

Iftikhar Ahmad

Political Science and the Good Citizen: The Genealogy of Traditionalist Paradigm of Citizenship Education in the American School Curriculum

- This article examines American political scientists' contribution to pre-collegiate citizenship education curriculum.
- During the twentieth century the American Political Science Association (APSA) promoted three different conceptions of citizenship education reflecting paradigm shifts in political science.
- The state-centric approach, as introduced during the 1910s, remained canonized in the school curriculum.
- By the end of the twentieth century a society-centric curriculum framework was proposed.

Purpose: The purpose of this article is to chronicle paradigm shifts in American political science during the twentieth century and their influence on political scientists' perspectives on pre-collegiate citizenship education curriculum.

Methodology: The research questions explored in this article are concerned with the history of political scientists' ideas about citizenship education. Therefore, historical method is used which involves an examination of evidence--primary sources. Those sources are the APSA's ten reports and statements.

Findings: In different decades of the twentieth century, the APSA committees and one taskforce prepared ten (10) reports and statements on pre-collegiate citizenship education which reflected three different paradigms in political science—Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism.

Keywords:

Citizenship education, political science, curriculum, traditionalism, history

1 Introduction

Citizenship education is a contentious realm. In democratic societies, diverse voices assert their own conceptions of good citizenship. In the United States, one notable group that spoke with the loudest voice and played an intermittent role in the pre-collegiate citizenship education in the twentieth century was the American Political Science Association (APSA), which not only shared its conceptions with school educators, on some occasions, it also made political attempts to influence the school curriculum. This paper chronicles and analyzes American political scientists' varying conceptions with regard to citizenship education in the public school curriculum.

All through the twentieth century, some authors studied the APSA's myriad activities with regard to citizenship education in public schools. However, they examined the APSA's activities in specific historical periods and, based on the evidence they examined, they reached diverse conclusions. For example, in their research, American scholars including Henry J. Ford (1905), Rolla M. Tryon (1935), Cora Prifold (1962), Jack Allen (1966), Hazel W. Hertzberg (1981), Mary J. Turner (1978), Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990), Hindy L. Schachter

(1998), Stephen T. Leonard (1999), and Stephen E. Bennett (1999) present competing interpretations of the APSA's conceptions of and approaches to citizenship and citizenship education. Although the scope of their study was limited because they examined isolated pieces of evidence, in their own way and time, these scholars engaged themselves in the extant discourse and produced a rich body of historical knowledge that contributes to our understanding of the APSA's approaches. More importantly, these scholars' findings are wide-ranging with regard to the APSA's activities related to the pre-collegiate citizenship education curriculum. While I find this literature valuable and take into consideration these scholars' findings and conclusions, my review of it, however, generated three questions which merit further inquiry. For example, a) what different conceptions of citizenship did the APSA promote in the twentieth century; b) did paradigm shifts within the discipline of political science influence political scientists' conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education; and c) what variables may explain the rise and decline of the APSA's level of activities in pre-collegiate citizenship education?

These inter-related questions warrant examination because the literature on political scientists' activities in public schools seems to pay little attention to the relationship between the development in the field of political science and the APSA's varying degrees of interest in the school community. In other words, since its birth in 1903, the APSA's myriad activities and standpoints with regard to citizenship education have not always been uniform but experienced several intellectual transformations. Thus, this paper argues that understanding the nature of those intellectual transformations is vital for understanding the APSA's motives, approaches, and activities with regard to citizenship

Iftikhar Ahmad is associate professor at Long Island University, New York. He earned his doctorate in education at Teachers College, Columbia University, NY. Ahmad has published articles on citizenship education in Educational Studies, Religion and Education, and Teachers College Record.
Long Island University, 720 Northern Blvd., Brookville, NY 11731, USA
Email: civiceducation@gmail.com



education in schools. This also helps in understanding the question of compatibility between political science and citizenship education in schools.

The paper also argues that what students learn today in the school curriculum was set in motion a century ago. The APSA's own reports and statements shed a shining light on political scientists' activities and changing conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. For example, the APSA's documents suggest that Traditionalism, the APSA's earliest approach to citizenship education, remained canonized in the twentieth-century American curriculum and has not been replaced. The Traditionalist worldview firmly established its ideological hegemony through the placing of teaching and learning about the state institutions squarely at the center of the citizenship education curriculum. Although other paradigm or movement, i.e., Behavioralism, developed within political science that promoted empiricism and inquiry within the field, Traditionalism remained firmly entrenched in the citizenship education curriculum.

It took political scientists many decades to realize that citizenship education was indeed a complex educational enterprise that required an interdisciplinary approach, and that simply teaching young people about governmental institutions was insufficient for preparing a caring, tolerant, and responsible citizenry. In other words, political scientists realized that their predecessors' approaches, i.e., Traditionalism as well as Behavioralism, were ineffective models for addressing the challenges of apathy and civic disengagement. Hence, by the late twentieth century, a new generation of political scientists, mostly women, briefly floated a normative conception of citizenship that introduced the concepts of tolerance, respect, and collaboration. However, they did not make any inroads into the school curriculum and quickly departed from the scene. Thus it appears that political scientists would rather focus their energies on doing empirical research in colleges and universities than delving into normative activities such as citizenship education in schools. This observation raises the question of the reward system in the field of political science as well as the question of compatibility between the field of political science and citizenship education. This and similar other questions are explored in this tentative historical inquiry.

2 Review of literature

In the twentieth century, many scholars, including political scientists, historians, sociologists, psychologists, and school educators have studied the problem of citizenship education in American schools. Most of them are aware of the APSA's past contributions to the public school curriculum and attempt to establish a connection between the APSA and the teaching of political science in secondary schools (Schaper, 1906; Tryon 1935; Pettersch 1953; Litt, 1963; Quillen, 1966; Turner, 1978; 1981; Shaver & Knight, 1986; Patrick & Hoge, 1991). Nonetheless, more than anyone else, it has been mostly political scientists who studied the activities of their own organization, namely, the APSA, with regard to its efforts

towards reforming the citizenship education curriculum in schools.

