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Major instructional goals of social education are affected negatively by the absence of equal status student relationships. Student status characteristics such as ethnicity, sex, ability status, and sociometric status are associated with unequal distributions of performance evaluations, participation, and productivity in small group instructional activities. Experimental studies are cited which indicate that status variables frequently cause the unequal distributions of performance thus impeding achievement of social educational goals. Ambiguities in the research findings, particularly related to sociometric status, are identified. Efforts to neutralize status effects are examined including games and teams, diffuse liking structures, peer models, and expectation states training. The theory of status characteristics and expectation states is examined in depth. Research and development tasks are then outlined for social educators concerned with promoting equal status student relationships.
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I believe there is a logical flaw common enough in the design of indirect process oriented teaching strategies to account for much of the rather disappointing results in research. Many strategies assume the pupil lacks some idea or skill at the outset and provide some problem or activity which requires the pupil to discover and use the unknown in order to find a solution (a new unknown), but to encourage creativity or open ended thinking, the teacher does not provide sufficient data to enable pupils to learn either unknown. Pupils who need to learn the unknowns must fail, pupils who can supply the unknowns do not need the lesson. Examples in well known strategies are presented and appropriate corrections are suggested.
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centered values dilemmas for every area and level of social studies instruction. This "how-to-do-it" article helps teachers to identify and select a central focus, the subject matter content and context, the decision-making situation, the values/moral setting, and the problem-solving format for every values/moral activity they want to plan. Teachers can use this model to assist students to use problem-solving and decision-making processes to comprehend and apply content, clarify their values and moral reasoning, and learn to make rational decisions.
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Learning lessons, social organization in the classroom, Hugh Mehan.
Reviewed by Stuart B. Palonsky
To Readers Of TRSE:

Starting next year, TRSE hopes to devote at least one issue to themes that are important to social studies education. These issues will provide a forum for giving systematic attention to particular problems, issues or dilemmas that confront the field.

The first theme to be explored will be the history of social studies. Our intention is to consider the origin of social studies as a curriculum field, to understand the assumptions and efforts of social studies educators in previous periods and to explore how current practices and "reforms" are related to the ideas, values, and conditions of the past.

Those readers who would be interested in submitting a manuscript for this issue on the history of social studies should send the manuscript (4 copies) to the editors by February 1980.

A second theme will give focus to the nature and character of theory in social studies education. Recent scholarship in the social sciences and education has raised significant questions about the meaning of social theory which we would like to explore on the pages of TRSE. People interested in contributing to an issue about theory in social studies research should contact the editors.

We would also like to invite our readers to submit to us ideas about future themes for the Journal issues.

Thomas S. Popkewitz
B. Robert Tabachnick
NEUTRALIZING STATUS CONSTRAINTS ON STUDENT PERFORMANCE IN SMALL GROUP ACTIVITIES
Ronald L. Van Sickle
University of Georgia

Introduction

Status is an individual's ranking in a group assigned by the other members of the group. It is an estimate of worth which is based on the extent to which the individual possesses characteristics valued or needed by a particular group (Sectord and Backman, 1964). Characteristics contributing to a person's status vary. In a high school, the degree of athletic skill possessed by a male student helps determine his status. Professors achieve higher levels of status by publishing research in refereed journals. Capacity for drinking beer in some situations is a valued quality that can confer varying degrees of status. The relevant group can be as large as a whole society or as small as a friendship clique.

Status is educationally important because it is a primary way that general social structural factors, such as ethnicity, become implicated in the lives of individual people. It is common knowledge that student achievement levels and other educational outcomes vary among racial, national, sexual, and social class groups of students in the United States. Viewing these characteristics as determinants of student status in classroom contexts can provide a way of understanding their effects on student learning behavior and subsequent performance. By examining how such characteristics are used by students to structure their academic and social interaction, insights can be generated which can lead to strategies for neutralizing some of the negative effects of low status.

Social educators frequently use small group activities in classroom instruction to work toward a variety of curriculum goals. One of those goals is teaching students more adequate decision-making procedures (Engle, 1960; Hunt and Metcalf, 1968: Kurfman, 1977). In small groups (3 to 7 members), students can explore questions of personal values and public policy, test the validity of empirical beliefs about human behavior, and plan ways of accomplishing tasks in the classroom, school, and community. Small groups can be settings in which students cooperatively implement plans and develop skills for achieving social and political goals (Gillespie and Lazarus, 1976). Also, small groups provide students with opportunities to develop skills of engaging in
effective interpersonal and interethnic group interaction (Banks, Cortés, Gay, Garcia, and Ochoa, 1976). For these and other reasons central to the purposes of social education, small groups are a commonly observed feature in social studies instruction.

Equal status interaction among small group members is a key factor in determining the extent to which small groups function productively and members participate effectively. Equal status interaction is characterized by each group member's recognition that the contributions of the other members are likely to be valuable in accomplishing the group's task (Nelson and Singleton, 1977). Without the general recognition that each member can play a constructive role in the group's work, most of the group members are unlikely to participate actively. An illustration of the value of widely distributed participation occurs in small groups where decisions are arrived at by group consensus or by a decision-maker who uses the advice of others. In such groups the decisions are likely to be correct more often than when one person decides alone. A synergistic phenomenon frequently appears in which the group decision is more adequate than the decision of any individual group member (Piper, 1974). Furthermore, if a small group activity is an integral component of an instructional process, many students will probably not experience the intended instruction if equal status interaction is not approximated. Students are unlikely to learn effective decision-making, participation, or interethnic group interaction skills if they are excluded from the instructional activities or relegated by other students to the psychological periphery of the activities.

In order to better understand the operation and effects of status systems in classroom, the discussion will be divided into four sections. First, important dimensions of status in classroom contexts will be identified. Second, the effects of status on participation and learning in small group activities will be articulated. Third, research based strategies to counter the negative educational effects of status systems in small groups will be explained. The theory of status characteristics and expectation states will receive special attention. Finally, implications for research and development in social education will be outlined.

Status Dimensions in Classrooms

People rank each other from better to worse along many dimensions. Based in part on status rankings, people hold expectations for others, extend or withhold opportunities, and evaluate their own and others' performances. By such means status systems intervene in the process of learning in small groups. They create and destroy opportunities and incentive to learn and participate. Some relevant status dimensions in schools are derived from the larger society. Such status characteristics examined here are ethnicity and sex. Another major student ranking system is oriented around student ability status as indicated by grades, test scores, ability groupings, and other public evaluations. In any given case, ability status might or might not reflect actual student ability.
Another set of status variables are sociometric in nature and are based on social power and relationships of liking and attraction (Cohen, 1972b). These four categories will be examined because of their pervasiveness, their social and educational significance, and the availability of research regarding their relationships with student classroom performance.

Other potentially relevant status dimensions (e.g., social class, athletic status) will not be considered due to a lack of research. Social class is a particularly notable omission since it is frequently regarded as a major variable in explaining educational performance. Given that numerous studies have been conducted relating social class and achievement and investigating how teacher behavior varies with student social background, it is amazing that virtually no research is available which clearly related social class and student classroom behavior.

In order to clarify the ways status factors intervene in the process of teaching and learning, three sets of dependent variables which characterize student performance are identified. One category of outcomes refers to “performance evaluations” which are all those judgments made about the adequacy or acceptability of one’s behavior. Examples are students’ and teachers’ ratings of one’s academic work, group contributions, and social behavior. The second dependent variable category involves “participation rates” which are frequencies of interpersonal communication. Examples include initiation rates, interaction rates, response rates, influence attempts, occurrences of cross-status interaction, and distributions of performance opportunities. The third category is “productivity,” that is, the extent to which one carries out tasks and achieves instructional goals. This outcome category gives an indication of how much effort students are willing to exert and the nature of their academic and participative performances. To learn and participate effectively in small groups, students must make and receive performance evaluations constructively, engage in adequate amounts of interaction, take and distribute performance opportunities equitably, carry out the tasks of the groups, and achieve the instructional goals. This analysis will clarify how status systems can produce unproductive levels and distributions of these characteristics. Unfortunately, research is not available which relates each independent variable with all three sets of dependent variables.

STATUS EFFECTS

This section of the presentation summarizes the findings of educational, psychological, and sociological studies related to interpersonal behavior. It describes naturally occurring behavior which can be expected in small group situations in classroom and schools. Studies of student performance in general classroom activities are examined if they help clarify student performance in small group activities. The focus is on students with given status characteristics (e.g., sex, ability statuses). Their behavior in relationships with other students and the
behavior of others toward them are explored. Particular attention is
given to studies in real or simulated school-type settings; however, rele-
vant studies not focused specifically on educational problems are used
to clarify the general nature of the phenomena. All findings reported
here are statistically significant. Whenever feasible, indicators of
magnitude are noted to aid in interpreting the findings. Due to a lack of
appropriate research, findings related to one or two of the three outcome
variables are sometimes absent for some of the status variables.

Ethnicity

Ethnicity refers to race, religion, or national origin. However, in-
vestigations of student relationships have focused overwhelmingly on
black and white students. Findings are reported here regarding patterns
of racial interaction and black and white students' evaluations of their
own and each others' academic abilities and social qualities.

Performance Evaluations. Both black and white students tend to
evaluate white students' abilities and performances more positively
than black students’. Wylie (1963) observed that black students in
junior high school estimated their academic ability to be less than their
white classmates' self-estimates. However, social class was a confoun-
ding variable in the study. Bartel, Bartel, and Grill (1973) observed that
both black and white students in kindergarten through fourth grades
assigned more white peers to positive intellectual and social categories
and more black peers to negative categories than expected by chance.
Furthermore, the proportion of black students assigned to positive
categories steadily decreased as student age increased. Cohen, Lohman,
Hall, and Lucero (1972) observed black and white junior high school
boys working together in four member cooperative task groups. Even
when the black students performed observably better than the white
students, the black students generally rated their own performances as
inferior to their white peers. The findings of these studies support the
conclusion that both black and white students generally evaluate black
students' performances in group situations as inferior to whites', even
when blacks' performances are clearly successful and objectively
superior.

Participation Rates. Students tend to select peers of their own race for
social and academic interaction in classroom activities. Crisswell (1939)
oberved a strong preference for own-race interaction throughout the
elementary grades. The preference was weaker in the earlier grades, but
by the fifth grade there was very little interracial interaction. In a more
recent study, third grade students sociometrically chose their own-race
peers much more often (approximately 2/3 of the time) than other-race
peers (Koslin, Koslin, Pargament, and Waxman, 1972). However, the
own-race preference was less for black males and white females in
classes which reflected the school's racial proportions. In a traditional
junior high school classroom situation characterized by individual
academic competition based on frequent testing, DeVries and Edwards
(1974) observed little cross-racial interaction. Cross-racial interaction
accounted for only 33% of the interaction which involved helping a classmate, 20% which involved receiving help and 31% which involved being friends. Wolf and Simon (1975) found that black and white elementary students tended to select friends in the numerically greater racial category. However, these cross-race friendship choices were usually unreciprocated. Larkins and Oldham (1976) observed virtually no voluntary verbal interaction between black and white students in a black majority desegregated, semi-rural high school. Singleton, Asher, and Alston (1976) presented findings which contradicted the other studies. Their data indicated that cross-racial interactions in integrated (i.e., approximately 20% black) third grade classrooms were frequent (48%) and positive (97%). In general, the research supports the hypothesis that interaction between black and white students in classroom settings is very restricted and becomes more so as student age increases.

A set of studies focused on cooperative, task-oriented, small groups produced findings consistent with the previously reported studies of classroom interaction. The groups were composed of two black and two white junior high or senior high school males. In such groups white students were much more likely than black students to initiate the most suggestions and exercise the most influence for group activity. Cohen (1972a) observed black students make only 42% of the suggestions. They successfully influenced the group 59% of the time compared to the white students’ 80% successful influence rate. Lohman (1972) observed a black initiation rate of 44% and a black successful influence rate of 38%, compared to a white influence rate of 53%. Groups with high or low interaction rates demonstrated clearer race differences than groups with moderate interaction rates (Cohen, 1972a). Cohen observed that when white and black students both made suggestions, the white students were much more likely to have their suggestions accepted and acted upon. Black students tended to offer short suggestions with much nonverbal communication while white students tended to talk and justify their positions at length. The general conclusion is qualified by noting that while a white usually ranked highest on initiation and influence, the second-ranking group member was usually a black rather than the other white.

In a third study, Cohen and Sharen (1977) studied the interaction of Western and Eastern Israeli junior high school age males. In Israel, citizens with western European and United States backgrounds tend to occupy higher status positions than citizens with eastern European backgrounds. This general ethnic status difference is reflected in small group school activities in much the same way as the black and white status difference in American society. In four member, cooperative, task-oriented groups, Western Israeli youth made over half the comments and had their suggestions accepted two-thirds of the time. The Cohen and Sharen study tends to support the hypothesis that ethnic status rather than inherent racial differences is the key to understanding student performance in multiethnic small groups. Cohen and her
associates have explored ways of altering patterns of unequal cross-status interactions; those findings will be reported in a later section of the presentation.

Sex

Social Interaction between males and females can be conceptualized in terms of role or in terms of status. Role emphasizes specialization of labor with an assumption that male and female roles are equally necessary because they are complementary. The status conceptualization focuses on the distribution of action, influence, opportunity, and performance. Unlike the role perspective, the status perspective highlights inequities in relationships if they exist (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). Consequently, sex viewed as a status characteristic is most appropriate for this analysis. The available research focuses primarily on the outcomes of performance evaluations and participation rates.

Performance Evaluation. Two studies indicate that females’ self-estimates of their abilities are lower than males’ self-estimates. Wylie (1963) observed that junior high school white females made lower estimates of their academic ability than their white male peers. Curtis, Zanna, and Campbell (1975) found that female law students reported working for lower grades (B) than male law students reported (B+ or A-). In this study there were no significant differences in the grades the men and women received. This is not clear from these investigations whether females make more or less accurate estimates than males or whether females tend to underestimate their abilities.

Participation Rates. Interaction between males and females appears to be very limited at least through junior high school. In third grade classrooms, interactions between boys and girls accounted for only 27% of the student interactions (Singleton, Asher, and Alston, 1976). In junior high school classrooms characterized by individual academic competition and frequent testing, DeVries and Edwards (1974) observed very restricted cross-sex interaction. Time was available for students to practice an academic task and to help each other if they wished. Of the student interactions which occurred, students reported the number of interactions with members of the other sex and the same sex. Cross-sex interaction accounted for only 13% of the interaction which involved helping a classmate, 10% which involved receiving help, and 21% which involved being friends.

Males tend to exhibit higher levels of participation in small group activities and classroom activities generally. Zander and Van Egmond (1958) observed that second and fifth grade males exhibited more influence attempts, successful influence, demands, and aggressive behaviors than females. In cooperative, decision-making groups composed of two male and two female high school students, the males were seven times more likely than the females to emerge as the leaders (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). In a follow up microteaching session in which the subjects were students, males dominated the instructional participation. In a similar study involving college students in
cooperative, decision-making groups, men initiated 56% of the comments and were four times more likely than women to be ranked as group leader (Lockheed and Hall, 1976). Male law school students reported volunteering over 60% more answers in class than did female students (Curtis, Zanna, and Campbell, 1975).

There were other differences in the activity of males and females. Concern about others' criticism was inversely correlated with several participation variables. Elementary school females concerned about others' criticism were more likely than similarly concerned males to withdraw from classroom activities. Concerned females initiated fewer interactions with others \( r = -0.35 \), engaged in fewer instructional interactions \( r = -0.55 \), and attended less to instructional activities \( r = -0.44 \). Concerned males tended to maintain rates of participation similar to relatively unconcerned boys. Males and females who were relatively unconcerned about others' criticism demonstrated similar rates of participation (Lahaderne and Jackson, 1970; Potter, 1976). On a simple nonacademic performance test, two-thirds of a sample of college women achieved lower scores when competing with other people than when working alone. Less than one-third of the male sample achieved at lower levels in competition (Horner, 1969).

Based on these research findings, several tentative conclusions can be drawn. Males tend to estimate their academic ability more highly than females do. Males and females tend to engage in little cross-sex academic interaction. In competitive situations female performance deteriorates more often than male performance. Males tend to exhibit higher levels of instructional participation than females and usually assume the leadership roles in group activities.

**Ability Status**

Ability status in classrooms is different from ethnic and sex statuses. The latter are ascribed while people think they assign ability status on the basis of individuals' academic performances. Academic performance is sometimes depressed or misperceived as a result of more general social factors. Nevertheless, ability status is assigned on the basis of what others perceive one's abilities and achievement to be. The accuracy of the perceptions must always be somewhat suspect. Research attention has been restricted to participation rates.

