7-15-1976

Indoctrination in Oregon public schools, 1947-1975

Daniel W. Dodge
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Dodge, Daniel W., "Indoctrination in Oregon public schools, 1947-1975" (1976). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 2447.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.2443>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF Daniel W. Dodge for the Master of Science in Political Science presented July 15, 1976.

Title: Indoctrination in Oregon Public Schools

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE THESIS COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]
Ralph Bunch, Chairman

[REDACTED]
Charles White

[REDACTED]
James Heath

The purpose of this study is to examine indoctrination in Oregon public schools during the period from 1947 to 1975. More specifically, it seeks to define and analyze the assumed changeable and dynamic aspect of indoctrination. The major hypothesis to be tested is that indoctrination has declined in strength during the test period.

After consideration of definitional, etymological, philosophical, and historical evidence, the term "indoctrination" was operationally defined as "a system of aims established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development of the individual". Indoctrination, so conceptualized, means concentration on the intentions of indoctrination, rather than actual results. The focus is upon what results are sought by authorities. This strongly suggests the nature of the data that was

chosen. The data utilized consisted of instructional aims published by the Oregon State Board of Education. Consistent with the operational definition of indoctrination, the State Board is the aim-making authority.

The data was obtained from a series of instructional guides published by the Oregon Department of Education. These guides contained instructional aims as approved by the State Board. Years chosen for analysis were 1947, 1955, 1966, and 1975. Except for 1947, the universe of general instruction aims and the social studies aims were selected for study. The 1947 guide had no general aims listed. Consequently, only social studies aims were utilized for analysis.

Four judges rated all selected aims on a least-to-most Q-sort scale, using the variable indoctrination. A composite correlation revealed a .993 judge agreement. The results of the study indicate that there was no significant difference at the .05 level among the years that were tested, except for 1955 which showed a significantly higher degree of indoctrination. As a consequence, the declining indoctrination hypothesis was rejected.

INDOCTRINATION IN OREGON

PUBLIC SCHOOLS

1947 - 1975

by

DANIEL W. DODGE

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
POLITICAL SCIENCE

Portland State University
1976

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the thesis of
Daniel W. Dodge presented July 15, 1976.

Ralph Bunch, Chairman

Charles White

James Heath

APPROVED:

Norman Green, Head, Department of Political Science

Richard Halley, Acting Dean of Graduate Studies and Research

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would be remiss if I did not recognize my lasting indebtedness to those who assisted me in this endeavor. Dr. Ralph Bunch of Portland State University was of constant encouragement to me. I am also grateful to Joyce Follingstad and Cynthia Griggins for their help in the preparation of the manuscript.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Dynamic Nature of Indoctrination.....	1
Political Philosophy and Indoctrination....	5
Indoctrination in Modern Nations.....	9
National Socialist Germany, 1933-1945..	9
USSR.....	13
USA.....	18
II CONCEPTUALIZATIONS.....	29
Ideology and the Political Process.....	29
Ideology: Historical Development of the	
Concept.....	31
The Education/Indoctrination Dichotomy.....	39
Definitions and Development of Education/	
Indoctrination.....	40
Distinguishing Education from Indoctrina-	
tion by Content, Method and Aim....	45
Operational Definitions.....	53

CHAPTER	PAGE
III	METHODOLOGY..... 63
	State Board of Education and Aim-Making
	Authority..... 63
	Sampling Methodology..... 65
	Q-Sort Methodology..... 68
	Pre-Test and Experiment..... 71
IV	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION..... 77
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION..... 92
	REFERENCES..... 97
APPENDIX	
A	Instructional Aims As Presented in Oregon State
	Department of Education Publications..... 102
B	Unitized Aims..... 111
C	Deleted Instructional Aims..... 123
D	Pre-Test and Q-Sort Test Subjects..... 124
E	Coding Judge Instruction Sheet..... 125

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I Patterns of Belief Systems.....	38
II Number of Instructional Aims by Year and Curricular Area.....	68
III Scale for Coding Instructional Aims.....	69
IV Inter-Judge Correlations.....	78
V Mean Category-Values for Social Study Aims.....	81
VI Mean Category-Values for General Aims.....	81
VII Mean Category-Values for Social Studies and General Aims.....	84

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
1 Least-to-most indoctrination scale.....	59
2 Mean category-values for the test period.....	83

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Dynamic Nature of Indoctrination

Schools in America are political institutions; they are subject to many of the same pressures and, to some degree, greater amounts of pressure than other institutions supported by the public. This seems to suggest indoctrination may have a dynamic rather than a static or stable nature. For example, schools may be more or less indoctrinative depending on the general political climate. "The school is under constant pressure from the community it serves; in some periods the pressure is more intense than in others, but it never really dies down."¹ A recent demonstration of this point was the phenomenon of "McCarthyism". Teachers were fired and textbooks rewritten for not expressing the "proper" view. "During the Joseph McCarthy era, mere accusation of 'red influence' was sufficient to frighten many school officials into firing teachers or removing books from school libraries."²

It is suggested that this dynamic nature of indoctrination can, in addition, be illustrated in Oregon Public Schools. During and in the aftermath of McCarthyism, schools probably exhibited more indoctrination than today. Such indoctrination was especially prevalent in the social studies programs of the

public schools. "To mold good Americans" stated the Oregon Department of Education in 1955, "this then is the highest goal of American social studies instruction."³ In the same publication, Rex Putnam, took a similar view regarding the goal of social studies instruction in the public school:

The first and foremost task of high school social studies teachers is to imbue their students with a deep and sincere love of their country. . . The prime objective is to develop concepts of loyalty, patriotism, moral and spiritual values, and the privileges and responsibilities of good citizenship.⁴

The purpose of this study is to assess the dynamic nature of indoctrination in the public schools of Oregon. Specifically, the hypothesis to be tested is that the public schools system in Oregon has become less indoctrinative during the test period which extends from 1947 to 1975. It is believed that Oregon schools have, in the past, and at least implicitly, tended to promote the development of "closed minds". The overall intent, whether conscious or not, was to fix certain normative beliefs and produce individuals with an ideology that was considered "desirable" by those in authority. Consider, for example, the following statement made by the school authorities in 1955 regarding the purpose of social studies instruction:

The first task of social studies teachers is to imbue students with a deep and sincere love of their country and to emphasize the sanctity of the individual as a part of the philosophy of a free people in contrast to the untenable concept of an omnipotent state controlling the lives of individuals. The social studies program is designed to constantly impress students with the ideas and principles under-

lying our government as expressed in the Constitution, laws, institutions and customs of the people of the United States of America. As important as are the other phases of the social studies, the development of concepts of loyalty, patriotism, moral and spiritual values, privileges and responsibilities of good citizenship as well as an understanding and appreciation of individual enterprise as a keystone of our economic structure is basic and imperative.

In addition to the development of citizens who are enthusiastic concerning the American way of life and our form of government, social studies objectives include the development of educated persons who are personally effective, who enjoy satisfactory social relationships and who are economically competent. To this end, social studies teachers accept a leadership role in working with other staff members of the school. They strive especially to give all students as complete an understanding, appreciation, and true faith in the American way of life as they are capable of, together with the character and tools essential to live in it.⁵

Such intentions as "to imbue students with a deep and sincere love of their country", "development of the concepts of loyalty, patriotism, moral and spiritual values", and "to give all students as complete an understanding, appreciation, and true faith in the American way of life" are all examples of an attempt to substantively affect the development of each individual's ideology. The result of exposure to the school system was a tendency to create students with fixed ideologies and closed belief systems with regard to such attitudes values, and beliefs.

Consider, now, the following statement made by the same authority in 1975 regarding the purpose of social studies instruction:

Social studies education is concerned with enhancement of human dignity through learning and commitment

to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end. Although this dual purpose is shared with other curricular areas, it clearly directs the particular purposes and the guidelines for social studies education.

Human dignity means equal access to the rights and responsibilities associated with membership in a culture. . . . The idea of human dignity is dynamic and complex, and its definition likely to vary according to time and place. The essential meaning, however, remains unchanged; each person should have opportunity to know, to choose, and to act.

Rational processes refer to any systematic intellectual efforts to generate, validate, or apply knowledge. They subsume both the logical and empirical modes of knowing as well as strategies for evaluating and decision-making. Rationality denotes a critical and questioning approach to knowledge but also implies a need for discovering, proposing, and creating; the rational individual doubts but also believes. The ultimate power of rational process resides in the explicit recognition of each person's opportunity to decide for himself/herself in accord with the evidence available, the values he/she chooses, and the rules of logic. Therein lies the link between human dignity and the rational process.⁶

This statement of purpose seems much closer to promoting an "open mind" than does the statement of twenty years before. The intention was still to produce an individual with an ideology that is considered "desirable" by the aim-making authority. However, the emphasis is on promoting a general rationality rather than a host of specific substantive attitudes, values, and beliefs. The impression is that the individual will decide on such specifics for himself. As a result, it is assumed that the individual's set of beliefs will be relatively free to grow in an independent fashion rather than be restricted and channelled by an authority. On the basis of these two statements of purpose, the hypothesis that the public school system in Oregon has become less

indoctrinative seems tenable at the least.

Political Philosophy and Indoctrination

. . . the full sum of me . . .
 Is an unlesson'd girl,
 unschool'd, unpractised,
 Happy in this, she
 is not yet so old
 But she may learn:
 happier than this,
 She is not bred so dull
 but she can learn;
 Happiest of all, is that her
 gentle spirit
 Commits itself to yours
 to be directed.

--Portia addresses her future
 husband in Shakespeare's
Merchant of Venice

Political behavior is determined to some degree by ideology, i.e., what men believe and value. If this is true, then the public schools provide, perhaps, the state with the greatest opportunity for the manipulation of these governors of behaviors. This fact has not escaped the notice of political and social philosophers, theorists and critics. The idea of manipulating members of society by way of indoctrination in the formal school system is certainly not new or novel. In the case of political philosophy, it dates back to ancient times.

Plato was perhaps the first to recognize the value of indoctrination to transform children into "good citizens" in his conception of the ideal state. In the Republic, Plato devised an extensive state-operated instructional program. He conceived political stability as a concomitant of the

proper indoctrination of the citizen. Citizens must be taught their proper societal roles to eliminate any possibility that would disturb the tranquillity and stability of the ideal state. The collective, in short, took priority over the individual. In addition, Plato was not above authoritarian methods to implement his program. He called for the separation of parent and child to speed the transition to his ideal state:

All above ten years of age in the city . . . must be sent out into the country; and all the children among them must be taken charge of and kept outside their present surroundings and the ways of life led by their parents; and the reformers must bring them up in their own ways and customs, which are such as we have described already. Thus most easily and most quickly, don't you agree, the city and constitution we described will be established . . .⁷

In the Far East, another ancient scholar emphasized the need for indoctrination of the people. Confucius, like Plato, recognized the link between "training better citizens" and securing the stability of particular political regimes. Force and coercion had no place in Confucius' conception of political control, however. In contrast to Plato, Confucius believed in the eminence of the family as a transfer device. Where Plato believed in the centrality of formal schooling to secure stability, Confucius understood the process to be centered on the family. The family would inculcate certain general values (e.g., respect for authority) that would later be transferred to the state.

In the words of Confucius:

Where there is righteousness in the heart,
 There will be beauty in the character,
 Where there is beauty in the character,
 There will be harmony in the home,
 Where there is harmony in the home,
 There will be order in the nation,
 Where there is order in the nation,
 There will be peace in the world.⁸

In more recent history of political thinking, Sir Thomas More was a believer in the value of indoctrinating people with the "proper values". In his satire on Sixteenth Century England, Utopia, More stressed the great importance of teaching "good opinions" to the young for the expressed purpose of maintenance and stability of the state. Accordingly, in his conception, teachers in Utopia

. . . use very great endeavor and diligence to put into the heads of their children while they yet be tender and pliant, good opinions and profitable for the conservation of their weal public. Which when they be once rooted in children do remain with them all their life after, and be wondrous profitable for the defense and maintence of the state of the commonwealth, which never decayeth but through vices rising of evil opinions.⁹

Probably the most controversial author to deal with childhood indoctrination was Jean-Jacques Rousseau. On the one hand he has been credited for being very strongly opposed to any type of indoctrination:

Rousseau, for instance, protested vociferously against treating children as little mannikins, as material to be poured into an adult mold. A child, he argued, should be treated with respect as a person.¹⁰

In contrast, Jean Jacques Rousseau has also been credited with emphasizing the necessity to indoctrinate and train citizens into conformity. He has been accused of contin-

ually expressing his conviction that the basis for social life resides in the instruction of the young, and zealously promoting citizen training. "Rousseau stands out as one of the most enthusiastic advocates of childhood political indoctrination."¹¹

The reason for these conflicting views of Rousseau with regard to indoctrination is simply that during his lifetime he underwent a metamorphosis. In Emile, one of his earlier books, he advocated individual, domestic instruction. The child would be free to explore the world on his own inclination with a tutor to help but not direct in this endeavor. This instruction was viewed by Rousseau as irreconcilable with indoctrinating for citizenship:

. . . we must choose between making a man or making a citizen. We cannot make both. There is an inevitable conflict of aims, from which come two opposing forms of education: the one communal and public, the other individual and domestic.¹²

However, Rousseau did in the end finally reconcile the individual/collective dichotomy. Emile, the personified image of Rousseau's thoughts, finally ends up after his isolation from communal influence as a country gentleman in full membership of the community he serves.

Eleven years after the publication of Emile, Rousseau's metamorphosis was complete. He was an advocate of childhood indoctrination. In a book titled The Government of Poland, Rousseau strongly urges the adoption of a national instructional program to fashion the minds of young Poles:

. . . it is education that you must count on to shape the souls in a national pattern and so to direct their opinions, their likes, and dislikes that they shall be patriotic by inclination, passionately of necessity.¹³

In addition, Rousseau paradoxically and perhaps sarcastically equates national education, freedom and servitude:

Truly national education belongs exclusively to men who are free; they and they only enjoy a common existence; they and they only are genuinely bound together by laws. Your Frenchman . . . Englishman . . . and your Russian are all pretty much the same man; and that man emerges from school already shaped for license, which is to say for servitude. When the Pole reaches the age of twenty, he must be a Pole, not some other kind of man.¹⁴

Indoctrination in Modern Nations

As with political theory and philosophy, indoctrination for actual political purposes has certainly not been only a product of modern nation-states. Although such is the usual conception, indoctrination is a common practice even in the most simple societies. Simple societies rely less on formal institutions such as the school, however. A low degree of social change provides for a stable transfer of the traditional ideology. Generally the family is considered the most important device for inculcating the ideas considered to be proper. In contrast, modern states probably rely more heavily on formal school systems to inculcate the "proper" belief system.

National Socialist Germany, 1933 - 1945

There can be little doubt of the intentions of the National Socialist Party in Germany during the period between

1933 and 1945. The Nazi regime intended to and successfully did indoctrinate a generation of German youth. Adolf Hitler expressed confidence in the power of the "right instruction" as a method of maintaining power. According to Hitler, the "reeducation" of the German people was the key factor for a successful revolution. In a speech at Paderborn, Germany, in 1933, the new German Chancellor discussed his method for assuring the success of the just completed National Socialist revolution:

The new state will be a product of phantasy if it does not create new people. For nearly two and a half thousand years virtually all revolutions have failed because their leaders have not realized the essential factor in making a revolution is not the assumption of power but the education of the people.¹⁵

Preventing the National Socialist's revolution from failing was not the only purpose that Hitler put this method to. The "education of the people" method was utilized to prepare the German population for World War II:

Hitler believed that in his own ideology he possessed the right principles for building a powerful Germany that would resume the battle for German supremacy. Before this war could be won abroad, it first had to be won at home by the destruction of liberalism, socialism, and communism as well as the implementation of a common ideology that would make the people immune to foreign propaganda and ready to fight with unmatched determination for race superiority.¹⁶

The National Socialists, after assuming power in Germany in January 1933, "set out to create new people who would be thoroughly indoctrinated in the Nazi ideology."¹⁷ They conceived of education as a continual process taking place on all levels of experience. However, they recognized

the difficulty inherent in the socialization of the older members of society, and thus concentrated on the young children. The Third Reich expressed great confidence in the power of indoctrinating German youth.

Revolutions sometimes demand the creation of new institutions, and this was the case after the National Socialists assumed power in Germany in 1933. The Hitler Youth was probably the most important of these new institutions. Its purpose was to teach the German youth the functions of the state and, by ethical, physical and political training, prepare the young for proper participation in the German State. Those students who did not belong to the Hitler Youth received at minimum two periods of National Socialist political instruction per week. By 1936, all students were compelled to join the Hitler Youth.

Although new institutions such as the Hitler Youth made a substantial contribution to the thorough indoctrination of the German young in the National Socialist concept of the state, their creative ideas "never came as close to replacing the traditional school as an important mold of the mind as some of them liked to believe."¹⁸ Political education, as before the Nazi takeover, for the most part remained in the realm of the regular school system. For the younger children in the six to ten age group, the school maintained the major responsibility. However, it did share responsibility with the Hitler Youth for older children.

The overall objective or aim of the National Socialist

system of instruction was to indoctrinate the German children with the National Socialist Weltanschauung. Although difficult to translate into English, this term has a meaning similar to "standard of values", "philosophy of life", or "attitudes towards things". However, the National Socialist usage had a mystical connotation. English translations do not convey the subtler meaning of the term. Weltanschauung was a feeling and a faith more than anything else. It bordered on a religion.

According to German Minister of the Interior, Wilhelm Frick, the objective or aim of the German schools in 1933 was "to educate the political man, who, in all thoughts and dealings, is rooted, serving and self-sacrificing, in his people, and who is united at heart and inseparable with the history and the fate of his country."¹⁹ Kneller, in a pre-World War II study of the educational philosophy of National Socialism, arrived at much the same conclusion:

National Socialism does not hesitate to admit that youth begins to be indoctrinated with its principles at the tender age of six, the purpose being to effect "a single system of the training of youth in the service of a single political will".²⁰

There appears to be substantial evidence that the National Socialists did in fact indoctrinate the German youth. But what about contemporary nations; do they indoctrinate? According to American educator and philosopher Frederick C. Gruber, there exists:

. . . a contest for the minds of men. The conflict of ideologies between the communist and the free world is now being waged in the classrooms of the

world, for education is one of the most powerful weapons devised by men to confound their enemies and to perpetuate their way of life.²¹

Whether this "education" Gruber refers to is indoctrination is a difficult question to answer. However, Jonathan Kozol is more explicit in his critical indictment of both the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.:

The first goal and primary junction of the U.S. public school is not to educate good people, but good citizens. It is the function which we call--in enemy nations--"state indoctrination". In speaking of the U.S.S.R., for example, we feel little hesitation to apply this term. In the U.S., in the double talk of the schools of education, we employ more elegant expressions like "the socialization function".²²

U.S.S.R.

