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Introduction

Teacher training workshops have long been a major approach used in efforts to upgrade public understanding about economics, and it is commonly assumed that students in our nation’s classrooms will be the indirect beneficiaries of teacher participation in such programs.

The rationale behind teacher inservice training hinges on the notion of a “chain reaction” of teachers-students-opinions-actions. That is, economic knowledge, transmitted in these workshops, will bring about a change in teacher opinions. Upon returning to their classrooms, these teachers will transmit the economic knowledge to their many students, thereby changing student opinions. Having experienced a change in opinions, the students and their teachers will alter their behavior in ways that are deemed desirable by the workshop supporters and instructors, e.g., students will tell their friends about the economics they have learned, teachers will strengthen the economics component in their classes.

It can be seen from the proliferation of teacher inservice training workshops that this approach to economic education has gained in popularity over the last few years. Among the many types of inservice workshops are those offered by the Joint Council on Economic Education through its affiliated State Councils and Centers for Economic Education. The number of these workshops offered nationwide has increased from 112 in 1954 to
385 in 1979 (JCEE, 1979, p. 81). The typical workshop is offered by one of the Centers for Economic Education during the summer months. Graduate credit is awarded through the host university. The participants, drawn from all grade levels and subject-areas, meet every day for a one to three-week period.

The recent surge of interest in this approach to economic education has highlighted the need to examine the effectiveness of these workshops as instruments for transmitting knowledge of economics and changing economics opinions of those involved directly and indirectly. To date, there exists relatively little research concerning the effect of these programs on participating teachers, and even less research concerning their effect on students enrolled in classes subsequently taught by these teachers.

Early studies appear to support the contention that workshops affect the economics achievement of the teacher participants (Dawson and Davison, 1973; Thornton and Vredeveld, 1977, pp. 93–99; Walstad, 1980, pp. 41–48) as well as their economics opinions (Hazlett, 1973; Hibner, 1959). Additional studies have shown a connection between inservice training and achievement and opinions of students of the participants (Highsmith, 1974, pp. 77–81; Thornton and Vredeveld, 1977, pp. 93–99; Walstad, 1980, pp. 41–48). Some of the more recent of these studies employ simultaneous equations techniques to also prove the relationship between achievement and opinions (Walstad, 1979, pp. 1–12; 1980, pp. 41–48).

Design

This study involved teacher participants in each of seven inservice workshops offered by the Louisiana Council on Economic Education (LCEE) in the summer of 1981, along with comparison groups of nonparticipant teachers. In addition, it involved public school students in fall semester, 1981, economics classes taught by participant and nonparticipant economics teachers.

A comparison design was used, with two treatment groups and two comparison groups. The treatment groups consisted of the entire populations of all non-economics teacher participants in the workshop and all economics teacher participants in the workshops.

The comparison groups consisted of two stratified, random samples which were drawn from the populations of all non-participant, non-economics teachers in Louisiana and all non-participant economics teachers in Louisiana. The samples were stratified in order to enhance comparison with members of the treatment groups. Treatment and comparison groups were then matched in order to insure no significant difference among a select group of characteristics. In addition, each economics teacher was asked to select one of his classes of economics students for the study. In an effort to provide a more consistent comparison among student groups, it was suggested that each of these teachers select his "best" class.

A total of 247 teachers were involved in the experiment. Of this number,
150 were participants in the workshops, while 97 were non-participants; 227 were non-economics teachers and 20 were economics teachers. One hundred forty-three of the non-economics teachers participated in the workshops and 84 did not. Similarly, 7 economics teachers participated in the workshops while 13 did not. Participants were drawn from 22 of the 64 parishes in the state of Louisiana.

The total number of students participating in the study was 642. Of this number, the treatment group consisted of the 219 students enrolled in economics classes designated by workshop participants. The comparison group consisted of the remaining 423 students, who were enrolled in classes designated by non-participants.

The Test of Economic Literacy (JCEE, 1979) was used for purposes of measuring achievement. Pre- and post-test achievement was measured by forms A and B of the TEL, respectively. Opinions about economics were measured by the "Survey on Economic Attitudes" (JCEE, 1979). Part I of the SEA, measuring opinions about economics as a subject, was used in the study. Each test instrument showed suitable validity and reliability.

The TEL and SEA were administered to the treatment and comparison groups of teachers at the beginning and end of the summer workshops. In addition, economics teachers administered these instruments to their classes of students at the start and close of the fall semester.

Findings

Ordinary least squares regression (OLS) was used to analyze workshop impact on teacher achievement. The results are shown in table 1. Workshop participation was shown to have a significant impact on teacher posttest achievement scores. Specifically, the expected increase in teacher achievement scores due to workshop participation was 7.26 points out of a possible 46 points on the TEL.

In constructing the OLS equations for achievement and opinions, pretest score was used as an independent variable. This permitted a more accurate delineation of the difference in posttest score that could be attributed to workshop participation alone. Pretest score was presumed to reflect the individual's cumulative experiences prior to the period being studied (Murnane, 1975). In addition, a dummy variable was used for "workshop participation." One indicated participation in an LCEE summer 1981 economic education workshop. Zero indicated no participation in either an LCEE summer 1981 economic education workshop or in any previous graduate economic education workshop. Similarly, a dummy variable was used for "population," with one indicating a parish with a population greater than 50,000 and zero indicating a parish with a population less than 50,000.

Of additional interest is the coefficient on the undergraduate economic background variable. When contrasted by the fact that the workshop coefficient was significant, this finding could appear to lend support to the contention that inservice training has a greater impact on teacher achieve-
Table 1: Regression Results for Teacher Posttest Economics Achievement

(t statistics are shown in parentheses, N = 247, Dependent Variable = Posttest Economics Achievement Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-.004 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Economics Achievement Score</td>
<td>.693 (13.57)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Dummy</td>
<td>7.260 (8.21)a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Economics</td>
<td>.318 (.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Dummy</td>
<td>-7.067 (-.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = parish population more than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = parish population less than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.001 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .549
F = 58.79

aSignificant at the .01 level.

ment than does preservice training. The finding may also indicate a poor retention rate for economics information.

Ordinary least squares regression was also used to analyze workshop impact on teacher opinions (see table 2). Again, workshop participation was shown to have a significant impact upon scores for teacher opinions about economics as a subject. The expected increase was 5.435 points, a range of 14 to 70 points, significant at a t-value of 4.928. The low R² in relation to the teacher achievement equation would seem to indicate a greater randomness in the opinion formation process.

The impact of the workshops on students of the participants was analyzed by combining teacher and student data in a two stage least squares regression equation (TSLS).