Indeed, literature on political scientists' educational ideas and activities in the area of pre-collegiate curriculum and instruction in political science may be disparate—when synthesized, two competing arguments emerge. The first argument presents a sanguine view of political scientists' contributions, suggesting that political scientists promoted the teaching of political science in schools to prepare good citizens. They would like to see political scientists continue working with the social studies educators in schools. For the lack of a better term, I call this group the Believers.

The second argument questions the compatibility of political science and citizenship education. The proponents of the second argument contend that since the intellectual mission of political science has been mainly limited to academic and empirical research, it is unfeasible for its practitioners to achieve any beneficial results in a normative activity such as citizenship education. I call this group the Skeptics.

Although both groups acknowledge political scientists' educational initiatives in schools, they disagree on the appropriateness of the ideas they may have introduced for the preparation of democratic citizens. For instance, the Believers, including Jack Allen (1966), Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus (1967), Hindy L. Schachter (1998), Richard G. Niemi and Jane Junn (1998; 2005), and Stephen E. Bennett (1999), affirm the educational value of political scientists' contribution to citizenship education. Conversely, Bernard Crick (1959), David Ricci (1984), Mary Jane Turner (1978), Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990), and Stephen T. Leonard (1999) consider the teaching of political science material in schools inconsequential for fostering democratic citizenship among the youth.

The focal point of the Believers' argument is that although the APSA's efforts in schools did not fully succeed in preparing democratic citizens, its original mission included citizenship education (Somit and Tanenhaus 1967; Schachter 1998). More importantly, some of the Believers argue that political science research and civic pedagogy in schools were mutually compatible (Bennett 1999, p. 755). Citing the contribution of Behaviorist political scientist Charles E. Merriam (1934), the Believers posit that it was feasible for political scientists to straddle both empirical and normative missions.

On the question of educational benefits that may be derived from the teaching of political science in schools, the Believers argue that such a course "palpably contributes to young people's understanding of public affairs" (Bennett, 1999, p. 756). In contrast with the Believers' sanguine view, the Skeptics characterize political scientists' efforts pertaining to the preparation of good citizens as no more than "pure futility and waste" (Leonard, 1999, p. 749). Indeed, this argument is as old as the APSA itself. For instance, soon after the formation of the APSA as an independent learned society in 1903, political scientist Henry Jones Ford (1905) questioned the



epistemological foundation of political science for good citizenship. The APSA had sought to integrate its three goals, i.e. the study of the state and its organs, the use of empirical methods, and the preparation of good citizens. In Ford's view, these three goals were irreconcilable at best.

In the succeeding decades of the twentieth century, political scientists, disciplinary historians, and philosophers of education, including John Dewey (1916), William B. Munro (1928), James Fesler, et al. (1951), Bernard Crick (1959), Edgar Litt (1963), Mary Jane Turner (1978), David Ricci (1984), Evron Kirkpatrick and Jeane Kirkpatrick (1962), Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990), and Stephen J. Leonard (1999), echoed Ford's prescient skepticism. In essence, this group of authors advances the proposition that professional prestige and the reward system in the field of political science came from empirical research and not normative activity such as citizenship education in schools.

In a sense, the Skeptics argue that political scientists could not make a substantial contribution to citizenship education in schools because it required forsaking their primary academic mission: conducting dispassionate empirical research for discovering generalizations, formulating theories, and explaining political phenomena.

Although the conceptual insights of both Believers and Skeptics enhance our understanding of the connection between political scientists and pre-collegiate citizenship education, both groups seem to paper over two pivotal issues in the debate.

First, proponents of both approaches assume the APSA to be a monolithic group, and in so doing, they inadvertently overlook the existence of multiple ideological cleavages within the APSA. Second, both perspectives consider the APSA as a learned society and hence discount the possibility that, at some point, the APSA may also have behaved as an interest group lobby that was engaged in promoting its members' ideological as well as professional agendas disguising as citizenship education. That is to say, understanding the APSA's motives is vital. Third, only a few of these scholars pay attention to civics pedagogy in schools.

On the APSA's activities pertaining to the promotion of political science in the school curriculum, one could argue that, because during the formative phase of their discipline, political scientists struggled to establish independent departments in colleges and universities, their advancement of knowledge of the national government was inextricably linked with their own professional self-interest. One could say that in the embryonic phase of their field of study, political scientists and their association sought to achieve two urgent goals: legitimacy and respectability. Indeed, they thought they could achieve both by promoting their field as a science, recruiting more students into political science, competing with historians, and by making political alliances with teachers' associations. Therefore, in the first three decades of the twentieth century, the APSA's behavior was more akin to a political lobby than a learned society. Nonetheless, it was during the early three decades that

the APSA achieved its goal: gaining a capstone status for political science in the school curriculum. Once political science achieved the capstone status in schools, it was canonized for the rest of the century and could not be replaced. For many decades of the twentieth century and beyond no one questioned why political science was considered necessary and sufficient for citizenship education.

Moreover, with a few exceptions, the bulk of the literature on the APSA's activities in the area of pre-collegiate citizenship education was produced by political scientists who focused on the curriculum aspect and not pedagogy. Political scientists engaged each other in the discourse but ignored the school teachers who teach citizenship in schools (Hepburn, 1987; Mann, 1996). The teachers' organization, the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), which represents the pedagogical aspect of citizenship education, disagree with political scientists on what counts as citizenship education. Since 1994, the NCSS has been defining citizenship education in interdisciplinary terms in that, in its view, teaching political science is necessary for citizenship education but it alone is not sufficient. In its definition of social studies, the NCSS asserts that citizenship education includes the teaching and learning of all social sciences, law, religion, as well as humanities (National Council for the Social Studies, 1994). Similarly, the findings of some education scholars' research, who studied citizenship education in schools, including Edgar Litt (1963), Jean Anyon (1978) and Cleo H. Cherryholmes (1990) seem to concur with the Skeptics by arguing that the teaching of political science has not produced positive results.