**Participation Rates.** Ability status is a major factor in students' selection of peers for work and play under typical classroom conditions. Bossert (1978) observed third and fourth grade students over a two year period. In classes characterized by public, comparable evaluations of students’ performances, students used this ability status data as a major criterion for academic and social interaction with similarly evaluated peers. In another study, first grade students read in publicly ranked reading groups. Students in the lower and middle groups chose students from the upper group for academic interaction more often than expected by chance. Students in the top group selected their own group members
twice as often and the other groups' members about half as often as expected (McGinley and McGinley, 1970). These studies provide evidence that students, at least at the elementary school level, use ability status as a criterion for choosing peers for interaction in classroom activities.

Ability status is involved in other important group behaviors. In decision-making groups in a simulation game, students perceived as having high ability by most other students initiated more interactions, suggested more group actions, and successfully influenced others at higher rates than students perceived as having low ability (Hoffman and Cohen, 1972). Previously unacquainted upper elementary school males were assigned to four member decision-making groups. The students were told publicly which two members were above average in reading skills and which two were average. These public evaluations reflected actual student reading performance. On a non-reading decision-making task, the high ability status students had much higher initiation rates (61% vs. 39%) and higher successful influence rates (60% vs. 40%) (Stulac, 1976). In a more stringent study, Morris (1977) observed previously unacquainted fifth and sixth grade males in four member, cooperative, decision-making groups. The students were publicly informed which two were above average in reading skills and which two were average. Unlike Stulac's study, however, Morris' subjects had objectively assessed equal reading skills. The high ability subjects made 61 percent of all verbal contributions and were selected as overall leaders 82 percent of the time. The groups were characterized by large differences in participation among the members. Van Kreveld, Willigers, Gloudemans, Rancuret, Van Der Weil and Pott (1974) conducted a similar study in which groups were informed of their individual member' degrees of a supposedly relevant ability. When equal ability status and unequal ability status groups were compared, no differences were observed in influence, in recognition of other members' contributions, or in the groups' congeniality. The investigators noted that they were uncertain whether the subjects regarded the fake ability test scores as credible information about their own and others' ability statuses.

Based on these findings, the following conclusions appear warranted. Students use ability status as a major factor in choosing with whom to interact in classroom activities. High ability status students generally participate at higher rates than lower ability status students. They will also usually assume leadership in group activities. Even when ability is objectively equal, students publicly classified as less than high ability will defer to high ability status students in small group interaction.

**Sociometric Status**

Sociometric status is a variable with multiple dimensions. It is important to try to identify which dimension or dimensions of this multifaceted phenomenon are being considered. The most common dimensions used in educational and social psychological studies are liking, influence, competence, and power. Terminology is not consistent in the
literature. Popularity may be the same as liking; influence and power might be used synonymously. Sociometric dimensions are sometimes used as outcome or dependent variables; however, their significance as independent variables is the focus in this analysis. In spite of the conceptual ambiguity surrounding sociometric status, it has been the focus of some of the most interesting work on student status effects. Unlike the other status variables, research on sociometric status has generated more findings about student productivity.

**Performance Evaluations.** Very little research is available regarding the effects of student sociometric status on students' evaluations of each others' performances. In a laboratory study of sociometric status among sixth grade males, the dart throwing accuracy of students with high sociometric status was overestimated by their peers 59% more often than the accuracy of students with low sociometric status (Mozdzierz, McConville, and Krauss, 1968). Individual students' self-evaluations were substantially correlated with their peers' evaluations ($r = .62$).

**Productivity.** Student productivity has been observed to be correlated with sociometric status over a wide range of grade levels and contexts. Zeichner (1978) observed that fifth and sixth grade males who were highly accepted in their classroom peer groups demonstrated higher reading achievement than students who were lowly accepted. Muma (1965) observed a similar relationship among junior high and senior high school students for general academic achievement. The relationship was unclear for the moderate range of peer acceptance. Van Egmond (1960) observed a similar relationship among elementary school students. He further determined that females' achievement was correlated more strongly with liking status and males' achievement was more strongly linked to influence status. Schmuck and Van Egmond (1965) observed a direct relationship between peer status and academic performance among elementary, junior high, and senior high school students of both sexes. However, other important factors related to females' achievement were parental and teacher support. Males' achievement was more strongly related to their satisfaction with the teacher than to peer status. Popularity was related more strongly to classroom performance than to performance on achievement tests in a study conducted by St. John and Lewis (1975). Even though the relationship is complex, student productivity is positively correlated with sociometric status.

Another finding reported by Zeichner (1978) was that students in classrooms characterized by diffuse friendship structures achieved more highly in reading than students in classrooms with centralized friendship structures. A centralized friendship structure is one in which there are a few sociometric stars, numerous students with few reciprocated relationships to the stars, and some social isolates. In comparison, a diffuse friendship structure is characterized by fewer and less outstanding sociometric stars, more students with interlocking relationships, and fewer or no social isolates. Reasonable questions to ask are: (1) Does the social structure affect student productivity? (2)
Does student productivity affect the social structure? or (3) Is there a reinforcing interaction between social structure and student productivity? Insufficient evidence exists to solve the problem conclusively; however, some relevant findings are available.

Buswell (1953) advocated the hypothesis that publicly evaluated student productivity leads directly to social acceptability. She observed in kindergarten classes no relationship between sociometric status and reading scores, a predictor of academic performance. In the fall of the first grade, the sociometric structure of those same classroom groups realigned in terms of academic ability. In sixth grade classes, Buswell observed a strong positive relationship between achievement and social acceptability. She hypothesized that first grade students received public evaluations of their academic performances and students used this data to choose peers for interaction. In kindergarten this kind of evaluative information was much less common. Buswell's interpretation is consistent with Bossert's (1978) previously reported finding regarding the relationship of public evaluations and student interaction.

On the other hand, a study by Schmuck (1962) provided evidence supporting the alternative hypothesis that sociometric structure effects student productivity. Schmuck studied the extent to which elementary, junior high, and senior high school students utilized their academic abilities. A key variable was the classroom liking structure which is defined as a composite of students' ratings of how well they like the other students in a class. Students who were low in the classroom liking structure and were perceptive enough to know it were likely to use their objectively assessed academic abilities less fully than those students who were high in the liking structure and knew it. Only 16% of the socially perceptive low status students were high utilizers while 56% of the socially perceptive high status students were. Schmuck also observed that students who believed they were high in the liking structure but were incorrect in the perception of their status were less likely to use their academic abilities at a low level than those students who were low in status and knew it. Only 18% of the inaccurate, low status students were low utilizers while 45% of the accurate, low status students were. The inaccurate students tended to utilize their abilities at a moderate level rather than a high level, however. These findings suggest that students in classrooms characterized by diffuse liking structures will tend to be generally more productive than students in classrooms with centralized structures. More research is needed to assess the validity of these competing hypotheses.

In summary, student productivity is positively correlated with sociometric status in most instruction groups. There is tentative evidence for two alternative hypotheses: (1) Diffuse sociometric structures tend to lead to higher student productivity and (2) Distributions of publicly known student productivity levels shape sociometric structures. Clarification of the relationship between sociometric structure and student performance will also clarify other status relationships. Students with high and low sociometric statuses in a classroom who are
grouped together to work in small groups are likely to perform unequally much like other high and low status students.

**Status Interactions**

Most of the research studies reported here focused on single status variables of interest to the investigators. Little attention has been devoted to the potential interacting effects on student behavior of two or more statuses. Lewis and St. John (1974) reported that black students in white majority classrooms who had high liking status among the white students tended to have higher grade point averages ($r = .36$) than black students low in liking status. Lahaderne and Jackson (1970) found a sex by ability status interaction in elementary school classrooms. High ability status females tended to participate in classroom activities at higher rates than low ability status females. High and low ability status males tended to have similar participation rates. Although other potential interactions can be hypothesized from other studies, very little effort has been focused on systematically exploring potential status interaction effects in instructional settings.

Several laboratory studies provided data which suggest hypotheses for investigation. However, the status variables in the studies were usually not those of primary interest in this analysis of small group instruction in classrooms. If a student possesses two statuses, one high and one low, how will that affect his or her interaction with another student with the same but oppositely valued statuses? Exline and Ziller (1959) compared three member, female, cooperative, task-oriented groups which had different distribution of status values. Some groups were composed of members who were equal on publicly announced ability status and voting power; others were composed of members who had a high status and a low status in opposite combinations. The status congruent groups were rated as more congenial, showing more agreement in discussion, and performing more adequately than the status incongruent groups. This is consistent with previously reported findings that interaction between high and low status group members was restricted and unequal.

Berger and Fisek (1970) studied the cooperative decision-making of previously unacquainted group members who publicly received two ability test scores. The subjects each scored high on one test and relatively low on another. The members' ability statuses were opposite (H-L and L-H). Influence was measured in terms of stay response rates, that is, the percentage of times subjects stayed with their original decisions after learning that they were in disagreement with their partners. In this case influence rates for these groups were midway (66% stay responses) between other groups with (H-H and L-L) and (L-L and H-H) status combinations. The H-H subjects' average stay response rate was 82% and the L-L subjects' rate was 53%. Berger and Fisek interpreted this finding to mean that the subjects combined the status characteristics into an average ability status.
Freese and Cohen (1973) conducted a similar study with an ability status and an ascribed status (i.e., age). When only the ascribed status was present, high status subjects stayed with their original decisions 74% of the time in spite of disagreements with the low status subjects. When in disagreement, the low status subjects demonstrated stay responses only 57% of the time. When both kinds of status were present, influence rates were determined by the ability status rather than the ascribed status.

Webster (1977) examined the effect of group members being equal on one ability status and different on another. Interaction and influence indices showed that participants disregarded the equating status variable and behaved in terms of the status variable which differentiated them. High status subjects demonstrated stay responses approximately 75% of the time in the face of disagreement and low status subjects produced stay responses approximately 42% of the time.

These studies generate interesting questions for further laboratory and field work. Does an ability status generally cancel the effect of an ascribed status like age, race, sex, or social class? Could a student low in an ascribed status demonstrate sufficient skill to acquire high ability status in another dimension compared to students high on the first status, and thus reduce the negative effects of the low ascribed status? Is there a hierarchy of ascribed statuses such that relatively high social class might reduce the negative effects of low ethnic status? More knowledge about the interactions of status variables could reveal some potential strategies for overcoming status based instructional inequalities. Before examining several attempts to neutralize instructionally negative status effects in small groups, the implications thus far for small group instruction will be summarized.

**Implications for Small Group Instruction**

The research examined describes student behavior frequently observable under typical classroom conditions. In small group interaction, high status members are likely to value low ethnic status members’ contributions less than their own regardless of the quality of the contributions. Low ethnic status members are likely to agree with those low evaluations. There is some evidence that females and students with low sociometric status will often experience the same conditions. Students who achieve the goals of the small group activity are likely to be those with high sociometric status in the group and class. It is unclear whether the sociometric status leads to the higher achievement or a record of high achievement produces the high status. While no research was found which explicitly explored the relationships between sociometric status and ethnicity, sex and ability status, it is probable that they are positively correlated although their order of precedence is unclear.

Given their preferences, students of the same ethnic, sex, ability, or sociometric statuses will choose to interact with each other most of the time. They will form small groups on these bases if they are given the
opportunity. If status heterogeneous groups are formed, high ethnic, sex, ability, and sociometric status members are likely to make most of the contributions to the group task, to make most attempts to influence others' decisions, to influence others successfully at high rates, and to be regarded as group leaders most often. Lower status students will generally acquiesce to the social domination of the higher status group members.

Even though there are gaps in the descriptive data about status oriented student behavior in small group activities, it is impressively consistent. Students, like other members of society in many contexts, use status characteristics to make decisions about whether to act, with whom to interact, how to evaluate another's performance, and to whom to defer. These social processes are likely to operate in most small group activities in classrooms unless something happens to alter them.

There are several negative outcomes for social education programs. If contributions to group decisions are disregarded or never made, then the quality of decision-making is likely to suffer. Students of lower status will frequently lose the opportunity to practice important social and decision-making skills. For some curriculum objectives, lower status students will be essentially excluded from the instruction. High status students will fail to learn to work cooperatively with others. If students often utilize status based evaluations of group members from different social backgrounds, then achievement of the goal of intergroup communication, understanding, and acceptance will be difficult to achieve. Proximity will not necessarily lead to understanding. Negative status based performance evaluations will be reinforced since little will occur to challenge anyone's low expectations for the low status students.

It is an explicit position in this presentation that status characteristics determine student performance to a significant degree in small group activities. However, there is an alternative explanation for the unequal distributions of performance evaluations, participation rates, and productivity across ethnic, sex, ability, and sociometric status groups. Perhaps there are true differences in the individuals composing those groups. For example, perhaps black people are generally less verbally competent than white people. That could explain the differences in influence between the groups. Perhaps students with high reading ability status simply are more competent academically and make more and better contributions to group decision-making than students with lower degrees of reading ability status. Perhaps students high in sociometric status are simply more capable than others low in sociometric status and are consequently more productive. If the differences are caused by real differences in ability across status groups, then it should not be possible to change these negative performance patterns by manipulating student status characteristics and expectations. However, in the next two sections on neutralizing status effects and the theory of status characteristics and expectation states, several cases will be presented in which major changes in student performance are produced by manipulating these variables. Such displays of effec-
tive control provide evidence for the hypothesis that the group differences examined thus far are primarily functions of status rather than true differences in groups members’ abilities.

**ATTEMPTS TO NEUTRALIZE STATUS EFFECTS**

Three approaches to neutralizing some status effects observed in student interaction are examined in this section. The first approach is the utilization of academic nonsimulation games in combination with student teams. Another approach is derived from, but not based on, research on friendship structures in classrooms. The third strategy involves presenting successful peer models for low status students to emulate. None of these approaches are widely implemented. They vary in effectiveness and require more research and development efforts.

**Games and Teams**

Edwards, DeVries, and Snyder (1972) and DeVries and Edwards (1973, 1974) experimentally compared effects of mathematics game and quiz instructional formats in combination with individual and team (i.e., cooperative small group) reward conditions. They sought to identify effects on junior high school students’ relationships, attitudes, and cognitive achievement. There were no differences in computational achievement; however, those students receiving team rewards improved their performances on divergent solutions tests approximately 26% more than students competing individually. Lower ability students who received team rewards expressed more interest in the instruction than did those students competing individually. Observations were made of the students’ on-task (i.e., peer tutoring) and off-task interactions. Peer tutoring was present in 28% of the interactions in the game conditions but in only 13% in the quiz conditions. Peer tutoring was present in 32% of the interactions in the team reward conditions but in only 7% in the individual reward conditions. There were no statistically significant interactions.

Students were also asked to name the students they helped, who helped them, and with whom they were friends. The team reward conditions produced more cross-sex interaction than the individual reward conditions on both the helping (45% vs. 26%) and friendship (30% vs. 19%) dimensions. There were no statistically significant differences between the game and quiz conditions. The team reward conditions also produced more cross-race interactions, but the effect was limited to the helping dimensions (“you helped”: 41% vs. 22%; “helped you”: 44% vs. 26%). The game treatment produced more cross-race interaction only in the “helped you” category (42% vs. 27%). The team reward condition was responsible for the larger amounts of peer tutoring and friendship interactions between sex and race status levels.

DeVries and Edwards demonstrated that team reward conditions in a competitive environment reduced the effects of sex and race status con-
straints. Under team reward conditions, males and females engaged in more academic and social interaction and black and white students were more cooperative and helpful regarding an academic task. The team members' interdependence encouraged interaction by making mutual assistance advantageous (DeVries and Edwards, 1974). In terms of student productivity, students receiving team rewards were more successful in generating divergent solutions to mathematics problems on an individually administered achievement test. If this finding will generalize to nonmathematical problems, the positive implications for small group instruction in social education will be further enhanced.

Diffuse Liking Structures

Unlike the games and teams approach, the strategy of attempting to change liking structures is untested and should be treated as a hypothesis. It is derived from research on classroom sociometric structures; however, the investigators were asking different questions and did not articulate change strategies.

As previously reported, Schmuck (1962) observed a positive correlation between students' accurately perceived liking statuses in a classroom and the utilization of their academic abilities. Furthermore, those students who incorrectly believed they had high liking status in the classroom tended to utilize their abilities more fully, though at a moderate level, than those students who were low in liking status and knew it. Schmuck (1963) also observed that students' estimates of their liking statuses were less accurate in classrooms with a wide range of liking choices (i.e., diffuse liking structures) than in classrooms with narrowly focused liking distributions (i.e., central liking structures). Possibly, students in classrooms with diffuse liking structures will tend to be more productive than students in classrooms with central liking structures.

Bossert's (1978) correlational study of classroom friendship (i.e., liking) structures and task organizations generated an idea for altering the structure and centrality of friendship relations in classrooms. Bossert observed that for students in classrooms characterized by instructional tasks that allowed public comparisons of individuals' performances (i.e., recitation classes), achievement was a major factor in friendship associations. When the same students moved as a group into a classroom a year later characterized by few activities that allowed public comparisons (i.e., multi-task classes), achievement stopped being a major factor in peer relationships. Students who moved from multi-task classrooms to recitation classrooms, realigned their peer associations in terms of achievement. Bossert also observed that friendship structures in multi-task classrooms were more fluid than in recitation-oriented classrooms.