Like the National Socialist in Germany, the Soviet Union has assigned much importance to the proper instruction of its young citizens. One author states that ". . . the very great importance that 'teaching Communism' as a prerequisite to the survival of the regime, has been fully honored in Soviet practice."²³ Although contending the emphasis in the present era is on military power, Taborsky, an anti-communist critic, notes that at least the ultimate success of communism will be realized only with the development of the proper consciousness and ideology:

. . . the fate of Communism depends in the long run upon the result of the endeavor to create a new type of a "Socialist Man"--a man who would genuinely believe that Communism gives him a better deal than "capitalism", materially as well as politically and socially, collectively as well as individually; a man who, if given true freedom to choose, would reach for Communism rather than Western democracy and who would turn out to be so altruistic and self-sacri-

ficing that he would fit into the promised utopia supposedly awaiting him at the end of the lengthy transition from socialism to Communism . . . Should such a progeny be successfully developed and reproduced in mass, the victory of Communism is assured. Should the endeavor fail, the ultimate defeat of Communism is inevitable . . .²⁴

Taborsky's anti-communist bias does not appear to color his judgment. In fact, a pro-communist pedagogist seems to confirm the Soviet intention to create this new "Socialist Man". With a totally Communist perspective, P.V. Zimin states:

Children and young people are brought up to love their socialist motherland, to be proud of its achievements, of the heroic deeds of the Soviet people, led by the Communist party and the Soviet Government. At the same time, children are taught to be internationalist, in conformity with the principles of Marxism-Leninism . . . Soviet teachers base their work on a respect for science and a deep understanding of its role in preparing the younger generation for life, in forming a Communist outlook.²⁵

Emphasizing the importance assigned to creating the "proper" ideology attached by the Soviet Government is the huge financing made available to the school system. Most aspects of the curriculum involve some referrent to the "proper" ideology. The Soviet school is credited with being very influential in changing and creating beliefs, attitudes and ideologies:

. . . one can only be astonished at the enormous amounts of money and effort the communists vest in this activity. Education, from kindergarten up, is shot through with ideology until in the last two years about one-half of the program is direct indoctrination . . . Literature, poetry, theater, film, painting, sculpture, all serve ideological purposes . . . The regime must be called, above all, an ideology, the forceful and total imposition of an idea system on a whole people.²⁶

Again, like the German National Socialist, the Soviet leaders created new institutions for instructional purposes after assuming power in 1917. Party youth organizations were established to both train future elites and instill loyalty to the new power structure. The Young Pioneers, Little Octobrists, and the Communist Youth League provide an excellent opportunity for a full program of instruction beyond the formal school system. Two Soviet pedagogists, G.V. Berezina and A.I. Foteyeva, emphasize the role played by the Young Pioneer and the Young Communist League:

The Young Pioneer organization and the YCL both play a tremendous role in instilling in a child a sense of civic responsibility, collectivism, the high moral principles of a Soviet citizen and the ability to work for the common good.²⁷

Like the Hitler Youth, then, the purpose of youth groups in the Soviet Union seems to be to indoctrinate the future citizens with select moral, ethical, and political principles.

In contrast to the National Socialists, the Soviet regime did not attempt to appeal to nationalism and national traditions. "until the mid-1930's the Soviet regime tended to justify itself by reference to its revolutionary aspirations for the future . . ."²⁸ The rise of Hitler and National Socialism resulted in a new emphasis by Soviet leaders on nationalism. Patriotism was restored as a method of rallying the Soviet citizens. However, the consequences of emphasizing nationalism were not to go unnoticed in the schools:

Soviet schools during this period ceased to be a medium trying to provide an ideal environment in

which the adolescent personality could blossom in a free self-governing community. Instead they became institutions designed to turn out loyal and productive Soviet citizens.²⁹

For the purpose of practical ends, Soviet citizens are instructed in the use of the scientific method. They are encouraged to think critically, but only in non-ideological areas. The aim of the Soviet regime is to develop citizens with a socialist political ideology. This is probably of greater importance than the cannons of science. However, Soviet pedagogists contend that there is no conflict between developing the socialist political ideology and employing the scientific method. Science and socialism are conceptualized as concomitant phenomena:

Soviet schoolchildren receive scientific information in all school subjects. This provides them with a Marxist-Leninist, materialistic outlook, making it possible for them to correctly understand current political, economic and cultural problems, to observe the growing strength of the socialist forces and the inevitability of the victory of communism as the most just of all social systems.³⁰

In the Soviet Union, all students must study the social sciences which contain a high indoctrination content. Required courses include the history of the CPSU, scientific communism, dialectical and historical materialism, and sometimes political economy. Soviet author M.N. Kolmakova writes that such courses help to ". . . instill a feeling of civic responsibility and patriotism in the youth, to arouse their interest in major political developments, both on a national and international scale."³¹

Intentions similar to those of the Soviet Union have

also been expressed by communist nations in Eastern Europe. The aim of the formal school system is to form the "proper" Marxist-Leninist perspective. According to a Bulgarian handbook for kindergarten teachers, "the education and formulation of the new man . . . must start in kindergarten."³² It is at this very young age that the teacher must "create a foundation for political education and a Marxist-Leninist attitude towards the world."³³ Utilizing a variety of techniques, the young citizens are lectured on "collectivist habits according to principles of socialist morality."³⁴ Accordingly, as one source reports from North Korea, there is little hope that such ideologies will not prevail:

One should not . . . underestimate the power of indoctrination in a setting in which the lack of any perceived alternatives to conformity is matched by the constant reminder that active conformity will pay off in both psychic and material rewards. When the agents, means, and substantive contents of socialization are subject to the ubiquitous control and surveillance . . . what hope is there of bringing up children who would challenge conventional wisdom and rebel against the status quo?³⁵

That the aim of formal instruction in the Soviet Union has a strong indoctrinative aspect is hard to deny. Most of the authors reviewed seem to support this conclusion. There is a political purpose to instruction, and this purpose is determined by those in positions of authority:

The deliberate and unconcealed political purpose that the entire educational and state-run child care systems are made to serve show the faith the Soviets maintain in the possibility of manipulating minds while they are yet young. The formal school system is directed to advance the purpose of those in authority.³⁶

U.S.A.

Does the United States differ significantly from either the National Socialist or the Soviet Union regarding indoctrination in the public schools? Critics of the American school system such as Jonathan Kozol argue that it does not; the primary purpose of instruction in the United States is to produce "good" citizens. Kozol contends that Americans call this indoctrination in communist nations, but education when it occurs in the U.S. In the United States, such confusion in terminology is utilized for maximum control. Indoctrination, Kozol states, must be subtle:

. . . indoctrination, in a nation dedicated to the idea of free conscience, must be far more subtle than in nations that are openly totalitarian. In a social order such as ours . . . people need to think themselves unmanaged, independent, free, if they are to be controlled with maximum success. 37

Not unlike Kozol, Dean Jaros believes that the public schools in the United States indoctrinate. However, he emphasizes the anti-communist role that the schools play:

Political indoctrination . . . is also to be found in more democratic nations. Civic education programs in the United States are cases in point. Public educators attract both praise and blame for their efforts to socialize the young both affectively and cognitively. New programs designed to buttress the young against the influences of Communism . . . serve to highlight the educator's political role and to emphasize the prevalent belief that direct indoctrination during childhood has important political consequences. 38

Jonathan Kozol theorizes that the public schools in the United States indoctrinate in more subtle ways than merely by providing instruction in citizenship training. Teaching

method, as well as content, is also of major significance. Kozol notes that students are provided with odd and useless information which they are expected to consume. The content of the information is not indoctrinative in itself, but the method of imparting it is. A pattern emerges from the teacher/pupil exchange, and it is the pattern of indoctrination. Students are subordinate, teachers dominate. Students are conditioned to submit to the authority of the instructor. In the words of Jonathan Kozol:

The significance . . . is not to test our acquisition of a single, odd and useless piece of mediocre information. Instead, like many other exercises, questions, regulations in the U.S. school, its sole significance consists in this: It tests the readiness, on the part of children, to give up reservations . . . Its one serious objective is to test the child's willingness not to SAY NO.³⁹

In addition, Kozol believes that the U.S. school system will not produce individuals with character, for example, such as Thoreau. The schools do not teach children to disobey the law in keeping with their own morals and consciences. Both the content and method of American instruction undermine the individual's ability to act on personal conviction. As a result the process of indoctrination produces people who conform to the status quo:

Public school is not in business to produce . . . young citizens who may aspire to lead their lives within the pattern . . . of courage and conviction. School is in business to produce reliable people, manageable people, unprovocative people: people who can be relied upon to make correct decisions, or else to nominate and to elect those who will make correct decisions for them.⁴⁰

Although the Federal government does not control the decentralized school system in the United States, its instructions, at the very least, have served the interests of the national government. Critics charge that the schools have produced millions of "good" citizens who pay their taxes and support the status quo with vigor. C. Wright Mills has stated, "If the centralized state could not rely upon the inculcation of nationalist loyalties in public and private schools, its leaders would promptly seek to modify the decentralized educational system."⁴¹ Regarding the political function of the public schools, another author comments:

... the schools are designed to build good citizens--citizens who both accept and by their own lives reflect the self-defined virtues of the society in which they live. In other words, the schools are expected to conserve the social and political status quo.⁴²

In the United States it has generally been assumed by most pedagogists that instruction was a diverse phenomenon. Because the schools were decentralized, schools were assumed to reflect local interest. Control was in the hands of the local school board. Curriculums were considered very diverse. Uniformity in the schools was considered unlikely. However, recent critics of U.S. education have charged that such a view is not accurate:

The educational system throughout the United States remains--with the exception of funding, materials, and student population--frightfully uniform. Without a national curriculum or national control, the United States has evolved a national school system characterized by an uncanny degree of uniformity.⁴³

Depending upon the state, mandatory attendance is re-

required in the United States from about age five or six up to fifteen or sixteen. In addition, the school occupies a great deal of the child's day:

If for no other reason than the time at the disposal of educational institutions at this impressionable stage of development is so great, we might expect the impact on political orientations to be of equivalent force.⁴⁴

Although various ideological biases are present in childhood development, ". . . all but the schools are random, casual and inconsistent. Only public school presents a law-mandated, certified, non-optional realm of childhood indoctrination."⁴⁵

The question of consensus is closely associated with the concept of indoctrination in the United States. By consensus it is meant the degree of basic agreement present in a society. The link between indoctrination and consensus is not difficult to establish. Indoctrination may be conceptualized as a possible origin or cause of consensus. However, consensus may also result from other factors such as the integrating effects of a common culture. There are two conflicting theories regarding the origin of consensus in the United States. The first theory may be labeled value or normative consensus. The second may be called "pragmatic consensus".

Value or normative consensus as a process is described by Edward Shils. He explains that due to the "need for order" in the individual there is a propensity to identify with something beyond oneself. Within a society there exists a "cen-

tral value system" that serves this function. It provides a propensity towards unity and consensus. The majority of the citizens recognize the central value system and are attached to it. The central value system promotes "awe-arousing centrality" resulting in respect for authority and voluntary cooperation in society. An individual's norms, beliefs, values, and ideology are real, not just a result of manipulation by an elite or an authority. Individuals generally agree or accept policy decisions because of the common cultural background that they share with the political strata.

Shils realizes that consensus is never complete in any society; there will always be a greater or lesser degree of "dissensus". He explains that there will always be a "periphery" composed of individuals or groups who are in some way segregated and separated from the "centre" or the central value system. However, Shils sees modern society resting on a technology which has raised the living standard and integrated the people into a unified economy. As a result there has been a ". . . more widespread participation in the central value system through education . . . and mass communication."⁴⁶ Shils contends, in short, that normative consensus is responsible for the high degree of consensus in the United States. Consequently, individual psychological need, not indoctrination, is responsible for consensus.

Critics of the normative consensus approach argue that no national culture exists in modern plural societies such as the United States. The culture is fragmented rather than

unified. The consensus which characterizes modern society is a result of ideology rather than culture:

Cultural integrity is not a characteristic of large industrial nation-states. The fact that the Soviet Union and the United States could remain relatively stable politically while possessing various cultural groupings, religious groupings, and economic classes reveals that other factors account for social cohesion. These other factors, ideologies, are major forces of social cohesion. Ideologies reveal the social character of a people and have largely replaced culture as the basis of social cohesion. Ideological communities have become the basis of social life in technological mass societies.⁴⁷

Michael Mann concentrates on ideology rather than on culture; he is a contemporary proponent of pragmatic consensus. In an empirical test, he demonstrates rather conclusively that the lower social strata (or periphery) simply accept the American structure because they see no alternative. His conception of the consensus process closely parallels Marx's idea of false consciousness; the workers are unaware of their true class interests. Mann explains that the working class is indoctrinated during the socialization process in the public schools. They are imbued with content that results in a consensual ideology. Soviet educational writer N.P. Kuzin seems to share Mann's position of the United States:

The great mass of children from working class homes receive only that minimum of education necessary for their future as workers in modern production. While giving the working people's children a minimum of knowledge, the ruling classes of a capitalist society at the same time step up the ideological conditioning of the youth, for they place great hope in the schools as a means of combating communism . . . The educational system of any given country is built on the basis of established cultural and historical traditions, but chiefly in accordance with the demands of the ruling class.⁴⁸

The very diversity that characterizes America, in short, seemingly negates the normative consensus approach. The United States does, however, enjoy a high degree of consensus:

That many men and women who live in the poverty-stricken areas of Appalachia or in the stratified urban ghettos scattered throughout the United States identify with the members of the Rockefeller, Kennedy, or Ford families, implies that other factors besides cultural similarity preserve the social cohesion within large industrial societies.⁴⁹

It is suggested here that one such source may be, as Mann demonstrates, indoctrination in the public school system.

Robert Dahl seems to closely share the conclusion reached by Mann. He too links indoctrination with consensus theory. According to Dahl's conception, most Americans possess an ideology or a set of political beliefs which he calls the "democratic creed". The elements of the creed are reasonably stable but quite abstract. Although disagreement and "dissensus" sometimes occur on specific applications, most people assume that the American political system is consistent with the "democratic creed". Dahl believes that this assumption is responsible for much of the consensus which characterizes the United States.

Where do Americans acquire the "democratic creed"? Dahl notes that ". . . vast social energies have been poured into the process of 'Americanization', teaching citizens what is expected in the way of words, beliefs, and behavior . . ."⁵⁰ Although adherence to the democratic creed is promoted and maintained by a variety of social processes, formal education is probably the most important according to Dahl:

. . . almost the entire adult population has been subjected to some degree of indoctrination through the schools . . . new citizens, young and old, have been properly trained in "American" principles and beliefs. Everywhere, too, the pupils have been highly motivated to talk, look and believe as Americans should . . . The extent to which Americans agree today on the key propositions about democracy is a measure of the almost unbelievable success of this deliberate attempt to create a seemingly uncoerced nation-wide consensus.⁵¹

In summary, Dahl seems to agree with Mann both on the ideological basis of consensus and on the indoctrination which results from attendance in the public schools in the U.S.

The material reviewed in this chapter, in conclusion, seems to indicate in a general fashion that indoctrination does exist in the American school system and that it has a dynamic, changeable quality depending on political conditions. Although the normative content of each program may differ, the pedagogical approach of the instructional program of the United States seems to closely parallel those of the National Socialist and the Soviet Union. This similarity, however, is dependent on how the term "indoctrination" is defined and conceptualized. Up to this point, what is actually meant by indoctrination is yet to be clarified. This is the task of the next chapter.

CHAPTER NOTES

¹Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), p. 121.

²John D. Pulliam, History of Education in America (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968), p. 108.

³Social Studies In Oregon Secondary Schools (Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1955), p. 9.

⁴Ibid., p. ii.

⁵Guide To Secondary Education In Oregon For School Years 1955-1957 (Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1955), p. 151.

⁶Elementary - Secondary Guide For Oregon Schools (Salem, Oregon: Oregon Department of Education, 1975), p. 3-1.

⁷Eric H. Warmington and Philip G. Rouse, eds., Great Dialogues of Plato (New York: The New American Library, 1956), p. 341.

⁸Oliver S. Ikenberry, American Education Foundations (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974), p. 74.

⁹Thomas More, Utopia, trans. John C. Collins (London: Clarndon Press, n.d.), p. 132.

¹⁰R. S. Peters, "Must An Educator Have An Aim?" in Aims of Education, ed. Leslie M. Brown (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 163.

¹¹Dean Jaros, Socialization to Politics (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), p. 12.

¹²William Boyd, ed., The Emile of Jean Jacques Rousseau (New York: Teachers College Press, 1962), p. 13.

¹³Jean Jacques Rousseau, The Government of Poland (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1972), p. 19.

¹⁴Ibid., pp. 19-20.

¹⁵W. E. Pulliam, Political Propaganda in the Secondary School Program of National Socialist Germany, 1933-1945 (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1971), p. 1.

¹⁶Hajo Holborn, "Origins and Political Character of Nazi Ideology," Political Science Quarterly, vol. 79, no. 4 (December 1964), p. 553.

¹⁷Pulliam Political Propaganda of Germany, p. 1.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 14.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 15.

²⁰George F. Kneller, The Educational Philosophy of National Socialism (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 158.

²¹N. P. Kuzin, "The Socialist Revolution and Education," in Education in the USSR, eds. N. P. Kuzin and M. I. Kondakov (Moscow, USSR: Progress Publisher, 1972), p. 8.

²²Jonathan Kozol, The Night Is Dark and I am Far From Home (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1975), p. 1.

²³Jaros Socialization to Politics, p. 13.

²⁴Edward Tabrosky, Conformity Under Communism (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1958), p. 1.

²⁵P. V. Zimin, "The Soviet School," in Education in the USSR, eds. N. P. Zimin and M. I. Kondakov (Moscow, USSR: Progress Publisher, 1972), p. 36.

²⁶Gerhart Niemeyer, "The Role of Ideology in Communist Systems," Orbis, vol. 17, no. 3 (Fall 1973), pp. 786-7.

²⁷G. V. Berezina and A. I. Foteyeva, "Educational Work and Extra-Curricular Educational Establishments," in Education in the USSR, eds. N. P. Kuzin and M. I. Kondakov (Moscow, USSR: Progress Publisher, 1972), p. 90.