3 Methodology

Since my inquiry primarily focuses on the questions of the political scientists' ideas with regard to pre-collegiate citizenship education, paradigm shifts in the field of political science, political scientists' activities in schools, and the compatibility of political science and citizenship education, it is vital to examine the historical record for information and perspectives. Fortunately, the record of the APSA's documents since the organization's inception is currently accessible both in paper and electronic form and could be interpreted through the canons of the historical method. In academic world, the historical method is recognized as a scientific method and has been successfully applied by notable twentieth century American historians of education including Lawrence Cremin (1964), Merle Curti (1978), Dorothy Ross (1992), Hazel W. Hertzberg (1981), Herbert Kliebard (2004), and Diane Ravitch (2007). Following the tradition of these education historians, I examine the relevant evidence to explain political scientists' ideas and activities in historical context by using the historical method of inquiry that requires taking four progressive steps. First, I gather the historical record or evidence. Second, I evaluate the evidence for validity and reliability. Third, I try to comprehend the meaning of the evaluated evidence in social and political context. Fourth, I separate, compare, categorize, and group the evidence according



to the message, ideas, and concepts embedded in each document. The raw material and tool at my disposal is the written record, i.e., the printed material consisting of the primary sources. In this case, the primary sources are the ten (10) different reports and statements that the APSA's leadership released periodically, some of which were published in the two official journals of the APSA, namely *The American Political Science Review* and *PS: Political Science and Politics* and others were published by the APSA in the form of books. The APSA's documents are the work product of its authorized committees and the Task Force between 1908 and 1998 and are believed to be credible, authentic, and valid primary sources, which are easily available to the general public. Moreover, the selected documents represent the social, political, and historical context in which they were written and, therefore, they mirror the real world. Although the selected documents offer an unobtrusive data, they have a disadvantage as well, which is that the documents are disparate and fragmentary that required cobbling up to establish a balanced historical account.

The documents were prepared by the APSA's seven committees and its Task Force, which mainly consisted of political science professors who taught political science courses at universities all across the United States and represented diverse regions and viewpoints. The seven committees and the Task Force were charged with the responsibility to convene meetings, to deliberate on the status of citizenship education, and to prepare reports and statements on behalf of the APSA. In other words, my assumption is that those reports and statements represented a direct description of the APSA's official policies and visions with regard to citizenship and citizenship education. Since the author of the selected primary sources is the APSA itself or its authorized representatives, one could presume their legitimacy, validity, reliability, and authenticity. More importantly, since the APSA published those reports and statements, it indicates that the APSA did so with the expressed intention that its policies and standpoints become part of the public record. Therefore, the degree of reliability of these reports and statements as primary sources is high. Hence the selected primary sources embody the APSA's ideas, values, aims, vision, and policies concerning the teaching of political science for the purpose of citizenship education in the pre-collegiate context. Moreover, the selected primary sources also indicate a significant evolution in the field of political science, more specifically, evolution in its realm of knowledge, methodology, as well as its *raison d'être*.

Between the first and its last decades of the twentieth century, the APSA's myriad committees issued the following ten reports and policy statements about the citizenship education curriculum in the public schools:

- APSA Report of the Committee on Instruction in Government, (1908)
- APSA Report of the Committee on Instruction, (1916)
- APSA Report of the Committee on Instruction in Political Science, (1922)

- APSA Report of the Committee of Five, (1925)
- APSA Report of the Committee on Cooperation with NCCS, (1939)
- APSA Report of the Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, (1951)
- APSA Report of the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Citizenship Education, (1971)
- APSA Task Force on Civic Education. *Citizenship Education for the Next Century: A Task Force to Initiate Professional Activity*, (1996)
- APSA Task Force on Civic Education: *Statement of purpose*, (1997)
- APSA Task Force on Citizenship Education in the Next Century. *Expanded Articulation Statement: A Call for Reactions and Contributions*, (1998)

4 Findings

First, the chronology of these reports and statements point to a simple but significant historical fact which is that the APSA issued its first five detailed and extensive reports (1908, 1916, 1922, 1925, 1939) within the four decades of its existence; the next two reports (1951, 1971) were detailed but issued after a gap of twenty years; in depth and breadth the APSA's last three policy statements (1996, 1997, 1998) are unlike the former reports and were released for three consecutive years after a hiatus of a quarter of a century. Second, my library search indicates that the APSA Committee on Education, 1991-1993, issued "APSA Guidelines for Teacher Training: Recommendation for Certifying Pre-Collegiate Teachers of Civics, Government, and Social Studies" (APSA, 1994). However, the APSA provides no information about the membership of its Committee on Education, 1991-1993, that prepared the guidelines and, therefore, this document is excluded from the analysis. Hence the analysis will concentrate on the ten (10) reports and statements noted here.

Third, between 1908 and 1971, the APSA formed seven committees which, in total, prepared seven extensive reports on the subject. However, after 1971, it stopped forming committees on citizenship education. In 1996, the APSA formed the Task Force on Civic Education for the Twenty-first Century, with an aim to promote citizenship education in schools but it did not prepare any extensive report similar to those issued between 1908 and 1971. For three consecutive years, 1996-1998, the Task Force issued three short statements articulating the APSA's vision on citizenship education.

Fourth, there is a clear difference between a report and a statement: whereas, in this case, a report provides data and a detailed account of the activities of the group, a statement, on the other hand, expresses the group's general opinion or intentions on a particular subject and also identifies the participants included in the group activities. Also, making a distinction between a report and a statement is vital because it points to the amount of time, energy, effort, and resources an organization may have allocated to preparing a document.

Thus my raw material or primary sources consist of the APSA's seven (7) reports and three (3) statements which I used for clues and information. My review of the



relevant literature on the subject reveals that no author, past or present, identified, gathered, or analyzed all ten of the APSA's reports and statements in one article or book.