If task organization and evaluation practices can shape classroom liking structures and if diffuse liking structures promote greater student productivity, then certain changes in common instructional practices
could improve student productivity through the classroom social structure. To maximize the hypothesized effects, small group tasks as well as individual tasks would be worked on simultaneously in a classroom. Students would have considerable latitude in organizing the completing the tasks. Students' performances could not be easily compared under these conditions (Bossert, 1978). Hypothetically, such a classroom task organization will lead to a more productive sociometric structure. In a classroom characterized by a multi-task organization and a diffuse liking structure, small group activities could potentially be highly productive in terms of student performance.

Peer Models

An exploration of the effects of successful peer modeling on the performances of black and white fifth grade students of both sexes at an academic task had mixed results. Bridgeman and Burbach (1976) presented students with a videotape of either black or white male peer models successfully performing an academic task in a mixed race setting. Following the videotape, the students performed the same task. Black males who observed videotaped black peers performed at a higher level than black males who observed a white peer. The performances of white males, white females, and black females did not differ significantly under the two conditions. White males' performance scores were higher after observing white peer models to the same magnitude as the black males after observing the black models. However, small sample sizes resulted in statistical nonsignificance for the white males.

Bridgeman and Burbach interpreted the findings as indicating that the black males' expectations for themselves were higher when black models were observed, thus resulting in more effort at the task. They hypothesized that white males exerted less effort after observing successful black peers since they believed they were academically superior to the black models. The black and white females were apparently unaffected by the race of the peer models. This study provides limited support for the hypothesis that successful peer modeling can increase student productivity shortly after observing a model. It is unclear what characteristics are necessary and sufficient for a person to be perceived as a peer.

Summary

Games and teams, liking structures, and peer models all appear to hold promise for neutralizing negative status effects. The games and teams approach has been tested under realistic school conditions. The strategy of changing liking structures is completely untested. Peer modeling has not been tested under typical school conditions and has not been developed sufficiently to clarify the key variables in identifying true peers. All three approaches warrant additional research and development.
STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPECTATION STATES
THEORY

The theory of status characteristics and expectation states is the product of a promising line of theoretical and empirical research on the effects of status characteristics (Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch, 1966 and 1972; Berger, Conner, and Fisek, 1974). The theory offers an explanation for the observation that a status characteristic external to a task situation, regardless of its relevance to the task, will determine the observable power and prestige order within cooperative task groups. The observable power and prestige order is operationally defined in terms of action opportunities (i.e., requests for performance), performance outputs (i.e., contributions to the group task), performance evaluations (i.e., judgments regarding the quality of others' contributions), and influence (i.e., change in positions to agree with another's position). Some of these concepts have been used in earlier parts of this analysis to organize research findings.

The Theory

The theory assumes certain conditions. First, two or more people cooperatively perform a task (e.g., interpreting statistical data) with outcomes which can be regarded as successful and unsuccessful. Second, a personal characteristic (e.g., mathematical ability) with more than one state (i.e., at least presence and absence) is instrumental to performing the task. Third, at the beginning of interaction participants have not assigned states of the personal characteristic to themselves or others. Fourth, one or more members of the task group possesses one state of a status characteristic (e.g., black race status) while other members possess another state (e.g., white race status). Fifth, no other status characteristic than the one of interest is available for differentiating between the members of the task group. The theory is not restricted to situations involving only one status characteristic; however, the initial explanation will be easier to understand with that simplification. The effects of multiple statuses will be considered later.

The following is a general outline of the theory. A particular status characteristic (e.g., race) becomes socially significant in a collective task situation when the status characteristic allows one to assign people to different social categories. The given status characteristic will become relevant to the instrumental personal characteristic (e.g., mathematical ability) if the status characteristic is the only basis for discriminating among the group members and if the personal characteristic has not been previously dissociated from the status characteristic. An example of dissociation is the commonly held belief that there is no particular relationship between social class and athletic ability. It is assumed that any given state of a status characteristic has an expectation for performance associated with it. This performance expectation state is positively or negatively evaluated. Consequently in a task group where the members are characterized by different states of
the status characteristic, the members will tend to assign positive and negative states of the personal characteristic consistently with the positive and negative performance expectation states associated with the status characteristic. As a result, the observable power and prestige order will be correlated positively with the positive or high states of the personal characteristic and the status characteristic. Much laboratory based experimentation supports this theoretical formulation. (See Berger, Conner, and Fisek, 1974 for this research.)

Consider this example to further clarify the theory. If the members of a collective task group must interpret some statistical data to solve a problem, they each must decide whose answers are most accurate and reliable. Assume the only basis for differentiating between the group members initially is race, a status characteristic. Somehow the members must assign positive and negative states of the instrumental personal characteristic, mathematical ability. Since race and mathematical ability have not been specifically dissociated, they will be regarded as relevant. Since in this society a relatively negative performance expectation state is associated with black race status, high states of mathematical ability will generally be assigned to white members and low states to black members of the task group. This will usually occur when there is a lack of credible, specific contradictory performance data which could counter the general performance expectation state. Consequently, white members will tend to have more opportunities to interpret the data, to talk more, to have their opinions accepted in cases of conflict, and so forth.

Multiple Status Characteristics

Recent research related to the theory of status characteristics and expectation states has focused on situations in which people are characterized by two statuses. The theory is concerned with the effects of two broad categories of status characteristics. Diffuse status characteristics are personal characteristics with states that are differentially evaluated; furthermore, there is a general performance expectation state associated with each state of the characteristic. For example, race is a diffuse status characteristic. In this society there commonly is a relatively positive general performance expectation state associated with each state of the characteristic. For example, race is a diffuse status characteristic. In this society there commonly is a relatively positive general performance expectation state associated with white race status and a relatively negative expectation state for people characterized by black race status. Black people are frequently expected to be less capable, more hostile, more excitable, less dependable, and so forth than white people. These are simply stereotyped expectations. Other examples of diffuse status characteristics are sex, social class, age, and nationality. Specific status characteristics are personal characteristics with states that are also differentially evaluated; additionally, there is a narrowly defined performance expectation state associated with each state of the characteristic. For example, reading
ability is a specific status characteristic. Particularly in school settings, there is a relatively positive expectation state for skillful readers and a relatively negative expectation for less skillful readers. In school learning contexts, a narrowly defined setting, skillful readers are expected to learn and participate effectively and poor readers are not. Poor readers frequently are not expected to make many positive contributions to the learning tasks of the class. Other examples of specific status characteristics are mechanical, athletic, and musical abilities. People apply expectations associated with diffuse status characteristics much more broadly than expectations associated with specific status characteristics.

In laboratory studies, Berger and Fisek (1970) and Berger, Fisek, and Crosbie (1970) examined the effects of two fictional but credible specific status characteristics (i.e., meaning and relational insight abilities) which subjects believed were equally relevant to a task. Each subject was publicly assigned high (H) and low (L) states of each characteristic in various combinations (i.e., HH, HL, LH, and LL) and paired with another subject for a two person cooperative decision-making task. The observed power and prestige order in terms of influence showed that the HH subjects stayed with their original positions (i.e., stay response) in spite of disagreements 82% of the time when paired with LL subjects and 72% of the time when paired with HL subjects. HL subjects demonstrated 66% stay responses in interaction with LH subjects and 62% stay responses when paired with HH subjects. LL subjects paired with HH subjects stayed with their original but contested decisions only, 53% of the time. In general, people characterized by inconsistent states of two equally important specific status characteristics will rank between people with consistent states in the power and prestige order. Apparently, the subjects used the information provided by the specific status characteristics to produce a combined single performance expectation state for each subject. In a similar study, Cohen, Kiker, and Kruse (1969) observed that an equating diffuse status characteristic state (i.e., age) partially cancelled the effects of other discriminating diffuse status characteristics (i.e., race, education).

Freese and Cohen (1973) examined effects of inconsistent states of a diffuse status characteristic (i.e., age) and a fictional but credible perceptual specific status characteristic in two-person decision-making contexts. Under conditions of high and low diffuse status states only, subjects interacted as expected (high-74% stay responses; low-57%). Subjects equated on the diffuse status characteristic but publicly and inconsistently ranked on the specific status characteristic showed a similar unequal interaction pattern (i.e., high 70% stay responses; low-59%). Low diffuse-high specific subjects interacting with high diffuse-low specific subjects behaved like high diffuse status only subjects (i.e., 69% stay responses). The high diffuse-low specific subjects behaved like low diffuse status only subjects (i.e., 59% stay responses). The specific status characteristic cancelled out the effect of the diffuse status characteristic. Freese (1974, 1976) further verified that when subjects
believe a specific status characteristic is relevant to a task, it will be used as the basis for distributing power and prestige within task groups.

In summary, specific and diffuse status characteristics function similarly in serving as bases for distributing power and prestige in cooperative task groups. When two status characteristics are perceived as equally important for a task, they will be combined into a single status order. An equating diffuse status characteristic can at least partially cancel the effects of a discriminating diffuse status characteristic. However, the conditions under which people will choose to use a status characteristic as an equating characteristic are unclear. When a person possesses a relevant specific status characteristic state inconsistent with a diffuse status characteristic state, the specific characteristic will tend to order interpersonal behavior. The laboratory findings will be considered further in educational applications of the theory.

Applications in Instructional Small Groups

There are several problems in applying a general social theory in natural educational settings for the purposes of improving student interaction and productivity (Berger, Conner, and Fisek, 1974). The theoretical concepts must somehow be translated into important educational variables. The natural setting must be adequately controlled and precisely measured without destroying it. The results must be both theoretically meaningful and practically significant. The natural setting might contain complex processes and variables irrelevant to the theory which could overwhelm the theoretical application. In spite of these problems, status characteristics and expectation states theory has been applied in reasonably realistic educational contests with results that should be encouraging to social educators.

Several studies using students in educational settings were conducted to assess the theory's validity under conditions less controlled than a laboratory. The theory was consistently supported for the status characteristics of ethnicity (Cohen and Roper, 1972; Lohman, 1972; Cohen, 1973, Cohen, Lockheed, and Lohman, 1976; Cohen and Sharen, 1977), sex (Lockheed and Hall, 1976), and reading ability status (Stulac, 1976; Morris, 1977). More importantly, efforts were made in these studies to utilize insights from the theory to promote more equal-status student interaction and more productive small group task achievement.

Ethnic Status. An early attempt by Cohen, Lohman, Hall and Lucero (1979) and replicated by Cohen and Roper (1972) to change a racially based status ordering was unsuccessful. Small groups of two white and two black junior high males built crystal radios after viewing a training film. The white subjects did not know that the black males viewed a better training film and practiced assembling the parts while they did not. While cooperatively building crystal radios in racially balanced small groups, the black males generally displayed a higher degree of competence than the white males. The investigators hypothesized that the black students' expectations for personal competence would be
elevated and would transfer behaviorally into other settings. However, when the same groups of students later engaged in a new cooperative decision-making task, the familiar unequal patterns of initiation, suggestion, and influence based on race status prevailed just as they did in untreated control groups. Treating the performance expectations of the black students was insufficient to create equal status relationships in the small groups.

In a follow-up study, Cohen and Roper (1972) arranged for junior high school black males to learn to build crystal radios, to view their competent behavior on videotape, and to receive praise with the white males present for their confident, competent performances. Next, the black students taught white males to build crystal radios. Later, in four-person, racially balanced groups, the students engaged in a new cooperative decision-making task. Overall, the distributions of acts initiated were nearly equal (black = 48%, white = 52%) and the blacks were chosen as leaders by the groups 51% of the time. The most active white males and least active black males performed very similarly to their counterparts in untreated control groups. However, the more active black students' participation rates were increased by the treatment and the less active white students' participation rates were depressed.

The investigators were also interested in determining effects of explicitly telling the students that the competent behavior the black males exhibited in building and teaching radio would enable them to be good team members for the decision-making task. Under the condition of explicit relevance more black males (63%) were chosen as overall group leaders by their peers, acts initiated were again nearly equal, hyperactive whites were rarely observed, and the difference in participation rates between the more active black and less active white males was even greater than under the implicit relevance condition.

Lohman (1972) used techniques such as peer role modeling, high status role modeling, absence of aversive consequences for new behavior, guided participation, and positive reinforcement in designing an expectation treatment. Black students were introduced to a strategy game by a competent black role model. The role model presented videotapes of previous groups who played the game and asked the students to rate the players according to several criteria. The role model also asked each black student three questions to elicit ideas for working with the racially balanced small groups in playing the decision-making game. The white students were separately taught how to play the game; however, the role model and intensive discussion were omitted.

Black and white students from a suburban, large white majority school demonstrated equal status in playing the game after treatment. More active black and white students were equally active and the less active black and white students were also equally active. Regardless of race, students in the experimental groups demonstrated overall activity rates 20% higher than their peers in control groups. Black and white students from a more ethnically mixed school (i.e., 1/3 black, 1/3 white, 1/3 Chicano) demonstrated very different behavior. In untreated control
groups, the white students dominated as usual (initiation rate = 57%). In expectation treated groups, the relative positions of the racial groups reversed extremely; black students initiated 64% of the actions. The least active black students initiated more acts than the most active white students (30% vs. 21%). Some factors not articulated in the theory made the treatment much more powerful for the students from the more ethnically pluralistic school.

Most of the work using status characteristics and expectation states theory has been done on racial interaction in the United States. Cohen and Sharen (1977) examined the effects of expectation training on the interaction between higher status Western Israeli and lower status Eastern Israeli students. The Eastern Israelis first learned and then taught Western Israelis academic or nonacademic tasks. Following this treatment, ethnically balanced, four-student groups engaged in two cooperative decision-making tasks unrelated to the earlier tasks. The academic expectation treated groups demonstrated nearly equal interaction and influence rates. The nonacademic expectation treated groups demonstrated equal rates. In untreated control groups, Western Israelis initiated 55% of the time and influenced the decisions 66% of the time. These findings support belief in the general nature of the status phenomena and the potential efficacy of expectation training in a variety of status contests. Next we will examine similar studies focusing on sex and reading ability statuses.

The most comprehensive effort to utilize the theory of status characteristics and expectation states in a school setting was made in an experimental summer school, the Center for Interracial Cooperation (Cohen, 1973; Cohen, Lockheed, and Lohman, 1976). The investigators believed that the diffuse status characteristic of race and the specific status characteristic of perceived academic ability operated in most classrooms to depress academic task activity of black students. Efforts were made to prevent the development of a single ability status hierarchy based on a competitive system of individual student accountability. (1) Students engaged in collective tasks and received evaluations as groups rather than as individuals. (2) Diverse classroom tasks requiring a broad range of talents and abilities were utilized. (3) Small group activities were constantly used in order to maximize opportunities for student participation and peer evaluation. (4) Teachers generally functioned as resource people for the group activities. (5) Student behavior was largely regulated by detailed instructions imbedded in the curriculum materials. (6) Grades, public recitation, and teacher evaluations of individual student performance were avoided in order to minimize student competition and negative personal comparisons.

Black males students spent five days at the Center before the white students arrived. During that time, black college students taught them four tasks related to the Malay language, geometry, building a radio transmitter, and a spatial problem-solving game. Each white student became the student of a black student the second week and learned to perform the four tasks. After this treatment, the initiation rates were equal. Following the tutoring phase, classroom instruction unrelated to
the treatment tasks occurred as previously described. By the end of the classroom phase, black students socially dominated the white students. Direct observation of classroom interaction, sociometric measurements, and assessments of the distribution of power and prestige in a cooperative decision-making task (black initiation rate = 60%) all supported this conclusion. The typical pattern of white social dominance was reversed.

Another alternative program aimed at improving student racial interaction was simultaneously conducted at the Center. Two racially mixed classes of males and two classes of females were taught the four tasks during the first week by an interracial team of teachers, teacher aides, and administrators who emphasized the value and necessity of cooperation. Each adult role was filled by equal numbers of each racial group. The students worked in small, racially balanced groups. This alternative program produced nearly equal status relationships early in the program (initiation rate: black = 49%, white = 51%) and completely equal interaction patterns by the end of the classroom phase. These findings are adequately warranted for the males but not for the females. There was a shortage of female students and some other difficulties which make the data analysis difficult to interpret. The females demonstrated nearly equal status interaction after the four task treatment (initiation rate: black = 49%, white = 51%) but appeared to regress toward less equal interaction during the classroom phase (black = 42%, white = 58%). Given the generally positive and unexpected findings, research is needed to explore the organizational variables which evidently produced the results and which are not part of the theory.

