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Correction

In the Winter, 1982 issue of TRSE, Volume 9, Number 4, the article “Culture and Rationality in Frankfurt School Thought,” by Henry A. Giroux, contained a number of typographic errors, for which TRSE apologizes. A major error occurred on page 30, where a significant segment of a sentence was omitted. It is reproduced here with emphasis on the portion omitted.

“In the ongoing debate over theory and empirical work, the same old dualisms appear, though in recycled forms, in which one presupposes the exclusion of the other. One manifestation of this debate is the criticism that the Frankfurt School rejected the value of empirical work, a criticism that is also being lodged currently against many educational critics who have drawn upon the work of the Frankfurt School.”
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A Validation Study of the Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale

Charles S. White
Indiana University

The field of the social studies has long suffered from conflicting definitions, an overlapping of functions, and a confusion of philosophies. These variations have resulted not so much from errors and mistakes as in diffusion and weakness. They have introduced uncertainties; they have perpetuated indecision; they have hindered unification; they have delayed progress. (Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1978, p. iv)

Thus did the late Edgar Wesley characterize the ongoing, and seemingly endless, quest for a definition of social studies on which a unified field could be built. Surveying the academic landscape from his unique vantage point, Wesley found what he believed was the most promising definitional effort in the work of Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. In the November 1970 issue of Social Education, Barth and Shermis proposed that the social studies be perceived in terms of three historical traditions: social studies as Citizenship Transmission (CT), as Social Science (SS), and as Reflective Inquiry (RI). The most detailed presentations of the three-traditions proposal appeared several years later in Defining the Social Studies (1977) and in The Nature of the Social Studies (1978), when Barr joined the effort.

Barr, Barth and Shermis based their proposal on a meticulous analysis of social studies documents spanning nearly a century, following trends in purposes, methods and content. The result, reported in the 1977 text, was a description of the social studies consisting of three distinct, competing and antagonistic philosophies, represented in Table 1. Beyond this, the authors proposed that current teaching practices, as heirs to these philosophies, can be classified similarly, as suggested by the central thesis of their 1978 effort:

The authors have identified at least three separate and distinct social studies traditions and have argued that teachers tend to teach in predictable ways; that these predictable ways form patterns, and that these patterns can be understood and interpreted (p. 18).
Table 1: Description of the Three Traditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Studies Taught as Citizenship Transmission</th>
<th>Social Studies Taught as Social Science</th>
<th>Social Studies Taught as Reflective Inquiry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td>Citizenship is best promoted by inculcating right values as a framework for making decisions.</td>
<td>Citizenship is best promoted by decision making based on mastery of social science concepts, processes, and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Transmission: Transmission of concepts and values by such techniques as textbook, recitation, lecture, question and answer sessions, and structured problem-solving exercises.</td>
<td>Discovery: Each of the social sciences has its own method of gathering and verifying knowledge. Students should discover and apply the method that is appropriate to each social science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Content is selected by an authority interpreted by the teacher and has the function of illustrating values, beliefs, and attitudes.</td>
<td>Proper content is the structure, concepts, problems, and processes of both the separate and the integrated social science disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


On the assumption that a correspondence between historical tradition and current practices exists, Barr, Barth and Shermis concluded their 1978 text with the Social Studies Preference Scale, developed and administered over several years by Barth and William R. Norris. Those who completed the scale would discover by which tradition their teaching might be classified and the degree of consistency inherent in their own purposes, methods and content of instruction.
Purpose

Confidence in the descriptive powers of the three-traditions thesis is highly dependent on whether the instrument that purports to measure its essential features is statistically reliable and valid. Though employed in studies for nearly five years, no reliability or validity evidence has appeared elsewhere in the literature. This study addresses this important question: What evidence is there that the Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale is a reliable and valid instrument by which to measure teaching orientations?

The Preference Scale

The instrument used for this study is the fourth and most current edition of the Barth-Shermis Scale, composed of 45 Likert-type items. Possible responses ranged from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). Each of the three dimensions of the conceptualization is represented by a discrete set of 15 items randomly intermingled with the other items. Of these 15, 5 items refer to purpose, 5 to method, and 5 to content. The structure of the scale is represented in Table 2.

Procedures and Methods of Analysis

Sample. A questionnaire was distributed to 190 secondary-school social studies teachers, grades 7–12, in six Midwest and New England school districts. Of the 91 returned (48%), one was discarded due to excessive missing data, leaving a final sample size of 90.

Questionnaire. The questionnaire contained a total of 92 items: seven background items, 45 items of the Preference Scale, and the 40-item Rokeach Dogmatism Scale; the latter scale was referred to as the “Companion Opinion Scale” in the questionnaire in order to avoid any possible negative impacts of its true title on respondents. Completion time of the entire instrument was approximately 45 minutes.

Measurement of Reliability. Internal consistency was assessed using Cron-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Item Structure of the Barth-Shermis Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Transmission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bach's alpha coefficient. Alphas were generated for each of the column di-

mensions (CT, SS, RI), the row dimensions (Purpose, Method, Content), the cell dimensions (CT Purpose, SS Method, RI Content, etc.), and for the Rokeach scale.

Content Validity. A content validity instrument was given to a panel of nine social studies experts, including four professors and five doctoral students. The latter had had instruction in the three traditions, and all panelists were provided with a copy of Table 1. The panel was asked to complete the following tasks: (a) sort the 45 Preference Scale items into three groups, one for each tradition, (b) for each item placed under a tradition, rate that item's "fittedness" within that tradition on a five-point scale, (c) sort the 45 items again, but in terms of purpose, method and content, and (d) comment on the quality of individual items and note any characteristics of the three traditions not addressed by scale items.

Construct Validity. Factor analysis. Preference Scale items were factor analyzed initially using a procedure to force the generation of three orthogonal factors, based on the claim of three distinct traditions. Further analysis explored solutions involving greater and lesser numbers of factors, as well as oblique rotation.

Correlation with another construct. The Rokeach dogmatism scale will measure an external construct by which to assess individual dimensions of the Preference Scale. The former instrument contains 40 Likert-type items calling for forced-choice responses ranging from +3 ("I agree very strongly") to -3 ("I disagree very strongly").

In the 21 years since Milton Rokeach created it, the Dogmatism Scale has been administered to a wide spectrum of people, including university students, teachers and public school students. Rokeach found Form E of the scale, used in this study, to have a reliability coefficient between .68 and .93, using the odd-even method corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula (1960, p. 89). This study found Cronbach alpha coefficient of .87 (N = 87). The scale was validated by Rokeach through a variety of Known Group experiments. Vacchiano, Strauss and Hockman (1969) and Ehrlich and Lee (1969) reviewed a large number of studies that used the Dogmatism Scale and agreed that the findings, though not conclusive, did tend to confirm Rokeach's theory of dogmatism as a generalized cognitive condition.

The Rokeach scale was an attempt to extend the work of T. W. Adorno, who had developed the Fascism Scale (F-scale) measuring right-wing authoritarianism (Adorno, 1950). The Dogmatism Scale focuses upon general authoritarianism, free from specific right-wing or left-wing content. It is designed to measure how open or closed is an individual's belief system. According to Rokeach, this quality is the "extent to which the person can receive, evaluate, and act on relevant information received from the outside
on its own merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation arising from within the person or from the outside" (p. 57). Low-dogmatism people, those with open belief systems, differ from high-dogmatism people in a number of qualities. Marker (1970) summed up the low-dogmatic person as one who:

sees the world as a more friendly place, does not depend as much on absolute authority, and evaluates other persons less on the basis of the authorities they line up with and more on the authorities' cognitive correctness, accuracy, and consistency with other information he has about the world. (p. 20)

Conversely, high-dogmatic people, with closed belief systems, display greater resistance to change in their beliefs and diminished ability to synthesize new beliefs into a new belief system (Marker, 1970). Dogmatic individuals also tend to display limited pre-decision search patterns when confronted with a problem, rather than reserving judgement until further information is gathered (Long & Ziller, 1965).

Given the characterizations of the three traditions represented in Table 1, the Dogmatism Scale was deemed appropriate to test a number of hypotheses relevant to the Preference Scale's validity.

Inter-dimensional correlation. Scores on each dimension should correlate, and not correlate, in predictable ways if construct validity is to be supported.

Patterns of substantive findings. Indications of validity can be observed when substantive findings from a number of studies tend to replicate. Specifically, percentages of respondents adhering to each of the three traditions or combinations thereof will be compared. These findings should be similar across studies that use the Barth-Shermis Preference Scale.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. There will be a significant positive correlation between level of dogmatism and score on the CT dimension.

A number of characteristics fundamental to the CT tradition have been found to be prevalent among high dogmatic individuals. In a study of college students, Zagona and Zurcher (1964) discovered that high scorers on the dogmatism scale preferred the lecture mode of presentation as well as objective, structured examinations—two hallmarks of CT method. Barr, Barth and Shermis make reference to the connection between CT and lecture in their discussions of CT method:

The authors, as well as others, have also examined many types of televised classroom discussions. By applying the Flanders Interaction Scale, it is possible to discern what we call a 54835 pattern. This is "lec-
ture," "ask questions," "student response to question," "response to student," "lecture." From this extremely common practice, we acquired the data on which we based our interpretation (1977, Footnote 2, p. 71).

Reliance on authority, a characteristic of CT content, also appears to be related to dogmatism. Kemp (1965) observed that high-dogmatic people tend to idealize authority, while Kirscht and Dillehay (1967) commented:

Through a structurally closed system of beliefs and disbeliefs, the highly dogmatic person defends himself against anxiety by reliance on authority and sharp, categorical rejection of beliefs not consonant with his established values (p. 46).

In their extensive discussion of this tradition, Barr, Barth and Shermis appear to support the view that, on the whole, CT teachers tend to be dogmatic. Observe the authors' description of the desired ends of citizenship transmission:

The end effect of much Citizenship Transmission is distortion—intended or unintended. Complexities are glossed over, issues are not acknowledged, problems are omitted—very often as a deliberate policy on the part of publishers or State or local curriculum committees. After 12 years of schooling, students tend to grow into an uncritical admiration for American history, ideals, celebrities, and institutions. So important is it to convey or support a particular point of view that the undeniable difficulties of our existence are denied. (1978, p. 62)

Citizenship transmission, the dominant mode of teaching, "is the uncritical transmission of selected ideals and beliefs" (p. 63). Core values "are not merely good because someone thinks they are. They are good. And they demand our allegiance" (1977, p. 85). Clearly, there is not much room in the Barr, Barth and Shermis conceptualization for the open-minded teacher.

Hypothesis 2. There will be a significant negative correlation between level of dogmatism and score on the RI dimension.