²⁸Robert Conquest, ed., The Politics of Ideas in the USSR (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1967), p. 39.

²⁹Ibid., p. 30.

³⁰Zimin "The Soviet School," in Education in the USSR, p. 48.

³¹M. N. Kolmakova, "Higher Specialised Secondary, Vocational and Technical Education," in Education in the USSR, eds. N. P. Kuzin and M. I. Kondakov (Moscow, USSR: Progress Publisher, 1972), p. 125.

³²Tabrosky Conformity Under Communism, p. 11.

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵B. C. Koh, "Ideology and Political Control in North Korea," Journal of Politics, vol. 32, no. 3 (August 1970), p. 672.

³⁶Jaros Socialization to Politics, pp. 12-3.

³⁷Kozol The Night Is Dark, p. 4.

³⁸Jaros Socialization to Politics, p. 15.

³⁹Kozol The Night Is Dark, p. 16.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 66.

⁴¹C. Wright Mills, The Power Elite (New York: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 6.

⁴²Jarol B. Manheim, The Politics Within (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975), p. 61.

⁴³Normand R. Bernier and Jack E. Williams, Beyond Beliefs: Ideological Foundations of American Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 11.

⁴⁴David Easton, "Function of Education in a Political System," The School Review 65 (Autumn 1957): 314.

⁴⁵Kozol The Night Is Dark, p. 3.

⁴⁶Edward Shils, Selected Essays (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970), p. 11.

⁴⁷Bernier and Williams Beyond Beliefs, p. 24.

⁴⁸Kuzin "Socialist Revolution and Education," in Education in the USSR, p. 8.

⁴⁹Bernier and Williams Beyond Beliefs, p. 23.

⁵⁰Robert Dahl, Who Governs (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), p. 317.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 317-8.

CHAPTER II

CONCEPTUALIZATIONS

Ideology and the Political Process

Ideologies--belief systems which bind "head and heart"--influence and are influenced by social systems. Ideologies open the door to certain changes and close it to others. To understand man's ideologies is to understand man.¹

Although this paper is primarily concerned with indoctrination, the discussion will begin with an examination of ideology. The logic of this decision is simple. If ideologies are indeed influenced by social systems, it is theoretically possible that they might be guided and channelled toward some prescribed end. Indoctrination, as it will later be defined and conceptualized, seeks by formal means to influence the development of ideology. The intended result of indoctrination is to channel and mold ideology. It is proposed that a clear understanding of ideology will lead to a greater degree of clarity in the conceptualization of indoctrination.

The above quotation only hints at the centrality of ideology to the political process. What men believe may perhaps be the most important causal agent of the political and historical events of a nation. Institutions, constitutional forms, laws and alike are of central significance only to the

degree to which men believe, conform, and identify with them. It is assumed, in short, that men hold certain ideologies concerning the political system and these ideologies in turn affect their political behavior.

Very generally, an ideology can be characterized as a belief system that governs how one looks at and understands the world. In his book, Political Ideology, Robert Lane attempts to clarify the concepts involved in an ideology, and in the process outlines their relation to the political process:

1. They deal with the questions: Who will be the rulers? How will the rulers be selected? By what principles will they govern?
2. They constitute an argument; that is, they are intended to persuade and to counter opposing views.
3. They integrally affect some of the major values of life.
4. They embrace a program for defense or reform or abolition of important social institutions.
5. They are, in part, rationalizations of group interests--but not necessarily the interests of all groups espousing them.
6. They are normative, ethical, moral in tone and content.
7. They are (inevitably) torn from their context in a broader belief system, and share the structural and stylistic properties of that system.

Most ideologies also have these qualities:

1. They are group beliefs that individuals borrow; most people acquire an ideology by identifying (or disidentifying) with a social group.
2. They have a body of sacred documents (constitutions, bills of rights, manifestoes, declarations), and heroes (founding fathers, seers and originators and great interpreters).²

Lane concludes that "all ideologies, like all other beliefs, imply an empirical theory of cause and effect in the world, and a theory of the nature of man."³

If the existence of ideology in Lane's sense is granted

then the relationship between what men believe and political and historical events surely cannot be denied. Although the link between ideology and political action has not been demonstrated, it is assumed that "political behavior is governed by norms, consciences, beliefs, and values."⁴ In brief, political and historical events may be explained, in part at least, by what men believe. "Presidents are not respected, laws are not obeyed, taxes are not paid, political stability does not prevail--unless people believe."⁵

The term "ideology" has been conceptualized in a myriad of ways. So far, it has not been clearly defined in this analysis and has been utilized in broad fashion. One would assume such a word would possess a fixed and clear meaning. However, the task of defining ideology is somewhat more difficult than it appears, for "'Ideology' has been, and remains, one of the most persistent and ubiquitous concepts in modern political thought."⁶ In addition, "the growing popularity of the term has been matched, if anything, by its growing obscurity."⁷ According to Robert Lane, "Even if we limit our interest to political ideology, the range and variety are formidable."⁸ Because of the close linkage between indoctrination and ideology, an attempt will be made to clarify the term for use in this study.

Ideology: Historical Development of the Concept

Francis Bacon was perhaps the first man to study ideology. It is no accident that the term emerged with the historical

development of the scientific age. In his original investigation of ideology, Bacon embarked on an examination of these preconceptions and prejudices of men, that were called "idols." These "idols" were believed to prevent objectivity in the employment and utilization of the scientific method.

Perhaps the first to use ideology as a purely distinctive term was a group of French post-Enlightenment theorists called Ideologues. The word was recognized as meaning the "science of ideas". Again, the term was linked to objectivity and science. Defined in this positive manner, ideology was seen as a method or technique for dissolving illusion and discovering truth. However, in contrast to the very positive and glowing connotations attributed to the word by the Ideologues, the French were also responsible for the use of ideology in a derogatory and disparaging fashion:

The term was first used pejoratively in the early 19th century to characterize those Frenchmen who wanted to guide the politics of the Napoleonic state by the abstract principles of the French Revolution.⁹

It was Karl Marx who significantly transformed the meaning of ideology, and in the process gave it the design of modern form. In Marx's conception, ideology refers to a type of duality of thought; this thought is both illusory and distorted. The dominant ideology reflects the interest of the ruling class and is transmitted through various social agencies. Under Marx's conception the school system of society, for example, would attempt to indoctrinate the young with the dominant ideology. If this indoctrination

process by schools and other social agencies were successful, the dominant ideology would be accepted by the non-ruling group. Marx labelled this result as "false consciousness." Such groups, in short, would have been successfully indoctrinated to support political, economic, and social institutions which opposed their own class interests.

Marx, however, failed to delineate to what degree ideology, i.e., false consciousness, is equivalent to reality itself. He seemed to assume his own theory was free from the "false consciousness" of ideology. As a result of this lack of delineation and clarity, Karl Mannheim was able to charge that Marxism itself was an ideology.

Mannheim attempted a clearer conception of the term ideology by distinguishing between ideology and utopia. Ideology was a set of beliefs, attitudes, values, etc. that incorporated the past and tended to preserve the existing power structure. Ideology served to maintain the status quo; this conception roughly parallels the Marxian conception of the term. Utopia was a set of beliefs, attitudes, values, etc. which would tend to destroy the existing power structure or status quo if it were acted upon. Utopia was thus a revolutionary ideology that had become manifest. This conception was roughly parallel to Marxism, at least as a specific example of a possible utopia.

Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan use the term "political myth" to encompass both of Mannheim's concepts, "ideology" and "utopia". The political myth is an entire body of beliefs which are associated with primary and

fundamental assumptions. Although they may be true or false, the myth is conceived true by the mass of citizens with great conviction. It comprises fundamental assumptions concerning political affairs. The myth is equivalent to Mannheim's "ideology" when it supports the status quo, and "utopia" when it opposes the same.

Lasswell and Kaplan cite Merriam's dyad of the contents of political doctrine which include "credenda" and "miranda." Credenda are things to be believed; miranda are things to be admired. All political systems utilize both to help assure support. The latter relates to the political myth in the following fashion:

The miranda are the symbols of sentiment and identification in the political myth. They are those whose function is to arouse admiration and enthusiasm setting forth and strengthening faiths and loyalties . . . Flags and anthems, ceremonials, and demonstrations, group heroes and the legends surrounding them --these exemplify the importance of miranda in the political process.¹⁰

If indoctrination is defined as a method by which ideology may be influenced, then it may possess a dyadic character. Indoctrination may seek to create the "proper" beliefs or "credenda." At the same time it may generate strong emotional feelings or "miranda." Both credenda and miranda would appear to be possible tools which could be utilized by an indoctrinator.

Mullins distinguishes between myth, ideology, and utopia. Ideology incorporates an historical consciousness which differs in a fundamental way from the non-historical

time of myth and utopia. Historical consciousness recognizes high amounts of social change; it is future oriented, noting the possibility for human control. Political efficacy is high; events are viewed as occurring on a linear continuum. The historical process is conceptualized and oriented for humans to shape it. Ideology, in short, is an action directed phenomenon.

In contrast, utopia and myth operate in a non-historical time frame. The function of utopian thought is criticism. It demonstrates perfection and reveals the shortcomings of the actual society. However, it does not confront the problems of transforming society; there is no plan of action. Myth is defined as certain fundamental assumptions, believed to be true with great certainty by the mass of society. This definition seems to closely parallel that of Lasswell's and Kaplan's. When myth prevails, according to Mullins, the social structure is sacred. It cannot be altered by man because the structure is sanctified by myth which explains both its importance and origin. It is assumed that in such a society both credenda and miranda would be strongly prescribed and closely followed. Since the following of such traditional patterns usually means uncritical acceptance of existing conditions and low political efficacy, maintenance of the status quo proceeds with little difficulty.

If Mullins narrowed the meaning of ideology by linking it with historical consciousness and political efficacy, Converse seemingly continues this trend in the usage of ideology

through the introduction of the idea of "constraint". Attempting to refine the term for empirical study, Converse used constraint to mean the success rate in predicting, given the initial information that a person has a specific attitude or belief, that he will possess certain additional attitudes or beliefs. Constraint is thus a measure of the cognitive consistency of personal attitudes and beliefs in relationship to a particular ideology. To illustrate, an ideological conservative may possibly express support for a balanced budget. Aware of this position, such an individual, to be consistent, should also oppose increasing welfare expenditures. To the extent that this prediction can be accurately ascertained, the ideology is exhibiting constraint.

Merelman, in his analysis of ideology, notes a duality in definitional attempts: "While Converse's discussion of ideology stresses cognition, Lane's definition emphasizes evaluation."¹¹ Borrowing from both Converse and Lane, Merelman combines cognition and evaluation to provide the following seven point definition of ideology.

1. "constraint" in political ideas
2. "evaluation and prescriptive system" (political preferences)
3. "persistence" (duration over time)
4. "global standards" (exhaustive and consistent judgments regarding any sub-category of political events within the ideology)
5. "boundaries" (refers to judging and sharply distinguishing between the political events which fall into different subcategories of ideology)
6. "deductive consistency" (ideological prescriptions must not produce logical absurdities)
7. "activist directives" (cannot produce apathy)¹²

Like both Converse and Merelman, Barnes contends that

an ideology is a particular belief system that is internally consistent and consciously held. The components of an ideology, in brief, must "hang together." Barnes defines a belief system as an "open term referring to a set of political attitudes held by an individual, whether exhibiting constraint or not."¹³ An ideology is thus a particular kind of belief system; it exhibits constraint.

If the notion of constraint is utilized to define ideology, the term would only include a small percentage of the electorate. Merelman states flatly that "the mass of Americans do not have a sophisticated conceptual organization by which politics may be understood."¹⁴ In the empirical study accomplished by Converse, only two and a half percent of the American public were classified as ideological under his definition of constraint. As a result the usage of the term so defined would restrict and limit its application to only those who are the most politically active and aware.

Finally, Sartori's analysis of ideology provides a conceptual link to indoctrination. He draws his original conception from Rokeach's idea of the "open and closed mind." Since everyone must rely on cognitive authorities for information, the argument asserts that differences between ideology and other belief systems reside in how such authorities are chosen and assessed. The individual's belief system is "open" to the extent that a person can obtain, evaluate and act on relevant information. In contrast, the "closed mind" is characterized by the inability to evaluate relevant information

on intrinsic merits while both relying and yielding to authority. To explain the patterns of belief systems, Sartori developed the following table:¹⁵

TABLE I
PATTERNS OF BELIEF SYSTEMS

	<u>Emotive Status</u>	
	Strong	Weak
Closed	I - Adamant	II - Resilient
Open	III - Firm	IV - Flexible

Impermeable to evidence and argument, the elements comprising the "Adamant" category are held in rigid and dogmatic fashion; their potential for activism is high. Although the elements of beliefs are fixed for category II, potential for activism is low because they are not passionately felt. The "Firm" category has strongly held elements of belief which are open to argument and evidence, and are therefore changeable in principle. Such elements possess more and stronger dynamic potential than category II. Finally, category IV consists of flexible elements, feebly held, open to evidence and argument. These flexible elements have low potential for activism.

If constraint is utilized as the criterion for defining ideology, then it is suggested that both the "Adamant" and the "Firm" classifications qualify as an ideology. It is assumed that individuals with strongly held beliefs, regardless of cognitive status, would tend to exhibit constraint.

In addition, the dichotomization of these two types can be utilized to infer greater or lesser degrees of indoctrina-

tion. The attempt to create a "closed mind" where the particular elements of beliefs are held in rigid, fixed and dogmatic fashion is assumed to be more indoctrinative than an attempt to create an "open mind" where all of the elements are open to argument and evidence. The reasons behind these assumptions will be explicated in the next section.

For the purpose of this paper, ideology will be conceptualized as existing on a continuum, with an "open belief system" occupying one extreme and a "closed belief system" the other. It will be defined as a set of internalized attitudes, values and beliefs which tend to exhibit constraint.

The Education/Indoctrination Dichotomy

But life is short and information endless; nobody has time for everything. In practice we are generally forced to choose between an unduly brief exposition and no exposition at all. Abbreviation is a necessary evil and the abbreviator's business is to make the best of a job which, though intrinsically bad, is still better than nothing. He must learn to concentrate upon the essentials of a situation, but without ignoring too many of reality's qualifying side issues. In this way he may be able to tell, not indeed the whole truth, but considerable more than the dangerous quarter-truths and half-truths which have always been the current coin of thought. 16

Now that ideology has been defined, the question in need of answering is how it is formed. Huxley provides a clue in the lines quoted above when he alludes to the "abbreviators". Men are influenced to believe in a particular fashion by the communication of ideas from a multiplicity of sources. Peer group and the family are both very instrumental in the formation of attitudes, beliefs, values, and the ultimate conscious-

ness that is the essence of ideology. Another source for the communication of ideas is the mass media (radio, television, newspaper, etc.) In addition, the development of ideology¹⁷ has been traced to the childhood learning process. In short:

Formal educational systems and propaganda networks combine with less formal agencies, such as family and peer groups, to influence the ways in which an individual structures his "reality".¹⁸

If it is accepted that ideologies are learned rather than magically induced or transmitted through genetic or other means, then it is possible that ideologies are shaped and developed to a considerable extent during the childhood learning process.

The arguments that follow are concerned with the development of ideology among the young. As with the adult, it is clear that there are many sources of childhood learning. The peer group, family, and mass media mentioned previously most certainly influence the process. However, these sources of influence are not within the scope of this paper. Here, only the public school as a source of childhood learning will be examined.

Definitions and Development of Education/Indoctrination

The terms "education" and "indoctrination" are not conceptually separate or distinct. The differences between the two words is arbitrary, and not easily ascertained. Webster's definition of each demonstrates that they often refer to the much the same phenomena:

educate . . . 1: to provide schooling for 2 a: to develop mentally and morally esp by instruction b: TRAIN, INSTRUCT syn see TEACH . . . 19

indoctrinate . . . 1. to instruct esp in fundamentals or rudiments : TEACH 2. to imbue with a usu. partisan or sectarian opinion, point of view, or principle . . . 20

In the Diction of Education Carter Good attempts to clarify "education" and "indoctrination" as follows:

education . . . the aggregation of all of the processes by means of which a person develops abilities, attitudes and other forms of behavior of positive value in the society in which he lives; the social process by which people are subjected to the influence of selected and controlled environment (especially that of the school) so that they may obtain social competence and optimum individual development; the art of making available to each generation the organized knowledge of the past. 21

indoctrination . . . in the broadest sense, the attempt to inculcate beliefs, a possible concomitant of any learning situation; in narrower terms, the attempt to fix in the learning mind any doctrine, social, political, economic, or religious, to the exclusion of all contrary doctrines, and in a manner preventing serious comparison and evaluation; the act of imbuing or instructing a person with doctrine considered relevant to the understanding of a concept or the carrying out of an operation, as in an indoctrination center, course, lecture, training etc. 22

Like Webster's, Good's definition of the two terms is not very distinct. Education, as characterized, is broad enough to include indoctrination as a method rather than as a separate concept.