Sex Status. Lockheed and Hall (1976) observed that previously unacquainted, male and female high school students demonstrated very unequal interaction in a cooperative decision-making game. In sexually balanced groups of four, males were seven times more likely than females to be leaders. In four-member, single sex groups, males and females initiated equal numbers of acts. The subjects in the single-sex groups were then reassigned to form mixed-sex groups to play another round of the game. These females were much more likely to be ranked as second most active and influential than were females in the earlier mixed-sex groups. Experience in all-female groups seemed to boost performance in later mixed-sex groups. Both the original and reassigned mixed-sex groups participated as students in follow-up microteaching sessions. Students demonstrated considerable consistency in participation from the game to the microteaching setting. For example, 78% of the highly active game participants were highly active in the microteaching class; 74% of the less active students remained relatively inactive. Expectations within the groups tended to generalize across settings; however, females in the reassigned game groups occupied more low activity positions in the microteaching session than they did in the game context. The expectation effect weakened rapidly for this key subgroup of females. In light of the previously reported expectation training studies, it appears that a more intensive period of expectation training
is needed to produce more consistent equal status sexual interaction.

**Ability Status.** Two studies were conducted recently to examine the effect of the specific status characteristic, reading ability. Stulac (1976) attempted to dissociate reading ability from performance expectations for a cooperative decision-making task. Intermediate grade males who were otherwise status equals participated in four person, decision-making groups in which reading ability test scores had been publicly announced. Groups not told that reading ability and decision-making contributions were unrelated demonstrated major differences in activity in favor of the high reading status students (initiation: high = 61%; low = 39%; influence: high = 60%, low = 40%). Groups in which reading and group contributions were explicitly dissociated by the investigator demonstrated nearly equal status interaction (initiation: high = 52%, low = 48%; influence: high = 53%, low = 47%).

In a related study, Morris (1977) was interested in determining if explicitly stated norms for cooperation and inclusion of all groups members in decision-making could alter a reading-based status order among intermediate grade males who were otherwise status equals. In untreated control groups, high reading status subjects contributed 61% of the acts and were selected as leaders 82% of the time. In the norm treated groups, high status subjects contributed only 53% of the acts and were selected as leaders only 55% of the time. Nearly equal status interaction occurred. Morris examined the number of times subjects performed analytic acts (i.e., offered reasons for their ideas or asked others to explain themselves). The treated groups exhibited a statistically significant greater number of such acts than the control groups (2.26 per minute vs. 1.93 per minute). These two studies indicate that a status order based on reading ability can be largely dismantled by verbal instructions to dissociate the ability from the task or by explicitly setting norms contrary to the unequal power and prestige distributions. These findings appear potentially relevant to the results of the Center's alternate program.

**Summary.** Most of the successful efforts to neutralize negative status effects in educational settings using the theory had a common feature. The low status students were given the opportunity to demonstrate competent behavior to the high status students. Usually, arrangements were made for the low status students to demonstrate competence superior to the high status students. This was often accomplished by having the low status students teach the high status students to perform tasks the latter students valued. A discriminating diffuse status characteristic (e.g., race, sex) was neutralized by generating a relevant specific status characteristic (e.g., radio building ability, gaming ability, language ability) which ranked the students opposite to the diffuse characteristic. As suggested by laboratory studies (Cohen and Freese, 1973; Freese, 1973, 1976), the students used the specific ability status characteristic to order their interaction instead of the diffuse status. Other approaches were used with varying degrees of success; however, this general approach was the most fully tested.
Implications for Social Education

Equal status relations are important in social education for several reasons. Effective decision-making is more likely to occur and to be learned under equal status conditions. For example, there are some data indicating that students engage in more analytic thinking when interacting with others on an equal basis (Morris, 1977). Group resources are more likely to be utilized effectively in social or political action efforts if group members are all active participants. Students are more likely to learn to interact constructively with and to appreciate students with social and cultural characteristics different from their own in equal status relationships. The objective is to minimize the naturally occurring superior-inferior status relationships. Small group activity settings designed in light of status characteristics and expectation states theory have been shown to be useful settings for promoting equal status interaction.

Several expectation training techniques for promoting equal status relationships in small groups have been tried based on theoretical principles. Low status students tutoring high status students to enable the latter students to perform tasks they value was the most common task (Cohen and Roper, 1972; Cohen, 1973; Cohen, Lockheed, and Lohman, 1976: Cohen and Sharen, 1977). Successful peer role modeling for low status students with guided participation in valued activities prior to interaction with high status subjects showed promise for overcoming unequal status orders (Lohman, 1972). Attempts to elevate low status students' self-expectations for competent performance generalized to new tasks only weakly if at all (Cohen and Roper, 1972; Lockheed and Hall, 1976). Verbal instructions to high and low status students that the discriminating specific status characteristic was irrelevant to the group task was effective in canceling a status characteristic's negative effects (Stulac, 1976). Similarly, setting clear expectations for groups that all students were to participate and cooperate in achieving the group task also was effective (Cohen, Lockheed, and Lohman, 1976; Morris, 1977). Each of these techniques could be utilized in social studies instructional settings, although the degrees of difficulty in implementing them would vary.

Even though status characteristics and expectation states theory offers many promising ideas, there are complications and qualifications. For example, how long will the equal status effects last? To what extent will the expectation training generalize to successive new tasks and new people? It appears that as presently implemented the effects are likely to be situation specific. Does expectation training work as effectively with females as with males? Some studies showed that even though the power and prestige distributions became equal between status groups, the distributions became more unequal within the status groups (Cohen and Roper, 1972). Also, sometimes the negative status order reversed rather than equalized (Lohman, 1972; Cohen, 1973). The application of expectation training is still imprecise and requires considerable refinement. Even with these qualifications, it is clear that a nascent
technology to promote more constructive intergroup and interpersonal communication is becoming available to social educators.

**RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN SOCIAL EDUCATION**

Small group activities are integral components of most social studies instructional programs. Available evidence shows that much student behavior in small groups is unequal status oriented behavior. The behavior obstructs high quality instruction, effective decision-making, effective social and political action, and progress in improving intergroup and interpersonal relationships. All the various efforts to neutralize the negative effects of status ordered interaction utilized small groups as settings for altering student behavior. Since several of those efforts demonstrated significant success, social educators should seek ways of utilizing the treatment principles in the context of social studies instruction in small groups. Considerable research and development in social education along these lines is needed before the various approaches can be implemented feasibly and effectively in most classroom situations.

Many social educators, like educators generally, view teaching and learning almost exclusively from a psychological perspective. This is not surprising since cognitive and affective changes are intended outcomes of teaching and learning. However, nonpsychological variables, such as status systems, can have major effects in instructional settings. Social variables affecting individuals' behavior often are not even conscious factors in peoples' thinking (Schlechty, 1976). Status systems are social variables which people sometimes perceive and sometimes do not perceive. In either case they exist apart from any individual and must be understood and treated as group phenomena. Social educators, due to their own extensive social educations, should be equipped conceptually to deal with the problem of unequal, status based behavior in instructional settings. The following recommendations for research and development are made with the assumption that a social perspective is needed to complement the more conventional psychological perspective of educators in order to produce a more comprehensive social psychological understanding of school learning.

**Status Related Instructional Outcomes**

Student behaviors such as performance outputs, performance evaluations, action opportunities, interaction rates, initiation rates, and influence rates have been used repeatedly throughout this analysis. They are important outcomes in social and political interaction. However, they are not the only significant student behaviors that are status related. Morris (1977) demonstrated that requesting and offering reasons in group decision-making were also status related. An important task is to identify other instructional outcomes that are or might be responsive to status processes.

Student behaviors important in systematic discussion might be status related. Some possible examples include: making personal attacks; challenging inconsistency; making irrelevant statements; and
stating issues (Newmann and Oliver, 1970). In contexts where other socio-political skills are relevant, student performances in the roles of advocate, organizer, and supporter are critical (*Gillespie and Lazarus, 1976). Role performance involving directing others' activities, accepting peer authority, and responding constructively to differing viewpoints are likely to be responsive to status variables. Similarly, students’ attitudes toward, perceptions of, and judgments about other students who have different social and cultural backgrounds are clearly affected by status factors. Student productivity outcomes include conventional measures of cognitive and affective achievement. Productivity outcomes were not studied extensively in the research summarized earlier in this analysis. Effective and efficient utilization of group resources in task completion could be another outcome. Amount of time on task (or academically engaged time) is gaining attention as a key instructional variable (Rosenshine, 1978), and it may be a socially sensitive indicator of individual and group productivity.

This listing of variables and potentially status related instructional outcomes is not exhaustive. Much conceptual clarification is needed to clearly identify and assess these outcomes. Indeed, adapting and inventing measurement instruments and procedures to assess these variables adequately is a major task. Accurately assessing the responsiveness of these and other outcomes to status processes and attempting to improve student achievement by regulating the social characteristics of classroom groups are necessary research and development tasks.

**Status Characteristics as Independent Variables**

There are several incompletely answered questions regarding status characteristics as independent variables. How do students use social class characteristics to make judgments about each other and to order their interaction? There is surprisingly little interpretable evidence regarding social class and student performance in small group or general classroom interaction. What other student characteristics serve as status variables but have not been studied? It is clear that athletic status plays an important role in school life. Spady (1970) observed that athletes are more likely than otherwise similar students to have college educational aspirations. The folklore of schools abounds with stories of athletes and their expected prerogatives. However, there is a dearth of evidence regarding athletic status and student behavior in instructional settings. These and other student characteristics are open to initial inquiries.

Other questions focus on relationships between status characteristics. Do the various student status variables form a natural hierarchy? Is sex more important than race for determining student interaction patterns? Will specific status characteristics (e.g., reading ability) generally influence student behavior more than diffuse status characteristics (e.g., race) when both are present and perceived as relevant to a task? More generally, how do status characteristics interact with each other? School and classroom groups are characterized by multiple status
characteristics more often than they are not. What is the nature of the relationship between sociometric status, achievement, and ability status? The answer to this question holds great potential significance for affecting group and individual student productivity.

Altering Performance Expectations

Several successful ways of altering performance expectations and interaction patterns for low status students were examined. Thus far, their degrees of effectiveness have not been compared in relation to particular status characteristics or combinations of characteristics. For example, verbal instructions were shown to cancel the effects of reading status (Stulac, 1976; Morris, 1977). However, will verbal instructions also cancel the negative effects of race status? Verbal instructions are much easier and less expensive to implement than the extensive training programs used by Cohen and her associates. Status characteristics and expectation states theory assumes that people have not met before the treatment period and have no knowledge of each other except certain status characteristics. To what extent will the various approaches break down longstanding status relationships. Most classrooms contain many students who have long known all or many of the other students and have already existing expectations for them. This problem is the widest gap between the theoretical expectations approach and the typical school situation. Bossert’s study (1978) indicates the possibility of teacher control in this area.

Practical considerations raise other questions for investigation. How long-lasting are the effects of various expectation training treatments for particular status characteristics? How long must the equal status condition be maintained before its effects generalize to new tasks and new people outside the treated group setting? All other curriculum objectives are not likely to be subordinated to the goal of creating equal status relationships; therefore, how can various treatments be incorporated into on-going small group instruction in social studies classrooms? Feasibility of implementation will be a key issue and social studies curriculum developers can contribute must in this area.

Organizational Factors

There are several instructional variables that do not fit neatly into any scheme but appear to be important and worth study. Cooperative, or at least non-competitive, instructional activities and group tasks appear in most of the attempts to neutralize status systems. To what extent do social studies teachers utilize cooperative activities and competitive activities? What happens to student productivity when students receive group evaluations in one class but are held individually accountable in other classes? Can equal status norms be established in school settings not characterized by equal status relationships among the adult roles? What kinds of curriculum objectives can and can not be attained in a context where small groups, multiple tasks, little or no public recitation, and group evaluations are the routine? The area of group and classroom organizational factors is unclear and deserves ex-
tensive exploration. Variables in this area might be utilized to formulate a major alternative to the expectation training approach.

**Costs of Equal Status Relationships**

An explicit position in this presentation is that equal status relationships promote the realization of several major goals of social education, and, therefore, are desirable. However, creating equal status relationships will undoubtedly involve some costs. What are they? Will instructional efficiency be impaired because students will need to interact more to accomplish tasks? Will high status students become less skillful leaders because they lose opportunities to practice leadership skills in small groups because leadership will be shared more among equals? Will students have difficulties transferring their expectations and equal status behavior to contexts outside the controlled environment of the schools? Will equal status student behaviors be dysfunctional in some important settings? Costs of various ways of implementing equal status conditions should be carefully considered and identified. Opportunities for research and development are numerous.

**SUMMARY**

Major instructional goals of social education negatively affected by the absence of equal status student relationships include learning to: (1) make more adequate decisions in individual and group contexts; (2) cooperatively implement and achieve group social and political goals; and (3) appreciate and interact constructively with people of differing social and cultural backgrounds. Instructional efforts to teach these goals in social studies classes often involve small group activities; however, status systems usually operate to impede goal achievement. Much student interaction in small group activities is characterized by unequal distributions of participation opportunities, task contributions, peer evaluations, rates of influencing, and student productivity. These distributions often are determined by student status characteristics, such as ethnicity, sex, ability status, and sociometric status.

Strategies for neutralizing the negative effects of status systems include games and teams, diffuse liking structures, peer models, and expectation states training. Applications of the theory of status characteristics and expectation states have the most extensive empirical support. The games and teams approach has also been tested repeatedly. Research and development tasks for social educators concerned with promoting equal status student relationships include: identifying additional instructional outcomes responsive to status processes; clarifying the ways status variables operate as independent variables; probing the relative effectiveness of alternative approaches to altering performance expectations; examining the effects of classroom organizational variables on status related performance; and assessing the costs of equal status student interaction in classrooms. Appropriately designed small group activities can be utilized as settings for producing equal status relationships which will enhance achievement of significant social education goals.
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Introduction
For half a century, social studies theorists have assumed that indirect, process oriented teaching strategies will improve pupil thinking, increase motivation, and enhance pupil self concepts. Unfortunately the research has generally not supported this assumption when discovery teaching strategies are considered as a whole. The recent series of process-outcome studies tend to suggest that indirect process oriented methods of teaching may actually have negative effects when compared to direct content oriented teaching methods. Although it is inconclusive, this trend in the research is disconcerting: it seems to suggest either that one of our most cherished assumptions is false or that there is some flaw or flaws which occur frequently enough in indirect teaching strategies to compromise results.

I believe there is a flaw which is frequently committed and serious enough to account for the disappointing track record of indirect process oriented teaching methods. Simply put, I think the flaw is that there is a tendency in indirect process oriented teaching strategies for teachers to provide too little information to enable a rational child to discover the ideas he or she is supposed to learn. I believe the flaw is harmful to elementary pupils.

In this paper, I will briefly review the research that demonstrates the need to refine indirect process oriented teaching strategies. I will define the logical error I call the Fallacy of Excluded Instruction and attempt to show how it will produce failure and negative affect when it is committed. I will then attempt to demonstrate that the fallacy is easily committed or even inherent in some popular indirect process oriented social studies teaching strategies. In each case, modifications in the form or application of the strategy will be suggested.

The Need to Improve Indirect Methods

Although there is some research which indicates that particular indirect process methods are effective (e.g. Massialas et al, 1970) the
general trend in the research on discovery learning provides little per-
suasive evidence that discovery learning strategies facilitate ability to
solve new problems or enhance understanding of content. (Schulman &

In the classroom research which correlates method with outcomes as
measured by standardized tests, an impressive number of recent studies
have shown positive correlations between high pupil achievement and
direct, content oriented instruction but low or even negative correlations
between high achievement and use of indirect process oriented methods.
(See Soar, 1973; Brophy & Evertson, 1974; Stallings & Kaskowitz, 1975;
Wright, 1975; American Institute for Research, 1976; Bennett, 1976;
Armento, 1976; Bloom, 1976; Rosenshine, 1977.) To be sure, this
research generally involves elementary pupils, reading and
mathematics subject matter and is subject to technical flaws and
limitations\(^2\), however the findings are perfectly reasonable and far too
common to be ignored on the basis of technicalities. There are studies
which contradict this general pattern (e.g. Massialas et al, 1970) but to
date the trend in evidence must be regarded as suggesting that direct
content oriented instruction is at least as reliable a means of producing
high achievement on content oriented tests as indirect discovery
oriented instruction, at least in elementary classes.