There were two primary reasons for using this technique. First, in using OLS to test for teacher achievement and opinions, a limiting assumption had to be made. It was assumed that achievement and opinions are independently, rather than simultaneously determined. Accordingly, neither achievement nor opinions were used as independent variables in the OLS equations. Finding a simultaneous relationship between them would have
rendered the parameter estimates in the OLS equations inconsistent (Walstad, 1979). TSLS allows us to circumvent the assumption of a non-simultaneous relationship between achievement and opinions and measure the impact of each of these variables upon the other (Walstad, 1979, pp. 1-12; Johnson, 1979, p. 3). In effect, the use of TSLS in gauging this relationship constituted a check on the proper specification of the teacher impact equations. If no simultaneous relationship was uncovered, this would lend support to the contention that the OLS equations were properly specified (Kmenta, 1971).

Secondly, the reduced form TSLS estimates permitted examination of the total effect of the workshops on the students and teachers. There were a couple of reasons for combining the teacher and student data sets. First, this would allow a more general test of the simultaneous relationship between teachers and students. Secondly, it permitted the model to have the maximum degrees of freedom, thus allowing for more efficient parameter estimates.

Figure 1 depicts the learning model upon which the TSLS equations were based. Inservice workshops were presumed to have a direct impact on the achievement of teacher participants, and the additional economic knowledge of these teachers was presumed to have a direct impact on students in

### Table 2: Regression Results for Teacher Posttest Economics Opinions

(t statistics are shown in parentheses, N = 247, Dependent Variable = Posttest Economics Opinion Score)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>9.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.240)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Economics Opinion Score</td>
<td>.557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.960)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Dummy</td>
<td>5.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.928)^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = comparison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Dummy</td>
<td>-.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.888)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = parish population more than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = parish population less than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.673)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .311 \]
\[ F = 27.25 \]

^aSignificant at the .01 level.
courses that they teach. More specifically, the workshops, along with several other independent variables, were presumed to affect teacher achievement. Similarly, the workshops, along with other independent variables, were presumed to affect teachers' opinions. However, the workshops were not presumed to affect the teachers' opinions directly. Rather the opinions were affected through achievement. Having had an impact upon the teacher, there is a spillover effect, through the teacher, to the student.  

The TSLS equations were as follows:

1. Posttest opinions, = γ₀ + A₁ pretest opinions, + A₂ per capita income of parish, + A₃ dummy (population), + A₄ dummy (teacher/student), + A₅ posttest achievement, + u₁.

2. Posttest achievement, = γ₀ + B₁ pretest achievement, + B₂ posttest opinions, + B₃ dummy (population), + B₄ (workshop participation), + B₅ dummy (teacher/student), + B₆ per capita income of parish, + u₂.  

The t-test was used to measure the significance of workshop participation as it effects achievement, and in turn, opinions. In addition, the significance of workshop participation as it effects opinions, and in turn, achievement,
was tested for. Table 3 portrays the TSLS estimates for the structural equations. Table 4 presents the reduced forms.

The TSLS coefficient estimate for the workshop dummy variable (2.005) indicated a significant effect of teacher workshop participation on posttest achievement scores of teachers and students ($t = 4.086; p < .05$).

In addition, posttest achievement score was shown to have a significant impact on the posttest opinion measure for teachers and students. Specifically, the estimate for posttest achievement score (.183) indicated a significant effect on opinions about economics as a subject ($t = 1.916; p < .05$).

Conversely, the coefficient estimate for posttest scores for teacher and student opinions about economics as a subject (-.069) indicated an insig-

Table 3: Results for Two Stage Least Squares Regression for Economics Achievement and Opinions—Structural Equations

(t statistics are shown in parentheses, N = 889)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Posttest Achievement Score</th>
<th>Posttest Opinion Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>12.016</td>
<td>26.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4.281)$^b$</td>
<td>(6.819)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Opinion Score</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10.835)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Achievement Score</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17.498)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Dummy</td>
<td>-1.353</td>
<td>1.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Parish population more than 50,000</td>
<td>(-1.976)$^a$</td>
<td>(1.211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Parish population less than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Dummy</td>
<td>5.236</td>
<td>3.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Teacher</td>
<td>(7.833)$^b$</td>
<td>(2.187)$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>.00003</td>
<td>-.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.103)</td>
<td>(-1.775)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Dummy</td>
<td>2.005</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 = Treatment</td>
<td>(4.086)$^b$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Achievement Score</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Opinion Score</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.916)$^a$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>131.71</td>
<td>34.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Significant at the .05 level.
$^b$Significant at the .01 level.
Table 4: Results for Two Stage Least Squares Regression for Economics Achievement and Opinions—Reduced Form Equations

(N = 889)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Posttest Achievement Score</th>
<th>Posttest Opinion Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.747</td>
<td>34.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Opinion Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Achievement Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Dummy 1 = Parish population more than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.575</td>
<td>1.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Parish population less than 50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Dummy 1 = Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.400</td>
<td>3.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>.00003</td>
<td>-.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Dummy 1 = Treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>1.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 = Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant impact on posttest achievement scores (t = 1.477; p > .05). Therefore, no simultaneous relationship between achievement and opinions was found to exist at the .05 level of significance.

However, it should be mentioned that a significant recursive relationship was identified. The regression showed that the workshop had a significant, positive impact on achievement score and that achievement score, in turn, has a significant impact on opinion score.

In addition, the TSLS reduced form estimates indicate a total workshop impact on students. While one would expect the reduced form estimate to be higher than the structural equation estimate, there was no significant difference between the two. The structural equations indicate that a student whose teacher took the workshop (teacher dummy = 0, workshop dummy = 1) scored approximately two points higher than the student whose teacher did not take the workshop (teacher dummy = 0, workshop dummy = 0). Since there is a priori, knowledge that the students did not take the workshop, the dummies (teacher = 0, workshop = 1) account for the direct impact of a participant teacher on student achievement, while the dummies (teacher = 1, workshop = 1) estimate the direct impact of the workshop on the teacher.

As a final note, the TSLS findings provide a check on the OLS equations used in the study. The results would appear to bolster the findings with respect to the impact of the workshop on teacher achievement. In the OLS
teacher achievement equation, opinions had been omitted as an independent variable. However, when they were included in the TSLS equation, they were found to have an insignificant impact. Therefore, it would appear as though the OLS equation for teacher achievement was well specified.

Conversely, TSLS results point to some possible specification problems in the OLS equation used to test workshop impact on teacher opinions. In that equation, achievement was not used as an independent variable. However, when achievement was included as an independent variable in the TSLS equations, it was found to have a significant impact on opinions. Therefore, the OLS teacher opinion equation might have been misspecified. However, the two procedures yielded mostly the same results, except for the fact that the TSLS analysis points to only a significant indirect impact of the workshop on teacher opinions.

**Conclusions**

Several conclusions were drawn from the study. First, participation in an economics workshop has a significant positive impact on the economics achievement of the teachers involved. Both OLS and TSLS techniques yielded findings of a direct impact of the workshops on teacher economics achievement.

Secondly, participation in a workshop has a significant positive impact on teacher opinions about economics as a subject. In addition, TSLS findings suggest that the impact on teacher opinions could occur as a result of the prior impact of the workshops on teacher achievement.