One method to resolve the problem of defining "education" and "indoctrination" would be to examine the etymology of these terms. One of the oldest and most popular notions concerning education is that it is merely the drawing out of our common human nature:

Working from a supposed etymological root of the word 'education' in the Latin educere, 'to lead out', they insist that all education is a process of summoning forth prior but only incipient elements in the child's nature.²³

However, the problem with this approach has been noted by Shedd. As the Latin roots of the term indicate, education is a metaphor. No objective correlative to the state a student is "in" or which he is "led out" exists:

These words may suggest many ideas which seem concrete: one is led out of ignorance into knowledge, or out of self into society, or out of savagery into civilization. Yet on examination these are all metaphoric descriptions themselves of relative conceptual states - relative to a particular individual's understanding of that society.²⁴

An additional problem in examining the origins of the term "education" is that there is disagreement among Latin scholars as to the root. As mentioned above, some scholars believe the root is the Latin word educere. However, "...some claim that 'education' comes from educare, 'to rear or nurture'."²⁵

In the Middle Ages, the word indoctrination simply referred to the implantation of the Christian doctrine. The Roman Catholic Church was the main institution of formal education and the transmitter of knowledge. Education and indoctrination referred to the same thing; the learning of the Christian doctrine. Teaching during this period emerged as a concept that almost exclusively related to the understanding of the Christian belief system. The Roman Catholic Church, according to one source, controlled the ideology of the world:

...the Roman Catholic Church controlled a network of educational and propagandistic institutions. Through its control the Roman Church implanted a Catholic perspective upon all major institutions. Regardless of economic class,

ethnic origin, or geographical area, the overwhelming majority of people in the Western world perceived and behaved according to the inner dictates of the "Roman Catholic perspective". Those individuals who failed to internalize the perspective or who rejected it were isolated, outcast, or ordered to recant - often assisted in the process through various means, not the least of which was execution. Thus the Jew in Catholic Spain or the Albigensian in Catholic France suffered because of his ideological "error". Gradually the Roman Catholic Church lost her control over the major communication networks. As such competing ideological forces as the insurgent nationalistic movements developed, the "Roman Catholic perspective of the world" was corroded and replaced by such national perspectives as "French", "Spanish", "English" and "German".²⁶

Conceptions concerning indoctrination have emerged slowly since about the Seventeenth Century. It was not until World War I, however, that the American consciousness was stirred to the implications of indoctrination. Some of the products of that war were authoritarianism, regimentation and propaganda; these factors acted like a catalyst in posing an American response to indoctrination. Americans generally linked authoritarianism with indoctrination. It was at this historical point that education and indoctrination became somewhat more distinct concepts in the minds of many Americans. Indoctrination was associated with thought control and coercion, while education emerged with a comparatively favorable connotation associated with greater freedom of thought. In sum, the rise of totalitarian regimes in the Twentieth Century provided a reference for Americans to separate the two terms. Indoctrination was associated with the school system of a dictatorship. Education was associated with the school system of a democracy such as the United States:

In the period since World War I American writers have frequently identified "education" as what happens in the schools of a democracy after the fashion of the U.S., and

"indoctrination" as what happens in totalitarian societies like "Nazi" Germany, Russia, or Red China...²⁷

In modern times since the Second World War, the issues of indoctrination among Americans has been reexamined in regards to the methods utilized by nations to maintain their particular social and political philosophies. Some professionals have advocated the position that the primary function of formal instruction is the transmission of cultural values to maintain such philosophies. Thus, "...education is the shaping of individuals --their understandings, their attitudes, their values and aspirations --in terms of the culture in which they happen to live."²⁸ Education so defined is not distinct from indoctrination. According to Willis Moore:

In the decades spanning World War II many Americans, impressed with the seeming success of the European dictatorships in molding the minds of their youth through the method of indoctrination, boldly advocated that we likewise indoctrinate American youth with the core ideas of democracy.²⁹

Progressive liberals like John Dewey opposed the movement of indoctrinating American youth. Progressives believed that the student's interest must be awakened; that pupils must acquire habits and skills that are useful to them. According to the progressive position, students are essentially rational human beings. As such they possess the potential and the capacity for formulating adequate decisions for themselves. The function of the school system for the progressives is that it should encourage the rational capability of the student. By the indoctrination of selective values, even consensual ones, the school would in essence be inhibiting the growth of this

rational capability. Objective and fair presentation by the school is necessary to develop the analytic ability inherent in all humans. The progressives term such an approach "education". The two views represent a major dichotomy in pedagogic philosophy.

So at the one end of the family tree generated by the concept of "education" there are procedures involving the use of authority in which the voice and the cane are used to produce a desirable end-product. Education is here conceived in the image of fashioning an object in the arts. At the other end, the importance of purpose and plans is stressed; but it is the purpose and planning of the child not of the adult.³⁰

Distinguishing Education from Indoctrination by Content, Method and Aim

In the recent literature concerning the distinction between education and indoctrination, definitions of the terms are usually made on the basis of one of three perspectives. Various authors have concentrated on either the method, content, or aim of the instructor to determine the nature of education as opposed to indoctrination. Method refers to how the instructor teaches. Content is concerned with what is taught, and aim is the intentions of those doing the teaching.

Willis Moore is one advocate of the method criteria for distinguishing between education and indoctrination. The emphasis on method, according to Moore, can be traced to previously discussed debate which emerged during World War II:

Americans were not then divided on either the aim or the content of political education. Both sides wanted to inculcate democracy in American youth and to strengthen its adherence to the democratic way of life. They differed, rather, on how to do this, on method, with some advocating the indoctrinative tactics of the Nazi party while

others, the liberals, insisting on the use of the free, objective procedures long identified with the public schools of America. So "indoctrination" has come to mean strictly a method of teaching.³¹

R. S. Peters seems to agree with the position of Moore. He contends that most of the disputes among educationists have largely been arguments concerning the desirability of a variety of principles involving procedure or method:

When we are concerned with the minds of men there are objections to bringing about positive results in certain sorts of ways. People make moral objections to pre-frontal lobotomy even as remedial measure. How much more objectionable would it be to promote some more positive state of mind, like a love of peace, in all men by giving them drugs or operating on everyone at birth?³²

Speaking of schooling generally, Paulo Freire closely agrees with both Peters and Moore. The basic form of teaching method is prescriptive. It is this prescription which is the basis of indoctrination in the schools.

Every prescription represents the imposition of one man's choice upon another, transforming the consciousness of the man prescribed to into one that conforms with the prescriber's consciousness. Thus, the behavior of the oppressed is a prescribed behavior, following as it does the guidelines of the oppressor.³³

As a result of the prescriptive nature of the teacher-student relationship Freire contends that education assumes a fundamentally narrative character. This situation is characterized by the teacher who narrates, and the students, who are characterized as patient, listening objects. Consequently, the contents of education, ". . . whether values or empirical dimensions of reality, tend in the process of being narrated to become lifeless and petrified."³⁴ Because of both the prescriptive and narrative nature of the schools:

Education thus becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor. Instead of communicating, the teacher issues communiques and makes deposits which the students patiently receive, memorize and repeat. This is the "banking" concept of education, in which the scope of action allowed to the students extends only as far as receiving, filing and storing the deposits.³⁵

Moore believes that American liberals have stigmatized the term indoctrination to the point where it no longer has a place in educational practice. He contends that education (defined by the liberals as a rational method of instruction) is an ideal method which should be practiced to the maximum. However, since everyone must rely on cognitive authorities for information, the non-rational approach is a necessary component to the instructional process. Moore suggests an "indoctrination-education continuum" to restore indoctrination to its proper place in the instructional system:

What I propose, as a modification of the older liberal theory of education, is that we frankly admit that learning necessarily begins with an authoritative and indoctrinative situation, and that for lack of time, native capacity or the requisite training to think everything out for oneself, learning even for the rationally mature individual must continue to include an ingredient of the unreasoned, the merely accepted . . . It would seem to be more in accord with reality to consider the "indoctrination" and the "education" of the earlier liberal educators to be the polar extremes of a continuum of teaching method along which actual teaching may move in keeping with the requirements of the situation.³⁶

Rejecting Moore's emphasis on teaching method, John Wilson selects content as the most important criteria for the establishment of the indoctrination - education distinction. Wilson asks his reader to consider the difference between hypnotizing a child to believe in Communism, and hypnotizing him to master physics. "Plainly it is not a difference in method:

it is a difference in the subject matter."³⁷

Wilson believes that the teaching of political, moral, and religious beliefs is objectionable because they are uncertain in content in a sense that academic subjects are not. This uncertainty in content between the two areas hinges upon the question of what constitutes evidence:

For with a scientific question we at least know what sort of evidence would count towards an acceptable answer: we are agreed in principle about how to answer. But with metaphysical and moral questions we are not agreed.³⁸

Although many strongly convicted people hold such beliefs, it is a fact that different people hold unlike beliefs. Beliefs must be placed in a special category because there is "no publicly-accepted evidence for them, evidence that any rational person would regard as sufficient."³⁹

To avoid indoctrination, Wilson continues, the beliefs taught must be rational and subject to evidence. They do not have to be certain, just probable. Indoctrinated content need not be subject to evidence, and this is its objectional trait:

The concept of indoctrination concerns the truth and evidence of beliefs, and our objection to it is basically that in the realm of belief we must put truth, evidence, and reality first, and other considerations second.⁴⁰

Wilson concludes that moral, religious and political values should be discussed rather than omitted in the formal school system. However, irrational prejudices must not be taught as sound moral principles. If the instructor acts as an instrument for teaching such societal prejudices, he

is indoctrinating.

The problem with utilizing content as the defining mechanism for education and indoctrination is the assumption that there will be agreement upon what constitutes evidence. Wilson seems to assume that somehow all individuals will accept scientific and rational evidence. He assumes that all individuals possess "open belief systems." Such terms as "objectivity" and "rationality" even mean different things to various ideological groupings:

Although adherents to both Puritanism and Scientism would praise objectivity and rationality, they would strongly disagree about their meaning, for the one finds these qualities in the realm of religion, while the other looks for them in science.⁴¹

R.M. Hare rejects Wilson's assertion of the central importance of content to the defining of education and indoctrination. Hare asks of Wilson: "Who are to count as sane and sensible people?" Many who would promote the indoctrination of an ideology consider themselves sane and sensible. Who will judge the merit of publicly-accepted evidence?

In addition, Hare rejects the method criteria of Moore. Like Wilson and Moore, he notes that at least some non-rational and rote teaching methods must be utilized, especially when dealing with young children. By non-rational or rote teaching methods is meant merely the unreasoned acceptance of instruction. Since everyone must rely on cognitive authorities, such methods must be used at least to a certain extent. However, non-rational or rote teaching

does not differ in a significant or fundamental fashion from what ought to be considered indoctrination (e.g., a non-rational method). Hare concludes that the difference between other kinds of teaching and indoctrination cannot be one of method.

It is Hare's contention that intention or aim is central to the distinction between education and indoctrination. By the use of a German rhyme and a short explanation, he demonstrates the problems of both the method and content approaches, and the utility of utilizing aims:

What your father wishes,
What your mother says,
Do it in silence.
Why? Don't ask questions.

Now if I wanted my children to keep this sort of attitude to me, or to what I was teaching them, then I should be indoctrinating. But I do not want this. I may have now to use non-rational methods of teaching, but my wish is that they may as soon as possible become unnecessary. So, though on occasion I may use the very same methods of teaching as the German who wrote this rhyme, and though my teaching may have exactly the same content. . . he is indoctrinating and I am not, because he wants the child always to go on taking its morality from its elders, even after they are dead, whereas I want the child as soon as possible to learn to think morally for itself.⁴²

Indoctrination is thus an intention to halt the ability of children to be able to utilize their native capacity to think and reflect upon moral issues. It is an attempt to fix an element in a developing ideology. The result is the creation of a "closed mind" that is characterized by the inability to evaluate relevant information on intrinsic merits while relying on and yielding to authority. An example is teaching a child to be such a "good" Catholic, Protestant, or Buddhist

that he would never examine the basis of his belief. The ideological mold is cast, and the mind is closed. Aiming at this target is indoctrination.

Hare continues his argument by asserting that aim has a primary impact on both method and content. He believes that aim is the factor that determines both form and substance. To illustrate, if the aim is indoctrination, the method of teaching will probably be non-rational. That is, the students will be required to accept without open discussion what is presented by the authority. Non-rational method implies submission to the authority and acceptance of teaching based upon faith rather than argument, logic, etc. In a similar manner, the content of what is being taught will likely be one-sided, "ignoring too many of reality's qualifying side issues."⁴³

From Hare's perspective, then, it is not indoctrination if the aim is to allow the eventual appraisal of beliefs by those being taught. Indoctrination exists when beliefs are taught never to be questioned. The aim of "education" is ultimately to have people think for themselves; the aim of "indoctrination" is ultimately to prevent people from thinking for themselves. As a result, "education" is a method for creating an open belief structure of ideology. It means that individuals can obtain, evaluate, and act upon relevant information consistent with their own beliefs. Thus they can decide issues for themselves.

The problem with Hare's approach is that it fails to

perceive its own logical moral assumption that people ought to think for themselves. This is as much of a moral assumption as that people ought not to think for themselves, or what Hare calls "indoctrination." Although the moral imperative of "thinking for oneself" is probably more consistent with the non-manipulative result which Hare seemingly desires, it is still manipulation. The author of such an intention wants to create an individual with a certain type of ideology. That is, one with an open belief structure. To aim, for the purpose of this paper, is to indoctrinate. As Morris notes:

. . . each viewpoint makes the same mistake, the mistake of believing that the young are things to be worked over in some fashion to bring them into alignment with a prior notion of what they should be. The young, in this conception of education, are to be used; they are to be employed on behalf of (1) a prepared, precertified idea of "human nature" which they are expected to fulfill, (2) an objective body of extant subject matter which they are expected to absorb, (3) an objective concept of a culture's ways and means of living which they are expected to assume, or (4) a set of dispositions, deemed fundamental, which are to be formed in them and for which they are expected to become the living vehicles.⁴⁴

Although recognizing the utility of method and content as discussed, this paper will concentrate upon aims. The focus will be on the macro rather than the micro level; aims will be examined in terms of the intentions of the state rather than of each individual instructor. The assumption here is that the aims as established by the state will determine to some extent the intentions of each instructor. This assumption appears to be shared by Dewey:

The vice of externally imposed ends has deep roots. Teachers receive them from superior authorities; these authorities accept them from what is current in the community. The teachers impose them upon children.⁴⁵

Operational Definitions

For the purposes of this study, then, all instructional aims will be classified as indoctrination. The act of aiming is conceptualized as a method of affecting the development of ideology. Indoctrination will thus be defined as a system of aims established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development process of the individual.

"Education" will be dichotomized to mean the absense of any intentions established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development process of the individual. Thus individual ideology will be free to develop without extrinsic direction; there will be no assumptions as to the "proper" ideology that should be developed. "Education", by definition, will mean that desired outcomes must be established by each individual for himself. All outcomes of instruction must be intrinsic to the individual.

As Moore suggested, education and indoctrination will be conceptualized as existing on a continuum. However, the continuum will be based on aims rather than on method as was used by Moore.

Position on this continuum will be determined by the

degree to which the expressed aims of an authority attempt to guide and channel the ideological development process of individuals. It is assumed that aiming for a "closed belief system" will be the most indoctrinative form. By closed belief system is meant an ideology which contains fixed belief elements which are neither subject to evidence nor argument. Such beliefs are normative and moral in content. The result on the ideology of the individual may be considerable. In the extreme "ideal case," the individual's ideology has been totally determined by the indoctrinator.

In contrast, it is assumed that aiming for an "open belief system" is probably a less indoctrinative form. By open belief system is meant an ideology that, although it may possess firm beliefs, is open to both evidence and argument. Such aiming does not create substantive beliefs, as with the previous case, beyond the aspect of forming an ideology that is open to both evidence and argument. Although this is still guiding and channelling, it is assumed that there is substantially more room for the recipient to influence the development of his own ideology than in the previous case.

In reality, formal school systems do not exclusively aim for either a closed belief system or an open belief system. Both types of aiming usually occur concomitantly. School systems aim to socialize both cognitively and affectively. By cognitively is meant the development of skills and knowledge of individuals; by affectively is meant the

attempt to determine substantive beliefs, values, attitudes, etc. Cognitive and affective aims correspond roughly to open and closed belief systems, respectively. As a result, the indoctrination potential of instructional aims is one of degrees. If the act of aiming is assumed, during any particular time period the amount of indoctrination present in instructional aims will be determined by the relative relationship between cognitive and affective aims.

In Oregon, the State Board of Education is the authority responsible for the establishment of instructional aims. For any given year, the State Board issues a substantial number of aims, each with a greater or lesser degree of indoctrination potential. These aims are intended to promote certain outcomes in students. Conceptually, aims may be divided into three broad categories to test the degree of indoctrination. These categories have been labelled "skill", "knowledge", and "value" promotion.

The content of some instructional aims is oriented towards the development of cognitive and intellectual capacities. That is, the object of the aim is that the individual be taught a skill which is intended to increase his or her ability to utilize knowledge and information. Two related assumptions must be noted. First, it is assumed that with such skill development students will have the capacity for forming a personal ideology and be less subject to any external prescription. Secondly, aims which develop cognitive and intellectual capacities would be classified

at the low end of the indoctrination continuum. Aims which promote skills are considered to be more consistent with an "open belief system" than either the knowledge or value promotion type.

Skill promotion type aims may be thought of as "procedural" because they are means to the end of developing personal values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. As stated previously, they are to occupy the low end of the indoctrination continuum. In the very lowest categories are to be goals such as thinking critically, solving problems, etc. Skills such as reading and writing are to be scaled higher because, it is assumed, they are necessary for indoctrination to occur. An individual, for example, may be taught to read so that he or she may readily consume propaganda. Although the basic skill is relatively free from indoctrination, the motive for it may not be. In contrast, aims dealing with the promotion of the development of cognitive and intellectual capacities such as thinking critically and solving problems may provide the students with the ability to develop a personal ideology and be insulated from attempts by others to guide and channel ideological development.

In addition to skill promotion, knowledge promotion type aims are assumed to be necessary to develop cognitive and intellectual capacities. The development of such abilities probably necessitates background information. For example, a knowledge of art, history, economics, etc., is a probable prerequisite to developing cognitive and intellectu-

al capacities. However, taken as a whole these aims must occupy a position on the indoctrination scale higher than skill promotion. The rationale for this placement is simple: it is assumed that the mere selection of an area of knowledge to be studied will have greater impact on the development of ideology than purely skill-oriented aims. To illustrate, a knowledge promotion aim such as "to develop a knowledge of American history" may tend to mold and shape an individual's beliefs to a greater degree than the promotion of a skill such as "to develop the ability to solve problems." American history implies certain content. Although problem-solving implies content, it is not prescribed specifically.

Within the knowledge promotion category itself, those aims that are more general in nature are to be classified as lower in indoctrination. To illustrate, an aim to "develop a knowledge of U.S. history" should perhaps be coded lower than an aim to "develop a knowledge of the U.S. Constitution". The former is probably more general than the latter. Both may perhaps be coded lower than an aim that would "develop an understanding of the rights and responsibilities of U.S. citizenship", which in the opinion of the writer is of greater specificity. All of this is based upon the assumption that to guide and channel ideological development requires a very specific selection of knowledge to be promoted.

Knowledge promotion aims do not necessarily dictate the specific value, belief, attitude or behavior the individual is intended to adopt. For example, it is one type of

an instructional aim that seeks to study the capitalist economic system, and quite another to promote the acceptance of that particular system as "good, right, and proper." Although both aims seek to promote some informational content, only the first is to be classified as knowledge promotion. Like skill promotion, knowledge promotion is considered procedural. The example of the study of the capitalist economic system would qualify as a procedure for arriving at a personal conclusion concerning the value of the capitalistic economy. The second is a conclusive value in itself requiring acceptance of a particular judgment.

