such topics as acculturation, racism, ethnocentricity, [and] cultural diversity" without which a multicultural perspective of history is impossible (pp. 444-445).
Few history advocates challenge this criticism. But it should also be noted that historians have played a leading role in working to correct this situation, through revisionist interpretations that are more inclusive, less biased, and less characterized by self-serving nationalism. The research of the most recent generation of progressive historians, including (among many others) Nancy Cott, Eugene Genovese, Herbert Gutman, and Carol Smith-Rosenberg, has begun to give attention to institutions long misinterpreted or ignored. The fact that so many people today are aware that history in the past has been distorted by its selective attention and its unexamined prejudices is due primarily to the scholarship of these progressive historians (Grob & Billias, 1987; Kammen, 1980).

In sum, there is no question that the history taught in schools has often been inaccurate and misleading, but one cannot conclude from this that a history-centered approach is inappropriate to the social studies curriculum. Indeed, one might argue more persuasively that the study of history deserves special attention in schools now more than ever: the strongest antidote for misinformation is more accurate information, not less information.

The Need for Empirical Research

Other critics of a history-oriented curriculum charge that history's claim to a central place in social studies education is not supported by empirical evidence (Gross, 1988; Thornton, 1990). This is true, but not surprising. Classroom-based research in social studies is a relatively new development, and many issues have yet to be studied empirically. Only within the last twenty years have researchers begun to examine what actually takes place in social studies classes.

Prior to the 1970s, social studies research focused primarily on issues related to the official curriculum (i.e., what official agencies or professional organizations said the content of the curriculum should be), and relied almost exclusively on curriculum documents, textbooks, and other instructional materials as evidence. Questions about what and how teachers taught and students learned were largely ignored. This situation has begun to change, but few in the field would argue with Hertzberg's (1981) observation that social studies educators "need a much wider and more solid information base than they have hitherto been willing or able to develop" (p. 165). Problems arise, however, when the general and largely valid charge of insufficient research in social studies is applied to the particular question of history's place in the curriculum.

Some of these problems involve issues of logical analysis, and others issues of historical analysis. The problems of logical analysis stem from one of the two assumptions upon which the validity of all
empirical research is based: first, that research data are accurate; and second, that they are relevant to the question. It is not merely a matter of getting the facts right, but of getting the right facts. In this case, the second assumption is problematic for a number of reasons.

First, empirical data about the operational curriculum (i.e., what happens in social studies classes) are at best indirectly related to questions about the official curriculum (in this case, whether or not social studies should be history-centered). The former are descriptive, the latter normative. What is, in other words, does not necessarily determine what ought to be. If it did, reform of any kind would be impossible.

Second, empirical data about the experienced curriculum (i.e., what students learn in social studies) are also only indirectly related to questions about the official curriculum. Much needs to be learned about the educational outcomes of history instruction, but the relevance of information about outcomes to questions about history's place in the curriculum depends almost entirely on the significance one attaches to the information. If, for example, research showed that students studying history could demonstrate an understanding of historical causation, the decision whether or not to teach history would still depend on the relative value one attached to this outcome. And this is not an empirical issue, but a value judgment.

Moreover, research efforts intended to identify specific outcomes associated with history education are inevitably complicated by the complex reality of the teaching and learning process. In other words, what students learn in studying history depends to a great extent on the myriad decisions teachers make in transforming the official curriculum into instruction and on the multiple factors that affect the way students learn. Reliable information about educational outcomes associated with a particular teacher variable (e.g., a teaching strategy) or learning environment variable (e.g., the heterogeneity of student grouping) may be identified, but the educational outcomes associated with history education in general are more difficult to identify with sufficient reliability.

This is not to deny the potential value of empirical research to inform some questions about the official curriculum. Empirical studies about developmental constraints on student learning may have great significance in determining the best way to organize history education. The basic question in this regard is when students develop the cognitive capabilities needed to study and learn history. For example, when and under what conditions do students develop the sense of time, the sense of empathy, and the critical judgment that the study of history demands? Research about these and related questions are fundamental to the organization of the official curriculum. However, it should be noted that existing research, although "thin and uneven," does not
indicate a need to delay history instruction for secondary school-age students for developmental reasons (Downey & Levstik, 1988, 1991).

Finally, considering the indirect relationship between the experienced and official curricula, research that focuses directly on questions about the former will probably be more fruitful and render more reliable results than efforts to use such research to substantiate or discredit recommendations about the latter. For example, data about the experienced curriculum presented by Ravitch and Finn in *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?* (1987) neither justifies nor refutes the call for a history-centered curriculum, but research that indicates the conditions which may best achieve specific outcomes has considerable value.

Elaine Reed, Administrative Director of the National Council for History Education, has identified a list of outcomes she believes history teachers should strive to promote (Gagnon & Bradley Commission, 1989). Such outcomes, she says, include a sense of "historical empathy"; an appreciation "of diverse culture and of shared humanity"; an understanding of the intricate "interplay of change and continuity" in historical development; a grasp of "the complexity of historical causation"; a "respect [for] particularity"; a suspicion of "abstract generalization"; an appreciation of "the importance of individuals" and "the significance of personal character" in human affairs; and the ability "to recognize the difference between fact and conjecture, between evidence and assertion, and thereby to frame useful questions" (pp. 302-319).

Research that explores the instructional and environmental conditions that are likely to achieve these and other outcomes has the potential to greatly improve the quality of history education and thereby strengthen its claim to the central position in the social studies curriculum. Advocates of a history-centered curriculum need to demonstrate how the outcomes they assert may actually be achieved. This is not to imply that good teaching can be "engineered into existence" (McNeil, 1988, p. 478), but rather that research of this sort is likely to identify a range of teaching and environmental variables that tend to promote specific outcomes, and, in the process, reveal teaching strategies and learning conditions that are generally ineffective.

Critics also fault the Bradley Commission and the National Commission on Social Studies for ignoring research about the "top-down" approach to reform they have followed. Such an approach, the critics contend, has proven ineffective historically, regardless of the merits of the reforms proposed. This claim is made in social studies frequently, and is usually substantiated by reference to the failure of the new social studies movement. Applying this analysis to the recommendation of the Bradley Commission (and by inference the
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National Commission on Social Studies), Stephen J. Thornton (1990) writes:

Like the [new social studies] reformers of the 1960s, there appears to be a tacit assumption that curriculum mandates ... will effect curriculum change. [But, in] the history of social studies education there is little evidence of new curriculum guides and instructional materials effecting widespread curriculum change. Analysts of the failure of the [new social studies movement], for example, suggest that teachers seldom alter the curriculum-in-use solely on the basis of curriculum mandates or the availablity of new materials. (p. 56)

This argument has a certain degree of merit, but is nevertheless a very "thin" analysis of an issue which, like most human affairs, is "thick" with multiple layers of causation and meaning (Geertz, 1973). Many factors contributed to the failure of the new social studies movement (Fenton, 1971; Haas, 1977; Hertzberg, pp. 109-118): its conception of education was one-dimensional, focusing almost exclusively on process while all but ignoring content; its instructional materials were contrived and lacked diversity; and, perhaps most importantly, it was a movement overwhelmed by the rapidity of change in the United States during the 1960s.

The movement was conceived during the optimism and confidence early in the decade when no challenge seemed beyond the country's reach. However, the instructional materials needed for implementation were not developed until later in the decade, when the country was in the midst of the most serious domestic crisis since the Great Depression. The movement's vision of cool, scientifically trained students discovering the truth about history and society was undone by the highly-charged issues of war, racism, and poverty which demanded immediate and emotional response.

The top-down orientation of the new social studies movement may have contributed to its failure. But, to conclude from this single example, as Thornton (1990) and James P. Shaver (1979) do, that social studies education is like a deep lake with the winds of curriculum reform merely rippling the surface and having little effect on the great body of schooling below, is probably an overgeneralization. Other historical examples refute it. The top-down approach of the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven one hundred years ago had a dramatic effect on history education in the schools (Hertzberg, pp. 8-16; Whelan, 1989, pp. 78-116; Whelan, 1991).
Although conditions were quite different in the 1890s than the 1960s, the question of top-down reform in social studies and its relationship to other factors that enhance or retard efforts to change the curriculum appears to need additional research before conclusions can be drawn. Educational reform is a complicated process, and the success or failure of a particular reform initiative is probably attributable to a complex combination of factors, and not a specific factor in isolation.

The need for additional research is true of social studies education in general. Many questions need additional study, especially questions about teaching and learning. Advocates of a history-centered curriculum have an obvious obligation to undertake this sort of research and thereby substantiate some of the conclusions about the study of history they have thus far merely asserted. On the other hand, critics of the history-centered position cannot expect to find conclusive answers to questions about the official curriculum in research data about the operational curriculum or the experienced curriculum. Both are only indirectly related to the official curriculum. Answers to questions about what students should study in school derive more from value judgments about the nature of human existence and the purposes of formal education than from empirical research.

Social Problems: The Proper Focus

The third criticism, that interdisciplinary study of social problems is more properly the focus of social studies education, differs from the two already discussed. Rather than presenting an explicit challenge to history as the core of the social studies curriculum, it advocates an alternate vision in which social problems are the principal focus of an integrated, interdisciplinary program of social studies education (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 1989b, 1989c). Supporters of this view "believe that a significant part, if not all, of the social studies" should be organized around "the direct study of social problems...in all their ramifications" (Engle & Ochoa, pp. 103-104). Within this framework, they see history as one of many "sources of information to be utilized in resolving questions" about social issues and institutions (p. 128).

Although not explicit, two criticisms of history exist in this problem-centered vision. First, history's analytical perspective is considered too narrow to grasp all aspects of social reality; and second, the study of history is considered less congruous than the study of social problems with social studies' ultimate objective of citizenship education. These interrelated criticisms are best analyzed in historical context.
The charge that history has a limited analytical perspective (i.e., that it cannot always discern all factors involved in a given situation) is not new. Historians have addressed this issue throughout the twentieth century, and, ironically, in so doing, have made some of the most important contributions to the development of an integrated vision of social studies education. During the Progressive era, the response of James Harvey Robinson to the question of history's analytical limitations was one of the principal intellectual sources from which this vision originally evolved (Hertzberg, 1981, pp. 17-30; Whelan, 1991). Since the 1960s, the interdisciplinary methods of inquiry developed by the "new social historians" have made this vision a real possibility (Grob & Billias, 1987, pp. 17-26; Higham, 1983, pp. 253-262; Kammen, 1980, pp. 205-387).

Robinson was the leading historical theoretician of his day, and the progressive philosophy of history he propounded was one of the two intellectual influences most evident in the historic report of the National Education Association's Committee on Social Studies in 1916 (Hertzberg, 1981, pp. 17-30; Whelan, 1991). This report is generally considered the most influential in the history of social studies education (Hertzberg, 1981, pp. 25-30). It officially recognized the term social studies, and, more importantly, officially endorsed the interdisciplinary ideal of history education that Robinson proposed (Committee on Social Studies, passim; Hertzberg, 1981, pp. 25-30; Whelan, 1991).

Robinson's philosophy of history and history education derived from two central principles (Robinson, 1912, pp. 1-25, pp. 70-100, pp. 132-153): that historians should expand the scope of historical inquiry by means of an intellectual alliance with the social sciences; and second, that they should investigate those aspects of the past that continued to shed the most light on the course of current events. He believed an interdisciplinary approach was necessary if historians were to explore the full range of human experiences, and that attention to relevant social issues was necessary for historians to fulfill their "chief obligation" to society (p. 80). Explaining his second point, Robinson said it was "most essential" for people to understand their own time; therefore, historians had a "duty" to study those aspects of the past that had a particular bearing on matters of present social concern (p. 80). Only then, he added, would history "come in time consciously to meet [the] daily needs" of society (p. 24).

Unfortunately, this synthesizing conception of history was largely unrealized in Robinson's time. He and other progressive historians discussed its possibility, and the Committee on Social Studies adopted its tenets as the basis for its report, but an integrated program of research about a broader and more pertinent range of human
experiences and their development remained an unfulfilled ambition. On a theoretical level, historians such as Charles Beard, Carl Becker, and Vernon Parrington continued for years to espouse Robinson's philosophy; but it was not until the 1960s and 1970s that many historians began to practice the type of historical study Robinson had proposed a half century earlier.4

This new generation of social historians has drawn on concepts and methods of inquiry originally developed by behavioral and social scientists to investigate many issues previously ignored or poorly apprehended by historians. Much of this research includes questions about race, ethnic and gender relations; social and geographic mobility; immigration; institutions of formal and informal education; the family; and the reality of economic opportunity, to illuminate issues of pressing social concern (Grob & Billian, pp. 17-26; Higham, pp. 253-262; Kammen, 1980, pp. 205-387). The thoughtful infusion of this new historical scholarship in the social studies curriculum will help to "bring the past into relationship with the present" (Robinson, 1912, p. 21) and thereby fulfill the dream Robinson and the Committee on Social Studies originally had for the subject.

This is not to suggest that history should be the only subject in the social studies curriculum. Neither the Bradley Commission nor the National Commission has made such a recommendation. Instead, both recommend that students have an opportunity to elect social science courses (Bradley Commission, 1988, pp. 20-21; National Commission, 1989, pp. 18-20), and that history courses draw on other disciplines whenever possible. The Bradley Commission, for example, describes history as "an interdisciplinary subject ... by its nature," and therefore recommends that social studies teachers organize history instruction around "themes and topics [that] lend themselves to teaching, and using, the relationships between history and biography, history and geography, history and the social sciences, history and the humanities" (pp. 23-25). The National Commission emphasizes the same point, describing "history and geography [as] the matrix or framework for social studies," but insisting that "concepts and understandings from political science, economics, and the other social sciences must be integrated throughout all social studies courses" (National Commission, p. 3).

Both commissions also recommend that the study of social problems should be included in the social studies curriculum. In fact, both propose a course in which students study "important public issues" as the capstone to social studies education (Bradley Commission, pp. 37-39; National Commission, pp. 18-20).5

This does not mean, as Engle and Ochoa (1988) contend, that students must wait until the last two weeks of a history course or the
final year of high school to study current social problems (pp. 129-130). Most of today's most pressing issues--racism, ethnic rivalries, urban violence, environmental decay, political corruption, the disintegration of empires, the maldistribution of wealth, the oppression of women, and the spread of disease, to list a few--have long histories and may be studied many times from many different perspectives in a survey history course. What teachers choose to emphasize--ethnic, environmental, and gender issues, for example, in studying the 19th century westward expansion of settlers in a United States history course--should be made in light of their "chief obligation" to select for study those aspects of the past that are relevant to matters of present social concern. Emphasizing irrelevant aspects of the past is merely antiquarianism, not history education.

The underlying point, history advocates argue, is that social problems are best studied in historical context and with the habits of mind of historical study brought to bear. If they are studied outside this context, even within an interdisciplinary frame of reference, the risk of "tunnel vision," is greatly increased. Social problems do not occur in isolation; there are always competing issues which demand public attention and the allocation of limited resources. For example, the failure of the United States during the last forty years to develop effective policies in response to mounting urban and environmental problems cannot be understood apart from the country's extended Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union. History embraces this sort of complexity, and its study prepares people to deal with its reality.

The question, therefore, is not whether the study of social problems should be included in social studies education. Of course, it should; to do otherwise would be irresponsible. Rather, history advocates believe social problems studied within a history-centered curriculum present the most realistic and enlightening perspective, and such an approach, therefore, is most consistent with social studies' ultimate objective of citizenship education.

**Conclusion**

Many issues raised by the critics are potentially constructive. The obvious exception is the specious claim that the study of history is ideologically conservative. Otherwise, the research and reforms called for by the critics' arguments are well-advised. A more solid base of research data about teaching and learning is likely to improve history instruction, and a more inclusive and relevant history curriculum is likely to further the interest of enlightened citizenship.

But the need for research and reform does not necessarily refute the proposition that history should be at the core of social studies education. History's role as the central and unifying social studies
subject is justified by reasons more profound than the issues raised by its critics. These reasons stem from an understanding of the nature of human existence which is essentially historical. The course of a life, the unfolding of an event, the influence of an idea, and the development of a society or a culture are all historical phenomena. They exist in time, connected to the past by their antecedents and to the future through their consequences. The concrete reality of human existence, in all its variability and developmental complexity, is the object of historical study. It is the only discipline open to the whole range of human experience and its development through time, and, as a result, is distinctively disposed to draw upon and synthesize knowledge and ideas from all other social subjects. The complex relationships within and among social groups, the production and distribution of goods and services, the legal and political organization of the state and its effects on society, and the evolutionary interaction between people and their physical environments are all understood best as they actually happen, within an historical context. This is not to assert an intellectual superiority for the study of history, but to recognize that it alone has such an encompassing breadth of vision and such a prolonged analytical perspective. For this reason, it is the most natural and best suited discipline around which to organize secondary school social studies education.

Endnotes

1 Both sides in this debate are critical of the way history is currently taught in schools. They agree that teachers rely on a very limited range of teaching strategies with which they dominate the learning environment, and that students are generally passive and rarely required to do more than memorize and periodically feed back factual information dispensed by the teacher (Cuban, 1991; Evans, 1989b; Gagnon & Bradley Commission, 1989; Goodlad, 1984; Ravitch, 1989). Since this critique is not contested and both sides agree that history teachers should employ strategies that actively engage students and put them in a position to exercise their judgment, I have not included it as a fourth category of criticism.

2 The report of the Committee on Social Studies also owes much to the influence of John Dewey, who, like Robinson, was quoted at length therein. Dewey's contributions, however, were related more to pedagogical issues, advising close attention be paid to the personal, intellectual, and psychological maturation of students. The ideas of the two men who were personal friends and colleagues at Columbia University tended to reinforce each other.

3 History, civics, and geography had long been taught in the schools, but the widespread adoption of social studies as a school
subject is usually traced to the Report of the Committee on Social Studies. The origin of the term social studies, however, is unclear.

4During the first half of the century, the most successful example of the type of history Robinson proposed was probably the thirteen volume History of American Life series edited by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Sr. and Dixon Ryan Fox in the 1930s and 1940s. In Europe, the most successful example was the Annales, a French journal edited by Lucien Febvre and Marc Bloch.

5The curricular recommendations of the Bradley Commission and the National Commission are remarkably similar to those of the Committee on Social Studies. All three recommended the inclusion of social science electives, the interdisciplinary organization of history instruction, and a problem-centered structure for the final course in the curriculum.
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Abstract
Over the last twenty years some social studies teacher educators have developed programs that prepare teachers to teach global perspectives. This study examined six exemplary teacher education programs in global education in order to identify factors related to program effectiveness. Special attention was paid to the perspectives of the teacher educators and their clients—the preservice and inservice teachers, school administrators, or curriculum supervisors who are served by the programs. A broad scope of program offerings and formats, support services, collaboration with other institutions and organizations, visible channels of communication, opportunities for professional growth, and excellence in leadership were some of the more important factors related to program effectiveness. Although the programs are idiosyncratic in order to address local contexts, they all respond to the felt needs of educators, treat teachers as professionals and overcome the ad hoc nature of inservice education through long term collaboration with schools.
Introduction

What does it mean to prepare a secondary social studies teacher to teach with a global perspective? Given thousands of years of world history and the increasingly complex, interdependent world of the 1990s, how do teacher educators set priorities on content? What are the criteria that preservice students, inservice teachers, administrators and other clients of teacher education programs use to judge the effectiveness of teacher education programs? Are successful teacher education programs in global education idiosyncratic or are there elements that are essential to all programs?

These questions and others were addressed in an in-depth study of six exemplary teacher education programs that focus on preparing teachers to teach with a global perspective. There were two underlying assumptions behind the study. First, the movement for global perspectives in social studies teacher education is critically important if teachers are to prepare youth to make well-informed decisions in their increasingly complex and interdependent world. Second, the study of effective teacher education programs in global education offers some significant lessons in how social studies teacher educators can better prepare teachers to teach about the world.

Survey of the Literature

As with many educational innovations, the movement for global perspectives in teacher education has produced reasoned arguments as to its need and mandate. Although it is common sense that teachers cannot teach what they do not know, the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education (as reported by the Council on Learning, 1981) has estimated that only five percent of the nation's K-12 teachers have any academic preparation in international topics or issues. This lack of formal preparation is reflected in a study by Barrows, Clark and Klein (1980), who found that education majors have much less knowledge of the world than do other college students. These statistics may change as the new standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1987) require that teacher education programs include a global perspective.