If one could place CT at one end of a philosophical continuum, RI would surely occupy the opposite end. "Reflective Inquirers formulated their position in large part as a reaction to the Transmission tradition" (Barr et al., 1978, p. 27). Hypothesis Two, then, makes intuitive sense, as Marker (1970) observed:

It seemed deceptively obvious that highly dogmatic teachers should be less successful than low dogmatic teachers when asked to perform the role of the inquiry teacher. Inquiry requires that the teacher encourage autonomy on the part of his students and to accept the products of student thinking. Such methodology should cause considerable dissonance within the dogmatic teacher's personality. (p. 47)
A number of studies tend to confirm that dogmatic people lack qualities important to an inquiry teaching role. Massialas, Freitag and Sweeney (1969) found that high-dogmatic respondents have more difficulty distinguishing fact from opinion than low-dogmatic individuals. Hunt and Metcalf (1968) observed that the minds of closed-minded teachers are "not open to reflective inquiry, insecurity prevents entertaining doubt concerning traditional views, and hence any effective thought about how problem solving might proceed" (p. 23).

**Hypothesis 3.** There will be no correlation between level of dogmatism and score on the SS dimension.

On the one hand, a teacher's reliance on the structure, content and methodology of the social sciences may be indicative of an overarching reliance on authority in general, a characteristic associated with high dogmatism. On the other hand, the thought processes required of both students and teachers in the SS tradition do seem to demand a degree of open-mindedness more common among low-dogmatic people. The anticipation of no correlation reflects this rather ambiguous picture.

**Hypothesis 4.** As the two most starkly opposing traditions, the CT and RI dimensions will be significantly negatively correlated.

**Hypothesis 5.** Since the three traditions have been portrayed as antagonistic, one would be surprised to find any significant positive correlations; where present, such correlation will be negligible.

**Limitations**

The nature of the sample raises a number of difficulties that must be addressed. While the size of the sample ($N = 90$) impacts most acutely on the factor analyses, the 48% return rate adds weight to the suggestion of sampling bias. The low return rate can be traced to the largest of the six participating school districts. Teachers there were not only facing school closings and personnel reductions, but were also in the midst of preparing for court-ordered busing, part of a racial desegregation plan commencing in the fall of 1981. The administrator who distributed the questionnaire was not surprised by the low return (25%) and felt that efforts to pursue non-respondents would be ill-advised and unfruitful, under the circumstances. Despite the low return, respondents from the district constituted 22% of the final sample. Thus, while excluding that district from analysis would have raised the overall rate of return to 64.5%, the sample would be reduced to 70 cases, an unacceptable trade-off. Moreover, there are reasons to be confident that sampling bias has not been significant. First, three characteristics of the sample are similar to comparable characteristics of respondents in the recent NCSS profile of 409 secondary social studies teachers (Note 1): average age (White $= 39.7$, NCSS $= “31–41”$), average years of teaching experience (White $=
14.9, NCSS = “10-14”), and NCSS membership (White = 17.9%, NCSS = 16.4%). Second, the overall results reported in this study are remarkably similar to those of a study based on a larger and random sample of social studies teachers (Andres, 1981).

Aside from the nature of the sample, the occurrence of missing values presented a problem. One case was discarded, as noted earlier, for excessive blank responses prior to statistical analysis. Another three cases were excluded from analysis involving the Dogmatism Scale for the same reason, though those cases were retained for Preference Scale analysis. Nevertheless, occasional omissions persisted in some of the remaining cases. To avoid having to reduce the sample size further, and since the remaining blank responses seemed to be randomly distributed among the 85 items involved, it was decided that each blank item would be assigned a value representing respondent uncertainty. For the Preference Scale, an “uncertain” response alternative was provided in the design, so blanks were recoded to that value (3). No such alternative was provided in the Rokeach Scale, so a fictitious midpoint value was assigned to blanks (3.5). This approach to missing values may have depressed the levels of the reported correlations.

Results

Reliability. Table 3 presents the reliability coefficients for the various subscales of the Barth-Shermis instrument. For the traditions, reliability values are comparable to those reported by Bonar (1977). The purpose, method and content dimensions are somewhat less reliable, particularly for content (.54). The alphas for the cell subscales are much lower, ranging from .69 (RI Method) to .35 (RI Content).

Content Validity. Sort by tradition. Prior to analysis, a minimum level of agreement among experts (seven out of nine) was established, below which an item would be judged weak in content validity. All items attained or exceeded this level after sorting by the panel, and all were placed under the tradition for which they were intended. Moreover, item-to-tradition fittedness ranged from 1.25 to 3.00 (M = 1.55, SD = .37). Because 1.0 indi-
icates a very high degree of fit, this shows a strong to moderate item-to-tradition fittedness.

As a check on panel consistency, a Pearson product-moment correlation was run between item-fit rating and level of panel agreement on items in the sorting task. This yielded an $r = -0.61 (p < .001)$, indicating good panel consistency in evaluating the tradition dimensions.

**Sort by purpose, method and content.** Panel members found this a particularly difficult task, so much so that two were unable to complete it. Only 12 items achieved the a priori level of agreement. Panel comments noted that scale statements contain multiple elements; often, each element points to a different dimension. Item 1 is a good example of this: “The principle [sic] task of social studies should be to help students assess personal and social value conflicts [emphasis mine].” The first phrase points to a purpose, the second suggests both purpose and method, and phrase three connotes content. This might have been the source of frustration for one teacher-respondent who wrote, “When I disagree with a statement that has two parts, how do you know which part (or both) is offensive?”

**Panel comments.** Though generally satisfied with the scale, individual panel members did express some reservations. One concern focused on the issue of item representativeness. In its simplicity, noted one expert, the three traditions formulation failed to accurately reflect social studies teaching as it is really occurring in the classroom. Actual situations are more complex than suggested by any of the three traditions. Another panelist pointed to elements of the RI tradition that he believed were omitted from the instrument. For example, there was no apparent reference in the scale to “thinking for its own sake”; no items were included to tap the concepts of “participation” or “global perspectives,” whether as to purpose, method or content.

Representativeness is further questioned by the claim that unwarranted emphases were placed only on one particular aspect of the SS and RI traditions. According to one panel member, the method associated with the SS tradition is stereotyped and dated; very few people ever subscribed exclusively to the discovery method as the way to teach a social science. Regarding the RI tradition, a second panelist observed, “I feel I am being led into a trap—a particular concept of reflective inquiry which places the primary emphasis on the students’ perceptions of reality,” to the exclusion of other important elements of RI.

Two panel members also took issue with the claim that the three traditions are mutually exclusive in terms of purpose, methods and content. In the words of one judge:

> Several elements of teaching, learning, thinking can properly fit both SS and RI categories. Indeed, “reflective inquiry” is basic to the practice of SS. Science is a way of knowing that involved decision making, criti-
Table 4: Three-Factor Varimax Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(CT) Factor 1</th>
<th>(RI) Factor 2</th>
<th>(SS) Factor 3</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(CT) Factor 1</th>
<th>(RI) Factor 2</th>
<th>(SS) Factor 3</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cism and insight, too. SS is applied to analysis of social issues and problems. There is such a thing as “the policy studies.” On the other side, I would think it rather difficult to engage meaningfully in RI without a grasp of knowledge pertinent to a problem. The academic disciplines are the best sources of knowledge we have about the way the world is.

At the practical classroom level, a panelist noted, a great deal of teaching goes on that mixes and matches elements of the three traditions; the three traditions need not be an either/or proposition.
Summary of content validity findings. Aside from the reservations expressed in panel comments, the Barth-Shermis Scale performed well in representing the content of the three traditions, judging from high fittedness ratings, impressive levels of agreement, and panel consistency. On the other hand, the purpose/method/content dimensions were judged to be seriously deficient. Nearly two-thirds of the items failed to reach a minimal level of agreement. While supportive of the three traditions, then, these results cast serious doubts on the content validity of the scale's purpose, method and content components.

Construct Validity

Factor analysis. The results of factor analysis generating three factors with varimax rotation are presented in Table 4. Items are listed by the tradition for which they are intended. To the right of each item are its loadings on each factor. Factors are labeled by tradition, based on initial inspection of item loadings; loadings less than .20 were omitted for clarity. Finally, the communality ($h^2$) values are noted. Ideally, all 15 items within a dimension will load strongly on one and the same factor, will have a near zero loading on the other factors, and will have $h^2$ values approaching 1.00.

From the factor loadings, three sets of observations are in order. First, it must be noted that the dimensions represented by the factors were distinctly the traditions dimensions, not the purpose/method/content dimensions. An
additional varimax analysis forcing nine factors, representing the nine cell dimensions, yielded a pattern of item loadings unrelated to the pattern intended by the scale's designers. The judgments of the content validity panel, contending that the purpose/method/content dimensions are virtually unintelligible, seem to be supported by this result.

A second set of observations focuses on the adequacy of the factor solution for each tradition-dimension. CT emerges as most distinct among the traditions; 14 of the 15 CT items load on that factor as intended, while only one loads on a different factor. The solution for the SS and RI dimensions is less adequate, where nearly a third of each tradition's items load improperly. Pursuing the possibility that the dimensions are not strictly orthogonal, an oblique rotation was performed; however, the pattern of item loadings remained the same.

As one examines the items that fail to load on the expected factors, however, one can draw a third, and perhaps more interesting, set of observations. Two of the five SS items not loading on SS load instead on RI; for the RI factor three of the four improper loaders load on SS. Is it possible, then that the scale in fact has tapped only two dimensions—a CT dimension and a second dimension characterized by elements of both the RI and SS traditions?

To test the two-dimensional hypothesis, a varimax factor analysis was run, designed to generate only two factors. Table 5 summarizes the results. Note that 14 of the 15 CT items again loaded on a single factor (Factor 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items</td>
<td>(RI/SS)</td>
<td>(CT)</td>
<td>h²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Two-Factor Varimax Solution
Table 5: con’t

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>(RI/SS) Factor 1</th>
<th>(CT) Factor 2</th>
<th>h²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 1, labeled RI/SS, contains 14 of the 15 RI items, as well as 11 of the 15 SS items. Six items remain out of place, yet closer scrutiny provides a plausible explanation for these contrary loadings.

One quality that seems to distinguish the one misplaced CT item from four of the five RI/SS items is the extent of the student’s role in making curricular decisions. It appears that any item advocating the use of student ideas was automatically associated by respondents with the RI tradition. There were three such items in the scale, one for each tradition. Item 16, the “student ideas” item for RI, loads heavily, as expected, on the RI/SS factor.
it had also loaded strongly on the RI tradition in the three-factor solution (.67). Item 38, the SS version of item 16, loads most strongly on the RI/SS factor, as it should; yet in the three-factor, this SS item loaded on RI (.46). Item 12, the errant CT item, follows the same pattern as its SS and RI counterparts, loading on the RI/SS factor (.42) and on the RI factor in the three-factor solution (.69).

The wording of four misplaced RI/SS items, on the other hand, emphasizes the minor role students are to play in decisions on instructional content and method, while clearly suggesting the dominant role of authorities. Two of the four items had also loaded on the CT factor in the three-factor model: items 7 and 45. In the former, "social science scholars" are the authorities who "have agreed" upon the content for students to pursue. In the latter, the teacher decides on the content, the importance of which the student will perceive "in the future." The content validity panel commented on item 45 as well, noting its CT flavor; students are doubly alienated from content, both in terms of its selection and its current relevance or utility.

Items 6 and 16 continue the pattern of external authority in the determination of curricular priorities. In the first case, students are to use the "procedures and findings of social science authorities [emphasis mine]; in the second, "average persons" are characterized as being inappropriate determinants of content. That the reference here is to students is clear; that the item could be construed as CT is suggested as well by panel comments and by its substantial secondary loading on the CT dimension in the three-factor solution (see Table 4).