The final classification for instructional aims is what has been called "value promotion". The content of an aim placed in this category must be substantive in nature. That is, aims must express a substantive and conclusive end rather than a means to an end. In such cases the State Board of Education determines a priori the value, belief, attitude, or behavior that each student will be encouraged to reach. The basis of such aims may be related to a social, economic, moral, religious, political, or philosophic doctrine. If such aims are successfully adopted by students, fixed belief elements are the result. Since these aims are assumed to have the intention of creating a "closed belief system", they are to be classified at the high end of the indoctrination continuum. In addition, it is assumed that the most indoctrinative aims are usually directed at the maintenance of the economic and political status quo. Examples of such

aims include "developing patriotism", "promoting loyalty to present institutional structures and institutions", "creating respect for authority", and "emphasizing the virtues of the existing economic system".

Schematically, the previous discussion and conceptualizations may be diagrammed as follows:

Figure 1. Least-to-most indoctrination scale.

CHAPTER NOTES

¹Normand R. Bernier and Jack E. Williams, Beyond Beliefs: Ideological Foundations of American Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973), p. 12.

²Robert Lane, Political Ideology (New York: The Free Press, 1962), pp. 14-5.

³Ibid., p. 15.

⁴Dean Jaros, Socialization to Politics (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973), p. 7.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Willard A. Mullins, "On the Concept of Ideology in Political Science," American Political Science Review, vol. 66, no. 2 (June 1972), p. 498.

⁷Giovanni Sartori, "Politics, Ideology and Belief Systems," American Political Science Review, vol. 63, no. 2 (June 1969), p. 398.

⁸Lane Political Ideology, p. 14.

⁹Herbert S. Dinerstine, "The Future of Ideology in Alliance Systems," Journal of International Affairs, vol. 25, no. 2 (1971), p. 238.

¹⁰Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Society (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 117.

¹¹Richard M. Merelman, "The Development of Political Ideology: A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization," American Political Science Review, vol. 63, no. 3 (September 1969), p. 751.

¹²Ibid.

¹³Samuel Barnes, "Ideology and the Organization of Conflict: On the Relationship Between Political Thought and Behavior," The Journal of Politics, vol. 28, no. 3 (August 1966), p. 514.

¹⁴Merelman "Development of Political Ideology," p. 750.

¹⁵Sartori "Politics, Ideology and Belief Systems," p. 405.

¹⁶Aldous Huxley, Brave New World Revisited (New York: Harper and Brothers, Inc., 1958), pp. ix-x.

¹⁷Jaros Socialization to Politics, p. 8.

¹⁸Bernier and Williams Beyond Beliefs, pp. 21-2.

¹⁹Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary (1963), s.v. "educate."

²⁰Ibid., s.v. "indoctrinate."

²¹Carter V. Good, Dictionary of Education (New York: Mc Graw-Hill, 1973), p. 202.

²²Ibid., p. 298.

²³Van Cleve Morris, "An Educational Theory," in Aims of Education, ed. Leslie M. Brown (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 119.

²⁴Robert M. McClure, ed., The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 158-9.

²⁵Morris "An Educational Theory," in Aims of Education, p. 119.

²⁶Bernier and Williams Beyond Beliefs, p. 37.

²⁷Brian Crittenden, "Indoctrination as Mis-Education," in Concepts of Indoctrination, ed. I. A. Snook (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 142.

²⁸Morris "An Educational Theory," in Aims of Education, p. 119.

²⁹Willis Moore, "Indoctrination and Democratic Method," in Concepts of Indoctrination, ed. I. A. Snook (Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 93.

³⁰R. S. Peters, "Must An Educator Have An Aim?" in Aims of Education, ed. Leslie M. Brown (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 163.

³¹Moore "Indoctrination and Democratic Method," in Concepts of Indoctrination, p. 95.

³²Peters "Must An Educator Have An Aim?" in Aims of Education, p. 162.

³³Paulo Freire, Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), p. 31.

³⁴Ibid., p. 57.

³⁵Ibid., p. 58.

³⁶Moore "Indoctrination and Democratic Method," in Concepts of Indoctrination, p. 97.

³⁷John Wilson, "Education and Indoctrination," in Aims in Education, ed. T. H. B. Hollins (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1966), p. 28.

³⁸Ibid., p. 29.

³⁹Ibid., p. 28.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Bernier and Williams Beyond Beliefs, p. 50.

⁴²R. M. Hare, "Adolescents Into Adults," in Aims in Education, ed. T. H. B. Hollins (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1966), p. 51.

⁴³Huxley, Brave New World Revisited, p. x.

⁴⁴Morris "An Educational Theory," in Aims of Education, pp. 121-2.

⁴⁵John Dewey, "Aims In Education," in Aims of Education, ed. Leslie M. Brown (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970), p. 155.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The State Board of Education and Aim-Making Authority

Instructional aims in Oregon Public Schools are established by the State Board of Education. The Oregon Legislature created the State Board by the authority of ORS 336.035. The Board consists of seven members that are appointed by the governor. ORS 326.051 outlines the functions of the State Board of Education. Among various other duties, the function of the Board includes prescribing minimum or required courses of study and establishing standards for public schools after having considered the goals or aims of modern education. Terms such as instructional goals, objectives, and aims seem to be used synonymously by the Board, and will be treated as such for the purpose of this analysis. Most seemingly imply the intended result of exposure of the individual to the school system.

Oregon law promotes the adoption of instructional aims as created by the State Board of Education. Financially, local districts have little choice but to accept the aims as prescribed. ORS 327.006 defines a "standard school" as a school that meets the standards set by the rules of the State Board of Education. One of the rules is that curriculum and program planning clearly reflect and integrate the

state-wide instructional aims established by the Board. If a local district or school fails to comply with any of the standards, then it may be declared a "nonstandard school" (or district) and lose claim to the Basic School Support Fund. This school support fund, established in 1947 by the Oregon Legislature, is the major source of state aid to the public school system. According to a document adopted by the State Board of Education recently:

. . . standards continue to serve the general purposes for which they were established when the Basic School Support Fund was enacted in 1947. Primarily, the standards are used as a means of qualifying school districts for state school funds.¹

In addition to qualifying districts for state funding, however, standardization helps to assure that state-wide aims will be adopted in each school.

The threat of a loss of moneys from the Basic School Support Fund is one way of enforcing uniformity in the public school system; another is the provision of ORS 336.035. This statute requires district boards to follow courses of study prescribed by law and the rules of the State Board of Education. According to the provisions of ORS 336.035, the local school district must "see that the courses prescribed by law and by rules of the State Board of Education are carried out . . ."² Since instructional aims have been filed as administrative rules by the Board, the statute also effectively promotes the adoption of such aims on a statewide basis.

Sampling Methodology

Until the mid-1930's, the State Board of Education published a program guide titled State Course of Study. This guide for local districts and schools consisted almost exclusively of outlines of prescribed subject content. Since then, however, the instructional guides published by the Board have placed greater emphasis on goals, objectives, and aims rather than on the particular content to be covered. Such guides have been published under similar but slightly different titles. For example, in secondary education the 1947 publication was titled A Guide to the Program of Studies in the High Schools of Oregon. The next issue published in 1949 was called A Guide to the Program of Studies in the Secondary Schools of Oregon. By 1951, the publication had changed to Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon. This series of guides continued under this heading until 1966, when they were for some unknown reason, discontinued.

After a nine year period, the Department of Education in conjunction with the State Board of Education again published a guide under the title of Elementary-Secondary Guide for Oregon Schools. This guide is a tentative draft dated May, 1975. This means simply that the contents of the guide will be field-tested in school districts during the 1975-1976 school year. After this trial period, the public will have an opportunity for input as to the content of the guide. There is, however, little evidence to suggest that the instructional aims contained therein will significantly

change as a result of the public input.

Although the instructional guides have been published under a variety of titles, they are sufficiently similar to constitute a set or series. In each case, they have been approved by the State Board of Education. Four of these instructional guides covering approximately a thirty year period have been selected to test the hypothesis that Oregon instructional aims have become less indoctrinative during the time in question. They are:

1. A Guide to the Program of Studies in High Schools of Oregon, 1947
2. Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon, 1955-57
3. Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon, 1966
4. Elementary-Secondary Guide for Oregon Schools, 1975

These particular guides and the instructional aims contained within them were selected for a variety of reasons. First and foremost, documents containing instructional aims were unattainable prior to 1947. Even the State of Oregon Library in Salem was without such material. A concomitant factor favoring the utilization of 1947 to begin the study was that it just happened to be the same year that the Legislature enacted the Basic School Support Fund. As previously mentioned, the moneys from this fund can be withheld for non-compliance by local schools to the aims issued by the State Board. Thus it was felt that this specific year would be particularly appropriate to begin this study.

It should be noted that the guides and the accompany-

ing aims that were selected for analysis were not chosen at random. As stated previously, no guide could be located prior to 1947 for Oregon secondary schools. From 1947 to 1966, they were published biannually. After 1966, no guides were written until 1975. Consequently, it was decided to use 1947 and 1975 to provide for the longest period for comparison of instructional aims. The 1966 and 1955 guides were chosen for analysis because they represented approximately equal points to further divide the time span under study. Consequently, although the years under examination were not selected at random, it was felt that they should be appropriate for measuring the changing pattern of indoctrination over time.

In addition, the guides that were selected dealt almost exclusively with secondary instruction. The decision was made to concentrate on the secondary school rather than the primary school. This decision was made because the social studies program is separated from other curricula at this level. This would provide the possibility for the measurement of the indoctrination content of instructional aims exclusive to the social studies program. It was assumed that a large percentage of any existing indoctrination would be carried out in this particular curricular area, a hypothesis tested later in the study and found to be not necessarily so.

Within each guide, two sets of instructional aims were selected for analysis. One set included all the aims issued

by the State Board of Education for the social studies program in the public schools for the years in question. The second contained all the prescribed aims listed under the general, overall purposes and goals of instruction in Oregon. The total number of aims in each category by year are as follows:

TABLE II
NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL AIMS
BY YEAR AND CURRICULAR AREA

	<u>1947</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1975</u>
General Instruction	0	22	74	17
Soc. Stu. Instruction	<u>12</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>9</u>
Yearly Totals:	12	58	93	26

Q-Sort Methodology

In order to analyze these instructional aims, the Q-sort forced distribution method was selected for use. Q-sort utilizes a nine-point scale; it was designed to measure a least-to-most intense expression of the defined content of a variable. The aims are scaled on a least-to-most indoctrination continuum. Indoctrination is defined as a system of aims expressed by the state which seeks to channel the ideological development of the individual.

The Q-sort is a forced distribution method. Forced distribution means that a certain statistically determined percentage of the total number of observations must be placed in each of the nine categories. The coder has, in short, a certain numerical quota to fill in each category. In this manner, the Q-sort approximates the normal curve with

a given set of observations. It assumes the greater number of units will be manifest in an average or modal expression rather than at the extremes. At the extremes of the least-to-most continuum only a small percentage of the total number of observations is assigned. Movement from either extreme towards the center of the scale progressively increases this percentage. A "bulge" is present at the middle of the scaled distribution. To maintain the balance of the forced distribution, an equivalent number of observations must be placed in categories one and nine, two and eight, three and seven, etc. The scale for coding instructional aims on a least-to-most indoctrination continuum for the present study is shown in Table III:

TABLE III

SCALE FOR CODING INSTRUCTIONAL AIMS

Category	INDOCTRINATION								
	Low							High	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Percent	5%	8%	12%	16%	18%	16%	12%	8%	5%
Number	9	15	23	30	35	30	23	15	9

The first row of numbers represents the nine point Q-sort categories; the second is the percentage on the total observations to be placed in each. The third row is the actual number of observations that are to be placed in each category. For example, in the first row find category one. The total percentage of instructional aims to be placed in this category to approximate the normal curve is five percent

of the total. With the total number of aims under investigation equal to 189, five percent of the observations is equal to nine. Therefore, nine instructional aims are to be placed in category one, fifteen in category two, twenty-three in category three, and so on.

It must be pointed out that the number of aims under investigation is a unitized quantity. Unitizing refers to the process of making a single unit from a more complex statement. It involves making a decision on the boundaries of the units to be coded. For example, consider the following instructional aim: "To develop an understanding of governmental operations and promote active citizen participation." Instead of this statement being given to the coding judges as is, if unitized, it would be divided into two statement aims: (1) "to develop an understanding of governmental operations", and (2) "promote active citizen participation". Generic to this point, Holsti states:

Many sentences contain more than one theme, and identifying proper boundaries between them is a judgmental process for which it may be difficult to formulate rules that cover every type of theme that may occur in the text.³

For the general purpose of this study, the process of unitizing merely entailed dividing aims which expressed what were considered to be two or more independent elements. Usually, division of aims occurred at a comma or connective conjunction. In most cases, the aims were listed in numerical sequence (aim 1, 2, 3, etc.). As a result the process unitizing involved only examining each and making a judgment

on the necessity to divide in the case of compoundedness. One exception was the general aims for 1966. For an undetermined reason, these aims were inconsistent with the other sets. They were expressed in a narrative rather than in an enumerated fashion. As a result, the 1966 general aims required more attention regarding unitizing. For a comparison of the actual aims and the unitized aims, see appendices A and B.

In addition, two aims were dropped from the analysis. Both deletions were made from the general 1955 set. Although these deletions were made rather arbitrarily, it is contended that these particular aims had a slightly differing focus than the remainder that were utilized for analysis. The deleted aims seemed more oriented towards the instructor than the student. For the purpose of maintaining as much unity as possible within the data and, more importantly, to prevent confusion in the coding by a panel of judges, the aims were simply removed from the analysis. See appendix C for a listing of deletions.

Pre-Test and Experiment

After the aims were unitized, a panel of graduate students was assembled to judge and code the 189 aims, placing each in the appropriate one-to-nine Q-sort category. However, to test the feasibility of the study, a pretest was utilized. Two judges, undergraduate students at Portland State University, were asked to perform the Q-sorting of the

unitized data in the presence of the writer. Discussion occurred between the judge and the writer on each scaling decision. The results were disappointing. What seemed to be happening was that the judges tended to code those aims consistent with their own ideology as less indoctrinative; aims opposed to the same were rated higher. Defining indoctrination as "a system of aims established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development process of individuals" was perhaps too broad of a definition to allow for sufficient agreement among coding judges.

As a result of the pretest it was decided that the definition of the variable was inadequate. Ambiguity resulting in a lack of precision in coding according to the definition of indoctrination was seen as the major problem to be solved. Indoctrination had to be conceptualized in a clearer and more explicit manner than previously thought in order to assure some degree of consistency among the coders.

This problem was at least partially overcome by creating three categories in which the aims were to be placed prior to the Q-sort process. These categories were to be considered as extended definitional aspects of the variable: indoctrination. As stated previously, the first category was labelled "skill promotion", the second was called "knowledge promotion" and the third, "value promotion". The purpose was to establish a definition for clearer conceptualization and greater agreement among the coding judges.

After the re-conceptualization of the definition of indoctrination and the resulting adoption of the three categories, another pretest was conducted with the same two judges. The same method was employed. The judge and the writer discussed the "why" of each coding decision, i.e., why one aim was more or less indoctrinative than another. The results were encouraging. The problem experienced previously of judges coding those aims consistent with their own ideology as less indoctrinative seemed to be minimized by the new approach. For example, once a judge recognized and classified an aim in the value promotion category, he was forced to place it high on the indoctrination continuum whether or not he agreed with the specific value being promoted.

After concluding the pretesting and reconceptualizing the concept of indoctrination, four graduate students were selected to act as the final coding judges. All were social science majors. One was majoring in psychology, one in geography, and two in political science. The group consisted of two women and two men; the age of the coders ranged from twenty-two to twenty-eight years old. All were inner-city dwellers and generally speaking, at least marginal members of the middle class. These coding judges were not chosen at random, but rather because they were acquaintances of the writer. However, the particulars of this research was not discussed with any of the coding judges prior to the time of the test.

Each of the 189 unitized aims was typed in upper and lower case letters on a standard, white, three by five inch index card. A five page list of instructions was given to each coding judge. These instructions are available in appendix E.

Extraneous variables were minimized as much as possible. This was accomplished by approximating, as far as possible, an identical testing situation for all of the coding judges. Quiet, well-lit rooms at Portland State University were used. Class scheduling prevented the use of the same room for all of the tests, but the actual rooms selected were very similar in nature. In addition, as mentioned previously all coding judges were given the same instruction sheet.

Prior to the commencement of the scaling process, the coding judges were asked to read completely the written instruction. Any questions arising from the first reading were answered before the testing actually began. Verbally, it was suggested that the judge begin by dividing the universe into the "skill promotion", "knowledge promotion", and "value promotion". Once this hierarchy of aims was established, the judge would be free to refine these broad classifications into the finer distinctions allowed by the Q-sort method. These verbal instructions were in compliance with the written instruction. In addition, each judge was informed that he or she could take as long as needed to sort the cards. The judges were informed that they could stop and relax, or speak to the tester. However, no discussion of coding was permitted

after the commencement of the testing. The actual time taken to complete the coding ranged from about forty-five to seventy-five minutes.

CHAPTER NOTES

¹Elementary-Secondary Guide for Oregon Schools (Salem, Oregon: Department of Education, 1975), p. 1-1.

²See ORS 336.035

³Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities (London: Addison-Westley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 136.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the scaling process was complete for all four of the coding judges, the reliability between the judges was computed. This "category reliability" is a result of defining and formulating categories "for which the empirical evidence is clear enough so that competent judges will agree on which items of a certain population belong in a category and which do not."¹ In the present case, this meant that there must be reasonable close agreement between judges in scaling the aims. If this agreement between judges was insufficient, the results of the study would be meaningless.

The degree of agreement between each of the judges was determined by computing an "inter-judge correlation." Only two judges can be compared at a time with this statistic. As a result there were six possible correlations between the four coding judges (judges 1-2, 1-3, 1-4, 2-3, 2-4, 3-4). This correlation was computed for each possible pair of the judges with the following formula as provided by North: $r = 1 - \frac{d^2_{ip}}{K}$. The numerator of the equation is equal to the total sum of the squared differences between any two judges. The denominator is described by North as follows:

K, the constant, is a function both of the prescribed distribution and of the total number of unit-statements which are scaled. X values refer to the number of statements prescribed for the designated category. Y values represent the number defining the rank of the category.²

To determine the value of the constant, K, the following formula is given by North:

$$K = x_1(y_1 - y_9)^2 + x_2(y_2 - y_8)^2 + x_3(y_3 - y_7)^2 + x_4(y_4 - y_6)^2$$

The inter-judge correlation ranges from between -1.0 to +1.0, with values above zero indicating a greater degree of agreement than expected purely at random. In order to permit the utilization of the results, it has been recommended that an inter-judge correlation of +0.70 or above is sufficiently high.³ Translated to the Q-sort scale, the +0.70 correlation means that the average disagreement is approximately 1.5 categories per unitized aim.