There are numerous studies which demonstrate that American teachers and students are apathetic and ignorant of past and present global events and issues (Barrows et al, 1981; Cogan, 1984; Hill, 1981; Pike & Barrows, 1979; Tye & Tye, 1983; Wilson, 1975; Woyach, 1987). In order to overcome this lack of interest and knowledge, many authors have called upon teacher educators to improve teachers' abilities to teach about the world (Goodlad, 1986; Martin, 1985; National...
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Governor's Association, 1989; O'Neil, 1989; Shaping the Future of International Studies, 1984; Smuckler & Sommers, 1988; Torney-Purta, 1982).

What does it mean to teach with a global perspective? The National Council for the Social Studies (1982) has defined global education as emphasizing that: (1) the human experience is an increasingly globalized phenomenon in which people are constantly being influenced by transnational, cross-cultural, and multicultural interactions; (2) there are a variety of actors (states, multinational corporations, private voluntary organizations, individuals) on the world stage; (3) the fate of humankind cannot be separated from the state of the world environment; (4) there are linkages between present social, political, and ecological realities and alternative futures; and (5) citizen participation is critical both in local and world affairs.

Alger and Harf (1986), Anderson (1979), Becker (1979), Hanvey (1978), Kniep (1986), Muessig and Gilliom (1981), and Woyach and Remy (1989) are important contributors to the on-going debate concerning what global education is or should be.

How do teacher educators conceptualize global education? The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1983) has defined global education as "the process by which people acquire a global perspective to explain events in recognition of the increasing interdependence of nations and cultures." In a status report of American teacher education programs in global education, Merryfield (1991) found that there was consensus in three areas. Teacher educators agreed that in order to prepare teachers in global perspectives they must address: (1) knowledge and appreciation of cultural differences and similarities both within the U.S. and around the world; (2) knowledge of the world as an interdependent system; and (3) an understanding of contemporary global issues, conflicts, and change. Although other elements in global education were addressed by some programs, Merryfield found much less attention to a global view of history (as espoused by Kniep, 1986), recognition of choices and attention to decision-making (Anderson, 1979; Hanvey, 1978), actors in world affairs (Alger & Harf, 1986) and issues related to the environment and technology (Kniep, 1986).

Practice

What do we know about teacher education programs in global perspectives? There has been relatively little systematic investigation of teacher education in global perspectives (Gilliom & Farley, 1990; Ochoa, 1986). Hadley and Wood (1986), Lamy (1982), Tucker (1982), and Urso (1990) have described the characteristics of their teacher education programs in global education. Gilliom and Harf (1985) have
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There is some evidence that teacher education programs can make a difference in how teachers teach about the world. Researchers have found that preservice courses and inservice workshops can influence teachers' attitudes and abilities in teaching global perspectives (Barnes & Curlette, 1985; Martin, 1988; Mitsakos, 1979; Thorpe, 1988; Tucker, 1983; Tye, 1980). Wilson (1982, 1983) has demonstrated that cross-cultural and overseas experiences improve teachers' understanding and motivation for teaching about the world.

There is very little research that has compared teacher education programs in global education or examined the national or international scope of global education in social studies teacher education. In research (1990) on the status and characteristics of teacher education programs in global perspectives across the U.S., Merryfield raised some worrisome issues. It appeared that in 1989 few preservice social studies teachers were being prepared to teach about the world, and most inservice social studies teachers who did participate in some type of program experienced only brief inservice workshops or presentations at professional meetings. The majority of teacher educators who were preparing social studies teachers to teach about global content were not social studies professors in colleges of education, but persons in other colleges or in private organizations. Finally, teacher educators involved in preparing social studies teachers to teach global perspectives identified two significant problems. Preservice and inservice teachers are often ethnocentric and have little or no knowledge of the world upon which to build. Even when teachers are motivated and knowledgeable, a lack of understanding and support at the building or district level confounds their abilities to infuse their knowledge of global perspectives into classroom instruction (Merryfield 1990, 1991).

These concerns and issues led to the study reported on here. I began the study with three questions. What are the characteristics of effective teacher education programs that prepare secondary social studies teachers to teach a global perspective? What are the factors that the program clients--preservice and inservice teachers, administrators, curriculum supervisors, and other persons affected by the programs--associate with their effectiveness? Are successful teacher education programs in global education idiosyncratic, or are there elements essential to all programs?
Method

In 1988 I carried out a reputational survey to identify American teacher education programs that prepare secondary social studies teachers to teach with a global perspective. I surveyed the 452 members of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies, the 50 persons in charge of international education for the states, and 60 persons who have been active in presentations or publications on global education over the last decade. These persons tentatively identified 88 programs as preparing secondary teachers to teach with a global perspective. I then interviewed program directors or professors of those programs in order to verify that there was a global education component in their programs. The 32 programs that did focus on global education are profiled in *Teaching About The World: Teacher Education Programs with a Global Perspective* (Merryfield, 1990).

From those 32 programs I chose six for more in-depth study. There were several criteria for this purposeful sample (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985 and Patton, 1980, for more on purposeful sampling). I wanted to: (1) compare relatively new programs with ones that had pioneered global education in the 1970s and early 1980s; (2) examine programs with different institutional bases; (3) reflect the geographic diversity of the 32 programs; and (4) focus on programs that the reputational survey had identified as being the best in the nation.

The programs selected were (1) the Social Studies Program at Florida International University, (2) the Global Education Program in Southern California at California State University at Long Beach, (3) Global REACH in Arlington, Washington, (4) the Massachusetts Global Education Program in Winchester, Massachusetts, (5) the Social Studies Program at the University of Kentucky, and (6) Social Studies and Global Education at The Ohio State University.

Although I learned a great deal about these programs through interviews during the selection process, the major data collection was carried out through site visits and reviews of program documentation. Site visits included observations of classes, workshops, presentations at professional conferences, planning sessions, meetings with advisory committees, and interviews with the program personnel, students, teachers, school administrators and other persons involved in or serviced by the programs. For example, data collection with Global REACH included a five-day site visit where I observed a two-day inservice program, and interviewed five of the program staff, fifteen teachers, five school administrators, and two state education officials who had worked with the program. I collected over 50 documents related to Global REACH's teacher education program in global education.
Depending on what was available from each program, I examined brochures, program mission statements, annual reports to funders, evaluations, newsletters, program descriptions, syllabi, instructional materials developed or used by the program, and other pertinent documents.

Following the constructivist paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 1989), I sought to collect data that would portray multiple realities of those persons involved in each program under study. I began the study with the questions noted previously. As I collected data, other questions emerged. For example, during my site visit in Kentucky, I found that the teachers who served as associate directors of the Bluegrass International Program (BIP) valued it because it had been a vehicle for their personal and professional development. Their involvement in the Bluegrass International Program had led to their publication of new instructional materials, presentations at national professional meetings, and leadership in global education within their school district and across the state. Recognition of this factor led me to ask educators in the other programs if their involvement in these programs had influenced their professional development.

Data were collected from November, 1989 through August, 1990. The findings are specific to the school year of 1989-1990. Each program director was asked to react to the findings as a member check on the trustworthiness of the study (see Guba & Lincoln, 1989: 238-241).

Findings

Program Characteristics

Conceptualization. What are the characteristics of effective teacher education programs that prepare secondary social studies teachers to teach global perspectives? First, let us examine how the six programs conceptualize global education. Program directors were asked, "As though you were speaking to a potential student, describe how your program conceptualizes global education." Looking across the six programs in Table 1, we can see some commonalities. All the program directors built their global focus on the rationale that young people need to understand their world better in order to make effective decisions in a time of increasing global interdependence and interconnections. Although most conceptualizations reflect an interdisciplinary approach to the study of world cultures and global issues, some programs also include attention to global systems, cross-cultural experiences, or specific disciplines of study.

Program offerings. Second, these six programs offer a wide variety of learning experiences and support services for preservice and inservice teachers. The programs that have developed out of secondary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Conceptualizations of Global Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Social Studies Education**  
Florida International University | Global education is the process that provides students and individuals with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are necessary for them to meet their responsibility as citizens of their community, state, and nation in an increasingly interdependent and complex global society. Education for a global perspective includes the following components: the ability to conceptualize and understand the complexities of the international system; a knowledge of world cultures and international events; and an appreciation of the diversities and commonalities of human values and interests. |
| **Global Education Program in Southern California (GEPSCA)**  
California State University at Long Beach | Global education is an interdisciplinary, integrative program designed to prepare students for responsible and informed citizenship in a world which is increasingly interconnected, international, multicultural, and multilingual. |
| **Global REACH**  
Arlington, WA | Global education is the interdisciplinary study of global issues, systems, and concepts that provide the skills and attitudes necessary to function effectively in an international environment. The curricula in a global education program incorporate multicultural concepts and intercultural perspectives. Global education is a responsibility of all educators; therefore global education must have a multidisciplinary foundation. |
social studies education programs at Florida International University, the University of Kentucky, and The Ohio State University have a full range of certification, undergraduate, master's, and doctoral degree programs, as well as non-degree program offerings for inservice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Conceptualizations of Global Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts Global Education Program (MGEP)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winchester, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an age where nations and peoples of the world have become increasingly linked in a variety of ways--through science, technology, trade and business, monetary systems, and international organizations--MGEP is responding by helping elementary and secondary schools improve their students' ability to deal with these changes and increase their skills and knowledge on subjects such as foreign languages, world history, geography, and global issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Studies and Global Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global education recognizes that as a democratic society in an interdependent world, the United States needs to develop citizens who have knowledge of the world beyond our borders--its peoples, nations, cultures and issues--and who understand how we affect the world. This need places an important responsibility upon educators to bring a global perspective into their teaching, curriculum development, and research activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Social Studies Education</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Today's teachers need to know about the world's peoples, cultures, and issues. Social studies teachers can best be prepared to teach with a global perspective through course work in history and the social sciences, through social studies methods classes, and through cross-cultural experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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teachers. Although the Global Education Program in Southern California, Global REACH, and the Massachusetts Global Education Program offer some programs for college credit, their major emphasis is on inservice education, not advanced degrees (see Table 2).

Across the programs there are considerable opportunities for in-depth study in degree programs, summer institutes, study tours, and other extended inservice workshops. However, the program offerings with the largest number of participants are short inservices and presentations at professional meetings. All the programs do offer a wide variety of both learning opportunities and on-going support for teachers through permanent resources such as curriculum centers, newsletters, and consultancies for program development.

**Special strengths.** Beyond the programs and services noted in Table 2, each of the six programs has special strengths in content and expertise. Special strengths in Table 3 were articulated by the program leadership. All these programs are characterized by expertise in specific content, noteworthy achievements, and collaboration with schools and various educational, business, and civic organizations. To some extent, the content expertise reflects the background of the teacher educators themselves. However, content expertise does arise through collaborative efforts, such as MGEP's coordination of the Massachusetts Geographic Alliance, or The Ohio State University's collaboration with the Central Ohio Center for Economic Education and the Mershon Center. Noteworthy achievements, again described by the program directors, demonstrate the six programs' long-term commitment to educating teachers through instructional and support services.

**Funding.** Funding for these programs falls into two major categories. The teacher education degree programs and other college credit courses are funded through state appropriations and tuition as on-going, institutionalized programs. However, most of the non-credit inservice offerings and special services (see Table 2) across all six programs are funded through grants from foundations and other private organizations, or through fee-for-service arrangements. Although it can be said that funding from outside the institutional base appears to be a critical factor for teacher education in schools, there are differences across programs.

The Massachusetts Global Education Program (MGEP) is an unusual teacher education program in many ways. Based in Winchester School District outside of Boston, MGEP is a non-profit organization that provides inservice programs and support services for teachers in Winchester Schools, other school districts in the Boston area, throughout Massachusetts, and neighboring states. Its director is a
### Table 2

Program Offerings and Student or Teacher Enrollments in 1989-1990

Degree programs and those Inservice programs for college credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Preservice courses</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Master’s degree</th>
<th>Graduate credit non-degree courses</th>
<th>Doctoral degree</th>
<th>Short presentations at professional meetings</th>
<th>Short presentations for local school systems</th>
<th>Other short workshops</th>
<th>Summer institutes</th>
<th>Study tours</th>
<th>Other long workshops of more than a week</th>
<th>Curriculum development</th>
<th>Resource center</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>Examples of other offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flor. Internat’l Univ. (Secondary social studies program, 1979)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Computer-based information network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPSCE (Center of Internat’l Education, 1986)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Workshops for trainers of trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global REACH (Private, non-profit organization, 1984)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>Consultancies for program development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*includes pre/post convention workshop; *b*presentations to methods classes; *c*some students teach overseas.
Table 2 (continued)
Program Offerings and Student or Teacher Enrollments in 1989-1990
Degree programs and those Inservice programs for college credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Preservice courses</th>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>Master's degree</th>
<th>Graduate credit non-degree courses</th>
<th>Doctoral degree</th>
<th>Short presentations a at professional meetings</th>
<th>Short presentations for local school systems</th>
<th>Other short workshops</th>
<th>Summer institutes</th>
<th>Study tours</th>
<th>Other long workshops of more than a week</th>
<th>Curriculum development</th>
<th>Resource center</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
<th>Newsletter</th>
<th>Examples of other offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGE-P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mini-grants to teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(School district, 1979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State Univ.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultancies on program development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary social studies prog., 1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. of Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conversation partners with international students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Secondary social studies program, 1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a includes pre/post convention workshop; b presentations to methods classes; c some students teach overseas.
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programs, as well as non-degree program offerings for inservice teachers. Although the Global Education Program in Southern California, Global REACH, and the Massachusetts Global Education Program offer some programs for college credit, their major emphasis is on inservice education, not advanced degrees (see Table 2).

Across the programs there are considerable opportunities for in-depth study in degree programs, summer institutes, study tours, and other extended inservice workshops. However, the program offerings with the largest number of participants are short inservices and presentations at professional meetings. All the programs do offer a wide variety of both learning opportunities and on-going support for teachers through permanent resources such as curriculum centers, newsletters, and consultancies for program development.

Special strengths. Beyond the programs and services noted in Table 2, each of the six programs has special strengths in content and expertise. Special strengths in Table 3 were articulated by the program leadership. All these programs are characterized by expertise in specific content, noteworthy achievements, and collaboration with schools and various educational, business, and civic organizations. To some extent, the content expertise reflects the background of the teacher educators themselves. However, content expertise does arise through collaborative efforts, such as MGEP’s coordination of the Massachusetts Geographic Alliance, or The Ohio State University’s collaboration with the Central Ohio Center for Economic Education and the Mershon Center. Noteworthy achievements, again described by the program directors, demonstrate the six programs’ long-term commitments to educating teachers through instructional and support services.

Funding. Funding for these programs falls into two major categories. The teacher education degree programs and other college credit courses are funded through state appropriations and tuition as on-going, institutionalized programs. However, most of the non-credit inservice offerings and special services (see Table 2) across all six programs are funded through grants from foundations and other private organizations, or through fee-for-service arrangements. Although it can be said that funding from outside the institutional base appears to be a critical factor for teacher education in schools, there are differences across programs.

The Massachusetts Global Education Program (MGEP) is an unusual teacher education program in many ways. Based in Winchester School District outside of Boston, MGEP is a non-profit organization that provides inservice programs and support services for teachers in Winchester Schools, other schools districts in the Boston area, throughout Massachusetts and neighboring states. Its director is a
## Table 3
Content Expertise, Achievements and Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Content Expertise</th>
<th>Noteworthy Achievements</th>
<th>Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Connecting the knowledge base to Hanvey's model of global perspectives; special attention to teaching about diverse human values and cultures, global economic systems, and the evolution of global systems.</td>
<td>Institutionalization of global education in Dade County Schools, the nation's 4th largest school district, through the Global Awareness Program; connecting preservice students with inservice teachers trained in global education.</td>
<td>Dade County Schools, the Florida Dept. of Educ., non-governmental organizations, business and labor organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPSCA California State University at Long Beach</td>
<td>Multicultural education, integration of global education in foreign language and social studies education; special attention to teaching about cultural universals, peace and security issues.</td>
<td>Building district teams of foreign language and social studies teachers; educating a critical mass of teachers in global education.</td>
<td>The UNA, Port of Long Beach, and the International Businessman's Association, other CISP centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global REACH Arlington, WA</td>
<td>Multicultural education; holistic treatment of culture and physical aspects of global education.</td>
<td>Building multidisciplinary teams of teachers and administrators in the U.S., Canada, and Great Britain; curriculum development, including Analyzing International News, Reach for Kids and other project REACH materials.</td>
<td>Local school districts, the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, the UNA, Amnesty International, the Joint Council on Economic Education, Council on International Trade, professional education associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td>Noteworthy Achievements</td>
<td>Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGEP Winchester, MA</td>
<td>Geography (MGEP coordinates the Massachusetts Geographic Alliance); East Asia; special attention to teaching about diverse human values, global economic systems, and global history.</td>
<td>Building teams of administrators and classroom teachers; servicing about 1500 teachers a year; operating out of a local school system through private funding and grants.</td>
<td>The Boston World Affairs Council, Massachusetts Council for the Social Studies, Massachusetts Teachers Association, State Department of Education, Tufts University, Wellesley College, the Principals Center at Harvard University, area studies centers at Boston University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies and Global Education</td>
<td>Economics, international relations, multicultural education, geography, Africa, China, the Soviet Union; Special attention to teaching about human values and cultures, global economic and political systems, peace and security issues, and development issues.</td>
<td>Masters and doctoral degree program in global education; multidisciplinary approach.</td>
<td>Local school systems, the Mershon Center, the Central Ohio Center for Economic Education, Columbus Council on World Affairs, The Ohio Council for the Social Studies, Ohio Geographic Alliance, The Social Science Education Consortium.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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classroom teacher whose salary is paid by the Winchester Schools and grant monies. Since it began in 1979, MGEP has been supported by many funders (see Table 4). Funding in collaboration with the Principals' Center at Harvard University supports the work of teams of teachers and administrators.

Global REACH in Arlington, Washington, has another approach to funding teacher education in global perspectives. The program developed as the global education extension of the Project REACH Consortium, a private, non-profit organization that has built a reputation for expertise and curriculum development in multicultural education. Since its inception in 1984, Global REACH's funding has been divided about equally between grants from foundations and fees from participating school districts. School buildings or districts pay annual fees for multidisciplinary teams of teachers to participate in five days of inservice education, usually a Fall Symposium, a Winter Work Session, and a Spring Share Fair. The program director is a classroom teacher who is supported jointly by his school system and Global REACH.

The Global Education Program in Southern California (GEPSCA) is based in the Center for International Education at California State University at Long Beach. It is a teacher education program based at a university, yet its focus is working with inservice teachers in school districts instead of preservice or graduate degree programs. Unlike all the other programs in this study, GEPSCA has grown out of an effort by a state legislature to improve student knowledge of the world. The California International Studies Project (CISP) has provided major support for GEPSCA and eight other global education centers in California. GEPSCA also depends on grants from foundations and donations from community and business organizations. Some funding supports a foreign language component, and GEPSCA works with teams of foreign language and social studies teachers.

The other three programs have institutional funding for preservice and graduate degree programs. For the most part they find it necessary to secure outside monies for inservice programs with schools. Since 1979 the Social Studies Program at Florida International University has provided inservice education to teachers, administrators, and media specialists through the Global Awareness Program (GAP). Recognized as one of the oldest and most successful collaborative efforts in global education, it has received funding from many sources (see Table 4) and has played a major role in professional development in Dade County Schools, the nation's fourth largest school system.

Since 1985 the Bluegrass International Program (BIP), a collaborative effort between the University of Kentucky and Fayette County Schools, has provided inservice education, teacher travel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Types of Funding</th>
<th>Examples of Funders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>Institutional funding for degree program and college credit; grant support for</td>
<td>Danforth Foundation, U.S. Department of Education, Dade County Public Schools, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International</td>
<td>inservice programs with schools.</td>
<td>Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center, The Florida Department of Education, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
<td>Florida International University Foundation, The Joyce-Mertz-Gilmore Foundation,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Longview Foundation, Social Issues Resources Series, The U. S. National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commission for UNESCO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEPSCA</td>
<td>Approximately 45% from state and matching federal grants; 25% from foundations;</td>
<td>California International Studies Project (state monies), Danforth Foundation, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
<td>30% from community and business organizations.</td>
<td>United Nations Association, California State University at Long Beach, Port of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Long Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Long Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global REACH</td>
<td>About 50% from grants and 50% from fee-for-service arrangements with schools.</td>
<td>Danforth Foundation, The Longview Foundation, Newsweek Education Programs, Boeing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Types of Funding</td>
<td>Examples of Funders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies and Global Education The Ohio State University</td>
<td>Institutional funding for degree programs and college credit courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Social Studies Education The University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Institutional funding for degree programs and college credit courses; grant support for inservice programs with schools through BIP</td>
<td>The Danforth Foundation, The Longview Foundation, Fayette County Schools, University of Kentucky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
opportunities, a resource center, instructional materials development, and a newsletter. Collaborative UK/Fayette County activities such as the annual International Fair and the International Classroom began several years before BIP and continue under its auspices. BIP has been funded by foundations and its sponsors (see Table 4).