I discuss the ten documents in chronological order and summarize the contents of the documents. The APSA's first report in 1908 was in fact based on William A. Schaper's survey of 238 high school students. In 1905, Schaper, a professor of political science at University of Minnesota, presented his paper at the APSA's annual conference: "What do our students know about American government before taking college courses in political science." Schaper concluded that high school students' knowledge of government was dismal. Alarmed by Schaper's findings, the APSA formed the Committee on Instruction in Government (CIG) to make recommendations on improving the teaching of political science in secondary schools. The CIG had five members. After collecting an extensive data on the status of teaching political science in high school, the CIG made several recommendations which included the separation of the subject of political science from history, making the course on political science mandatory for high school graduation, and preparing teachers to teach political science. In brief, the 1908 report was the APSA's first and, a fairly successful attempt, to introduce political science as a capstone course to the pre-collegiate academic community. In other words, the APSA asserted itself in an academic and intellectual space that was hitherto occupied by the American Historical Association (AHA). The APSA had arrived on the scene as a new formidable rival throwing down the gauntlet to AHA and confidently claiming a share for political science in the school curriculum. Thus the APSA's first report may be considered as a blueprint for its future activities.

The APSA released its second report in 1916, which was, in its scope, much more extensive than 1908 report, and was published in the form of a book titled *The Teaching of Government: Report to the American Political Science Association*. This report was prepared by the Committee on Instruction (CI) which consisted of seven professors including Mabel Hill, the first woman ever to serve on any APSA committee. The report noted that "deplorable deficiency" existed in high schools with regard to the teaching of political science and made recommendations for improving the teaching of political science (APSA, 1916, p. 61). First, it equated the teaching of political science with citizenship education. Second, it proposed that teachers training institutions should include civics in their curricula. Third, it recommended that unprepared teachers should be properly trained to teach civics in high schools. Fourth, it suggested that textbooks on civics should include topics on the structure and functions of local government and other social science topics such as sociology and economics should be excluded from it. The CI expressed the desire that political scientists gain a complete proprietary control over the civics curriculum in schools.

Several years later, the APSA appointed the Committee on Instruction in Political Science (CIPS) which had five

members. Some of its members had previously served on the two similar committees. The task before the CIPS was "to define the scope and purposes of a high school course in civics and to prepare an outline of topics which might properly be included within such a course" (APSA, 1922, p. 116). In 1922, CIPS published its report "The Study of Civics" in the *American Political Science Review*, the APSA's official journal. Around the country, fifty-eight professors of political science, history, and other fields, including historian Charles A. Beard of Columbia University and social scientist Charles E. Merriam of the University of Chicago approved the report (APSA, 1922, pp. 124-125). The CIPS's report declared that "in the field of social studies all roads lead through government" (APSA, 1922, p. 117). The report equated the civics course with political science.

The APSA launched its fourth committee in 1923 and was named the Committee of Five (COF) which submitted its report in 1925. The task assigned to COF was to study the state laws regarding the teaching of political science in secondary schools and to lobby the state legislatures. The COF found that laws around the country in this regard were dissimilar and, therefore, it recommended standardization across the United States. First, it proposed that the APSA should draft laws regarding making the teaching of political science mandatory for high school graduation and send them to all fifty state legislatures. Second, the laws would include that teachers in all states must complete a course in political science before receiving professional certification. Third, the contents of a civics course should be limited to political science (APSA, 1925, p. 208).

In the late 1930s, the APSA used a new strategy for promoting the teaching of political science in public schools. This time it authorized its fifth committee—Committee on the Social Studies—for the purpose of fostering cooperation between the APSA and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), an organization of teachers engaged in the pedagogical aspects of the social sciences in schools. This committee noted that citizenship education was the direct function of the state because a large number of the young people attended government-funded schools; only a small number attended colleges. It claimed that improvement in the teaching of civics in schools was achieved due to the APSA's contributions. In its report of 1939, this committee recommended three areas in which the APSA could cooperate with NCSS: 1) curriculum recommendation for a senior high school course in political science; 2) teacher preparation and certification in social studies; and 3) political scientists will publish articles in *Social Education*, an official journal of NCSS.

After the 1939 report, it took the APSA a decade to authorize Committee for the Advancement of Teaching (CAT), which had seven members. The CAT was assigned to conduct a study on the status of the teaching of political science in public schools across the United States. The study was funded by a grant of \$10,000.00 from Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The CAT submitted its report to the APSA in



1951 under the title, *Goals for Political Science*. The report expressed its disappointment over the effectiveness of the APSA committees, both past, and present, to have had any "significant effect in increasing the rapport between the two groups of teachers" (APSA, 1939, p. 221). This referred to the nature of the relationship between political scientists in colleges and teachers in schools. The report recognized that since political scientists had a low regard for school teachers, this mindset kept the two groups from collaborating (APSA, 1939, p. 229). The report's recommendations with regard to political scientists' role in the pre-collegiate citizenship education triggered an intense debate among fellow political scientists. The intramural debate was published in the APSA's *American Political Science Review* in 1951. Those who participated in the debate were political scientists James W. Fesler, Louis Hartz, John H. Hallowell, Victor G. Rosenblum, Walter H. C. Laves, W. A. Robson, Lindsay Rogers, and Clinton Rossiter. The participants offered their competing views on political scientists' role in the pre-collegiate citizenship education.

After about twenty years of inertia, in 1970, the APSA once again formed a committee to study the status of curriculum and instruction in the area of "political science education" in secondary schools. The new committee was called the Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education, which had six members. After working for a year, in 1971, the committee issued its landmark report "Political Education in the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science." The report conceded that political scientists and school teachers lived in a state of "two socio-cultural systems that largely co-exist in mutual isolation of one another" (APSA, 1971, p. 432). Political scientists had remained "uninterested, ill-informed, and contemptuous" of schools because those were "primitive" and "unhappy places," and "the two groups were like foreigners who spoke different languages and, therefore, did not communicate" (APSA, 1971, p. 433). This was the APSA's last report.