The research on the affective effects of indirect process oriented in-
struction and direct instruction is also inconclusive. Herman (1977)
reports a series of studies which he interprets as suggesting that social
studies is unpopular because social studies teachers are too direct and
use too few indirect child centered activities. It is interesting to note
that reading, mathematics and spelling are more popular than social
studies among elementary students (Jersild & Tasch, 1949; Herman,
1977) and despite the evidence that social studies teachers do use read-
or-present and question strategies (see Shaver, Davis and Helburn,
1979), these subjects are probably more directly taught than Social
Studies; some other explanation of Herman’s findings must be explored.
Actually Herman’s studies (and presumably those he references as
models) are badly confounded by the fact that he defines direct teachers
as those who talk and direct a lot “and. . .[are] generally disrespectful
and critical of children’s ideas and feelings. . .” while indirect teachers
are defined as those who share the spotlight, provide a supportive
climate and reinforce children’s answers. (Herman, 1977, p. 59) It is in-
appropriate to systematically assign all disagreeable teachers to the
“direct” category and then attribute affective effects to methods
variables like amount of teacher talk or variety of activities. Similarly,
by assigning teachers who fail to produce acceptable answers to the
direct category and those who do produce acceptable answers to the in-
direct category the definition confounds effectiveness with indirectness.
Perhaps Herman’s data is better interpreted as showing that nice
teachers who are effective are more popular than nasty teachers who are
ineffective.
Even with this serious confounding however, Herman shows few
direct effects. Rather his data indicate that attitude toward social
studies improves as indirect-with-praise and pupil intelligence in-
creases. This interaction may indicate that more intelligent pupils bring
more knowledge to lessons from prior experience and can complete ac-
tivities or solve problems by drawing upon this previous learning while
less able pupils, who presumably possess less relevant knowledge, are
not given sufficient information to enable successful performance. They
fail frequently and learn to dislike the subject even though the teacher is
extremely nice.

When the terms "direct" is redefined to include "tells pupils informa-
tion and directs extensively" without requiring that the teacher also be
nasty and ineffective, quite a different picture emerges from recent
process product research. Using this definition, there are studies that in-
dicate that school anxiety increases in indirect process oriented classes
(Wright, 1975; Bennett, 1976), that self concepts are lowered (Stallings
and Kaskowitz, 1975; Van Horn, 1976) and there is some inconsistent
(Bennett, 1976, Horowitz, 1979) evidence that student centered, in-
direct, process oriented teachers who do not structure lessons to definite
conclusions are less popular among students than highly directive, con-
tent oriented teachers (Massialas et al, 1970; Van Horn, 1976; Flanders

The findings are mixed and must be regarded as inconclusive.
However the trend in the research does not support the assumption that
process oriented indirect methods of instruction taken as a whole im-
prove thinking ability, or increase achievement, or improve affect or self
concepts.\footnote{3}

The Fallacy as a Cause of Failure

I suspect that the real issue is not so much whether the teacher uses
direct expository methods or indirect discovery methods as it is a matter
of whether the teacher insures that sufficient data or information is
presented and understood by pupils to enable success in pupil
assignments. For example, in the Massialas study the effective and pop-
ular teachers in the "inquiry probing" group made sure the data was
available that would imply solutions to problems and that students
attended to and used it systematically. The least effective teachers
elicited some form of processing without insuring that students had and
used necessary and sufficient data to enable a rational conclusion. The
same pattern emerged in the Van Horn (1976) study. Highly rated effec-
tive teachers used "Information" strategies (statements, lecture,
questions, conclusions, set, closure) while less effective teachers used
"Helping (Person)" strategies (rap sessions, social problem,
irrational/creative thought, displaying/modeling, and personal openness
(Van Horn, 1976). The difference between methodologies is essentially
that good teachers first teach pupils sufficient information to enable
them to draw warranted conclusions, (i.e. make the necessary ideas or
examples available and make sure the students learn and use them) while ineffective teachers simply ask pupils to invent conclusions out of thin air or random prior experience...which is the essence of the Fallacy of Excluded Instruction. Perhaps direct content oriented methods are surprisingly effective because they are more likely to give information that would enable a rational response to questions. Of course the fallacy would be committed if the teacher rambles on about one set of facts and then tests pupils on another logically independent set of facts.

The Fallacy of Excluded Instruction is a particular kind of logical error in teaching. It is committed when:

1. The teacher has some objective(s), stated or implied, that pupils will discover some general principles (G), and/or learn some thinking strategy (T), and/or clarify some value (V), as a consequence of the lesson, activity, or discussion.
2. The teacher attempts to elicit discovery of the objectives by posing a problem or suggesting an activity which requires pupils to use the ideas contained in the lesson objective to complete the activity or find a solution to the problem (S).
3. And the teacher does not supply or instruct pupils with new information which is logically sufficient to communicate or evince either the content to be discovered (ideas G, T or V) or the solution to the concrete problem (S).

For example, the teacher might want elementary pupils to discover ideas like discrimination, exploitation and learn generalizations about the effects of educational inequality on economic opportunity. To accomplish these goals, the teacher poses a problem: “What should we do about economic injustice?” (which requires pupils to understand and use the concepts, principles and values implicit in the lesson objective) and leads pupils in an open ended discussion without providing data or teaching the concepts and principles to be discovered.

The task is analogous to giving students an algebra problem with one or more unknowns on the content side of the equation, and a different unknown on the solution side of the equation with operations on the unknown variables unspecified:

Unknown G (?) Unknown T (?) Unknown V = Unknown S

Logically, if pupils do need to learn the principles, thinking skills or values in the objective (i.e., they are unknown prior to the lesson), and if they need to learn a solution, then they cannot be expected to solve the problem until they are taught something they did not know before. If they do solve the problem without being taught something new, their success is not evidence that they learned anything; it is merely proof that they were capable of solving the problem with knowledge possessed prior to the lesson...and the activity is really only a fancy kind of practice exercise.
The Fallacy of Excluded Instruction is a serious error. It is theoretically sufficient to produce low self concepts, high levels of anxiety, low ratings of teachers and subjects, and destroy the pupil's will to study. If it is committed with much frequency in social studies, it would convert this most humane subject into a kind of psychological snake pit for less able students.

In personality theory, it is generally accepted that repeated failure will lower an individual's self concept. When self-concept is reduced, anxiety and insecurity develop. When anxiety develops, defense mechanisms such as displacement of blame, task repression, and assorted reaction formations develop (Calvin et al., 1961). If pupils are regularly engaged in problem solving tasks and activities which teach insufficient data to enable a successful solution, then pupils will fail often and these negative effects should follow. In addition, in behaviorist theory (Skinner, 1938) when a student tries and fails at a task repeatedly, effort to solve similar problems will be extinguished; the student will learn to avoid discovery learning. When a method assumes pupils lack the knowledge that would imply a solution to a problem and fails to present or evince that knowledge then the method will logically produce failure and these undesirable consequences should follow.

The Fallacy of Excluded Instruction exists in many of the most widely advocated strategies in social studies. Although these strategies have not generally been tested for negative effects, there is some very suggestive evidence available that the hypothesized negative effects do occur. Several common examples follow.

The Fallacy and Divergent Questions

The practice of asking open ended or divergent questions (e.g., Torrance and Myers, 1970) to stimulate creative thinking and problem solving is widely advocated in social studies literature and may be implied in the old National Council for the Social Studies guideline:

First, these guidelines take the position that enduring or pervasive social issues such as economic injustice, conflict, racism, social disorder, and environmental imbalance are appropriate content for the curriculum for grades K-12. The primary purpose of social studies is neither to advance the frontiers of knowledge nor to produce social scientists. Rather it is to engage students in analyzing and attempting to resolve the social issues confronting them. (Manson et al., 1971, p. 18)

Teachers probably do not know solutions to such problems and intentionally avoid teaching definite generalizations or principles to avoid leading pupils to pat predetermined conclusions on such issues.

By definition, divergent questions have no single correct answer and, of course, cannot be answered by a simple deduction from information provided because deduction is a convergent process when premises are
given. Truly open ended questions almost necessarily commit the Fallacy of Excluded Instruction. If a pupil lacks the prior knowledge to permit a deduction, he will fail to answer the question; but if he is assumed to have the prior knowledge and to be able to answer without instruction, he may not need the lesson in the first place. If the missing principles are taught, the fallacy would not exist but then the question becomes rather convergent.¹

Two studies show what happens when unanswerable questions are asked. Rothkopf and Koether (1978) presented subjects with a list of study questions prior to presentation of a reading passage. In one treatment, the first questions in the list were related to the topic but did not have answers in the text. Later questions were directly answerable from the text. Another treatment group was given a list of the same questions but in reversed order (answerable questions first, unanswerable last). After allowing ample time for reading, subjects were tested on the answers to the questions. The researchers found that pupils who experienced the unanswerable questions first were unable to answer even the answerable questions. Apparently, they discovered that the answers were not available and gave up before completing the study assignment. The researchers concluded that it may be harmful to use unanswerable questions as a study guide. Gall et al (1975) observed what may be the same phenomenon in classroom discussions which used high frequency of open ended questions. Not only did pupils in the open ended group not learn to think for themselves, they apparently learned not to try to learn the information presented in instructional materials and scored lower on tests of information. Pupils in the open ended question treatment expressed negative feelings about the lesson.

Limited use of divergent questions may be appropriate at the beginning of a lesson as a means of elaborating possibilities to be explored, as long as success does not depend upon production of effective answers. An occasional open ended question or even "rap" session may even be useful for establishing a set to learn or to relieve the routine of instruction. The point of this discussion is that a steady and frequent diet of opinion questions which are truly open ended will eventually produce frustration and bad study habits.

The Fallacy and Simulation Games

Simulation games are extremely popular in social studies literature. Generally, simulation games are intended to teach some principle or principles, and to facilitate decision making or problem solving processes. They usually attempt to do so by providing pupils with a concrete problem to be solved in order to win the game. In order to solve the problem, the pupils must use the principle(s) which the game is supposed to teach. Of course the principles which are to be learned are not stated in the introduction to the game since that would give away the solution, and there may be nothing in the data given in introducing the game or in playing it which would suggest the key principles. If the
teacher does not drop rather broad hints (i.e., provide input or cues) and the assumption that pupils need to learn the principles is valid, the fallacy is committed. Students who do not know the solution at the outset will fail and lose the game. This is exactly what Ryan and Wheeler (1973) observed in Seal Hunt (MACOS, 1970) when pupils entered the game with a competitive set...implying that they needed to learn to cooperate. Pupils who already were disposed to cooperate were significantly more likely to survive, but may have learned nothing. Perhaps the omission of sufficient data in the games themselves explains why games using group decision making and teachers involvement in the discussion are more effective (Van Sickle, 1977): these devices would enhance the odds that some knowledgable child or the teacher would supply ill-informed pupils with the data necessary to solve the problem.

Simulation games may be quite useful in establishing a set to learn some principles, or as an exercise in which pupils apply knowledge that has been taught. However, unless data sources are made available during the game which states key principles or suggests solutions, or an intentionally instructive debriefing is provided, they are probably unreliable means for they are usually designed for eliciting the discovery of new principles.

**The Fallacy in Problem Solving**

Dewey's model of problem solving does not necessarily commit the fallacy because its purpose is to help students organize and apply known information to resolve a problem. Dewey asserted that teachers should do everything possible, including teaching by direct content oriented methods, to insure the conditions were present that would enable students to solve problems successfully (Dewey, 1928). Unfortunately, Dewey's work has been misinterpreted to have teachers lead children to formulate conclusions or make decisions about specific issues without making the principles upon which those conclusions are to be based known. When the teacher depends upon insight or untested assumptions about prior knowledge rather than upon providing data, the fallacy becomes quite common.

As Martorella (1976) describes it, Dewey's model has five steps as a teaching strategy:

1. Create within the context of subject matter a problem.
2. Ask students to verbalize the issue or clarify it.
3. Solicit from the students some possible solutions or explanations. . .clarify terms, allow pupils to reflect.
4. Assist students to test hypotheses systematically and provide assistance with use of references and research tools.
5. Assist students in arriving at the most probable conclusions...emphasizing the tentative nature of conclusions with the possibility of error at step 3.

This procedure is a problem solving or decision making strategy, as opposed to an inductive strategy. Induction requires that a problem be defined, instances given or sampled and compared for common characteristics, an hypothesis formed and (preferably) tested against new instances. Here, the model does not provide instances prior to asking pupils to form an hypothesis. If the problem really is a problem, it is entirely possible that no student will be able to suggest an hypothesis at step 3. The logical problem can be corrected by pretesting or teaching principles from which an hypothesis can be deduced or by presenting analogs or precedent cases from which an hypothesis can be induced, before posing the problem. This instructional sequence may not require much pupil creativity, but will reduce failure.

the Fallacy in Concept Formation

The fallacy is technically implicit in Taba’s concept formation strategy (Taba, 1971). The teacher wants pupils to discover a particular classification rule (a concept). The teacher provides a set of “items” (pupils are not told that all items are exemplars of the concept) and asks pupils to describe them. Now any object can be described for color, shape, size, mass, composition, function, age, origin, aesthetic appeal and so on. If children describe thoroughly, it is easy to imagine they will find more than ten variables in each item. Then the teacher asks pupils how the items can be grouped...the number of groupments is the factorial of the number of different attributes pupils perceive...if there are only ten types of attributes that differ in the set, there would be more than 3,800,000 groupments possible...one of which is the classification rule the teacher hopes will be discovered. The teacher is warned to be very careful not to imply that there is one right answer...and is to give no hints. Now, if pupils really do not know the concept to be discovered, and it is at all complex, the chances seem fairly slim that they will stick with the task long enough to stumble on it by chance. Of course, the children may not realize they are failing, because practically anything they say is “right” (assuming the teacher doesn’t get frustrated and lose enthusiasm for suggested groupments) but the lesson will ramble through all the proper classifications pupils already know...and must certainly become a screaming bore. In fact, Taba herself once suggested that the method will take a long time and may not work at all unless some pupil already knows the concept.\(^5\)

As a bare minimum in concept learning, the teacher must supply examples and non-examples and tell pupils which are which in order to give them enough data to tackle the problem rationally (Markle, 1975).
The Fallacy in Values Clarification

If Rath’s (1966) assumption that children do not have clear values is true, and the teacher really does not use leading questions and examples to produce a socratic sequence, the fallacy is probably common in values clarification...although not necessarily so. If the child does or says something first, and the teacher asks “Why?” then the child may be able to reflect on his reasons or immediate motivation and supply an answer by retrospection (which implies that he has a functional value at the outset.) On the other hand, if the interaction begins with a question out of the blue, and the child is asked what he thinks, and the child really does not know the relevant values, then there is no assurance that the teacher will supply any input that will break the impasse...and the child has no means to decide. Values clarification may be a useful form of psychotherapy in that it could help pupils get over guilt feelings and set goals, but, as Lockwood (1978) points out, there is little indication that it develops values, in the sense of abstract ideals.

If it is assumed that pupils come to school with prior commitments to certain actions or ideals but are unsure of the exact meaning or limits of those ideals it might be possible to clarify value concepts by presenting a variety of instances, examples or case studies and asking pupils to, first, select those items they subjectively prefer. Each individual might compare those preferred items to identify common elements which do not appear in instances judged undesirable (McKenzie, 1974). This approach would at least give pupils some means of inducing a value concept from isolated judgments.

The Fallacy in Independent Activities

Although I have not done a frequency count that would permit comparison of the frequency of the fallacy in social studies lessons with its frequency in other subjects, I believe it is extremely common. Elementary teachers are exhorted to use a variety of activities to involve children in thinking exercises which lead them to develop some higher order thinking faculties. These activities often involve asking children to draw scenes or murals of life in other times or places, to role play people in unfamiliar situations, to imagine they are astronauts who have crashed on the moon and must decide what equipment to take on an overland trek to a distant base station, to learn new concepts by completing crossword puzzles when the terms are not given, to sit on a guessing panel and guess how a famous person would have answered some question, or play a bean-bag game where the child will “show the close relationship between the history of an area and its productivity” by naming a product matched with a state and then throwing a bean-bag into a waste basket (Roy, 1965). Unfortunately, teachers often substitute these activities for lessons that teach the information pupils need in order to perform the activity. In an informal inquiry, I asked my students to analyze games and activities suggested in idea files, like Spark (Roy, 1965), 150 plus! Games and Activities for Early Childhood.
(Spenser, 1976), texts and curriculum guides for the fallacy. In my students' judgement, the fallacy was committed in more than half of the activities they sampled in social studies and most of the rest came off as drill or trial-and-error learning.

Conclusion

Of course, without having analyzed the logic of a large sample of actual lessons as they are taught in classrooms, it is not possible to state on the basis of direct evidence that the fallacy accounts for the disappointing research on effects of indirect teaching. Thus, this paper only suggests the following hypotheses:

Teachers who commit the Fallacy of Excluded Instruction frequently will produce low levels of achievement, and negative feelings in pupils.

If indirect process oriented methods of instruction which commit the fallacy are excluded from the population of strategies used to test the effectiveness of discovery methods of instruction, more positive effects will be observed in achievement and affect than will be observed when strategies which commit the fallacy are included.

