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The task of educating competent citizens is one of the most important challenges facing any society. In America, this task has become rather complex as society has grown from a predominantly agrarian one to a society of large-scale organizations (corporations, governments, labor unions, political parties, colleges and universities) using advanced technologies. This complexity has been further confounded by the fact that America is becoming increasingly interdependent with other nation-states and peoples in the world. In short, as society has increased in its complexity, so has the educational task of developing citizen competence (Remy 1977, pp. 3-14).

The competencies (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) to function in the role of citizen are acquired through learning and instruction, referred to as citizenship or political education.* The task of citizenship education, including the

---

*From an international perspective, the term political education is synonymous with citizenship education (Mehlinger 1977, pp. 2-3). Turner (1977, p. 2) has defined citizenship education as "... those programs and processes that provide knowledge, skills, values and experiences people need ... to act as responsible citizens." Citizenship education may be functional or dysfunctional for the preservation of the socio/cultural order, often referred to as the "system" or status quo (Patrick 1977, p. 192).
concept of citizenship, has been generally neglected in recent times by educators and social scientists as a productive area for empirical research (McClosky and Brill 1977, p. 86; Remy 1977, p. 15). In an interview with an associate editor of the Columbus Monthly (Bosworth September 1979, p. 76), Dr. Harold L. Enarson, President of The Ohio State University, reaffirmed this general neglect of citizenship education by stating:

> Despite the splendid oratory, we [universities] don't know any more how to create good citizens than we did fifty years ago.

The research that has been conducted by educators and social scientists has focused primarily on such agents of learning as families, peer groups and schools (Beck 1977, pp. 115, 134). As a result, the roles of other agents i.e., churches, voluntary organizations, businesses, labor unions, governments, and mass media, have received relatively little scholarly attention. Although recognized as having potential influence, these other agents of learning have been neglected by researchers for one or both of the following reasons: (1) exposure to them is not considered to be widely distributed or universal; and (2) the basic assumptions in the study of political socialization (primary and structuring principles) have led to a focusing on the agents of early learning (Beck 1977, p. 140).*

*Political socialization is a facet of or coterminous with citizenship education which pertains to programs and processes aimed at shaping the attitudes (values and beliefs) or behaviors of people in support of the socio/cultural order (Pranger 1968, p. 43; Mehlinger 1977, p. 4; and Patrick 1977, p. 192).
The primary principle (what is learned first is retained the longest) and the structuring principle (what is learned first molds later learning) are not completely shared by everyone in the field of political socialization (Beck 1977, p. 122; Weissberg 1974, pp. 23-25).* According to Beck (1977, p. 122), the direct challenge posed by Marsh and Searing et al. of the assumptional base of political socialization research

... signal at least a turning point in the study of the agents of socialization—away from an almost single-minded concentration on early learning and its agents and toward a focus on learning throughout the life cycle.

Given the neglect of citizenship education by scholars and the increasing complexity of society in which people function as citizens, there seems to be a real need to investigate what constitutes citizenship education in the United States today. Such an investigation would entail "contextual mapping" across institutional sectors of society: primary groups, schools, government, business and labor, voluntary organizations, religious organizations, and the mass media. "Contextual mapping" would require descriptive research studies which identify the sources or agents within each of the sectors contributing to citizenship education and analyzing their respective programs and processes.

To begin to fill the void in the existing research, a descriptive research study was conducted to determine the role of a youth-serving organization, the 4-H Youth Program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, during fiscal year 1979 (October 1, 1978 - September 30, 1979), in developing the citizenship competencies of young people. The specific objectives of this study were to answer the following questions:

1. What kinds of citizenship-related 4-H projects and activities are conducted by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program?

2. What subject matter or content areas are emphasized in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?

3. What domains of learning (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) are emphasized in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?

4. What levels of evidence (data) are utilized for evaluating the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?

5. In what ways are 4-H members, junior leaders and clubs/groups recognized for their achievements in the area of citizenship?

6. What are the types of support or assistance received by county Extension offices, area Extension centers, and the State 4-H Office for citizenship education programming?

7. What types of support or assistance are available from the College of Agriculture and Home Economics of The Ohio State University for 4-H citizenship education programming?

8. What types of support or assistance from The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics would strengthen, in the opinion of county and area 4-H agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator," 4-H citizenship education programming?
9. What are the role conceptions of a democratic citizen held by county Extension agents (4-H), area Extension agents (4-H), department chairpersons, and assistant Extension directors?

10. What is the relationship between the variable, role conception of a democratic citizen, and the following characteristics of respondents:

   (a) undergraduate and graduate major fields of study

   (b) attendance at National 4-H Center educational programs

The research hypotheses of this study were the following:

Hypothesis 1 Extension faculty/staff members having undergraduate and graduate majors in education and/or social sciences will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

Hypothesis 2 Extension faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs of the National 4-H Center will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

In this study, the researcher attempted to contribute to and build upon the knowledge generated by previous research in the fields of citizenship education, political education and political socialization. At the same time, the researcher endeavored to produce knowledge that would empirically support recommendations useful to the State 4-H staff.
CHAPTER I
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Meaning of Citizenship

The term citizenship is an ancient, dynamic, and complex concept. Due to its nature, citizenship is often thought to be abstract, difficult to define, and have a multitude of meanings. The issue of defining citizenship, according to Meyer (1978, p. 13), must be addressed by any group attempting to improve instruction in the area of citizenship education. According to Remy (1977, p. 17), the task of citizenship education is contingent upon how the role of citizen is defined.

The U.S. Constitution, as adopted on March 4, 1789, plus the first ten amendments (Bill of Rights) contained absolutely no definition of the concept of citizenship. Except for a few "passing references" i.e., requirements for holding national offices (president, vice president, senator, and representative), there is no further mention of citizenship in the Constitution prior to the 14th and 15th "Civil War amendments" (Roche 1949, p. 1; Bickel 1974, p. 369). For example, the Preamble of the U.S. Constitution speaks of "We the people of the United States" not of "We the citizens of the United States" and the Bill of Rights throughout defines
the rights of people, not of citizens per se (Bickel 1974, p. 307).

According to Bickel, the "first authoritative definition of citizenship" in American law was the Civil Rights Act of 1866. This act declared:

All persons born in the United States and not subject to any foreign power, excluding Indians, not taxed, are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States (1973, p. 372).

In 1868, the 14th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution was adopted setting forth a definition of citizenship modeled on the Civil Rights Act of 1866. Section I of this amendment read:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subsequent to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the state wherein they reside (Bickel 1974, p. 374).

In essence, the 14th Amendment stated that a citizen was a person who is either native born or naturalized and under the law of the United States. In addition to its inclusion in the 14th Amendment, the concept was also mentioned in three later constitutional amendments (15th, 19th, and 26th) to affirm the right of blacks, women, and eighteen year olds to vote, respectively (Bickel, p. 380).*

In addition to omitting a definition of citizenship in the Constitution, the framers also made no mention of the

*In the early days of the United States, only white, adult males had the right to vote—and only those males who owned a certain amount of property. The 15th, 19th, and 26th amendments expanded the voting right.
duties and responsibilities of citizens to government or society. Caldwell stated:

It apparently did not occur to the 18th century constitution-makers that the duties and responsibilities of citizens, as individuals and organized groups, should be specified in fundamental law (1976, p. 486).

Although the "constitution-makers" recognized the importance of citizens to the endurance of a republican government and democratic principles, it seemed inconsistent to them to have specified the duties and responsibilities of citizens since they were the authors of constitutions and governments (Caldwell 1976, p. 485).

Thus citizenship, as a legal concept, may be generally defined as membership in a nation-state—a status entitling the person the right to vote (if eighteen years of age) and to hold public office and to equal protection of the law. According to Bickel (1974, p. 383), the Constitution and our past practice under it have provided minimal content into the concept of citizenship.

As a concept, citizenship, in addition to having a dejure or legal status, consists of democratic ideals or values i.e., civic virtue, equality, individual rights, participation, self-governance, which originated or were renewed and elaborated upon in earlier societies and civilizations. The modern concept of citizenship is derived from several sources: ancient Israel, Greek city-states (Athens in particular), the Christian-Roman world and the revolutions of the sixteenth (Reformation), seventeenth (Puritan Revolution
of 1648 and the Glorious Revolution of 1688 in England), and eighteenth (American and French Revolutions) centuries (McClosky and Brill 1977; Roelofs 1957). From a historical perspective, citizenship, according to McClosky, Brill, and Roelofs, has a recognizable and an accepted meaning in terms of its valuational content.

According to John J. Sirica (May 1976), a former judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, "good citizenship" is comprised of six basic qualities and values which should be possessed by every American citizen. A citizen should:

1. Have a desire for unity—the building of a free society through cooperation, fellowship, and working side by side

2. Be concerned with justice, private as well as public, by serving as a juror, insisting upon the independence of the judicial system, and exercising good conduct

3. Strive for peace and tranquility in international as well as domestic affairs so the nation will progress socially and economically

4. Be concerned about defense, the military and the principles of life and liberty

5. Be devoted to the general welfare, happiness and prosperity of all Americans by placing one's talents and training at the service of fellow Americans

6. Focus mind and heart on liberty by participating (voting and serving as elected or appointed officials) in those activities of government that affect freedoms of choice, speech, press, religion, etc.

The core value or essential quality of citizenship is civic virtue (Caldwell 1976, p. 484 and McClosky and Brill
According to Caldwell, (1976, p. 484), the words, civic virtue, meant to the founders of the United States:

... the subordination of personal advantage to the public good ... And virtue was evidenced when the citizen placed his abilities (and if necessary, his material resources) at the service of the republic.

McClosky and Brill (1977, p. 85) stated that civic virtue, historically defined, means:

... caring for others and respecting their rights. It means obedience to the law and the maintenance of social order and tranquility. It means sharing in the public life of the community, assuming responsibility through such activities as voting, jury service, the payment of taxes, and acquiring knowledge about public affairs. It means contributing to the decision process and public policy. It means joining in the efforts to ensure justice and due process for others as well as oneself. It means exhibiting civility in the public arena and solicitude for the rights of others. It incorporates an element of allegiance to a civitas (whether it be a city or a national state), and it presupposes the enjoyment of such democratic benefits as equality, liberty, and protection against the arbitrary exercise of power.

Walzer (1974, pp. 594-605) suggested that civic virtue consists of loyalty to the republic; defense of the country when it is genuinely endangered; obedience to the law and a certain decorum of behavior in one's public conduct; tolerance of the opinions and the social, religious, and political characteristics of others; and participation in civic and public affairs.

The ideals or values of citizenship are not a prescription of what citizenship should mean or what it would mean in a certain kind of society, but of what it has, in fact,
come to mean in the course of history (Roelofs 1957, p. 30; McClosky and Brill 1977, p. 84). According to Roelofs (1957, p. 169):

This historical connection between ancient and modern exists and that it is this connection which has determined both what we, in our citizenship, are and what we ought to be.

Many of the disputes about the meaning of citizenship are really about the extent to which its values are being realized and how best to realize them (McClosky and Brill 1977, pp. 94-95). Such "reality disputes" are the providence of social science research and not historical analysis (Thompson 1970, pp. 181-183).

The ideals or values embodied in the term citizenship serve several purposes with respect to the individual and to society (American Association of School Administrators 1954, p. 51).

1. Provides a standard to guide an individual's personal behavior
2. Serves as a base or foundation for human association and cooperation
3. Serves as a measure of persons, institutions, and public policy
4. Serves as a standard for determining whether systems of social relationships attain the status of social institutions
5. Holds society together and prevents it from becoming an aggregation of individuals without a purpose or goal.

In summary, the foundation of citizenship education is the values which are embedded in our history. Bell (1976, p. 38) stated:
it is important to recognize that the question of whose values is not really relevant. They are all of our values—or ideals—of the many, many elements of our pluralistic society. There might be room to differ on the source of values . . . but it is not the source that concerns us. The social-political agreement of our body politic, on which this country rests, resides in a set of values which transcends their source and ethnic or racial diversity.

Process of Citizenship Education

In an essay, Pranger (1968, pp. 3, 102) asserted that the virtuous citizen is disappearing as an important political actor. The "eclipse" of the virtuous citizen, according to Pranger (1968, pp. 27, 51), is not the result of "universal human nature" or the "limitations of individual intelligence," but the "modern political culture" dominated by the "politics of power." To illustrate this, Pranger developed a paradigm showing the transmission of citizen role information within two "ideal types" of political culture, the "politics of power" and the "politics of participation" (see figure 1). Neither of these "ideal types" exists in its pure form, but of the two, the "politics of power" prevails as the dominant political culture today.

In Pranger's paradigm, political culture (environment) is comprised of tangible objects or artifacts (actors, actions, settings, and interests), referred to as the "objective political culture," and the "subjective political culture." The latter component consists of: the method of communicating role information; response of the citizen (or citizen role); and response information (feedback) from citizen to culture.
Fig. 1. Political culture paradigm
Pranger (1968, pp. 48-49) identified "two crucial variables" which determine the way in which citizens act or behave: information made available regarding political objects and the method of communicating such information. In a political culture dominated by the "politics of power," the information being transmitted (message) emphasizes these objects: governmental leaders, actions generated by the decisions of leaders, geographical nation-state, and the ascendency to leadership positions involving competition and conflict (Pranger 1968, pp. 23-35). While the information transmitted in the "politics of participation" focuses on: citizens, action generated by collaborative efforts among citizens, social groups relevant to a citizen's life space, and the exploration of differences and the resolution of problems (Pranger 1968, pp. 90-97).

In terms of the second variable, method of communication, the "politics of power" utilizes political socialization which prescribes one way or style for playing the role of a citizen i.e., voting for representatives. The "politics of participation," on the other hand, is characterized by political education which encourages flexible role making through "participatory experiences." Political education prepares persons occupying the status of citizen to exercise independent judgment as to the proper conduct or behavior of a citizen (Pranger 1968, pp. 49-50).

Weissberg (1974, p. 186), in having reviewed a number of research findings relating to "preadult, political
learning," concluded that young Americans are being socialized to be good citizens of an "electoral competition democracy" (a variant of the "politics of power"). The primary responsibility of citizens in an "electoral competition democracy," according to Weissberg (1974, pp. 176-177), is to elect governmental leaders to act in their behalf in the making of public policy. Within the "politics of participation," as discussed by Pranger (1968, p. 12), citizens have the primary responsibility for governing themselves directly in social groups relevant to their life space—wherever decisions are made affecting their lives.

Newmann (1979, pp. 4-5) suggested that the groups relevant to a person's life space comprise two different settings or contexts in which a person functions in the role of a citizen. The "micro context" consists of the family, peer groups, voluntary associations, classrooms, etc., whereas the "macro context" consists of large-scale organizations i.e., government agencies, legislatures, political parties, corporations, labor unions, etc. Newmann (1979, p. 11) pointed out that the task of governance is different within each of these contexts:

... in the micro context our essential task is to work closely with one another in rather direct self-governance; in the macro context our task is to influence elites who run larger institutions that affect life within smaller communities.

In advocating a balance of participation by citizens in both micro and macro context, Newmann (1979, pp. 13-14) suggested that educators:
1. Teach about micro and macro contexts of citizenship, explaining distinction and helping young people to inquire about them from historical, sociological, psychological and political perspectives;

2. Provide learning opportunities within each of the contexts. For example, youth ought to have opportunities to observe and participate in organizations run by youth, in school governance and in advisory roles on adult governing bodies. Whereas, in the "macro context," opportunities would include work in electoral politics, advocacy for issue-oriented pressure groups or special youth advocacy projects.

Citizenship education, according to Remy (1977, p. 22), is not limited to early or preadult learning, but is "... cumulative and continuous throughout life." The learning that results from citizenship education is cumulative in that it builds on itself to produce, at any point in time, a person's particular level of citizenship competence. The learning is also continuous because it begins early in a person's life and continues throughout life. During the course of a person's life, there are certain times which are more suitable or appropriate for learning particular knowledge, skills, and attitudes than others.