For one-quarter of a century, after the APSA released the 1971 report, it remained silent on the issue of teaching political science or citizenship education in public schools. No committees were appointed and no reports were released. In brief, during the 1970s, 1980s, and early 1990s, as a learned society, the APSA remained quiescent towards schools. Occasionally some APSA members, such as Mary A. Hepburn (1975; 1987) made attempts to draw the APSA's attention to the question of improving citizenship education in schools through collaboration with school teachers. Sheila Mann (1996) notes that the APSA declined to participate in *America 2000: An Education Strategy* that President George H. W. Bush had launched in 1991 to improve curriculum standards of school subjects. The APSA's premise was that there was no consensus among its members on the civics and government curriculum.

The protracted lull was interrupted in 1996 by the then APSA's president-elect, Elinor Ostrom, who submitted a proposal to the APSA Council for creating the Task Force

on Civic Education for the Next Century. Ostrom argued that civic engagement had fallen, citizens' political efficacy had declined, and citizens' participation in the political process had plummeted (APSA, 1996). The term "civic engagement" was borrowed from an article "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital" written by Robert Putnam (1995), a Harvard professor. Ostrom complained that schools presented a "cardboard model of citizenship" to students with a little emphasis on teaching inquiry and organizational skills" (APSA, 1996, p. 756). The Task Force was authorized in 1996 comprising of eleven political scientists--six of them were women. One of the six female members was Elinor Ostrom, who won the Nobel Prize in 2009.

In 1997, the Task Force released a one-page document, "Statement of purpose of the American Political Science Association Task Force on Citizenship Education" that identified the problem of civic apathy among American citizens, offered an explanation, and proposed steps the Task Force would be taking to foster civic engagement through citizenship education (APSA, 1997, p. 745).

In 1998, the membership of the Task Force expanded to fifteen, adding two more female political scientists to the list. The same year, the Task Force released a two-page progress report, "Expanded articulation statement: A call for reactions and contributions," in which it conceded that political scientists' emphasis on teaching about government in citizenship education may have contributed to the engendering of "unhealthy cynicism and political disengagement" in the American polity (APSA, 1998, p. 636). The document suggested that citizenship education should emphasize teaching virtues, tolerance, collaboration, analysis, and traditions. This was the last statement the APSA released on the subject of citizenship education or the teaching of political science in the pre-collegiate context. The Task Force wrapped up its activities in 2002. Melvin J. Dubnick (2003), the co-chair of the Task Force, lamented that the Task Force did not leave any noteworthy legacy behind.

5 Discussion

First, between 1908 and 1998, the APSA's seven committees and one Task Force released seven reports and three brief statements on citizenship education. No evidence is available to suggest that the APSA released any other reports or statements on the subject of pre-collegiate citizenship education. Indeed, in their private capacity, some political scientists may have conducted research on citizenship education. However, for our purpose, we are concerned exclusively with the reports and statements that the APSA, as an organization, authorized and approved.

Second, since the ten documents were written in different historical contexts, they reflect not only the moods of the historical periods in which they were written but also the extant paradigms in political science. A review of the conceptual frameworks presented in the documents suggests that they may be divided into three different categories. Each group of documents repre-



sents the APSA's three distinct approaches to and visions for the pre-collegiate citizenship education, i.e., Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism.

Third, the first five (5) reports (1908, 1916, 1922, 1925, 1939) consider the study of the structure and functions of the government as sine qua non for citizenship education. Those five reports categorically claim that all roads to citizenship lead through the study of the institutions of the state (APSA, 1922, p. 117). In other words, the five reports considered the state to be the unit of analysis and, therefore, recommended that students must complete a course in government to graduate from high school and, also that teacher training programs must include a civics course for teacher certification. In addition, the five reports emphatically rejected the notion that citizenship education was an interdisciplinary field. The APSA asserted its desire that it wanted a proprietary control over the subject of civics, and expressed its angst when it discovered that the existing civics curriculum included other social sciences; it declared that the civics course in schools should include only political science or the study of government, and nothing else. To promote its agenda, the APSA not only engaged in a propaganda campaign but also lobbied state legislators for making the teaching of political science mandatory for high school graduation and teacher certification. As an independent learned society, the APSA sought to secure its monopoly over the construction of knowledge.

A question may be raised about the APSA's motive behind its activities. Was it patriotism that the APSA was promoting? The first five reports certainly do not mention patriotism. Besides, patriotism is a normative activity and the APSA was projecting itself as the purveyor of the scientific study of politics. Patriotism was an activity for other civic, philanthropic, and professional societies, such as American Bar Association, the American Legion, and the National League's Committee on Constitutional Instruction that had taken political measures towards enacting laws mandating the teaching of government and civics courses in schools. Their goal was to inculcate patriotism in millions of American citizens, mostly new immigrants, who they believed not to be "devotedly loyal to the United States" (APSA, 1925, p. 207).

The APSA's objectives were different from philanthropic organizations in that its interest in the matter was not related to patriotism—it sought to carve out a niche for political science in the pre-collegiate educational arena under the garb of citizenship education. In addition, the APSA considered itself the sole authority on the contents of civics; its interest in promoting the teaching of civics or government courses was therefore markedly different from the civic organizations' normative and public welfare missions. More importantly, whereas civic organizations focused their attention on society and its myriad problems, the APSA's constitution of 1903 called for "the encouragement of the scientific study of politics, public law, administration and diplomacy" (APSA, 1903, p. 5). Nonetheless, the APSA's

activities suggest that it promoted a normative agenda as well which was to establish and strengthen the national state (Gunnell, 1995; Dryzek, 2006).