There are two ways to avoid the fallacy. The first is to very carefully determine, by some incredibly elaborate form of readiness test of knowledge, whether each child has some relevant and sufficient knowledge available to solve the problem before assigning the problem. For several reasons, including the difficulty and time required for classroom teachers to design, administer, and interpret these diagnostic tests for each problem, I believe this approach to avoid the fallacy is impractical. The second method of avoiding the fallacy is to determine at least one logically sufficient set of facts and/or principles to enable a solution to a problem, and then plan a content oriented presentation that will teach this specific knowledge well, and teach the necessary content before asking pupils to apply the knowledge in solving the problem. Admittedly this approach will reduce creativity to application tasks, but perhaps it is only reasonable to suppose that elementary pupils should concentrate on learning ideas and how to use them before being asked to solve the problems of racism, economic injustice, conflict, and environmental imbalance. If children are to be asked to solve problems by deduction, the teacher must be able to teach the general principle which composes the major premise of the deductive syllogism. If children are to learn to solve problems by induction, they must have and understand the facts of specific instances before they can describe and compare them to the hypothesis about a general pattern. In either case, the key step in helping children to solve problems is not to ask thinking questions but to teach the information needed. I suspect we will find that is harder to teach teachers to teach information well than we have supposed.
NOTES

1. I am sincerely sorry that terminology is such a mess in educational discourse. Individuals who attempt to organize findings of studies on these diverse systems can only try to be honest about usage. My own understanding of “direct content oriented teaching methods” is roughly equivalent to Van Horn’s conception of what he calls “Information” strategies: the teacher uses set to achieve a particular goal, gives rules, definitions, or examples in some form or other and generally attempts to structure lessons to some form of closure. Information strategies can, I believe, be inductive when the teacher gives data. My conception of “indirect process oriented strategies” is fairly similar to Van Horn’s Helping (Person) Strategies, which include rap sessions, social problem “solving” in the case where pupils merely field and discuss opinions, irrational creative thought, the type of learning center activity or project where pupils are supposed to discover, invent or otherwise express themselves without being given reasonably clear instruction on data to be used or procedure to be followed and, of course, the specific methods discussed directly in this paper.

2. These studies have been criticized on various grounds ranging from complaints about the low cognitive level of achievement tests through the fact that they are correlational rather than experimental in nature, to sampling and statistical technicalities. For an example of this discussion, see the Review symposium in the American Educational Research Journal, (1978) 15, 159-169, and Winne (1979).

3. I apologize again for the vagueness of definitions in this section. The purpose is to demonstrate that strategies which emphasize process over content are less effective than traditionally supposed. I think that conclusion is beyond doubt.

4. It is possible to distinguish at least two degrees of divergence in questions. The most extreme form is an open-ended opinion or creativity question whose answers cannot be judged right or wrong or more or less probable on the basis of available data. The second form is the type of question that has several different answers which can be deduced from known principles and can be judged right/wrong or more or less likely. The first type of divergent question must necessarily commit the fallacy since providing the information that would imply an answer is precluded. The second type of divergent question commits the fallacy only if the teacher assumes pupils need to learn the premises needed to form the diverse answers to the question and the teacher also withholds the principles or data that would make these premises available to pupils. Thus the fallacy is committed when the teacher assumes pupils need to learn the effects of overpopulation, and asks
“What do you think will happen if the world becomes overpopulated?”

It is not committed when the teacher assumes pupils need to learn the effects of overpopulation and tells pupils,

“Overpopulation of a territory of a chimpanzee troupe has been observed to produce malnutrition, increase competition and conflict within the troupe, aggression against neighboring troups, and even cannibalism.

“What do you think will happen if the world becomes overpopulated?”

I doubt that this second pattern is properly thought of as divergent.

5. It is almost unjust to criticize Taba’s method because, more than anyone else in the early 1960’s, she tried to train teachers to elicit and direct specific mental operations of children in a way that would lead them logically to a conclusion. This was a true breakthrough in progressive philosophy and a key idea in my own philosophy. Taba’s work was inhibited by the assumption that open endedness was good in thinking exercises and by the primitive state of research in concept learning. I believe she was not satisfied with her strategy because it was so inefficient and unreliable in teaching content and would have corrected it if she had lived longer. Unfortunately the strategy is illogical, inefficient and inadequate for teaching concepts. The process of random grouping is far better done by computer in science and is practically useless to laymen. But the strategy is still sold to teachers as a good idea.
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Introduction

Values clarification, values analysis, and moral education are very much a part of the affective thrust of social studies education in the 1970's (Barr, 1971; Ehman, 1977; Metcalf, 1971; NCSS, 1979; Tucker, 1977). In pursuit of this emphasis, some teachers have nearly abandoned cognitive and content-specific instruction to ensure adequate time has been given for the values/moral aspects of their student's all around development (Benjamin, 1975; Mehlinger, 1978; Shaver, 1977; Stewart, 1975). In reviewing and using much of the currently available values/moral materials, it is easy to understand how teachers may have developed the false perception that content learning and values/moral education processes are at opposite ends of some single continuum. This perception is apparently widespread far beyond what one might imagine since calls for "back to the basics" are widely interpreted to mean a return to the cognitive aspects of learning a specified content area and a rejection of the supposed over-emphasis on affect (Hahn, 1976).

Surprisingly, few social studies educators (Kownslar, 1975; Metcalf, 1971; Shaver, 1977) have pointed out the consistency between the basic problem-solving processes inherent in the "New Social Studies" of the 1960's and the values/moral education processes stressed in this decade. Both feature essentially the same processes and procedures and both may be viewed as representing "content-free" models relevant for planning, developing, and carrying out content-centered instruction. Subsequently, teachers should help students use these problem-solving and decision-making processes as they comprehend and apply content, clarify their values and moral reasoning, and learn to make rational decisions in the contemporary world (Kownslar, 1975; Mehlinger, 1978; NCSS, 1979; Shaver, 1977).

This article describes a model whereby social studies teachers can create and write content-centered learning activities which are likely to
achieve their desired cognitive and affective student outcomes. This approach allows teachers to plan and develop social studies subject matter-related materials which are likely to enhance comprehension of social studies content while simultaneously helping students to practice and acquire decision-making, valuing, and moral reasoning skills. Using this model, teachers can develop values dilemmas which include the social studies content they want to teach. Teachers may also use these activities as a means of shifting from a single discipline to an interdisciplinary orientation in their subject matter presentations (Stahl, 1976a, 1978, 1979b).

The term "values dilemma" refers to an instructional activity whose focus, content, context, values/moral setting, and format combine to describe or produce a situation which requires students to respond using personal and social values (and where appropriate, moral reasons) as they form feasible and appropriate responses. Values dilemma activities do not require that the situation or information provided identify an obvious dilemma or a conflict which generates equally compelling alternatives. It is expected, however, that the activity will work to produce a situation whereby students find that they must deal with personal and social values in considering, weighing, forming, and living with their responses. If the teacher or teacher educator follows the guidelines presented in this article, such individuals can develop "values dilemma" activities which have a high probability of producing real intellectual values/moral conflict and/or dissonance within the students confronted with such activities.

1A preliminary analysis of the results of two experimental studies which included 18 senior high and 20 junior high school social studies classes with the treatment being activities developed according to this model suggests that the experimental students scored significantly higher on immediate and delayed content specific posttests (p < .01) as well as on an attitudinal posttest (p < .05) which measured student attitudes relative to empathy, communications skills, problem-solving, decision-making, personal consistency, and assenting-dissenting skills. Students having the experimental activities also seemed to possess more favorable attitudes about themselves, the content they studied, and their participation in classroom discussions. The data from these studies are currently in preparation for publication (Stahl, 1979c, and Hunt, 1979, both unpublished.) An attitudes measurement instrument to determine the effects of this approach has been developed and found to be a reliable and valid test to measure group attitudes, value positions, and self understanding. A description of this instrument, the "Stahl Multidimensional Inventory of Values and Attitudes," is available from the author.

2A "values dilemma" is defined as a planned content-centered learning activity which is designed to assist students comprehend subject matter content, develop decision-making skills, and engage in valuing and/or moral reasoning processes. Well-constructed values dilemmas often require students to state, clarify, and use both their values and their moral beliefs in responding to the same episode. Hence, the term "values dilemmas" is used to describe only those content-oriented values strategies, value sheets, moral dilemmas, or moral judgment episodes which require students to engage in Conceptual, Relational, and Valuation thinking behavior. Values dilemma should be used as an integral part of an ongoing unit of subject matter centered instruction to help students better understand the content they are studying as well as some of the uses they may put to this content in out-of-class situations.
The Approach Defined

According to the "verbal evidence" or "cognitive" approach to values/moral education outlined by Casteel and Stahl (1975), individuals clarify their values and moral beliefs, make decisions and judgments, and comprehend and apply data by thinking and reasoning about information, problems, situations, and dilemmas in certain ways. To these authors, values/moral thinking and learning consist of specific kinds of mental processes which individuals use as they consider, comprehend, make decisions about, test, and use values and moral reasons concerning a given context and based upon the information they have available to them. Since these mental thought processes are internal, they take place entirely within the minds of the individual students without ever becoming public. Classroom teachers on the other hand cannot take for granted that these internal processes are actually taking place or have just taken place internally (in his/her mind).

Teachers who desire certain specific types of thinking or responses must convert these to specific types of verbal statements and then must get students to use these statements in the classroom.

Figure 1 An illustration of how one may use student oral statements in planning, carrying out, and assessing instruction.
taking place. Teachers need to have information which they can hear, see, or observe which will let them know (by inference) that these values/moral thinking processes are indeed taking place in the minds of their students.

A convenient and observable way teachers can get evidence as to whether these internal processes are taking place is to use activities which require students to “talk through” their values/moral-related thinking and decision-making with others. As teachers hear statements which resemble the appropriate internal processes, they can be reasonably assured that these valuing processes are in fact taking place (See Figure 1). Thus, from an instructional standpoint, and since they are all cognitively based, the clarification of values, values analysis, and moral reasoning can be said to be occurring only when the teacher has “verbal evidence” (in the form of oral or written statements made by students) that the internal mental processes associated with comprehension, valuing, decision-making, and reasoning have just taken or are taking place.

According to Casteel and Stahl, four major types or phases of thinking must take place during values/moral classroom instruction. These four are: Conceptual, Relational, Valuation and Reflective. Conceptual thinking involves student understanding and comprehension of available and relevant data, the situation, terminology, interpretations, comparisons, and relationships within and among the content being studied. Relational thinking focuses on the student’s realization of the connection between what the present content, situation, and values/moral issues are and the focus of the lesson or some related content, problem, or values/moral issue which has already been or is presently being studied. Finally students demonstrate Valuation processes when they engage in thinking that considers alternatives, consequences, criteria, and reasons as they attempt to reach a decision.

The suggestion that the language (verbal statements) one uses is an indicator of an individual’s inner thoughts and feeling is supported by research in semantics (Bowie and Morgan, 1962; Firestone and Brody, 1975; Postman and Weingartner, 1967). This research suggests that as an individual uses language to relate and respond to reality, more often than not, s/he reveals more about her/himself than s/he does about reality. Thus, since verbal messages are explicit and the receiver accepts that they are under the conscious control of the sender within the content and context of the giver, it may be assumed that verbal statements constitute one valid means of inferring an individual’s level of knowledge and comprehension, value and belief system, and emotive state as s/he understands and makes use of them.

A reliable and validated interaction analysis instrument (The Social Science Observation Record: SSOR) related to this instructional model is available for use in observing, coding, recording, tabulating, and interpreting the verbal and non-verbal behaviors of students and teachers during values/moral discussions (Casteel and Stahl, 1973. Also see Tucker, 1977, p. 108).

The first three types of thinking is based upon the first three “phases of values clarification” originally defined by Casteel and Stahl (1975) and revised and redefined by Stahl (1976b and again in 1978).
These three “phases” are not borrowed from any one source or model. Instead, each separate phase represents a synopsis of (as well as parallels many of) the attributes included in a number of seemingly diverse approaches to content/process-oriented instruction such as “decision-making” (Engle, 1960), “effective choosing” (Cherryholmes, 1971), “critical thinking” (Ennis, 1962), “reflective thinking” (Hunt and Metcalf, 1968; Massialas and Cox, 1966), “values analysis” (Coombs and Meux, 1971; Fraenkel, 1977), and the “jurisprudential approach” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). As Tucker (1977) reports, all of these models and approaches, and those suggested by Kohlberg (1975), Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966, 1978) and Casteel and Stahl (1975), are ultimately tied to the philosophical position of Dewey (1933, 1939) and the work of Raup, Axtelle, Benne, and Smith (1950).

All of these models and approaches have stressed to varying degrees of importance of:

a) understanding factual information and the objective examination of data, situations, events, etc. (Note that the Conceptual phase focuses on the comprehension of available and relevant data and the situational context, and definition of terminology for semantical clarity, the objective interpretation of data, and so forth—all characteristics of information processing which emphasize understanding).

b) realizing the “relevancy” (i.e., relatedness or connectedness) among and between different pieces of data, situations, contexts, values/moral issues and positions being studied and/or which may be or have been studied. This description of relevancy (and the emphasis placed on relational thinking in this model) is in congruence with Associationist learning theory which stresses the importance of forming associations to increase learning and memory functioning (Ebbinghaus, 1913; Johnson, 1976; Berelson and Steiner, 1964). (Note that the Relational phase provides for the concern for and need to help students determine relevant associations within the information available to be processed.)

c) making decisions or judgments of one type or another within the context of more encompassing decision-making abilities including the consideration of alternatives, the examination of consequences, the identification and awareness of the reasons or criteria for making decisions and values/moral judgments and choices. (Note that the description of the Valuation phase includes the provision for these separate decision-making steps in logical proximity to one another as they would tend to

"The author wishes to note that Simon et al. (1972) modified the original values clarification approach of Raths et al. (1966, 1978) towards converting it into a “values affirmation” approach. This conversion occurred with their rearrangement of the order of the seven sub-processes of valuing to require the consideration of alternatives and their respective consequences after and not before the making of a choice—a subtle change, but one that has a major impact on the expected and real outcomes of values clarification strategies as these were originally defined by Raths et al. (1966, 1978)."
occur within dilemma-or problem-solving situations. The appropriateness of these separate steps as well as support for the construct of these parts into a single interrelated "phase" has been provided by a panel of leading social studies educators (Casteel and Stahl, 1973).

As described above, these phases are not unique to any one model of instruction or curriculum development. Instead these phases provide a convenient framework for including the essentials of all the approaches and models cited above. This framework also provides a means for thinking about values/moral thinking and learning in the classrooms. Finally, this three-phase framework may also be used in thinking about substantive and process-oriented non-values/moral related learning as well.

Hence, teachers who specify as their goals the development of subject-matter understanding, decision-making skills, clarified values and value choices, and moral reasoning skills should use activities which stimulate students to "provide verbal evidence" that they are using Conceptual, Relational, and Valuation types of thinking.

Reflective thinking is often overlooked in helping students to deal with both the cognitive and values/moral dimensions of their decisions. One reason for this oversight is that students must have something to "reflect upon" (Dewey, 1933). According to Casteel and Stahl, students will have collected a minimal amount of data to reflect upon after they have responded to three or more values dilemmas related to the same instructional focus or values/moral setting. A teacher guides students through the reflection process by directing their attention to theWhats, Whows, and Whys of their decisions on the previous values dilemmas. This procedure forces students to look back over and consider the consistency of and their personal commitment to their own decisions regarding similar situations and values/moral conflicts. Without Reflection, students are unlikely to see the broad scope and application of their value/moral choices and beliefs—a major criticism of value/moral education today. The Reflective phase of this curriculum model in part is a deliberate step to focus on the need for consistent values/moral choices and reasons and to prevent the values/moral relativism that is so prevalent with some other approaches (Steward, 1975; Shaver, 1977).

Interestingly, when classroom teachers use correctly prepared content-centered values dilemmas, students automatically incorporate within their thinking and reactions statements which identify their values, preferences, moral reasonings, moral judgments, and feelings as they attempt to resolve the cognitive-based situations presented to them. This apparently natural response pattern may be used by

*The analysis of audio cassette tapes of students within groups responding to values dilemmas based upon this approach provides objective evidence to support this statement. Even when the context appears to some observers to be rather "value free", individuals within group settings consistently use values/moral decision-making statements (i.e., Valuation phase verbal statements) as they attempt to resolve the values dilemma.
teachers to help students understand how the affective dimensions of their reasoning and decisions are very much interrelated with the cognitive dimensions.

Steps to Identifying the Content, Context, and Setting of a Values Dilemma

Before describing five types of values dilemmas which can be developed for social studies instruction for K through college level classrooms, some suggestions as to how subject matter content may be included in these activities will be introduced.

First, a central focus for the activity or lesson ought to be identified. This focus should be a written statement in complete sentence form which identifies precisely what major point, idea, question, or generalization the activity is to stress. In social studies classroom units, this central focus would most often stress some generalization related to the subject matter content being studied (e.g., When individuals or groups allow competition to get out of hand, conflict and violence often result). In other cases, the focus may center on a particular values/moral issue, belief, controversy, or situation (e.g., Is the best way to make up for past inequality to adhere strongly to a program of reverse discrimination?).