Weissberg (1974, pp. 23-31) advanced models to account for "areas of political learning" that are acquired during developmental stages of a person's life. In early childhood, a person acquires "basic political attachments and identifications" (with institutions, customs and symbols) and
"consensually held factual knowledge." Late childhood and early adolescence is when persons acquire skills relevant to future participation, more specific and accurate information about the political culture, and general policy preferences, especially partisan preference. Late adolescence and adulthood is associated with learning about specific issues and actions that are encountered in the day-to-day politics.

**Scope of Citizenship Education**

The scope of citizenship education has two basic dimensions: sources of learning that contribute to citizenship development and the messages communicated by these sources. From an analytical standpoint, messages consist of these parts: objective, content and context. The objective of a message involves the changes in behavior the message is intended to bring about. The content of the message is the subject matter with which the message is concerned. Context refers to the exercise of authority relationships from which the message evolves.

**Sources of Learning**

In American society, citizenship education has been assumed by many to be the primary or exclusive responsibility of formal educational institutions (Turner 1977, p. 2). However, according to Tyler (1977, p. 16), education, particularly citizenship education, must not be confused with schooling.
An educational system, of which school is only a part, furnishes the experiences through which a young person learns to participate constructively in a modern industrialized society. What he or she experiences in the home, in social activities in the community, in chores and jobs, in religious institutions, in reading, in listening to radio and viewing television, and in the school are all part of the educational system through which he or she acquires knowledge and ideas, skills and habits, attitudes and interests, and basic values.

Carter (Fall 1963, pp. 169-171), in discussing the scope of education in terms of developing "mature, competent, and responsible citizens," viewed the various sources of learning on a continuum, based on the extent to which the curriculum of each was structured (see figure 2). Four-H, along with the other sources of learning i.e., church, family, and other contacts, lies somewhere between the two extremes: experiences of living and formal schooling. From a historical perspective, Carter (1963, pp. 170-171) stated:

... 4-H appears to have been effective in pulling the extremes closer together, thus permitting the young person to make more sense of both extremes ... it (4-H) has had the effect of integrating learning experiences--of relating all learning to real life--rather than encouraging the viewing of each educational effort in isolation.

![Fig. 2. Continuum of curriculum structuring](image)

In addition to schools, Remy (1977, pp. 26-27) stated that there are agents or sources of learning in six other
institutional sectors of society engaged in citizenship education: government (local, state, and national), business and labor, voluntary organizations (adult and youth), mass media (television, movies, radio, newspapers, and magazines), primary groups (family and peer groups), and religious organizations. These sectors function, according to Remy (1977, p. 27), both as settings where individuals confront daily the tasks of governance and as sources of citizenship-related knowledge, skills, attitudes, and experiences.

Goals/Objectives

In the field of citizenship education, scholars have basically agreed on the sets of goals/objectives or domains of learning that are required to achieve good citizenship (Fenton 1977, p. 110; Mehlinger and Patrick 1977, p. 1; Patrick 1977, p. 193; Turner 1977, p. 2). A comprehensive program of citizenship education has goals/objectives in each of these domains: knowledge, skills (intellectual, participatory) and attitudes. Knowledge involves an understanding of the "human condition": traditions, institutions and functions of human society; group and interpersonal relations; and contemporary problems and issues and their implications. Skills involve intellectual skills i.e., the ability to acquire reliable information and to make moral judgments about others. Participation skills involve the ability to cooperate with others in a group to achieve a common goal and to influence the actions of others. Attitudes involve identification or attachment with traditions, principles, and
institutions and the development of a sense of self worth or self esteem. In addition to these domains of learning, Mehlinger and Patrick (1977, p. 43) and Turner (1979, p. 2) have included a fourth domain referred to as participation experiences. This domain involves opportunities to apply what has been learned in interactional situations, interpersonal as well as group. According to Remy (1977, p. 19), participation experiences or "learning by doing ... has long been an effective way to master complex skills, acquire practical knowledge and develop a positive self-image."

Mehlinger and Patrick (1977) reviewed citizenship education programs conducted by various agents, in five different sectors of society, in terms of their emphasis on domains of learning: knowledge, skills (intellectual and participatory), attitudes, and participation experiences. Although they described their examination as being superficial, the authors found that each sector tended to emphasize certain domains of learning. For example, schools emphasized knowledge and intellectual skills; the family, knowledge and attitudes; mass media, knowledge; voluntary associations, participatory skills and experiences; and religion, attitudes and participatory experiences. The sectors, as a whole, tended to emphasize or promote the acquisition of knowledge through their respective programs rather than the other domains.

In summarizing the current situation in the field of citizenship education, Mehlinger and Patrick (1977, p. 55) stated:
The kinds of learning emphasized in different citizenship education programs are often uneven and disjointed. Some programs, especially those conducted in schools, stress mostly formal learning of knowledge and thinking skills. However, this formal learning is rarely applied to real problems in the world outside the school. In contrast, other programs emphasize learning by doing through participation experiences in the community. However, participants may bring little knowledge or academic skills to their tasks, and they may lack the intellectual tools necessary to derive meaning from their experiences.

Turner (1977) examined documents that were produced by various agents, in four different sectors of society (education, business, labor, and voluntary), to determine the areas (domains) of learning that they were emphasizing. The results of her analysis of documents are summarized in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
<th>Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**NOTE:** Sectors are rated in each learning area on a scale of 1 - 4, with 1 indicating maximum emphasis and 4 indicating minimum emphasis.
Turner (1977, p. 37) concluded:

Our examination of documents from the various sectors of society indicates that each sector tends to emphasize one or two of these learning areas at the expense of others. This generalization holds least true for the voluntary sector, whose materials and programs are fairly evenly distributed across the spectrum of learning areas. Yet even in that sector experience-based educational opportunities, in which day-to-day behavior is modeled and emphasized, tend to be dominant.

The studies undertaken by Mehlinger, Patrick, and Turner seem to suggest that some sectors may be more appropriate than others for providing certain learning experiences related to citizenship development or teaching certain knowledge, skills or attitudes.

Content of Instruction

Turner (1979, pp. 15-16) in having analyzed Newman's list of "eight generally distinguishable approaches to civic education" and the "Seven Key Approaches to Citizenship Education" listed in the Selected Readings in Citizenship Education prepared for the National Conference on Education and Citizenship, identified twelve areas of content and/or approaches that are currently associated with citizenship education:

1. Academic disciplines—history and political science
2. Social problems
3. Critical thinking/Decision making
4. Values clarification and skills/Concrete values
5. Ethics/Moral development
6. Community involvement/Action skills/Community education
7. Law-related education  
8. Economics/Free enterprise education  
9. Global perspectives education  
10. Family-related education  
11. Multi-ethnic education/Pluralism  
12. Personal development and social skills/Prosocial behavioral training

In addition to these areas of content and/or approaches, Turner (1979, p. 16) acknowledged that some persons would expand this list to include sociology and psychology, career awareness/development, consumer education, and environmental and energy education.

The above content areas seem to suggest that the field of citizenship education has no "parent discipline." The content, regardless of the area or areas to be included or excluded in a program, will be drawn from those academic areas or disciplines concerned with human relationships i.e., history, social sciences and/or the humanities.

Context of Instruction

Behaviors are not only influenced by the content of the message being transmitted, but also how the message is transmitted (Weissberg 1974, p. 17). The way in which the message is transmitted, referred to as the context of instruction or "hidden curriculum," involves the exercise of authority relationships i.e., the pattern of group governance, application of rules and procedures, and the way in which
teachers interact with learners (Mehlinger 1977, p. 7; Patrick 1977, p. 204).

Although there seems to be limited evidence about the relationship of learning to the context of instruction, Patrick (1977, p. 216) indicated that there is enough available data to suggest that the context of instruction or "hidden curriculum" is an important condition of learning which can be modified to improve the learner's development of skills and attitudes.

The importance of the context of instruction for citizenship education is that the content of a message may be contradicted or reinforced by the instructional context (Mehlinger 1977, p. 8). In other words, the message may be no more important than the context from which it evolves.

Youth-Serving Organizations

Youth-serving organizations perform an important role in preparing young people as citizens. Each of these organizations has been engaged explicitly in citizenship education or in areas related to this goal i.e., character building or leadership training (Merriam 1934, p. 104; Roelofs 1957, pp. 2, 3; Weissberg 1974, p. 16; Beck 1977, p. 136). The most common citizenship themes in youth organizations, according to Weissberg (1974, p. 16), are obedience to established authority, respect for the nation and flag, and the obligations of "good citizens."

In the United States, an estimated fifteen to twenty million young people, one out of three, are served by youth
organizations (Vaughan 1978, p. 5). According to Hanson and Carlson (1972, p. 5), youth-serving organizations in the United States have been generally accepted as an integral part of modern American life.

The impact that these youth organizations have had on American society is extremely difficult to measure. Hanson and Carlson (1972, p. 5) stated:

... our research tools are not sufficiently refined at this point to measure precisely what benefits occur from participation in youth organizations.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of youth-serving organizations have been largely limited to personal observations, testimony, and beliefs (Hanson and Carlson 1972, p. 5; Vaughan 1978, p. 5).

In table 2, a profile of the major youth-serving organizations is presented. The list of organizations in the table is admittedly incomplete since there are many other youth organizations operating in the United States today. The main criteria that was used for inclusion of a youth organization was its longevity and membership size.

Youth-serving organizations have continually and systematically assessed and modified their respective organizational structures and programs. To attract more young people as members and to be more responsive to the needs and interests of their membership, youth-serving organizations, as indicated in their annual reports, have:

1. Redefined their membership requirements with respect to age and/or sex
2. Expanded their services to geographic areas not originally served
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>National Headquarters</th>
<th>Founding Year</th>
<th>Mission/Purpose</th>
<th>Membership Requirements</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Adult Leaders</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy Scouts of America</td>
<td>North Brunswick, N.J. 08902</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>To provide for boys and young adults an effective educational program designed to build desirable qualities of character, to train in the responsibilities of participating citizenship, and to develop personal fitness.</td>
<td>Boys ages 7-10 (Cub Scouts), 11-17 (Boy Scouts), and young men and women ages 15-20 (Explorers)</td>
<td>3,465,887</td>
<td>1,252,251</td>
<td>137,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys Clubs of America</td>
<td>771 First Ave. New York, N.Y. 10017</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>To promote the health, social, education, vocation, character and leadership development of boys.</td>
<td>Boys ages 6-18</td>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Fire Girls (Camp Fire)</td>
<td>4601 Madison Ave. Kansas City, MO. 64112</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>To provide through a program of informal education, opportunities for youth to realize their potential and to function effectively as caring, self-directed individuals, responsible</td>
<td>Young people, regardless of sex, from birth to 21 years of age</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
<td>............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>National Headquarters</td>
<td>Founding Year</td>
<td>Mission/Purpose</td>
<td>Membership Requirements</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Adult Leaders</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Youth Program</td>
<td>SEA-Extension U.S.D.A.</td>
<td>Early 1900s</td>
<td>To provide for the development of youth individuality and as responsible and productive citizens.</td>
<td>Boys and girls ages 9-19</td>
<td>4,072,644</td>
<td>374,082</td>
<td>139,127 clubs &amp; special interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Farmers of America (FFA)</td>
<td>P.O. Box 15160 Alexandria, VA. 22309</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>To develop agricultural leadership and cooperation and citizenship.</td>
<td>Young men and women in high school who are enrolled in vocational agriculture</td>
<td>509,735</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>8,148 chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Homemakers of America (FHA/HERO)</td>
<td>2010 Massachusetts Ave., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>To help youth assume their roles in society through home economics education in areas of personal growth, family life, vocational preparation and community involvement.</td>
<td>Young men and women in middle, junior and senior high schools who are enrolled in or have taken part in home economics and related occupation courses</td>
<td>447,919</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>12,140 chapters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>National Headquarters</td>
<td>Founding Year</td>
<td>Mission/Purpose</td>
<td>Membership Requirements</td>
<td>Members</td>
<td>Adult Leaders</td>
<td>Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls Clubs of America</td>
<td>205 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y. 10016</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>To be an advocate for the rights of girls; provide opportunities for girls to recognize their worth as human beings and develop their full potential; to help girls become knowledgeable, creative and active participants in a representative society. . . .</td>
<td>Girls ages 6-18</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl Scouts of the U.S.A.</td>
<td>830 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>To inspire girls with the highest ideals of character, conduct, patriotism, and service that they may become happy and resourceful citizens.</td>
<td>Girls ages 6-8 (Brownies), 9-11 (Junior), 12-14 (Cadettes), and 14-17 (Seniors)</td>
<td>2,583,000</td>
<td>557,000</td>
<td>159,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Jewish Welfare Board (JWB)</td>
<td>15 East 26th St., New York, N.Y. 10010</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>To help improve the quality of Jewish living in America and to develop a sense of community and a sense of Jewish peoplehood.</td>
<td>People of all ages</td>
<td>1,000,000+</td>
<td>........</td>
<td>375+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jewish Community Centers, YM-YWHA, branches & camps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>National Headquarters</th>
<th>Founding Year</th>
<th>Mission/Purpose</th>
<th>Membership Requirements</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Adult Leaders</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young Men's Christian Associations of the U.S.A. (YMCA)</td>
<td>291 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10007</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>To develop Christian personality and build a Christian society.</td>
<td>Boys, girls, women and men of every age</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
<td>700,000</td>
<td>1800+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Women's Christian Association of the U.S.A. (YWCA)</td>
<td>600 Lexington Ave., New York N.Y. 10022</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>To draw together into responsible membership women and girls of diverse experiences and faiths, that their lives may be open to new understanding and deeper relationships and that together they may join in the struggle for peace and justice, freedom and dignity for all people.</td>
<td>Women and girls 12 years of age and over</td>
<td>1,315,688</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Data presented in this table were compiled by the researcher from materials (annual reports, fact sheets, manuals, and membership statistic summaries) that were received from the national headquarters of each of the major youth-serving organizations (see Appendix A). Membership statistics should be interpreted with some caution because: (1) a boy or a girl may be a member of two or more of these organizations, and (2) some of the organizations i.e., JWB, YMCA and YWCA serve adults as well as youth.
3. Redesigned program delivery systems to include, in addition to traditional groups (clubs, troops, teams, etc.), instructional television, day camps, day care centers, community outreach workers, and special interest workshops and courses

4. Broadened the content of their educational program in terms of subject matter and life skills

5. Increased efforts to recruit, train and service adult volunteer leaders to serve as board and committee members, group advisors, and instructors

6. Increased emphasis on the training of professionals in such areas as communications, group and interpersonal relations, instruction, personnel and financial management, and program development

7. Sought additional financial support for programs and operations from public (government) as well as private (individuals, corporations, and foundations) sources

According to Hanson and Carlson (1972, pp. 7-8), youth-serving organizations have several characteristics in common, namely:

... membership is usually voluntary on the part of the child ... The membership is open to all children regardless of race or religion, within the prescribed age and sex limitations.

The major organizations also tend to use similar methods of operation. They all function, in part at least, through small groups which have adult sponsorship but which retain a high degree of self-direction ... base their programs on the interests and needs of youth ... Emphasis is placed on learning by doing. Although the goals are educational, in most cases, the methods are recreational.

Although there are many similarities or common characteristics between the various youth organizations, important differences do exist. Mawby (1966, p. 266), the former Assistant Director for the 4-H Youth Program at Michigan State University, stated that the most important distinguishing feature of 4-H is its affiliation with the land-grant
university. The 4-H Youth Program is the youth phase of the Cooperative Extension educational program of the university. This university affiliation of 4-H has enabled professionals, who have responsibilities for 4-H, to have direct access to the resources of the colleges of agriculture and home economics or the entire university.

Vaughan (September 1978, pp. 6-9), Assistant Deputy Director for 4-H Youth Program, SEA-Extension, USDA, cited six "unique features" of 4-H which distinguish it from the other major youth organizations.