Fourth, the reports of 1951 and 1971 recommended a central role for political science in pre-collegiate citizenship education. However, the two reports discard the APSA's time-honored approach to citizenship education. The two reports proposed an innovative conceptual framework that relegated the study of the state institutions to the margins and recognized the individual and his behavior as the unit of analysis in citizenship education. For example, the 1951 report noted that formal knowledge of governmental institutions was not sufficient to inculcate democratic attitudes. In a sense, by not stressing instruction in government, the authors of the 1951 report repudiated the state-centric Traditionalist approach to citizenship and citizenship education.

Thus, as a research method and, as a movement, Behavioralism was a significant conceptual about-face in political science. The early proponents of Behavioralism were political scientists Charles E. Merriam and Harold Lasswell and their graduate students at the University of Chicago. In 1925, in his inaugural address as the APSA president, Merriam introduced the idea of scientific research methods in political science. In 1925, Merriam also published a book *New Aspects of Politics* that explained development in political science and made the case for the scientific method, a method popular in other social sciences such as psychology and sociology. It was a revolutionary orientation. From then on, political scientists borrowed research ideas from other social sciences, such as psychology, sociology, and anthropology, and began introducing them into political science (Waldo 1975).

After the Second World War, Behavioralism emerged as a new paradigm or a research program in political science and its proponents received generous financial support from philanthropic foundations such as Carnegie Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, and Ford Foundation. Behavioralism became popular when three authors, Paul F. Lazarfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet (1944) published their *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. It would be fair to posit that this book revolutionized social sciences, including political science.

Yale University political scientist Robert Dahl (1961) notes that in contrast with the Traditionalist paradigm that focused on the study of the state, the new generation of political scientists applied opinion survey methods to study citizens' political behavior, attitude, and opinions. Because political scientists who served on the APSA committees of 1951 and 1971 belonged to a generation of scholars who were part of a protest movement, i.e., Behavioralism, I call their approach Behavioralist, which is to a large extent, reflected in the two reports.

Thus the APSA's reports of 1951 and 1971 present a conception of citizenship that was different from the Traditionalist conception presented in the earlier five reports. Instead of a state-centric approach embodied in

the APSA's first five reports, the reports of 1951 and 1971 seek to promote a value-neutral approach that, like other social sciences, underscores empiricism, formulation and testing of hypotheses, and ordering of evidence. Informed by Behavioralism, the two reports recommended the teaching of inquiry, opinion survey, cognitive skills, hypothesis testing, and empirical methods in citizenship education.

Fifth, the APSA's last three brief statements were released in 1996, 1997, and 1998 by its Task Force on Civic Education for the Twenty-First Century. The Task Force's primary mission was to foster civic engagement. All three statements were published in the APSA's official publication, *PS: Political Science and Politics*. The brevity of the statements somehow demonstrates a lack of urgency on the part of the APSA towards citizenship education. Nonetheless, the Task Force's Expanded Articulation Statement of 1998 showed political scientists' volte-face on the teaching of government for the purpose of citizenship education: The Task Force recommended a complete departure from its predecessors' prescriptions, both Traditionalist and Behavioralist, by offering an alternative prescription which was that teaching "virtues", "diversity", "tolerance", and "collaboration" were vital for citizenship education.

One may question why the Task Force would use such normative language that could not be found in the APSA's prior seven reports. Neither Traditionalist nor Behavioralists mentioned words like "diversity", "tolerance" and "virtues". Indeed, the Task Force suggested that teaching values were vital for good citizenship. Although the three statements are very brief, they mirror the sentiments of the Task Force members. More importantly, the statements are a repudiation of the previous two conceptions of citizenship education: Traditionalist and Behavioralist. Clearly, this approach was society-centered because it highlighted the basic social problems that plagued American democracy in the late Twentieth-century. Since the new approach stepped away from a value-neutral to a value-laden framework, it may be called the Post-behavioralist approach. This approach shied away from studying either the institutions of the state, as Traditionalist had promoted or, the individual's behavior, as Behavioralist had proposed; instead, it underscored the study of societal problems.

To understand the sentiments of the members of the Task Force concerning citizenship education, that they expressed in Expanded Articulation Statement in 1998, it is first necessary to learn about the participants as people as well as their research orientation in the discipline of political science. One key fact to mention is that six of the fifteen members of the Task Force were female, which never happened in previous committees. One woman who served as co-chair of the Task Force was Jean Bethke Elshtain, philosopher of peace and feminism from the Divinity School of the University of Chicago; she was well-known and widely published. Another woman member was the APSA's president, Elinor Ostrom whose research focused on ordinary peo-

ple in different societies. One female member was political scientist Mary Hepburn who had an extensive experience in building bridges between college professors and school teachers. Similarly, the other three female scholars had also accomplished a great deal in political science and were well known in the profession. Thus the composition of the Task Force was different from the APSA's former committees in that gender equity received full attention here. In a sense, the membership of the Task Force reflected not only the reality of the advances in social and gender relations in the late twentieth century but also mirrored social and paradigmatic shifts within the field of political science. One could argue that as liberal and progressive orientation in political science, Post-behavioralism had opened doors to fresh ideas and new people.

What then differentiates the Post-behavioralist paradigm from the Behavioralist paradigm and what doctrine it proposed on citizenship education? The term, Post-behavioralism, became well-known among the late twentieth-century political scientists. In fact, the term was coined by the David Easton, the president of the APSA in 1969. Easton also served on the APSA committee that prepared the 1971 report. If Behavioralism was a protest movement against the Traditionalist paradigm in political science, Post-behavioralism challenged the orthodoxy of empiricism in Behavioralist political science. Whereas Behaviorists focused on value-neutral political research, values were at the core of the Behavioralist research. Also, whereas Behavioralism promoted apolitical political science, Post-behavioralists fostered the importance of relevance and social action for change. Research techniques and sophistication were less important for Post-behavioralists than substance.

Easton (1969) noted that since the Behavioralist paradigm in political science failed to explain or predict the myriad social, racial, economic, political and international problems of the 1960s and 1970s, it had become irrelevant as a research agenda. Easton argued that it was one of political scientists' social responsibilities to "improve political life according to humane criteria" (Easton, 1969).