Third, there is no significant simultaneous relationship between economics achievement and economics opinions of both teachers and students. Economics achievement has a significant influence on economics opinion formation. However, economics opinions do not significantly influence economics achievement.

Finally, teacher participation in an economics inservice workshop has a significant, though indirect, positive impact on both the economics achievement and opinions about economics of students in subsequent economics classes that they teach. Specifically, workshops affect student achievement through their prior impact on teacher achievement and opinions. Similarly, workshops affect student opinions through their prior impact on teacher achievement and opinions, and student achievement. The identified economics learning model is depicted in figure 2.

**Implications**

The findings of this study suggest the need to use TSLS, along with OLS, in further research into the effectiveness of various economic education programs. This study corroborates Walstad's findings that achievement affects opinions, but opinions do not affect achievement (Walstad 1979, 1980). This suggests a need to re-examine previous studies showing opinions to have an effect on achievement (Karstennsen and Vedder, 1974, pp. 101-111;
Hodgin and Manahan, 1979; Deboeck and Sloane, 1972). TSLS may be most useful as a check on the consistency of OLS parameter estimates.

In addition, this study suggests a need for further research modeled according to common conceptions of the impact of teacher training on students of the participants. It carries previous research a step further in applying the workshop treatment solely to the teachers, while tracing the impact to subsequent economics classes taught by these participants. The design and statistical techniques were grounded in the notion that a workshop’s impact on students is indirect, occurring solely through an induced change in the achievement and opinions of the teacher participants. Accordingly, no treatment was given directly to the students, thereby marking a departure from previous studies in this area (Thornton and Vredeveeld, 1977, pp. 93–99; Walstad, 1979, pp. 1–12).

The findings support the concept of a chain reaction of workshop effect. Future studies should attempt to calculate a teacher-student multiplier for achievement and opinions. As an example, it would be useful to find the expected net addition to all the students’ achievement scores that would result from an additional point in one teacher's achievement score. The multiplier
would be helpful in comparisons of the cost-effectiveness of inservice training for students and teachers vis-à-vis inservice training solely for teachers.
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Endnotes

1 Louisiana's Act 83 (1976) requires all public high school students to take a one-semester course in "the essentials and benefits of the free enterprise system" as a prerequisite to graduation. The course, entitled "free enterprise," provides an overview of basic capitalist economic principles and the operation of the American economy. Students enroll in the course during their senior year.

2 For purposes of highlighting the indirect effect of the workshops on economics classes, the economics and non-economics teachers were considered separate populations. An economics teacher was defined as a public school teacher who had taught the state-mandated economics course at least one time prior to the summer workshop involved in the study, and who taught at least one section of the economics course in the fall semester immediately following the summer workshop.

3 Match factors included mean age, mean years teaching experience, mean number of undergraduate economics courses previously taken, and mean population and per capita income of the parish (county) in which the school is located. Difference in means tests indicated no significant differences between treatment and comparison groups regarding any of the above background characteristics.

4 A likert scale format is used for responses to the SEA. In scoring Part I, it was necessary to reverse-code some of the fourteen items in order to establish a one-directional scale. Specifically, items that were considered "pro economics" were reverse coded. A scale of 14 (very negative opinions about economics) to 70 (very positive opinions about economics) was then designed.

5 Content validity of the TEL and SEA were established by panels of reviewers. Relationship to the content of the TEL was one of the criteria used to evaluate each item on the SEA. In addition, pilot testing produced TEL reliability statistics of 3.02 standard error of measurement for Form A and 3.01 for Form B, along with a Cronbach Alpha of .875 for Form A and .872 for Form B. Finally, pilot testing for Part I of the SEA yielded reliability statistics of 3.177 standard error of measurement and .881 Cronbach Alpha.

6 Teacher testing during the summer was conducted and closely monitored by the workshop coordinators, while the fall testing was conducted by the economics teachers and monitored by the social studies supervisors for the various parishes involved in the study.

7 The model is consistent with the rationale for teacher training as conducted by the Joint Council on Economic Education and its state affiliates. In particular, workshops are always geared primarily toward upgrading teacher achievement. It is only through the change in teacher achievement that teacher opinion change occurs.

8 The coefficient $B_4$ measures the direct impact of the workshop on teacher achievement along with the direct impact of a workshop teacher participant on the student. While the information could have been disaggregated into teacher and student data sets, the resulting parameter estimates would have had fewer degrees of freedom, thereby producing less conclusive evidence of the general efficacy of the workshops.
Introduction

Despite repeated observations and reports about the lecture and textbook orientation of most social studies teaching (e.g. Gross, 1977; Morrisett, et al., 1980; Shaver et al., 1979), case study data (e.g. Jarolimek, 1977) suggest a greater diversity of teaching practice than reports of general trends indicate. It is the teacher who is recognized as the key to this diversity and therefore, at the level of particular classrooms, understanding the teacher is important to knowing and understanding classroom social studies.

What, then, do we know about the social studies classroom teacher? We have demographic and survey data (e.g. Shaver et al., 1977; Superka et al., 1980) which provide an overview, a general idea, about teachers' concerns and frustrations. But we are only just beginning to understand the links between these concerns and frustrations and day to day teaching practice (e.g. McNeil, 1977). We know little about how practitioners, rather than scholars, give meaning and purpose to social studies and how these meanings, rather than scholarly definitions, give direction to classroom practice. We know little about the intentions and beliefs which underlie practice.

Perspectives

The beliefs and abstract ideas which teachers express about social studies often seem to have little effect on their teaching practice. While their con-
ceptions of social studies may be influenced by the terminology of various trends such as 'inquiry' or 'values education,' their practice appears not to be. In order to understand the meanings teachers give to social studies then, we must inquire into more than these abstract conceptions; we must look at their ideas in the context of teaching practices.

A concept of teacher perspectives as it has come to be used in the literature, captures the ideas, behaviors and contexts of particular teaching acts (Becker, 1961; Boag, 1980; Cornbleth, 1982; Grace, 1978; Hammersley, 1977; Janesick, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975). Perspectives are the meanings and interpretations which teachers give to their work and their work situation. Unlike more abstract statements, perspectives are set in the concrete world of actual situations and have reference to particular behaviors. They are a kind of operational philosophy developed out of experiences in the immediate and distant past, and applied to specific situations.

Perspectives are not to be understood apart from the behaviors they lead to in particular situations. Teacher perspectives take into account how the situation of the school and classroom is experienced, how this situation is interpreted given the teacher's background of experiences, beliefs and assumptions and how this interpretation is manifested in behaviors.

In their recent work, Berlak & Berlak (1981) offer a useful way to talk about teacher perspectives. They suggest conceptualizing teachers' acts as ongoing resolutions to a set of competing demands or dilemmas. The language of dilemmas provides a way to take into account teachers' beliefs and actions as they are situated in particular contexts.