The inter-judge correlations were computed for the four coding judges. The results are indicated in Table IV.

TABLE IV
INTER-JUDGE CORRELATIONS

Judges	1	2	3
4	.714	.711	.696
3	.914	.803	
2	.830		

With the exception of one correlation, all of the results were above the +0.70 mark. Even the relationship between judges three and four was so close to the +0.70 level

(0.696), that it was felt that sufficient agreement between those particular coding judges was present.

When utilizing a consensus of judgments as was done in this study, it is possible to compute one composite reliability from all of the inter-judge correlations. This statistic provides a summary of the information regarding agreement among the judges. Like the inter-judge correlation, it ranges from +1 to -1. However, what constitutes sufficient agreement is always higher. To compute the composite reliability, the following formula was utilized with N equal to the number of judges participating in the consensus:

$$r_{\text{composite}} = \frac{N \text{ (average inter-judge correlation)}}{1 + [(N-1) \text{ (av. inter-judge correlation)}]}$$

For this study, the composite reliability for the four judges was equal to .933. ". . . a composite reliability of +0.80 is adequate to secure the reliability of the data for analysis."⁴ As a result, both the inter-judge correlations and the composite correlation suggest that sufficient agreement existed between judges to permit the use of the scaled data for analysis.

To further test agreement among the judges, the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was used. The Friedman is a non-parametric test, a necessary concomitant of working with ranked ordinal data such as in this study. In order to calculate this statistic, the mean category-value for each judge for both general aims and social studies aims was computed. "The category-values derived from the

scaling process are assigned as attributes to the unit-statements which have been scaled. The mean of the series of judgments on a particular unit-statement is used."⁵

To illustrate, if unit-statement number three is placed in category four by one judge, in category five by two judges and in category six by the fourth judge, the mean is derived by the sum of the categories divided by the number of judgments. Statement number three is therefore given the category-value of twenty divided by four, or 5.0. The simple formula below was utilized for this computation.

$$V_{ij} = \frac{\sum(dc)}{N}$$

V_{ij} equals the degree of intensity of indoctrination and is the category-value. The descriptive-connective, dc , is the category from one to nine into which each aim was placed. N is equal to the number of judgments made.

Tables V and VI contain the mean category-values for the study. Table V displays the values for social study aims while Table VI the mean category-values for general aims. For both tables, vertical columns represent the four judges and the horizontal rows are indicative of the series of years under analysis.

From reading Table V, and studying the horizontal rows for any of the years, a cursory examination seems to indicate that the mean category-values were very similar between the judges. This would tend to indicate agreement. Using these figures, the Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks

TABLE V
MEAN CATEGORY-VALUES FOR SOCIAL STUDIES AIMS

	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4
1975	4.11	4.00	4.00	4.67
1966	3.21	3.11	3.32	3.11
1955	5.72	6.00	5.53	5.81
1947	2.75	3.33	3.00	3.17

TABLE VI
MEAN CATEGORY-VALUES FOR GENERAL AIMS

	Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4
1975	4.88	4.82	4.82	4.88
1966	5.24	5.08	5.28	5.31
1955	6.18	6.18	6.27	5.50

was next employed to test the following hypotheses:

H₀: There is no significant difference in judgment between the four coders on the general aims to education.

H_a: There is a significant difference in judgment between the four coders on the general aims to education.

Assumptions: (1) the experiment has been blocked
(2) the data is continuous
(3) equal sample sizes

Ranks (using the data from Table VI):

		Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4
Gen. Aims	Years of	1975	3.5	1.5	3.5
		1966	2.0	1.0	4.0
		1955	2.5	2.5	4.0
					1.0
R _j =		8.0	5.0	8.5	8.5

Test: Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks;

$N = 3$ (number of rows: years) $k = 4$ (number of columns: judges)
 R_j = sum of the ranks of the j th column

Test Statistic:
$$\chi^2_r = \frac{12}{Nk(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^k (R_j)^2 - 3N(k+1)$$

$$\chi^2_r = 1.7$$

the probability of χ^2_r being 1.7 with $k=4$,
 $N=3 = .727$

Level of significance: .05

Decision rule: If $p \leq .05$, reject H_0 ; if $p > .05$, do not reject H_0 .

Conclusion: Since $.727 > .05$, do not reject H_0 .
 There is no significant difference in the judgments made by the four coders on the general instructional aims for Oregon's Secondary Schools. Therefore, the data suggests agreement between judges.

H_0 : There is no significant difference in judgment between the four coders on the social studies aims to education.

H_a : There is a significant difference in judgment between the four coders on the social studies aims to education.

Assumptions: same as above.

Ranks: (using the data from Table V)

		Judge 1	Judge 2	Judge 3	Judge 4
Years of	1975	3.0	1.5	1.5	4.0
Soc. Stu.	1966	3.0	1.5	4.0	1.5
Aims	1955	2.0	4.0	1.0	3.0
	1947	1.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
$R_j =$		9.0	11.0	8.5	11.5

Test: Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks;
 $N = 4$ (number of rows; years) $k = 4$ (number of columns: judges)
 R_j = sum of the ranks in the j th column.

Test Statistic: same as above. $\chi^2_r = .975$
 the p. of $\chi^2_r = .975$ with $k = 4$, $N = 4$ equals .90.

Level of Significance = .05.

Decision Rule: same as above.

Conclusion: Since $.90 > .05$, Do not reject H_0 .
There is no significant difference in the judgments made by the four coders on the social studies instructional aims for Oregon's Secondary Schools.

Like the general instructional aims, there is also no significant difference in the judgments made by the four coders on the social studies instructional aims for Oregon's secondary schools. This, coupled with the inter-judge correlations and the composite reliability seemed to indicate sufficient agreement to permit analysis of the coded data.

The following graph illustrates the dynamic nature of instructional aims in Oregon during the test period. The fixed points for each year were computed by extracting the mean score for all of the category-values. Thus the values expressed on the vertical axis represent the average category-value; the horizontal axis indicates the particular year. The lines on the graph plot the average of the category-values for both social studies and general instructional aims. A third line illustrates the midpoint between social studies and general aims.

Figure 2. Mean category-values for the test period

Because of the nature of the subject matter under consideration, it was originally thought that social studies aims might contain a higher degree of indoctrination than found in the general instructional aims for the same time period. It was with this idea in mind that they were included in the study for analysis. In contrast to this hypothesis, however, visual examination of the above graph (Figure 2) suggested that the general aims received higher category-values than did the social studies. This might have meant that general aims had a more indoctrinative content than did social studies aims.

To test whether there was any significant difference between the general and social studies aims, the Mann-Whitney U-Test was employed. The Mann-Whitney U-Test is especially useful with small samples such as was the case with this study. This test is a non-parametric alternative to the t-test, and was used to compare the general and social studies aims on the single criterion of indoctrination. To compute the Mann-Whitney U-Test, the means of the category-values were separated by year and by subject area. These figures are displayed in the following table.

TABLE VII
MEAN CATEGORY-VALUES FOR SOCIAL STUDY AND GENERAL AIMS

	Soc. Stu.	General
1975	4.194	4.853
1966	3.184	5.230
1955	5.763	6.034
1947	3.062	-----

Ho: There is no significant difference in the ranks between general and social studies aims.

Ha: There is a significant difference in the ranks between general and social studies aims.

Assumptions: 1) the data is on at least an ordinal scale
2) the data is continuously distributed.

Ranks: (using the data from Table VII)

	Soc. Stu.	General
1975	3.0	4.0
1966	2.0	5.0
1955	6.0	7.0
1947	1.0	---
$\sum R_a = 12.0$		$\sum R_b = 16.0$

Test: Mann-Whitney U-Test; $n_a = 4$ (number of social studies ranks), $n_b = 3$ (number of general aims ranks),
 $N = n_a + n_b = 7$

Test Statistic: the U statistic is the smaller of U_a or U_b

$$U_a = n_a n_b + \frac{n_b (n_b + 1)}{2} - \sum R_b \quad U_a = 2.0$$

$$U_b = n_a n_b + \frac{n_a (n_a + 1)}{2} - \sum R_a \quad U_b = 10.0$$

Level of Significance: .05, two-tailed test

Decision Rule: if $U \leq 0$, Reject H_0 ; if $U > 0$, Do not reject H_0 .

Conclusion: Since $2 > 0$, do not reject H_0 . There is no significant difference between social studies and general aims. It appears that the small difference seen on the graph in Figure 2 is insignificant.

There seems to be no evidence from the data to suggest any difference in the degree of indoctrination of social studies or general instructional aims for Oregon's secondary schools. These results may lend credence to another hypothesis that instructional aims, regardless of subject category (social studies or general aims), tend to be closely related in degree of indoc-

trination in each year examined. Looking at the graph in Figure 2 seems to indicate this very point.

To test the main hypothesis of this study, the Friedman Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks was utilized to indicate significant differences between the years selected for analysis. The main hypothesis as stated previously was that instructional aims have become less indoctrinative during the test period. The first method of examining this question statistically was an analysis of the general instructional aims during the years of 1975, 1966 and 1955.

Ho: There is no significant difference between general instructional aims for 1975, 1966 and 1955.

Ha: There is a significant difference between general instructional aims for 1975, 1966 and 1955.

Assumptions: 1) the experiment has been blocked
2) the data is continuous
3) equal sample sizes

Ranks: (using the data from Table VI)

	1975	1966	1955
Judge 1	1.0	2.0	3.0
Judge 2	1.0	2.0	3.0
Judge 3	1.0	2.0	3.0
Judge 4	1.0	2.0	3.0
$R_j =$	4.0	8.0	12.0

Test: Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks;
N = 4 (number of rows: judges) k = 3 (number of
columns: years) R_j = sum of the ranks in jth column.

Test Statistic:
$$\chi_r^2 = \frac{12}{Nk(k+1)} \sum_{j=1}^k (R_j)^2 - 3N(k+1)$$

$$\chi_r^2 = 8.0$$

the p. of $\chi_r^2 = 8.0$ with N=4, k=3 equals .0046

Level of Significance: .05

Decision Rule: if $p \leq .05$, reject H_0 ; if $p > .05$, do not reject H_0 .

Conclusion: Since $.0046 < .05$, reject H_0 . There is a significant difference between the general instructional aims for 1975, 1966 and 1955.

The data suggests that there is a significant difference in general instructional aims at least between the years of 1975 and 1955. There was no further testing that could be done to decide if 1966 and 1955 or 1966 and 1975 were significantly different. The available Friedman's tables will only deal with three or more columns. Because there is a significant difference between 1955 and 1975, the data does, however, suggest a trend toward less indoctrination over this twenty year period.

Looking at the social studies aims from the years 1947, 1955, 1966 and 1975, the Friedman non-parametric test was again used to help decide if there is a significant difference between these years.

H_0 : There is no significant difference between social studies aims for 1975, 1966, 1955 and 1947.

H_a : There is a significant difference between social studies aims for 1975, 1966, 1955 and 1947.

Assumptions: same as above.

Ranks: (using the data from Table V)

	1975	1966	1955	1947
Judge 1	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.0
Judge 2	3.0	1.0	4.0	2.0
Judge 3	3.0	2.0	4.0	1.0
Judge 4	3.0	1.0	4.0	2.0
$R_j =$	12.0	6.0	16.0	6.0

Test: Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks;
 $N = 4$ (number of rows: judges) $k = 4$ (number of columns: years) R_j = the sum of the ranks in j th column.

Test Statistic: same as above. $\chi_r^2 = 10.8$

the p. of $\chi_r^2 = 10.8$ with $k=4$, $N=4$ equals .0016

Level of Significance: .05

Decision Rule: same as above.

Conclusion: Since $.0016 < .05$, reject H_0 . There is a significant difference between the social studies aims at least for 1955 and the two lowest ranked years: 1966 and 1947.

The data suggests that there is a significant difference between these four years of social studies instructional aims. Since 1947 and 1966 have equal sums of ranks, it was assumed that at least the aims from 1947 and 1966 were significantly different from 1955 which possessed the aims with the highest sum of ranks. Therefore, a further test was conducted on the three years with the lower sums of ranks (1975, 1966, 1947) to discover if there was an additional significant difference between these three years.

H_0 : There is no significant difference between social studies aims for 1975, 1966 and 1947.

H_a : There is a significant difference between social studies aims for 1975, 1966 and 1947.

Assumptions: same as above.

Ranks: (using the data from Table V)

	1975	1966	1947
Judge 1	3.0	2.0	1.0
Judge 2	3.0	1.0	2.0
Judge 3	3.0	2.0	1.0
Judge 4	3.0	1.0	2.0
$R_j =$	12.0	6.0	6.0

Test: Friedman's Two-Way Analysis of Variance by Ranks;
 $N = 4$ (number of rows: judges) $k = 3$ (number of columns: years) R_j = sum of the ranks in the j th column.

Test Statistic: same as above. $\chi_r^2 = 6.0$

p. of $\chi_r^2 = 6.0$ with $N = 4$, $k = 3$ equals .069

Level of Significance: .05

Decision Rule: same as above.

Conclusion: Since $.069 > .05$, do not reject H_0 . There is no significant difference in social studies aims for 1975, 1966 and 1947.

There was no significant difference between the social studies aims of 1975, 1966 and 1947. The data therefore tends to confirm the conclusion that the 1955 social studies aims of Oregon's secondary schools were significantly higher than the other three years studied, but there was not sufficient evidence of a difference between 1975 and 1966 to support the proposition that there was a downward trend in the degree of indoctrination over that decade.

In summary, the Friedman and Mann-Whitney U tests have rejected the hypotheses that instructional aims were more indoctrinative for social studies than for general categories, and that indoctrination has gradually declined during the test period. Although it is granted that only certain years were studied and therefore the results may have varied with the selection of alternate years, it is contended that these results are probably reasonably accurate in describing the actual trend of indoctrination in the aims.

Translating these statistics, the balance between "skill", "knowledge" and "value" promotion has probably remained, with

the exception of 1955, reasonably unchanged. The particular case of 1955 probably can be explained by the McCarthyism phenomenon. However, in the long term trend, the data seems to lend conviction to the idea that the balance between aiming to create individuals with "open belief systems" and "closed belief systems" has remained on the whole, constant.

CHAPTER NOTES

¹Robert C. North, Ole R. Holsti, M. George Zaninovich and Dina A. Zinnes, Content Analysis (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1963), p. 63.

²Ibid.

³Ibid., p. 64.

⁴Ibid.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis generally was to examine, indirectly, indoctrination in the public schools of Oregon. Specifically, the main hypothesis to be tested was that the schools have become less indoctrinative during the test period. Indoctrination was operationally defined as "a system of aims expressed by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling ideological development". The focus was on the intention to indoctrinate rather than on the actual results of the process.

The concept of ideology received close attention because of its link with indoctrination. It was conceptualized as existing on a continuum with "open beliefs" at one extreme and "closed beliefs" at the other. Ideology was defined as "a set of internalized attitudes, values, and beliefs which tend to exhibit constraint." Both the "open" and "closed" belief structures were assumed to fit this definition.

A least-to-most scale for indoctrination was devised. Aims promoting an "open belief structure" were defined as less indoctrinative than those which promoted a "closed belief structure". The categories of skill, knowledge, and value promotion were devised to aid in the scaling process.

The data utilized consisted of instructional aims published by the State Board of Education. The years 1947, 1955, 1966, and 1975 were selected to test the declining indoctrination hypothesis. The data was analyzed by a panel of judges utilizing the Q-sort technique. Agreement between judges was sufficient for analysis.

With the exception of 1955, the results indicated no significant differences at the .05 level. The differences between the scores for 1947, 1966, and 1975 were so small that they were probably due to randomness. The scores in question were the means for the category-values in each year. This indicates that the coding judges ranked the universes of aims for 1947, 1966, and 1975 as about equal with each other in strength of indoctrination.

In 1955 there was a significant difference at the .05 level. This suggests that the probability was 95 out of 100 that the observed difference in the 1955 score was not due to randomness. This implies that the difference between the means of the category-values for 1955 and the other years was sufficiently large so that it was unlikely to occur at random. In other words, the coding judges scored 1955 aims different in degree of indoctrination than other years.

To determine if 1955 was rated higher or lower in indoctrination than the other years, all that is required is a visual check of the category-values. Since the 1955 aims had the highest values, it may be inferred that the coding judges scaled this set higher in indoctrination than the other years of aims. This was the case because the high

numbers on the Q-sort scale represented greater degrees of indoctrination, and the category-value assigned to each aim corresponds to this scale.

The findings indicated rejection of the declining indoctrination hypothesis. If this hypothesis were to be confirmed, two conditions would be necessary. First, the difference between the means of the category-values would all have to be significant at the .05 level. Second, these values would have to be arranged in descending order, with 1947 possessing the highest value, 1975 the lowest, and 1955 and 1966 following the diagonal trend line.

The actual results differed greatly from this model. Three of the years studied, as explained previously, did not indicate even significant differences in their mean category-value scores. This implies a horizontal line with one peak representing the higher indoctrinative mean category-value of 1955.

This differs greatly from the model proposed to confirm the hypothesis. As a result, the declining indoctrination hypothesis was rejected.

Beyond the rejection of the declining indoctrination hypothesis, the data does suggest two ideas. As stated before, 1955 was higher in indoctrination, probably as a result of McCarthyism. Secondly, the closeness of mean category values for 1947, 1966 and 1975 may tend to indicate some stability in indoctrination, with 1955 as an atypical case.

In conclusion, the State Board of Education in Oregon is responsible by law for creating prescriptive aims. What has been measured is the relative strength of the "how to think" aims against the "what to believe" aims. Although many of the relatively stronger prescriptions of "what to believe" have ebbed since 1955, the State Board continues to function as a prescriber. This fact alone has impact for indoctrination. As one pedagogist noted as far back as 1938:

To prescribe what people are to believe is, in essence, the principle of dictatorship In other words, education becomes a mean for developing the younger generation according to a predetermined model. The essential feature . . . is not changed by the claim that it is a means for preserving democracy.¹

CHAPTER NOTES

¹Boyd H. Bode, "What is the Meaning of Freedom in Education?" in Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, eds., Harold B. Alberty and Boy H. Bode (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938), p. 9.