The final RI/SS item to load on CT is item 8: "The validity and relevance of content in solving student identified problems can best be judged by the students themselves." The loading bears a negative value, though, indicating an inverse relationship between CT and that item. This is not inconsistent with the content panel's unanimous view that item 8 is associated with RI and is highly suited to that tradition (fittedness rating = 1.63). Its low communality value (.13), however, is a sign that item 8 is a particularly weak item, and future revisions of the scale might be strengthened by its exclusion.

Given the foregoing item analysis and the results of factor analysis, the two-factor solution appears to be most adequate and suggests that inservice social studies teachers view the field in terms of dichotomous, rather than trichotomous, philosophies, with CT as one and a combination of RI and SS as the other.

Correlation with the Rokeach Scale. The Pearson product-moment correlational method was employed to test Hypotheses 1 through 3 stated earlier.

Hypothesis 1. A significant positive correlation of .38 (p < .001) was found between level of dogmatism and score on the CT dimension.
**Hypothesis 2.** The negative relationship between dogmatism and RI was not found.

**Hypothesis 3.** Contrary to expectation, there was a significant positive correlation of \(0.27 (p < 0.05)\) between level of dogmatism and the SS dimension.

The character of these relationships tends to support the results of factor analysis presented above. While the CT dimension appears strong, the RI and SS dimensions perform less predictably. With respect to the latter, the relationship between SS and dogmatism is far less ambiguous than predicted. Indeed, the element of authority in the social sciences seems to play a larger role in these teachers' minds than other characteristics of the SS tradition.

**Inter-dimensional correlation.** The pattern of inter-dimensional correlations is understandable, given the results of factor analysis and correlation.

**Hypothesis 4.** The CT and RI dimensions correlated positively at \(0.21 (p < 0.05)\), contrary to expectations.

**Hypothesis 5.** All of the traditions are correlated to some extent at the \(0.05\) level or below. Aside from the CT/RI relationship above, the CT/SS correlation is \(0.39 (p < 0.001)\) and, interestingly, the RI/SS correlation is the highest, a \(0.58 (p < 0.001)\). This confirms the notion that the two probably constitute one idea, rather than two, in the minds of the respondents.

**Comparison of substantive findings.** Barr, Barth and Shermis summarized the results of several of their own studies that found most respondents "clustered with some overlap around the Three Traditions, with a fourth group reflecting a truly eclectic, though inconsistent, position" (1977, p. 95). Examination of the specific studies cited suggests that this characterization of findings is more true of one source in particular, *The Nature of the Social Studies* (1978), which is itself a summary of previous but uncited studies. In Chapter Five of that book, the authors reported approximate percentages of "students and teachers" for each tradition and their combinations: CT = 10%, SS = 10%, RI = 20%, CT/RI = 10%, SS/RI = 20%, and CT/SS/RI = 30%. No further information of the type normally included in reports of empirical research is provided (Barth & Shermis, Note 2). Two of the remaining citations were studies by Barth and Norris (1976a and 1976c). Sampling only pre-service teachers, these authors discovered a pattern very different from that described in their 1977 text. Among American respondents, none endorsed the CT tradition, three to four percent were SS adherents, and 41-49% claimed RI as their philosophy. No figure was given for a CT/SS/RI combination; however, among secondary methods students, 12-13% held "indefinite" or "unclassified" positions. Among
studies conducted by other researchers, this second pattern of findings is much more typical.

Bennett (1980) administered the Barth-Shermis Preference Scale to social studies supervisors and college educators in Virginia and found a rather skewed pattern of responses. Most of these educators endorsed all three traditions (CT/SS/RI). When high-school teachers in West Virginia were sampled, a similar result was reported: "It would appear that teachers were quite eclectic in endorsing all three traditions but leaned more favorably toward the reflective inquiry tradition" (Bonar, 1977, p. 75).

Results of the current study tend to match those of Bennett and Bonar. Of 90 cases, only one endorsed a distinct tradition (SS), while two cases espoused a CT/RI combination. The most substantial grouping of respondents was associated with CT/SS/RI—73 cases (81.7%). Of some interest is the grouping of remaining respondents within the RI/SS combination, second only to the three-tradition combination in size (14.4%).

Summary of Validity Findings. On the whole, experts in social studies education give support to the claim that the Barth-Shermis Scale does delineate three distinct conceptions within the field. Moreover, with exceptions described earlier, the instrument passes the test of item representativeness. This positive picture of content validity carries over, at least to some extent, to factor analysis results. The CT tradition emerged as most distinct in the minds of teachers sampled, whether two or three factors were generated. As predicted, CT was significantly correlated with dogmatism.

On the other hand, there are challenges to scale validity. The purpose/method/content dimensions of the instrument appear decidedly inadequate, based on both the panel of experts and factor analysis. With regard to the traditions dimensions, it appears that the in-service teachers sampled do not view the SS and RI traditions as the distinct positions that either Barr, Barth and Shermis or the panel identified. Factor analysis demonstrated considerable mixing of these traditions’ items, leading one to suspect that a two-tradition view of social studies is more relevant to teachers in the classroom. The substantial SS by RI correlation tends to support this possibility, as does the discovery of a distinct group of RI/SS respondents in the sample. Finally, the pattern of respondents’ attachment to the three traditions was considerably different from that reported by Barr, Barth and Shermis (1977 & 1978).

Discussion

The three-traditions formulation has been advanced as a means of describing current philosophical positions and current teaching practices in the field of social studies. The results of this study have implications for the utility of the Barr, Barth and Shermis conceptualization as a descriptive tool.
Since the content of the Preference Scale was judged as representative of the three intended traditions, one would expect three strong dimensions to emerge in factor analysis and three distinctive respondent groupings to form around each of the traditions—if the traditions are indeed descriptive of practice. The findings of this study did not fulfill those expectations. Indeed, two very different patterns emerged, meriting some comment.

The first of these unexpected patterns involves a linking of the RI and SS traditions, perhaps reflecting in practice what Suzanne Helburn proposed in theory in her reaction to *Defining the Social Studies* (1977, pp. 110-113). Helburn argued that an RI/SS amalgam could be accomplished by focusing on the strengths of each tradition, while de-emphasizing historical and philosophical differences as characterized by Barr, Barth and Shermis. "The synthesis," she wrote, "is a truer representative of both Dewey and the scientific tradition, which Dewey saw as one" (p. 111). It is possible that this formulation more closely matches the thinking of practicing teachers than does the three traditions model. Before accepting such a proposition, however, one must recognize that this study does not prove that teachers recognize an RI/SS amalgam. Nor do the findings demonstrate that Helburn’s model is a more theoretically powerful conceptualization. Such judgments fall outside the purposes of this paper.

The second pattern contrary to Barr, Barth and Shermis’ expectation is the sizeable grouping of respondents adhering to all three traditions simultaneously. The vast majority of teachers sampled appear to share this position with James Shaver, who also contributed a reaction to *Defining the Social Studies* (pp. 114-117). The authors argued, in their 1978 text, that the CT/SS/RI group are educators who are “inconsistent” and whose “teaching is confused” (Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1978, p. 52). If this group comprised only 30-40% of the social studies teachers, as suggested by the authors, the confusion might be plausible. It becomes somewhat less believable when 81% of practicing teachers in the field fall into this category.

The rather checkered performance of the Preference Scale in describing current practices draws an interesting response from Professors Barth and Shermis. They are not surprised that most teachers do not recognize distinctions among the traditions, that they tend to mix elements of the three traditions. Only teachers (and methods students) who have studied the traditions would be able to interpret the scale and identify with a particular philosophical position. In fact, using the scale with teachers who do not know the three traditions or the 45 items would be an inappropriate application of the instrument. The Social Studies Preference Scale, they suggest, is more useful in undergraduate methods courses as a pre- and post-test (Note 3). If this is the case, it would appear that Barth and Shermis have retreated considerably from their stance in *The Nature of the Social Studies*.

If the three-traditions model is limited in its descriptive power, perhaps its real strength lies in prescription. At least one respondent appeared to sup-
port this view: "A lot of these questions look like you are looking at and for the ideal—not the actual fact of what is going on in most classrooms." This study was neither designed nor intended, however, to assess the model's usefulness as a guide to rationale-building or to teacher education. The content experts, for example, were asked whether the items were representative of the three traditions, not whether the traditions encompassed all that the social studies is or ought to be, though some panel comments did question any such claim. This study does cast a shadow, however, over efforts to extract a unified definition for the social studies from these three somewhat muddled positions. Both Shaver and Engle have commented on other, though related, definitional problems (Barr et al., 1977).

In conclusion, the Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale, in spite of its shortcomings, has been shown to be reliable and to display some measure of validity. While revealing the difficulty of making clear distinctions between the traditions' content, methods and purposes, this study helps to illuminate the relationship between the beliefs of practicing social studies teachers and the three philosophical traditions portrayed in the Preference Scale. Teachers sampled tended to view preferences in terms of two positions rather than three. Moreover, social studies teachers showed themselves to be a most eclectic group of educators, choosing liberally from each tradition to achieve their instructional goals.

Reference Notes

1. Dr. Anna Ochoa provided information from the 1982 NCSS survey data. Dr. Ochoa was guest editor for "A Profile of Social Studies Teachers," appearing in the October 1981 issue of Social Education.

2. Dr. Barth has provided the following information with regard to these studies in written comments dated July 1, 1981 and forwarded them to the author during a meeting with Dr. Shermis on July 18, 1981:

   The original students that were the base for Chapter 5 in The Nature were undergraduates and graduates who knew the three traditions and could interpret the 45 items.

   I am indebted to Professors Barth and Shermis for their extensive and illuminating comments on an earlier draft of this article.

3. Barth, James L. & Shermis, S. Samuel. Personal communication, July 18, 1981. Dr. Barth's comments were contained in margin notations on a draft copy of this article and in a memorandum dated July 1, 1981.

Endnotes

¹For statistical analysis, responses were recoded such that stronger agreement was represented by a greater numerical value.

²The a priori criterion level of significance was set at .05.

³Responses were recoded for analysis to positive integers from 1 to 6; the greater the value, the stronger the agreement.

⁴One may argue that this conceptualization is too narrow, that it excludes the teacher who attempts to instill enlightened allegiance to fundamental values on the basis of open-minded consideration of alternative viewpoints. Under a broader characterization of CT, use of dogmatism as its correlate would be open to question. However, since it is the Barr, Barth and
Shermis conceptualization that is being assessed, one must exclude what they exclude, leaving the Dogmatism Scale a most appropriate choice.

In the first of their articles (1976a), Barth and Norris sampled pre-service social studies teachers in Nigeria and found that 57% were "unclassified." The remaining were fairly evenly distributed among the three traditions and two combinations reported: CT/SS and SS/RI. These results were also reported in the Nigerian Education Forum (1976b), the fourth and final article cited in Defining the Social Studies.