The dilemma language represents the interconnectedness, as well as the apparent contradictions, of teacher behavior and thought within the schooling context. Dilemmas represent the thought and actions of teachers involved in ongoing negotiation within themselves and with the social world. They are linguistic devices which provide a way to talk about the contradictions and conflicts which arise as human beings interact in social settings. While dilemmas acknowledge the possibilities for consciously selecting from and creating alternatives, they also provide a means of becoming aware of and describing teacher actions which are not consciously chosen.

In a study of teacher perspectives, a researcher may choose to focus on teachers, and the dilemmas they face, at various stages in their careers. One stage of concern to teacher educators is, of course, the stage of pre-service education.

The Pre-Service Teacher

The field experience of a pre-service teacher is generally regarded as a formative period in a teacher's career. The study reported here sought to examine the relationship of the field experience to preparation for teaching social studies in the elementary school. In general, literature on field experiences and social studies teaching generally is not very illuminating. The major focus has been on the effectiveness of particular training techniques de-
signed to get student teachers to successfully use certain teaching strategies (e.g. Grannis 1970). But this research tells us little about how these student teachers incorporate these experiences into their thinking about social studies or their future practice.

This criticism can be made about research on student teaching generally. Although hundreds of studies have been conducted on the impact of student teaching, only a few have explored the dynamics of the experience itself. Rather, much research on teacher education has focused on teaching behavior apart from beliefs and intentions, or on student-teacher attitudes, and the influences on these attitudes, as expressed through various survey instruments (Zeichner, 1979).

A few recent field studies have inquired into the perspectives of student-teachers, although these have focused on perspectives toward teaching generally, rather than toward curriculum or, more specifically, social studies. From these studies, in which student-teachers are observed and interviewed in the context of their teaching, we learn that student teachers are, in general, concerned with order, management and survival. It is not clear, however, what impact this might have on perspectives toward social studies. Furthermore, most of these studies focus on a dominant perspective among student teachers. With some exceptions (e.g. Goodman, 1982; Lacey, 1977; Tabachnick, 1982), we do not have much insight into the possible complexity of this perspective or into other varieties of perspectives or how this complexity and variety may manifest itself in perspectives toward teaching areas. This study, then, was undertaken to contribute to our knowledge of teachers’ perspectives by focusing on student-teacher perspectives toward social studies.

Methodology

In order to investigate student teacher definitions and interpretations of social studies in the elementary school classroom, it was necessary to observe and talk with informants about concrete teaching experiences. A field study methodology, entailing indepth, study, was deemed most appropriate. Student teaching in this study, was regarded as a social event involving extensive interaction with people, situations and settings over an extended period of time. A field study approach focusing on a small number of informants would allow the researcher to determine the ways in which these informants made sense of their teaching experiences.

For indepth study, four student teachers were selected from an elementary teacher education program at a large mid-western university. This number of informants allowed opportunity for extensive observations and interviews. The researcher sought to select student teachers who appeared to hold conceptions of social studies deemed “desirable” in social studies literature. This was determined through the use of a Conceptions of Social Studies Inventory developed for this research and administered to all students beginning their elementary field experience (Adler, 1982); in addition rec-
ommendations of social studies method professors were sought.

The four students selected were those whose conceptions of social studies were characterized by:

- a belief that worthwhile social studies knowledge is that which is personally meaningful to the knower;
- a process orientation or desire to involve pupils in the process of critical thinking;
- a view of social studies as part or potentially part of an integrated curriculum;
- a belief that social interaction is an important component of social studies learning;
- a desire to involve pupils in making decisions about social studies curriculum and learning activities;
- a desire to use resources other than or in addition to the text.

The research took place over a four month period. Data were collected primarily through observation and interview. Each student teacher was extensively observed teaching social studies lessons at least five times during the semester; often non-social studies teaching was observed as well. Each observation was followed by an interview probing the student teacher's thoughts on the conduct of the lesson observed and on the teaching experience in general. The observations, then, provided a concrete focus for talk about social studies. More structured interviews were conducted at the beginning and the end of the semester. These interviews, not based on particular observations, probed the student teachers' understanding of rationales for teaching social studies and what they thought ought to go on in the social studies classroom. These interviews also explored the general value orientations and background characteristics which may have been influential in the formation and development of perspectives. In addition, each cooperating teacher was interviewed for his or her perception of the student teacher. Finally, each student teacher completed two writing activities designed to elicit his or her abstract conceptions of social studies.

Interviews were not organized into predetermined protocols; rather, they were guided by orienting questions and concerns, often arising out of observations. Such concerns included the informants' rationale for a particular lesson, their perceptions of the teaching experience, their interpretation of the learners' actions and reactions as well as their perception of their own roles as teachers. After reviewing field notes, more specific questions emerged and these were asked in subsequent interviews. This interaction of data review and analysis with subsequent interviews allowed the researcher to clarify misconceptions and to gain deeper insight into the informants' perspectives.

The data were analyzed on two levels. One level was the preparation of individual profiles describing each student teacher's perspective toward teaching and toward social studies as it emerged in observations and interviews. The second level looked across the cases at the similarities and differ-
ences among the people observed. The individual profiles show how abstract ideas about social studies developed into, or were replaced by, ideas about what would actually be appropriate in the classroom. As each student teacher developed his or her definition of the teaching experience, particular dilemma resolutions and perspectives emerged. The comparison and contrast dimension of the analysis focused on a few key issues or dilemmas.

Portrayals

The main actors in this study were Sally, Laura, Peter and David. The portrayals which follow, briefly describe each informant's perspectives toward teaching generally and toward social studies more specifically. The more general perspectives will be discussed first since it would be misleading to describe perspectives toward social studies without illustrating each informant's pattern of concerns. That is to say, perspectives toward social studies were intertwined with perspectives toward children, toward learning and toward the teacher's role.

Following this more general description of perspectives will be a description of each informant's perspectives toward social studies. These descriptions make use of the language of dilemmas described earlier. Rather than placing the informants in static categories, these descriptions aim to capture the dynamic quality of teaching. For example, while each informant expressed a conception that worthwhile social studies knowledge is that which is personally meaningful to the knower, each had at least been exposed to the idea that worthwhile knowledge is the knowledge of experts found in textbooks and other authoritative sources. What social studies knowledge meant to each in practice, was the resolution (or lack of resolution) of these contrasting ideas. Similarly, each of the conceptions noted earlier may be contrasted with an opposing, although not necessarily mutually exclusive, point of view.

The dilemmas described in these portrayals were not necessarily conscious dilemmas for the informants. For some, resolutions to at least some possible dilemmas came with ease and, in such cases, it makes more sense to talk about patterns of resolutions than about contradictory pulls. In some cases, dilemmas were more conscious and troubling and the teaching and talk about teaching were characterized more by contradiction than by resolutions. In both cases, the dilemmas served as linguistic devices to describe the variety of teaching acts, chosing from the even greater variety of possibilities.

This portrayal section will be followed by a discussion of the conceptions of and perspectives toward social studies which emerged from the field study data and analysis.