1. The USDA/land-grant university system not only permits but requires local autonomy with respect to the determination of the needs of youth, kinds of 4-H programs, and organizational structure

2. Four-H has an open and flexible organizational structure e.g., membership open to both sexes, no national rules and regulations imposed upon local 4-H organizations and members (except for minimum age requirements for 4-H delegates to national events), no requirements with respect to uniforms, equipment, supplies, dues (unless established locally by action of 4-H members)

3. Financial support for 4-H is derived from both public and private sources at the national, state and local level

4. Four-H has official status as an educational program of the land-grant university of each state and territory of the United States

5. All professional 4-H employees (federal, state, and county) are "faculty" of the USDA/land-grant university system

6. Four-H is the only youth program whose name and emblem is protected and governed by a federal criminal statute

Four-H is an educational program of the USDA/land-grant university system (Vaughan 1978, p. 2) serving 4,072,644
members, primarily nine to nineteen years of age (see Appendix B). Four-H programs are conducted in 3,150 counties of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Guam under the supervision of county Extension agents, the Cooperative Extension Service of the land-grant colleges and universities, and SEA-Extension, USDA. The overall mission of the Cooperative Extension Service in conducting 4-H programs is "... the development of youth individually and as responsible and productive citizens" (SEA-Extension, USDA 1977).

4-H Citizenship Education

Four-H, like many of the other youth-serving organizations (Boy Scouts, Boys Clubs, Camp Fire Girls, and Girl Scouts), had its beginnings in the early 1900s. The 4-H movement began sometime between 1902 and 1907 in Ohio, Illinois, Texas, Iowa, and Mississippi.* These early "4-H clubs" were established in rural areas by school teachers and superintendents, parents, and local business and civic leaders for the purpose of supplementing the school curriculum through club meetings, projects, and exhibits (Anderson 1977, p. 14).

The basis of the "4-H Club idea" was the belief, among the early pioneers of the 4-H movement, in the club as a means of fostering "successful citizenship" among boys and

*The essential notion regarding the founding of 4-H is that it did not happen all at once with any person, place or time (Reck 1951, p. viii; Mawby 1966, p. 262). In general, the 4-H movement gathered momentum in the early 1900s but forerunners had been cited in the mid 1800s (Mawby 1966, p. 262).
girls (Aiton 1961, p. 5). The local 4-H club has been considered a "natural laboratory" for citizenship education because it provides learning opportunities relating to self-government: election of officers, use of parliamentary procedures, holding an elected office, serving as a chairperson or member of a committee, and planning and conducting club programs (Freeman 1969, pp. 55-57). According to Mawby (1966, pp. 268-269):

Ideally, the local club organization will provide an opportunity for each member to function as an active member of the group, participating in the decision-making process and assuming responsibilities for various phases of the group's program.

In addition to the governance of the 4-H club by members, 4-H projects and activities have also been a means through which 4-H members learn to become responsible citizens (Dildine 1962, Prologue p. 1). Citizenship learning opportunities have been provided in 4-H through specific citizenship projects and activities and/or as an essential part of every project and activity (Freeman 1969, p. vii).

Four-H club governance, projects and activities have been supplemented through a variety of programs and services offered by the National 4-H Council. Listed below are descriptions of the National 4-H Council programs and services which emphasize citizenship development.

Citizenship-Washington Focus (Citizenship Short Course) is conducted at the National 4-H Center on a weekly basis from June through August each year. This citizenship education program is designed to:
... stimulate youth (4-H members, 15 years of age or older) to search for solutions to contemporary issues, practice leadership skills and become more meaningfully involved as concerned and action-oriented citizens when they return home (National 4-H Council 1978, p. 3).

Through participating in workshops and seminars held at the National 4-H Center and by taking field trips to monuments, U.S. Capital, government agencies, etc., in the Washington, D.C. area, 4-H members learn about their American heritage, the three branches of the federal government (legislative, executive, and judicial), national problems and issues i.e., energy and international affairs (National 4-H Council 1978, pp. 3-6).

Citizenship in Action is an action oriented citizenship education program sponsored by the Reader's Digest Foundation and the National 4-H Council. Each year, financial grants are awarded to 4-H groups (clubs, councils, etc.) to initiate projects that contribute to youth development and community improvement. Grants are awarded on the basis of detailed project proposals prepared by 4-H groups and submitted to the National 4-H Councils through the state 4-H office (National 4-H Council 1979).

International 4-H Youth Exchange (IFYE) Ambassador and Caravan Programs are for 4-H members fifteen to eighteen and sixteen to twenty-one years of age, respectively. The major purpose of these programs is twofold: (1) to learn about
people in other countries and their way of life (culture) by living with families and (2) to share their experiences with others upon their return to the United States (National 4-H Council 1979).

Citizenship Awards Program is also administered by the National 4-H Council through the support of the Coca-Cola Company (National 4-H Council 1979). As shown in figure 3, the citizenship awards program is comprehensive with awards given to 4-H members at county, state, and national levels.

County: Four medals of honor
State: An expense-paid trip to National 4-H Congress. Certificates of Merit for two winners per state
National: Nine educational scholarships of $1,000 each
Special: Two Presidential Award winners receive silver trays

Fig. 3. National 4-H citizenship awards program

National 4-H News Magazine is published by the National 4-H Council ten times a year and provides adults, teen, and junior leaders with citizenship education program ideas. For example, the "1978 Article Index" in the January 1979 issue of National 4-H News (p. 26) identified twelve feature articles which focused on citizenship. In Ohio, approximately 28 percent of the adult volunteer leaders who supervise 4-H clubs/groups subscribe to the National 4-H News.
In addition to publishing citizenship articles annually, the editors, in 1975, of *National 4-H News* sponsored the "Bicentennial Responsible Freedom Contest" in which 4-H clubs were awarded plaques or certificates for "outstanding community citizenship projects." "Plaque-winning entries" were for such projects as the development of a community bike lane, voter registration campaign, community park restoration, expression of views to representatives on federal legislation (*National 4-H News*, October 1975, p. 7).

**Educational Aids** are produced and distributed by the National 4-H Council in the area of citizenship to support county 4-H programs. These include a book, a leader's handbook, *National 4-H News* reprints, a slide-tape set, and information and promotional leaflets (National 4-H Council 1979).

Sanders (1972, p. 142) stated that one of the areas that Extension professionals, agents as well as specialists, need to be competent in is "history and philosophy," particularly "citizenship and public responsibility." The National 4-H Council supplements the in-service education of the various state Extension Services through internships at the National 4-H Center and the National 4-H Staff Development and Training Program (National 4-H Council 1979). For example, the National 4-H Council conducted a workshop, "Managing More Effective 4-H Citizenship Education Programs," at the National 4-H Center from January 15-19, 1979. Major topics for discussion included: functional definition of citizenship,
life skills model for 4-H citizenship education, citizenship activities and materials, and citizenship awards ("Managing More Effective 4-H Citizenship Education Programs" 1979).

Three major efforts, a research study and two program committees, have been made to strengthen citizenship education as an area of emphasis within the 4-H Youth Program. The National 4-H Club Foundation (now the National 4-H Council) conducted a three year study (1955 through 1957), referred to as the Citizenship Improvement Study, in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service, USDA (now SEA-Extension, USDA). In September 1973, the National 4-H Citizenship Development Committee submitted a report, after a year of deliberation and study of 4-H citizenship education programs, to the Assistant Administrator (now Assistant Deputy Director), 4-H Youth Division, ES-USDA. In October 1976, the National 4-H/CD Program Committee submitted a report to ECOP's subcommittees on 4-H and Community Development which set forth a comprehensive program framework for a "unique approach to citizenship education," referred to as 4-H/Community Development (1976, p. 2).

The Citizenship Improvement Study (CIS) was financed through a grant from the Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation and involved three professional staff members of the 4-H Foundation, five state 4-H staff members and twenty-five county Extension agents in four states (Ohio, Oregon, Texas, and Vermont) and Puerto Rico (Dildine 1962, Chapter Eight, pp. 1-2). The major outcomes of this study were:
1. Participating agents were able to effectively bring about desired behavioral changes in 4-H members or adult leaders using the CIS definition of democratic citizenship. This "guiding definition," stated that a "good citizen in our democracy" is:

A person who is effective in cooperative self—other relations because he:

--Deeply UNDERSTANDS himself and others, and understands democratic working relations;

--Realistically ACCEPTS and BELIEVES IN the positive potentials in all people.

As a result, he:

--Effectively and habitually ACTS with deep concern for the common welfare (self and others), and

--Takes into balanced account 'freedom with responsibility' both his rights from others and his obligations (Dildine 1962, Prologue, p. 1).

2. The study revealed several areas of citizenship education needing further study and development: relation of subject matter projects to citizenship development; development of citizenship education programs with an emphasis on community service; potential role of International Farm Youth Exchange (now International 4-H Youth Exchange) alumni in international education; application of CIS findings for teenage involvement in 4-H; effect of "competition and awards" on citizenship development; programs fostering the effective use of the scientific method by 4-H members in solving problems; and the effect of programs with an emphasis on democratic relations with others beyond the family, peer groups, and school (Dildine 1962, Chapter Seven, pp. 36-45, 49; Chapter Eight, p. 4).

3. The twenty-five county agents participating in this study improved their "citizenship teaching competencies" as a result of the assistance they received from the "teaching teams" (4-H Foundation staff and state 4-H CIS coordinators). Agents indicated that direct face to face consultation, either individually or as a group, with "teaching teams" was of greater value than the reference materials (Dildine 1962, Chapter Six, pp. 47-48; Chapter Eight, p. 5).
The major outcome of the National 4-H Citizenship Development Committee's efforts was the development of a "life skills model for 4-H citizenship education" (1973, pp. 10-18). This model, as shown in figure 4, categorizes citizenship competencies, referred to as life skills, into five clusters: developing realistic self image (Person-Self Skills); relating to another individual or to a component of a group (Person-Person Skills); perceiving and interpreting information (Person-Data Skills); relating to an entire group (Person-Group Skills); and relating to society (Person-Society Skills).

![Figure 4](image-url)
The Committee proposed a national 4-H citizenship education program, based on the aforementioned model, encompassing six basic objectives (1973, p. 10). Four-H members/participants should:

1. Become aware of their relationship to others; family, peers, state, nation, and world
2. Understand the kind and quality of participation in interaction situations
3. Acquire life skills essential to participation as an effective citizen
4. Help 4-H youth to use their life-skills in dealing with issues as they affect self and others
5. Achieve respect for and responsiveness to needs, rights and responsibilities of others
6. Gain an insight into principles, processes, and structures of democracy and maximize their potential as effective participants in the community

The National 4-H/CD Program Committee advocated a process oriented approach focusing on community for fostering the acquisition of citizenship life skills among 4-H members/participants. This approach, according to the 4-H/CD Program Committee, involves youth working with adults in a process of identifying problems and/or opportunities, setting goals and priorities, looking at alternative solutions, planning, initiating action, and looking back to discover if the community and the persons involved are any better off for the effort (1976, p. 2).

Through the 4-H/CD approach, the community serves as a "real-life laboratory" for the development of youth as effective citizens.

Included in this report were a number of recommendations relating 4-H/CD program goals and objectives; curriculum development; staff development; evaluation; accountability
and research; and an incentives program. With respect to a 4-H/CD incentives program, the Committee recommended that recognition should be given on a group basis as a means of promoting group effectiveness and cohesion. However, the Committee also stated that individual awards area should be fully utilized by 4-H members/participants seeking individual recognition (1976, pp. 19-22).

In 1976, a task force, appointed by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP), prepared a document, 4-H in Century III, setting forth direction and recommendations for 4-H in the next decade. One of these recommendations related directly to citizenship education.

Recommendation No. 25 reads:

Citizenship and leadership development, with emphasis on skills and attitudes needed to contribute in our democratic system should be given high priority in the 4-H program at local, county, state, national and international levels. More opportunities should be provided also for youth to commit themselves to solving real and significant problems of their communities.

Ohio 4-H Youth Program

The 4-H Youth Program is one of four major educational programs conducted by the Cooperative Extension Service of The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and county governments. The other Cooperative Extension programs are: Agricultural Industry, Community and Natural Resource Development, and Home Economics. Extension
faculty and staff are located in each of Ohio's eighty-eight counties, in ten area centers, and on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University (see figure 5).

Four-H in Ohio is essentially an out-of-school, educational program for boys and girls between the ages of nine to nineteen. As shown in table 3, approximately 61 percent of the 4-H members are between the ages of 9 to 11 (late childhood) while 35 percent are between the ages of 12 to 14 (early adolescence) and 14 percent are 15 to 19 years of age (middle and late adolescence).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-11 years</td>
<td>118,689</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-14 years</td>
<td>49,296</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>27,504</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195,489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In terms of programming, the emphasis in 4-H is upon practical, real-life learning experiences which are intended to supplement the educational efforts of the home, church,
Fig. 5. Ohio Cooperative Extension Service office locations.
and school. These learning experiences are provided through a variety of program delivery approaches: community 4-H clubs, special interest groups, residential and day camps, instructional television, special events i.e., Ohio 4-H Congress, cooperating with in-school activities, and working with other youth programs (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1978c).

Since the beginning of 4-H in Ohio in 1902, when a "boys' and girls' agricultural club" was organized by A. B. Graham, Superintendent of Schools in Springfield Township, Clark County (Christian 1959, pp. 2-3, 46), the scope of the 4-H Youth Program has continually expanded, particularly in terms of member enrollment, organized 4-H clubs, and projects. For example, in March 1903, Graham's Springfield Township club had eighty-one members engaged mainly in four projects: corn growing, soil testing, vegetable garden growing, and flower garden growing (Reck 1951, pp. 13-14). Since its founding, the Ohio 4-H Youth Program has expanded to 195,489 4-H members, 20,770 junior leaders (4-H members fourteen to nineteen years of age), 8,912 4-H clubs and special interest groups, and 144 projects (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1979).

Although originally conceived as a rural, educational program, by 1979 approximately thirty-eight percent (37.8) of the 4-H members resided in towns, cities, and suburbs over 10,000 in population (see table 4). However, the Ohio 4-H Youth Program continues primarily to serve youth who reside on farms and in small towns.
### TABLE 4
**OHIO 4-H MEMBERS BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of Residence</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central cities over 50,000 pop.</td>
<td>23,614</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs of cities over 50,000</td>
<td>22,035</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns and cities 10,000-50,000</td>
<td>28,267</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns under 10,000 and rural non-farm</td>
<td>75,902</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms</td>
<td>45,671</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>195,489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Various 4-H program responsibilities are performed by faculty/staff at all levels (state, area, and county) within the Cooperative Extension organization (see figure 6). As of August 1979, this faculty consisted of an assistant director, 4-H, an associate state leader, six assistant state leaders, eight area agents, and eighty-nine county agents, plus program assistants (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service August 1979e). Faculty members having major responsibilities in other program areas (Agricultural Industry, Community and Natural Resource Development, and Home Economics) also assist with many of the 4-H programs (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1979c).
Fig. 6. Organization Chart of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service
County 4-H agents assist adult volunteer leaders, referred to as "advisors," in the operation of 4-H clubs and special interest groups and in the supervision of 4-H projects and activities by providing research based information concerning teaching methods and subject matter. In 1978, 20,770 advisors volunteered their time, energy, and money to the 4-H Youth Program (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1979d).

Project instruction is provided to members by volunteer 4-H advisors and/or county 4-H agents. Subject matter specialists in the sixteen academic departments and one division of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics are responsible for developing project materials for 4-H members and teaching aids for advisors and agents. These specialists work very closely with the State 4-H staff as technical subject matter authorities for their respective areas of responsibility.

