

Overview

RON BRANDT

Preparation for citizenship is, unquestionably, a principal aim of education. Questions arise, however, when we begin thinking about the nature of citizenship and how to educate for it. As John Patrick (page 36) says, it would be a lot easier if citizenship were synonymous with obedience, but in our society it requires both loyalty and independent thinking.

How much of each should schools seek to develop in the young? Andrew Oldenquist (page 30) makes a strong case for a determined effort to inculcate "middle-class values." A more indirect approach is advocated by Lawrence Kohlberg (page 19). Kohlberg offers a reasoned response to some probing but friendly questions posed by Thomas Sobol (page 16), who, as a local school superintendent, is on the firing line.

Moral education can be limited to classroom discussion of moral dilemmas or it can include the philosophy and operation of the school itself. Ralph Mosher (page 12), who has worked closely with alternative schools that are putting Kohlberg's ideas into practice, summarizes what he and others have learned so far and suggests a future agenda for moral education.

R. Freeman Butts (page 6), has devoted much of his professional interest in recent years to the subject of citizenship. In this issue he reviews responses of Americans to the current international situation and proposes a set of values he believes must be at the heart of curriculum for the educated citizen.

A way to address these values is described by Harry Ross and Julius Yashon (page 25). They have developed units for Evanston Township High School in Illinois that cause students to consider examples of inhumanity condoned by "good citizens," such as the Holocaust in Germany and the internment of Japanese Americans in the United States during World War II.

Which brings us to where we began. Finding the proper balance be-

tween indoctrination and anarchy is just one of the heavy responsibilities of educators in a free society. Criteria for evaluating a citizenship education program are listed by Richard Remy (page 10), who also helped enlist several of the authors for this issue.

In our May issue we asked readers to tell us what they thought of *Educational Leadership*. We received relatively few replies—246—so the results are not necessarily representative but they are interesting and helpful.

The survey form asked readers to name a few articles they liked especially well. We expected that most of those listed would be from the February, March, April, and May issues—and they were. What surprised us a little was that of the 141 articles published in 1979-80, 89 different titles were listed. We think that means our effort to serve a variety of interests is succeeding.

You might like to know which articles scored highest in our informal poll. They were: "Curriculum Mapping" by Fenwick English (April); "Improving Instruction Through Instructional Design" by Gary McKenzie (May); "Trouble Over Testing" by Walt Haney (May); "Toward a New Sociology of Curriculum" by Henry Giroux (December); "Students Can Learn to Be Better Problem Solvers" by Arthur Whimby (April); "Starting a New Job" by Stephen Fisher, Barry Jentz, and Daniel Cheever, Jr. (May); "Learning: A Matter of Style" (column) by Rita Dunn (April and other issues); and "Future Priorities for Curriculum Reform" by Elliot Eisner (March).

Knowing what was especially well liked may enable us to do a better job of choosing articles in the future. We conclude, based partly on these results and partly on a survey of ASCD Board members, that readers like articles that are informative, analytical, and practical. They want less personal opinion and more descriptions of successful programs.

One issue we sought to clarify involves publication of research. Most

readers seem to feel that detailed formal reports of single research studies are usually not appropriate for *Educational Leadership*. Some university staff members may think differently because they are expected to do research and to publish the results. However, with technological developments such as the ERIC system there are more suitable ways to disseminate results of studies which may be sound but which by themselves are of limited significance. In any case, a journal such as ours should serve the interests of readers more than writers.

Consolidations of research are another matter. Readers say they want authoritative articles that synthesize important research findings, generalize the results, and suggest implications for practice. Beginning with this issue we present, in cooperation with ASCD's Research Information Service, a series of articles interpreting research on topics of current interest. This month's article (page 84) is on self-concept. With this issue we also introduce a new look created by Art Director Amy Rupp. We're pleased with the new appearance and hope you will be too.

I don't expect to write about the journal itself very often because I prefer writing about supervision, curriculum, and instruction, but I wanted to report what we learned from the survey and what we plan to do about it. We are grateful to those who replied; we want *Educational Leadership* to live up to its name. Your comments and suggestions are always welcome.

Call for Articles on Curriculum Development

Our April issue will examine aspects of the curriculum development process. We welcome articles describing practices used successfully by schools and school systems. Manuscripts should be sent no later than January 1, 1981 (earlier if possible) to Executive Editor, *Educational Leadership*, 225 N. Washington St., Alexandria, VA 22314.

Copyright © 1980 by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. All rights reserved.