The factor patterns and tradition groupings in this study were also discovered by Pacita N. Andres in her 1981 doctoral dissertation from Indiana University. Analyzing the responses of a random sample (N = 190) of Indiana secondary social studies teachers, Andres found the same RI/SS factor, as well as the preponderance of CT/SS/RI respondents. To confirm factor similarity, the statistical procedure RELATE (Veldman, 1967) was used to compare the three-factor varimax solution described in the Andres study with that found here (Table 4). The procedure generated values directly interpretable as correlations between the factors derived from the two analyses. The coefficient for each of the factors is quite high: CT = .94, SS = .95, RI = .99.

For his assistance with the RELATE procedure, I wish to thank Dr. Lee H. Ehman of Indiana University.
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Student learning is frequently viewed as a function of the interaction between a learner and a task situation and the interaction between a learner and a teacher. However, these are only two perspectives. One's perspectives largely determine how one attempts to describe and explain a phenomenon. The questions asked, the concepts used to ask the questions, and the methods and data viewed as appropriate for answering the questions are based on the perspectives. It is important to know how the assumptions underlying these perspectives limit our understanding of learning in schools and what other perspectives are available to study learning.

Two Psychological Perspectives

The individual psychological perspective views learning as a function of a person's mental characteristics and/or behaviors interacting with a task situation. For example, Ausubel (1963) used the concept of cognitive structure (i.e., the organization, stability, and clarity of knowledge) to explain meaningful verbal learning. Given this perspective a reasonable educational treatment is to alter a learner's cognitive structure prior to a learning task by using general concepts and propositions and making explicit the internal logic and organization of verbal material (Joyce and Weil, 1972). Another individual psychological view of learning is Kohlberg's theory of moral thought development through a sequence of intellectual stages (Galbraith and Jones, 1976). Given Kohlberg's interpretation, a learner must observe reasoning at one level higher than his or her current stage if development is
to be facilitated. Rothkopf's attention to mathemagenic behavior in learning from prose focuses on individual response modes (e.g., note-taking, underlining) and the placement of questions in reading material (Faw and Waller, 1976). Skinner's use of operant conditioning is another well-known approach to changing individual learner behavior through reinforcement of selected behaviors (Anderson and Faust, 1973).

All of these approaches to understanding and facilitating learning share a common assumption: Learning is a function of individual mental or behavioral factors. This might be generally true when a learner is working alone. When instructional prescriptions are made from this perspective, a teacher is assumed; however, the teacher is at the periphery of the scene. In much research, efforts are made to control nuisance variables such as teachers, numerous student characteristics, and class effects by randomizing or removing them altogether. Applications of the results of such research have been less productive than anticipated because nonindividual factors probably overwhelm the individual psychological factors. Learning in school is generally a social psychological experience rather than an individual one.

The dyadic perspective views learning as a function of the interaction between a learner and a teacher. This perspective incorporates the interpersonal nature of most school learning situations. An example of this perspective is Flanders' study of teacher influence through interaction analysis (Dunkin and Biddle, 1974). Rosenshine and Furst's review of teacher effectiveness research (1971) identified teacher clarity, enthusiasm, business-like behavior, and instructional variability as promising variables for affecting student achievement. The efforts of the immense number of studies done from this perspective have not produced many clear prescriptions for effective teacher behavior.

Gage, et. al. (1976) conducted a major experimental study on teaching clarity (i.e., structuring, soliciting, and reacting) which illustrates the problems of this perspective. Efforts were made to build on previous research, avoid earlier errors, and produce a definitive statement. The modest conclusions were: (1) low cognitive level soliciting increased achievement of both high and low cognitive objectives; (2) high structuring produced some increase in achievement; and (3) high reacting produced some increase in achievement. The treatment effects, student aptitudes, teacher effects, and aptitude treatment interactions together accounted for less than 50% of the variance in student performance. Gage, et. al. concluded that one must either view teacher behavior studies as of questionable value or believe that greater degrees of research design complexity and statistical sophistication will reveal more powerful treatment effects in this area.

An assumption underlying all this work is that learning is a function of psychological factors manipulated by a teacher in a dyadic relationship. It is further assumed that the dyadic explanation will generalize to typical classroom conditions in which a teacher attempts to work with 20 to 35 students.
simultaneously. However, the explanations for student learning are conceptualized in terms of a two-person tutoring interaction. Conceptually and empirically, the larger social environment is at the periphery of attention and is often viewed as a complex set of nuisance variables.

Unless school learning is viewed from a socially coherent perspective, the insights gained from psychological and teacher effectiveness research cannot be utilized as productively as possible. School learning is generally learning in groups. Consequently, many students might not be participating in the instructional interaction of a classroom. Various psychological and teacher effectiveness instructional approaches probably fail or have modest effects because the treatments occur only sporadically, if at all, for many students. Classroom research on these approaches might be assessing instructional non-events for many students, thus producing equivocal or neutral results. In addition, student-student effects are usually not even considered. The two research perspectives discussed thus far do not conceptualize school learning in an adequately comprehensive fashion.

A Social Perspective

A social perspective views learning as a function of relationships between individuals and groups within a classroom context. An individual student's academic motivation and expectations are shaped by social structures, sometimes overlapping, composed of status systems and their associated reward structures and roles. The characteristics and relationships of students as a group or groups in a classroom can structure the quantity and quality of teacher-student, student-student, and student-task interaction. Researchers have commonly studied characteristics of individuals, such as aptitudes and social class background, in order to predict and explain greater or lesser achievements in schools. Consequently, problems in schools have been interpreted as failures to help particular categories of students (Cohen, 1972b). Less commonly studied are social variables which characterize no particular student but do meaningfully describe a number of people simultaneously.

Educational researchers should explore the implications of social variables for individual student achievement in order to understand more adequately student learning in schools. A set of social variables clusters around the concept of status. Status refers to a criterion used by group members to rank other members from better to worse according to their possession or lack of possession of a particular quality, such as a desirable race, sex, or academic or social skill. Reward structures (i.e., the system of distributing valued goods, services, or approval) affect the interaction of teachers and students. Students can be important participants in the distribution of rewards in a classroom. Other group variables include cohesion, norms, authority, and roles (Schmuck and Schmuck, 1975). Numerous possibilities
exist for analyzing classroom learning groups in terms of these and other sociological concepts.

A social perspective assumes that much learning in schools occurs in group contexts. The beliefs and evaluations of other students as well as those of the teacher can affect how much a student participates in learning activities and how much effort he or she will expend to complete an assignment on an individual basis. Instructional prescriptions resulting from this perspective differ from those described earlier. Instead of attempting directly to change individual students' mental or behavioral characteristics, the classroom group is treated. Perhaps a status system which discourages active involvement by minority students must be altered or neutralized. Perhaps a reward system must be modified to make rewards distributed by the teacher and students more accessible to students who have experienced little satisfying response to their efforts.

In summary, the three perspectives focus attention on different aspects of learning and teaching. The individual psychological perspective emphasizes students' internal mental characteristics and/or individual behaviors which facilitate learning. The dyadic perspective emphasizes teacher behavior and the interaction between a student and a teacher. The social perspective emphasizes relationships between individual and groups within a classroom context and the implications of those relationships for individual students' efforts and learning. The three perspectives are complementary and should all be used for an adequate understanding of most instructional situations. Special consideration is given here to the social perspective since it is underutilized frequently.

In order to illustrate the social perspective, two lines of inquiry will be described briefly. One line, based on status characteristics and expectation states theory (Berger, Conner, and Fisek, 1974), has been largely directed or influenced by Elizabeth G. Cohen at the Center for Educational Research at Stanford University. The other line, based on the concepts of team learning and reward structures, has been carried out largely through the Student Team Learning Project of the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University. Both have produced important research findings and both hold significant implications for research on school learning.

**Status Characteristics and Expectation States**

Status characteristics and expectation states theory is a complex, refined theory. The following is a brief overview. A general status characteristic (e.g., race) becomes socially significant in a collective task situation when it enables group members to decide whose contributions are likely to be most helpful in accomplishing the group task. A general status characteristic has a general performance expectation associated with it. Consequently, group members with a positive ranking on the status characteristic will be expected, in the absence of contradictory information, to have more of what-
ever specific ability is required to accomplish the group's task. In this society, for example, white students are likely to be viewed by other students as generally more competent than black students at an academic task. In group work, the higher status students are likely to make more suggestions, criticize others' ideas more frequently, receive less criticism, and have their suggestions accepted more frequently than lower status students (Cohen, 1972a). This generalization has been repeatedly observed in various status situations for black and white students (Cohen, 1972a; Cohen, 1973; Cohen & Roper, 1972; Lohman, 1972; Cohen, Lockheed & Lohman, 1976), Eastern and Western Israelis (Cohen & Sharen, 1977), females and males (Lockheed & Hall, 1976), and average and above average readers (Stulac, 1976; Morris, 1977).

Cohen and her associates have developed approaches to neutralizing the negative effects of student status systems through a program of natural observation, highly controlled laboratory experiments, less controlled experimental educational programs, and, most recently, field experiments in conventional, desegregated schools. Most of the successful efforts to neutralize negative status effects in educational settings 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 general status characteristic (e.g., race, reading ability) was neutralized by generating a relevant specific status characteristic (e.g., gaming ability, language ability, radio building skill) which ranked the students in reverse order to the general characteristic (VanSickle, 1979). Both high and low status students observed that the low status students could perform competently in the classroom context. This treatment produced equal-status or nearly equal-status participation (e.g., initiation rates, response rates, influence rates) between the high and low status groups of students.

Recent studies in the classrooms of desegregated schools have added a new degree of complexity to this line of inquiry. Rosenholtz (1979) neutralized a status system based on reading ability by implementing a multiple abilities curriculum. By convincing students that reading skill did not accurately predict performance on many academic tasks, high and low reading status students moved toward equal-status interaction. Rosenholtz focused the curriculum and accompanying evaluation system on visual ability, intuitive thinking, and reasoning. Cohen (1979) attempted to use the multiple abilities curriculum in the commonly encountered situation in which race and academic status systems both exist. The results were much more complex since an uncontrolled social power status system also existed in the classrooms which was more powerful than the experimental treatment. While treatment effects could be observed, they were very modest. Much
theoretical and empirical work needs to be done, particularly in relating participation and cognitive learning, but the educational significance of this line of inquiry is clear.

**Reward Structures**

The Student Team Learning Project has explored the academic and social effects of cooperative learning efforts and group and individual reward structures. Three techniques have been studied: (1) Teams-Games-Tournament; (2) Student Teams-Achievement Divisions; and (3) Jigsaw. The Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT) approach groups students in mixed ability teams of four or five students who help each other achieve instructional objectives. Representatives of each team compete in three-person, equal ability tournaments. Each team member contributes his tournament score to the total team score. Additional rewards are made to those teams with high total performance. In a review of ten experiments comparing TGT to traditional instruction, DeVries and Slavin (1978) reported generally positive effects on academic achievement, interpersonal concern, race relations, and peer norms helpful in academic achievement.

The second technique, Student Teams-Achievement Divisions (STAD), is similar to TGT except that the tournaments are replaced with individual quizzes with the scores totaled to produce team scores. Slavin (1978) reviewed four experiments that compared STAD to traditional instruction and reported that STAD increased cross-racial attraction and interaction, liking for others, feelings of being liked, and peer norms for academic achievement. Academic achievement effects were less clear; two studies reported no difference, one indicated a large positive effect on black students' achievement, and one showed a positive effect on a treatment-specific achievement measure. It was determined that group rewards and their effect on achievement norms were more important for learning than peer-tutoring.