There are approximately eighty regular projects and sixty-four pilot projects grouped into the following subject matter areas (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1979b, pp. 4-5):

| Clothing   | Entomology       | Leadership       |
|           | Family Life      | Development      |
| Marketing | Field and Garden | Livestock        |
| Communication | Crops         | Management       |
| Conservation | Food and Nutrition | Personal       |
| Consumer   | Health           | Development      |
| Education  | Housing and      | Veterinary       |
| Engineering | Furnishings      | Sciences         |

Four-H projects are tools to be used

... in teaching responsibility, skills and techniques, objective thinking, decision making, personal and other areas of development to boys and girls (Ohio Cooperative Extension Service 1975, p. 15).
Summary

The concept of citizenship has a long history, dating back to ancient Israel and Greece. As a legal concept, citizenship in the United States refers to membership in the nation-state, a status entitling a person to certain rights and equal protection of the law. In addition, citizenship is also a moral concept emphasizing the responsibilities of a person toward others as they engage in the tasks of governance.

A person performs in the role of citizen in both small groups and large-scale organizations. These groups and organizations serve both as a setting (micro or macro) where a person confronts the tasks of governance (making or influencing decisions) and as a source or agent of learning to cope with these tasks. The learning stimulated by agents is cumulative and continuous throughout a person's life.

Small groups and large-scale organizations lie within one of seven institutional sectors of society: primary groups (family and peer groups), schools, voluntary organizations, religious organizations, business and labor, government, and mass media. Each tends to emphasize a certain domain(s) of learning (knowledge, skills, attitudes) through their citizenship education program. However, the institutional sectors, as a whole, tend to emphasize or promote the acquisition of knowledge.

Currently, there are twelve content areas drawn from history, social sciences, or humanities that are associated
with citizenship education. The content transmitted through citizenship education programs may be contradicted or reinforced by the context of instruction or "hidden curriculum."

Within the voluntary organization sector, youth-serving organizations perform an important role in citizenship education. One of these organizations, 4-H Youth Program of the land-grant university system, has historically emphasized citizenship education as a major component of their program. Four-H citizenship education is provided through a variety of learning opportunities: 4-H club/group meetings, projects, activities, and events. Since these learning opportunities have not been "well documented," further study is needed to analyze 4-H citizenship education programs throughout the nation.
CHAPTER II

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A description of the procedures that were employed in the study are presented in this chapter. Procedural information included concerns the: design of the study, description of the population, development of the instruments, collection of data, analysis of data, and characteristics of respondents.

Design

A descriptive (survey—ex post facto) research design was employed to: (1) describe the general status of the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program and (2) investigate relationships between certain characteristics of the respondents and their role conception of a democratic citizen. Variables included in this study were operationally defined as follows:

Role Conception of a Citizen: ideas about the behavior or actions appropriate for a person occupying the status of citizen in a democratic society.

Role conceptions of a citizen included—

Spectator: Native born or naturalized person who is loyal to the United States of America and who obeys the laws and governmental authorities.
Occasional participant: Person, at least eighteen years of age, who elects governmental leaders to enact laws, sets policy and in general manages the affairs of governmental jurisdictions.

Participant: Person, at least eighteen years of age, who elects governmental leaders and who engages in non-electoral forms of participation in the making of public policy.

Participator: Person who responsibly participates in the decision making processes of groups in which he or she is a member.

4-H Projects and Activities: learning opportunities provided or arranged by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program for the purpose of providing the knowledge, skills and attitudes 4-H members need if they are to behave or act as democratic citizens.

Instructional Content Areas: sets of topics currently associated with citizenship education categorized as American Heritage, government, election/political parties, law, economics, international relations, problems and issues, information processing, democratic values, value clarification, group dynamics and leadership, social action/community development.

Domains of Learning: sets of goals/objectives or outcomes relative to citizenship education categorized as knowledge, skills (intellectual and participatory) and attitudes.
Evaluative Evidence: data collected for the purpose of evaluating the impact of the 4-H citizenship education program. Evidence for program evaluation included: time expended by professional or volunteer staff, number of teaching activities performed, number of 4-H members or junior leaders involved in projects and activities, interest of 4-H members or junior leaders in projects and activities, and behavior change in 4-H members and junior leaders.

Recognition: acknowledgement of the behavior of 4-H members and junior leaders considered appropriate for a citizen by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program. Forms of recognition included: verbal praise, personal letters or notes, newsletters, delegation of leadership responsibilities, recognition meetings/banquets, publicity through mass media, and awards.

Program Support: assistance or services rendered or made available by volunteer and professional staff of The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics and resource persons for the purpose of facilitating the planning, conducting, and evaluating 4-H citizenship educational programs at county, area, and state levels.

Major Field of Study: principal field(s) of academic specialization of the Ohio Cooperative Extension faculty/staff members at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels.

Major fields of study were classified as--

Education: adult and continuing education, agricultural education, environmental education,
extension education, and home economics education.

Behavioral and Social Sciences: anthropology, communications, economics, geography, history, political science, psychology, and sociology.

General Agriculture: agricultural engineering, agronomy, animal science, dairy science, entomology, horticulture, plant pathology, and poultry science.

General Home Economics: child development, clothing, home furnishings, home management, nutrition, and textiles.

General Natural Resources: fisheries management, forest industries management, forest resource management, forest biology, parks and recreation administration, and resource development.

National 4-H Council Educational Programs: citizenship, leadership and staff development programs offered by the National 4-H Council's Washington, D.C. office, National 4-H Center. These educational programs include: Citizenship-Washington Focus, National 4-H Leader Forums, Regional 4-H Leader Forums, National 4-H Staff Development and Training Program, Internship at the National 4-H Center, and International 4-H Extension Travel Seminar.

Population

The population for this study consisted of the following Ohio State University Cooperative Extension Service
faculty/staff members: 88 county Extension agents having 4-H program responsibilities, 8 area Extension agents (4-H), one assistant state leader (4-H), 16 departmental chairpersons, the Director of the School of Natural Resources, the Head of the Section of Information and Applied Communications, and 5 assistant Extension directors. The entire population was surveyed by the researcher, totaling 120 Extension faculty/staff members.

At the request of the researcher, an Ohio Cooperative Extension Service staff directory, dated August 1979, was provided by the Assistant Director, Administration. This directory contained the names and addresses of faculty/staff members in the survey population. For those ten counties having either two county Extension agents (4-H), a vacant county Extension agent (4-H) position, or no county Extension agent (4-H) position, the Assistant Director (4-H) was requested to provide names of those faculty/staff members who, in his opinion, would be most knowledgeable of the 4-H citizenship education program in their particular county. A copy of the memorandum, dated August 27, 1979, requesting names of these faculty/staff members is included in Appendix C.

Development of Instruments

Two methods were used to collect data: (1) questionnaires mailed to county Extension agents, area Extension agents (4-H), and the assistant state leader (4-H); and (2) personal interviews with department chairpersons, the Director
of the School of Natural Resources, the Head of the Section of Information and Communications, and the assistant Extension directors. The questionnaire was designed primarily to solicit information about the 4-H citizenship education program conducted in Ohio at the county, area, and state levels during fiscal year, 1979. The interviews were for the purpose of determining the type of support or assistance that is currently available from departments and units within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, The Ohio State University. Both instruments were constructed to obtain the respondent's conception of the citizen's role in a democratic society.

The two instruments were selected for their respective advantages. For example, the mail questionnaire permits a wide coverage in terms of geographical area, greater possibility for honesty and frankness, and more considered answers. In addition, it also is relatively less expensive to administer in comparison to the interview (Kerlinger 1973, p. 487; Mouly 1978, pp. 189-90). The interview, on the other hand, has these advantages: (1) attains a higher response rate than mail questionnaires, (2) permits probing for answers so there are fewer "don't knows" and "no answers," (3) allows for clarification of seemingly confusing questions (Babbie 1973, pp. 171-172).

The mail questionnaire was not a published, standardized instrument but was developed by the researcher for this study (see Appendix C). Construction of the questionnaire items was based on an extensive review of the literature and
the comments of graduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education majoring in extension education, and faculty members having areas of specialization in citizenship education, extension education, research methodology, and youth organizations. In addition, the questionnaire was also pre-tested with 15 faculty members employed by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service who, within the last five years, had held a county or area 4-H agent position in Ohio but who are now employed in another position with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

The questionnaire consisting of instructions, open- and closed-ended questions and scales, was arranged into seven content sections—projects and activities, instructional content areas, goals/objectives, evaluative evidence, recognition, program support (persons and materials), and general information—relating to 4-H citizenship education. Of the 48 items comprising the questionnaire, 30 were scalar items pertaining to instructional content areas emphasized, goal/objectives emphasized, evaluative evidence utilized and adequacy of college support received.

In terms of the scales, respondents were asked to rate the items related to instructional content areas, goals/objectives, evaluative evidence and program support on a one-to-five point scale indicating the degree of emphasis, utilization or adequacy placed on each item. The highest possible score on an item was five. The lowest possible score on an item was one.
The Cronbach alpha technique was employed to assess the reliability of the three sets of scales included in the mail questionnaire. The reliability coefficient for the sets of scales were: content areas, .78; evaluative evidence, .79; and goals/objectives scale, .87.

The 12 items comprising the goal/objective set were broken down into three sub sets of scales, referred to as learning domains, consisting of four items each. The skill domain had a reliability coefficient of .75, whereas the knowledge and attitudes domains each had a reliability coefficient of .69.

The interview schedule was developed by the researcher and consisted of open- and closed-ended questions (see Appendix D). Interview items were arranged into three sections—general information, role conception of a democratic citizen, and available program support with transitional statements between each section.

Analysis of Data

To analyze the data obtained from the instruments, the researcher utilized the following measures of central tendency and variability: mode and relative frequencies; mean and standard deviation. Relation or association between variables were determined by the Cramers V statistic. Chi square for independence was used to test each of the hypothesized relationships at the .10 level of significance.
Data collected in this study were processed by the Instructional and Research Computer Center facilities of The Ohio State University and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) system of computer programs.

Collection of Data

The questionnaire was mailed on September 7, 1979, accompanied by a letter of explanation from the Assistant Director (4-H), and a preaddressed, stamped envelope. Potential respondents were asked to complete the questionnaire and to return it to the researcher in the enclosed envelope by September 19, 1979. To increase the rate of response to the questionnaire, follow-up mailings were administered to the nonrespondents.

On September 20, 1979, a follow-up letter, written by the researcher, was sent to the nonrespondents encouraging them to complete the questionnaire. A second follow-up mailing consisting of another copy of the questionnaire, a letter and a return envelope was sent on October 1, 1979 to the remaining nonrespondents (see Appendix C). Questionnaires not received by October 8, 1979 were not included in the analysis of data.

Interviews were conducted on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University by the researcher between September 10 and October 3, 1979. A letter, dated August 31, 1979 written by the Assistant Director (4-H) introducing the researcher and explaining the purpose of the study, was sent
to interviewees (see Appendix D). The interviews were conducted in a conversational manner and ranged in length from approximately 20 to 60 minutes.

Of the 120 faculty-staff members surveyed, 112 or approximately 93 percent responded either to the questionnaire or to the interview. Table 5 indicates that 89 or approximately 92 percent of the faculty/staff members who were mailed questionnaires responded, while 23 or 100 percent of faculty/staff members who were contacted for an interview responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Number of Potential Respondents</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Characteristics of Respondents

Age

The age of the respondents ranged from 22 to 62 years with the mean age being 35 years. Almost 75 percent of the respondents were 39 years of age or less as shown in table 6.
TABLE 6
AGE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean = 34.92
SD = 10.08

Sex

As shown in table 7, the respondents tended to be predominantly male, with about one out of every four being female.

TABLE 7
SEX OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level of Formal Education

The level of formal education is shown in table 8 as the highest academic degree obtained by respondents. The categories do not consider studies toward a degree that was yet to be received or non-degree studies. Six percent of the respondents had completed a Bachelor's degree, whereas 94 percent reported that they had completed advanced degrees beyond the Bachelor's level, with the Master's level being the modal category at 73 percent.

TABLE 8
HIGHEST ACADEMIC DEGREE COMPLETED BY RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Completed</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Position Title of Respondents

As shown in table 9, 72 percent of the respondents held a county agent position within the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service organization. Seven percent of the respondents held an area Extension agent, 4-H position, while 21 percent held a state level position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Level</th>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Assistant County Extension Agent, 4-H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Extension Agent, 4-H</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Extension Agent, Home Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County Extension Agent, Agriculture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>71.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Area Extension Agent, 4-H</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant State Leader, 4-H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Chairperson</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director, School of Natural Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head, Information and Applied Communications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Length of Service

Length of service was defined as the number of years that respondents had served in their present position. As shown in table 10, 82 percent of the respondents have served in their present position for 10 years or less, with one to five years of service being the modal category at 36 percent. Of the 24 respondents who reported having less than one year of service, 23 of them held county Extension agent positions.

TABLE 10

LENGTH OF SERVICE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Service</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 15 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 20 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>112</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III
FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter is devoted to an analysis and interpretation of the data (findings) that were obtained from the responses to both the mail questionnaire and personal interviews. Included are tables and figures which present the data in detail, accompanied by paragraphs of discussion which point out important aspects of the data and whether hypotheses were confirmed.

4-H Projects and Activities

County Extension agents, area Extension agents (4-H) and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to identify "citizenship-related projects and activities" conducted by their respective units during fiscal year 1979. Table 11 reveals that 99 percent of the units conducted leadership training sessions; 87 percent, 4-H club governance; 85 percent, U.S. flag etiquette; 84 percent, leadership development projects; 81 percent, community improvement projects; and 72 percent, service on boards, commissions and committees with adults.

The Ohio 4-H Congress and Citizenship-Washington Focus, although reported by only 1 percent of the respondents, are
TABLE 11
4-H CITIZENSHIP-RELATED PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES
CONDUCTED DURING FISCAL YEAR 1979
(N = 89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project and Activity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership training sessions</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H club governance</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. flag etiquette</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development projects</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community improvement projects</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on boards, commissions, and committees with adults</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer services to the less fortunate</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career exploration visits or days</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrastate or interstate 4-H exchanges</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday celebrations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government visits or days</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International exchanges</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community surveys and studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International education projects</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter registration drives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get-out-the-vote campaigns</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabulation or reporting of election results</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock arrest and trial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio 4-H Congress (leadership, government, and careers)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship-Washington Focus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

coordinated by the State 4-H Office of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service to supplement on-going citizenship-related projects and other activities at the county and area levels. The Ohio 4-H Congress was conducted from June 13 through 16,
1979 and emphasized leadership development, the state legis­
lative process and career exploration.

Of the 64 respondents who indicated having 4-H members or junior leaders serving on boards, commissions, and com­mittees with adults, 61 actually specified the groups. The following groups sponsored by The Ohio Cooperative Extension Service were the most frequently cited: county and area 4-H committees (73 percent), junior fair boards (32 percent), 4-H expansion and review committees (12 percent), and county ex­tension advisory committees (7 percent). In addition to these, respondents mentioned 4-H members and junior leaders serving as members of a number of groups not sponsored by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service. These groups included: a citizen's committee on alcohol and drug abuse, county human services board, county council of health and social agencies, commission on aging, county youth council, youth services association, community council, and county study committee.

Instructional Content Areas

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to rate the amount of instructional emphasis given by their unit to each of the twelve content areas that are currently associated with citi­zenship education. The scale ranged from 1 to 5 with 1 being "almost NEVER emphasized" and 5 being "almost ALWAYS empha­sized."
Table 12 indicates that the content area receiving the most emphasis, having a mean of 4.60, was group dynamics and leadership. Other content areas receiving considerable instructional emphasis in descending order, were value clarification, problems and issues, democratic values, and American heritage. The least emphasized content areas were law, international relations, and elections/political parties having means of 2.01, 2.00, and 1.56, respectively.