REFERENCES

Primary References

- Barnes, Samuel H. "Ideology and the Organization of Conflict: On the Relationship Between Political Thought and Behavior." The Journal of Politics 28:3 (August 1966): 513-20.
- Bernier, Normand R., and Williams, Jack E. Beyond Beliefs: Ideological Foundations of American Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Brock, Horace W. "Consciousness Aleph." National Review, March 30, 1973, pp. 364-6.
- Brown, Leslie M., ed. Aims of Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1970.
- Dahl, Robert A. Who Governs? New Haven: Yale University Press, 1972.
- Elementary-Secondary Guide For Oregon Schools, pre-publication draft, Salem, Oregon: Oregon Department of Education, 1975.
- Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Friedman, M. "The Use of Ranks to Avoid the Assumption of Normality Implicit in the Analysis of Variance." Journal of American Statistical Association 32 (1937): 688-9.
- Guide to Secondary Education In Oregon. Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1966.
- Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon for School Years 1955-1957. Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1955.
- A Guide to the Program of Studies in the High Schools of Oregon. Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1947.
- Hollins, T. H. B., ed. Aims in Education. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1964.
- Holsti, Ole R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. London: Addison-Westley Publishing Company, 1969.
- Jaros, Dean. Socialization to Politics. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Kneller, George F. The Educational Philosophy of National Socialism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941.

- Kozol, Jonathan. The Night Is Dark and I Am Far From Home. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1975.
- Kuzin, N. P., and Kondakov, M. I. Education in the USSR. Moscow, USSR: Progress Publishers, 1972.
- Lane, Robert E. Political Ideology. New York: The Free Press, 1962.
- Mann, Michael. "The Social Cohesion of Liberal Democracy." American Sociological Review 35 (June 1970): 423-37.
- Merelman, Richard M. "The Development of Political Ideology: A Framework for the Analysis of Political Socialization." The American Political Science Review 63:3 (September 1969): 750-67.
- Mullins, Willard A. "On the Concept of Ideology in Political Science." American Political Science Review 66:2 (June 1972): 498-510.
- North, Robert C., Holsti, Ole R., Zaninovich, M. George, and Zinnes, Dina A. Content Analysis. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Pulliam, W. E. Political Propaganda in the Secondary School History Program of National Socialist Germany, 1933-1945. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968.
- Roscoe, John T. Fundamental Research Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Sartori, Giovanni. "Politics, Ideology, and Belief Systems." American Political Science Review 63:2 (June 1969): 398-411.
- Shils, Edward. Selected Essays. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1970.
- Snook, I. A., ed. Concepts of Indoctrination. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1972.
- Social Studies In Oregon Secondary Schools. Salem, Oregon: State Department of Education, 1955.

Secondary References

- Alberty, Harold B., and Bode, Boyd H., eds. "Educational Freedom and Democracy," Second Yearbook of the John Dewey Society. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1938.
- Apter, David E., ed. Ideology and Discontent. New York: The Free Press, 1964.
- Arian, Allan. "The Role of Ideology in Determining Behavior." The American Sociological Review 15:1 (March 1967): 47-57.
- Ballow, Richard Boyd. The Individual and the State. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.
- Bell, Daniel. The End of Ideology. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.
- Boyd, William, ed. The Emile of Jean Jacques Rousseau. New York: Teachers College Columbia University, 1962.
- Carnoy, Martin. Education as Cultural Imperialism. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1975.
- Cassinelli, C. W. "Totalitarianism, Ideology, Propaganda." Journal of Politics 22:1 (February 1960): 68-95.
- Conquest, Robert, ed. The Politics of Ideas in the USSR. New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers, 1967.
- Dinerstine, Herbert S. "The Future of Ideology in Alliance Systems." Journal of International Affairs 25:2 (1971): 238-265.
- Easton, David. "The Function of Education in a Political System." The School Review. 65 (Autumn 1957): 304-16.
- Ford, Nick A., ed. Language in Uniform. New York: The Odyssey Press, 1967.
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Hall, Louis J. The Ideological Imagination. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1972.
- Holborn, Hajo. "Origins and Political Character of Nazi Ideology." Political Science Quarterly 79:4 (December 1964): 542-54.
- Huxley, Aldous. Brave New World Revisited. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

- Ikenberry, Oliver S. American Education Foundations. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1974.
- Jennings, M. Kent, and Niemi, Richard G. The Political Character of Adolescence. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Key, V. O., Jr. Public Opinion and American Democracy. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Koh, B. C. "Ideology and Political Control in North Korea." Journal of Politics 32:3 (August 1970): 655-74.
- Kornhauser, William. The Politics of Mass Society. New York: The Free Press, 1959.
- Lasswell, Harold D., and Kaplan, Abraham. Power and Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.
- Manheim, Jarol B. The Politics Within. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- McClure, Robert M., ed. The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971.
- Mills, C. Wright. The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- More, Thomas. Utopia. translated by John C. Collins. London: Clarndon Press, n.d.
- Morrissett, Irvian, ed. Concepts and Structure in the New Social Science Curricula. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Niemeyer, Gerhart. "The Role of Ideology in Communist Systems." Orbis 17:3 (Fall 1973): 778-92.
- Pulliam, John D. History of Education in America. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1968.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques. The Government of Poland. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1972.
- Shakespeare, William. The Merchant of Venice. Edited by John Russell Brown. London: Methuen and Company, 1959.
- Taborsky, Edward. Conformity Under Communism. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1958.
- Warmington, Eric H., and Rouse, Philip G., eds. Great Dialogues of Plato. New York: The New American Library, 1956.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam Company, 1963.

Westby-Gibson, Dorothy. Social Foundations of Education. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Zeigler, Harmon. The Political Life of American Teachers. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONAL AIMS AS PRESENTED IN OREGON STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS

From A Guide to the Program of Studies in High Schools of
Oregon, 1947.

Social Studies Aims

1. To help pupils to acquire an informational background which will enable them to arrive at logical conclusions, and social understandings which will enable them to function better as members of society.
2. To assist pupils in developing certain abilities and habits of work such as:
 - a. The ability to locate needed information
 - b. The ability to read and comprehend this information
 - c. The ability to evaluate sources of information--distinguishing between original sources and secondary authorities, and reliable and unreliable sources
 - d. The ability to apply information to the solution of problems
 - e. The ability to approach controversial issues objectively, employing known fact rather than prejudice
 - f. The ability to see and demonstrate the significance of cause and effect
 - g. The ability to think straight in time historically and space geographically
 - h. The ability to work cooperatively with others
3. To help pupils apply what they learn to personal and current human situations. When this cannot be done, the significance of what has been studied is open to serious question.

From A Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon, 1955-57

General Aims

1. Attain the highest type of patriotism through a deep and abiding love for our country, loyalty to its institutions and ideas, and a compelling desire to keep them inviolate.
2. Develop an understanding of the basic principles of American Democracy which include the worth of the individual, justice, and fair dealing.
3. Strive toward the ideals of American citizenship and devel-

op a world outlook and a feeling of personal responsibility as a world citizen.

4. Develop an understanding that all citizens of the United States should enjoy the same privileges and assume the same responsibilities of citizenship regardless of race, national origin, or creed.
5. Develop an understanding of the concept that free enterprise is the keystone to our economic structure.
6. Recognize his potentialities and evolve a plan of development in keeping with his capacities, needs, and interests.
7. Make full use of his mental powers through broad, deep, clear thinking, and through the exercise of his creative abilities.
8. Develop maximum facility in the use of language and in the understanding and interpretation of basic areas of knowledge.
9. Enjoy good health, proper posture, and physical fitness through developing and maintaining them at a high level.
10. Equip himself through general and special education for earning a satisfactory and happy living in a vocation for which he is naturally well fitted.
11. Develop an understanding of high moral and spiritual ideals and apply them to daily living.
12. Prepare himself for use of leisure time through appreciation of beauty in literature, music, and art, and through skill in recreational activities.
13. Develop his personality for harmonious living with himself and others through honest, unselfish, and unstinted service.
14. Prepare himself for the responsibilities and privileges of family life and for contribution to the welfare of the community.
15. Develop the ability and desire to evaluate his own behavior in relation to the immediate social group in which he moves, and to the inter-groups of our nation and the world, with a view to bringing about individual and social adjustment.

From Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon, 1955

Minimum Skills

1. Ability to interpret printed, pictured, and audio-visual materials, including books, speeches, newspapers, radio and television broadcasts, films, magazines, maps, charts, globes, and other graphic materials
2. Ability to identify and determine means of solving problems--think critically; sift and weigh evidence; distinguish between fact and opinion; compare, contrast, summarize, and draw inferences in harmony with the evidence and the underlying conditions
3. Ability to use correctly works of social, economic, and political significance
4. Ability to use library and other community resources in the pursuit of knowledge both for pleasure and utility
5. Ability to identify correctly people, events, and institutions in time, place, and importance
6. Ability to participate in democratic group activity in classroom and school both as leader and follower

Developed Understandings

1. A fundamental principle of democracy is respect for the dignity of each and every human being regardless of race, religion, culture, inheritance, or social and economic status.
2. The progress from a simple agrarian society to a complex industrial pattern, including the impact of technology, has increased the dependence and interdependence of man.'
3. People of all ages, races, religions, and nations have contributed to the advancement of human welfare and world progress.
4. There is an underlying spiritual unity in the world; its manifestations within different cultures are only variations.
5. Variations in culture pattern should be judged on merit alone and not on superiority-inferiority prejudices.
6. The importance of a knowledge of the past, and particularly of our men of character, their deeds and words, as they are recorded in the great documents, is essential to the development of good citizenship.

7. All citizens of the United States should enjoy equal opportunity and thus all should assume the obligations of citizenship as well.
8. Our economic principles, including the right of the individual to invest his services or capital for profit, contribute to the national well-being; consequently, a knowledge of these principles is essential.
9. The exercise of free enterprise springs from the principle of individual freedom of opportunity; perversion of this keystone of the American economic structure through emphasis on statism or other forms of collectivism should neither be permitted nor tolerated.

Appropriate Attitudes

1. Loyalty to American ideals and pride in our heritage--the highest type of true patriotism to our country
2. Loyalty to our governmental institutions which embody American principles and ideals and a compelling desire to keep them inviolate.
3. Respect for law and for legally constituted authority
4. High regard for that which is honest and honorable
5. Acceptance of responsibility as a citizen with concern for the civic welfare
6. Awareness of the strength of spiritual values, as voiced in the great religions of the world
7. Respect for judgments and opinions shaped by experience and maturity
8. Readiness, when necessary, to suspend judgment; to recognize and discount prejudices; to actively combat all forms of discrimination
9. Awareness of the universal appeal of the arts and the satisfaction to be derived from them
10. Sympathy for the problems of others and intelligent direction of individual personal problems
11. Respect for property rights, both personal and community
12. Respect for all kinds of work and appreciation of a job well done

From Guide to Secondary Education in Oregon, 1966

Citizenship. The good citizen knows his country--its people, its history, its geography, the structure and function of its government, and its internal and external problems. He understands the fundamental principles of American democracy--political, economic, social, moral, and spiritual.

He is loyal to American ideals, is proud of his heritage, respects constituted authority, has concern for the welfare of his country and of his fellow men at home and abroad, and seeks ways to increase world cooperation towards a just and lasting peace.

He participates in the life of his community and nation by exercising his rights and assuming his responsibilities as a member of a free and self-governing society, and he strives to improve it.

Basic Skills of Communication. The effective citizen has, to the extent of his ability, achieved proficiency in use of the basic tools of learning. He recognizes that communication is fundamental to intellectual development and has acquired skill in receiving ideas through reading, listening, and observing and in expressing them through writing and speaking. He understands the use of symbols from other fields such as mathematics, science, music, and the visual arts and may have extended his range of communication by mastering other languages.

He recognizes that learning is continuous throughout life.

He employs the basic skills efficiently to gather, organize, and disseminate information, to think critically, to solve problems, and to gain enjoyment. He uses the skills and understandings to acquire knowledge and to participate in individual and group activities.

Health. The educated person knows the structure and functions of his body, is aware of hazards to his own and his community's well-being, and knows desirable mental and physical health practices. His health practices are based upon factual information. He understands the role of health services in the welfare of the community and the importance of good health to himself and others. He understands the interrelationship of mental and physical health.

He finds satisfaction in developing and maintaining good health habits and attitudes. He regards physical and mental fitness as a personal obligation as a family member and as a citizen.

He practices safety and applies health knowledge in daily living, and supports efforts to safeguard and improve the health of the community.

Family Life. The effective family member has knowledge and skills which result in the wise use of money, time, and energy; the provision of adequate food, clothing, and shelter; the care, training, and guidance of children; and constructive interrelationships among members of the family and with the community.

He recognizes the family as the basic institution of our society, and also its changing role in our contemporary society. He has an appreciation, respect, loyalty, and a sense of responsibility for his own home.

He maintains affectionate home relationships. He provides an adequate and secure home within his means. He accepts his share of the duties and responsibilities for maintaining satisfactory personal and family relationships.

Economic Life. The educated person has a knowledge of our natural and human resources and of the necessity for their wise use and conservation. He understands the workings of the economic system in our society and he has some comprehension of other systems. He recognizes that the abundance of goods and services he enjoys as a consumer is largely a result of the high productivity of a free enterprise system.

He accepts the necessity for controls that will help insure a fair distribution of the products of the economy. He appreciates the value of labor and feels satisfaction in doing well any task he undertakes.

He acquires the skills and understandings that will provide a foundation for vocational success. He learns about occupational opportunities and requirements. He earns his way in the world; and he secures information that enables him to consume goods and services wisely.

Moral and Spiritual Values. The educated person has gained an insight into moral and spiritual values. He knows the main facts of the history of religions and he understands the contributions of the Judeo-Christian ethic to Western culture, and the role of our national ideals. He is familiar with the significant contributions of literature, art, music, science, and other fields of learning to moral and spiritual growth.

He seeks support in a faith that upholds the virtues of goodness and morality and which explains and reconciles his relationship to fellow men and the universe. He regards devotion to truth and services to fellow men as a high goal among the active outcomes in his life. He places human values

above material things.

He is humane and considerate in actions and dealings, has sympathetic understanding of differences and deviations, and is respectful of the rights of others. He exhibits personal integrity measured by the accepted values of the culture. He defends religious liberty and other human freedoms vigorously and opposes all forms of tyranny over the human mind. He responds with appreciation, reverence, and reasoned conduct to the worthy ideals of his country, his faith, and his culture.

Aesthetic Values. The educated person has developed sensitivity to aesthetic values. He can discriminate among expressions of artistic and creative achievement. He understands fundamental aesthetic principles having to do with expression, organization of environment, and our art heritage.

He observes, appreciates, and wants to preserve the things of beauty provided by nature or produced by man.

He incorporates aesthetic principles into his daily living. He supports the endeavors of his community to improve the aesthetic life and opportunities of the people.

Social Studies.

- * Participation in cultural, social, and civic activities and opportunities for the development of appropriate attitudes and appreciations.
 - * Development of skills unique to the social studies.
 - * Acquisition of social studies facts.
 - * Mastery of inquiry appropriate to the social studies.
 - * Development, application, and transfer of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
 - * Developing a sense of time and chronology
 - * Thinking concretely, abstractly, and creatively
 - * Locating and gathering information
 - * Organizing and evaluating information
 - * Reading, speaking, writing, and listening to social studies materials
 - * Interpreting graphic material
 - * Participating democratically
- Skills unique to the social studies are:
- * Developing a sense time and chronology
 - * Interpreting graphic material
 - * Participating democratically

From Elementary-Secondary Guide for Oregon Schools, 1975

General Aims

Each individual will have the opportunity to develop to the best of his or her ability the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary to function as a (an):

INDIVIDUAL: To develop the skills necessary for achieving fulfillment as a self-directed person; to acquire the knowledge necessary for achieving and maintaining physical and mental health and to develop the capacity for coping with change through an understanding of the arts, humanities, scientific processes, and the principles involved in making moral and ethical choices.

LEARNER: To develop the basic skills of reading, writing, computation, spelling, speaking, listening, and problem-solving; and to develop a positive attitude toward learning as a lifelong endeavor.

PRODUCER: To learn of the variety of occupation; to learn to appreciate the dignity and value of work and the mutual responsibilities of employees and employers; and to learn to identify personal talents and interests, to make appropriate career choices, and to develop career skills.

CITIZEN: To learn to act in a responsible manner; to learn of the rights and responsibilities of citizens of the community, state, nation, and world; and to learn to understand, respect and interact with people of different cultures, generations and races.

CONSUMER: To acquire knowledge and to develop skills in the management of personal resources necessary for meeting obligations to self, family, and society.

FAMILY MEMBER: To learn of the rights and responsibilities of family members, and to acquire the skills and knowledge to strengthen and enjoy family life.

Social Studies Aims

1. Develop an awareness of self, reflect on their society's values and be able to develop and clarify a personal set of values.
2. Understand generalizations, and interdisciplinary concepts drawn from the various social sciences including

anthropology, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, sociology, international affairs.

3. Develop and practice a variety of intellectual skills appropriate to the social studies.
4. Understand and respect individual and cultural differences and similarities.
5. Be able to participate in societal activities as individuals and members of groups.

APPENDIX B

UNITIZED AIMS

Social Studies, 1947

1. To help pupils to acquire an informational background which will enable them to arrive at logical conclusions.
2. To promote social understandings which will enable pupils to function better as members of society.
3. Develop the ability to locate needed information.
4. Develop the ability to read and comprehend information.
5. Develop the ability to evaluate sources of information --distinguishing between original sources and secondary authorities and reliable and unreliable sources.
6. Develop the ability to apply information to the solution of problems.
7. Develop the ability to approach controversial issues objectively, employing known fact rather than prejudice.
8. Develop the ability to see and demonstrate the significance of cause and effect.
9. Develop the ability to think straight in time historically.
10. Develop the ability to think straight in space geographically.
11. Develop the ability to work cooperatively with others.
12. To help pupils apply what they learn to personal and current human situations.

Social Studies, 1955

1. Loyalty to American ideals.
2. Pride in our heritage--the highest type of true patriotism to our country.
3. Ability to interpret printed, pictured, and audio-visual materials.