The Jigsaw method, the third technique, differs in that cooperative effort and individual rewards are used. Five or six students, who are each responsible for a segment of a lesson, are grouped. Students from different groups responsible for a given segment meet and check each other's understanding of their common assignment. Next, each student teaches his or her segment to the other group members. Each student in the group is dependent on all the others to help him or her combine the pieces of the lesson into a whole. Unlike the other techniques, students are evaluated and rewarded individually. Aronson, Bridgeman, and Geffner (1978) reviewed several field studies related to the Jigsaw method and concluded that experimental subjects demonstrated increases in self-esteem, liking for classmates, and liking for school. Also, minority students and low-achieving white students achieved more than students receiving conventional instruction while high-achieving whites performed as usual.

The Student Team Learning Project has been based on a variety of the-
oretical and empirical inquiries. Consequently, its theoretical sophistication is less than that of the status characteristics and expectation states approach and the explanations for the effects of the cooperative learning techniques are still somewhat unclear. Slavin (1977) identified a critical component of these techniques which represented an advance over earlier work comparing cooperative and competitive techniques. He observed that students must have important resources which they can choose to share or withhold. Otherwise, individual reward structures are more effective than cooperative structures for increasing achievement although the social and attitudinal benefits are largely lost.

The two lines of inquiry described here developed independently. However, there are similarities in effects that theoretical analysis might explain. Understanding the effects of social variables, such as status and reward structures, might be increased through such efforts.

**Implications for Social Studies Educational Research**

Research on student learning in schools from a social perspective has several implications for social studies education. First, social studies teachers usually instruct classes of students with wide ranges of academic ability and achievement. This great diversity often makes individualizing instruction impractical. Methods developed from a social perspective, such as the student team learning techniques described earlier, can reorganize relationships among students in a feasible way which promotes academic achievement. Research on the instructional effects of team learning in low achieving social studies classes indicates that positive achievement effects will probably result in homogeneously grouped classes as well (Allen and VanSickle, in press). Much more research and development is possible with a focus on altering peer norms and expectations for high achievement.

Second, decision-making in groups is a prime domain for the application of a social research perspective. Widespread student participation is especially important in light of research on small group decision-making. Groups are more likely to make correct decisions when decisions are arrived at by consensus or by a decision-maker who uses the advice of others than when one person decides alone. "Correct decisions," in this case, refer to judgments of accuracy, effectiveness, or efficiency; they do not refer to moral judgments. Often the group decision will be more adequate than the decision of any individual group member (Piper, 1974).

Fraenkel (1981) suggested that group discussions of moral issues can possibly lead to personal behavior more consistent with an individual's moral thought if individual decisions rather than group decisions are required. A variety of cooperative group activities which involve individual accountability could give students greater self-confidence in their beliefs while enabling them to benefit from others' help and insights. Fraenkel cited several social psychological studies that make his proposals promising; he recom-
mended that educational researchers and developers explore the possibilities. Instructional research from a social perspective is in order.

A third implication involves the goal of many social educators to teach students to participate effectively in discussions by focusing on systematic discussion skills (Newmann and Oliver, 1970). Among the discussion behaviors which are probably sensitive to social conditions, such as status differences, are: stating issues; challenging inconsistency; and making personal attacks. Also, Morris (1977) observed that the frequencies of requesting and offering reasons in group decision-making were related to perceived reading ability status differences even though the subjects were objectively equal. Social research could contribute to making discussion and decision-making goals more feasible to attain for students and teachers.

A fourth implication is the effect of social variables on teacher behavior in teacher-led discussions. In a research review, Smith (1979) noted that teachers tend to select a small number of students in a class to answer questions. The selection criteria are often student characteristics which form status hierarchies, such as race, social class, physical attractiveness, and, especially, academic ability. In an experimental study which compared predictable and unpredictable teacher solicitation patterns, Smith (1980) observed that student examination of stimulus material and concentration on the substance of a discussion were greater under the unpredictable solicitation condition. This finding leads to the hypothesis that teachers whose solicitation patterns are predictable strengthen status systems among students that produce negative instructional outcomes. Research is needed to investigate this hypothesis and to identify ways teachers can neutralize negative status effects in group discussions.

Fifth, some educators recommend curriculum goals which include cooperative group action and analysis of group organization and performance in the school and the community (Gillespie and Lazarus, 1976, 1979). For such instructional programs to be effective, social conditions which militate against social participation must be treated. Further, students must also understand these troublesome social conditions if learning is to transfer beyond specially treated, equal-status classroom conditions. Available research on these topics is virtually nonexistent.

Sixth, simulation gaming provides a feasible means of manipulating classroom social variables. Assigning students to simulation roles with statuses inconsistent with their actual statuses can produce observable changes in student interaction. There is very little research that has attempted to measure the nature or strength of the impact of simulation gaming on student status systems, norms, expectations, and interaction. In a study of simulation game design characteristics, VanSickle (1977) observed that the distribution of game resources affected the satisfaction students experienced in working with their fellow group members. Interest in the real-life analogue of the simulation game was positively affected by a moderate level of small
group integration rather than high or low levels. These findings support the possibility that appropriately designed simulation games could be a means of altering classroom social structural variables.

Seventh, an important goal for many social educators is to provide students with opportunities to develop skills of engaging in effective interpersonal and interethnic group interaction (Banks, Cortés, Gay, Garcia, and Ochoa, 1976). Problems of status, performance expectations, and norms tend to make group interaction mirror the negative features of intergroup relations in the larger society. Close proximity does not guarantee positive relationships. The two lines of inquiry described in this paper involving student statuses and reward structures show that classroom social conditions can be created which break down stereotypes and actualize the values of human dignity and the worth of the individual. Enough research has been done to support instructional development efforts aimed at producing feasible school programs.

These implications cover a broad range of questions and problems which concern social studies educators, although they do not exhaust the possibilities. Social studies professionals need to incorporate a sophisticated social understanding of school learning into their instruction. By virtue of their social scientific and historical orientations, they should be especially well-prepared to understand and use a social perspective.

Instructional programs based on psychologically oriented research and development are more likely to demonstrate benefits if social conditions are arranged to support them. Due to the individual and dyadic perspectives underlying most school learning research and the tendency of educators to interpret student behavior as a function of individual characteristics, social research on learning is an underdeveloped field (Schlechty, 1976). Opportunities for research and development are numerous in exploring the social aspects of school learning and identifying the social conditions under which psychologically based instructional procedures can operate effectively.
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The New Middle Class and the Organization of Curricular Knowledge

Margaret M. Holmes
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Introduction

Social studies curricula in the twentieth century have been dominated by history, geography, and varying notions of citizenship education with forays into “critical thinking,” “inquiry,” “action learning,” and other developments aimed to change the teaching of social studies from learning of “mere” historical and geographic facts and conceptual frameworks. These forays have been relatively brief, though in the late 1960s they appeared to have enough momentum to move the social studies to a more central role in at least the elementary school curriculum (Jarolimek, 1981). The argument of this essay is that an explanation for the lack of staying power of the occasional deviations from the subject-based curriculum of the social studies lies in the relationships between social class and the organization of knowledge and thus, beyond the logic of the curriculum. These deviations are of the type that rest easily in what has historically been called an integrated curriculum (Dressel, 1958) and what Basil Bernstein (1975) has more recently called an integrated “code.”

The most recent, and probably most extreme, articulation of the integrated curriculum occurred in the open classroom movement of the 1970s. Here, a limited number of elementary school classroom teachers in the United States and more in England put the notions of action learning, inquiry, and critical thinking into practice in a way which dominated their classrooms (Holmes, 1980; North Dakota Study Group, 1976). Open educa-
tion will be used as a case study to argue that integrated curricula are in-
viable in American culture, not because of faulty logic or poor psychologi-
cal principles but because they are inconsistent with class interests of the
new middle class who persist in a dependence on the traditional hierarchical
sorting mechanism of public schools. The "natural" limits of open educa-
tion and integrated curricula in general are not natural at all but are a func-
tion of both class interests (especially the new middle class) and bureaucratic
social control.

In order to make the linkages between social class and curriculum organi-
ization this essay will draw heavily on the work of Basil Bernstein in Class,
Codes and Control, Vol. 3. The third volume should not be confused with
Bernstein's earlier work on linguistic codes, collected in Class, Codes and
Control, Vol. 1. The linguistic work began with the observation that middle-
class and working-class children use different linguistic styles in school and
that most teachers use and value middle-class language. Important field
study research over the last 15 years has pursued the implications of this
observation for children in classrooms, often pointing to ways in which the
culture of schools supports middle-class children and not those children
who speak non-standard dialects or whose style of non-verbal interaction is
other than middle-class. Bernstein's early work unfortunately is dominated
by a social deprivation model of the working-class. Working-class language
he calls a "restricted code;" middle-class language he calls an "elaborated
code." The implication clearly is that working-class children have restricted
thinking styles, less intellectual ability and therefore more problems in
school than do middle-class children. The original observation that lan-
guage use is an integral part of social class and that it affects children's
school experience was important. The social deprivation view of the work-
ing class is unfortunate.

Volume 3 of Class, Codes and Control begins with another important
observation, unrelated to the linguistic analysis in Volume 1, despite Bern-
stein's attempts to link them. He points out that the organization of the cur-
riculum in schools has implications for social control. In particular, an inte-
grated curriculum, especially as he observed it in the English infant schools,
necessitated changed pedagogical styles which might have implications for
the nature of the social fabric in the long run. In an essay, "Open Schools—
Open Society?", Bernstein speculated that the new pedagogical style might
mean weakened authority and a different basis for social control in the
society at large. Thus, he took the discussion of integrated curricula be-
yond an academic argument over the advisability of combining traditional
academic disciplines into "broad fields" (Davis, 1981). The notions of "clas-
sification" and "frame" which Bernstein uses to distinguish between "in-
tegrated" and "collection" curricular codes as they apply to the open class-
room example will be introduced, followed by an application of Edwards'
(1979) analysis of the structure of bureaucratic work and its dominance in the
20th century to show how open education could not survive because the integrated code ultimately did not support the class interests of its clientele, the new middle class.