It should be noted that topics, themes, or concept-labels which take the form of one-word headings or incomplete sentences are not appropriate as statements of the central focus. This is because they provide no real focus for thinking and serve primarily as token labels. To be most effective in guiding the development of worthwhile content-centered values dilemmas, teachers should start the planning phase of a lesson or an activity with a clearly identified written statement of the central focus which the activity or lesson is to emphasize.¹⁰

Secondly, teachers need to decide upon the content and contest for their values dilemma. Decisions in this phase of planning determine the subject matter information and situations students will study, learn, and respond to in the classroom. A content and contest may identify and describe:

- a personal situation (e.g., an individual, such as Benedict Arnold, who turns traitor because of the lack of recognition from his peers);

- a governmental crisis (e.g., the dilemma the Provisional Government found itself in following the 1917 collapse of the Tsarist government);

- a political situation (e.g., deciding whether or not to retain the Electoral College as opposed to the popular election of the President);

¹⁰An in-depth description of a ‘focusing statement’ as well as a listing of the ground rules for developing focusing statements appropriate for social studies units are available (Stahl, 1979a).
- a geographical condition (e.g., the problem of determining foreign policy on the basis of a nation's geographical location, resources, or position);
- an anthropological situation (e.g., deciding which outsiders, if any, should be allowed to visit a newly discovered primitive people or tribe);
- a scholarly interpretation (e.g., reviewing the merits of Velikovsky's revision of the history of many ancient civilizations);
- or
- a social condition (e.g., the problem of how to deal with large numbers of unemployed and unskilled teenagers).

Any two or more of the above may be combined and other areas of social studies-related content and contexts may be used to develop contexts which are appropriate for study in the classrooms.

Thirdly, the decision-making situation or context of the values dilemma may be developed from several different points of view. Students may be asked to react to situations from the perspective of an outside observer or of an active first person participant in the situation itself. For instance, contexts may range from describing a situation and asking students merely to respond to it to that of placing the student in the position of being an individual who is forced to deal with an actual dilemma. The use of different points of view allows teachers to help students examine and react to values dilemmas from various personal perspectives rather than always from the same viewpoint.

Among the points of view which are available to be used, teachers may use one or more of the following as appropriate:

A) Observer-reactor point of view. A values dilemma using this point of view may describe a situation where an individual or group was presented with a problem and the reactions of the person(s) involved. With the situation described, students are asked to respond in terms of whether or not the events, situation, or data described are good or bad, right or wrong and so forth. For example, students may be given a description of a Presidential decision and then asked to react to the situation and decision in terms of its goodness, badness, rightness, etc. This point of view allows the student to participate somewhat as an on-looker rather than an activist in the situation or context described. For students and teachers who have had little experience in direct, personal participation in values/moral activities, this point of view requires much less risk than some of the other perspectives.

B) Distal directive point of view. Values dilemmas written from this viewpoint would also describe a situation where a person or group is faced with a problem (or dilemma) that needs to be resolved. This context includes information about the who, what, when, and why of the situation up to the point where an actual decision has to be made. At that point, students are called upon to respond to the situation by revealing what the person or group
should, ought to, or must do or should have done. For example, an activity could describe the promotion and recognition problems Benedict Arnold faced after his battlefield heroics and how these rewards might be gained by changing sides. Then, students would be asked to respond as to what Arnold should have done or had to do in this instance. This perspective allows students to participate more actively in the decision process while also allowing them the freedom to detach themselves from direct personal involvement in the situation itself.

C) **Personal projective point of view.** Values dilemmas may ask students to become involved on a more active, personal level. Activities from this point of view describe a situation where a person or group needs to make a decision. Again the context details the who, what, when and where of the situation. However, at the point where the decision is to be made, the student is drawn into the context and is called upon to take the role of the decision maker, i.e., to become an active participant. This is done by adding a phrase similar to the one which follows immediately before the decision is to be made: “Suppose you are ____________ and it is you who must decide what is to be done. Considering the situation and alternatives, you decide to . . . ” Thus, at the last minute students are pulled into the dilemma to respond from a “What will I do” rather than a “what should s/he do” perspective.

D) **First person point of view.** Finally, values dilemmas may be written where the student is called on from the very beginning to be the person who in the context is confronted with a problem in need of being resolved. In this activity, students are placed in the role of the decision maker at the very outset and thus are required to approach the entire context and dilemma from a more personalized point of view (i.e., each student knows from the very beginning that it is “I” who must decide). This context allows students to more easily “take the role” rather than merely “play at the role” of the problem solver in the episode being described. For instance, a values dilemma may be written about Caesar at the Rubicon and includes from the beginning such phrases as “You are Caesar.” “You know that . . .” “Your military advisors tell you that . . .” “Your friends in the Senate have written to say that . . .” “You realize that . . .” “You call your generals together and announce to them your decision to . . .” This approach to the content allows students to develop a “mind set” of Caesar (i.e., to role take) instead of responding as a contemporary American to a 2,000 year old event (i.e., play at the role). Activities written from this point of view seem to help students retain more factual knowledge about and develop more understanding of social studies events than any of the first three perspectives.

Depending upon the particular content, objectives, and purposes the values dilemma is to stress, teachers may approach the development of
these episodes from entirely different points of view. The flexibility makes it possible to help students to become more or less personally involved in the dilemma and decision.\textsuperscript{11} It also allows teachers the opportunity to develop situations from widely different perspectives while their students consider how their own decisions may change depending upon one's point of view. These diverse vantage points are relevant for students learning to deal with social studies and personal life situations as well as refining decision-making skills.

In addition to considering what point of view a given context may take, the teacher may develop values dilemmas from several different "reality-issue bases." Decisions about which reality-issue base is to be used determine whether context will be "real" (i.e. drawn from and reported as an actual event or situation), "adjusted" (i.e., drawn from an actual event or situation with name, settings, places, etc., altered), "distorted" (i.e., developed with some connection to an actual event or situation with some actions, sequences, and the like altered in some important ways), "contrived" (i.e., developing a situation with no real event to model for the primary purpose of having students deal with a situation like the one being developed), or "hypothetical" (i.e., developing a situation which purposely brings into play two or more values, value choices moral issues, or values positions with the focus clearly on the values/moral dilemma rather than on the specifics of the situation or content being presented).

These different reality-issue bases allow the teacher to decide whether the content and context is to be drawn directly from real events of a subject matter nature to the extreme of focussing on values/moral issues conflicts within hypothetical situations. In the latter instance, the value/moral conflicts can often be abstracted from similar conflicts which may be found in the subject matter areas students have been, are, or will be studying.

The various guidelines suggested above play an important role in the values/moral growth of students. If students are to consider, clarify, comprehend, and use values and moral reasons rationally, they should have sufficient and objective information and situations available to study and understand.\textsuperscript{12} These content and context guidelines identify the kinds of information useful for guiding the development of teacher constructed content-based values dilemmas. In addition, teachers are becoming increasingly aware that values/moral activities which provide little or no real information and merely call upon students to react "affectively" to simple verbal cues have little functional value for either content learning or the clarification of values and moral reasoning (Benjamin, 1975; Mehlinger, 1978; Shaver, 1977; Stewart, 1975).\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11}According to McKeown (1975), students may alter the value/moral choice that they make as well as change the reasons they have (or give) for making such choices according to the nearness (proximity) or farness (distance) of the dilemma from their immediate personal perspective.

\textsuperscript{12}The Revised N.C.S.S. Curriculum Guidelines (1979) and the various social educators mentioned earlier in this article argue for the complementary relationship of these cognitive and cognitive-affect dimensions of instruction and learning.
Finally, consideration has to be given to the values/moral setting which would be most appropriate to the central focus, content, and context which a particular values dilemma is to stress. There appear to be at least five settings around which social studies-centered values dilemmas can be developed. These are:

1) A neutral issue or context which individuals may react to or consider in terms of some (or their own) values or moral beliefs (e.g., a methodological procedure, a building, a particular reference source, an antique, or an artifact may be identified and students asked to consider its merit, worth, goodness, etc.);

2) A value or moral issue which could be considered in its polar dimensions (e.g., a situation is described where a person or group could be fair or unfair, honest or dishonest, just or unjust, etc.);

3) A single, major value or moral issue in direct conflict with another major value or moral issue within the same problem solving situation or dilemma (e.g., a situation is described where a church elder who supports the ACLU position on “freedom of speech” is forced to contend with the United Church of Satan’s desire to march in the Annual Christmas Parade);

4) A value or moral issue which may cause conflict because it allows for two or more possible choices or courses of action or which may cause an individual to question the scope and extent of his/her original value or moral belief (e.g., a situation is described where a governor who values obedience to the law could restore peace and order faster by disobeying and ignoring the law than by following it); and

5) A situation where two or more values or moral beliefs are applicable and may even conflict (e.g., a situation is described where an archeologist who values the interpretations given by experts as well as his own professional reputation has to reconcile certain new data with current expert opinions with which the new data is grossly inconsistent).

In planning and writing content-centered social studies values dilemmas, teachers may decide to take a situation or event from the subject matter their students are currently studying and develop this context.

Teachers have available a number of relatively content-free and non-subject matter directed “values clarification strategies” which have been proposed as being applicable for classroom use (Simon, Howe, and Kirschenbaum, 1972). One element which makes some of these strategies “content-oriented” is the use of Fact, Concepts, and Values questions (Harmin, Kirschenbaum, and Simon, 1969). However, “values dilemmas” place much greater stress on the direct use of social studies related content and on the comprehension of this content as an integral part of decision-making than do most available values clarification materials. They also require that students use certain types of verbal statements in their oral responses as evidence that the activities are, in fact, doing the task they were developed to do.
around one of the five settings just described. They may decide to start with one of these five settings and identify a situation in their subject matter content which would illustrate the particular values/moral setting selected. Or, teachers may develop a contrived problem or dilemma based upon a real life situation or condition which may cut across two or more of these settings.

As teachers work with these five settings, they soon realize that it is virtually impossible to plan a values dilemma which when students react to it will get the one values/moral setting originally selected. For this reason, these five settings provide only a convenient frame of reference to help in the planning and writing stages of values dilemmas. They are not absolute categories which teachers must rigidly adhere to as they develop and use these activities. In any case, the final decisions as to which context, content, and setting are appropriate rest on the specific subject matter content, processes, and values/moral learnings the individual social studies teacher chooses to emphasize.

**Formats of the Values Dilemma**

Once the focus, context, content, and setting have been considered, an additional step is to decide what type of problem solving procedures the students should use as they respond to and work through the activity. Each of the five formats or types of values dilemmas introduced here emphasizes different decision-making and problem-solving procedures, processes, and types of outcomes. One format, the Standard Format, requires relatively simple reaction behaviors to follow-up questions while the others require increasingly more complex thinking and decision-making procedures. It is therefore possible for teachers to plan and write values dilemmas for the social studies which require students to use several very different types of decision-making processes.

These formats also serve to identify the role of the teacher during the time students are responding to the activity in class. Teachers may develop values dilemmas where their follow-up discussion questions are the sole determiner of the success or failure of the activity (again the Standard Format). These questions serve to direct students to use specific thinking and reasoning processes as they react to a given content resource or situation (see Figure 2). Teachers may want to develop values dilemmas where the directions and instructions needed to guide student thinking in specific ways are built into the context of the activity itself (i.e., the remaining formats). These particular values dilemmas tend to free the teacher from becoming actively involved in the discussion of the values dilemma as students are reaching a decision within large or small group settings. After these other formats, teachers will want to use follow up questions to review the major points the students were to understand, the decisions which they made, and the reasoning they used as they worked their way through the activity. These different formats provide the teacher the opportunity to develop a wide range of decision-making skills in students. They also allow for the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conceptual Thinking</th>
<th>Relational Thinking</th>
<th>Reasoning Thinking</th>
<th>Consequential Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empirical Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comparative Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relational Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impressive Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the text, in what year did the Battle of Troy take place?</td>
<td>How are these two religious groups alike?</td>
<td>How is this reading tied to our study of “How our economy works?”</td>
<td>What ought to be done to continual violators of our anti-pollution laws?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the name of the current Secretary of State?</td>
<td>In what ways are these two newspaper accounts alike?</td>
<td>How is this interpretation of the assassination related to the evidence we reviewed yesterday?</td>
<td>What should we do to make sure the ERA Amendment passes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From your notes in class yesterday, what were the three major causes of the Civil War?</td>
<td>Is this graph similar to the chart you see on page 14 of the text?</td>
<td>In what ways is this article connected to our study of prison reform?</td>
<td>What should the government do to stop people from smoking?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is the author of the book <em>Roots</em>?</td>
<td>How is Darwin’s theory different from that of Velikovsky’s?</td>
<td>How are these two events related to the final surrender of the Japanese?</td>
<td>What should schools do to teachers who refuse to serve on jury duty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what year was the Magna Charta signed by King John?</td>
<td>Which of these two candidates has more financial support?</td>
<td>In what ways might this proposed environmental education program be related to what we are already doing in this course?</td>
<td>What should Congress do to stop the high rate of inflation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the three branches of our Federal Government?</td>
<td>How are these two governments different from one another?</td>
<td>How is this research finding different from that reported in the latest <em>Time</em> article?</td>
<td>If you were head of the FBI, what would you demand be done to stop Communism from spreading in the U. S.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to the radio report, what political party won the most seats in the new Parliament election in England?</td>
<td>How is this research finding associated with the results of your own research in this course?</td>
<td>In their approaches to this question, how are these 2 historians alike?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2. Types of questions likely to get students to use patterns of statements associated with Conceptual, Relational, and Reasoning thinking.*
teacher to become involved as directly or indirectly in the activities as s/he would like. A teacher can develop values dilemmas which can increase or decrease his/her own continual active involvement in the activity as it is being used in the classroom. So, teachers who lack strong discussion and questioning skills can actually design values dilemmas which minimize their need to use these behaviors in the classroom. However, regardless of which format is selected for use, the activity as students respond to it must get them to use statements which indicate Conceptual, Relational, Valuation, and (eventually) Reflective thinking.

**Figure 3.** An example of the Standard Format of the Values Dilemma.

**Investigating the Kennedy Assassination Puzzle**

The House Select Committee on Assassinations has begun its three months of public hearings of the murder of John F. Kennedy. The investigation for the first time will test the much-criticized findings of the Warren Commission, which reported in 1964 that the President apparently was killed by a lone assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald, in Dallas.

A major concern will be whether the House Committee, fraught in its early stages with internal dissension and public ridicule and limited by money shortage and the erosion of evidence, can provide credible answers to who killed Kennedy, whether or not they acted alone, and whether the federal agencies involved in the initial investigation did their jobs properly.

A month-long inquiry by a team of *New York Times* reporters disclosed that the House investigation has uncovered several startling new aspects of both cases. Yet, none of the new findings will lay to rest the suspicions of conspiracy in the deaths.

House investigators have "accoustical evidence" that contrasts sharply with the Warren Commission finding and for the first time gives some support to the suggestion there may have been at least two gunmen involved. This evidence was found from a tape recording made when a motorcycle police officer left his radio transmitter on during the motorcade attack on November 22, 1963. Under new accoustical analysis procedures, it appears to contain the sound of four separate shots. The Warren Commission concluded there were three and only three shots all of which were fired by Oswald.

The Commission also said that 2.3 seconds were required to operate the World War II bolt-action Italian rifle identified as the murder weapon. The sound of the apparent fourth shot on the tape comes only 1.4 seconds after the third round. This time span makes it virtually impossible for the fourth shot to have come from Oswald's rifle.

Even under the best of circumstances, the investigation will be difficult. Kennedy has been dead for fifteen years. Evidence has been lost, destroyed or covered up. Numerous witnesses have since died or their stories are inflated by time, publicity, and retelling.

Though many in government and the public arena at least give "lip service" to a desire to "know the truth" about the assassinations, more than one group or segment may feel uncomfortable with new conclusions and full disclosures. For instance, the FBI and the Central Intelligence Agency may face very embarrassing revelations about their failures to prevent Kennedy's death or to in-
vestigate it fully. The Kennedy family is privately uncomfortable about facing long public hearings that may dredge up new criticisms of Kennedy when he was alive.

Meanwhile, due to the apparent strength of the new evidence which has been found, the Committee has asked for additional funds to continue investigating several of its better leads.


1. According to the article, what Committee of Congress will begin hearings on the Kennedy assassination?

2. On what day was President John F. Kennedy killed?

3. What are three factors which will work against the Committee in its attempts to uncover the “truth?”

4. How does the number of shots found in the accoustical evidence differ from the number reported in the Warren Commission Report?

5. In what ways would the tasks of the Warren Commission and the House Select Committee be alike?

6. Why would the reactions of the Kennedy family and the FBI to the new investigation be similar to one another?

7. How is this reading tied to our study of “How Our Federal System of Government Works?”

8. How is the work of the House Select Committee related to the work Congress is assigned to do by our Constitution?

9. Should Congress vote more money to support the investigations of the House Select Committee on Assassinations?

10. What must be done to end the talk that more than one person was involved in the assassination of President Kennedy?

11. Is it good that the Government is still spending money to study this particular assassination?

12. When should the Government stop spending money on such projects?

13. If you were a member of the Kennedy family, would you want to find out the “truth” about the assassination?

14. If evidence were found by the Committee to positively prove that at least two men fired shots at Kennedy, would this restore your “faith” in our Government?