Outside funding was of critical importance in the early development of both GAP and BIP. However, when foundation monies became harder to secure in the late 1980s, both these collaborative efforts survived through restructuring and support from school districts. Because of their certification and degree programs, the Florida International and Kentucky programs do have some important advantages. Global education is a major component of the professional and academic courses in their preservice teacher education programs. Their students are required to take courses that prepare them to teach about the world. At the University of Kentucky, all social studies majors complete a hierarchy of cross-cultural experiences and some students teach in other countries. Social studies students at Florida International University are required to infuse a global perspective into all their lesson planning and student teaching. Consequently, as the graduates of these certification programs become classroom teachers, they are well on their way to teaching with a global perspective. The graduate programs at these institutions have a similar impact because of the global content of the graduate degree experience. Graduates of master’s and doctoral programs have taken on positions of leadership in promoting and implementing global education. The integration of globally-oriented certification programs, graduate degree programs, and inservice collaboration and support services can provide a powerful approach to meeting the needs of teachers and school districts.

Although there has been attention to global education in The Ohio State University’s Social Studies Program since the 1970s, a graduate program in global education was formally initiated in 1988. The global program collaborates with the Central Ohio Center for Economic Education and the Mershon Center, internationally known for its work in national security, world affairs, and civic education. At this time the major focus of the Social Studies and Global Education Program is infusing global education in certification programs and expanding master’s and doctoral degree programs. OSU is unique in that the graduate degree programs require international experiences and five core courses on different aspects of global education. The program is funded as an institutionalized university degree program.

Looking across the summary of program funding in Table 4, we can see the significance of external funding. A single funder, the Danforth Foundation, has played a major role in inservice education for five of these teacher education programs in global education.
These six teacher education programs are characterized by: (1) similar conceptualizations of global education; (2) many diverse program offerings and support services for preservice and inservice teachers; (3) special strengths in content, noteworthy achievements, and collaboration with schools and other organizations; and (4) institutional support for degree programs, and grant or fee-for-service arrangements for inservice teacher education in schools.

Client Perspectives on Effective Programs

The underlying purpose of all these programs is to help teachers and school districts improve their teaching about the world. During the data collection, much attention was given to program clients--those teachers, administrators, and others who use the knowledge, experiences, and materials to improve the instruction of students. After clients described their experiences with the program, they were asked to: (1) evaluate the program in terms of its effectiveness in helping students, teachers, and schools; and (2) outline any concerns, pertinent issues, or suggestions for improving or expanding the program. Through content analysis (see Lincoln and Guba, 1985) of these data, I found that there were four major factors associated with program effectiveness.

The scope of program offerings and support services. First, almost all clients considered the scope and variety of program offerings—the actual instructional experiences and support services—to be of paramount importance. Again and again, teachers and others stated that they needed more information about cultures, global issues, interdependence, and other topics. When clients spoke about the relationship between programming and effectiveness, they most frequently brought up the scope of offerings, on-going support services, international or cross-cultural experiences, and work in teams as factors associated with program effectiveness.

With no exceptions, clients preferred teacher education programs that included a broad scope of instructional offerings and support services. They wanted a wide variety of instructional formats ranging from regular university courses to after-school workshops, weekend retreats, and overseas study. They were enthusiastic about a wide variety of content expertise; not surprisingly, they preferred topics that related to state or local curriculum mandates or perceived weaknesses in adopted textbooks. Program clients rated on-going support services such as resource centers, speaker bureaus, and curriculum development as essential. Many clients talked about opportunities for study and travel overseas or cross-cultural experiences in the local community as turning points in their motivation and ability to teach about other cultural perspectives. In some programs such as
Global REACH, MGEP, and GEPSCA, teams of educators are an important implementation strategy. Based on the data collected from their clients, the team concept is very much related to program effectiveness because it provides additional support at the building level.

Collaboration and communication. Second, program clients emphasized the importance of the program staffs' collaboration with other organizations and institutions. Clients perceived of collaboration as leading to more services, opportunities, funding, and professional development. "Because of collaboration, I now have become involved in Global Tomorrow, the L.A. Multicultural Steering Committee, and the California Council for the Social Studies," a Long Beach educator noted. Communication goes hand in hand with collaboration as it creates awareness of up-coming courses or workshops, new materials, speakers, special events, grants, study tours, and other opportunities. Visible channels of communication in the form of newsletters, mailings, and advisory committees provide clients with opportunities for personal and professional development as the programs break down the isolation of classroom teachers and build a "community of educators with common interests," as one team of teachers noted.

Program leadership. A third category of responses related to program effectiveness involved leadership. For several of the programs, program clients identified the program director or a professor as the critical force in creating and maintaining a successful program. Comments such as the following were frequently heard. "It [GAP] could not have happened if it were not for Jan [Tucker]," a school administrator noted. A dean at the University of Kentucky described Angene Wilson as "the driving force for international education in the whole college." A high school teacher explained Paul Mulloy's impact on MGEP in this way. "He is a high school teacher, so he understands what we need. He links us up with resources and workshops. He is always there when you need him." The most frequently mentioned leadership qualities included "diplomatic" skills in relationships with school districts, the ability to "incite enthusiasm in teachers," recognition and appreciation of teacher-perceived needs and realities, the demonstration of a long-term commitment to working with schools, and "a sense of genuine caring for teachers and kids." Steering committees or advisory boards were also given credit for important roles in developing and maintaining effective programs.

Opportunities for professional growth and leadership for teachers and administrators. Many teachers and administrators have found new teacher programs to be an avenue for continued professional
involvement and leadership. All of these programs have had an impact on the lives of teachers. A team of teachers at Decatur High School in Federal Way, Washington, spoke at length about how their experiences over the last five years with Global REACH had led to "our own personal and professional development" and their roles in the district as curriculum developers of four new courses and managers of such projects as an annual Culture Fair, U.N. Day, Third World Awareness Week, and a Human Rights Club. All of these programs have provided opportunities for many teachers and administrators to become teacher educators themselves through presentations at professional meetings and inservice workshops.

Suggestions and Concerns

Program clients were also asked if they had any concerns about the program or suggestions for improving it. For the most part their concerns or suggestions were reflected in the factors noted above. Most frequently, clients brought up expansion of numbers and types of offerings as the best way to strengthen the program. Almost as a wish list, teachers and administrators asked for more instructional formats, a wider variety of topics or courses, more materials developed or disseminated, more opportunities for travel and study abroad, and more support services. An underlying theme of these suggestions for improving or expanding programming appears to be the client's desire to have teacher education programs based on their immediate needs or the needs of their school.

There were two concerns raised by clients that warrant attention. Within each of the preservice programs at Florida International, The Ohio State University, and the University of Kentucky, there were a few complaints that global education is "forced down our throats," in the words of one college senior. Students complained that they were not given a choice of whether or not to accept the tenets of global education. They perceived that they were required to prepare lessons, cooperate in cross-cultural experiences or demonstrate competence in global perspectives whether or not they personally accepted the ideas. One student teacher explained, "I am for global education, but it becomes a burden when we have to have a global perspective in all our lesson planning." This type of complaint, however, came only from a few preservice, undergraduate students.

A second, thornier problem comes through in these excerpts from interview notes: "We have a racist community, and I don't see [the program] as addressing that problem at all." "[The program] tolerates racism and ethnocentrism. They seem to focus more on making America competitive than on tolerance in [the local community]." "From what I've seen, the [program] is for white, middle-class Americans to learn about other countries. It doesn't do anything for understanding the
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problems of our poor or minority children here." "We have to get beyond food and festivals and confront our own prejudices before we can begin to understand other peoples. [The program] seems to think that all we need is information on economic interdependence or security issues. What we need is help in changing the way we look at ourselves and the world."

These and other clients were concerned about two overlapping issues. How should teacher education programs deal with racism and ethnocentrism? How does global education relate to issues in the local community? Although these concerns come from only a few clients, they reflect some of the issues facing the American movement for a global perspective in education. However, the controversial issues that emerged in this study differ considerably from the usual ultraconservative criticism that global education is antithetical to civic education (For more on controversies, see Lamy, 1990; Metzger, 1988; O'Neil, 1989; Ravitch, 1989).

Beyond these issues, there were some critical observations by clients that focused on teacher educators. As noted elsewhere, university-school collaborations are often problematic by the nature of their cultures (Sarason, 1982; Tucker, 1990). Clients frequently noted that "their" university-based teacher educators understood and met the existing needs of teachers and schools instead of pushing university or other agendas. In addition, some clients of Global REACH and MGEP concluded that these programs were effective because they were not based in universities, and the program leader was not a college professor. The underlying assumption appears to be that teacher educators, especially college professors, who do work well with teachers and schools in long-term, collaborative relationships are the exception, not the rule.

In summary, teachers, administrators and other educators who are clients of these six teacher education programs relate program effectiveness to these factors: the program offerings (a wide scope of instructional opportunities, on-going support services, cross-cultural experiences, and teams within schools); long-term collaboration with schools and other organizations; good communication with clients; program leadership; and opportunities for professional growth. Some clients of these programs did raise concerns about global education requirements in preservice programs and ways that the program staffs dealt with racism, ethnocentrism, and other issues in the local community.

Are Effective Global Education Programs Idiosyncratic?

The six programs were chosen because they are all considered exemplary in their preparation of secondary social studies teachers in
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global education, and yet they have some significant differences in institutional bases, content expertise, funding, and formats for instructional and support services. Each of the programs is unique, having evolved from the opportunities, personalities, resources, expertise, needs, and constraints of its own local context. Yet there are essential elements that are common to all six programs.

**Responding to the felt needs of teachers.** During the site visits the most salient commonality was how the staff of each program had learned to meet the needs of teachers and schools. These programs are not perceived as pushing their own agendas, but as responding to the expressed needs of educators and schools. Although there were some striking differences across the six programs in process or content, the program clients used similar criteria in judging the effectiveness of the programs. The question, "Does this program help me in my instruction?" appears to be the bottom line for teachers. Clients particularly wanted instructional materials that can easily be integrated into mandated courses.

**Treating teachers as professionals.** A second element across the programs relates to how teacher educators treat their clients. "They treat us like professionals," was a frequently heard praise. What does this phrase mean in teacher education? Let me share examples from an inservice and a graduate degree program.

One of the 1990 events of Global REACH was the annual Ft. Worden Retreat, a two-day inservice at a picturesque state park right on the Strait of Juan de Fuca, about an hour and a half north of Seattle. Teams of teachers from schools in British Columbia and across Washington stayed together in quaint Victorian homes that once housed officers' families. From Wednesday evening to Friday noon, about 100 teachers had many opportunities to learn, share, plan, and enjoy. The program included accomplished plenary speakers, choices of informal presentations in small groups of 15 or so, sharing sessions, and time to reflect and plan with teams. Free materials, resources, and handouts on upcoming opportunities were on display. Meals offered a wide variety of Northwest specialties and a time to share with new and old friends. Some teachers had been coming to this conference for five years, and more experienced teachers welcomed firstcomers. The program director, a classroom teacher himself, encouraged their reflections and planning, while leaving decisions to the teachers. If they wished, the teachers could receive college credit for the retreat. Participants spent their evenings watching videos on Chile or environmental issues, playing games related to global education, or just enjoying each others' company.
At The Ohio State University, one of the courses of the graduate program in 1989-90 was "Infusing Global Perspectives in Education." The course examined aspects of the changing world, contemporary global issues, and conceptualizations of global education. It included an application project where teachers developed their own personal conceptualization of global education, as they experimented with course content in their own teaching and learning. Teachers were asked to act as critical decision-makers, experimenting with ways to make global education their own. A significant part of the course was spent reflecting upon and sharing efforts to infuse global perspectives into existing courses. Teachers themselves chose topics for five out of the ten sessions. In 1989, they chose to focus on the themes of global interdependence and cross-cultural awareness. The course also provided time for examination of supplementary materials and information on resource people in the local community and across the U.S. The classes met in the comfortable setting of the media center in a new middle school. For the last class, the teachers brought international dishes to the professor's house for debates on controversial issues in global education chosen by the teachers.

What do these examples have in common that translates into treating a teacher as a professional? They demonstrate respect for the teacher's judgment and expertise by listening to their choices for content and process. The programs ensure that the teacher has the stimulation, time, and resources to reflect, plan and share. Finally, they provide the creature comforts and collegiality that demonstrate high value for teachers as individuals.

Working with teachers and schools in long-term, collaborative relationships. The older programs have overcome the usual ad hoc nature of work with inservice teachers in global education through long-term, collaborative relationships. Teachers regularly attend inservices, check-out new materials and interact with resource persons over many years. The strategy of building teams of teachers at the building level appears to work synergistically in motivating teachers and ensuring continuity as new teachers enter and other teachers leave. These relationships appear to work well for teacher educators as they become well-known and trusted as colleagues and resources for teachers and administrators. Long-term, collaborative relationships also provide teacher educators with opportunities to develop and test theories and carry out research on teaching and learning.

The staff of Florida International, Kentucky, MGEP, and Global REACH programs are all proud of their long-term, collaborative relationships with teachers and schools. In return the clients of these programs speak of the teacher educators as trusted colleagues who support, invigorate and inspire educators.
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It appears that these six programs are idiosyncratic and yet have important commonalities. It is the contextual differences in the programs that help them meet the differing needs of teachers and schools. We cannot clone GEPSCA and expect it to mesh with the needs of teachers in Bloomington, Indiana in the same ways it does with the needs of those in southern California. Although programs may adopt ideas from each other, the programs succeed by responding to local needs, opportunities, and constraints. These teacher educators also share two other commonalities. They respond to the needs felt by teachers and they treat clients with respect as professionals. Finally, teacher educators appear to be most successful in overcoming the limits of inservice education by developing long-term, collaborative relationships that provide on-going support and new knowledge for teachers and help teacher educators understand the realities of the changing nature of schools and students.

Implications

There are intriguing issues arising from this study. First, to what degree should teachers and schools drive the teacher education agenda? Classroom instruction is the ultimate target of teacher education programs. Should teacher educators focus on realities of state and local curriculum mandates and the expressed needs of teachers? Or should teacher educators use their expertise and research to improve upon the status quo?

This "driver's seat" dilemma has other ramifications. There is more to global education than adding the study of India or Africa to a world history course. If teachers are not cognizant of the overall differences between a global perspective and other approaches to teaching about the world, how can they initiate such teacher education? Many of the program directors responded to teachers' requests for an after-school presentation on Islam during a Middle East crisis or a curriculum packet on changes in Eastern Europe as new political and economic systems evolve. Can this hot spot response provide teachers with the knowledge and skills they need to teach with a global perspective? On the other hand, can teacher educators develop credible relationships with teachers if they act upon the assumption that they as teacher educators know more than classroom teachers about what is best for students? In some of these programs, classroom teachers are teacher educators. Perhaps the consequences of holding a dual role needs to be examined.

A second implication relates to the incredible cultural and educational diversity of the United States in the 1990s. The content--facts, concepts, generalizations--taught in these six programs varies widely as they respond to different contexts. The Florida International
program has a strong emphasis on economic and cultural interdependence with the Caribbean, Hispanic cultures, and issues relevant to Miami's geographic position. On the other hand, Global REACH focuses more on environmental issues and the peoples of the Pacific Rim. If teacher educators are responding to local context, how will these content differences affect the ways in which future Americans view and interact with their nation and the world? Although there is agreement that teacher educators simply cannot teach everything teachers need to know about the world, is there a core of knowledge that all teacher educators who prepare secondary social studies teachers should address?

Finally, there is much to be gained by teacher educators visiting and learning from each other's programs. My observations of classes in Miami and workshops in Long Beach, interviews with teachers in Boston, handouts from Arlington, and syllabi from Lexington have greatly contributed to the improvement of my classes, my work with schools, and my tacit understanding of what a powerful position teacher educators potentially hold. It is a challenge for all of us who work with teachers to learn as well as teach.

Endnote

1This study was funded through a grant from the Mershon Center, The Ohio State University. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 7, 1991.
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CLASSROOM CLIMATE AND CIVIC EDUCATION IN SECONDARY SOCIAL STUDIES RESEARCH: ANTECEDENTS AND FINDINGS

Angela M. Harwood
Emory University

Abstract

A broad range of researchers probing complex learning processes have mounted sustained investigations of teaching focused on descriptions of classroom climate. This review presents an overview of the theoretical grounding and instrumentation used in traditional studies of classroom climate; explores the development of social studies classroom climate research; critically examines how classroom climate has been defined and measured in research on the climate of secondary social studies classes; and provides suggestions to improve classroom climate constructs through an integration of social studies literature and the traditional approaches to the study of classrooms. Suggestions for improving future research are presented.

Introduction

Helping students become informed participating citizens has been a central goal for educators since the founding of the public education system in the United States. The recognition of the importance of teaching citizenship by the National Education Association Committee of Ten in 1892 set the stage for nearly a century of debate on how best to educate students to become contributing members of our democratic society. Social studies educators and researchers continually strive to define the necessary elements of pedagogy and curriculum that will ensure that students are equipped to
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become active participants in defining and solving the political and social problems faced by our nation.

Social studies researchers have evaluated many aspects of the schooling process for their effects on developing student knowledge of, and positive attitudes toward, government and politics. In determining how best to provide education for citizen action, researchers have focused on the outcomes of curricular interventions, teaching methods, and student involvement in extracurricular activities. One promising strain of this research that has been acknowledged has evolved from investigations of individual classroom climates, and the relationship between the educational atmosphere of social studies classes and the attitudinal development of students.

The effects of classroom climate at both the elementary and secondary school levels have been explored by a number of social studies researchers over the past two decades. Angell (1991) reviewed climate findings of the elementary school literature; this review includes published and unpublished research, as well as dissertations that are directly relevant to the study of classroom climate in secondary social studies education. Classroom climate has been defined as "the intersection of teacher behavior and classroom curriculum factors" (Ehman, 1980a, p. 108), and generally refers not to who teaches or what is taught, but to how teaching is carried out.

The study of classroom climate, however, has not been limited only to those interested in social studies education. A broad range of researchers probing the complex processes of learning have mounted sustained investigations of teaching that have focused on descriptions of classroom climate. Two traditions of research in classroom climate, varying in their theoretical base and empirical approach, have evolved as educational researchers have attempted to identify which classroom variables affect student learning. The literature that has developed from these research traditions, although it provides valuable information for those interested in the study of classroom climate, has remained largely unexplored by social studies researchers. In light of this fact, this review has four purposes: (a) to provide a brief overview of the theoretical grounding and instrumentation used in traditional studies of classroom climate; (b) to explore the development of social studies classroom climate research; (c) to examine critically how classroom climate has been defined and measured in the social studies literature; and (d) to provide suggestions to improve classroom climate constructs through an integration of social studies literature and the traditional approaches to the study of classrooms.
Overview of Research Traditions in the Study of Classroom Climate

This overview introduces and considers the methods employed in researching classroom environments. The overview highlights the development of the two major traditions in this research field and summarizes findings from each. More exhaustive reviews of research in these traditions, which are beyond the scope of this article, have been provided by others (Anderson, 1982; Chavez, 1984; Medley & Mitzel, 1963; Moos, 1979; Randhawa & Fu, 1973; Walberg, 1969; Withall & Lewis, 1963).

Early interest in the classroom environment has been traced to social psychological researchers in the late 1920s (Chavez, 1984). Two theoretical models, each derived from work in social psychology, gained preeminence in the study of classroom environment (Anderson, 1982; Chavez, 1984; Nielsen & Kirk, 1974; Randhawa & Fu, 1973). The two theoretical models (the Getzels-Thelen Social System Model and the Murray Environmental Press Model), their empirical operationalizations, and research employing these methods are presented below.