TABLE 12
MEAN EMPHASIS ON INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT AREAS
(N = 89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Area</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group dynamics and leadership</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value clarification</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems and issues</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic values</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American heritage</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social action/community development</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information processing</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International relations</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections/political parties</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domains of Learning

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to rate the degree or amount of emphasis that was placed on twelve goals/objectives in their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Each goal/objective was rated on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being "almost NEVER emphasized" and 5 being "almost ALWAYS emphasized." For the purpose of analysis, the goals/objectives were classified into three domains of learning (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) and a mean and standard deviation were computed for each domain as shown in table 13. The skills domain received the greatest emphasis with a mean of 3.42, next was the attitude domain with a mean of 3.28, and the least emphasized with a mean of 2.86 was the knowledge domain.

A comparison of the learning domain means was made using a one-way analysis of variance. As shown in table 14, the learning domain means were significantly different beyond the .05 level. A Tukey's post hoc analysis revealed that the skills and attitudes domain means did not differ significantly at the .05 level; whereas, the means of the skills and attitudes domains differed significantly from the mean of the knowledge domain. Thus, the skills and attitudes domains of learning were emphasized more than the knowledge domain in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program.
### TABLE 13

**MEAN EMPHASIS ON GOALS/OBJECTIVES**
**BY DOMAINS OF LEARNING**
**(N = 89)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Domain</th>
<th>Goal/Objective</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>To cooperate and work with others in groups in order to achieve common goals</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To make rational, moral judgments about people, institutions, decisions and policies</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To influence the actions of citizens, leaders, and officials</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To acquire and interpret accurately information about problems and issues</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>To have respect for and responsiveness to the rights and responsibilities of others</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To have a feeling of competence to influence effectively decisions that affect their lives</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To have pride in their American heritage</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To appreciate the contributions made by people in other countries to civilization</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>To acquire knowledge of problems and issues affecting self and others</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To acquire knowledge of the principles, processes and institutions of American society</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To acquire knowledge of their American heritage</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To acquire knowledge of government and people in other countries</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF LEARNING DOMAIN MEAN EMPHASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>15.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>126.72</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>141.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p .05

Evaluative Evidence

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to rate the degree to which each level of evidence (as shown in table 15) was utilized in assessing their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Each level of evidence was rated by respondents on a scale from 1 to 5, with 1 being "almost NEVER utilized" and 5 being "almost ALWAYS utilized." Respondents reported the "number of 4-H members and junior leaders involved in projects and activities" as the level most utilized, with a mean of 4.07, while "behavioral change in 4-H members and junior leaders" received the least utilization by units, with a mean of 2.76. The other three levels--"number of teaching activities performed," "time expended by 4-H professionals and/or volunteers," and "interest of 4-H members or junior leaders in projects and activities"--received means of 3.85, 3.62, and 3.44, respectively.
TABLE 15
MEAN UTILIZATION ON EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE
(N = 89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Evidence</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of 4-H members or junior leaders involved in projects or activities</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teaching activities performed</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time expended by 4-H professionals and/or volunteers</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest of 4-H members or junior leaders in projects and activities</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral change in 4-H members or junior leaders</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognition

County Extension agents were asked to identify the forms of recognition utilized by their unit to acknowledge the citizenship achievements of 4-H members, junior leaders, and 4-H clubs or groups. Table 16 indicates that counties utilized a wide variety of recognition forms with publicity, awards, and verbal praise cited by 68 percent, 60 percent, and 54 percent of the respondents respectively, as the "most used" forms.

Of the 72 respondents indicating the use of awards as a form of recognition, 66 actually specified the award(s) used by their unit. The respondents identified 12 citizenship-
TABLE 16
FORMS OF RECOGNITION UTILIZED BY COUNTIES
FOR 4-H CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION
(N = 80)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of Recognition</th>
<th>Used</th>
<th></th>
<th>Most Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity (mass media)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal praise</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal letters or notes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegation of leadership responsibilities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition meetings/banquets</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

related awards, 10 for individual achievement and two for 4-H club or group achievement. As shown in table 17, the awards reported most frequently, in descending order, were: the trip to Citizenship-Washington Focus (63 percent); citizenship medals provided by The Coca-Cola Company (59 percent); and trip to the Ohio 4-H Club Congress (43 percent). The award having the largest number of recipients with 220 was the trip to the Ohio 4-H Congress.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Award Sponsor</th>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Total Number Recipients for each Award</th>
<th>County Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship-Washington Focus</td>
<td>County 4-H committee junior leadership clubs, fairboards, businesses and/or civic groups</td>
<td>Trip to citizenship-Washington Focus at National 4-H Center, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>The Coca-Cola Company</td>
<td>Medals</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio 4-H Congress</td>
<td>County 4-H committees, fairboards, agricultural societies and/or businesses</td>
<td>Trip to Ohio 4-H Congress at The Ohio State University, Columbus</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Reader's Digest</td>
<td>Medals</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>The American Youth Foundation</td>
<td>Book, I Dare You, and certificates</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td>Award Sponsor</td>
<td>Type of Award</td>
<td>Total Number Recipients for each Award</td>
<td>County Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Chamber of Commerce, Grange, businesses or individuals</td>
<td>Certificates, medals, plaques or scholarships</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Leadership Camp</td>
<td>Westfield Companies</td>
<td>Trip to State 4-H Leadership Camp</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Camp</td>
<td>County 4-H Committees and/or businesses</td>
<td>4-H camp scholarships</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Conservation Camp</td>
<td>Soil and Water Conservation Districts</td>
<td>Trip to State 4-H Conservation Camp</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>Medals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-H Club/Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep Ohio Beauti-</td>
<td>Ohio Roadside Council</td>
<td>Certificates and/or cash</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tiful (Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honor Club</td>
<td>County 4-H committees and/or fairboards</td>
<td>Certificates, banners and/or cash</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Support: Persons and Materials

Volunteers and Faculty/Staff Members

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H coordinator" were asked to identify those persons (volunteers and faculty/staff members) affiliated with the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, The Ohio State University, who have assisted with their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Of the 89 respondents, 86 or 97 percent reported volunteer 4-H advisors and their co-workers as having provided assistance for their unit's program (see table 18). Area Extension agents and state program staff members (assistant directors and program leaders) were reported as a source of support by 63 and 56 percent of the respondents, respectively. None of the respondents cited state subject-matter specialists as a source.

TABLE 18
VOLUNTEERS AND FACULTY/STAFF MEMBERS PROVIDING PROGRAM SUPPORT (N = 89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteer and Professional Staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer 4-H advisors</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit co-workers</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Extension agents</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant directors and program leaders</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and Applied Communications personnel</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State subject-matter specialists</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With respect to the types of program support received by units for their 4-H citizenship education program from volunteers and faculty/staff members, table 19 shows that 51 percent of the respondents reported the planning of projects and activities; 48 percent, training of 4-H members and junior leaders; 46 percent, preparing instructional materials; 44 percent, the conducting of in-service education; and 43 percent, the training of volunteer 4-H advisors. Only 11 or 12 percent of the respondents reported volunteers or faculty/staff members assisting with the evaluation of their unit's 4-H citizenship education program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning 4-H citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training 4-H members and junior leaders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing citizenship-related instructional materials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting in-service education workshops</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training volunteer 4-H advisors</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing award sponsors</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating 4-H citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing financial grants for community or environmental projects</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with the recognition of 4-H members through the mass media</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resource Persons

As shown in table 20, county and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" reported the following resource persons as providing support for their unit's 4-H citizenship education program: government officials (57 percent), business persons (53 percent), legislators (47 percent), school teachers or administrators (47 percent), and civic organization leaders (43 percent). Only 3 of 89 respondents or 3 percent reported union officials serving as resource persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Person</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government officials</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business persons</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislators (local, state &amp; national)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School teachers or administrators</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic organization leaders</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm organization leaders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International exchange participants</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister, priests or rabbis</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers or judges</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union officials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 89 respondents, 38 actually cited the support or assistance received from resource persons for their unit's
4-H citizenship education program. "Serving as a speaker at 4-H citizenship-related activities" i.e., leadership training sessions, local government and career days, and recognition banquets, was the most frequently cited type of program support, having been identified by 28 or 74 percent of the respondents (see table 21). The "sponsoring of citizenship-related awards" and the "planning and organizing of 4-H citizenship-related projects and activities" were reported by 40 percent and 34 percent of the respondents, respectively. Only 2 or 5 percent of the 38 respondents reported resource persons "assisting with the evaluation of citizenship-related projects and activities." The primary activities in which resource persons assisted with the evaluation were local government and career days.

**TABLE 21**

**PROGRAM SUPPORT RECEIVED FROM RESOURCE PERSONS**

(N = 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving as speakers at citizenship-related activities</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>73.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsoring citizenship-related awards for 4-H members and clubs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing 4-H citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing citizenship-related award sponsors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserving facilities or loaning equipment for citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisting with the evaluation of citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructional Materials

Project books (55 percent), slides (53 percent), films (44 percent), bulletins (37 percent) and games/simulation (35 percent) were the most frequently reported types of instructional materials used in 4-H citizenship education programs (see table 22). The least cited type of instructional material being used was video tapes, having been reported by only 3 percent of the 89 respondents.

TABLE 22
INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS UTILIZED
(N = 89)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Material</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project books</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletins</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games or simulation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape recordings</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparencies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaflets, brochures or handouts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video tapes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary source of instructional materials for unit 4-H citizenship education programs, as shown in table 23, was the Cooperative Extension Service (Ohio or USDA) and faculty/staff members within each individual unit, having been reported by 40 percent and 32 percent of the respondents, respectively. The least frequently cited source of
instructional materials were other agencies and organizations. The following agencies and organizations were reported as providing instructional materials: civic organizations, a drug council, Future Farmers of America (FFA), Georgia Cooperative Extension Service, local governments, public libraries, schools, and the Soil Conservation Service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Developer</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Primary Source</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Extension Service (Ohio or USDA)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit faculty/staff members</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National 4-H Council</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer 4-H advisors</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agencies and organizations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequacy of Program Support

On a scale from 1 to 5, county and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to rate the adequacy of support their unit (county, area, or state 4-H office) received from the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. The mean score for this item of 2.79 indicates that
the 89 individuals who responded felt the program support was less than adequate.

As shown in table 24, fifty-two of the 89 respondents specified 11 types of program support that should be provided by the College of Agriculture and Home Economics to strengthen 4-H citizenship education in their respective units. The most frequently cited types of program support were the development of "lesson plans" or "teaching outlines" (31 percent), audio visual materials (27 percent) and a citizenship project book (21 percent).

Available Program Support

To determine the support or assistance available, given existing personnel and financial resources, for 4-H citizenship education within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, an interview was conducted with 23 department chairpersons, assistant directors, etc. Each of the interviewees responded on behalf of their respective department or unit. As shown in figure 7, there were basically seven different types of support or assistance available.

1. Undergraduate and graduate education for future 4-H professionals provided by the departments of Agricultural Education and Home Economics Education

2. In-service education for county and area 4-H agents provided by the Staff Development and Program analysis unit in cooperation with the State 4-H Office

3. Research and evaluation studies conducted by graduate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Support</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson plans for use by 4-H agents, advisors, and camp counselors in a variety of learning situations</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio visual materials on such topics as alcohol and drug abuse, juvenile delinquency, premarital sex, Ohio history, local government, voter registration and officer training</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship project book for 4-H members</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &quot;comprehensive list&quot; of citizenship-related projects and activities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for use by 4-H agents and advisors to &quot;follow through&quot; with 4-H members upon their return from Citizenship-Washington Focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-service education sessions for 4-H agents with an emphasis on each of the &quot;major dimensions&quot; of citizenship education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A list of citizenship-related materials and from whom the materials may be acquired</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of the citizenship section of the 4-H Camp Counselor's Handbook</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &quot;correspondence course&quot; for 4-H junior leaders on citizenship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &quot;state government weekend&quot; for 4-H members to be held at The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 7. Available Program Support within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H Citizenship Education.
students (theses and dissertations) and faculty members within the departments of Agricultural Education and Home Economics Education and the Staff Development and Program Analysis unit

4. Consultation with 4-H faculty/staff members by departments and units regarding problems (issues) and alternative solutions, government agencies and regulations, and "industry economics" and careers relating to their respective areas of specialization

5. Educational materials i.e., project books, leader's guides, prepared by departments and units

6. Special national and state events i.e., Citizenship-Washington Focus, Ohio 4-H Congress, coordinated by the State 4-H Office with the National 4-H Council or departments and units within the College

7. Films distributed by the Information and Applied Communications unit

Citizen Role Conception

Faculty/staff members comprising the survey population were asked to select one of the following statements which they felt most accurately described their role conception of a citizen in a democratic society.

Spectator: Native born or naturalized person who is loyal to the United States of America and who obeys the laws and governmental authorities.
or subject matter areas associated with citizenship education seemed to suggest relationships between certain educational experiences of persons and their role conception of a democratic citizen. One would expect persons who have either majored in education and/or the social sciences while in college or attended any of the educational programs offered by the National 4-H Center to have a rather broad role conception of a citizen. A broadly conceived citizen role would be one which is open to young people as well as adults and involves responsible participation in a variety of group...
Occasional Participant: Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders to enact laws, set policy, and in general manage the affairs of governmental jurisdictions.

Participant: Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders and who engages in nonelectoral forms of participation in the making of public policy.

Participator: Person who responsibly participates in the decision making processes of groups in which he or she is a member.

Of the 112 faculty/staff members who returned a questionnaire or participated in an interview, 111 selected one of the above statements. Figure 8 indicates that 77 (69 percent) of the respondents selected the participator role conception of a citizen; 18 (16 percent), the participant role; 12 (11 percent), the spectator role; and 4 (4 percent), the occasional participant.

**Hypotheses Testing**

In this section is presented a discussion with respect to the hypotheses tested in the study. Discussion will focus on each variable's level of measurement, statistical tests used, the results of these tests, and the interpretation of the findings.

The hypotheses were formulated based on a review of the literature relating to citizenship education. The content
and organizational settings, including but not limited to government.

Hypothesis 1

*Research hypothesis.* Extension faculty/staff members having undergraduate and graduate majors in education and/or the social sciences will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

*Null hypothesis.* There will be no significant association between Extension faculty/staff members' major field of study and their role conception of a democratic citizen.

As shown in table 25, a low association (Cramer's V = .12) with a probability of .523 was found between the nominal variables, faculty/staff members' major field of study and their role conception of a democratic citizen. Although a slightly higher percentage of faculty/staff members with a major(s) in education and/or the social sciences (68 percent) held a participator role conception than did those with a major(s) in a technical field of agriculture, home economics, or natural resources (67 percent), the difference was negligible. In contrast, 76 percent of the faculty/staff members with a major in a technical field and one in education or the social sciences held a participator role conception of a citizen. Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected at the .10 level of significance.
TABLE 25
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY AND ROLE CONCEPTION OF A CITIZEN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Role Conception</th>
<th>Major Field of Study</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participator</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 3.21\] \hspace{1cm} \[df = 4\] \hspace{1cm} \[p = .523\]

Cramer's V = .12
Research hypothesis. Extension faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs of the National 4-H Center will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

Null hypothesis. There will be no significant association between attendance of Extension faculty/staff at National 4-H Center educational programs and their role conception of a democratic citizen.

Since both variables, attendance at National 4-H Center educational programs and role conception of a democratic citizen, are nominal level data, a Cramer's V statistic was calculated. Table 26 depicts the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Role Conception</th>
<th>Attended Program(s)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>All Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectator</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participator</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 5.13 \quad df = 2 \quad p = .077 \]

Cramer's V = .22

The correlation coefficient was significant at the .10 level of significance. Therefore, the data did support
the research hypothesis. Those faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs tend toward a participa-
tor role conception of a democratic citizen than those who have not attended programs.

Although the correlation coefficient was significant at the .10 level of significance, the degree of association was low. The low degree of association did indicate a trend but was not viewed as a strong level of association.
CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Problem

The task of educating competent citizens is one of the most important challenges facing any society. In America, this task has become rather complex as society has grown from a predominantly agrarian one to a society of large-scale organizations using advanced technologies. This complexity has been further confounded as America has become increasingly interdependent with other nation-states and peoples in the world.