15. If Congress finds no new evidence of a conspiracy, should the Supreme Court as third division of our Federal Government begin its own investigation?
The guidelines for constructing each of the formats are below. They provide an introduction to how the context and content of a values dilemma need to be developed to ensure that the particular decision-making procedures and processes have the greatest chance of taking place as students respond to the activity in the classroom.

The *Standard Format*. The Standard Format provides students with a resource which focuses their attention and a series of follow-up questions to which they are to respond (see Figure 3). The resource may be a textbook reading, poem, speech, cartoon, newspaper article, recording demonstration, experiment, graph, or any other material which may provide some content related to the focus of the lesson. This resource is followed by a series of questions designed to get students to write out answers which reveal they have some knowledge of the content of the resource, see how the content is related to the focus of the activity or lesson, and made some decisions and judgments about the content of the resource. *As a general rule*, it is suggested the resource included in the Standard Format be followed by at least four Conceptual, two Relational, and four Valuation-type questions. These questions should be used as springboards upon which to guide the discussion which follows the students’ responses. The Standard Format allows students to explore their values and feelings in a relatively non-threatening environment and to gain familiarity and security in dealing with personal values and feelings as integral aspects of learning and knowing.

The *Forced Choice Format*. The Forced Choice Format provides students with a situation where a major character or group is forced to make a decision and where the alternatives available to them are: (a) all specifically identified; (b) limited in number; (c) either all “good” or all “undesirable” options; (d) all stated within the activity and contest itself; and (3) the only alternatives from which a choice can be made (see Figure 4). In short, the context of the values dilemma is written so that students are placed in a situation where they are forced to make a choice and forced to choose from a limited number of given options (usually three to six). In all cases the context explains why a student’s refusal to make a decision puts the matter out of his/her hands and increases the risks of a worse consequence than any of the options which are available. At the same time, the context makes it clear that for students to consider other options is unacceptable and a waste of time. Hence, students are required to pick only one option and once selected, they lose all the other alternative choices. The Forced-Choice Format focuses on those situations where individuals may have to make a choice from among a limited number of almost equally attractive or almost equally unattractive alternatives. This format offers students the opportunity to engage in activities that not only allow them to make decisions in forced-choice situations, but also helps them to realize that in some cases, the selection of one option costs the individual all the others which at one time were open to him/her.
Give Them Reservations Or Give Them Death

You are a citizen in the Arizona Territory. The year is 1865. You have lived in the area for many years and you know the Indians well. During this time, you have seen Indians attack the settlers and you have seen Indians being attacked by soldiers.

The first territorial governor, John N. Goodwin, has come to you for help. The governor has just come back from a horseback tour of the Arizona Territory. Everywhere he went he found deserted mines, burned-out ranches, and abandoned farms. People were screaming that the government had to protect their lives and property from the Indians.

General James H. Carleton, a soldier and an Indian fighter, has proposed a plan. General Carleton’s plan says:

(1) All Indians will be sent to reservations immediately.
(2) All Indians who will not leave will be forced to go.
(3) All Indians who refuse to go to the reservations will be treated as enemies and hunted down.

The governor is concerned about the treatment of the Indians and the problems of the settlers. The governor does not know what to do about General Carleton’s plan. Should he accept the plan? Should he reject the plan? The governor wants to do the best he can for all of the people.

For this activity you are a member of the governor’s advisory board on Indian affairs. Your task and the task of the group is to decide whether or not the governor should accept General Carleton’s plan.

In order to help you make this important decision, you are holding an open hearing. Four people will speak with you and give you some information and their opinions.

The four people at the hearing are:

(1) General James H. Carleton. He will present the military point of view and the reasons for his plan.
(2) Tom Jeffords. Called “Red Whiskers” by the Indians, this man is the blood brother of the Indian Chief Cochise.
(3) Kit Carson. This scout and Indian fighter will give his opinions on reservations and present the Indian affairs point of view.
(4) Adeline Grey. As one of the first settlers in the Salt River Valley, she will present the point of view upon which she says our country was founded.
INFORMATION AND OPINION SHEET

Directions: The information and opinions provided by these people should be carefully considered before you make your decision. Although you may not agree with some statements, you should carefully discuss all statements with members of your group before you make your group decision.

GENERAL JAMES H. CARLETON - His points include:

(a) Order must be maintained at all costs.
(b) The Indians are savages. They don’t wear clothes. They don’t speak English.
(c) The Indians attack the settlers and destroy property.
(d) The settlers need the land for farming, ranching, and mining.
(e) Indians do not obey the law. They can’t be trusted.
(f) The only way the white settlers can stay in Arizona is to destroy the Indian.

TOM JEFFORDS - His points include:

(a) The Indians farmed the land and made homes long before the settlers came.
(b) Indians live at peace with Nature. Their lives are simple.
(c) The whites are brutal. They attack villages and kill women and children.
(d) The land belongs to everyone and everyone should be free to use it.
(e) The white man breaks treaties when he wants to. He does not keep his word.
(f) The ways of the Indian are not bad. Indian ways are different than the white ways.

ADELINE GREY - Her points include:

(a) All people deserve equal rights.
(b) This country values freedom. The Indians are free people.
(c) If forced to live on reservations, Indians will be denied liberty and the pursuit of happiness.
(d) Killing is wrong.
(e) If treated with understanding, Indians can become good citizens.
(f) Our country was founded on individualism and the rights of the individual.

KIT CARSON - His points include:

(a) Indians will be easy to manage on the reservations. They can be controlled.
(b) We need the best land. Reservation land might not be good, but Indians don't need land anyway.
(c) Because of their savage nature, we must have complete control of Indians.
(d) Indians will receive food and blankets.
(e) Indians may not leave the reservations.
(f) Indians are like little children and animals. They have to be taken care of or they will get into trouble.
Directions: Members of your group are to agree to accept or reject General Carleton's Plan. You should seek some basis for agreement. This means that you are not to vote. Instead you must reach a common conclusion that all members of your group are willing to defend.

General Carleton's Plan

(1) All Indians will be sent to reservations immediately.
(2) All Indians who will not leave will be forced to go.
(3) All Indians who refuse to go to the reservations will be treated as enemies and hunted down.

What reason might you have for accepting or stopping General Carleton's Plan?

What might happen by your voting to accept or reject General Carleton's Plan?

Please check ('m') the box to indicate your decision.

☐ WE ACCEPT GENERAL CARLETON'S PLAN
   General Carleton should proceed at once

☐ WE REJECT GENERAL CARLETON'S PLAN
   General Carleton should be stopped at once

If asked for the reasons for making this decision, we would say

__________________________________________________________________________________

The possible good things that might happen because of this decision are

__________________________________________________________________________________

The possible bad things that might happen because of this decision are

__________________________________________________________________________________
The **Affirmative Format.** The Affirmative Format provides students with a situation where a major character or group is forced to make a decision and the person or group is free to make any decision which is consistent with the given situation. Students may be presented with some possible alternative options and may reject them all. They may combine some of those given to form an option they like better than any one of those provided. In other words, students are free to select or invent any appropriate decision they wish to make in order to respond to and resolve the situation before them. For this reason, the Affirmative Format is often referred to as the "open-ended" or "free-response" format. This format helps prepare students for decision-making situations where they have a great deal of flexibility in what decision(s) they can make.

The **Rank Order Format.** The Rank Order Format provides students with a situation where a major character or group is forced to make a decision and where the alternatives available are listed. Students are informed that the only options they can choose are those provided and that each option is mutually exclusive. In this format, the person or group is deliberately made aware that their first choice may not be available at the time it is needed or may not work to resolve the problem. Thus, the person or group’s second ranked choice will be checked as to its availability or effectiveness. This procedure will be followed for all available options (usually 4 to 9) until the situation is settled or resolved. The fact that students are made aware that their choices will be considered as ranked is important. When activities are written so that students perceive that their top ranked choice will work or will be obtained, they pay little real attention to the ranking of the remaining options. The procedure recommended here merely guarantees that students are always selecting the top option from the remaining alternatives all the way down to the final pair of options to be rank ordered.

This format makes students consider the relative value of a number of nearly identical options to one another such that they assign a specific rank number (e.g., “1” to indicate First, “2” to indicate Second, etc.) to each option. To be most effective, this activity requires that the context informs students that the item ranked Number “1” may not be available and thus the item they rank Number “2” must be selected with care. This procedure will be followed until the highest ranked option still available or which works is located.

The **Classification Format.** The Classification Format provides students with a situation where a major character or group is forced to make a decision and where the alternatives available are listed. However, in this format, the person or group is forced to divide the alternatives into three specific categories or classes of options (i.e., alternatives which are most desirable, least desirable, and those not included in either of these two classes). Thus, the persons or groups described in the contest are forced into a compromising or bargaining position where
they are to identify what they want most to obtain and what they are most willing to give up in order to secure their preferred choices. In writing this format, the person or group featured must be instructed to sort the listed alternatives (usually 9 to 15) into the three classes or groups described above.

This format makes students consider the relative value of alternatives in situations where they have to give up something in order to gain, preserve, or protect other things they value more highly. As a result, students use and refine compromise, bargaining, and negotiation skills necessary in many everyday life situations.

**Options Available in Developing Values Dilemmas**

Given that the teacher can plan and write values dilemmas from the perspective of a particular focus, contextual situation, specific content area, point of view, values/moral setting, and format structure, the range of activities which can be constructed is almost limitless (see [Figure 5](#)).

![Figure 5](#) An illustration of the nearly unlimited options which are available to plan and develop social-studies-oriented values dilemmas.
This article has introduced specific guidelines which social studies teachers may wish to follow in developing activities designed to enhance the subject matter comprehension, the decision-making skills, and the values/moral clarification and reasoning processes of their students. Taking these suggestions, teachers can free themselves from their dependence on expensive commercially-produced values/moral education materials and activities and start creating their own episodes for their own particular classroom needs and students. They may also use these suggestions to make better use of the curriculum material they already possess.

**Conclusion**

Social studies education requires that individuals learn to deal effectively with both the cognitive and affective components of the personality (Ehman, 1977; NCSS, 1979; Tucker, 1977). Therefore students ought to learn how to use various decision-making and problem-solving processes while comprehending and applying content-related data. They must also learn to clarify, understand, use, and reflect upon their values and moral reasons in light of real and possible events and situations (Fraenkel, 1973, 1977; Metcalf, 1971; Oliver & Shaver, 1966). Only when value/moral choices are considered in light of objective data and feedback can one expect logical reasoning and rational decision abilities to result. The revised NCSS Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines (NCSS, 1979) concur with all of these arguments. Using content-centered values dilemmas based upon the approach described here offers social studies teachers the means to achieve their diverse goals.

As presented here, teachers have available a strategy whereby they can incorporate social studies content to construct problem-solving situations cutting across different value/moral settings and requiring different types of decision-making processes. By following the recommendations suggested here, teachers can effectively meet both their cognitive and affective social education objectives at a time when many see this as being impossible.
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Ethnography, once described as “the best kept secret in behavioral research,” has moved out of the social science closet and into the classroom. Shaver and Larkins (*Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, 1973*), among others, have encouraged the use of ethnographic research because, they argue, the nature of many current research problems does not lend itself to hypothesis testing and statistical analysis. They have suggested that ethnographic research may help “tease out the complicated relationship” between teachers, pupils and their environment which so pervasively influences instruction.

The expressed goal of *Learning Lessons* is to present a description of the relationships, interactions and social organization of classroom instruction by using a form of observational field research which is referred to as “constitutive ethnography.” The author attempts to explain the formation and development of school behaviors that form the social structure around which academic learning is woven. Basic to the research design of constitutive ethnography is the notion that social structures are the products of human interactions. It is argued that what are typically accepted as “objective social facts,” such as academic achievement, and routine classroom behaviors, such as “positive discipline,” for example, are social structures which are defined, created, and sustained by the verbal and non-verbal exchanges of teachers and students. A constitutive ethnography describes the social interactions in the classroom and analyzes the social structures and the consequent behaviors which are produced.
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Ethnography, once described as “the best kept secret in behavioral research,” has moved out of the social science closet and into the classroom. Shaver and Larkins (*Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, 1973*), among others, have encouraged the use of ethnographic research because, they argue, the nature of many current research problems does not lend itself to hypothesis testing and statistical analysis. They have suggested that ethnographic research may help “tease out the complicated relationship” between teachers, pupils and their environment which so pervasively influences instruction.

The expressed goal of *Learning Lessons* is to present a description of the relationships, interactions and social organization of classroom instruction by using a form of observational field research which is referred to as “constitutive ethnography.” The author attempts to explain the formation and development of school behaviors that form the social structure around which academic learning is woven. Basic to the research design of constitutive ethnography is the notion that social structures are the products of human interactions. It is argued that what are typically accepted as “objective social facts,” such as academic achievement, and routine classroom behaviors, such as “positive discipline,” for example, are social structures which are defined, created, and sustained by the verbal and non-verbal exchanges of teachers and students. A constitutive ethnography describes the social interactions in the classroom and analyzes the social structures and the consequent behaviors which are produced.

Mehan analyzes the interactions which take place during the teaching of nine classroom lessons taught during one school year. The class is a combined first-second-third grade class in San Diego composed of an equal number of black and Mexican-American students. The neighborhood in which the school is located is described as urban and “in transition.” The teacher of the lessons is Prof. Courtney Cazden who spent the year away from the Harvard Graduate School of Education to work in a primary classroom. Prof. Cazden volunteered for the study and wrote an introduction to the book.

*Learning Lessons* draws attention to the nature of classroom discussions and the routine procedures for speaking in class. There are, for example, discrete, three-part interactional sequences characterized by initiation (teacher asks a question), reply (student responds to teacher’s question), and evaluation (teacher judges adequacy of student reply). The differences between everyday speech and school speech are also noted. Mehan notes, for example, that only in schools is the speech of adults characterized by an evaluation component that ends a particular interaction with someone else.

Mehan details the creation of the tacit rule structure which governs the social interactions of the classroom. The longitudinal nature of the study indicates that significant social learning does take place over the course of the year. Mehan argues that it is important for students to exhibit this social learning because success in school includes not only the mastery of academic content but also the classroom rules which allow students to demonstrate their knowledge in socially approved ways. Competent membership in the classroom community, he writes, “involves weaving academic knowledge and interactional skills together like strands of rope, providing factually correct content in the interactionally correct form.

Mehan’s findings are not startling, nor should they be. One of the goals of ethnographic research is to present information that the participant in the social investigation may know but is not able to articulate or explain. The strength of these studies, as in much social research, lies not in the ability to present new information but to provide fresh insights and offer new explanations for the commonplace but unnoticed data of everyday life.

*Learning Lessons* is valuable for the detailed descriptions it provides and for the interesting model of ethnographic classroom research it proposes. Mehan is an experienced ethnographer but his best writing on the methodology appears elsewhere (see, Mehan and Wood, *The Reality of Ethnomethodology*, 1975). This is unfortunate because the shift in research emphasis from quantified studies using a psychological base to qualified studies using a sociological/anthropological base is new in school settings and warrants further elaboration and justification. There is a new enthusiasm for field research methods in education but one needs to be critical in the selection of methodology and the research problem investigated. As Mehan’s work indicates, field research is not
one design but several, each with its own specific strengths and applications. In addition to constitutive ethnography, field research in school settings has included microethnography, participant observation, and a host of observation and interaction scaling techniques. While the literature of sociology and anthropology evidences a growing skepticism about field research (see, Lewis A. Coser, "Two Methods in Search of a Substance." American Sociological Review, 40: 691-700, and Mehan's reply, "De-Secting Ethnomethodology. The American Sociologist, 11:13-21), educational researchers appear to be far less sophisticated in the use of the methodology and far less critical of its merits.

Mehan's work reflects both the strengths and weaknesses of the methodology. Field researchers typically strive for unique descriptions of a social setting which are not available by other means. Mehan has done this. His descriptions are interesting and meticulous. Drawing on the data contained in the videotaped lessons and placing them in the context of linguistic analysis and social interaction theory, he presents a clear picture of classroom interactions. It is fresh in its focus and persuasive in its analysis. Ethnography, however, is supposed to go beyond description and become a hypothesis generating device which opens new avenues for study and investigation. Very few ethnographic studies have been able to do this. Ethnographic studies need replication (they, indeed, may not stand up without replication) and need to be supported by appropriate statistical research. Many of the variables which Mehan and other ethnographers identify could be further investigated using standard quantitative measures but ethnographers are often so critical of experimental research that they fail to acknowledge the potential benefit of combined ethnographic and statistical techniques. While educational research may have depended too long on studies which measure the covariance of isolated factors, the complex nature of research problems in schools demands all of our research skills.
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