Getzels and Thelen's Classroom as a Social System Model

Getzels and Thelen (1960) proposed that individual classes may be considered as social systems, in which interactions are guided by the role expectations, institutional demands, and the individual personalities and needs of the participants. "In working out this balance between the institution and the individual," Getzels and Thelen assert, "the group develops a 'culture' or, perhaps better here, a climate, which may be analyzed. . ." (p. 79). They suggest that classroom teachers may choose to emphasize institutional demands and expectations, or to respond to individual personalities and their needs. Teaching style, and the interaction between students and teachers, is therefore the central element of research that followed from this model.

A series of studies by Withall (Withall, 1949, 1969; Withall & Lewis, 1963; Withall & Thelen, 1949) focused on the development and validation of the Climate Index (Withall & Lewis, 1963). The Index was used to categorize teachers' verbal behavior, and its theoretical basis raised crucial questions about how the quality and nature of teacher-student interaction influenced learning and achievement in the classroom (Withall & Lewis, 1963). This empirical work in defining elements of classroom climate guided a series of other researchers who continued to explore this line of inquiry.

Medley and Mitzel (1958, 1963) expanded Withall's method in their development of the Observation Schedule and Record (OScAR)
which contained scales representing emotional climate, verbal emphasis, and the social organization of classrooms. Researchers coded both verbal and nonverbal behaviors of teachers as supportive or hostile using this rating scale. One of the most highly sophisticated and widely-used instruments for observing classroom interaction patterns was developed by Flanders (1964, 1970). The Flanders system provided ten categories that are used to classify student-teacher interactions (Flanders, 1970). Flander's Interaction Analysis system included the sequential analysis of students' and teachers' verbal contributions, and a matrix through which the proportion of direct or indirect teacher influence, or the ratios of teacher-to-student or student-initiated to teacher-initiated talk are computed.

The empirical focus of research grounded in the social system model of Getzels and Thelen lies in the direct analysis of teachers' behaviors—specifically, their interactions with students. Although the behaviors were operationally defined and measured in slightly different ways by researchers in this tradition, the interaction in the classroom, as controlled by the teacher, was seen as the defining element of classroom climate.

**Murray's Environmental Press Theory**

A second tradition of research on classrooms is derived from Murray's (1938) theory of environmental press. Murray also made an ecological argument for the basis of behavior, defining a press as "a temporal gestalt of stimuli which usually appears in the guise of a threat of harm or promise of benefit" (p. 40) to organisms. Organisms respond to these environmental pressures in order to satisfy their needs. The central focus of research from this theoretical basis is on students' perceptions of their environments and environmental pressures and demands.

Trickett and Moos (1973) were influenced by Murray's theory of environmental press in their development of the Classroom Environment Scale (CES). The CES was a questionnaire for students that assessed their perceptions of nine classroom dimensions: (a) involvement; (b) affiliation; (c) support; (d) task orientation; (e) competition; (f) order and organization; (g) rule clarity; (h) teacher control; and (i) innovation.

Steele, House, and Kerins (1971) also developed an instrument—the Classroom Activities Questionnaire—based on the theoretical work of Murray. The CAQ was designed to appraise both affective and cognitive dimensions of the instructional climate. Four major dimensions of instructional climate—lower thought processes, higher thought processes, classroom focus, and classroom climate—were assessed by students on a questionnaire. The classroom climate dimension focused on students' attitudes and feelings toward their classes, and contained six
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factors: enthusiasm; independence; divergence; humor; teacher talk; and homework.

Summary

Two broad traditional approaches to the study of classroom climate have been introduced. The traditions share a central focus on the interaction that occurs in classrooms as the determinant characteristic of classroom climate. The definitions of classroom climate derived from Murray's environmental press theory share with those derived from the Getzels-Thelen model a central focus on teacher behavior. The measurement of climate, however, is accomplished in two radically different ways in these traditions. Researchers who grounded their work in the social systems model measured classroom climate through low-inference instrumentation, which enabled them to analyze overt teacher behaviors. The observation and codification of teacher-student interaction served as the basis of analysis. Those who grounded their work in theories of environmental press, however, relied on students' perceptions of their teachers' behaviors, and employed techniques such as questionnaires to collect data for analysis. Although research on classroom climate in the field of social studies shares methods used in both of these two traditional approaches, it was grounded in empirical work in political socialization and the curricular assessments and reforms of the 1960s.

Classroom Climate Research in Social Studies Education

Social studies educators have long been concerned with providing a classroom climate to facilitate democratic learning. Dewey (1916) asserted that the environment was a potent element of education, and proposed that intellectual freedom and exchange should be central elements of civic education. Kohlberg (1975) held that moral development would be facilitated when students actively participated in the governance of their school communities and were challenged to consider others' points of view through role-playing and discussion. Therefore, as measures of classroom climate were being developed by a broad range of educational researchers during the 1950s and '60s, social studies educators were also beginning to focus attention on the definition and measurement of the concept. Their subsequent investigations shared many of the methodological approaches found in the general literature on classroom climate, but the definitions of climate and the outcome variables measured were quite specific to social studies pedagogy. An examination of how the research tradition in social studies classroom climate was generated helps to explain why this was so.
Precursors to Social Studies Classroom Climate Research

Contemporary interest in the effects of classroom climate in social studies education first began to appear in the political socialization literature of the 1960s. The findings of these early socialization studies, combined with changing perspectives on social studies curriculum and teaching methods, provided the direction for social studies researchers that guided the early investigations of classroom climate. A review of several socialization studies widely cited in curricular assessments and later research reports shows how the interest in classroom climate research in social studies developed.

Early research on the civic outcomes of schooling. Encouraging students to become actively participating citizens is a central goal of civics education (Langton, 1988; National Council for the Social Studies, 1981; Roselle, 1979). Among the most important objectives in civics instruction are increases in political knowledge, interest in politics, feelings of political efficacy, desire to participate in politics, civic tolerance, and decreases in political cynicism (Patrick, 1969). Early research on the role played by schools in the political socialization process indicated that formal schooling was not producing the positive attitude and participation outcomes social educators hoped would occur (Almond & Verba, 1963; Hess & Torney, 1967; Langton & Jennings, 1968).

The seminal study of civic cultures in five nations conducted by Almond and Verba (1963) assessed many sources of political attitudes, including several aspects of formal schooling. The researchers found that adults who remembered participating in school discussions and debates scored higher on measures of political efficacy. Findings from this study also indicated that those adults who remembered being taught about government and politics also scored higher on measures of efficacy. This suggested, the authors concluded, that the content of teaching might also be an important variable in determining political attitudes. They concluded that schooling did, indeed, play a large role in democratic socialization. Further research on the effects of schooling, however, indicated the complexity of the relationship.

Hess and Torney (1967) made an extensive study of the political attitudes and participation of elementary age children. Their purposeful national sample, including schools from both small and large cities in five regions of the United States, contained over 12,000 students and their teachers. Results of the teacher questionnaire indicated that teachers thought the function of the elementary school curriculum was to emphasize the emotional attachment of children to their country, and impress upon them the necessity for obedience and conformity. Data from teachers indicated this "basic tone of awe" (p.
106) of government was reinforced through the use of daily patriotic rituals and the display of, and reference to, national symbols in the classroom. Results from student questionnaires indicated that students had not recognized the role of debate, disagreement, and conflict inherent in the democratic process; that they saw laws as absolute and unchanging; and that they perceived figures and institutions of government as powerful, competent, benign, and infallible. The authoritarian control of the teachers studied by Hess and Torney produced a classroom climate in which the open discussion of ideas was discouraged.

Hess and Torney (1967) asserted that teachers' focus on authoritarian interaction styles did play an important role in the process of political socialization, but not necessarily a positive one. Although schools seemed to be powerful agents in instilling political norms, such as party voting, party affiliation, and party loyalty, they did so at the risk of underemphasizing other salient aspects of democratic politics. Hess and Torney found that teachers ignored "tougher, less pleasant facts of political life in the United States" (p. 218) and avoided teaching about the role of conflict in the political process, while their students assumed passive roles in the classroom. The authors noted the possible outcomes of such civic education:

For some children, the combination of complacency and compliance may contribute to political inactivity and the failure to progress from early levels of involvement (attachment to nation) to a more vigilant, assertive involvement in political activities (p. 111).

Hess and Torney concluded that the particular emphasis on submission to authority in citizenship training in the elementary schools indicated a need for further definition of basic concepts of citizenship education, and a reevaluation of the social studies curriculum.

Langton and Jennings' (1968) classic study, conducted in 1965, measured the effect of social studies courses on student's political knowledge, interest, efficacy, cynicism, civic tolerance, and participative orientation. The subjects were 1669 high school seniors, drawn from a national probability sample. The number of social studies courses taken by each student was scored and correlated with political attitudes and behaviors. While the general direction of the findings indicated that greater exposure to social studies courses was associated with positive attitudes and a more participative orientation, Langton and Jennings noted that the size of the correlations indicated "the relationships are extremely weak, in most instances bordering on the trivial" (p. 858). In an attempt to assess the potential effect of the quality and type of teaching on political attitudes, Langton and
Jennings also collected student perceptions of courses and teachers. No consistent relationships between political attitudes and student ratings were observed, but Langton and Jennings suggested that student perceptions, as well as the nature of the classroom discourse, might warrant further examination.

The results of these empirical investigations were taken seriously by social studies educators, who discussed the results in the light of needed pedagogical reforms (Hawley, 1971; Patrick, 1967, 1969). As debates raged over the best curriculum to teach democratic values, interest in describing the appropriate methods and classroom climate for social studies education heightened.

**Curricular assessments and reforms.** As the literature on the abysmal performance of schools in producing positive civic outcomes emerged, social studies educators began to reassess how curricular content and teaching strategies might encourage the development of students' positive political attitudes and participatory behavior. Both Patrick (1967, 1969) and Hawley (1971) commented on the insights provided by political socialization research, and drew similar conclusions that directed the flow of research on classroom climate. Concurrently, several members of the social studies community were identifying the discussion of controversial issues as an important element of social studies pedagogy.

Patrick's (1967, 1969) commentaries on the implications of political socialization research for the reform of social studies education included many salient ideas that were later tested by researchers interested in classroom climate. Patrick noted the prevalent teacher focus on maintaining authority and obedience in the classroom and the continual concentration on the inculcation of loyalty toward the political system as aspects of civic education that would lead to dysfunctional citizenship. The schools' emphasis on conformity, he asserted, lends an empty ring to the democratic values and ideals they try to teach. He suggested that the absence of research that indicated a strong direct relationship between formal political instruction and the formation of political attitudes indicated that "the schools' impact upon political values emanates mainly from the prevailing climate of opinion and educational atmosphere" (1967, p. 47). He noted that it was possible that the authoritarian atmosphere of our schools may "subvert textbook and teacher prescriptions of democratic political values" (1967, p. 65) and contribute to closed-minded political beliefs. Patrick concluded not only that the structural framework of civics instruction was in need of changes (1969), but that any approach to improving political socialization through formal education would include "creating an academic environment conducive to creativity, free expression, inquiry and open-mindedness" (1967, p. 54).
The subsequent research on classroom climate in social studies followed directly from Patrick's interpretation.

Hawley's (1971) later interpretation of socialization research suggested the "need to direct new attention to the subtle and not so subtle lessons about politics that students learn from the social organization of the schools themselves" (p. 328), which further emphasized the need to assess classroom climate. Hawley suggested that students learn about democratic political values and processes not only through the formal curriculum but also through observing and experiencing how such processes are adhered to in schools' social systems.

Like Patrick (1967), Hawley felt there might be a link between teacher emphasis on compliance to rules and authority and the development of passive and authoritarian attitudes toward politics. Hawley also postulated that fostering the development of attitudes, skills, and behaviors consonant with democratic values depended on the following: the encouragement of student participation in class; the encouragement of free expression and open discussion of controversial issues; opportunities for student expression and the encouragement to question authority; student involvement in the formulation of school and classroom policies; the extent to which school staff dealt with important issues in a democratic fashion; and the extent to which schools were not segregated on the basis of race or ability levels. Many of Hawley's hypotheses were later tested by a number of researchers exploring the effects of classroom climate in social studies education.

Other members of the social studies community were also suggesting curricular reforms closely related to the initial formulations of climate measures in social studies research (Hunt & Metcalf, 1968; Newmann & Oliver, 1970; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). Social studies education in the 1960s was characterized by the New Social Studies movement and curricular reforms funded by the infusion of federal monies (Hertzburg, 1982). Prevalent curricular theories of that era included the social science and inquiry approaches. Not all social studies educators, however, agreed with these approaches, and several of their suggestions for curricular reform contained elements that would later become the focus of research on classroom climate.

Hunt and Metcalf (1968) asserted that social studies should be taught through the reflective study of cultural problems, or the examination of "closed areas" (p. 24) of society. They believed that careful inspection of conflicts between individuals and groups in society would afford students the opportunity to consider reflectively rational solutions to problems that generally engender only emotional responses. Hunt and Metcalf described classrooms that would stimulate reflective thought as those in which the teachers would not merely seek a
narrowly defined right answer to problems, but those in which all types of student responses would be treated with consideration.

Discussions were seen as an essential element of the reflective method of teaching. Hunt and Metcalf devoted an entire chapter of their methods text to "climate making as a part of method." They asserted that teachers must concentrate on providing a classroom in which student ideas are treated with respect, and in which students are afforded numerous opportunities to express their beliefs. They provided examples of non-threatening ways in which teachers might raise additional points of view and encourage student consideration of other perspectives, and emphasized that teachers should make students feel "relaxed, in a good mood, and free from threat" (p. 211). These characteristics of reflective classrooms are quite similar to those defined later by researchers as elements of open classroom climates.

Proposing curriculum for use in the Harvard Social Studies Project, Oliver and Shaver (1966) defined a jurisprudential approach to the teaching of social studies. It was based on free and open discussion of controversial issues as a method for the rational resolution of conflict. The emphasis in the jurisprudential approach was on the intellectual qualities of dialogue, which the authors viewed as a tool for learning the legal, ethical, and factual substance of controversy, and for analyzing its resolution. Their pedagogical model was also based on instructional techniques that encouraged students to participate actively by publicly taking personal positions on issues and justifying them in class discussions. Newmann and Oliver (1970) further delineated this approach, and defined the teacher as "a listener, questioner, and clarifier of what students say, rather than a 'truthgiver' or guide to student discovery of preselected truths" (p. 237).

It was from the background of early empirical studies on the effects of schooling, and the criticism of curricular practices, that the study of classroom climate in the social studies emerged. Initial investigations by Ehman (1969, 1970) focused exclusively on dimensions of discussion, and helped to define the approach social studies researchers would follow as the literature on classroom climate developed.

Empirical Investigations of Classroom Climate Variables

A number of social studies researchers have explored the relationship between classroom climate variables and many different attitudinal or achievement measures. Much of the research reflects the status accorded discussion as a teaching method in social studies. For this reason, research in the social studies literature shares a focus on classroom interaction with traditional research on classroom climate. Many of the investigations, however, focus more closely on describing the types of discourse or teaching behaviors that were postulated to
have particular relevance for social studies instruction. A critical appraisal of the findings from social studies classroom climate research indicates that a variety of definitions of climate exist, and the findings from investigations are mixed.

Table 1 provides an overview of the studies reviewed in this section. Reliability statistics are included for those studies in which they were reported. A summary of findings is also reported.

**Ehman's Early Work.** The initial articulation of the importance of studying classroom climate in social studies is found in the work of Ehman (1969, 1970, 1972). Ehman's early conceptualization of classroom climate remained a central part of the study of the concept by social studies researchers for several years.

In his first report of empirical work on social studies classroom climate, Ehman (1969) cited the previously mentioned work of Patrick (1967), Langton and Jennings (1968), and Almond and Verba (1963), and used findings from those studies as a starting point for his inquiry. Ehman sought to expand the investigation into school effects beyond the rather gross measures of numbers of social studies classes taken, to "exploit some relevant qualitative variables which get at what we shall refer to as 'classroom climate' " (Ehman, 1969, p. 560). In describing these aspects of teaching, Ehman hoped to determine their relative effects on the political attitudes of high school students. In so doing, he aspired to move beyond questions of how the quantity of civics instruction affected students, and address issues of quality.

Ehman (1969) studied a random sample of 334 students from a large urban high school in the Detroit metropolitan area, stratified on the basis of sex, grade level, race, and ability level. He measured student attitudes on four attitudinal scales: political cynicism; political efficacy; sense of citizen duty; and political participation. The defined climate variables were the numbers of social studies courses taken, the number of teachers who had dealt with controversial issues, and five items on a classroom climate scale.