Sally

Perspectives Toward Teaching. Sally began her student teaching experience with both enthusiasm and anxiety. More than once, she expressed the concern that she "wasn't ready to teach"; but she also repeated her determina-
tion to be a teacher: “I like teaching. I want to do it.” The major theme in Sally's teaching perspectives was her developing sense of teacher identity, her relationship with her pupils. For Sally, student teaching was a time of uncertain identity, not quite a teacher, no longer a student. During this time, she was self-consciously both a teacher and learner, coming to grips with her own sense of authority and developing confidence in her own expertise.

Not untypically, Sally was very attracted to structure, order, and control. Throughout the semester she worked to develop ways to establish the structure and order she believed were necessary for a productive learning environment. But she was also attracted to the notion that children must control learning if real learning is to take place: “hopefully, they'll carry the ball, keep learning and wanting to learn.” It was the teacher's responsibility, she explained, to control the classroom and the learning environment. But a good teacher must be responsive to children: flexible, caring and patient—not merely an autocrat.

And so Sally came to her teaching with a propensity for both high and low teacher control of children's activities. On one level teaching behavior appeared as movement toward greater teacher control. It may be more accurately characterized, however, as finding a middle-ground, a satisfactory resolution, at least tentatively, to a dilemma of control.

While the overriding theme of Sally's perspectives toward teaching focused on issues of control, it is important to say something about other aspects of her perspectives toward teaching. Her talk about teaching reflected a concern with the diversity and individuality of the children. Her lessons, however, often had all the children doing the same thing at the same time, suggesting contradiction between conception and practice. However, she explained that she was striving to use a variety of materials and to implement a variety of activities so that all the children would have access to the information and concepts being taught.

Finally, while Sally worried about order, she also worked to implement her belief that it is important to get children actively involved in the learning process. Thus Sally worked to maintain an orderly classroom while structuring a learning environment which would provide stimulation and the opportunity for involvement.

**Perspectives Toward Social Studies.** Sally's abstract conceptions of social studies knowledge were characterized, like those of the other informants, by a view of knowledge as personal, process-oriented and integrated. But the meaning of these conceptions, when examined in relationship to actual teaching, reveal a complexity of thought and intention.

Sally was attracted to a view of knowledge as both “public” and “personal.” Knowledge as personal meant, to Sally, the development of empathy in children, empathy for people of other times and other places. Giving pupils a sense “of what it was like to live then” was crucial, in Sally's thinking, to really understanding history or other social studies. Personal knowledge also meant that children's experiences must be incorporated into
the curriculum. Ways must be found, argued Sally, to make the social studies curriculum something that touches children's lives.

At the same time, she was attracted to a concept of public knowledge; that is, that there is a body of information, facts and skills which is accepted as worthwhile by a community of scholars. While espousing and acting on a view of knowledge as personally meaningful to children, Sally taught a publicly accepted curriculum. She never questioned whether it was worthwhile for children to know about New World exploration, only how she might make this body of knowledge personally meaningful to them.

Similarly, a view of social studies as process oriented was counterbalanced by belief that content is important. She wanted children to learn a process of asking questions, of gathering and evaluating information and reaching conclusions. But she also was concerned that they develop general background knowledge—that they learn content. Sally was vague about just what that background knowledge entailed. She often used the term awareness—children ought to be aware of history and of current events; but facts to be memorized for their own sake are just going to be forgotten anyway. In brief, Sally was attracted to both a content and a process approach to social studies and saw the two as interrelated and worked to find a balance of the two in her own teaching.

Sally also acted, to a certain extent at least, on her conception of social studies as part of an integrated curriculum in which there is considerable overlap in skills, content and concepts of various disciplines. At the same time, she was pulled toward a view of social studies as unconnected to other curriculum. In her classroom, there was clearly a period of time designated as social studies, a discipline separate and apart from other disciplines.

As the semester progressed, Sally became increasingly comfortable with her ability to satisfactorily resolve dilemmas of teaching, at least in that particular setting. For example, maintaining an orderly classroom and providing diverse activities for a variety of children had, at first, seemed like an unsolvable dilemma. But with the support of her cooperating teacher, she learned to establish classroom order in the midst of diverse activities. Similarly, she found what she felt were satisfactory resolutions to other dilemmas; she felt she was coming close to finding ways to satisfactorily balance sometimes conflicting pulls.

Laura

Perspectives Toward Teaching. Like Sally, Laura also said that teaching was something that she'd always wanted to do. She stated that she wanted to work with children who "just seemed to need more, more love or more attention. Then you can make more of a difference with them." This desire to work with individual children, especially those with problems, was a strong factor in her view of teaching and the teacher's role.

But equally important was her concern with order and structure. Unlike Sally, and indeed unlike many student teachers, Laura was not uncertain about the authority she wanted in the classroom, and discipline was rarely a
problem for her. She implemented an ordered view of the classroom which was comfortable and, apparently, workable for her. Her preference for a highly structured classroom was reflected in the thoroughness and detail with which she prepared lessons, the care which she took to state and enforce classroom rules, and the specific directions and supervision she gave to students as they worked. It is important to note that Laura saw herself as developing responsibility in children, not as simply enforcing the rules of the institution.

But at the same time Laura was uncomfortable with the possibility of creating order at the expense of creativity and independence. She tried to build into the curriculum (which was largely established by a school committee) some opportunity for student creativity: “I hoped that they would take what they learned and apply it to something creative of their own.” The students, however, seemed confused by these activities and had trouble working on their own.

Another, and related, aspect of Laura’s perspectives toward teaching was her concern with the school as an organization. On the one hand, she stressed the importance of coordinating curriculum across grade levels and having an institutional set of expectations and goals which everyone would adhere to. On the other hand, she felt this coordination should come from the teachers themselves and was not willing to carry out a set of impersonal, institutional demands. To Laura, communication and interdependence with other people were an important part of “being a professional.”

Laura’s concern with individual problem children demonstrated her perspective toward children as unique. She spoke about children as individuals. She gave individual children a good deal of attention outside of class. “I don’t think of kids in groups,” she commented during our last interview, “but as individuals.” However, in her actual teaching, Laura was attracted toward a view of children as having “shared characteristics.” That is, generally children were all taught the same thing at the same time. During her student teaching semester, Laura resolved this dilemma by making a distinction between her relationships as a teacher with the whole class and her relationships with them as a helping adult out of class.

Perspectives Toward Social Studies. Laura too, showed evidence of an attraction toward social studies as personal knowledge. To Laura, social studies curriculum was personally meaningful in that it prepares children for adult life: “before too many years they are going to be part of the voting population that decides these things.”