**The New Middle Class**

What has been called the "new middle class," here and elsewhere, should probably be called middle income. The "new class" as it has been talked about in the United States has meant those people involved in information industries and service professions: teachers, radio and television professionals, social workers, lawyers and physicians, to name a few. These are people whose livelihoods demand skill in manipulating and controlling symbol systems, both language systems and technical symbol systems. Gouldner (1979) sees this new class as intellectuals, rather than as simply an occupational category. The term new class for this group was used in the late 1960s to indicate their affiliation with the new politics and the new left. Gouldner points to their preference for what he calls a "culture of critical discourse" and their anti-business attitude. Optimistically, Gouldner says:

The New Class is the most progressive force in modern society and is a center of whatever human emancipation is possible in the foreseeable future. It has no motives to curtail the forces of production and no wish to develop them solely in terms of their profitability. The New Class possesses the scientific knowledge and technical skills on which the future of modern forces of production depend. At the same time, members of the New Class also manifest increasing sensitivity to the ecological "side effects" or distant diseconomies of continuing technical development. The New Class, further, is a center of opposition to almost all forms of censorship, thus embodying a universal societal interest in a kind of rationality broader than that invested in technology . . . It is the most cosmopolitan of all elites. Its control over ordinary "foreign" languages, as well as of technical sociolects, enable it to communicate with other nationalities and it is often a member of a technical guild of international scope. (1979, p. 83)

It was to this new class that open education appealed. They adhered to an egalitarian sentiment, and thought of schools as having the potential to be instrumental in social reform. They were attracted to open education, which they recognized as a potentially more egalitarian social organization. Open education also appealed to their self-interest. Open classroom teachers' emphasis on having children think through their own work projects and their emphasis on inquiry often succeed at teaching children the analytic and linguistic skills valued in the occupational settings of the middle and upper middle income groups, from which the parents and teachers who joined the open classroom effort originated.
Open Education, the New Middle Class, and Curricular Codes

Open education represented one of the great hopes for promoting diversity in American elementary schooling in the 1970s. It was a short-lived movement clearly linked philosophically to 1930s progressive education. Its clientele was made up largely of liberals mobilized by Vietnam Era protests and by the writing of open education advocates like Joseph Featherstone (1971), Roland Barth (1972), Charles Silberman (1971), John Holt (1969), and Lillian Weber (1971), as well as the chroniclers of the success of English progressive infant schools. The writing which spawned the open classroom movement was a combination of protest and proposals for renewal of American schooling, particularly in the early grades. The protests were a wide ranging mixture of the so-called romantic protests against dullness and routine, and social protests against IQ testing, tracking, and the inequality of inner-city as opposed to suburban schools (Kozol, 1967).

The proposals for open education pointed to an American version of the English infant schools, building on the indigenous nursery school tradition (Weber, 1968) and memories of the 1930s American progressive movement exemplified by the Dewey School (Mayhew and Edwards, 1966). However, it never received widespread institutional support from universities or public schools. This was an inevitable consequence of a liberal reform movement which appealed to the new middle class. The middle class is that group most dependent on education for access to jobs and middle income privileges. It is they who must use the hierarchical arrangements and sorting mechanisms of schooling to gain access to middle income positions in society for their children. For that reason, while the egalitarian potential of open education appealed to liberal sentiments, the effort could not be sustained. Open education represented considerable professional risk for teachers because it entailed, among other things, a protest against bureaucratic arrangements.

For reasons which have to do with the nature of teachers’ expectations for what their work should entail, the pool of teachers willing to sustain such a protest was small. It will be argued that the position of new middle class teachers in the class structure as it has evolved in the twentieth century in the United States militates against their involvement in fundamental change in schooling. This is something they "instinctively know" since their experience living in the culture has taught them well how to maintain their position.

In social studies curricula it has been assumed that an interdisciplinary approach will encourage people to be autonomous in using their much under-valued powers of analysis, synthesis and integration in understanding problems. Basil Bernstein, in *Class Codes and Control*, Vol. 3 (1975) talks about such an approach as an "integrated code," as opposed to a "collection code." Differences in curricular organization provide the criteria by which he calls a scheme an integrated or a collection code. A collection code is one in which the boundaries between subject areas are very strong. Subjects are clearly insulated from each other and parallels or overlaps between subjects are not pointed out. Subject matter is highly compartmentalized. Subjects
are literally collected and arranged in some hierarchical order. An integrated code is quite the opposite. Subject boundaries are deemphasized and topics are subordinated to a relational idea.

The boundaries around the pedagogical relationship provide another dimension within the collection code/integrated code distinction. The boundaries around the pedagogical relationship Bernstein refers to as the “frame.” Strong framing implies few options are exercised by teacher and/or pupils in the control of what is transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship. Weak framing implies a more fluid relationship in which a range of options is available to the teacher and pupils in establishing the nature of the pedagogical interchange. Differences in the strength of frames may be established by local school administrators' standards, by the form of curricular materials, or by norms established in classrooms. The consequences of working within a collection vs. an integrated code are not restricted to differential organization of a textbook, but reach into different mechanisms of social control.

**Educational Codes and Social Control**

Bernstein hypothesizes that collection codes, by consequence of their strong classification, teach students a strong subject loyalty and identity, and they teach that knowledge is private property. The collection code encourages students to adopt a pure, unambiguous identity.

The specialized version of the collection code will develop careful screening procedures to see who belongs and who does not belong, and once such screening has taken place, it is very difficult to change an educational identity. The various classes of knowledge are well insulated from each other. Selection and differentiation are early features of this particular code. (1975, p. 96)

Strong framing in the collection codes suggests that neither student nor teacher has much control over selection, pacing, timing or organization of the curriculum. The order in which the pieces of the subject matter at hand are to be presented and learned are laid out hierarchically. The system has considerable stability, as little of the information presented is considered to be provisional or changeable. The key to strong framing in conjunction with strong classification is discipline. Bernstein points to the consequences for pupil-teacher interaction in strong framing.

This means learning to work WITHIN a received frame. It means, in particular, LEARNING what questions can be put at any particular time. Because of the hierarchical ordering of the knowledge in time, certain questions raised may not enter into a particular frame.

This is soon learned by both teachers and pupils. Discipline then means accepting a given selection, organization, pacing and timing of knowledge realized in the pedagogical frame... (1975, p. 98)
Another aspect of strong framing is that it creates sharp boundaries between the everyday community knowledge of the pupil, his family and his peers and, by contrast, school knowledge. Integrated codes, on the other hand, are realized in different relationships, particularly in the areas of authority structures, educational identities and concepts of property. Weak classification in an integrated code is realized in subordinating school subjects to a relational idea or a "supraconcept" which focuses upon general principles at a high level of abstraction. Bernstein argues that selecting topics from a variety of traditional subjects and teaching them as they relate to a central theme has pedagogical consequences. It reduces the significance of the particulars of the traditional subjects and increases the emphasis on exploring general principles. This leads to less teaching of bodies of fact and more attempts to show students how knowledge is created.

Weak framing in an integrated code means both teachers and pupils will have some degree of control over pacing and timing of what is to be learned. Consequently, more control over daily activity is placed in the hands of pupils and teachers, creating a rather ambiguous situation with respect to social order. The fluid situation necessitates that a primary mode of daily operation under an integrated code is negotiation of rules and of social relationships.

Bernstein (1975), in an article called "Class and Pedagogies: Visible and Invisible," postulates that developmental psychology as well as the theories of Freud and Chomsky are often drawn upon to justify an integrated code because of shared assumptions. These are derived from the weak classification and weak framing principles. These, he feels, are uniquely the child-rearing modes of the new middle class. He focuses particularly on an emphasis on play and on personalization in the progressive infant schools.

Bernstein sees these relationships as applying not just to the work situations of the new middle class, but to the role of the mother among the new middle class. For the old bourgeoisie, the mother took care of control and teaching of the children. This was possible under the individualization of the collection code. Likewise, the working class expected to turn over their children to a strict teacher who taught from textbooks in a predictable way through an orderly progression of tasks and skills, and whose organization was visible, standardized and immediately understandable.

Bernstein sees women of the new middle class, in their new roles, as caught in a bind produced by new role expectations. He sees the new middle class mother as being personally responsible for every aspect of her children's rearing, and therefore tied to supervising them constantly. However, being new middle class, she also expects some occupation outside her home that is personally, intellectually fulfilling and remunerative. According to Bernstein, her resolution of the tension produced by this conflict is to find a good infant school or open classroom teacher who will raise her children the way
she would if she had the time. Thus, new middle class families look to substitute mothers in the early years of preschool and elementary school. Progressive education is, however, confined to the earlier phases of schooling, since higher education, to which the new middle class aspires, is dominated by the examination system and a collection code (strong classification and strong frames). Open education becomes confined to those years that “do not count” in preparing children for higher education.

Whatever the origins of integrated codes, it is clear that open classroom teachers, who abandoned the collection code and began to promote integrated codes, made other teachers and administrators uncomfortable. Open classroom teachers said, “We don’t want a reading program; we just want children to read. As long as children read, it doesn’t matter what they read.” Children in open classrooms didn’t have social studies programs. They did projects. They did projects concerning how much food was wasted in the lunch room. They did projects in which they cooked apples into applesauce and surveyed the class as to which batch of applesauce was liked best by the other children. The teachers systematically refused to answer questions about whether this was “science,” “social studies,” “language arts,” or “arithmetic.” They said the projects involved all of these, and that it was irrelevant what one called them. What was important was that the children defined a project and carried it out. An integrated code challenged both the putting on of boundaries around school subjects and the hierarchical organization of subjects into “programs.” In doing so, they also did away with a notion of linear progress. If there was no program, then there was no progress through the program. Teachers instead produced final reports, narrative reports, stories, poems and animated films as evidence that children were learning. Most formal testing was restricted to standardized tests given at traditional intervals.

Despite their egalitarian values, the new class could not support open education because of the inherent risks it posed to their children’s futures. Open classroom teachers’ integrated code did away with the supremacy of outside objectives, allowing children to establish with the teacher what was important work. Potentially, this not only could undermine the imposed hierarchy of elementary subjects, but also teach children that they could have power over ideas and information. Would this not be an important lesson for the children of a middle class aspiring to managerial and professional positions? Would not members of the new class want children to learn to exercise their options as well as take satisfaction in being able to include the culture of all children in an open classroom curriculum? The suggestion was appealing, and for that reason, open education was fleetingly appealing to the new class. However, the new class also understood their need for the hierarchical collection code which differentially dealt privileges and access to middle income jobs to middle class children.
Social Class and Social Relationships

An integrated code was appealing to both the egalitarian sentiments and the intellectual disposition of the new middle class. However, examination of the position of most middle income people in the social structure points to a limited constituency for the open classroom movement.

As Anyon (1980) points out, occupation and income contribute greatly to social class, but do not entirely define it. Social class is, rather, a series of relationships: ownership relationships, relationships between people, and relations between people and their work. These relationships become important because it is through one's work that one relates to various aspects of the production system. In addition the dispositions toward work and the expectations of what one can do within the confines of what is legitimate in one's work are powerful norms communicated to children through both the school and the family.

These sets of relationships, which are an integral part of the class structure, constitute at least some of the ways one relates to the production process in society. The first of the three relationships identified by Anyon, ownership of capital, is the most straightforward. One relates to the system of private ownership of capital by either participating in the ownership of the apparatus of production in society or, on the contrary, working for a wage or salary and having one's labor be a source of profit or making it possible for others to realize profit. Middle income workers and professionals may own stock in corporations, sharing some concerns of the capitalist class, but do not direct the use of capital. The new class most often possess what has been called "symbolic capital." Symbolic capital is those socially legitimated skills (linguistic, technical, and analytic) that provide its owners the ability to produce the dominant scientific or artistic culture or to manage production. Skillful use of symbolic capital may yield access to ownership of physical capital. Clearly, in the acquisition of cultural capital, schools play a critical role. As Bourdieu points out (1979), families may expose children to the culture of privilege so that such skills become "natural," though it is not as simple to inherit symbolic capital as it is to inherit physical capital. While to be a capitalist one must exercise control of capital, it is more straightforward to control physical capital inherited from family position than to control social power through manipulation of symbol systems. In either case, one must exercise the power available in physical or symbolic capital to effect structural relations between people and between people and work to be a capitalist.