The task of citizenship education has been generally neglected in recent times by educators and social scientists as a productive area for empirical research. The research that has been conducted, however, has primarily focused on these agents of early learning i.e., families, peer groups, and schools. As a result, the roles of other agents contributing to citizenship education have received relatively little scholarly attention.

Given the neglect of citizenship education by scholars and the increasing complexity of society in which people function as citizens, there is a need to investigate what constitutes citizenship education in the United States today.
Such an investigation entails "contextual mapping": the identification of agents within the various institutional sectors of society which contribute to citizenship education and an analysis of their respective programs and processes.

To begin to fill this void, a descriptive research study was conducted to determine the role of a youth-serving organization, the 4-H Youth Program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service, in citizenship education. The role of the Ohio 4-H Youth Program was based on an analysis of those citizenship-related 4-H projects and activities that were conducted during fiscal year 1979 (October 1, 1978 – September 30, 1979). The existence of a 4-H citizenship education program was inferred from an analysis of these projects and activities.

**Research Questions**

The following questions were developed to guide the study and to serve as a basis for the research design:

1. What kinds of citizenship-related 4-H projects and activities are conducted by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program?
2. What subject matter or content areas are emphasized in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?
3. What domains of learning (knowledge, skills, and attitudes) are emphasized in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?
4. What levels of evidence (data) are utilized for
evaluating the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program?

5. In what ways are 4-H members, junior leaders, and clubs/groups recognized for their achievements in the area of citizenship?

6. What are the types of support or assistance received by county Extension offices, area Extension centers, and the State 4-H Office for citizenship education programming?

7. What types of support or assistance are available from the College of Agriculture and Home Economics of The Ohio State University for 4-H citizenship education programming?

8. What types of support or assistance from The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics would strengthen, in the opinion of county and area 4-H agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator," 4-H citizenship education programming?

9. What are the role conceptions of a democratic citizen held by county Extension agents, area Extension agents (4-H), department chairpersons, and assistant Extension directors?

10. What is the relationship between the variable, role conception of a democratic citizen, and the following characteristics of respondents:
   (a) undergraduate and graduate major fields of study
   (b) attendance at National 4-H Center educational programs
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for testing relative to the preceding research question, number 10.

Hypothesis 1  Extension faculty/staff members having undergraduate and graduate majors in education and/or social sciences will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

Hypothesis 2  Extension faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs of the National 4-H Center will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

Methodology

A descriptive (survey - ex post facto) research design was employed to address the specific questions relating to this study. Variables of primary interest in this study were: 4-H projects and activities, instructional content areas, domains of learning, evaluative evidence, forms of recognition, program support, role conception of a democratic citizen, major fields of study, and attendance at National 4-H Center educational programs.

The population for this study consisted of 120 faculty/staff members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service: 88 county Extension agents having 4-H program responsibilities, 8 area Extension agents (4-H), an assistant state 4-H leader ("state 4-H citizenship coordinator"), 16 departmental chairpersons, the Director of the School of Natural Resources, the Head of the Section of Information and Applied Communications, and 5 assistant Extension directors. The entire population
was surveyed by the researcher with names and addresses of the faculty/staff being obtained from a staff directory dated August 1979.

The data collection methods used to survey the population were: (1) questionnaires mailed to county Extension agents, area Extension agents (4-H), and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator"; and (2) personal interviews with department chairpersons, the Director of the School of Natural Resources, the Head of the Section of Information and Communications, and the assistant Extension directors. The questionnaire was designed primarily to solicit information about the 4-H citizenship education program conducted at the county, area, and state levels. The interviews were for the purpose of determining the type of support that was available from departments and units within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics. Both instruments were constructed to obtain the respondents' role conception of a democratic citizen.

The questionnaire and interview schedule were constructed by the researcher based on an extensive review of literature and the comments of graduate students in the Department of Agricultural Education and faculty members specializing in citizenship education, extension education, research methodology or youth organizations. In addition, the questionnaire was also pre-tested with fifteen faculty members currently employed by the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service who had held county or area 4-H agent positions within the last five years in Ohio.
The questionnaire was mailed on September 7, 1979, accompanied by a letter of explanation from the Assistant Director (4-H) and a preaddressed, stamped envelope. To increase the rate of response, two follow-up mailings were administered on September 20 and October 1, respectively, to nonrespondents.

Interviews were conducted on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University by the researcher between September 10 and October 3, 1979. A letter written by the Assistant Director (4-H) introducing the researcher and explaining the purpose of the study was sent to interviewees ten days prior to an interview.

To analyze the data obtained from the instruments, the researcher utilized the following measures of central tendency and variability: mode and relative frequencies; mean and standard deviation. Relation or association between variables were determined by the Cramer's V statistic. Chi square for independence was used to test each of the hypothesized relationships at the .10 level of significance.

Data collected in this study were processed by the Instructional and Research Computer Center facilities of The Ohio State University and the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences system of computer programs.

Cronbach alpha coefficients were utilized to assess the reliability of the three scales included in the mail questionnaire. The reliability coefficients for the scales were: instructional content areas, .78; evaluative evidence,
.79; and goals/objectives, .87. The latter scale, goals/objectives, was subdivided into three scales, referred to as learning domains. The skill domain had a reliability coefficient of .75, whereas, the knowledge and attitudes domains each had a reliability coefficient of .69.

Of the 120 faculty/staff members surveyed, 112 or approximately 93 percent responded either to the questionnaire or interview. Eighty-nine or approximately 92 percent of the faculty/staff members who were mailed questionnaires responded, while 23 or 100 percent of faculty/staff members who were contacted for an interview responded.

Characteristics of Respondents

Demographic data concerning the respondents were collected on the following variables:

a. **Age.** The age of the respondents ranged from 22 to 62 years with the mean being 35 years.

b. **Sex.** There were 85 males and 27 females in the group of respondents. Males represented 76 percent of the respondents and females represented 24 percent.

c. **Level of Formal Education.** Six percent of the respondents completed a Bachelor's degree, whereas 94 percent completed an advanced degree(s), with the Master's level being the modal category at 73 percent.

d. **Position Title.** Seventy-two percent of the respondents held a county Extension agent position. Seven
percent of the respondents held an area Extension agent (4-H) position, while 21 percent held a state level position i.e., department chairperson, assistant Extension director, etc.

e. Length of Service. Eighty-two percent of the respondents served in their present position for ten years or less with one to five years of service being the modal category at 36 percent.

Summary of Major Findings

Following are the major findings that were derived from data obtained from questionnaires and interviews.

4-H Projects and Activities

During fiscal year 1979, there were twenty types of citizenship-related projects and activities conducted by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program. The most frequently identified 4-H projects or activities were: leadership training sessions (99 percent), 4-H club governance (87 percent), U.S. flag etiquette (85 percent), leadership development projects (84 percent), community improvement projects (81 percent), and service on boards, commissions, and committees with adults (72 percent). Of the 64 respondents who indicated having 4-H members or junior leaders serving on boards, commissions, and committees, 61 specified the type of group. The most frequently cited groups were affiliated with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service and included: county and area 4-H
committees (73 percent), junior fair boards (32 percent), 4-H expansion and review committees (12 percent) and county extension advisory committees (7 percent).

Instructional Content Areas

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" rated the amount of instructional emphasis placed on twelve content areas in their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Each content area was rated by 89 respondents on a scale from 1 to 5.

The content area that was most emphasized, having a mean of 4.60, was group dynamics and leadership. Other content areas that were emphasized, in descending order, were: value clarification (mean = 3.58), problems and issues (mean = 3.32), democratic values (mean = 3.19), and American heritage (mean = 3.08). The least emphasized content areas were law, international relations and elections/political parties having means of 2.01, 2.00, and 1.56, respectively.

Domains of Learning

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" rated the amount of emphasis placed on twelve goals/objectives in their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Each goal/objective was rated by 89 respondents on a scale from 1 to 5.

The twelve goals/objectives were classified into three domains of learning, each domain consisting of four goals/
objectives. The skill domain received the greatest emphasis with a mean of 3.42, next was the attitude domain with a mean of 3.28, and the least emphasized, with a mean of 2.86, was the knowledge domain. A Tukey's post hoc analysis of the results of a one-way analysis of variance revealed that the skills and attitudes domain means did not differ significantly at the .05 level; whereas, the means of the skills and attitudes domains differed significantly (.05 level) from the mean of the knowledge domain.

Evaluative Evidence

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" rated the degree to which five levels of evidence were utilized in evaluating their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Each level of evaluative evidence was rated by 89 respondents on a scale from 1 to 5. The "number of 4-H members and junior leaders involved in projects and activities" was the level of evidence most utilized by units, with a mean of 4.07. While "behavioral changes in 4-H members and junior leaders" was the least utilized level, with a mean of 2.76. The other three levels—"number of teaching activities performed," "time expended by 4-H professionals and/or volunteers," and "interest of 4-H members or junior leaders in projects and activities"—received means of 3.85, 3.62, and 3.44, respectively.
Recognition

Counties utilized a wide variety of recognition forms i.e., publicity, verbal praise, awards, etc., to acknowledge the citizenship achievements of 4-H members, junior leaders or 4-H clubs/groups. Publicity (mass media), awards, and verbal praise were cited by 68 percent, 60 percent, and 54 percent of the 72 respondents, respectively, as the three "most used" forms.

Sixty-six respondents identified 12 citizenship-related awards, 10 for individual achievement and two for 4-H club or group achievement. The awards reported most frequently, in descending order, were: trips to Citizenship-Washington Focus (63 percent), citizenship medals (54 percent), and trips to the Ohio 4-H Congress (43 percent).

Program Support: Persons and Materials

Volunteers and Faculty/Staff Members

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" were asked to identify those persons (volunteers and faculty/staff members) affiliated with the College of Agriculture and Home Economics who have assisted with their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. Of the 89 respondents, 86 or 97 percent reported volunteer 4-H advisors and their co-workers as having provided assistance for their unit's program. Area Extension agents and state program staff members (assistant directors and program leaders) were reported as a source of support by 63 and 56 percent
of the respondents, respectively. None of the respondents cited state subject-matter specialists as a source.

With respect to the types of program support received by units from volunteers and faculty/staff members, 51 percent of the respondents reported the planning of programs and activities; 48 percent, training of 4-H members and junior leaders; 46 percent, preparing instructional materials; 44 percent, the conducting of in-service education; and 43 percent, the training of volunteer 4-H advisors. Only 11 or 12 percent of the respondents reported volunteers and/or faculty/staff members assisting with the evaluation of their unit's 4-H citizenship program.

Resource Persons

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" reported the following resource persons as providing support for their unit's 4-H citizenship education program: government officials (57 percent), business persons (53 percent), legislators (47 percent), school teachers or administrators (47 percent), and civic organization leaders (42 percent). Of the 89 respondents, 38 cited the support or assistance received from resource persons for their unit's 4-H citizenship education program. "Serving as a speaker at 4-H citizenship-related activities" was the most frequently cited type of program support, having been identified by 28 or 74 percent of the respondents. Only 2 or 5 percent of the respondents reported resource persons assisting
with the evaluation of citizenship-related projects and activities.

**Instructional Materials**

Project books (55 percent), slides (53 percent), films (44 percent), bulletins (37 percent), and games/simulations (35 percent) were the most frequently reported types of instructional materials used in 4-H citizenship education programs. The primary source of instructional materials for unit 4-H citizenship education programs was the Cooperative Extension Service and faculty/staff members within each individual unit, as reported by 40 percent and 32 percent of the respondents, respectively. The least frequently cited source of instructional materials were other agencies and organizations.

**Adequacy of Program Support**

County and area Extension agents and the "state 4-H citizenship coordinator" rated, on a scale from 1 to 5, the adequacy of program support their unit received from the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education. The 89 respondents felt that the program support was less than adequate, as indicated by the mean of 2.79. Fifty-two of the 89 respondents specified 11 types of program support that should be provided by the College. The most frequently reported type of program support pertained to the development of educational materials: lesson plans for use by 4-H agents, advisors and camp counselors (31
percent); audio visual aids for use by 4-H agents and advisors (27 percent); and a citizenship project book for 4-H members (21 percent).

Available Program Support

There were basically seven different types of support or assistance available from departments and units within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education. These were: undergraduate and graduate education for future 4-H professionals; in-service education for county and area 4-H agents; research and evaluation studies; consultation with 4-H faculty/staff members at all levels within the organization; educational materials development; special national and state 4-H events; and film distribution.

Citizen Role Conception

There were 111 respondents who selected one of the following statements to describe their role conception of a citizen in a democratic society.

Spectator: Native born or naturalized person who is loyal to the United States of America and who obeys laws and governmental authorities.

Occasional Participant: Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders to enact laws, set policy and in general manage the affairs of governmental jurisdictions.
**Participant:** Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders and who engages in nonelectoral forms of participation in the making of public policy.

**Participator:** Person who responsibly participates in the decision making processes of groups in which he or she is a member.

Seventy-seven (69 percent) of the respondents selected the participator role conception of a citizen; 18 (16 percent), the participant role; 12 (11 percent), the spectator role; and 4 (4 percent), the occasional participant.

**Hypotheses**

The findings of this study relative to the hypotheses tested are discussed in this section.

**Hypothesis 1**

Extension faculty/staff members having undergraduate and graduate majors in education and/or the social sciences will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

Using a Chi square test for independence, no significant association (Cramer's $V = .12$) was found between Extension faculty/staff member major field(s) of study and their role conception of a democratic citizen at the .10 level of significance ($p = .523$).

Although a slightly higher percentage of faculty/staff members with a major(s) in education and/or the social sciences (68 percent) held a participator role conception than did those with a major(s) in a technical field of
agriculture, home economics, or natural resources (67 percent), the difference was negligible. In contrast, 76 percent of the faculty/staff members having a major in a technical field and one in education or the social sciences held a participator role conception of a citizen.

Hypothesis 2 Extension faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs of the National 4-H Center will tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen.

A low association was found between Extension faculty/staff member attendance at National 4-H Center educational programs and their role conception of a democratic citizen. A Cramer's V correlation coefficient of .22 was obtained with a probability of .077. A higher percentage of Extension faculty/staff members who had attended educational programs (84 percent) held a participator role conception of a democratic citizen than those who did not attend such programs (63 percent). The research hypothesis was confirmed at the .10 level of significance.

Conclusions

Following are the conclusions based on the findings of this study.

1. Faculty/staff members of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service tend to hold a rather broad conception of the role of a citizen in a democracy. They generally conceive a citizen to be a participator: a person, regardless of age, who responsibly
participates in the decision making processes of groups i.e., family, social club, school, community, etc., to which he or she belongs.

2. The Ohio 4-H Youth Program conducts a wide variety of citizenship-related 4-H projects and activities. The most prevalent citizenship-related projects and activities are: leadership training sessions, 4-H club governance, U.S. flag etiquette, leadership development projects, community improvement projects, and service on boards, commissions, and committees with adults.

3. Four-H members and junior leaders serve primarily with adults on boards, commissions, committees, affiliated with the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service.

4. The content area that is predominantly emphasized in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program is group dynamics and leadership. The least emphasized content areas are law, international relations, and elections/political parties.

5. The skills and attitudes domains of learning are emphasized more than the knowledge domain in the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program. This is consistent with recommendation No. 25 in the report, entitled 4-H in Century III, by ECOP.

6. The predominant level of evidence utilized to evaluate the Ohio 4-H citizenship education program is the number or 4-H members and junior leaders
involved in citizenship-related projects and activities. While the least utilized level is behavioral change in 4-H members and junior leaders.

7. A wide variety of recognition forms are utilized to acknowledge the citizenship achievements of 4-H members, junior leaders or 4-H clubs/groups. The most used forms of recognition are publicity (mass media), awards, and verbal praise.

8. Citizenship-related awards predominantly recognize 4-H members and junior leaders for their individual achievements. These awards are inconsistent, as incentives, with the primary thrust of the Ohio 4-H citizenship program: 4-H members and junior leaders cooperating and working with others in groups.