Furthermore, much of what Laura would label social studies, although not taught during the time officially designated social studies, is that which deals with young people’s problems: “We try to be alert to the problems kids are having. If it’s something that affects a lot of kids we can bring it up in class.” Laura stressed that a primary emphasis in social studies for her would be what she called values education and personal development.
While leaning toward an attraction toward personal knowledge, Laura’s teaching and talk about teaching indicated a strong attraction toward knowledge as certain rather than problematic. The lessons observed consisted of the teacher presenting information which the pupils would write down and later apply. This was consistent with her perspectives toward control and order, toward childhood as a time of preparation for the years to come and toward a concern for the organization, for preparing children for the next grades.

Interestingly, while Laura’s conceptions of social studies as indicated on her inventory, showed a tendency to see knowledge as process oriented, this did not enter into her talk about actual teaching. The lessons she taught had a content emphasis and she never talked about teaching children thinking skills. Laura defined inquiry in social studies as “a way of learning through asking questions.” But, she added, “I don’t know how to teach someone to ask questions.”

During her student teaching semester, Laura expressed little conscious sense of dilemmas. She saw knowledge largely in terms of information and facts to be learned for their own sake. Her social studies teaching seemed to have more to do with her attraction for order and structure than did her abstract conceptions of social studies.

Peter

**Perspectives Toward Teaching.** The theme of integration was an overriding one for Peter. “I guess I’ve seen myself as a real integrator,” he said. The classroom to him was a place where diverse interests and knowledge should be connected to one another and to the real world. Peter entered education because he saw the elementary school classroom as a perfect outlet for a man with diverse interests and a desire for socially responsible work. To Peter, teaching was a job to which he could bring himself and still have the time and energy to pursue those interests which he could then, in turn, bring back to the classroom: “The elementary classroom seemed like a place where you could do a lot of different things as an adult . . . yet still be doing a job that contributes to the common good.” Unlike many student teachers, Peter did not have to struggle with classroom management or with defining his relationship to the children. Teaching for him was an opportunity for self expression and learning, as well as for instructing. His perspectives toward teaching were characterized more by a concern for learning and curriculum than by concerns for developing a comfortable teacher role and learning to relate to children. Peter sought to resolve a dilemma of high vs. low teacher control of pupil action in a way that would find a balance between teacher and pupil control.

“I like to think that you take the interests of the kids and because you have more knowledge, more background, you can build that into a meaningful educational experience.”
Although Peter occasionally encouraged children to work independently, his predominant teaching behavior reflected the idea that learning is, to a large extent, a collective endeavor. Peter believed that learning best takes place when people are motivated by and learn from interaction with others. Children, as well as teachers, can stimulate and contribute to one another's learning. For Peter, this was a clear resolution.

**Perspectives Toward Social Studies.** The idea that knowledge is integrated and that school knowledge needs to be connected to life were essential to Peter's talk about social studies. Making “connections between otherwise isolated and meaningless facts and knowledge” is, said Peter, basic to his philosophy of education and of social studies. These connections are crucial to real learning and, this being the case, provide what Peter called the “greater context.”

He was strongly attracted toward a resolution of knowledge as personally meaningful and viewed social studies as that which helps make the connections between school knowledge and “real life systems.” The theme of connecting learning in school to “real” life recurred throughout Peter's talk about teaching and curriculum and was demonstrated in his teaching as well. Peter’s cooperating teacher noted that one of Peter’s strengths was that “he tried to make the lessons meaningful to them as ten and eleven year olds, not just a body of information they were given by an adult or a textbook that they are expected to memorize.”

Furthermore, in Peter's perspective, knowledge which is personally meaningful primarily emphasizes knowing as a way of thinking and reasoning. Each lesson observed presented the children with open-ended questions or problems, something to ‘figure out.’ It was not sufficient for children to learn the *process* of inquiry, Peter, in addition, encouraged children to develop a critical stance toward knowledge. He spoke of knowledge as problematic and taught in a way that would encourage skeptical questioning. It is important, he explained, that children learn not put too much faith in experts but learn to examine evidence, ideas, and values for themselves.

Peter's conceptions of social studies as demonstrated on the Social Studies Inventory and during our first interview, were given greater meaning in the context of his teaching experiences and beliefs. He chose teaching because he saw the classroom as a place to develop his wide range of interests rather than having to specialize. He was strongly attracted to knowledge as integrated—to not making artificial distinctions between domains of knowledge and to relating knowledge to life and to the children. He sought to establish connections not only among what was being taught but among the learners as well, by structuring and supporting group learning and interaction. He sought, throughout the semester, to actively engage the students in learning and teaching, as he himself was engaged. Finally, he had chosen to work in classroom where he perceived it would be possible for him to implement his teaching philosophy. For Peter, dilemmas of teaching manifested them-
selves in occasional problems of implementation rather than ambivalence in his conceptions of teaching.

**David**

**Perspectives Toward Teaching.** An introspective, thoughtful and religious man, David was eager to develop in young people the ability to use their minds. He spoke often of wanting to stimulate a “joy of learning” in the youngsters he worked with. A joy which would come as learners were enabled to discover things for themselves. One reason David chose his student teaching site was that he felt that the cooperating teacher was teaching social studies in a stimulating way which was compatible with his own goals: “getting the kids to process information and draw conclusions seemed worthwhile to me.”

For David, student teaching turned out to be a frustrating experience. He was forced to face conflicts between his ideas and hopes about teaching and his actual experience. Unlike the other student teachers I observed, David was unable to come to a satisfactory resolution to the dilemmas of teaching he faced during this experience.

His idealized notions of teaching and learning were contradicted by his actual experiences in the classroom. He found children who, it appeared to him, were unmotivated to learn. At the same time David believed that school is a place where learning must occur. Hence, while it would be ideal for students to have a high degree of control over their activities and time, there “has to be some way to insure that work is taking place.” Ideally there would be “no need for telling them what they have to learn without giving them any choices. But that’s difficult to do in a situation where they have to learn.” And indeed, the lessons observed were all tightly teacher structured and implemented, and consisted primarily of lecture and worksheets.

The resolution of high teacher control was not a happy one for David. His original conceptions about ideal learning did not change and he was uncomfortable with his teaching practice. He regarded his role as teacher as too coercive for real learning, although necessarily coercive given his perceived demands of the schools. He felt pressure to “cover the material,” to be “sure that children learn.” Yet he explained, and his cooperating teacher confirmed, that he had a good deal of leeway in deciding what to teach. Indeed, David’s assumptions about what the school demanded seem to have been more important than actual constraints imposed at this particular school.

David’s relationship with his pupils was characterized, on one hand, by respect and consideration. But he was also reluctant to develop personal relationships with his pupils. Despite his expressed interest in working with troubled children, he was careful not to intrude where he felt he may not have been wanted. While maintaining respect for his pupils, he kept some
distance from them and never seemed to arrive at an understanding of them or of his relationship to them.