Thus the Task Force's Articulation Statement of 1998 was consistent with the Post-behavioralist credo that the liberal purpose of citizenship education was to teach citizens to aspire to freedom, dignity, and equality, and to play active roles as political actors in all social settings, including labor unions, church governance, and corporate management (APSA 1998, p. 636).

Nonetheless, none of the Task Force's three statements discussed any practical solutions, such as: a) how the Task Force would collaborate with public school communities to improve citizenship education; b) what curriculum to be recommended to schools; and c) what goals were to be achieved and how? In essence, the three statements were no more than mere identification of the problem, i.e., the lack of civic engagement in American democracy.



6 Conclusion

The APSA's activities with respect to the pre-collegiate citizenship education curriculum have generated a body of literature that sheds light on the complex nature of the relationship between the academic discipline of political science and pre-collegiate citizenship education. A review of the literature generated three inter-related questions: a) what different conceptions of citizenship did the APSA promote in the twentieth century; b) did paradigm shifts within the discipline of political science, in any way, influence political scientists' conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education; and c) what variables may explain the rise and decline of the APSA's level of activities in pre-collegiate citizenship education?

Thus this exploratory historical inquiry seeks to ferret out plausible explanations for the above three questions by examining the primary sources: the APSA's ten reports and statements—all released between 1908 and 1998. These documents represent the trajectory of the APSA's evolving approaches to the idea of citizenship and the citizenship education curriculum for the public schools. The APSA released its first five reports (1908, 1916, 1922, 1925, 1939) during its Traditionalist phase prescribing the scientific study of the structure and functions of the state and presenting it as citizenship education. In so doing, the APSA struggled to eliminate all other social sciences from the civics curriculum except political science; that is to say, the APSA defined civics as political science. Thus, for Traditionalist political scientists, the purpose of citizenship education was limited to the study of the political organs of the nation-state—in their view, other social sciences had a peripheral status. Moreover, based on the evidence, one could argue that with its early and persistent efforts the APSA succeeded in canonizing its Traditionalist conception of citizenship education—a state-centric world-view—in the school curriculum.

However, the Traditionalist paradigm in political science lost its intellectual luster when other social sciences—psychology and sociology—emerged in academia that emphasized the empirical study of the human behavior and society. Influenced by psychology and sociology, the new generation of political scientists questioned the validity of Traditionalism as a useful research paradigm and, therefore, introduced Behavioralism as a new research paradigm into the discipline of political science.

Behavioralism promoted a value-neutral political research methodology—it presented politics as an apolitical activity. Unlike the Traditionalist approach, the APSA's two committees of 1951 and 1971, underscored the teaching and learning of empirical methods, formulation and testing of hypotheses, and constructing theories. Political scientists authored several high school textbooks from the Behavioralist perspective which underscored the scientific study of the voters' behavior.

After the APSA released its 1971 report, Behaviorists jettisoned any normative activity, such as citizenship education. The scientism of the Behavioralist paradigm was found to be inadequate and was challenged by the

society-centered political scientists, namely, the Post-behavioralists. Even though the Post-behavioralists claimed that they considered substance to be more important than methodology, and values more important than objectivity, there is no documentary evidence to suggest that their liberal rhetoric yielded any concrete results for the pre-collegiate citizenship education curriculum.

As compared with the achievements of Traditionalists and Behaviorists, the Post-behavioralists actually ignored citizenship education altogether as a meaningful activity. To be fair to Post-behavioralists, the Task Force, which included the APSA's two presidents—Elinor Ostrom and Robert Putnam—did suggest certain progressive ideas to be included in the school curriculum; however, in the words of its co-chair, Melvin Dubnick, the Task Force was wrapped up in 2002 and "did not leave any legacy" (Dubnick, 2003, p. 253).

All three paradigms in political science—Traditionalism, Behavioralism, and Post-behavioralism—were orientations, world-views. More importantly, the three paradigms may be viewed as three distinct ideologies about the construction of knowledge. The state-centric ideology demonstrated its power and influence over the school curriculum and hence shaped it to achieve its desired goal which was to strengthen the nation-state. In comparison with Traditionalism, the proponents of both Behavioralism and Post-behavioralism failed to assert their impact on the citizenship education curriculum and quickly became irrelevant.

Based on the APSA's first five reports, one may theorize that three independent variables may have contributed to the rise of the APSA's activities in regard to citizenship education in the schools. First, in its Traditionalist phase, establishing political science as an independent academic subject was a major motive. Second, the APSA faced a formidable and experienced competitor—American Historical Association (AHA)—that had established its roots in the school curriculum. To carve out a niche for political science, the APSA committees had to work harder than the AHA to promote political science both as a genuine science and as citizenship education. Third, in its Traditionalist phase, the APSA used political lobbying to make the teaching of political science mandatory for high school graduation. Hence the Traditionalist conception of citizenship and citizenship education which captured the intellectual beachhead in the school curriculum during the early twentieth century remained canonized for over a century and could not be challenged or replaced. This suggests that the ideological antecedents of the current American model of citizenship education may be traced to the Traditionalist approach promoted by the founders of the American Political Science Association.