9. The prevailing sources of support for 4-H citizenship education are 4-H advisors and unit staff members. Secondary sources include area Extension agents (4-H) and State 4-H staff members. University affiliated personnel predominantly assist with activities planning, 4-H member and junior leader training, instructional materials development, inservice education, 4-H advisor training and securing award donors.

10. The most frequently used resource persons are governmental officials, business persons, legislators, school personnel, and civic organization leaders. Resource persons predominantly serve as speakers
at citizenship-related activities.

11. Units receive minimal assistance from university affiliated personnel and resource persons in evaluating citizenship-related activities.

12. The most frequently used citizenship-related materials are projects books, slides, films, bulletins, and games/simulations that were developed by the Cooperative Extension Service and unit faculty/staff members. The least prevalent materials are those developed by other agencies/organizations.

13. The support or assistance provided by the various departments and units within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education, as viewed by 4-H agents, is less than adequate. The development of additional educational materials (lesson plans for activities, audio visual aids, and a citizenship project book), according to 4-H agents, is needed to strengthen this aspect of the 4-H Youth Program.

14. There are existing resources within the College of Agriculture and Home Economics which could be utilized to strengthen the 4-H citizenship education programming i.e., undergraduate and graduate courses for future 4-H professionals, in-service education sessions for 4-H agents, future research and evaluation studies, development of educational materials.
15. There is no significant association between Extension faculty/staff members' major field(s) of study and their role conception of a democratic citizen.

16. Although the degree of association is low, faculty/staff members who have attended educational programs of the National 4-H Center tend toward a participator role conception of a democratic citizen than those who have not attended such programs.

Recommendations

Specific recommendations relating to 4-H citizenship education programming and areas for future research are set forth for consideration by the State 4-H staff.

Program

1. Lesson plans for citizenship-related activities should be developed by the State 4-H staff and distributed to county and area 4-H agents through the "Ohio 4-H Newsletter." The format for these lesson plans should include: an activity title, citizenship content area designation, primary age group(s) for which the activity was designed, behavioral objective statement(s), procedures for conducting the activity, and evaluation procedures.

2. Awards for individual achievement in the area of citizenship should be fully utilized by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program. However, since the major program
thrust of 4-H citizenship education in Ohio is group dynamics and leadership, an award for group achievement should be established to serve as an incentive for cooperative group efforts among 4-H members.

3. Since the National 4-H News contains a number of articles each year focusing on citizenship, volunteer leaders should be strongly encouraged to subscribe to this magazine.

4. Additional opportunities should be provided 4-H members and junior leaders to serve with adults on "non Extension" boards, commissions, and committees as associate or regular members.

5. A citizenship project book should be developed by the State 4-H Office or obtained from another source for 4-H members, ages 9 to 14.

6. Instructional materials developed by other agencies/organizations should be actively sought, evaluated, and distributed to county and area 4-H agents.

7. In terms of the filing system for 4-H, the primary subject division, "Subject Matter Areas," should be further expanded to include a secondary subject, entitled "Citizenship," to facilitate the locating of materials.

Research

1. What domains of learning, content areas, and age groups are emphasized in the citizenship-related
instructional materials (publications and audio visual aids) by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program?

2. What are the perceptions and attitudes of 4-H members toward the citizenship education program?
   a. How satisfied are 4-H members and junior leaders with the citizenship education received through the Ohio 4-H Youth Program?
   b. What do 4-H members and junior leaders want to learn as a result of participating in the program?
   c. What types of instructional materials do 4-H members and junior leaders like and what kinds of citizenship-related projects and activities do they find worthwhile?
   d. How can the program be modified to meet the needs and interests of 4-H members and junior leaders?

3. How effective is the 4-H citizenship education program of the Ohio Cooperative Extension Service?
   a. What is the impact of citizenship-related projects and activities on 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge, skills, and attitudes?
   b. What is the impact of the "hidden curriculum" (pattern of 4-H club/group governance, application of rules and procedures, and interaction between agents/advisors and 4-H members) on 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge, skills, and attitudes?
   c. Which has the greater impact on 4-H members and junior leaders, citizenship-related projects and activities or the "hidden curriculum?"
   d. How can citizenship-related projects and activities and the "hidden curriculum" be modified to facilitate learning?

4. What is the relationship between citizenship education provided by the Ohio 4-H Youth Program and that provided by other agents, particularly families,
churches, and schools?

a. Does citizenship education provided by the various agents reinforce or contradict one another?

b. Is coordination among educational activities of agents possible or desirable?

c. If coordination is possible as well as desirable, how might this be brought about?

The Assistant Director (4-H) should review the above research areas and communicate those he and members of his staff deem important to the chairpersons of the departments of Agricultural Education and of Home Economics Education. Such a communiqué should facilitate graduate students having an interest in 4-H citizenship education to undertake research (theses and dissertations) in one of these areas.
APPENDIX A

Letter to "National Directors" of Major Youth-Serving Organizations
January 9, 1979

5353 Portland Street, #204
Columbus, Ohio 43220

Dr. E. Dean Vaughan
Assistant Deputy Director
4-H Youth
SEA-Extension, USDA
Washington, D.C. 20250

Dear Dr. Vaughan:

I am a graduate student at The Ohio State University who is interested in engaging in research related to the role of youth serving organizations in citizenship education. In reviewing literature for my dissertation, I have found very little published on the major youth organizations with the possible exception of a book, Organizations for Youth and Children, copyrighted in 1972.

Given the apparent void in the literature, I would like to request any information that you could provide which would describe the following features of the 4-H Youth program.

- Purpose(s) and objectives
- Primary method(s) of achieving objectives
- Membership eligibility requirements
- Current membership enrollment and characteristics
- Number and type of organized, local groups
- Number and role of volunteer leaders, paraprofessionals, and professionals
- Financing (primary sources and annual budget)

If it is not possible for you to personally provide this type of information, perhaps you could forward to me, at the above address, any publications, i.e., annual reports, research studies, promotional material, etc., which describe the essential features of the 4-H Youth program.

Any assistance that you can provide in response to my request would certainly be appreciated.

Sincerely,

C. Stephen Scheneman

NOTE: In addition to Dr. Vaughan, letters were sent to the "National Directors" of each of these youth organizations: Boy Scouts, Boys Clubs, Camp Fire Girls, FFA, FHA/HERO, Girls Clubs, Girl Scouts, JWB, YMCA and YWCA.
APPENDIX B

USDA/Land-Grant University System
APPENDIX B

The 4-H Youth Program is a unique partnership involving a complex network of relationships (linkages) between the Cooperative Extension Service and other agencies and organizations. This network of relationships is referred to as the USDA/land-grant university system (see figure 9). Each of the agencies and organizations within this system influences the direction, content, and financing of 4-H Youth programs.

Science and Educational Administration-Extension (SEA-Extension): an educational agency of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) which provides national leadership in Cooperative Extension Programs (Agriculture and Natural Resources, Community Resource Development, 4-H Youth and Home Economics) to insure their coordinated support of significant national goals. It acts as the liaison between USDA and officials of land-grant institutions on all matters relating to Cooperative Extension work and represents Extension in relationships with other agencies of USDA, other departments and agencies of the executive branch, Congress, and numerous private organizations (USDA NASULGC 1968, p. 20; Thompson and Brown 1976, pp. 58-59).

Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP): the national policy committee of Cooperative Extension, created as a unit of the Division of Agriculture of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULCG). ECOP's membership is composed of three state Extension directors from each of the four regions (North Central, Northeast, Southern and Western), of the United States plus the Deputy Director, SEA-Extension, USDA. Although ECOP has no formalized authority, it serves as a primary voice for the articulation of national policy and provides a mechanism by which all state Extension Services may join together for direct representation to the legislative and executive branches of the federal government (USDA-NASULGC 1968, p. 20). ECOP has established subcommittees (Legislative; Agriculture, Forestry, and Related Industries; Program Development and
Fig. 9. USDA/land-grant university system
Management; Public Affairs; 4-H Youth; and Health Education) to review program activity, staff needs and competencies, and advise on national priorities (USDA-NASULGC 1968, p. 21).

National 4-H Council: a non-profit educational organization (formerly the National 4-H Service Committee and National 4-H Foundation) which utilizes private sector (individual, corporate, and foundation) resources in assisting the Cooperative Extension Service advance the membership, leadership, and influence of the 4-H Youth Program. The Council carries on a broad range of functions: operates the National 4-H Supply Service and the National 4-H Center; provides citizenship and leadership training for youth, adult volunteers and professional staff; provides international exchanges and training; publishes National 4-H News; arranges and announces national and regional programs offering incentives and recognition; coordinates National 4-H Congress; and provides publicity and public relations support (National 4-H Council 1979).

Land Grant Institutions: colleges and universities established by the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 having three major functions: resident instruction, research, and extension. Cooperative Extension is administered within the university's College of Agriculture or by an office outside the College of Agriculture that is directly responsible to the university's president's office. Research based information generated by a college, university, and/or USDA is disseminated to the residents (adults and youth) of the state or territory through county Extension offices (Thompson and Brown 1976, p. 60). As a part of a land-grant institution, Cooperative Extension is subject to the policies and procedures of that institution and the state or territory government of which it is a part (USDA-NASULGC 1968, p. 20). Land-grant institutions are located in 50 states, the District of Columbia, and three territories (see figure 10).

County Extension Offices: a unit, partially funded by county government which brings the Cooperative Extension Service in continuing, direct contact with people (adult and youth), in their own environment and involves them in program development through advisory committees. The professional staff, Extension agents, have a minimum of a bachelor's degree and serve in the roles of program manager and educator (USDA-NASULGC 1968, p. 20).
Fig. 10. Land-grant institution locations.
APPENDIX C

Mail Questionnaire

and Related Correspondence
August 27, 1979

TO: Dr. Charles W. Lifer
   Assistant Director, 4-H

FROM: C. Stephen Scheneman

RE: 4-H Citizenship Education Survey Population

Listed below are ten county Extension units having either two 4-H agents, a vacant 4-H agent position or no 4-H agent position. For each of these units, please designate one faculty member (by placing a check mark beside his or her name) who you feel would be the most knowledgeable of their unit's 4-H citizenship education program.

Counties with Two 4-H Agents

1. Geauga Co.    Mr. Thomas H. Rutledge    Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H
                 Miss Mary Lou Horvath    Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

2. Hancock Co.   Mr. Edson N. Bishop     Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H
                 Miss Charlene A. Walker  Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

3. Lucas Co.     Mr. Norman L. Moll       Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H
                 Miss Carla E. Edwards    Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

                 Mrs. Rochelle K. Franks   Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

5. Seneca Co.    Mr. Dwight A. Leedy      Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H
                 Mrs. Brenda K. Young      Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H
Counties Having Vacant 4-H Agent Position

6. Darke Co.  Mr. Dennis K. Baker  Co. Ext. Agt, Agr  
              Mrs. Ellen D. Teller  Co. Ext. Agt, HE & CNRD  
                  (Vacant)  Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

7. Logan Co.  Mr. Harold C. Schneider  Co. Ext. Agt, Agr & CNRD  
               Miss Susan K. Wolff  Co. Ext. Agt, HE  
                  (Vacant)  Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

                Mrs. Ann W. Miller  Co. Ext. Agt, HE  
                  (Vacant)  Co. Ext. Agt, 4-H

Counties Having No 4-H Agent Position

              Mrs. Diana S. Eberts  Co. Ext. Agt, HE

10. Vinton Co.  Mr. David M. Boothe  Co. Ext. Agt, Agr & CNRD  
                Mrs. Deanna L. Tribe  Co. Ext. Agt, HE

Your immediate response, preferably by Friday, August 31, to my request would be greatly appreciated.

Please have your secretary give me a call (2-0262) after you have selected a faculty member for each of the above county units.

Thank you.

cc: Dr. Robert W. McCormick
July 22, 1979

TO:      Dave Barrett       Willie Larkin
         Sexton Burkett     Cathy Mullen
         Fred Harrison      Steve Mullen
         Judy Kies          Travis Poole
         David Kittrell     Robert Romig

FROM:    C. Stephen Scheneman

RE:      EVALUATION OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

Thank you for consenting to evaluate the attached 50 item questionnaire. This questionnaire is designed to obtain information from Ohio county and area 4-H agents about their respective unit's 4-H citizenship education program.

Please evaluate the questionnaire in terms of the following:

- Format of questionnaire
- Clarity of instructions
- Wording of questions
- Exclusiveness & exhaustiveness of response categories
- Spelling, capitalization & punctuation

Write your comments and suggestions directly on the questionnaire.

If possible, please return the questionnaire to Room 250, Agricultural Administration Building by Friday, July 27.

Thank you for your cooperation!

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Robert W. McCormick
August 10, 1979

To: Former County and Area Extension Agents, 4-H

Re: Ohio 4-H Citizenship Education Survey

Dear Co-workers:

The enclosed questionnaire was developed by Mr. C. Stephen Scheneman, a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University. Next month, this questionnaire will be mailed to our county and area 4-H agents to help us determine the general status of 4-H citizenship education in Ohio on a variety of issues.

In order to conduct this survey, however, the questionnaire must be field tested with a group of individuals who are similar to the survey population. Consequently, your cooperation and assistance is needed for conducting this survey.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire for the county or area office in which you last held a 4-H agent position. Since this is a field test, please also note editorial suggestions along page margins and the approximate length of time to complete the questionnaire. Upon completing the questionnaire, return it to Mr. Scheneman in the pre-addressed, stamped envelope.

Your prompt response to this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Lifer
Assistant Director, 4-H

CWL:pm

Enclosure

cc: Clarence J. Cunningham
    George R. Gist
    Area Supervisors
To: County and Area Extension Agents, 4-H
    Selected County Extension Agents, Home Economics
    Selected County Extension Agents, Agriculture
    State 4-H Citizenship and Short Course Coordinator
Re: Ohio 4-H Citizenship Education Survey

Dear Co-workers:

The enclosed questionnaire was developed by Mr. C. Stephen Scheneman, a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education, The Ohio State University. Your response to the questionnaire will help in the determination of the status of 4-H citizenship education in Ohio.

The results of this survey along with the results of interviews with Assistant Directors and Department Chairpersons will be used by the State 4-H Office as a basis for strengthening our 4-H programming in the future.

Upon completion of this study, a summary of the results will be made available to you, from our office, upon request.

Your prompt response to this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Charles W. Lifer
Assistant Director, 4-H

CWL:pm

Enclosure

cc: George R. Gist
    Clarence J. Cunningham
    Area Supervisors
Dear

 Approximately two weeks ago, your assistance was requested in completing a questionnaire concerning your unit's 4-H citizenship education program. If you have not already done so, please complete the questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience. The questionnaire will take you approximately twenty minutes to complete.

Your prompt response will be greatly appreciated. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance.

Sincerely,

C. Stephen Scheneman

cc: Dr. Charles W. Lifer
Dearest,

Enclosed is another copy of the "Ohio 4-H citizenship education questionnaire" for your response. If you have already responded to this questionnaire, please disregard this letter. If you have not responded, please take a few minutes to do so now. In order to be included in the analysis, your response should be mailed to me in the preaddressed, stamped envelope by October 8, 1979.

The State 4-H staff will use the information obtained from this survey and a separate departmental survey as a basis for strengthening 4-H programming in the future. Individual responses will not be released to anyone; however, summary information will be made available to the State 4-H Office.

Your response is needed and will be greatly appreciated. Please respond by October 8, 1979.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

C. Stephen Scheneman

enclosure

cc: Dr. Charles W. Lifer
OHIO 4-H CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION SURVEY

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS ARE DESIGNED TO OBTAIN INFORMATION ABOUT THE 4-H CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION PROGRAM CONDUCTED BY YOUR UNIT (COUNTY OFFICE, AREA CENTER OR STATE 4-H OFFICE) DURING THE LAST TWELVE MONTHS. PLEASE READ EACH ITEM VERY CAREFULLY AND MAKE YOUR RESPONSES AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE.