Ehman's (1969) classroom climate scale measured student perception of the following elements of social studies classes: the frequency of treatment of controversial issues; teachers' objectivity in discussing controversial issues; teachers' neutrality in discussion participation; student feelings of freedom to express their ideas in issue discussions; and the frequency with which teachers dealt with issues of racial tension and integration or segregation. Ehman defined an open class as representing students' perception of having had a teacher who dealt with controversial issues quite often, and who maintained a neutral but objective position in a climate of free discussion. A closed classroom was defined as one characterized by infrequent discussions of
### Table 1
Summary of Social Studies Climate Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>CLIMATE VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ehman (1969)</td>
<td>334 high school students in urban Detroit</td>
<td>5-items, combined into a Guttman scale, R=.863. Also number of social studies classes, and number of controversial issues teachers.</td>
<td>4 political attitude Guttman scales: Cynicism (5 items, R=.871); Participation (4 items, R=.897); Citizen Duty (4 items, R=.928); Efficacy (4 items, R=.908)</td>
<td>Partial order correlations beta weights:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#SSCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#CITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehman (1970)</td>
<td>103 high school students in Detroit 14 Teachers teaching 28 classes</td>
<td>Proportion of time spent in normative mode in class discussions of controversial issues; recorded by modified Flanders' interaction analysis</td>
<td>Cynicism and efficacy scales, items and reliability not reported.</td>
<td>Data array reported, no statistical tests were conducted. Mean change scores for each teachers' students were computed and &quot;compared&quot; to mean proportion of time spent in normative mode. Normative discussion mode &quot;appeared to be related&quot; to positive changes in cynicism; only slight difference in changes in efficacy scores.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>CLIMATE VARIABLES</td>
<td>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levenson, (1972)</td>
<td>Random national sample of 1,669 12th grade students and 317 social studies teachers</td>
<td>Interview data: numbers of social studies courses taken; teacher indications of frequency of public affairs discussion</td>
<td>Index of Students' perceived responsibility to participate in politics; determined by coded answers to open-ended questions</td>
<td>Multiple classification analysis used to determine the strength of nine variables in predicting students responsibility to participate scores. Individual beta coefficients not reported; climate variables ranked 6th and 7th in strength of prediction and beta coefficients were reported to range from .01 to .11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grossman (1975)</td>
<td>1,312 students in nine San Francisco high schools; grades 10-12</td>
<td>10-item School Environment Scale (KR20=.76) Student perceptions of class environment, including: Amount of time spent in controversial issues discussion; Student-teacher conflict in class; Students' willingness to freely express themselves in class; Also measured: Number of controversial issues courses taken; Number of social studies courses taken.</td>
<td>Toleration for Dissent: - legitimacy of conflict in a democratic system; - freedom of speech and expression; - nonviolent protest activities; - dissent activities which didn't reject use of violence.</td>
<td>Pearson correlations of climate variables and toleration for dissent; SPSS multiple stage-wise regression: R beta #Contro. courses 53 11 Express opinions 54 .07 School environ. 54 .06 No significant findings for amount of contro. issue discussion, conflict with teachers, or number of social studies classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY</td>
<td>SAMPLE</td>
<td>CLIMATE VARIABLES</td>
<td>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</td>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torney, Oppenheim, &amp; Farnen (1975)</td>
<td>Nationally stratified random sample of 6252 students and 602 teachers in U. S.</td>
<td>Teacher discussion of sensitive issues (11 items combined for one score); Student freedom of expression scale (4 items, KR20=.776); Ritualistic Practice Scale (4 items, KR20=.595); Items combined with 24 others to form &quot;Learning Conditions&quot; Block.</td>
<td>Civic Achievement Test Anti-Authoritarianism (scale of 10 items, KR20=.638) Discussion Participation (scale of 3 items, KR20=.794)</td>
<td>Predictive value of blocked learning conditions variables assessed in stepwise regression, explained: 2.8% of the Achievement Test Variance 3.5% of the Anti-Authoritarianism attitude variance 3.0% of the variance in Discussion Participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Long & Long (1975)          | 588 junior and senior high school students in southern Illinois | 2-Item Index of Controversial issues discussion: Frequency of discussion Willingness of teachers to allow controversial issues discussion | Political Attitude Scales: -Efficacy (4 items, CR=.91); -Cynicism (5 items, CR=.87); -Civic Tolerance (3 items, CR=.87); -Political Process (5 items, CR=.92); -Political Function (3 items, CR=.91); Political Participation: -political interest; -discussion of politics; -media exposure; -extracurricular partic. | Correlations of Discussion Index scores and attitudes and behaviors; reported separately for junior and senior high levels:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficacy</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynicism</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Exposure</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)
Summary of Social Studies Climate Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>CLIMATE VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ponder & Button (1975); Button (1972) | one experimental and one control class in each of 2 Austin high schools. 235 students in sample. | Mean student-initiation ratios. Student-initiated questions and comments were recorded during 2 observations each week using the Student-Initiated Interaction Schedule. | 5-item cynicism scale (test-retest reliability=.779) | Correlations between Mean Student Initiation ratios and attitudes were computed for each class; significant correlations for the entire classes were found in only one experimental class:  
Cynicism EFF5 EFF8  
-.369 583 .471 |
| Ehman (1977, 1980) | 339 high school students in nine midwestern schools | Frequency of controversial issues exposure Range of viewpoints covered in class Freedom of opinion expression | Political confidence Political interest (alphas for scales between .60 to .88, not individually reported) | Multivariate analysis of variance to determine the predictive strength of each classroom climate variable:  
Frequency of Controversial Issues:  
Interest very often .117 .003 .091  
occas/never -.172 -.214 -.176  
Confidence very often .004 -.062 -.189  
occas/never .009 .010 .031  
Range of Viewpoints:  
Interest almost always .145 .058 .134  
some/never -.120 -.200 -.158  
Confidence almost always .00 .082 -.182  
some/never .024 .004 -.032  
Freedom to Express Opinion:  
Interest free .149 .181 .256  
hesitant -.073 -.240 -.190 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>CLIMATE VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zevin (1983)</td>
<td>Ten eleventh grade classrooms in ten high schools in New York</td>
<td>Levels of student participation measured by application of Flanders' Interaction analysis; Student/Teacher Talk Ratio; Student Initiated/Teacher initiated Talk Ratio;</td>
<td>Political Trust; Political Efficacy; (scales unreported; adaptations of those used by Ehman 1977).</td>
<td>Pearson correlations between Interaction Ratios and Attitudes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson correlations between Interaction Ratios and Attitudes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S/T Talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S/T Init.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torney-Purta &amp; Lansdale (1988)</td>
<td>Two samples of students in the San Francisco Bay Area: -Sample A: 200 students; -Sample B: 757 students.</td>
<td>Individual measures of classroom climate: - freedom to express ideas in classes; - teacher interest in international issues; - international issues discussion.</td>
<td>International economic knowledge score; International Security knowledge score; Concern for international issues score.</td>
<td>Multiple regression analysis to determine strength of climate variables in prediction; significant predictors were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative observational data of students in sample A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Security knowledge: Sample A: Freedom of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample B: Teacher interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom of expression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freq. of discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1 (continued)
#### Summary of Social Studies Climate Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDY</th>
<th>SAMPLE</th>
<th>CLIMATE VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>FINDINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blankenship, (1990)</td>
<td>202 students in three south-eastern school districts</td>
<td>12 item classroom climate scale, extended version of the Hahn, et al. (1988) scale</td>
<td>Political confidence (12 items, alpha=.83)</td>
<td>Correlations between classroom climate scales and attitudes and knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach's alpha=.820; Qualitative data from teacher logs and field observations</td>
<td>Political interest (10 items, alpha=.85)</td>
<td>R Confidence .309 Interest .239 Trust .138 Efficacy .338 Global attitudes .321 Global knowledge .147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political trust (8 items, alpha=.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political efficacy (10 items, alpha=.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global attitudes (10 items, alpha=.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global knowledge test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn &amp; Tocci (1990)</td>
<td>1459 students from the U.S., U.K., Denmark, Netherlands, Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>5-Item Classroom Climate Scale (alpha=.58); frequency of issue discussion; teachers' encouragement of student expression; teachers' encouragement for students to make up minds on issues; pupil freedom to disagree openly with teachers; teachers getting students to speak openly and freely in class.</td>
<td>Six multi-item political attitude scales: Political interest (alpha=.85) Political trust (alpha=.78) Political confidence (alpha=.69) Political efficacy (alpha=.64) Womens' pol. rights (alpha=.83)</td>
<td>Pearson correlations between climate and attitude scales: Interest .21 Trust .21 Confidence .16 Efficacy .20 W. rights .14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controversial issues, and teachers who expressed their own opinions while students felt hesitant to join any discussion that did take place.

Ehman used analysis of variance and multiple regression to assess the relationships between climate variables and attitudinal measures. He hypothesized that the effects of the number of social studies courses taken and the number of teachers who discussed controversial issues would be accentuated if students perceived that the classroom climate was intellectually open. He therefore defined a model that used classroom climate as an intervening variable and hypothesized that discussions in open climates would result in positive attitude changes, and that those in closed climates would result in negative attitude changes.

Ehman found, for the overall sample, that an open classroom climate increased exposure to controversial issues, and that higher numbers of social studies courses correlated with lower cynicism, a higher sense of citizen duty, increased participation, and increased efficacy. Further analysis indicated that classroom climate had differential effects for white and black subsamples in his surveyed population. He found that the number of social studies courses, combined with an open climate, increased cynicism in the black subsample, while it decreased cynicism in the white subsample. He also found that an open climate increased participation for the black subsample, but had no effect for the white subsample.

Ehman then examined the combined effects of classroom climate and the discussion of controversial issues. He found that for the black subsample, an open climate for controversial issues was negatively related to cynicism, and positively related to sense of citizen duty, efficacy, and participation (gammas=-.28, .13, .29, .43, respectively). For the white subsample, discussion of controversial issues in an open climate showed little relationship with cynicism, efficacy and participation and a moderate relationship with sense of citizen duty (gammas=-.02, -.01, -.02, .24 respectively).

Although these findings do not provide strong support for the hypothesis that an open classroom climate combined with controversial issue discussions will correspond with positive attitudes and behaviors, the data presented for students from closed classrooms point out the potential negative effects of closed climates. Ehman reported negative relationships between controversial issues discussion in a closed climate and measures of political efficacy, participation, and sense of citizen duty. The gamma correlations of these relationships (ranging from .20 to .60) indicated the potential negative effects of a closed classroom climate.

Ehman concluded that the variable that assessed the number of social studies courses taken was probably too indelicate to warrant further investigation. He also noted the importance of establishing an
open climate for the discussion of controversial issues, in order to avoid
the negative outcomes of such discussion in a closed climate evidenced
by his data. In this first investigation of classroom climate, Ehman's
operationalization of the concept centered on discussions and how they
were conducted. This definition became a cornerstone upon which many
of the investigations of classroom climate in the social studies during
the 1970s were built. The frequency of discussions, the extent to which
controversial issues were addressed, and student perceptions of freedom
to express their ideas were investigated in several studies that are
reviewed in the following sections.

The Development of the Climate Literature

Subsequent research on the effects of classroom climate
followed the lead of Ehman's early investigations. Elements of
classroom climate—particularly the frequency of discussions, the
inclusion of controversial issue discussions, and students' perception of
freedom to express ideas—were evaluated in a number of studies on the
effects of schooling. Various combinations of these elements, with the
addition of a few others, served as the basis of investigations by many
different researchers (Ehman, 1977, 1980b; Grossman, 1974; Hahn &
Tocci, 1990; Levenson, 1972). In addition to the dimensions of discussion
defined by Ehman (1969), other researchers evaluated elements of
classroom interaction patterns, including the degree of student-
initiated verbal interactions in discussions, the amount of student
participation in defining the classroom structure, and student
perception of specific teacher behaviors (e.g., their willingness to hold
discussions and how fairly they treated students).

Further research on discussions. Ehman (1970), believing that
the type of discussion in which students were involved might make a
difference, assessed the amount of normative discourse—discussions
which involved considerations of what is good and bad or right and
wrong—used by teachers during controversial issues lessons in 28 classes
in one school in Detroit. Borrowing a method used in the traditional
studies of classroom climate, he used a modified version of Flander's
Interaction Analysis system to determine the proportion of time each
teacher spent in normative discourse. In the same study, Ehman
collected questionnaire data on the changes of 103 students' political
efficacy and political cynicism in that school over a two-year period.
Ehman reported that the "proportion of time in the normative mode
does appear to be related to change in cynicism of students" (p. 82),
with increased discussion positively related to changes in cynicism.
The data array presented in the report shows that there was only a
slight difference in the proportion of time spent in the normative mode
when the students' change scores on efficacy are considered, and Ehman indicated that it was "too slight to be considered meaningful" (p. 82).

Ehman noted that the weakness of the effects might be due to the low proportion of total class time observed teachers spent in the normative mode (an average of .02). He asserted that such a low proportion would be a weak agent for change in attitudes. Although it is not possible to draw strong conclusions from these data, Ehman suggested that the kind of discourse occurring in social studies classes may be more important than the amount of discourse, and he suggested that more focused research would be needed to substantiate his findings.

In a second analysis of the same data, Ehman (1972) determined the relationships between the number of social studies courses taken, the exposure to controversial issues, and changes in political efficacy. He found a Pearson correlation between the number of semesters of social studies taken and political efficacy of .15 (p<.01), while that between exposure to controversial issues and efficacy was .13 (p<.10). This lends weak support to the hypothesis that the frequency of exposure to controversial issues, an element of classroom climate, has a positive effect on students' feelings of political efficacy.

Levenson (1972) also sought to determine the relationship between the frequency of issue discussions, the exposure to civics instruction, and student attitudes. Interview data from a national sample of 1,669 twelfth grade students and 317 social studies teachers were used. Students' exposure to civic instruction and teacher indications of the frequency with which they discussed public affairs were the two climate variables that were included in this study. The outcome variable, student awareness of the obligation to participate in political life, was measured by an open-ended question on students' idea of what it takes to be a good citizen. The answers were coded and scored, resulting in an index of participatory responsibility.

Levenson reported the predicted mean participation responsibility score expected for each response on each variable, but did not report the associated beta weights. He reported that the beta weights ranged from .01 to .11, and the two classroom variables ranked sixth and seventh in their strength of prediction, so their beta weights were probably quite low. It is interesting to note, however, that students in classes in which public issues were discussed very often had higher predicted responsibility scores (mean=4.36) than did their counterparts in classes which rarely or never discussed issues (mean=4.23).

Levenson's findings do not strongly support claims of the benefits of classroom discussion. He noted that the two climate variables, combined with seven other school predictors, explained only 2.6% of the variance in mean scores on the participatory responsibility
index. Levenson's findings indicate that the students' course track (whether they were college bound or in vocational programs) and their perceptions of how much public affairs courses increased their political interest were the strongest predictors.

Grossman (1974) modified and extended Ehman's definition of climate to determine the relationship between civics classes and student toleration for dissent in a study of 1,312 high school students from nine San Francisco schools. Grossman defined toleration of dissent as the acceptance or rejection of controversial political behaviors, and measured student attitudes toward the legitimacy of conflict in a democratic political system, freedom of speech and expression, nonviolent protest activities, and dissent activities which did not reject the use of violence, as indicators of this attitude.

The climate variables in Grossman's (1974) study included measures of the general school environment, and separate measures of the classroom climate. The school environment scale contained 10 items, including some that were earlier defined by Ehman (1969) as elements of classroom climate. For that reason, analysis of the scale is considered appropriate for this review.

The measures Grossman (1974) defined as particular to the classroom were the amount of time devoted to controversial issues; the amount of student-teacher conflict; and the students' willingness to express themselves freely in the classroom. Grossman also included the number of controversial issues courses taken and the number and type of social studies courses taken.

Correlations for the toleration of dissent and the school environment scale and each of the individual classroom measures were reported, as were the beta weights each variable ascertained as a predictor of tolerance in a multiple stage-wise regression. Grossman (1975) found no statistically significant relationships between percentage of time devoted to controversial issues, conflict with teachers, or the number of social studies courses taken and toleration for dissent. In contrast, the correlations between the toleration of dissent and the number of controversial issues courses taken and willingness of students to express their ideas in class were statistically significant (R=.53 and .54, respectively), and achieved beta weights of .11 and .07 in the multiple regression equation. Findings from the analysis of school environment also indicated strong relationships with the measured attitude (R=.55).

The findings from Grossman's (1974) analysis of individual classroom variables add strength to the argument that an open classroom climate is related to positive civic attitude outcomes. It is difficult, however, to evaluate the findings from his school environment scale vis-a-vis the climate literature. Several "traditional" classroom climate measures were used in the scale, but
their relative individual effects were not assessed, and the other items on the scale are not necessarily directly related to classroom climate. Similar problems in determining the relationship between climate variables and student attitudes arise in reviewing the findings from the following study.

In conjunction with work on the International Educational Assessment (IEA), an extensive study of civic education in ten countries was reported by Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen (1975). The study measured the effects of civic education on the development of civic achievement and attitudes, and it is often cited in the literature on classroom climate as supportive evidence for the effects of classroom climate. A close reading of the study, however, raises several concerns about this practice. Although Torney et al. identified classroom climate variables as important predictors of civic achievement for the ten countries in which they collected data, they noted that climate variables were not strong predictors in the U. S. sample:

While the Civic Education regression findings are in general rather similar across countries, this exception in the United States demonstrates the risk of generalizing from research conducted in only one country--even when the countries concerned seem similar.

In spite of these noted differences, the study is continually cited as providing evidence of the strength of classroom climate variables. Additionally, the statistical methods used to assess the power of classroom effects necessarily preclude the interpretation of effects of climate variables as they are generally accepted in the literature. To critically assess the contributions of classroom climate variables reported in the study, only the data from the United States will be considered in this review.

The study included a nationally stratified random sample of 247 schools, with 6,252 students and their 602 teachers in the United States. Torney et al. (1975) analyzed survey data from both teachers and students that are pertinent to the discussion of climate effects: teachers' assessments of the appropriateness of discussing sensitive issues; and students' perceptions of the encouragement of independence of opinion and the practice of patriotic rituals in their classrooms. The teachers' readiness to discuss sensitive issues was measured by their responses to 11 questions in which they assessed the appropriateness of political discussion on a range of issues. The 11 responses were combined to produce one variable used in later analysis. Students responded to four items asking how much freedom of expression was encouraged in their classrooms, and those responses were combined to create an
independence of opinion variable. These variables were chosen from a
group of 160 variables and were selected for inclusion in further
analysis based on their partial correlation coefficients in predicting
civic achievement and attitude outcomes.

These climate variables were then combined with 24 others to
form a block that was labelled learning conditions. Other variables
included in the block measured a wide range of school and teacher
characteristics, varying from the proportion of minority group students
in the school to the hours per week teachers spent in preparation for
their classes. Three other major blocks of variables were also defined:
home background; type of school and program; and kindred variables
(variables expected to have some effect on civic outcomes, such as
expected education, hours of pleasure reading, and political
participation). These blocks of variables were then entered into a
stepwise multiple regression analysis, and the predictive value of each
block was reported.

The procedure of blocking climate variables with such a large
number of other variables that are unrelated to classroom climate
necessitates cautious interpretation of the findings reported in Torney et
al. (1975). Because the individual climate variables of interest were
not analyzed separately, it is difficult to ascertain their contribution to
the block and therefore their individual predictive value. Further, the
reports of the predictive value of the overall learning conditions block
indicate that it was of little value in predicting either civic
achievement or civic attitudes as defined in this study. Torney et al.,
found that in the United States, the contribution of the learning
conditions block was particularly small, accounting for only 2.8% of the
variance in scores on the civic achievement test, 3.5% of the variance on
a measure of anti-authoritarianism, and 3% of the variance in political
discussion participation. These findings from the United States data do
not provide strong support for the effects of classroom climate.

Many researchers have cited the Torney et al. (1975) study as
one in which classroom climate was demonstrated to have strong
effects. Indeed, this was a conclusion of the authors in their overall
assessment of the data from ten countries. Although the authors
identify classroom climate variables as

the only school-based variables that seemed to
contribute in what might be called a positive direction
to the students' achievement of all three desired
outcomes (as evidenced in the regression analysis)
(p.329), the data they present from the United States
do not support that general finding.
Neither this study by Torney et al. (1975), nor the one by Grossman (1975) lends full support to the claims that classroom climate is related to students' political attitudes. Unfortunately, the assessment of several individual climate variables included in these studies was muddied by their combination with other, non-related variables.

Further investigations by Ehman (1977, 1980b) added the dimension of student perceptions of the range of viewpoints covered during controversial issues discussions to his study of classroom climate. He collected survey data from 339 students in nine midwestern high schools. Data were collected at three time points across two years, and consisted of measures of nine separate attitudes as well as classroom climate variables. Three classroom climate measures were used in this investigation: the frequency of controversial issues exposure; the range of viewpoints presented by teachers; and the freedom students felt to express their opinions. The attitudes measured that are of interest for this review were political confidence and political interest; each was measured by scaled sets of items.

Ehman's (1980b) report of the longitudinal attitude trends indicated that political confidence decreased substantially over the two-year period, and interest dropped slightly from the first to second years, then rose again in the third. Multivariate analysis of variance was used to measure the effects of the three social studies classroom climate variables on these changes in student attitudes. Ehman found that for all three years, exposure to controversial issues was associated with increased political interest and increased political confidence. Similar relationships were found between the range of viewpoints expressed during controversial issues discussion and these attitudes: further, students reporting a wider range of views in discussions were more interested in politics, and felt more politically confident. The third climate variable, freedom to express opinions, was also related to increased political interest and political confidence. Each of the three climate variables was, therefore, found to relate directly and positively to measures of both political confidence and political interest.

Hahn and Tocci (1990) further extended this line of research in a study of the effects of controversial issues discussion on students' political attitudes in five nations. A non-random sample of 1,459 students from the United States, the United Kingdom, Denmark, the Netherlands, and the Federal Republic of Germany participated in the study, which sought to determine the relationships between classroom climate and basic democratic attitudes. The sample included schools located in small cities or suburbs of each country and was obtained with
the cooperation of educators who had attended international meetings on civic or global education.

Hahn and Tocci (1990) developed a new classroom climate scale composed of variables that had been identified as important in many of the earlier studies. The scale included five items designed to measure student feelings of freedom to express opinions contrary to those of the teacher and other students, and student perceptions of teachers' respect for and encouragement of expressing such ideas, as well as the frequency of discussions. Correlations were found between student perceptions of open climate and political interest, political confidence, political trust, political efficacy and support for women's rights (r's=.21, .16, .21, .20, and .14, respectively). Although these correlations cannot be considered statistically significant due to the non-randomness of the sample, they do indicate that for the students surveyed classroom climate was related to political attitudes.

In addition to reporting these correlational data, Hahn and Tocci (1990) also reported data obtained from an experimental treatment that was employed in half of the participating classes in each of the five nations. Experimental group teachers were asked to lead a value analysis discussion of a controversial public policy issue at least once every two weeks over a school term. Students in experimental and matched control group classes completed the questionnaire described above at the beginning and end of the school term, and analysis of covariance, using pretest scores as the covariate, was used to determine the effect of the value analysis discussions on each of the measured political attitudes. For the United States sample, only one difference between the treatment and experimental groups was noted: the adjusted mean for the experimental group's score on the Equal Rights for Women scale was higher than that of the control group.

The correlational findings reported in this study generally (but weakly) support the theory that political attitudes are related to student perceptions of classroom climate, but they also support Ehman's (1970) previous hypothesis that infrequent discussions of controversial issues are not likely to make much of an impact on student attitudes. Hahn and Tocci (1990) concluded that it might be more fruitful to compare classes that represent varying levels of open or closed climates to further discern the relative effects of each.

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

Research on perceived teacher behaviors. Another strand of research on classroom climate focused more closely on the specific behaviors of teachers and how they contribute to the development of student attitudes. Research on student perceptions of their teachers' willingness to discuss ideas, and their perceptions of the equality of treatment by teachers were both added as dimensions in the study of classroom climate.

Long and Long (1975) included student perceptions of teachers' willingness to discuss controversial issues in a study of the effects of discussion on attitude and behavioral outcomes. They constructed a Controversial Discussion Index from two variables: student reports of the frequency of controversial issues discussion, and the degree to which they felt their teachers were willing to allow discussion of controversial opinions. The study included 588 junior and senior high school students in southern Illinois. Students completed a questionnaire that included the Discussion Index and sets of items used to measure their political efficacy, trust, sophistication, and civic tolerance. The researchers also included a set of behavioral variables to which students indicated their political interest, their discussion of political issues, their media exposure, and extracurricular activities.