David was similarly perplexed about how to motivate children's learning. He believed that real learning had to be intrinsically motivated, but he daily faced the reality of a seemingly unmotivated class. And so, although David would like to have facilitated self-motivated learning, he was at a loss as to how he might stimulate motivation. The pupils, said David, seemed only to enjoy "filling in blanks and things." While this was unsatisfactory to him, he felt he was unable to successfully ask them to do anything else. Interestingly, David, like Peter, felt that school should be connected to "real life" to be meaningful. But when asked whether he could make connections in his own classroom he replied:

"I don't know. You could theoretically, I don't know if you could bureaucratically. I've heard of people who try to start things like that. The principal or somebody says 'you have to do this.' So they hurry up and do that and if there's some time left they do what they wanted to do."

Perspectives Toward Social Studies. David's perspectives toward social studies were similarly characterized by frustration and unsuccessful dilemma resolutions. He felt, on the one hand, that knowledge should be personally meaningful and useful. On the other hand, he was concerned that children learn the concepts and information he saw as basic to the discipline. The study of history, in itself, ought to stimulate pupils' "sense of wonder," ought to be meaningful for them. And yet it was readily apparent to David from the beginning of the semester that most pupils simply didn't care about the history he was trying to teach. David, as teacher, would like to have been the vehicle for making public knowledge personally meaningful, but he was unable to find a way to do so.

Similarly, David was very attracted to a process resolution of the process-content dilemma. He talked about the importance of teaching "thinking skills" and trying to get pupils to make inferences. At the same time he was concerned that his students learn information, the facts and theories laid out in lectures and texts. Observations of his teaching revealed a strong tendency to emphasize knowledge as content; but his talk about his teaching showed that this was not satisfactory. Throughout the semester he was unable to find a way to integrate the two ends of the dilemma.

Aspects of David's ambivalence were shown in his talk about social studies knowledge as integrated. On the one hand, he argued, integrating disciplines is a good idea since in our ordinary thinking we don't make distinctions. On the other hand, maybe it would be better to teach social studies (and other disciplines) separately so as to be sure not to neglect or short change one area.

David's perspectives toward social studies could not meaningfully have been determined by simply knowing his conceptions or ideas about social
studies and teaching. Only in the context of the particular classroom, did the ambivalence and uncertainty which characterized his thinking and his actual teaching emerge. I should add that David ended the semester without working out these conflicts to his satisfaction and did not intend to go into teaching.

Conceptions of Social Studies

Not unsurprisingly, it was found that the student teachers' abstract conceptions of social studies seemed to guide practice only superficially. While each of the four was able to articulate conceptions about social studies, practice did not always reflect the ideas. Nonetheless, conceptions of social studies did exist and did play some part in guiding teaching.

Through interviews and writing, each student teacher expressed beliefs and ideas about what social studies is and why it ought to be taught. Each informant gave the term a very broad and general definition. "To me there is no definition because it involved so many things," said Sally. "Social studies is dealing with man in general, his past, his present, his future," Laura explained. To Peter, social studies "encompasses almost everything." And David argued that social studies is "the study of the interaction of people on a personal, community, society, national and international level."

In discussing the reasons why social studies ought to be taught, all four of the student teachers stressed the importance of having pupils learn such knowledge in order to become educated people; but just what that knowledge ought to be was not clarified, even when asked directly. Peter, Sally and Laura also emphasized that social studies ought to enable young people to make informed personal and public choices. Peter and Sally talked about the development of empathy or perspective taking as an important goal for social studies and Laura stressed what she called "values clarification" or learning about oneself. David questioned whether there was any practical value to social studies, given the nature of our society and the decision-making process. But he still advocated including social studies in the school curriculum.

Perspectives toward Social Studies

But these abstract ideas only began to suggest what social studies meant to these four people and thus the focus on their perspectives was crucial. Despite similarities in their initial ideas about social studies and despite the differences among all four which emerged in their teaching, their perspectives toward social studies can be roughly grouped into two categories, one group exemplified by Sally and Peter, the other by Laura and David. Sally and Peter tended to see worthwhile social studies knowledge as that which is personally meaningful. Each stressed the importance of the children's personal experiences and the development of empathy in children. They each tended to emphasize developing in children the skills of learning and reason-
ing and sought to implement a social studies curriculum which would emphasize this process approach. Peter demonstrated an understanding of social studies knowledge as tentative and constructed, and encouraged in his pupils skepticism and doubt as well as reasoning and inquiry. Both Sally and Peter emphasized the need to integrate knowledge in the classroom and in their teaching methods, both sought to implement a variety of learning activities.\(^6\)

Laura and David represented a different set of perspectives toward social studies. They both stressed the importance of “public” over personal knowledge. That is, they were concerned that children learn the insights and information developed by scholars. Both emphasized the teaching of content over processes of learning and reasoning and saw this content as certain rather than tentative knowledge. Both Laura and David did integrate some of their class curriculum, but each stressed the importance of doing so only when it was “appropriate.” More often, they felt, integrating various subjects would be forced and counter-productive. In their teaching methods, Laura and David relied heavily on textbook or other pre-packaged materials. This was consistent with their emphasis on having children absorb information already well structured.\(^7\)

A description of the conceptions and perspectives of these four informants toward social studies gives only a partial view of the perspectives relevant to their social studies teaching. Their perspectives toward social studies curriculum, knowledge and activities were best understood by considering their perspectives toward teaching and learning in general. Assumptions about social studies alone did not fully illuminate practices in social studies.

The perspectives of each of the four student teachers could be seen as a matrix or pattern of interrelated dimensions with an overriding theme, or themes, which threaded throughout their talk and practice. These themes may be described as major concerns which acted as filters or lenses through which the student teaching experience was viewed and interpreted.

Sally struggled with developing her teacher identity, with becoming comfortable in the teacher role and in her relationship with pupils. Laura’s perspectives were characterized by her emphasis on structure and order in her teaching and in her view of the school and the process of schooling. Peter’s perspectives were characterized by the theme of “connections,” his view that diverse interests and knowledge can be connected with each other and with the “real world.” And David’s perspectives were characterized by a concern with joyful learning and by the contradictions he perceived between his idea of teaching and the reality.

These themes wove together the perspectives of each toward teaching, learning and children as well as toward curriculum and knowledge. The social studies teaching of each informant was best understood in the context of this broad pattern of perspectives, as described above, rather than simply in their perspectives toward social studies as such.
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Conclusions

This study began by addressing the conceptions of social studies held by each informant. In many ways, the beliefs they expressed were not unlike those held by many social studies educators. They talked about the importance of having pupils gain knowledge, but warned against blind indoctrination. They emphasized the development of "thinking skills:" gathering and processing data, developing decision-making abilities and interpersonal skills. It would seem that, for some student teachers at least, the "gulf" between scholars and teachers may not be so vast when one looks at the level of abstract ideas.

Not surprisingly, however, there is a different picture when social studies teaching is observed. Among Sally, Peter, Laura, and David, one finds greater variety than their conceptions of social studies alone would suggest. Given this, one might infer that expressed beliefs about social studies are little more than slogans, unrelated to teachers' social studies practice. However, Sally, Laura, Peter, and David did have ideas about social studies and they did not discard these when planning and teaching. But these ideas were only one element in a broader framework. This broader framework took into account the immediate situation, past experiences and other beliefs and assumptions. Social studies teaching was shaped then, not only by beliefs about social studies but by such things as a concern for developing an appropriate teacher role, ideas about what school is about and what ought to be learned there, as well as by past experience in social studies and in community activities.