References

- Allen, J. (1966). Political science in the teaching of secondary school history. In Riddle, D.; Cleary, R. (Eds.), *Political science in the social studies* (pp. 273-285). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Anyon, J. (1978). Elementary social studies textbooks and legitimating knowledge. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 6(3), 40-55.
- APSA. (1908). APSA Committee of Five (APSA). 1908. Report of the Committee of Five of the American Political Science Association on Instruction in American Government in Secondary Schools. *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association* 5, 219-57.
- APSA. (1916). *The teaching of government*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- APSA. (1922). The study of civics. *American Political Science Review*, 16 (1), 116-25.
- APSA. (1925). Report of the APSA Committee of Five. *Historical Outlook* 16 (5), 207-11.
- APSA. (1939). Committee on Cooperation with NCSS Report. General Education Board Collection, 1-3, fol. GO32. Tarrytown, N.Y.: Rockefeller Archives Center.
- APSA. (1951). Teaching. *Goals for political science*. New York, NY: William Sloane Associates, Inc.
- APSA. (1971). Political education in the public schools: The challenge for political science. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 4, 431-57.
- APSA Committee on Education 1991-1993. (1994). APSA guidelines for teacher training: Recommendation for certifying pre-college teachers of civics, government, and social studies. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 27(2), 261-262.
- APSA. (1996). Citizenship education for the next century: A task force to initiate professional activity. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 4, 755-8.
- APSA. (1997). Statement of purpose of the American Political Science Association Task Force on Citizenship Education. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 4, 745.
- APSA. (1998). Task Force on Citizenship education in the next century, expanded articulation statement: A call for reactions and contributions. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 31, 636-7.
- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Bennett, S. (1999). The past need not be prologue: Why pessimism about civic education is premature. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 4, 755-7.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1990). *Political scientists on citizenship education: A non-existent discourse*. Report No. So 020 785. East Lansing, MI: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Elementary Subjects, Institute for Research on Teaching. ERIC Document: ED 318669.
- Cremin, L. (1980). *American Education: The National Experience, 1783-1876*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Crick, B. (1959). *The American science of politics: Its origins and conditions*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Curti, M. (1978). *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Co.
- Dahl, R. (1961). The behavioral approach in political science: Epitaph for a movement to a successful protest. *American Political Science Review*, 55(4), 763-772.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Libraries.
- Dryzek, J. S. (2006). Revolutions without enemies: Key transformations in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 100(4), 487-492.
- Dubnick, M. J. (2003). Nurturing civic lives: Developmental perspectives on civic education: Introduction. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 36(2), 253-255.
- Easton, D. (1969). New revolution in political science. *American Political Science Review*, 63(4), 1051-1061.
- Elshstain, J. B. (1974). Moral woman and moral man: A consideration of the public-private split and its political ramifications. *Politics and Society*, 4, 453-474.
- Elshstain, J. B. (1981). *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Fesler, J., Hartz, L., Hollowell, J. (1951). Goals for political science: A discussion. *American Political Science Review*, 45 (4), 996-1024.
- Ford, H. J. (1905). The scope of political science. *Proceedings of the American Political Science Association*, 2, 198-206.
- Gunnell, J. G. (1995). The declination of the 'state' and the origins of the American political science. In Farr, J.; Dryzek, S.; Leonard, S.T. (eds.). *Political Science in History: Research Programs and Political Traditions*. NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Hepburn, M. A. (1975). Bridging political science and political education in the schools. *Teaching Political Science*, 2(3), 345-352.
- Hepburn, M. A. (1987). Improving political science education in the schools: College-school connections. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 20(3), 691-697.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). *Social studies reform 1880-1980*. Boulder, Colo.: Social Science Education Consortium.

- Kirkpatrick, E; Kirkpatrick, J. (1962). Political science In Hunt, E., (ed.), *High school social studies: perspectives*, (120-125). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Kliebard, H. (2004). *Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893-1958*, 3rd ed., New York: Routledge.
- Lazarfeld, P., Berelson, B., Gaudet, H. (1944). *People's Choice: How the Voter Makes up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Leonard, S. T. (1999). The pedagogical purposes of a political science. *PS: Political science and politics*, 4, 749-754.
- Mann, S. (1996). Political scientists examine civics standards: Introduction. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 29(1), 47-49.
- Merriam, C. E. (1934). *Citizenship education in the United States*. New York: Scribner's Sons.
- Munro, W. B. (1928). Physics and politics—an old analogy revisited. *American Political Science Review*, 22, 1-11.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Expectations of excellence: Curriculum standards for social studies*. Washington, D.C.: NCSS.
- Niemi, R; Junn, J. (1998). *Citizenship education: What makes students learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Niemi, R; Junn, J. (2005). *Citizenship education: What makes students learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Patrick, J; Hoge, J. (1991). Teaching government, civics, and law. In Shaver, J. P. (ed.), *Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning*, (427-436). New York: Macmillan International.
- Pettersch, C. A. (1953). The teaching of government in the United States with special reference to secondary schools from 1861 to 1930. Ph.D. diss., Columbia University.
- Prifold, C. (1962). *A history of the American Political Science Association's activities in the field of secondary education in government, 1904-1962*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6 (1), 65-78.
- Quillen, I. J. (1966). Government-oriented courses in the secondary school curriculum. In Cleary, R. and Riddle, D. (eds.), *Political science in the social studies, thirty-sixth yearbook*, (254-72). Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Ravitch, D. (2007). History's struggle to survive in schools. *OAH Magazine of History*, 21(2), 28-32.
- Ricci, D. (1984). *The tragedy of political science: Politics, scholarship, and democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ross, D. (1992). *The Origins of American Social Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schachter, H. L. (1998). Citizenship education: Three early American Political Science Association committees and their relevance for our times. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 31, 631-5.
- Schaper, W. A. (1906). What do students know about American government before taking college courses in political science? *Journal of Pedagogy* 18, 265-88.
- Shaver, J. P.; Knight, R. S. (1986). Civics and government in citizenship education. In Wronski, S. P.; Bragaw, D. H. (eds.), *Social studies and social sciences: A fifty-year perspective*, (71-84). Bulletin No. 78. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Somit, A; Tanenhaus, J. (1967). *The development of American political science: From Burgess to Behavioralism*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tryon, R. M. (1935). *The social sciences as school subjects*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Turner, M. J. (1978). Political education in the United States: History, status, critical analysis and an alternative model. Ph.D. diss., University of Colorado at Boulder.
- Turner, M. J. (1981). Civic education in the United States. In *Political education in flux*. In Heater, D.; Gillespie, J. A. (eds.), (pp. 49-80). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.