Correlations between scores on the Discussion Index and each of the political attitudes and behaviors indicated that classroom issue discussions produced mixed results. The correlations were reported for the junior and senior high school levels separately. For the junior high students, increased discussion was weakly but positively correlated with political cynicism (gamma=.08); and negatively correlated with civic tolerance (gamma=-.15), political efficacy (gamma=-.24), and the two measures of political sophistication (gammas=-.12; -.16). The results for senior high school students were similar. Discussion was negatively correlated with efficacy (gamma=-.27) and one measure of sophistication (gamma=-.06), and positively correlated with cynicism (gamma=.13) and the second measure of sophistication (gamma=.17), and was unrelated to civic tolerance (gamma=-.02).

The correlations between the discussion of controversial issues and student political behavior offered more positive findings. Discussion was positively related to political interest for the younger students (gamma=.32), political discussion for both groups (gammas=
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.28 and .40), attention to the media (gammas=.60 and .31) and extracurricular activities (gammas=.24 and .10).

The findings from this study indicated that the discussion of controversial issues was generally related to negative civic attitude outcomes. This study was the first, however, to correlate climate variables with behavioral outcomes. The positive findings reported on the relationships between discussions and behavior indicate that behavioral variables warrant further investigation in research on classroom climate. The results of this investigation do not clearly demonstrate the importance of student perceptions of their teachers' behaviors in predicting political attitudes. They do, however, raise a potentially interesting area for further exploration. It is possible that modeled teacher behaviors, as perceived by students, affect the way students feel about politics.

Research on student participation in the classroom. The extent to which students are involved in classroom participation also has been evaluated for its potential effect on political attitudes. Several studies employed various types of interaction analysis to assess the degree of student involvement in classroom discussions, and others investigated how the involvement of students in rule-making or curricular decisions, might affect their political attitudes.

Button (1972), and Ponder and Button (1975), theorized that if students were encouraged to initiate questions and statements in class, and if they, in fact, did so, then their sense of personal political efficacy would increase (Ponder & Button, 1975, p. 224). They also hypothesized that cynicism would decrease. The investigators designed a four month experimental curriculum that was taught in two high schools in Austin, Texas. Two comparison classes, which followed the regularly mandated school curriculum, were compared with the experimental classes.

Teachers of the experimental classes promoted student involvement in the classroom, and the involvement of students was measured through the use of an interaction scale. Two class sessions per week were analyzed for each control and experimental class. Comparisons between the control and experimental classes indicated that students in the latter were more involved in classroom interactions. Student political attitudes were measured by three scales: a five-item political cynicism scale, and two efficacy scales, one containing five items, and the other containing eight. Pearson correlations were computed for mean student initiation ratios in each class and scores on the efficacy and cynicism scales. Statistically significant correlations were found in one experimental class only. In that class, the mean student-initiation ratio was moderately and negatively correlated with cynicism (r=-.37) and positively correlated
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with the five- and eight-item measures of efficacy (r's=.58 and .47 respectively).

The results of this exploratory investigation are suggestive. The finding that student involvement was significantly related statistically to political outcome measures in only one experimental class may indicate that student participation alone is not a salient variable. There may have been other teacher characteristics that served to complement the student involvement variable and magnify its effects. Further investigations that include both a variable that measures student involvement and some additional teacher characteristics would help to clarify this picture.

A study by Zevin (1983) also addressed the issue of the amount of student participation in classroom discussions. Zevin studied one eleventh-grade classroom in each of ten high schools in New York. Two social studies classrooms in each school were selected "on the basis of strongly contrasting styles of classroom interaction, that is, direct versus indirect, lecture versus discussion, and low versus high student participation" (p. 124). The ten classes used in the study were chosen from a number of classrooms that were observed and analyzed using the Flanders Interaction Analysis system. Five of these classes were selected for the study because they were open or student-oriented, and five were selected as closed or teacher-oriented.

Each of the ten selected classes was observed three times during the year by trained observers, and ratios of student-to-teacher talk, and the more specific student-initiated to teacher-initiated talk, were recorded for each. A questionnaire designed to measure students' political trust and political efficacy was administered in all of the classes, and student attitude scores were correlated with the discussion ratios. Zevin found that political trust was negatively correlated with both student-initiated discussion and student-to-teacher talk ratios. Students' sense of political efficacy, however, was correlated positively with each. Zevin concluded that greater discussion of politics may result in frank expressions of negative feelings, causing a decrease in trust. He also thought that the increased degree of efficacy might signal greater agreement toward statements which were made in class that people can affect, change, or participate successfully in politics. Zevin argued that it was possible that

the amount of student commentary is, in itself, an insufficient guarantee of an open climate for discussion, while the degree of student-initiated discussion logically demonstrates greater and perhaps more genuine opportunity to share feelings about politics. (p. 125).
This pair of studies, which investigated the relationship between student involvement in classrooms and their political attitudes, present some interesting findings. The findings indicate a positive relationship between students' participation and their feelings of political efficacy (Button & Ponder, 1975; Zevin, 1983), but are inconclusive with regard to the relationship between participation and cynicism. These results suggest that further research on student participation as an element of classroom climate, and how it relates to student political attitudes, is warranted. Interaction analyses similar to those employed in these studies could be used to further explore how (or if) verbal classroom interaction patterns and political attitudes are related.

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

Torney-Purta and Lansdale (1986) sought to identify variables in the school that would predict higher levels of global awareness and global concern. They presented data gathered in 1984 from two research efforts containing non-random samples of schools: the American Schools and the World Project (sample A), and the Stanford and the Schools Study (sample B). Sample A consisted of 200 students and sample B consisted of 757 students, all from San Francisco Bay Area high schools. Students answered questionnaires designed to measure their knowledge of international economics and international peace and conflict, and their global interest, feelings of kinship, and concern. The questionnaires measured climate by asking students to indicate how often international issues were discussed in their classes, how interested they thought their social studies teachers were in international issues, how much they thought their school supported the discussion of international issues, and how free they felt to express opinions in class different from the teachers'. Field observations of sample A classes provided additional information about the climate in those classrooms.

Regression analysis was performed on the data to ascertain which of the above climate variables were significant predictors of global knowledge and global attitudes. The researchers found that two characteristics of the school were important predictors of global economic knowledge: whether or not the student felt free to express an opinion that was different from that of the teacher and whether or not the teacher was perceived as being interested in international issues. These two variables were significant predictors, however, only for
students in sample B. Torney-Purta and Lansdale (1986) reported that climate variables that were statistically significant predictors of international security knowledge were "freedom to express opinions in class" for sample A and "teacher interest in international issues" for sample B. Climate variables were also significant predictors of the global concern measure. For both samples, freedom to express opinions in class was significant and for sample B discussions of international issues in class was also statistically significant.

The researchers report that the observational data collected in this study showed that there were considerable differences between the classrooms in sample A. They indicated that teachers had different degrees of ability in fostering the encouragement of differences of opinion and in involving students in discussions. They also noted that the classrooms differed on the type of questioning that predominated, with some teachers asking convergent questions with single right answers, and others asking divergent questions that stimulated the expression of different opinions. The researchers noted that divergent questioning increased the interaction between students, and that teachers who used it recognized differences of opinion in positive ways, and encouraged the examination of alternative perspectives on issues. They also found that more students participated in discussions when teachers asked divergent questions.

Another important element of setting the classroom climate noted by Torney-Purta and Lansdale was the variety of resources that teachers used. They reported that all observed teachers used textbooks, but that they used other sources to a varying degree. Teachers who introduced additional sources or assigned topics for students to research and report on in class faced challenges in motivating their students, but once motivated, the students often expressed new confidence and interest in the subject matter.

Torney-Purta and Lansdale concluded that the frequency with which international issues were discussed was not the primary agent affecting students' global attitudes and knowledge. They asserted that the manner in which the discussion is framed is more salient, and that students' feelings of freedom to express ideas contrary to those of the teacher is of particular importance.

Blankenship (1990) collected both quantitative and observational data to investigate the relationship between classroom climate and global knowledge and attitudes. Two hundred and two students in international studies classes in three southeastern school districts completed questionnaires, and teacher logs of classroom activities and classroom observations were conducted to determine the amounts of discussion used in each class.

Blankenship explored the relationship between classroom climate variables and scores on a global knowledge test. The
relationships between climate variables and political attitudes, including students' feelings toward international issues, and their political trust, efficacy, interest, and confidence were also evaluated. The classroom climate measure used was an adaptation of the scale used by Hahn and Tocci (1990), and contained 12 items. Findings from the quantitative analysis indicated there were statistically significant correlations between classroom climate and global knowledge (r = .15), global attitudes (r = .32), and measures of political trust (r = .14), confidence (r = .31), interest (r = .24), and efficacy (r = .34).

The qualitative data were used to address an exploratory research question concerning the distinguishing characteristics of classes that were perceived by students to be more open or less open. Participating teachers were asked to keep daily logs of the type and duration of instructional activity for a period of two to four weeks during the study. Each teacher was also observed during 14 class sessions by the researcher. Blankenship found during these observations that activities labeled as "lecture" were treated the same way as activities labeled as "discussion," so these two categories were combined. Blankenship noted that time spent in lecture/discussion might be a very important factor: teachers' documentation suggested that the majority of their classroom time was spent engaged in lecture/discussion activities; the average amount of time spent in this instructional mode was 47.9 per cent, with the highest report 61.5 per cent and the lowest report 30.9 per cent. The teacher who reported spending the least amount of time in lecture discussion was perceived by students as having the most closed climate, and the teacher who reported the most time spent in lecture discussion had the highest climate average. On scored questionnaires, observational data suggested that teachers in both open and closed classrooms (as perceived by students) used a variety of materials, and no clearly different patterns of student responsiveness or student involvement were discerned in the different types of classes.

The findings of these two studies suggest several avenues for further research. The positive relationships found between indicators of open classroom climate and global attitudes suggest that students' attitudes toward specific elements of politics, as well as their general political attitudes, may be affected by the classroom atmosphere. The relationships found between climate and increased global knowledge also indicate that additional studies of how climate is related to achievement outcomes may be warranted. Finally, the findings from the qualitative data gathered by these researchers underscores the complexity of classroom climate formation, and the need for further research using qualitative methods.
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Summary

The variety of research methods used in the study of classroom climate, combined with the wide variety of outcome measures with which climate has been associated, makes it difficult to summarize the literature as a whole. An assessment of how various elements of classroom climate affect political attitudes, as reported in these studies, presents a decidedly mixed picture.

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

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

Research in which the relationships between elements of classroom climate and political knowledge or behavior have been investigated has been less extensive. Positive relationships, however, with r's ranging from .14 to .60 have been found both between climate and global knowledge (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1988), and climate and political participation (Ehman, 1969; Long & Long, 1975). This suggests that climate may affect more than just attitudes.

Overall, the findings from this body of research provide several glimmers of hope for both social studies researchers and practitioners. The consistent relationships between classroom climate and political interest, efficacy, and confidence, with r's ranging from .11 to .58, suggest that what happens in social studies classrooms is indeed related to what students think about politics. There are also indications in this literature that teachers, and their handling of their
classrooms, may have an effect on student knowledge and behaviors. The complexities of these relationships, however, have not been fully explored: further research on how the conduct of social studies teaching affects student attitudes and behaviors therefore remains fertile ground.

Conclusions

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

1. A broadening of the definition of "climate." Most of the studies of classroom climate in social studies have focused on discussions—specifically student perceptions of their content and frequency. Given the longstanding and widely acknowledged role of discussion in social studies pedagogy (e.g., Barber, 1989; Hunt & Metcalf, 1968; McFarland, 1989; Newmann, 1989; Oliver & Shaver, 1966), this focus has been appropriate. A wide array of literature on classroom climate indicates, however, that there are many other variables that play a role in the development of climate. An examination of that literature suggests that reconceptualizing climate constructs to include additional student and teacher variables would better enable researchers to explore the relationship between climate and political socialization. Based on a review of this literature, the following four dimensions are proposed: (a) classroom activities; (b) teacher characteristics; (c) student involvement or engagement; and (d) classroom social atmosphere. Each of these is considered below.

The recent investigations by Blankenship (1990) and Torney-Purta and Lansdale (1988) suggest that an essential element of climate may be the pedagogical approaches taken by teachers. Research on the types of classroom activities and materials used in individual classes may help us to understand more about how classroom climate is formed. The measurement of classroom activities might be accomplished through both observational techniques in which the types and duration of activities or teacher strategies are examined and through student perceptions gathered through questionnaires and interviews. Qualitative descriptions of how teachers and students interact in these various activities would also be very illuminating.

Several studies suggest that student perceptions of their teachers also play a role in the definition of climate (Ehman, 1980b; Long & Long, 1975; Steele, House & Kerins, 1971; Trickett & Moos,
Discrete teacher characteristics such as fairness, tolerance for diverse ideas, interest in students, interest in subject matter, and enthusiasm are among many that might be studied. Student perceptions of these characteristics might be assessed via questionnaires; they could be more fully explored through interviews with students.

Student involvement also seems to be an important part of classroom climate (Button, 1972; Ponder & Button, 1975; Zevin, 1983), and it might be assessed through student responses to their perceived participation in rule-making, curricular or activities decisions, or involvement in discussions. The use of interaction analysis systems (e.g., Flanders, 1970; Medley & Mitzel, 1958, 1963; Withall & Lewis, 1963), as well as classroom observations and student interviews, could further our knowledge of how student involvement in social studies classes affects their political attitudes and behaviors.

Although many of the studies on classroom climate in general contained measures of the social atmosphere of classes (e.g., Steele, House & Kerins, 1971; Trickett & Moos, 1973), this area has remained unexplored by social studies researchers. Social atmosphere, including student perceptions of interactions in the classroom, might include assessments of cooperation or competition among students or the existence of cliques.

The concept of classroom climate is very complex. Social studies researchers need to broaden their definition of the concept to include variables from at least these four categories. Analyzing the interactions among these four dimensions would present a more multifaceted description of classroom climate.

2. Reassessment and reevaluation of outcome measures. To this point, investigations of classroom climate have focused primarily on the effects of climate on political attitudes. Although there is a relatively well-developed literature on the measurement of students' political attitudes (e.g., Campbell, Gurin & Miller, 1952; Hawkins, Marando & Taylor, 1971; Hepburn & Napier, 1980; Langton & Jennings, 1968; Robinson, Rusk & Head, 1968; Stentz & Lambert, 1977), analysis of attitude scales used in some social studies research suggests this literature has not been considered in formulating measures of political attitudes. In addition, few researchers report either scale items or reliability statistics, which increases the difficulty of assessing their findings. Additional outcome measures may also warrant further investigation. There is some indication in the literature (e.g., Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1986) that behavioral changes and increases in knowledge may be related to classroom climate; future researchers should address this possibility.

3. Analysis of climate variables. Two analytical issues are posed by social studies classroom climate research: the manner in which climate variables are considered during analysis; and the type
of statistical applications that are employed. Interpretation of the findings of many studies is hindered by the inappropriateness of the analytical procedures that were used. In a few studies, classroom climate variables were combined with other, non-related variables for analysis, making it impossible to sort out their strength in predicting outcome variables. In other studies, inadequate explanations of the statistical methods used were provided. Additionally, most of the findings are based on correlational analysis, with only a few attempts to assess the interaction of climate variables and other predictor variables. Most of the studies included in this review used non-random samples, which also renders the tests of statistical significance reported by researchers inappropriate.

There are also indications in the literature that the relationships between climate variables and outcome variables may differ given students’ ethnicity (Blankenship, 1990; Ehman, 1969; Ponder & Button, 1975); age (Long & Long); and gender (Blankenship, 1990, Hahn & Tocci, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1988). It seems appropriate, therefore, that future researchers should consider analyzing their data by subgroups.

4. Providing more holistic research approaches. The methodological approaches taken by researchers of classroom climate all provide useful pieces of information in the study of classroom climate. Those pieces, however, provide only a fragmented view of a complex phenomena. With only two exceptions (Blankenship, 1990; Torney-Purta & Lansdale, 1988), individual researchers included in this review have used methods from only one research paradigm in trying to unravel the complex elements or effects of classroom climate. In general, there has been an overreliance on survey research, which provides only a glimpse of what happens in classrooms and how students perceive them. A combination of methods, borrowing from both quantitative and qualitative approaches, might provide valuable insights into the importance of climate in the educational process. In-depth qualitative studies of classrooms are particularly needed; such research could provide additional insights into what the most salient climate variables are, and would help us to understand better how teachers structure the climate of their individual classrooms. In addition, data gathered from intensive student interviews could reveal how climate affects student attitudes and behaviors, as well as other possible outcome variables.

Careful consideration of each of these elements in need of clarification in the social studies research literature would strengthen the claims that can be made about classroom climate. Such information, in turn, might provide important information on which social studies educators may base pedagogical decisions.
Research on the relationships between the climate in social studies classes and various desired civic outcomes suggests that teachers may have a substantial impact on the socialization of their students. A number of social educators are currently decrying a crisis in civic education (e.g., Barber, 1989; Parker, 1989), which is characterized by increasing dropout rates, an escalation of violent crimes committed by youth, and resurgent racism on high school and college campuses. A recurrent theme in the writings of these contemporary social studies philosophers is the lack of community spirit, engendered by increasing individualism. In order to restore a sense of community, they assert, it is necessary to refocus civic education in the public, rather than private sphere (Beyer, 1988; Boyer, 1989; Green, 1985; Parker, 1989). The key to reestablishing a strong democracy, in which students have a heightened sense of civic duty, is identified commonly as the development of public talk (Barber, 1989). Public talk is the collective deliberation over shared problems and prospects (Wood, 1988); consideration of problems in the public space (Green, 1985); and speaking, listening, and reflecting on public issues (Barber, 1989). For social studies educators to create in their classrooms the type of discourse implied by these writers, it is critical that they understand how their own conduct helps to create the necessary climate for such discussion. Further research on classroom climate in social studies instruction can help practitioners to develop this needed understanding.

Endnote

1Ehman (1977) initially reported a negative relationship between classroom climate and political confidence due to a data error. See Hahn & Avery (1985).
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BOOK REVIEWS

In this issue, Roberta Ahlquist and Michael O'Loughlin critique philosopher Richard Paul's latest book, *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs To Survive In A Rapidly Changing World*. In a wide ranging essay, Ahlquist and O'Loughlin challenge Paul's notion of critical thinking as a "denial of the subjectivity of human experience". In addition, they present their own view of critical thinking, based on the idea that people are shaped, in great part, by their interaction with others. That is, people learn, through their own experiences, how to make decisions about their lives.

In his response, Paul refutes Ahlquist and O'Loughlin's concerns, and discusses his conception of critical thinking. He discusses "eight essential features of all reasoning" that are based on the idea that students need intellectual standards to assess their own thinking and the thinking of others.

Critical thinking is an important part of what we, as social studies educators, teach our students on a daily basis. I hope that this discourse will stimulate the thinking of the readers of TRSE, and that the ideas of Ahlquist, O'Loughlin and Paul regarding critical thinking will encourage all of us to think about how we might teach our students to think critically.

Perry M. Marker
Book Review Editor

ESSAY REVIEW

Playing God: Critical Thinking and the Fantasy of Rationality


Review by ROBERTA AHLQUIST, San Jose State University, San Jose, CA., and MICHAEL O’LOUGHLIN, Hofstra University, Hempstead, N.Y.

Given the ambitious title of this book and the claim by Gerald Nosich in the preface that Richard Paul's perspective on critical
thinking is nothing short of revolutionary, readers might be forgiven for approaching it with high expectations. Such readers will be disappointed, we believe, both because of technical shortcomings in the structure of the book, and because the rational notion of critical thinking and critical thinking pedagogy being advanced by Paul are ill suited to education in a pluralistic, democratic society such as the United States. Paul's book, which consists of an introduction, 39 chapters, and two appendices, addresses the general nature of critical thinking, and the pedagogical strategies necessary to teach for critical thinking.