Social class, then, is manifested through relationships entailing degrees of personal autonomy, independence, power and control. People's ownership relations, relationships to each other and to their work vary according to social class. It is not too surprising, then, that the "style" of schools serving different populations varies and that the variation appears appropriate. Everyone "knows" that in ghetto schools teachers must employ strict disci-
pline and give children little control over the nature and pacing of their work. In suburban schools, on the other hand, children "can handle" more freedom. Style of discipline and expectations for achievement within the framework of American schooling vary with social class in a predictable fashion. This is possible because the organization of curricular and pedagogical arrangements is hierarchical. Open education offered, in the integrated code form, principles of social control that had the potential to offer alternatives to or to undermine the hierarchical organization of "normal" schooling. The limits on the audience for open education can be understood by looking at the position of new class workers in the economy and the nature of the twentieth century workplace. Middle income workers could not easily abandon hierarchical arrangements themselves nor, ultimately, support schooling which failed to conform to or threatened the social and occupational arrangements to which they were accustomed.

The Rise of Bureaucracy as a Means of Social Control

There is a question about the nature of the workplaces of the new class clientele of open education in general. While many of the new class think of themselves as professionals, they are actually highly paid workers increasingly working for large bureaucratic organizations. They do not control capital, though they may make management decisions within a defined area of responsibility. Richard Edwards in *Contested Terrain, the Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century* (1979), demonstrates that the twentieth century has seen a major reorganization of social control in the workplace in the United States. It is in this context that the early demise of the integrated code form of open education appears inevitable.

Edwards analyzes the evolution of the modern corporation in terms of an ongoing process of conflict and control among workers and bosses. The resulting social organization of the workplace is an artifact of the struggle. He notes that the workplace has remained, in the twentieth century, hierarchical, that is, ruled from the top down, but that the form of hierarchical control has changed. In the nineteenth century, small entrepreneurial businesses were the basis of American capitalism. The system of control was personal. A single person, surrounded by a small group of foremen and managers, ruled the firm. This "simple" control, where the boss is close and powerful, continues to exist in the small-business sector of the American economy, which has shrunk dramatically.

By 1915, the assembly line was well established in both the textile and automobile industries, bringing "technical control" to the fore as a mechanism of the control of workers in production. Any system of control involves direction of work tasks, evolution of work and the rewarding and disciplining of workers. Technical control involves designing machinery and planning the flow of work to physically control the labor process in the interest or efficiency. As a result of assembly line technology and employment, the workers lost control of the pacing and sequencing of tasks.
Edwards contends that, due to the effectiveness of workers' strikes in thwarting technical control, large firms have evolved a third form of social control of work: bureaucratic control.

The defining feature of bureaucratic control is the institutionalization of hierarchical power. 'Rule of law'—the firm's law replaces 'rule of supervisor command' in the direction of work, the procedures for evaluating workers' performance, and the exercise of the firm's sanctions and rewards; supervisors and workers alike become subject to the dictates of 'company policy'. Work becomes highly stratified; each job is given its distinct title and description; and impersonal rules govern promotion. (Edwards, 1979, p. 21)

In bureaucracies, control is built into the social and organizational structure of the firm, into job categories, work rules, wage scales and promotion procedures. Hierarchical control is in this way institutionalized, and its authors made less visible to workers. The hierarchy is maintained, and workers who want to get ahead turn to "working the system" rather than confronting it. As Edwards points out, there is more worker protection. It is, however, at the price of a loss of personal initiative.

The workplace today is a vastly changed place from the shops and offices of seventy-five or a hundred years ago. Then nearly all employees worked for small firms, while today large numbers toil for the giant corporations. Here especially we see the results of the twentieth-century transformation of work. Where once foremen ruled with unconstrained power, there now stands the impersonality (and seeming invincibility) of the organization. Where once workers had few rights and no protections, there now exists a whole set of claims from job bidding rights to grievance appeals to the possibility of a career within the firm. Where once the distinction between workers and bosses was sharp and clear there now are the blurred lines of a more stratified and less class-conscious workforce. (1979, p. vii)

What is the connection between the domination of most workplaces by bureaucratic control and the early socialization "appropriate" for children? Teachers as well as most new class parents work in bureaucracies: university, government, and industry bureaucracies. While they work with symbol systems and may need to produce innovative ways of looking at information, a problem space which would promote the curricular concept of an integrated code, their occupational settings are largely bureaucratic. In the integrated code form of open education, teachers proclaimed that work definitions and procedures were appropriate matters for the students to decide for themselves. Teachers stretched the definition of what was educative beyond the limits that many school administrators were able to accept or justify. Open classroom teachers could "get away" with their activity only because their students continued to score well on tests.
Conclusion

The extent to which the integrated code threatened hierarchical organizations of subject matter and task structure ultimately made open education unappealing to new class elementary teachers and undoubtedly also to new class parents who largely understood and accepted the rules of work in bureaucratic organizations. The unorthodox principles of self-direction implied in the integrated code continue to be unacceptable in a bureaucracy. One would expect elementary education to continue to reflect these constraints. It will easily incorporate ecology or computer programming or any other contemporary changes in the subject matter content. It will not incorporate challenges to hierarchical social control as long as the dominant sources of jobs are primarily hierarchically organized. That is the fundamental meaning of "back to the basics". The basic subjects of the 1980's are dictated by the current economic demands of the employment marketplace. The context in which these skills are taught in schools is equally influenced by the social organization of the workplace where these skills can be marketed and used.
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Commentary and Criticism

This section of TRSE provides space for the presentation of argument, debate, discourse or position in regard to issues in social education. The editors seek thoughtful critique and response. We encourage your participation.

A Response to our Critics: Reflective Inquiry is not the Same as Social Science

S. Samuel Shermis*,
Purdue University

Introduction

From the inception of the Three Traditions argument in 1970, there has been pressure to deny that social studies teaching can be understood in terms of three separate and conceptually distinct traditions. This has sometimes taken the form of a specific denial that Social Science (SS) and Reflective Inquiry (RI) are substantially different. The argument is that since both are essentially the same, why not collapse the two and consider them as one tradition.

Thus, in 1977 Suzanne Helburn in her response to the Barr-Barth-Shermis Defining the Social Studies called for a synthesis of RI and SS. More recently Charles White points out that social studies educators in a panel called upon to respond to some elements of the Barth/Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale "... found this a particularly difficult task, so much so that two were unable to complete it." White also discovered that

*As this article is being written, Barth is in his sabbatical year, very probably subverting social studies on several continents. However, as we discussed the ideas in this article before he left, the arguments made in this work do reflect his position.
public school teachers, asked to take the Social Studies Preference Scale, did not distinguish among the three different positions.

While there are indeed similarities between the Social Science and Reflective Inquiry traditions, there are also important differences which are not clearly discernible. Perhaps the major distinction lies in the area of problem definition and conception of the problem-solving process as it applies to social problems. We begin this analysis with a brief summary of "problem" as it has been used in the Social Science tradition, summarize the term as it is employed in Reflective Inquiry, and conclude with an analysis of what I take to be the essential difference.

What Is A Problem in the Social Science Tradition?

As Barth and I have already pointed out, the context of problem-solving in the Social Science tradition is what we have called "the disciplinary problem." Disciplinary problems are topics or concepts which, over the years, have become an important part of the conceptual storehouse of academic disciplines. Over the years, "culture" has lain in the province of cultural anthropologists, just as "class stratification" has been "owned" by sociologists and "economic competition" by economists. Our research has suggested that such ownership is not a monopoly, that any term may be used by any number of different disciplines, but that by the 20th century all of the young social science disciplines had staked out their claim to certain phenomena which they then regarded as their own.

We also discovered, as has been pointed out in these pages, that sociologists exercised an important, perhaps the chief influence on the thinking of social studies educators. When we examined the development of the term "social problem" as used by late 19th and early 20th century sociologists, we discovered that there was no clear definition of the term until the mid-1930s. In place of a definition, sociologists concerned with societal disjunctions, threats to philosophical values, stressful conditions, etc., defined problems ostensively. They pointed to disturbing behavior and claimed that "crime" was a problem, as was also "prostitution" and "labor conflict." This practice permitted sociologists to define any behavior they chose as problematic without identifying their assumptions, values or definitional processes. When sociologists and their graduate students, some of whom became social studies educators, curriculum-makers and text writers, turned their attention to writing social problems texts, they continued this same usage. That is, they simply named behavior and labeled it problematic, e.g., there was a "drug problem" which was as described by the writer, and the problem—as one infers from reading a number of texts—is that young people abuse marijuana. In sum, social problems texts writers and teachers con-
tinued the practice begun by social scientists: *they determined the social problem for students, defined it, provided the relevant data and very possibly pointed to a “correct” solution.* This process we have seen at work not only in older texts but also in recent ones written by those in the Social Science tradition.

**The Reflective Inquiry Position**

Beginning with the Deweyan axiom that a problem does not function as such unless it is defined by an individual—that is, perceived, internalized, noted, felt by an organism—those in the Reflective Inquiry tradition attempted to relate the individual definitional process to social problems. Using Alan Griffin’s contribution, Closed Area theory, Hunt and Metcalf, for instance, argued that problems arise predictably when individuals cannot decide what course of action to take or what value ought to be preferred at a given moment. This happens quite frequently because, given the nature of a pluralistic, rapidly changing society in which certain social phenomena evoke considerable feeling, individuals frequently are torn by internal contradictions and conflicts. Closed Areas—e.g., sex, drug use, political theory, racial relations, religion, class stratified behavior—possess two characteristics. First they are productive of unsolved conflict, that is, persisting internal strife and disunity; and they also generate interpersonal conflicts, that is, protracted discord between two or more persons or two or more groups. Second, because the cultural phenomena are shielded from inquiry, they are therefore not easily available for objective inquiry by the young. Thus, Closed Area behavior enveloped in a thick mantle of ignorance, misinformation, irrationality, confusion and heightened emotion.

Paradoxically, it is precisely such behavior that ought to be studied in social studies classes. Not only could such behavior be examined from the perspective of all social science and humanities disciplines, it is out of such behavior that “problems” arise which usually generate a need for “public policy” and “decision-making.” By noting when youngsters reveal conflict, irrationality, confusion, prejudice, misinformation and other Closed Area behavior, in classroom discussions, social studies teachers can take advantage of conditions which propel problem-solving thought, research, and inquiry.

**The Crux of the Matter**

The major distinctions between SS and RI may have emerged by this time. From the standpoint of the traditional Social Science position, the defining process is done, *a priori*, by an instructor, a text author or a curriculum writer. The student is to accept the problem as defined for him. The active partner in the process, of course; is the definer who amasses the details, conceptualizes the issue and spells out the shape, nature and implications of the problem for learners. The learner is the passive partner whose essential function is to receive, accept and reproduce the intellectual opera-
tions of others. What is missing here is Dewey's belief that unless someone feels, senses or owns a problem, the doubt and concern essential for thought are absent.