4. Develop the understanding that a fundamental principle of democracy is respect for the dignity of each and every human being regardless of race, religion, culture, inheritance, or social and economic status.
5. Loyalty to our governmental institutions which embody American principles and ideals, and a compelling desire to keep them inviolate.
6. Ability to identify and determine means of solving problems.
7. Ability to sift and weigh evidence and think critically.
8. Ability to distinguish between fact and opinion.
9. Compare, contrast, summarize, and draw inferences in harmony with the evidence and the underlying conditions.
10. Develop the understanding that the progress from a simple agrarian society to a complex industrial pattern, including the impact of technology, has increased the dependence and interdependence of man.
11. Respect for law and for legally constituted authority.
12. High regard for that which is honest and honorable.
13. Ability to use correctly words of social, economic, and political significance.
14. Develop the understanding that people of all ages, races, religions, and nations have contributed to the advancement of human welfare and world progress.
15. Acceptance of responsibility as a citizen with concern for the civic welfare.
16. Awareness of the strength of spiritual values, as voiced in the great religions of the world.
17. Respect for judgments and opinions shaped by experience and maturity.
18. Ability to use library and other community resources in the pursuit of knowledge both for pleasure and utility.
19. Develop the understanding that there is an underlying spiritual unity in the world, and its manifestations within different cultures are only variations.
20. Develop the understanding that variations in culture pattern should be judged on merit alone and not on superiority-inferiority prejudices.

21. Readiness, when necessary, to suspend judgment.
22. To recognize and discount prejudices.
23. To actively combat all forms of discrimination.
24. Ability to identify correctly people, events, and institutions in time, place, and importance.
25. Awareness of the universal appeal of the arts and the satisfaction to be derived from them.
26. Ability to participate in democratic group activity in classroom and school both as leader and follower.
27. Develop the understanding that all citizens of the United States should enjoy equal opportunity and thus all should assume the obligations of citizenship as well.
28. Develop the understanding that our economic principles, including the right of the individual to invest his services or capital for profit, contribute to the national well-being.
29. A knowledge of our economic principles is essential.
30. Sympathy for the problems of others.
31. Intelligent direction of individual personal problems.
32. Respect for property rights, both personal and community.
33. Respect for all kinds of work.
34. Appreciation of a job well done.
35. Develop the understanding that free enterprise springs from the principle of individual freedom of opportunity.
36. Develop the understanding that perversion of this keystone of the American economic structure (free enterprise) through emphasis on statism or other forms of collectivism should neither be permitted nor tolerated.

General Aims, 1955

1. Attain the highest type of patriotism through a deep and abiding love for our country.
2. Loyalty to American institutions and ideals.
3. Promote a compelling desire to keep American institu-

tions and ideals inviolate.

4. Develop an understanding of the basic principles of American Democracy which include the worth of the individual, justice, and fair dealing.
5. Strive toward the ideals of American citizenship.
6. Develop a world outlook.
7. Develop a feeling of personal responsibility as a world citizen.
8. Develop an understanding that all citizens of the United States should enjoy the same privileges and assume the same responsibilities of citizenship regardless of race , national origin, or creed.
9. Develop an understanding of the concept that free enterprise is the keystone to our economic structure.
10. Make full use of his mental powers through broad, deep, clear thinking.
11. Develop maximum facility in the use of language.
12. Develop maximum facility in the understanding and interpretation of basic areas of knowledge.
13. Enjoy good health, proper posture, and physical fitness through developing and maintaining them at a high level.
14. Equip the student through general and special education for earning a satisfactory and happy living in a vocation for which he is naturally well fitted.
15. Develop an understanding of high moral and spiritual ideals.
16. Apply high moral and spiritual ideals to daily living.
17. Prepare the student for use of leisure time through appreciation of beauty in literature, music, and art.
18. Prepare the student for use of leisure time through skill in recreational activities.
19. Develop the student's personality for harmonious living with himself and others through honest, unselfish, and unstinted service.
20. Prepare the student for the responsibilities and privileges of family life.

21. Prepare the student to contribute to the welfare of the community.
22. Develop the ability and desire to evaluate the students own behavior in relation to the immediate social group in which he moves, and to the intergroups of our nation and the world with a view to bringing about individual and social adjustment.

Social Studies, 1966

1. Participation in cultural, social, and civic activities.
2. Provide opportunities for the development of appropriate attitudes and appreciations.
3. Acquisition of social studies facts.
4. Mastery of inquiry appropriate to the social studies.
5. Development of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
6. Application of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
7. Transfer of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
8. Develop a sense of time and chronology.
9. Thinking concretely, abstractly, and creatively.
10. Locating information.
11. Gathering information.
12. Organizing information.
13. Evaluating information.
14. Reading.
15. Speaking.
16. Writing.
17. Listening to social studies materials.
18. Interpreting graphic material.

19. Participating democratically.

General Aims, 1966

1. To know this country--its people, its history, its geography.
2. To know the structure and function of American government.
3. To know the internal and external problems of the country.
4. To understand the fundamental principles of American democracy--political, economic, social, moral, and spiritual.
5. Develop loyalty to American ideas.
6. Promote pride in American heritage.
7. Develop respect for constituted authority.
8. Promote concern for the welfare of the country.
9. Promote concern for fellow men at home and abroad.
10. Promote the seeking of ways to increase world cooperation towards a just and lasting peace.
11. Develop participation in the life of the community and nation by exercising the rights and assuming the responsibilities as a member of a free and self-governing society.
12. Achieve proficiency in the use of the basic tools of learning.
13. Acquire skill in receiving ideas through reading, listening, and observing, and in expressing them through writing and speaking.
14. Understand the use of symbols from other fields such as mathematics, science, music, and the visual arts.
15. Develop the understanding that learning is continuous throughout life.
16. Develop basic skills so as to efficiently gather, organize, and disseminate information.
17. To think critically.

18. To solve problems.
19. Develop the ability to use skills and understandings to acquire knowledge.
20. Participate in individual and group activities.
21. To know the structure and functions of the body.
22. To know of health hazards to his own and his community's well-being.
23. To know desirable mental and physical health practices.
24. To develop health practices based upon factual information.
25. To understand the role of health services in the welfare of the community.
26. To understand the importance of good health to oneself and others.
27. To understand the interrelationship of mental and physical health.
28. Promote satisfaction in developing and maintaining good health habits and attitudes.
29. Promote physical and mental fitness as a personal obligation as a family member and as a citizen.
30. Promote safety and the ability to apply health knowledge in daily living.
31. To develop efforts to safeguard and improve the health of the community.
32. To develop the knowledge and skills which result in the wise use of money, time, and energy.
33. To develop the knowledge and skills which result in the provision of adequate food, clothing, and shelter.
34. To develop the knowledge and skills which result in the care, training, and guidance of children.
35. To develop the knowledge and skills which promote constructive interrelationships among members of the family and with the community.
36. To recognize the family as the basic institution of our society.

37. To recognize the changing role of the family in our contemporary society.
38. To develop an appreciation, respect, loyalty, and a sense of responsibility for one's own home.
39. Promote the maintenance of an affectionate home relationship.
40. To promote the student to provide an adequate and secure home within his means.
41. To promote the sharing of the duties and responsibilities for maintaining satisfactory personal and family relationships.
42. To develop a knowledge of our natural and human resources.
43. To develop a knowledge for the wise use and conservation of our natural and human resources.
44. To understand the workings of the economic system in our society.
45. To promote some comprehension of other economic systems.
46. To recognize that the abundance of goods and services one enjoys as a consumer is largely a result of the high productivity of a free enterprise system.
47. To promote acceptance of the necessity for controls that will help insure a fair distribution of the products of the economy.
48. Promote the appreciation of the value of labor.
49. Promote the feeling of satisfaction in doing well any task one undertakes.
50. To acquire the skills and understandings that will provide a foundation for vocational success.
51. To know about occupational opportunities and requirements.
52. To promote earning one's way in the world.
53. To secure information that enables one to consume goods and services wisely.
54. To gain an insight into moral and spiritual values.

55. To know the main facts of the history of religions.
56. To understand the contributions of the Judeo-Christian ethic to Western culture.
57. To understand the role of our national ideals.
58. Familiarity with the significant contributions of literature, art, music, science, and other fields of learning to moral and spiritual growth.
59. To promote the seeking of support in a faith that upholds the virtues of goodness and morality and which explains and reconciles one's relationship to fellow men and the universe.
60. To promote devotion to truth and services to fellow men as a high goal among the active outcomes in one's life.
61. To promote human values above material things.
62. To promote humanness and consideration in actions and dealings with others.
63. To promote sympathetic understanding of differences and deviations of others.
64. To promote respect for the rights of others.
65. To develop personal integrity measured by the accepted values of the culture.
66. Promote defense of religious liberty and other human freedoms.
67. To oppose all forms of tyranny over the human mind.
68. Promote appreciation, reverence, and reasoned conduct to the worthy ideals of country, faith, and culture.
69. To develop sensitivity to aesthetic values.
70. To learn to discriminate among expressions of artistic creative achievement.
71. To understand the fundamental aesthetic principles having to do with expression, organization of environment, and our art heritage.
72. Learn to observe, appreciate and preserve the things of beauty provided by nature or produced by man.

73. To incorporate aesthetic principles into daily living.
74. Promote the support of the endeavors of one's community to improve the aesthetic life and opportunities of the people.

Social Studies, 1966

1. Participation in cultural, social, and civic activities.
2. Provide opportunities for the development of appropriate attitudes and appreciations.
3. Acquisition of social studies facts.
4. Mastery of inquiry appropriate to the social studies.
5. Development of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
6. Application of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
7. Transfer of concepts and generalizations basic to the social studies.
8. Develop a sense of time and chronology.
9. Thinking concretely, abstractly, and creatively.
10. Locating information.
11. Gathering information.
12. Organizing information.
13. Evaluating information.
14. Reading.
15. Speaking.
16. Writing.
17. Listening to social studies materials.
18. Interpreting graphic material.
19. Participating democratically.

Social Studies, 1975

1. Develop an awareness of self.
2. Reflect on their society's values.
3. Be able to develop and clarify a personal set of values.
4. Understand generalization and interdisciplinary concepts drawn from the various social sciences.
5. Develop a variety of intellectual skills appropriate to the social studies.
6. Practice a variety of intellectual skills appropriate to the social studies.
7. Understand individual and cultural differences and similarities.
8. Respect individual and cultural differences and similarities.
9. Be able to participate in societal activities as individuals and members of groups.

General Aims, 1975

1. To develop the skills necessary for achieving fulfillment as a self-directed person.
2. To acquire the knowledge necessary for achieving and maintaining physical and mental health.
3. To develop the capacity for coping with change through an understanding of the arts, humanities, scientific processes, and the principles involved in making moral and ethical choices.
4. To develop the basic skills of reading, writing, computation, spelling, speaking, listening, and problem-solving.
5. To develop a positive attitude towards learning as life-long endeavor.
6. To learn of the variety of occupations.
7. To learn to appreciate the dignity and value of work.
8. To learn the mutual responsibilities of employees and employers.

9. To learn to identify personal talents and interests.
- 10.. To learn to make appropriate career choices.
11. To develop career skills.
12. To learn to act in a responsible manner.
13. To learn of the rights and responsibilities of citizens of the community, state, nation, and world.
14. To learn to understand, respect and interact with people of different cultures, generations, and races.
15. To acquire knowledge and to develop skills in the management of personal resources necessary for meeting obligations to self, family, and society.
16. To learn of the rights and responsibilities of family members.
17. To acquire the skills and knowledge to strengthen and enjoy family life.

APPENDIX C

DELETED INSTRUCTIONAL AIMS

1. Exercise the student's creative abilities.
2. Evolve a plan of development in keeping with his capacities, needs, and interests.
3. Recognize the student's potentialities.

APPENDIX D

PRE-TEST SUBJECTS

Joyce Follingstad
P.O.Box 653
North Plains, Oregon

Richard Teasley
235 S.W. 139th
Beaverton, Oregon

Q-SORT TEST SUBJECTS

Cynthia Griggins
908 N.W. 25th
Portland, Oregon

Brad Post
6210 S.W. Pomona
Portland, Oregon

Rose Reed
632 N.E. Goin St. #3
Portland, Oregon

Steve Sherrell
3236 Harvey St. #30
Portland, Oregon

APPENDIX E

CODING JUDGE INSTRUCTION SHEET

The purpose of this study is to measure the changing degrees of indoctrination in Oregon Public Schools during the last thirty years. Indoctrination is defined as a system of aims established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development process of individuals. Such aims imply the prescription or promotion of selected values, attitudes, and beliefs. The coder's help is solicited to scale the accompanying sample of instructional aims published by the Oregon State Board of Education. The first step in this scaling process is to place each aim in one of three categories. The categories are "skill promotion," "knowledge promotion," and "value promotion." They are defined below. Please sort the accompanying aims in the appropriate classification. Examples have been provided to ease this process.

Skill Promotion

The content of some instructional aims is oriented towards the development of cognitive and intellectual capacities. That is, the object of the aim is that the individual will be taught a skill which is intended to increase his ability to utilize knowledge and information. Two related assumptions must be noted. First, it is assumed that with such skill development individuals will form a personal ideology, and will become less subject to socialization by the

State Board of Education. Secondly and concomitant to the first assumption, aims which develop cognitive and intellectual capacities are to be classified at the low end of the indoctrination scale.

Such aims may be thought of as "procedural" because they are means to the end of developing personal values, beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors. Skill promotion-type aims tend to allow the individual's ideology to develop independently as personal experience dictates. Examples of such aims are as follows:

Develop critical thinking among students.

Promote the ability to sift and weigh evidence, draw inferences and conclusions.

Learn to locate and organize information, solve problems, and be objective.

Improve and develop reading, writing, spelling, listening, observing, speaking, evaluating, discussing, thinking, interpreting, etc.

Knowledge Promotion

In addition to skill promotion, "knowledge promotion" type aims are assumed to be necessary to develop cognitive and intellectual capacities. The development of such abilities probably necessitates background information. For example, a knowledge of art, history, economics, etc., is a probable concomitant to developing cognitive and intellectual capacities. However, taken as a whole these aims are to occupy a position on the indoctrination scale higher than skill promotion aims. The rationale for this placement is simple: it is assumed that the mere selection of an area of knowledge

to be studied will have greater impact on the development of ideology than purely skill-oriented aims. To illustrate, a knowledge promotion aim such as "to develop a knowledge of American history" may tend to mold and shape an individual's beliefs and values to a greater degree than the promotion of a skill such as "to develop the ability to think critically." This is assumed to be the case.

Knowledge promotion aims must not dictate what specific value, belief, attitude, or behavior the individual will adopt. For example, it is one type of an instructional aim that seeks "to develop and understanding of the capitalist economic system", and quite another "to develop the understanding that capitalism is the keystone of our economic structure". Although both aims seek to promote a knowledge, the first should be classified as knowledge promotion and the second not. Like skill promotion aims, knowledge promotion aims must be procedural. The first example would qualify as a procedure for arriving at a personal conclusion concerning the value of the capitalist economy. The second is a conclusive value requiring acceptance of a particular judgment. Additional examples of knowledge promotion include the following:

To understand the principles of the American economy.

Develop a knowledge of world history.

Understand aesthetic principles and art theory.

To understand the structure and function of our government.

Develop a knowledge of the history of religion.

Value Promotion

The content of an aim placed in this category must be substantive in nature. That is, aims are to express a substantive and conclusive end rather than a means to an end. In such cases the State Board of Education determines a priori the value, belief, attitude, or behavior that each student will be encouraged to reach. The basis of such aims may be related to a social, economic, moral, religious, political, or philosophic doctrine. Since these types of aims are assumed to have the greatest impact on ideological development, they are to be classified at the high end of the indoctrination scale. Illustrations of idea promotion follow:

Develop patriotism and love of country.

Loyalty to American ideals and governmental institutions.

Promote respect for property rights.

Develop the understanding that free enterprise is the best economic system.

To promote responsibility and respect for home and family.

Q-sort Method

Q-sort is a method utilizing a nine point scale; it is designed to measure a least-to-most intense expression of the defined content of a variable. After the instructional aims have been classified as skill, knowledge, or idea promotion, the coder will be asked to scale the accompanying aims on a least-to-most indoctrination continuum. Indoctrination will again be defined as a system of aims established by an authority for the purpose of guiding and channelling the ideological development process of individuals.

The Q-sort is a forced distribution method. Forced distribution means that a certain statistically determined percentage of the total number of observations must be placed in each of the nine categories. The coder has, in short, a certain numerical quota to fill in each category. In this manner the Q-sort approximates the normal curve with a given set observations. It assumes the greater number of units will manifest in an average or modal expression rather than at the extremes. At the extremes of the least-to-most continuum only a small percentage of the total number of observations is assigned. Movement from either extreme towards the center of the scale progressively increases this percentage. A "bulge" is present at the middle of the scaled distribution. The coding judges are required to place an equivalent number of observations in categories one and nine, two and eight, etc.

The scale for coding instructional aims on a least-to-most indoctrination continuum for the present study is as follows:

	Low		INDOCTRINATION						High	
Category	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
Number	9	15	23	30	35	30	23	15	9	

The first row of numbers represents the none point Q-sort categories; the second is the actual number of observations that are to be placed in each category. Thus, coding judges are required to place none instructional aims in the lowest indoctrination category (number one) and also nine in the

highest (number nine). Fifteen aims should be classified in the next lowest and highest categories, numbers two and eight respectively. This process should be followed until all categories are filled and all aims exhausted.

Procedural, skill promotion aims are to occupy the low end of the indoctrination continuum as stated previously. In the very lowest categories are to be goals such as thinking critically, solving problems, etc. Skills such as reading and writing are to be scaled higher, because it is assumed that they are necessary for indoctrination to occur. An individual, for example, may be taught to read so that he may readily consume propaganda. Although the basic skill is relatively free from indoctrination the motive for it may not be. In contrast, aims dealing with promoting the development of cognitive and intellectual capacities such as thinking critically and solving problems are to provide the individual with the ability to develop his own ideology and insulate him from attempts by others to guide and channel individual ideological development.

Instructional aims classified previously as knowledge promotion are to follow skill-oriented aims on the indoctrination continuum. Those aims that are more general in nature are to be classified as the lower in indoctrination among this set. To illustrate, an aim to "develop a knowledge of U.S. history" may perhaps be coded lower than "develop a knowledge of the U.S. Constitution". The former is more general than the latter. Both may probably be coded lower than an aim that would "develop an understanding of the rights and

responsibilities of U.S. citizenship", which in the opinion of the writer is of greater specificity. All of this is based upon the assumption that to guide and channel ideological development requires a very specific selection of knowledge to be promoted.

In the high categories, value promotion type aims are to be placed. It is assumed that the most indoctrinative aims are usually directed at the maintenance of the economic and political status quo. Examples of such aims include "developing patriotism", "promoting loyalty to present institutional structures and institutions", "creating respect for authority", and "emphasizing the virtues of the existing economic system". Aims with less importance in maintaining the status quo are to be rated less indoctrinative.