Paul argues unabashedly for "objective" reason as the standard for critical thinking and appears to have no qualms about suggesting that the standards of argumentation set down by philosophers such as himself should serve as the normative standards against which others' efforts at critical thinking ought to be judged. Furthermore, Paul subscribes to what Walkerdine (1988) refers to as the fantasy of the government of reason, namely belief in a world devoid of emotions and commitments in which reasonable people come together to chart a common course and iron out their differences through rational argumentation. In the remainder of this review we will illustrate some of the principal features of Paul's conception of critical thinking and pedagogy, and we will point out why this approach is destined to preserve the status quo in social education rather than to serve as the basis for emancipatory change.

We wish to raise some questions regarding knowledge and learning which Paul ignores or dismisses. What does it mean to come to know? Is knowing a disinterested, rational process of detaching oneself from one's own auto-biographical experiences in order to come to an objective understanding of reality? Is knowledge socially constructed and knowing therefore inherently subjective? Is it possible to specify principles of rational thought that represent universal, normative standards against which the goodness of individual thought can be assessed? Is knowing inherently socioculturally situated such that differences in race, class, and gender, as well as in the sociohistorical and cultural contexts in which people live their lives, influence the ways in which people come to know? Is knowing best characterized as a process of solitary cogitation by a single individual? What if coming to know is embedded in the social practices and interactions in which people engage? Is the purpose of teaching to enable people to come to view reality from an objectively rational perspective? Or is the purpose of teaching to empower students by providing opportunities for people to understand the socially constructed nature of their realities so that they might act to transform them? Are there universal principles of rationality which are timeless and enduring? What if rationality itself is a social construction that mirrors a given sociopolitical
ideology within Western culture? Ultimately, we need to inquire of those who argue for universal, normative standards of rationality: Who decides on the standards for good reasoning? and, Whose interests are best served by these standards?

In seeking a root cause for the lack of critical discourse in society Paul does not inquire into the structural features of either society or the educational system. Instead, his focus is on the intellectual characteristics of ordinary people. Paul argues that most people have a natural tendency to think and act irrationally. He states:

Most people unconsciously internalize the basic world view of their peer group and society with little or no conscious awareness of what it would be to rationally decide upon alternative ways to conceptualize everyday situations, persons, and events. Utterances, by themselves and others, are taken at their face value or twisted by egocentric inclinations and vested interests. Similarly, most people are responsive to and awed by social rituals and the trappings of authority, status, and prestige. They live their lives, as it were, in surface structures. They reduce complex situations to self-serving verbalizations. Thus, not surprisingly, many people do not know how to explicate and clarify an issue, how to enter sympathetically into points of view they have consciously or unconsciously rejected. Deeply insecure, most people are only concerned with injustices inflicted upon themselves personally or upon those they ego-identify with. They easily dehumanize those who thwart, or appear to thwart, their vested interests; they typically resent those whose beliefs conflict with their own. Their reasoning is often infantile at root (pp. 72-73).

Furthermore, the naivete of the populace is not confined to intellectual matters, according to Paul, but is to be found also in the moral domain:

There is little to recommend schooling that does not foster what I call intellectual virtues...These same characteristics are essential to moral judgment. The "good-hearted" person who lacks intellectual virtues will act morally only when morally grasping a situation or problem does not presuppose intellectual insight. Many, if not most, moral problems and situations in the modern world are open to multiple
Offering his own homespun psychological classification, Paul suggests that ordinary people can be classified either as naive idealizers, as rationalizers, or as critical thinkers. While offering no data to back up this classification, Paul suggests that naive idealizers "tend to accept the ideology of their society as descriptive of reality. Their horizons are conceptually and pragmatically limited...They tend to be easily manipulated." (p. 82). Rationalizers are blessed with greater insight, but due to their cynicism they use the system to their advantage rather than try to change it: "Being engaged in manipulations to further their self-interest, rationalizers tend to ignore the discrepancies and inconsistencies in the unspoken social ideology they use to their advantage....rationalizers take advantage of openings for power and gain." (p. 82). Then there is that select group that Paul identifies as critical thinkers:

I would dub this third choice of life-style that of the reasoner, the genuinely fairminded, critical thinker, the person transforming blind conformity into rational conviction. Admittedly a tiny minority, this group is a force for progressive social change and transformation (p. 82).

What then are we to make of Paul's cynical view that the "everyday world of social action is shot through with sophistry and hypocrisy" (p. 85), and that "far too many individuals...alternate between simpleminded morality and morally indifferent rationality"? (p. 135). On an intellectual level we can respond by pointing out that this point of view is simply at variance with what we know about everyday reasoning in intellectual and moral domains. Recent research in the moral domain by Gilligan and colleagues (e.g., Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Lyons & Hanmer, 1990; Gilligan, Ward & Taylor, 1988, and in the psychology of everyday thinking as cultural practice (e.g., Lave, 1988; Rogoff, 1990; Steedman, Urwin & Walkerdine, 1985; Walkerdine, 1988; Wertsch, 1991) has served to unmask what Lave (1988) refers to as the essentially colonialist mentality underlying much of the normative research that claims to demonstrate the shortcomings of human reason while, all the while, studying human performance in decontextualized settings using inappropriate normative models. On an emotional level, we have difficulty accepting a perspective that suggests that our partners, children, neighbors, cousins and perhaps even ourselves are, as likely as not, either hopelessly naive or repulsively manipulative. Paul's perspective can be productively contrasted with Freire's
Critical Thinking

(1970/1989) implicit faith in the potential of human beings for love, humanization, connection, and ultimately transformation. The crucial difference, of course, is that Freire identifies the lack of critical faculties among peoples as a symptom of powerlessness in the face of forces of oppression outside themselves, while Paul locates the blame within the psyche of each individual.

Paul would have us ignore the least esteemed, the least educated amongst us. But where has he been for the last 50 years not even to realize that many of our inventors and scientists are as likely to credit dreams, intuition, multiple paradigms, both scientific and non-scientific, or even chaos, for their discoveries, as technical rational reason? (Gleick, 1987). Corroborating information continues to accumulate which indicates that the narrow patriarchal, Eurocentric, Western view of the rational, mechanical universe "out there" is ill conceived, because there is no way to truly separate the observer from the observed. To quote a famous Zen phrase, "The instant you speak about a thing you miss the mark." Capra points out that many of our brightest, and most creative scientific minds are now studying Zen and other non-Western, non-linear philosophies and religions for models of wholeness and interdependency, rather than relying upon one model based on traditional, patriarchal, abstract Western thought (Capra, 1975).

Having diagnosed human irrationality as a deficiency within individuals, it follows that Paul sees a cure in terms of the infusion of rational critical thinking skills. He argues:

We become rational, on the other hand, to the extent that our beliefs and actions are grounded in good reasons and evidence; to the extent that we recognize and critique our own irrationality; to the extent that we are unmoved by bad reasons and a multiplicity of irrational motives, fears, desires; to the extent we have cultivated a passion for clarity, accuracy, and fairmindedness. These global skills, passions, and dispositions, integrated into a way of acting and thinking characterize the rational, the educated person (p. 14).

One significant problem with Paul's scheme is a denial of the subjectivity of human experience. Drawing on the same rationalist model as Piaget, whom he cites approvingly (e.g., Ch. 8), Paul argues that the everyday experiences -- or biases as he pejoratively labels them -- that people bring to new situations are "obstacles to teaching for rational thinking" (p. 452). Contrary to encouraging individuals to engage in personal construction of meaning, and contrary to celebrating
the sociocultural contexts of students' lives for the diversity of perspectives they introduce to the classroom, Paul labels these respectively as egocentric and sociocentric biases (e.g., p.114ff). Rather than creating opportunities for these multiple voices to be heard in classroom dialogue, Paul argues that students must detach themselves from their own experience so that they may view reality in an objective and detached manner. Consequently in the critical thinking class there is little opportunity to address issues of social justice, race, class, gender, poverty, equity, etc. The notion that curriculum might be grounded in and emergent from the text of students' lived experiences and voices is entirely negated. The effect is to create a system of education which will equip students with a specific lens -- the technical-rational one -- for viewing themselves in relation to the world, and thus to deny students the transformative possibilities that can come from, in Freire's terms, naming their worlds so that they might be thus empowered to act to change those worlds. Paul states that students can't think about the world until they see it in his detached way:

Only when students have a rich diet of dialogical and dialectical thought do they become prepared for the messy, multidimensional real world, where opposition, conflict, critique, and contradiction are everywhere. Only through a rigorous exposure to dialogical and dialectical thinking do students develop intellectually fit minds (p. 248).

One of the things that makes this anthology particularly hard to critique is that Paul's position is often quite inconsistent from one essay to another. It is puzzling to find, for example, in Chapter 11 that Paul acknowledges the fact that thought is necessarily context-bound, yet in the same chapter argues that "we need to restore confidence in the search for truth" (p. 171), and that our goal must be "to cultivate the individual as intellectually autonomous" (p. 173). Paul's discomfort with any possibility of relativistic thought, or with the notion that knowledge is socially constructed, causes him to return repeatedly to the "universal standards for thought" (e.g., p. 253 & p. 399) exemplified in the quotes presented earlier. Nowhere is this more evident than in Chapter 12, in which, while discussing ethical development, Paul talks about the "universal, general principles of morality shared by people of good will everywhere" (p. 178). Paul seems unaware of crosscultural research illustrating the diversity of moral standards used by various cultural groups (e.g., see Damon, 1988), not to mention research on the context-specificity of moral judgment by Gilligan and colleagues which, as noted earlier, has been highly
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critical of universalist assumptions about moral development. The contradictions persist. While, on the one hand, Paul argues for universal, culture-free moral standards, he has no hesitation in permitting a diversity of moral stances to exist, provided each stance can be rationally justified, as the following reveals:

I identify myself less and less with particular substantive beliefs. I make common cause, not with those who uncritically reinforce, nor with those who sophisticatedly defend, my substantive beliefs, but with those who critically hold whatever beliefs they hold. I recognize that as a critical liberal or conservative or radical or socialist or Christian or communist or feminist or atheist or capitalist, I have more in common with those who critically hold their beliefs, even though they may substantively disagree with me, than I have with those who uncritically or closemindedly defend the substance of what I believe (p. 443).

Yet, while Paul favors a multiplicity of correct stances for open-ended issues such as intellectual and moral judgments, he has no hesitation in suggesting that in areas of monologic discourse, such as math and science, we must lead students to the right answer through reason. The discussion on pp. 505-506 clearly reveals Paul's understanding that all words have fixed meanings to which students must learn to subscribe. "To persuade students that it is possible to use words precisely, we must demonstrate to them every word in the language has an established use with established implications that they must learn to respect" (p. 506). And, for math and science: "Even when dealing with monological problems (like many found in math and science), students need to move dialogically between their own thinking and 'correct' thinking on the subject before they come to appreciate the one 'right' (monological) way to proceed. They cannot simply leap directly to "correct" thought; they need to think dialogically first" (p. 246). In referring to math and science as monologic, Paul seems quite unaware of the literature on the social constructedness of mathematics (e.g., Lave, 1988; Walkerdine, 1988) and science (e.g., Knorr-Cetina & Mulkay, 1983; Latour & Woolgar, 1979). Neither does he seem at all conversant with the idea that the very words we use in everyday speech are social constructions to which we add our own particular nuances of meaning. Furthermore, not only are our words culturally laden, but the discourses we choose to use are also coded with messages about power. As the discussion of Bakhtin's work in O'Loughlin (in press) and Wertsch (1991) indicates, culturally sensitive teaching requires us to be extremely self-reflexive about the cultural and power
Ahlquist and O'Loughlin

assumptions that are inherent in the words we use to talk with our students. By seeking to impose our discourse as the canon, we serve to alienate and disenfranchise students who do not have cultural access to the codes we employ.

The root problem in Paul's whole enterprise is the attempt to present a certain hegemonic discourse, namely rational critical thinking, as the standard for all persons in dealing with the realities of their lives. The crucial questions must be restated: Whose standards are these? In whose interest are they being offered? Paul's answer would appear to be that the decontextualized, intellectualized discourse of Western white male philosophers is universally appropriate because the value of rationality as a social good is naturally self-evident. Lave (1988), drawing on Sahlins' (1976) earlier work, argues that the Western concept of rationality that Paul and others take for granted is itself a culturally constructed discourse like any other, and she calls into question "the idea that rationality represents a mode of human thought, an unchallengable canon of mental processing whose application is sufficient to establish the superiority of its product" (pp. 173-74). Likewise, in The Mastery of Reason, Walkerdine (1988) argues that success in an educational system of the type envisioned by Paul requires "the triumph of reason over emotion, the fictional power over the practices of everyday life" (p. 186). Walkerdine notes that this denies people their own subjectivity, but holds out to them the tantalizing fantasy of Reason's Dream, "an idealized and calculable universe [which] is part and parcel of the dream of rational government. The dream, therefore, is not just a wild and crazy dream of playing God, but a fantasy invested in current attempts to govern through bourgeois democracy" (p. 214). The elements of such fantasy recur throughout Paul's anthology (e.g., Introduction, Chs. 7, 11, 12, 39). Truly critical and transformative education cannot occur in circumstances in which students are denied the opportunity to become reflective about the issues of ideology and power that govern their destinies. It is only when teachers take seriously the sociocultural practices within which meaning-making takes place that possibilities for critical thought and action are enabled.

Paul's book is problematic also from a technical perspective. The 39 chapters are composed of essays written at various times over the past few years by Paul and loosely grouped into thematic units. Unfortunately the book, which is self-published by Paul's Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique, is much too long and is poorly edited. While A.J.A. Binker is identified as the editor of the anthology, the editor's role appears to have been limited to writing brief abstracts for each of the essays. Many of the essays are repetitious and the clarity of the book would be greatly enhanced by a more judicious selection of articles and a more rigorous editing. There are
many instances in which lengthy arguments are repeated almost verbatim in succeeding chapters. The reader would be well advised to abandon any plans for reading the selections in a linear sequence. Instead, the collection is best viewed as a resource to be dipped into for insight into particular topics. The feeling that the book is self-indulgent is confirmed by the inclusion, following the preface, of a section entitled "Comments from leaders in the field." This seven-page section consists of laudatory comments—and, oftentimes, gushing praise—from thirteen of Paul's colleagues in the critical thinking movement. These are not comments from people outside of the field of critical thinking, but primarily comments by men who Paul has featured at his yearly critical thinking conferences at Sonoma State University. Abbreviated versions of their comments also appear on the back cover. While such self-serving comments hardly belong in an academic book, their presence here is particularly jarring since the primary thrust of Paul's argument is that people must become detached from their own self-serving tendencies in order to deal with the world in a rational and reasonable manner. If Paul were to adhere to his own dictum of trusting the reasonable judgment of his readers, such testimonials would hardly be necessary.

Our view of critical thinking assumes that people are shaped in great part by their interactions with others in the world. We do not see any advantage or rationale to Paul's perspective of blaming the victim. Our view of human nature is not based on a deficit model, but rather places trust in the basic goodness of people; people's tendency to support and affirm, not to egoistically manipulate or abuse others. To try to fit people into one of three categories, "naive idealizers," "rationalizers," or "critical thinkers," is too limiting. There is enormous diversity in human behavior. We are far more multifaceted and complex in our individual and collective thoughts and actions than Paul's categories allow. We argue not that people are deeply insecure or have an inherently natural tendency to think and act irrationally, but rather that we learn through our experiences how to make rational as well as intuitive decisions about our lives, that we use our judgement about what is "good logic" versus "bad logic," in a social and political context and from diverse cultural perspectives. We acknowledge the subjectivity in our lives as part of what makes us human. The logical extension of Paul's view of humans is that they become machines, void of subjective feeling and cultural context, because context and subjectivity would interfere with a universal standard of rationality. To argue for detachment from one's cultural and subjective reality is to deny one's humanity. His perspective is grounded in patriarchy and modernism: a linear, value-free, hierarchical, abstract, pseudo-scientific, and highly technical hegemonic world view. "The ideal of
an educated person held by a given era, as Derrida points out, is always predicated on the basis of a theory of truth " (Ulmer, 1985, p. 167).

It is imperative that the question of whose truth, and which truths be addressed. Paul's view of knowledge, morality and truth is predicated on several assumptions which we find problematic. Paul anoints as critical thinkers only those who ascribe to a hegemonic body of rationalist knowledge with universal standards derived from a Eurocentric perspective; he validates knowledge and theory produced primarily by male scholars for dissemination primarily to white male scholars. As a model and vision for the future of diverse societies in flux, we find this a regressive, extremely narrow, and archaic interpretation of truth and knowledge.
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Richard Paul responds

The Art of self-refutation or "Physician, heal thyself!"
A Reply to Ahlquist and O'Loughlin

RICHARD PAUL, School of Education, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA.

It's difficult to know where to begin with the Ahlquist/O'Loughlin review (hereafter A & O). They managed to do what I would have thought impossible in reading a 400-plus page book and that is to get virtually everything wrong. On the whole, therefore, I find the review intellectually uninteresting, for there is little challenge in responding to a commentary that so completely mis-reads a text. Finally, the review is riddled with stereotyping, name-calling, and self-refuting contradictions. In my response, I will first document my criticisms of the review--especially of A & O's notion that knowledge is simply a subjective, social construct--and then take some space to state accurately for the record, and for any potential interested readers, a hint of, as against A & O's erroneous conception of, my views.

One interesting question is, perhaps, how and why A & O managed so inept a review. My guess is that early on in their reading of my book, they formed a rigid stereotype and based all of their subsequent reading on it—that I am a "narrow, patriarchal, Eurocentric, Western," "modernist," "self-indulgent," "colonialist," "cold," "emotionless," "abstract," "pseudo-scientific," "hegemonic," "archaic," "victim-blaming," "regressive," "linear," "decontextualized," "intellectualized," "cynical," "wild and crazy," "white male" philosopher "playing God" with "alienated and disenfranchised students." The only remaining question is, "Other than than that, am I OK?"

Apparently not, for I find that (contrary to my own conception of my views and those of my self-indulgent white male Eurocentric patriarchal friends) I view humans as "machines void of subjective feeling and cultural context," that I write "hegemonic discourse," that I "deny people their own subjectivity," that my approach "is destined to preserve the status quo," that I believe that "knowing is best characterized as a process of solitary cogitation by a single individual," that I do not believe in "providing opportunities for people to understand the socially constructed nature of their realities,"
that white male philosophers should decide "the standards for good reasoning," that one should "not inquire into the structural features of either society or the educational system," that I do not recognize "the shortcomings of human reasoning," that I lack "implicit faith in the potential of human beings for love, humanization, connection and ...transformation," that I do not recognize "forces of oppression," that I believe we should "ignore the least esteemed, the least educated amongst us," that I believe in a "rational, mechanical universe," that "our partners, children, neighbors, cousins and perhaps even ourselves are ... either hopelessly naive or repulsively manipulative," that I deny "the subjectivity of human experience," that I think that "everyday experience" is simply "bias," that I do not believe in "creating opportunities for ... multiple voices to be heard in classroom dialogue," that I believe "that students must detach themselves from their own experience," that "in the critical thinking class there is little opportunity to address issues of social justice, race, class, gender, poverty, equity, etc.," that "all words have fixed meanings," and that I "validate knowledge and theory produced primarily by male scholars for dissemination primarily to white male scholars." How does one begin to defend oneself against such a miscellany of sweeping charges?

Self-Refutation
Perhaps here. A & O are seemingly unaware of how thoroughly Western the view is that all knowledge is a "relativistic," thoroughly "subjective," "social" construct. Perhaps, too, they are unaware of how completely this Western idea squares with traditional North American anti-intellectualism and with the traditional North American distrust of anything that smacks of intellectual discipline. Perhaps they are also unaware—I assume they are—that those with chauvinistic, racist, nationalistic, or sexist bent can easily claim justification for their views by appeal to the very standard A & O defend: one's innate right to his or her own subjective, social constructions. If all views are to be confirmed in subjective experience, then everyone has a right to that same confirmation, everyone a right to have his or her own "voice" treated not only as authentic, but as authentic as anyone else's.

Research itself becomes nothing more than one of many sets of "subjective" voices in a sea of such voices, all on an equal subjectivist plane: Hitler, Stalin, Einstein, Martin Luther King, Karl Marx at the British Museum, Fredrick the haberdasher on Division Street in Chicago, and Jack the Ripper roaming the streets of London. If one cannot hold persons to minimal canons of sound reasoning, minimal conditions of intellectual discipline, expecting them to be minimally clear, precise, and accurate, to articulate carefully the questions or problems they are posing, to strive to distinguish relevant from
irrelevant evidence (given what is at issue), to make every effort to reason consistently, to recognize the implication of one's views, to consider objections from contrasting well-reasoned perspectives, to apply the same standards of evidence to oneself that one applies to others, to recognize important differences between questions of different types (for example, between what is "legal" and what is "ethical"), to distinguish evidence from conclusion, fact from interpretation, information from knowledge, vested from public interest, and so forth..., if one refuses to accept even these minimal standards of intellectual inquiry and discourse, then all is lost. We might as well close down all intellectual inquiry, get our guns, and shoot it out collectively at sundown.