As we have indicated, the plethora of Social Science materials developed in the 1960s and early 1970s did, in fact, make use of problems. What should be clear is that these were disciplinary problems, already so defined by consensus of social scientists. In many of the economics education materials, the problem was to understand and then apply the axiom that natural resources are in short supply but that human wants are infinite. Or the problem was to understand the position that division of labor considerably enhances efficiency. In some of the geography materials, the problem was to contrast and compare diffusion and independent invention. Some of the history materials attempted to get students to recognize that even eyewitness data are flawed. Some of the sociology curricula tried to persuade students that the most significant aspect of religion was the relationship between religious rite and ideology and position in the class structure.

What can be seen is that the disciplinary problems revolve around the perceptions, attitudes, modes of data gathering, axioms, assumptions and constructs of social science disciplines. There is, to be sure, a considerable difference between the pre-1960 social science approach, which was ordi-
narily limited to the findings and conclusions of social scientists, cut down, simplified and with much of the data and complexity reduced, and those of the more recent social scientists which emphasized the social science inquiry process as well as the products of inquiry. However, in both cases, the approach was to define a problem in social science disciplinary terms, for students.

From the standpoint of RI, not only is something not a problem unless it is owned and defined and felt as such by a learner but a social problem must also be defined by a learner as well. That is, according to the RI position, there are no “social problems,” objectively existing and defined as such until they are perceived and shaped by someone. There is no problem in an abso-
lute sense called “drug abuse” or “poverty” or “crime.” The reason for this has to do with the definitional process to which we alluded earlier. First, in the thinking of certain sociologists, “pre-packaged” social problems are both unduly constricting and unfair. They are constricting because they usually do not take into account different perceptions, unfamiliar data, minority interpretations and unpopular views. They are unfair because they do not permit large sections of the populace—usually the poor and politically powerless—to take part in the process of placing social problems on a na-
tional agenda. And without being able to do this, political power is kept from flowing into the hands of those who have a rightful claim to it.

Consider, for example, something called “First Amendment Rights,” which is generally labeled and described in abundant, if one-sided, detail for students by text authors or teachers. From the RI standpoint, the label
probably should be “Conflict Between Freedom of Speech and Public Security.” “The Public’s Right to Know Versus the Individual’s Right to Privacy,” “The Right of Newspapers to Report the News and the Rights of Individuals to a Fair Trial.” Such phrasing is an attempt to specify the nature of the conflict. It is not a generalized, vague and amorphous topic, such as “The importance of free expression,”10 “Limitations to free expression,”11 “The nature and importance of public opinion,”12 “Threats to free speech,”13 or “Limits on obtaining information.”14 Rather the problem is defined precisely—in terms of what makes it a problem, i.e., a conflict in values which perpetuates an unsolved, controversial, touchy issue, a matter of continuous debate, one that evokes passion and argument. This phrasing I have used above, however, does not exhaust the possibilities for, in terms of RI, the problem may be defined any way a student cares to define it—provided the student has been required to undergo a definitional process.

By the same token, the traditional mode of defining something called “the drug problem” as an excessive, immoral and dangerous use of illicit drugs, especially pot, by the young is, once more, contrary to an RI position. The ‘drug problem’ could be defined in terms of pharmaceutical houses that have trained physicians to overprescribe certain drugs. It could be defined in terms of lifestyles that predispose individuals to consume too much aspirin, coffee, uppers, downers and booze day after day, in order to reduce stress. Or it could be defined in terms of deliberate adult hypocrisy. Or it could be defined in terms of an entire culture that recommends something out of a bottle for any and all intrapersonal problems.

Summary

The point is this. For Reflective Inquiry a problem is not a problem unless an individual senses it as such; it follows that the shape, nature, character and label of any social problem awaits definition by individuals who are inquiring into it. Neither individual problems nor social problems come prelabeled.

In sum, Social Science is not the same thing as Reflective Inquiry. At important points there are philosophical and practical differences which cannot be dissolved or overlooked. The ground of the RI problem is individual experience. The origin of the SS problem is the traditions of the discipline. From the RI point of view, a problem is not a problem unless an individual defines it as such. From the standpoint of SS, a problem is whatever a consensus of experts regard as a problem. From an RI position, students can define a problem as they see fit, provided they go through a definitional process. From the SS position, the objective is to have students undergo a thought process which has already proven to be effective in yielding precise and fruitful conclusion. From an RI reference, a social problem arises because the culture is full of unresolved conflict and incompatible patterns.
From an SS reference, problems arise because individuals within a discipline have been unable to resolve certain persistent issues.

While this summary may have resolved the problem in my own mind, I have the utmost faith that others may not agree. Hopefully, a problem has been generated.


3Ibid., p. 11 in original draft.

4See Shermis and Barth, "We All Know What a Problem Is. Don't We?" Peabody Journal of Education, 47(April, 1978) 338–341.


6Which we did in a monograph “What is a Social Problem? How Do Sociologists Define the Term,” an unpublished monograph, Purdue University, 1979.

7Which we described in “Nineteenth Century Origins . . . ,” op. cit.


9I am obliged to my colleague and friend, Professor Robert Perrucci, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, Indiana, for this observation.


11Ibid.

12Ibid.


14Ibid.

Reviewed by Murry R. Nelson, The Pennsylvania State University

Is American society more violent than ever before? Judging by our nation's history violence has always been a significant force in the social fabric of this country. The Boston Massacre, the Whiskey Rebellion, the Haymarket Riot, race riots of the early 1900's and 1945, the attacks on civil rights demonstrators, the 1968 police riot at the Democratic convention all illustrate this point. But until recently one institution had been relatively immune from such confrontation—the schools.

The previous "tranquility" in schools may have been caused by the early racist or class biased groupings schools have often perpetuated which encouraged many minority group members to leave school as soon as possible. The serenity may have been a function of greater parental faith in schools and, thus, greater parental support of the schools. The school calm could also have been due in part to a lack of television that lessened students' exposure to violence as well as information on civil rights and students' rights. At this point the causes are of interest, but of greater concern are ways that people in schools can better cope with violence and confrontation. One volume, Our Nation's Schools—A Report Card: "A" in School Violence and Vandalism, noted that between 1970-73 in 759 school districts

- homicides increased by 18.5 percent
- rapes and attempted rapes increased by 40.1 percent
- robberies increased by 36.7 percent
- assaults on students increased by 85.3 percent
- assaults on teachers increased by 77.4 percent.

It is from this background that Bybee and Gee have produced a volume that they hope will provide practical recommendations for the complex problems of violence facing educators today. (They) "have attempted to offer a practical agenda for immediate adoption to help reduce alienation, educate for democratic values, encourage appropriate behavior, and resolve school-related conflicts" (ix).

The authors strive toward this monumental goal through a mixture of historical and social theory, case studies of rights of children and students, moral posturing and practical recommendations. Despite the book's relatively short length, the result is a well written, coherent commentary on class
and school disruptions and commensurate policies. The style is clear and clean, making it readable for parents, teachers, administrators, or school board members. The case studies are thoughtfully presented and their selection from a variety of school environments such as urban junior high, suburban junior high, rural high school makes the cases that much more effective.

The book is divided into eight chapters, two of which are case oriented and provide the precedents for legal belief concerning youth and schools. One of these is a historical chapter which provides the reader with a useful historical basis for decisions made in the past twenty-five years. Other books such as the ACLU hand books or the recent Teachers and the Law by Fischer, Schimmel and Kelly provide solid legal foundations, but they fail to trace those legal roots back to the earlier years of our nation's history. Bybee and Gee do this briefly, but well.

After providing the case material the authors shift to a broadbased societal examination of violence and schools, then try to link that to a lack of values understanding on the part of students and teachers. Chapter five attempts to provide a better understanding of ethical development by examining the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg and June Tapp. The authors conclude this chapter by offering law-related education as "a direct step toward reducing student disruption and facilitating ethical development and legal literacy through education." (156). Despite that forceful statement, so little attention is paid to law-related education that the reader is hardly convinced.

This is a problem that this book is bound to have since 250 pages is hardly sufficient to do all that the authors hope to do. Most of the time their synthesis of reams of material is accurate and convincing. There are places, however, where more development of the material was required and the section on law-related education is one of those places.

The last three chapters shift to practical recommendations and ideas. Although not the most extensive practical volume in this area, the coupling with the previously described well grounded theories and cases make this section seem more believable. Conflict "dynamics" within various dimensions are presented in a hierarchical fashion, from the student's need for affirmation all the way to violence. The chapter on the resolution of school conflicts deals with different approaches such as those of William Glasser, Rudolf Dreikus and Thomas Gordon. The authors end the chapter with their own eight step approach to conflict resolution in schools.

Many administrators, teachers and parents will find this book useful. It is straightforward, provides fine research and data and relates them to history with a degree of compassion and common sense.

Despite all this I found myself troubled a bit by this book because of its "acceptant tone," i.e., its commitment to dealing with what is, rather than taking strides towards more than cosmetic changes. Attitudinal understand-
ing is a step in this direction but the notion of deeper change for social improvement is not a factor in this volume. Maybe it should not be. Maybe the deficiency is in me and the many social educators who define themselves as reconstructionists. Reading *Violence, Values and Justice in the Schools* left me satisfied at the problem solving approach, but disappointed by seeing the problems confined to school management rather than societal resolution of such problems.
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Abstracts

A Validation Study of the Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale

The Barth-Shermis Social Studies Preference Scale has been used in research for several years as a measure of social studies educators' orientations with respect to Barth and Shermis' three traditions (1970; Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977, 1978). This study examines the extent to which the scale is a reliable and valid instrument. The scale was administered in the spring of 1981 to 90 in-service secondary social studies teachers in six midwestern and northeastern school districts. Both content and construct validity were assessed and reliability measures obtained, utilizing a broad range of conventional methods. The results suggest that the Barth-Shermis Scale, while reliable, is deficient in the realm of validity. The claim that the three traditions are descriptive of teaching practice is seriously challenged by the emergence of a more descriptive two-tradition pattern and by the absence of respondents adhering to single traditions.

A Social Perspective on Student Learning

Most educational research on student learning in schools has been characterized by conceptualizations of learning involving the interaction between a learner and a task situation and the interaction between a learner and a teacher. A social perspective which incorporates the characteristics and relationships of learners as a group or groups in a classroom has been utilized infrequently. Research on status characteristics and expectation states and student team learning are used to clarify how the immediate social environment of the classroom can structure the quantity and quality of learner performance. Implications of a socially coherent perspective on school learning are identified for social studies educational researchers and developers.

The New Middle Class and the Organization of Curricular Knowledge

This essay explores the relationship of curricular organization to social class and the constraints imposed on curriculum innovation by the structure of the workplace in America. It is suggested that the “inquiry” and “critical thinking” elements of social studies curricula share a style of social control most extensively attempted in the 1970’s open classroom movement. Basil Bernstein’s integrated collection code analysis of curriculum is linked to the organization of work in contemporary America to indicate that there are considerable limitations on the possibilities for implementing an integrated code in the public schools.