ALL RESPONSES WILL BE HELD IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE. THE CODE NUMBER IS FOR THE PURPOSE OF FOLLOW-UP ON NONRESPONDENTS ONLY.

YOU MAY WANT TO CONSULT WITH YOUR CO-WORKERS BEFORE COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PARTICULARLY IF YOU HAVE BEEN IN YOUR CURRENT POSITION FOR LESS THAN A YEAR OR IF THERE ARE OTHER FACULTY/STAFF MEMBERS IN YOUR UNIT HAVING 4-H PROGRAM RESPONSIBILITIES.

YOUR PROMPTNESS IN RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE PRE-ADDRESS, STAMPED ENVELOPE BY SEPTEMBER 19, 1979, WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

1. Listed below are various types of citizenship-related 4-H projects and activities. Indicate by checking ( ) the appropriate blank those 4-H projects and activities that were CONDUCTED BY YOUR UNIT during the last twelve months.

___ Folding, displaying and honoring U.S. Flag
___ Holiday celebrations i.e., Independence Day
___ 4-H club governance (electing officers, holding office, serving on committees, and conducting meetings)
___ Voter registration drives
___ Get-out-the-vote campaigns
___ Local government days or visits
___ Career exploration days or visits
___ Ohio 4-H Congress
___ Citizenship-Washington Focus (Citizenship Short Course)
___ Volunteer services to the less fortunate
___ Community or county surveys
PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES (continued)

Community improvement projects

4-H member, junior leader or camp counselor leadership training sessions

Serving as members on boards, commissions, and committees with adults (specify): _______________________________

Intrastate or interstate 4-H club exchanges

International exchanges (International 4-H Youth Exchanges)

International education projects

Others (specify): _______________________________

IF YOU CHECKED ANY OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE COMPLETE THE REMAINDER OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE. IF NOT, PLEASE COMPLETE THE GENERAL INFORMATION SECTION ON PAGES 9-10 AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

CONTENT OF INSTRUCTION

Below are listed several content areas that are currently associated with citizenship education. Circle the number on the scale that best represents the amount of instructional emphasis placed on each content area in your unit's 4-H citizenship education program during the last twelve months.

2. AMERICAN HERITAGE: flag etiquette, holidays and landmarks commemorating persons and events or contributions of ethnic, racial and religious groups

Almost NEVER Emphasized 1 2 3 4 5

3. GOVERNMENT: functions, structure and processes of local, state or federal government

Almost ALWAYS Emphasized

4. ELECTIONS/POLITICAL PARTIES: voter registration, campaigning for public office, voting or role of political parties

Almost NEVER Emphasized 1 2 3 4 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT (cont.)</th>
<th>Almost NEVER Emphasized</th>
<th>Almost ALWAYS Emphasized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. LAW: purpose, sources and types, rights and duties or institutions (law enforcement agencies, courts and prisons)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ECONOMICS: economic systems (controlled, market and mixed), production-consumption process, forms of business organizations, labor unions, consumer protection organizations, or career opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: interdependencies among nations, international organizations or government and culture of other countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PROBLEMS AND ISSUES: i.e., discrimination, crime, drugs, energy, pollution, unemployment and war</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. INFORMATION PROCESSING: acquiring and interpreting information about problems and issues from a variety of sources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. DEMOCRATIC VALUES: i.e., human dignity, tolerance, equality, justice, loyalty and self-governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. VALUE CLARIFICATION PROGRESS: identifying and clarifying values which guide personal behavior and serve as standards for judging others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. GROUP DYNAMICS AND LEADERSHIP: democratic decision making, leadership styles, task and maintenance roles or duties of 4-H officers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SOCIAL ACTION/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: a series of steps or stages to influence those changes which depend upon decisions made in the community or outside of it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Listed below are several goals/objectives related to citizenship education. Circle the number on the scale that best represents the degree of emphasis that was placed on each goal/objective by your unit during the last twelve months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Almost NEVER Emphasized</th>
<th>Almost ALWAYS Emphasized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge of the principles, processes and institutions of American society</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge of their American heritage, including symbols and customs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge of governments and peoples in other countries</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' knowledge of problems and issues affecting self and others</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' ability to acquire and accurately interpret information about political, economic, and social problems or issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' ability to make rational, moral judgements about people, institutions, policies and decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' ability to cooperate and work with others in groups in order to achieve common goals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' ability to influence the actions of other citizens, leaders and officials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' pride in their American heritage, including symbols and customs

23. Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' appreciation for the contributions to civilization made by peoples of other countries

24. Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' feeling of competence to effectively influence decisions that affect their lives

25. Developing 4-H members' and junior leaders' respect for and responsiveness to the needs, rights and responsibilities of others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEIS OF EVALUATION EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Listed below are levels of evidence (data) for evaluating educational programs. Circle the number on the scale that best represents the degree each level of evidence was utilized in evaluating your unit's citizenship education program during the last twelve months.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Almost NEVER Utilized</th>
<th>Almost ALWAYS Utilized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Time expended by unit staff members or volunteer 4-H advisors</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Number of teaching activities performed i.e., meetings, tours</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Number of 4-H members or junior leaders involved in projects and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Interest of 4-H members or junior leaders in projects and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Behavior (knowledge, skill and attitude) change in 4-H members or junior leaders</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOGNITION

31. Please check (✓) all those forms of recognition utilized by your unit during the last twelve months to acknowledge the achievements of 4-H members, junior leaders or 4-H groups in CITIZENSHIP. Then, please double check (✓✓) those THREE forms of recognition most used in your unit's citizenship education program.

   - Verbal praise (personal conversations or telephone calls)
   - Personal letters or notes
   - Newsletters
   - Delegation of leadership responsibilities
   - Recognition meetings/banquets
   - Publicity (newspaper, radio or television)
   - Awards (pins, medals, trips, scholarships, etc.)

32. If you checked "awards" in above item, please complete the following chart by identifying the name of the award, type of award (e.g., medal), award donor, whether it is an individual or group award, and number of recipients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Award</th>
<th>Type of Award</th>
<th>Award Donor</th>
<th>Individual or Group Award</th>
<th>Number of Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PROGRAM SUPPORT: PERSONS AND MATERIALS

33. Please check (✓) all those persons affiliated with The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics who have assisted with your unit's 4-H citizenship education program during the last twelve months.

   - Volunteer 4-H advisors
   - Unit co-workers (agents, program assistants or work study students)
PROGRAM SUPPORT (continued)

Area Extension agents (specify type of area agent i.e., CNRD, 4-H, etc.):

Assistant directors and program leaders (specify program areas, i.e., CNRD, 4-H, etc.):

State subject-matter specialists (specify departments or divisions):

Information and Applied Communications personnel

34. Please check (√) all those types of program support that your unit received during the last twelve months from The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education.

- Assistance in planning the 4-H citizenship education program (projects and activities)
- Training of 4-H members and junior leaders
- Training of volunteer 4-H advisors
- Providing in-service education workshops
- Assistance in evaluating the 4-H citizenship education program (projects and activities)
- Preparation of citizenship-related instructional materials
- Securing award donors or sponsors
- Securing financial grants for community or environmental projects
- Other (specify):

35. Please check (√) all those resource persons who have assisted with your unit's 4-H citizenship education program during the last twelve months.

- School teachers/administrators
- Government officials (administrative)
- Legislators (local, state or national)
- Lawyers/judges
- Businesspersons
- Union officials
35. (CONT.)
___ Farm organization leaders ___ Ministers, priests or rabbis
___ Civic organization leaders ___ Others (specify): ______
___ Persons from other countries __________________________

36. Describe the types of program support that your unit received during the last twelve months from resource persons for 4-H citizenship education. (Be as specific as possible.)

37. Please check (✓) all types of INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS used in your unit's 4-H citizenship education program.

___ Films ___ Project books
___ Slides ___ Games/simulations
___ Transparencies ___ Bulletins
___ Tape recordings ___ Other (specify): ______
___ Videotapes

38. Please check (✓) all those producers of citizenship-related instructional material for your unit. Then, double check (✓/) your unit's PRIMARY SOURCE of citizenship-related instructional materials.

___ Volunteer 4-H advisors ___ National 4-H Council
___ Yourself or unit co-workers ___ Other organizations (specify)
___ Cooperative Extension Service (OSU or USDA)

39. Please indicate on the scale the degree of program support received by your unit from The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education.

Not Very Adequate Very Adequate
1 2 3 4 5
40. What types of program support from The Ohio State University's College of Agriculture and Home Economics do you feel would enhance or strengthen the 4-H citizenship education program in your unit? (Be as specific as possible)

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

GENERAL INFORMATION

Please complete the following by either filling in or checking (✓) the appropriate blank concerning information about yourself.

41. Age: ____ years

42. Sex: ____ Male  ____ Female

43. Undergraduate and graduate education (please indicate ALL degrees received and the major field of study for each degree):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree (✓)</th>
<th>Major (specify)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44. Position title:

____ County Extension Agent, 4-H
____ Area Extension Agent, 4-H
____ Other (specify): ____________________

45. Length of service in your current position:

____ Less than 1 year  ____ 11 to 15 years
____ 1 to 5 years  ____ 16 to 20 years
____ 6 to 10 years  ____ Over 20 years
46. Have you ever, as an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service, ATTENDED any of the educational programs offered by the National 4-H Council through the National 4-H Center in Washington, D.C.?

___ Yes (If yes, proceed to item #47)

___ No (If no, proceed to item #48)

47. Please check (✓) all those educational programs in which you have participated.

___ Citizenship-Washington Focus (Citizenship Short Course)

___ National or Regional 4-H Leader Forums

___ International 4-H Extension Travel Seminar

___ Internship at National 4-H Center

___ 4-H Staff Development and Training Workshops (specify):


48. Below are four alternative statements about democratically oriented citizens. After reading all four, check (✓) the ONE statement that you feel most accurately describes YOUR conception of the role of a citizen in a democratic society.

___ Native born or naturalized person who is loyal to the United States of America and who obeys the laws and governmental authorities.

___ Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders to enact laws, set policy and in general manage the affairs of governmental jurisdictions.

___ Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders and who engages in nonelectoral forms of participation in the making of public policy.

___ Person who responsibly participates in the decision making processes of groups in which he or she is a member.

PLEASE REVIEW THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO MAKE SURE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE ITEMS. RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO MR. C. STEPHEN SCHENEMAN IN THE PREADDRESSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE BY SEPTEMBER 19, 1979.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION
APPENDIX D

Interview Schedule

and Related Correspondence
To: Assistant Directors  
Department Chairpersons

Re: Ohio 4-H Citizenship Education Survey

Dear Colleagues:

Mr. C. Stephen Scheneman, a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education, is currently conducting a study relating to the general status of Ohio's 4-H citizenship education program. One of the major questions to be addressed is the type of program support available for 4-H citizenship education from departments and units in the College of Agriculture and Home Economics.

Sometime next week, Mr. Scheneman will be contacting your office to make an appointment for an interview with you. These interviews, along with the results of a questionnaire to be mailed to our county and area 4-H agents, will be used by the State 4-H Office as a basis for strengthening our programming in citizenship education (i.e. career awareness, community development, consumer affairs, environmental improvement, government operations, leadership development, etc.).

Your assistance and cooperation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Charles W. Lifer  
Assistant Director and  
State Leader, 4-H

CWL:pm

cc: George R. Gist  
Roy M. Kottman  
Robert W. McCormick
Hello, my name is Steve Scheneman. I am a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education majoring in the field of extension education.

As indicated in Dr. Lifer's memorandum, I am currently conducting a research study to determine the general status of Ohio's 4-H citizenship education program. One of the major questions to be addressed in this study is the type of program support or assistance available from departments and units in the College of Agriculture and Home Economics for 4-H citizenship education.

GENERAL INFORMATION

To begin with, I would like to know a little about you as an individual.

1. What is your age? ___ years

2. Sex: ___ Male ___ Female (Obtain from personal observation)

3. In terms of your undergraduate and graduate education, please name the degrees which you have received and the major field of study for each degree.
3. (CONT.)

Degree (✓)

Bachelor's Degree
Master's Degree
Doctorate Degree

Major (specify)

4. What is the official title of your position? ________________

5. How many years have you served in this position?

Less than 1 year ______________ 11 to 15 years
1 to 5 years ______________ 16 to 20 years
6 to 10 years _______________ Over 20 years

6. Have you ever, as an employee of the Cooperative Extension Service, attended any of the educational programs offered by the National 4-H Council through the National 4-H Center in Washington, D.C.?

YES ___ NO ___
(Proceed to # 7) (Proceed to # 8)

7. Would you please identify those educational program(s) in which you have participated?

Citizenship-Washington Focus (Citizenship Short Course)
National or Regional 4-H Leader Forums
International 4-H Extension Travel Seminar
Internship at National 4-H Center
4-H Staff Development and Training Workshops (specify):
ROLE CONCEPTION OF CITIZEN

8. Typed on this card (HAND INTERVIEWEE CARD) are four alternative statements about democratically oriented citizens. After reading all four statements, please indicate to me the ONE statement - a, b, c, or d, - that you feel most accurately describes YOUR conception of the role of a citizen in a democratic society.

(PAUSE - ALLOW INTERVIEWEE SUFFICIENT TIME TO RESPOND)

___ a. Native born or naturalized person who is loyal to the United States of America and who obeys the laws and governmental authorities.

___ b. Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders to enact laws, set policy and in general manage the affairs of governmental jurisdictions.

___ c. Person, eighteen years of age or older, who elects governmental leaders and who engages in nonelectoral forms of participation in making of public policy.

___ d. Person who responsibly participates in the decision making processes of groups in which he or she is a member.

AVAILABLE PROGRAM SUPPORT

One of the major objectives of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics is to prepare Ohio's young people as useful (responsible and contributing) citizens. (HAND INTERVIEWEE CONTENT AREAS SHEET) Currently, there are several content areas, as shown on the sheet which I have just handed you, associated with objectives of this nature. Those areas associated with citizenship education include: American Heritage, Government, Elections/Poltical Parties, Law, Economics . . . .
9. Given existing resources (personnel and financial), what types of support can your department or unit provide county Extension offices, area Extension centers or the State 4-H Office for the purpose of implementing 4-H citizenship education programs i.e., projects, activities, and special events?

(PAUSE - ALLOW INTERVIEWEE SUFFICIENT TIME TO RESPOND)

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

That completes the interview. I would like to THANK YOU for taking time out of your busy schedule to participate in this study.

(REQUEST ROLE CONCEPTION CARD AND CONTENT AREAS SHEET TO BE RETURNED)
CONTENT AREAS ASSOCIATED WITH CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

AMERICAN HERITAGE: flag etiquette, holidays and landmarks commemorating persons and events or contributions of ethnic, racial and religious groups

GOVERNMENT: functions, structure and processes of local, state or federal government

ELECTIONS/POLITICAL PARTIES: voter registration, campaigning for public office, voting or role of political parties

LAW: purpose, sources and types, rights and duties, or institutions (law enforcement agencies, courts and prisons)

ECONOMICS: economic systems (controlled, market and mixed), production-consumption process, types of business organizations, labor unions, consumer protection organizations, or career opportunities

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: interdependencies among nations, international organizations or government and culture of other countries

PROBLEMS AND ISSUES: i.e., discrimination, crime, drugs, energy, pollution, unemployment and war

INFORMATION PROCESSING: acquiring and interpreting information about problems and issues from a variety of sources

DEMOCRATIC VALUES: i.e., human dignity, tolerance, equality, justice, loyalty and self-governance

VALUE CLARIFICATION PROCESS: identifying and clarifying values which guide personal behavior and serve as standards for judging others

GROUP DYNAMICS AND LEADERSHIP: democratic decision making, leadership styles, task and maintenance roles or duties of 4-H officers

SOCIAL ACTION/COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS: a series of steps or stages to influence those changes which depend upon decisions made in the community or outside of it
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