The standards above--clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, and consistency, etc. -- are precisely the standards defended in my book. Now since A & O insist that the standards I am defending are nothing other than white, male, Eurocentric standards, I have no choice but to conclude that they believe that women when they reason, and non-European males as well, do not recognize any responsibility to be clear in their statements as to what is at issue, precise in their use of words, accurate in their citing of evidence, relevant in the considerations they bring to bear on the issue, or consistent in what they say from paragraph to paragraph. Is this not an insult to women and non-European men? Are rational women really willing to concede that such concerns are white Eurocentric male concerns? Simon DeBeauvoir would stir in her grave. And for good reason.

If all knowledge is nothing more than a subjective social construct and there are no objective standards to which alleged knowledge must submit, then the views of A & O are themselves nothing more than their own subjective construct and I and other white males have no responsibility to listen to them. Furthermore, if we do choose to (subjectively) listen to them, we have no responsibility to characterize them accurately, to be influenced by the evidence they cite, to respect the logic of their inferences, to follow out the implications of their conclusions, to recognize the relevance of their reasons, etc. etc. I can with perfect (subjective) justification say, "That is their subjective construct, here is mine, you decide on yours and there's an end to it!"

Subjectivism, consistently held, can provide for no privileged positions above the fray. Herein lies the grounds for its own inherent incoherence. If we accept it, we need not listen to any voice, respect any person, recognize any human or animal right, concern ourselves, for that matter, with any moral values whatsoever. We could if we liked approve of, or alternatively deny the existence of, exploitation, abuse, cruelty, war, or genocide. These are all, please remember, nothing more than subjective, social constructs. They may be your subjective social construct, but I as a subjectivist have inherent right to choose my own.
You may choose to subjectively construct them, but why should I if they don't confirm my subjective beliefs.

Note the simplicity and the novelty. We can now arrange the books in the library according to a new catalog system: White Eurocentric Male Subjective Constructs, White Female Eurocentric Subjective Constructs, Oriental Male Subjective Constructs, Oriental Female Subjective Constructs, and so on, with sub-categories that delineate down to the finest detail various specific forms of subjective construct. This being done, we could then free our students, as they so desperately wish to be freed, from any responsibility to adhere to objective standards in judging their own or anyone else's reasoning, all reasoning to be viewed alike as one subjectivist construct among a myriad of others. Students could then choose books and intellectual positions much as they now choose breakfast cereals. "Oh, you like Captain Crunch! I like Sugar Coco Puffs!" We would then hear comments in the hallways like, "Hey, did you know that Jack is into white, Eurocentric, male social constructs?" To which others would reply, "Cool! But I of course like female, non-Eurocentric, social constructs!" or "I like them too, but it all depends on my changing moods of course! Sometimes I prefer racist social constructs, what about you?"

The fatal problem for subjectivists like A & O is that they cannot play by the very rules they argue for. Indeed, they cannot even argue for their own views without refuting themselves by their implicit use of the very canons of rational exchange they claim to have "proven" to be (no more than) white, male, Eurocentric social constructs. Hence, trapped in this inevitable double-standard, A & O argue inconsistently every step along the way, continually presupposing the very standards they negate:

1) They assert as an objective, demonstrable fact that knowledge is an "inherently subjective," social construct.

2) They assert as an objective, demonstrable fact that there are no universal standards of rationality, no universal "standards for good reasoning."

3) They claim that I ignore relevant evidence by failing to inquire "into the structural features of either society or the educational system."

4) They claim on numerous occasions that my views are refuted by objective demonstrable evidence, established by empirical research that reveals undeniable facts, for example:

   a) that Gilligan and colleagues have (presumably objectively) established "what we know about everyday reasoning in intellectual and moral domains;"
b) that Walkerdine and others have (presumably objectively) refuted other research as based on an "essentially colonialist mentality;"

c) that Damon and others have established (presumably objectively) that moral standards are diverse;

d) that Gilligan has established (presumably objectively) that moral judgments are context-specific;

e) that Bakhtin has established (presumably objectively) that there are "cultural and power assumptions that are inherent in the words we use to talk with our students;"

f) that Sahlin has established (presumably objectively) that the Western concept of rationality is "itself a culturally constructed discourse;" and

g) that "corroborating information" (presumably accurate and relevant information) continues to accumulate which indicates that the narrow patriarchal, Eurocentric, western view of the rational, mechanical universe...is ill conceived."

Finally, to top things off, they end up claiming that my reasoning is flawed because it is "often quite inconsistent" (forgetting, of course, that consistency on their own view is simply a white, male, Eurocentric standard). Are they making the charge of inconsistency only because I am a white North American male? Or do they believe that women and non-white males from Asia and Africa also have a responsibility to be consistent in their writings? And if they do, isn't this a universal standard of the sort they deny? And if they don't, how do they go about understanding persons who affirm and deny one and the same thing?

What I Do Not Believe

It should be clear by now that much of what A & O accuse me of believing and favoring I do not, in fact, believe or favor. I do not believe in an emotionless world. I do not believe in disembodied reason. I do not believe in absolute truth. I do not believe in contextless thinking. I do not believe in Western, male domination. I do not believe that thoughts can be separated from feelings, emotions, or values. I do not believe that in understanding and assessing reasoning, we can ignore its social function in the world, nor the interests served thereby. I do not believe that thought can be understood separate from behavior. I do not believe that people are ugly and repulsive. I am not opposed to love. I do not believe in ignoring one's personal experience.

What I Do Believe

Instead I believe that thinking is constructed, that we are naturally disposed to view the world with ourselves and our group as the egocentric or socioecentric hub, that we need to learn how to reason clearly, accurately, and fairly, that we do not naturally use words with
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precision, that we can learn to do so, that we can learn to seek appropriate evidence to support our views, that we can discipline our minds through an education focused on reasoning and critical thinking, that education, properly so called, is always to be distinguished from training, socialization, and indoctrination, that human reason is circumscribed and limited, that passionate commitments are intrinsic to education and to a full human life, that universal intellectual values are presupposed in emancipatory education, that unless we are students of our history we will be trapped by it, that what joins all people together as humans is more important than what separates them by race, gender, or ethnicity, that well-educated persons learn as such to think beyond their own culture's presuppositions, that students can find their own voice only when they learn to be something other than a mindless record of the voices they have internalized from their parents, peer group, and society, that persons from different groups can communicate only if there are standards for communication that go beyond ethnicity, gender, and race.

The Importance of the Universal

I argue that not only critical thinking, but reasoning as well (which is presupposed by critical thinking) is based on universal standards and features: 1) on universal standards for reasoning (clarity, precision, accuracy, relevance, consistency, depth, breadth, fairness...), 2) on universal features of reasoning, and 3) on traits of mind essential to rationality. I have already introduced the notion of universal standards for reasoning. Let me now suggest what the universal features or elements of reasoning are. I shall then follow with a listing of the traits of mind essential to rationality. What you should do if you want to challenge any feature or trait listed is to trace the implications and consequences that would follow from their absence. Each standard, each feature, each trait is necessarily presupposed in other standards, features or traits, or indispensable to tasks, goals, or objectives required in the life of an engaged, reasoning person.

The Universal Features of Reasoning

What is reasoning? Reasoning is the drawing of conclusions on the basis of reasons. One can draw conclusions about poems, microbes, people, numbers, historical events, social settings, psychological states, everyday situations, character traits, indeed, about anything whatsoever.

What makes good reasoning good reasoning? (rather than something else)? To become adept at drawing justifiable conclusions on the basis of good reasons is more complex than it appears, for drawing a conclusion is always the tip of an intellectual iceberg. There is much more that is implicit than is explicit in reasoning, more components
that we do not express than those which we do. To become skilled in
good reasoning we must become practiced in making what is explicit,
explicit, so that we can "check out" what's going on "beneath the
surface" of our thought.

Whenever you draw a conclusion, you do so in some circumstances,
making some inferences (that have implications and consequences)
based on some reasons or information (and assumptions), using some
concepts, in trying to settle some question (or solve some problem) for
some purpose within some point of view. Persons skilled in reasoning
can re-construct and plausibly assess any of these elements as they
function in their reasoning.

Eight Essential Features of All Reasoning

1) Purpose, goal, or end-in-view. Whenever we reason, we reason to
some end, to achieve some purpose, to satisfy some desire or fulfill some
need. One source of problems in reasoning is traceable to "defects" at the
level of goal, purpose, or end. If our goal itself, for example, is
unrealistic, contradictory to other goals we have, confused or muddled
in some way, then the reasoning we use to achieve it is problematic.

2) Question at issue (or problem to be solved). Whenever we attempt
to reason something out, there is at least one question at issue, at least
one problem to be solved. One area of concern for the reasoner should
therefore be the very formulation of the question to be answered or
problem to be solved. If we are not clear about the question we are
asking, or how the question relates to our basic purpose or goal, then it
is unlikely that we will be able to find a reasonable answer to it, or one
that will serve our purpose.

3) Point of view or frame of reference. Whenever we reason, we must
reason within some point of view or frame of reference. Any "defect" in
our point of view or frame of reference is a possible source of problems in
our reasoning. Our point of view may be too narrow or too parochial,
may be based on false or misleading analogies or metaphors, may be not
be precise enough, may contain contradictions, and so forth.

4) Empirical dimension of reasoning. Whenever we reason, there is
some "stuff", some phenomena about which we are reasoning. Any
"defect," then, in the experiences, data, evidence, or raw material upon
which our reasoning is based is a possible source of problems.

5) Conceptual dimension of reasoning. All reasoning uses some ideas
or concepts and not others. Any "defect" in the concepts or ideas
(including the theories, principles, axioms or rules) within which we
reason is a possible source of problems.

6) Assumptions: The starting points of reasoning. All reasoning must
begin somewhere, must take some things for granted. Any "defect" in
the starting points of our reasoning, any problem in what we are taking
for granted, is a possible source of problems.
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7) Implications and consequences of reasoning. Where our reasoning is taking us. All reasoning begins somewhere and proceeds somewhere else. No reasoning is static. Reasoning is a sequence of inferences that begin somewhere and takes us somewhere else. Any "defect" in the implications or consequences of our reasoning is a possible source of problems.

8) Inferences. Reasoning proceeds by steps called inferences. To make an inference is think as follows: "Because this is so, that also is so (or probably so)." Any "defect" in the inferences we make during reasoning is a possible source of problems.

The Traits of Mind Essential to Fairminded Critical Thinking

These intellectual traits are interdependent. Each is best developed while developing the others as well. They cannot be imposed from without; they must be cultivated by encouragement and example. People can come to deeply understand and accept these principles only by analyzing actual experiences of them. These traits include: an intellectual sense of justice, intellectual perseverance, intellectual integrity, intellectual humility, intellectual empathy, intellectual courage, faith in reason, and intellectual autonomy.

• Intellectual autonomy. Having rational control of one's beliefs, values, and inferences. The ideal of critical thinking is to learn to think for oneself, to gain command over one's thought processes. Intellectual autonomy does not entail willfulness, stubbornness, or rebellion. It entails a commitment to analyzing and evaluating beliefs on the basis of reason and evidence, to question when it is rational to question, to believe when it is rational to believe, and to conform or resist when it is rational to conform or resist.

• Intellectual empathy. Understanding the need to imaginatively put oneself in the place of others in order to genuinely understand them. We must recognize our egocentric tendency to identify truth with our immediate perceptions or longstanding beliefs. Intellectual empathy correlates with the ability to accurately reconstruct the viewpoints and reasoning of others and to reason from premises, assumptions, and ideas other than our own. This trait also requires that we remember occasions when we were wrong, despite an intense conviction that we were right, and consider that we might be similarly deceived in a case at hand.

• Intellectual sense of justice. Willingness and consciousness of the need to entertain all viewpoints sympathetically, and to assess them with the same intellectual standards, without reference to one's own feelings or vested interests, or the feelings or vested interests of one's friends, community, or nation; implies adherence to intellectual standards without reference to one's own advantage or the advantage of one's group.
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• **Intellectual humility.** Awareness of the limits of one’s knowledge, including sensitivity to circumstances in which one’s native egocentrism is likely to function self-deceptively; sensitivity to bias and prejudice in, and limitations of, one’s viewpoint. Intellectual humility is based on the recognition that no one should claim more than he or she actually knows. It does not imply spinelessness or submissiveness. It implies the lack of intellectual pretentiousness, boastfulness, or conceit, combined with insight into the strengths or weaknesses of the logical foundations of one’s beliefs.

• **Intellectual courage.** The willingness to face and fairly assess ideas, beliefs, or viewpoints to which we have not given a serious hearing, regardless of our strong negative reactions to them. This courage arises from the recognition that ideas considered dangerous or absurd are sometimes rationally justified (in whole or in part), and that conclusions or beliefs espoused by those around us or inculcated in us are sometimes false or misleading. To determine for ourselves which is which, we must not passively and uncritically “accept” what we have “learned.” Intellectual courage comes into play here, because inevitably we will come to see some truth in some ideas considered dangerous and absurd and some distortion or falsity in some ideas strongly held in our social group. It takes courage to be true to our own thinking in such circumstances. Examining cherished beliefs is difficult, and the penalties for non-conformity are often severe.

• **Intellectual integrity.** Recognition of the need to be true to one’s own thinking, to be consistent in the intellectual standards one applies; to hold oneself to the same rigorous standards of evidence and proof to which one holds one’s antagonists, to practice what one advocates for others; and to honestly admit discrepancies and inconsistencies in one’s own thought and action. This trait develops best in a supportive atmosphere in which people feel secure and free enough to honestly acknowledge their inconsistencies, and can develop and share realistic ways of ameliorating them. It requires honest acknowledgment of the difficulties of achieving greater consistency.

• **Intellectual perseverance.** Willingness and consciousness of the need to pursue intellectual insights and truths despite difficulties, obstacles, and frustrations; firm adherence to rational principles despite irrational opposition of others; a sense of the need to struggle with confusion and unsettled questions over an extended period of time, in order to achieve deeper understanding or insight. This trait is undermined when teachers and others continually provide the answers, do students’ thinking for them or substitute easy tricks, algorithms, and short cuts for careful, independent thought.

• **Faith in reason.** Confidence that in the long run one’s own higher interests and those of humankind at large will best be served by giving the freest play to reason -- by encouraging people to come to their own
conclusions through a process of developing their own rational faculties; faith that (with proper encouragement and cultivation) people can learn to think for themselves, form rational viewpoints, draw reasonable conclusions, think coherently and logically, persuade each other by reason, and become reasonable, despite the deep-seated obstacles in the native character of the human mind and in society. Confidence in reason is developed through experiences in which one reasons one's way to insight; solves problems through reason; uses reason to persuade; is persuaded by reason. Confidence in reason is undermined when one is expected to perform tasks without understanding why; to repeat statements without having verified or justified them; to accept beliefs on the sole basis of authority or social pressure.

**Patronizing Women and Non-Westerners**

To suggest that only Western white males are concerned with clarity, relevance, precision, empirical evidence, accuracy, consistency; strive to achieve intellectual courage, intellectual integrity, intellectual humility, intellectual perseverance, and intellectual empathy; to believe that only Western white males strive to regulate their formulation of the question at issue; analyze the concepts they use; notice their inferences and assumptions; pay attention to implications and consequences, is to patronize women and non-Western males. Rationality within any culture is a matter not of simple conformity to culture, but of educated capacity to critique that conformity and rise above it.

To attribute all of the standards of reason above to Western white males is to give them much too much credit. These standards do not belong to anyone, but to everyone. They have not been invented by white males, for they are implicit in all intelligible uses of the intellect and language. They are embodied in intellectual history, for without them there would be no such history. They are preconditions for the development of any field of inquiry whatsoever (for if there are no standards from the perspective of which "development" is to be assessed, then there can be no development, only replacement of one view with a second no better than the first).

**What About Moral Reasoning?**

A & O, of course, dismiss my analysis of the need for critical thinking in moral education. They simply assert that "crosscultural research" has established that there is a "diversity of moral standards". They provide the reader with no inkling of what my actual position is. What I argue for, in fact, is this, that:

Nearly everyone...gives at least lip service to a universal common core of general ethical principles--for example, that it is morally
wrong to cheat, deceive, exploit, abuse, harm, or steal from others; that everyone has a moral responsibility to respect the rights of others, including their freedom and well-being; to help those most in need of help; to seek the common good and not merely their own self-interest and egocentric pleasures; to strive in some way to make this world more just and humane (p 176).

I argue as well (without contradicting myself, I believe) that there are serious moral disagreements when it comes down to concrete moral judgments:

The moral thing to do is often a matter of disagreement even among people of good will. One and the same act is often morally praised by some, condemned by others. Furthermore, even when we do not face the morally conflicting claims of others, we often have our own inner conflicts as to what, morally speaking, we should do in some particular situation...Because of complexities such as these, ethically motivated persons must learn the art of self-critique, of moral self-examination, to become attuned to the pervasive everyday pitfalls of moral judgment: moral intolerance, self-deception, and uncritical conformity.

There is no reason to suppose that agreement about abstract principles entails agreement about the application of those principles to cases. A & O, predictably, completely miss the point. Because they do not read the text well enough to follow the distinction that is explicitly drawn between general agreement on abstract moral values and specific disagreement about actual cases (when individuals apply moral principles through the filter of their own ideological point of view), they think I am contradicting myself. Needless to say they fail to mention that I cite such documents as the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (p 225), as specific examples of the level at which I believe there is "general" agreement (that is, at the level of moral lip service).

I summarize my view as follows:

The problem is not at the level of general moral principles. No people in the world, as far as I know, take themselves to oppose human rights or stand for injustice, slavery, exploitation, deception, dishonesty, theft, greed, starvation, ignorance, falsehood, or human suffering. In turn, no nation or group has special ownership over any general moral principle. Students, then, need skill and practice in moral reasoning, not indoctrination into the view that one nation rather than another is special in enunciating these moral principles (p. 178).

I summarize the educational needs that follow from this analysis in a number of ways:

Unless educators in all countries can begin to foster genuine critical thinking in schools accessible to most people, or some other means is
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developed or generated for helping people free themselves from the self-serving manipulations of their own leaders, it is doubtful that "ethical reasoning" will play an appropriate role in social and economic development. Ethical reasoning, to be effective, cannot be "uncritical," for ethical principles must be applied in the context of human action and interests heavily polluted by distortion and one-sidedness, by vested interests portrayed in the guise of ethical righteousness (p 228).

What About the "Technical" Problems?

A & O's main complaint about the technical side of the book is that there "are many instances in which lengthy arguments are repeated almost verbatim in succeeding chapters." It seems to me that A & O's dismal failure to follow accurately any part of the reasoning in the book is testimony aplenty of the need for overlap between essays. The notion that most readers will take a basic argument developed in one context and trace out its implications by themselves in a wide variety of other contexts is unrealistic.

Conclusion

Students desperately need intellectual standards to assess their own thinking as well as the thinking of others, just as educators need intellectual standards to assess curriculum and instruction. If we are to teach students to think for themselves, we must also teach them standards by which they learn to hold their thinking accountable. For example, it is of little use to encourage students to draw inferences if they have no standards by means of which to assess those inferences. It is of little use to encourage them to use analogies if they do not understand how to distinguish sound from "misleading," or "false," analogies. It is of little use to ask students to "organize" their writing if they have no sense of the intellectual standards that underlie disciplined writing. It makes little sense to try to teach them skills of oral expression if they have no sense of what it is to express an idea or line of reasoning in an academically defensible manner. There is no point, in other words, in getting students to do "more" thinking in any area of learning if they have no way of assessing the quality of that thinking. Disciplined thinking -- thinking based on explicit standards known to the thinker -- is essential to the development of a disciplined mind. Such standards cannot be found in what divides us ethnically, sexually, or racially. We cannot set up different standards of evidence, different standards of inference, different standards of credibility for students of different ethnic or racial groups. We cannot have one set of intellectual standards for male and another for female students. Critical thinking is self-monitored thinking, based on intellectual standards presupposed in the nature of human discourse and
communication. Those standards have nothing about them that is in any way ethnic, racial, or sexual in nature.
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