The perspectives toward social studies which emerged during the student teaching experience of the four informants were influenced by a variety of factors. The institutional features of schooling helped to determine what was seen as possible and feasible. At the same time, background factors of biography and beliefs served as filters through which the immediate situation was viewed and the possible and feasible were interpreted.

No one factor alone shaped these informants' perspectives toward social studies—not their beliefs about social studies, nor the institutional nature of school, nor their uncertainties as novice teachers. Rather it was the interaction of a variety of features, and their own actions which in turn helped to shape their situations.

It is important here to note the dynamic quality of the perspectives each student teacher held. Apparent contradictions or inconsistencies emerged in actions of each and between beliefs each held and practices observed. It seems useful to acknowledge that people often hold apparently contradictory ideas and beliefs, the various aspects of which may be called up in specific situations. Within the broad, interrelated framework of an individual's pattern of perspectives, an apparent contradiction can be seen less as a puzzle or inconsistency and more as a particular resolution for a particular situation.
Implications

This study involved a small number of informants, thus generalizations must be made with caution. However, the descriptions and analysis which emerged do suggest some implications for both teacher educators and researchers.

First, the findings indicate that while conceptions of social studies may have some bearing on social studies teaching, perspectives toward social studies are embedded in teacher's interpretations and understandings of the teaching situation more generally. Professors may be able to influence their students' conceptions of social studies. But the issues and strategies raised in methods classes may have more impact if raised in the context of broader questions such as the role of the teacher, the nature of the learner and the function of schooling. Such issues are often addressed in foundation courses, but in addition preservice teachers may need to explore and be helped to articulate their personal, and often taken for granted, assumptions about these foundations questions and to integrate them with ideas and techniques presented in methods classes and, eventually, with their actual social studies teaching. Preservice teachers can be encouraged to explore links between what is desirable and what is possible in social studies teaching, to consider ways to work within, or around, given school structures, to explore the possibilities of becoming change agents within a school without alienating staff or administrators. In short, social studies methods may best have meaning within the context of prospective teachers' understandings of and experiences with broader questions of life in the classroom.

Implications for research in social studies may be derived as well. The four informants in this study held conceptions of social studies not unlike those advocated in the literature. In the classroom, however, a broad range of factors and assumptions affected teaching and thus practice did not always conform to conceptions expressed. What factors then do influence teachers perspectives toward social studies? Are there some factors which seem more important than others? Are there, in fact, some factors which teacher educators can control or at least influence? What factors might modify or develop the perspectives of beginning teachers and of experienced teachers?

Finally, more needs to be known about the perspectives themselves. Although the perspectives of the four informants in this study could be roughly grouped in two categories, such categorizations are indeed "rough." No simple dichotomy can capture the complexity of actual perspectives, nor their dynamic quality. Some categorization, however, provide us with greater understanding of teaching and of the practioners' interpretations of classroom situations. What categories of perspectives toward social studies might emerge given the input of a greater number of informants? What do teachers in practice regard as worthwhile knowledge, as appropriate definitions and rationales?
Research on teacher perspectives may be one way to help bridge the gap between theory and practice. Certainly it is important to develop thoughtful rationales and meaningful curricula for social studies education. But successful implementation will only come with the collaboration of teachers. Research on teacher perspectives would seek to understand the dynamics of teaching and to acknowledge and value the interpretations and insights of practitioners.

Endnotes

1 The Conceptions of Social Studies Inventory asked students to respond on a scale of 1 through 5 (strongly disagree to strongly agree) to a series of twenty-five statements about Social Studies. These included such statements as:

"Social studies should be integrated with other areas like reading or science."
"Elementary school children are not emotionally prepared to handle learning about problems in our society."
"When there is not enough time for everything, it is better to cut social studies than to cut math."

For the complete inventory see Adler (1982).

2 One activity asked students to write a definition of social studies, and of key terms such as inquiry, values and inferences. Another presented students with brief descriptions of four social studies lessons. Students were asked to write several paragraphs expressing their thoughts about these lessons. For more detail see Adler (1982).

3 All names have been changed for purposes of anonymity. The material quoted in this section has been taken from interviews with the informants.

4 In the Dilemmas of Schooling, Berlak and Berlak suggest sixteen dilemmas which characterized the teaching they observed. While the descriptions in this paper rely on the language of dilemmas, they do not refer necessarily to the specific dilemmas the Berlaks outlined.

5 When Laura talked about values clarification or values education she was not referring to Simon et al. Values Clarification (N.Y.: Hart Publishing Co., 1972) nor to any other particular approach to values education. She simply felt that students should be given the opportunity to discuss value issues and to examine their personal values.

6 This is not to say that there weren't important differences between Sally and Peter, especially at the level of practice. Peter, for example, was more successful at implementing an integrated curriculum in which he used social studies as a thread to tie classroom activities together. He was also better able to develop a variety of learning activities and rely less on the textbook.

7 David and Laura also had a number of differences. For example, although David's teaching emphasized established facts and information, he wanted to be able to find a way to teach pupils to "figure things out for themselves." Laura was confident in her teaching, David was not.
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An Exploratory Comparison of Two Methods of Assessing Teacher Attitude toward Instructional Strategies
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This paper reports a research project combining quantitative and qualitative approaches to research methodology. Two data collection procedures, one representative of each approach, were employed to discover practicing teachers’ attitudes toward selected instructional strategies. The data obtained from each collection procedure were examined and compared. Subsequent analysis of the qualitative data produced tentative empirical generalizations.

The study is exploratory in respect to its focus upon a methodological goal. The purpose was to compare the responses of participants to two data collection procedures differentiated by the degree of researcher-controlled structure inherent in their design. A semantic differential attitude questionnaire was chosen from the quantitative tradition, and a nonschedule standardized interview represented qualitative methodology.

Background

Multiple methods are needed to increase research validity, because one method alone cannot be expected to produce a complete and accurate representation of empirical reality (Denzin, 1978; LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). A researcher may not develop a full description of participants’ meanings if a single highly structured method is used. Although structured protocols, such as paper-and-pencil attitude surveys, have advantages of rapid and ef-
cient administration to large numbers of subjects, they rely upon implicit constructs which may be interpreted variably among the subjects responding to them (Mehan, 1976). The researcher has no opportunity to discover the subjects' interpretations of the survey instrument. A remedy for this problem is the addition of an unstructured research method such as a nonschedule interview which elicits more variable participant expression on the topic (Becker & Geer, 1960; Schatzman & Strauss, 1973).

Teacher attitude toward selected social studies instructional strategies was chosen as the substantive area for investigation with the combined data collection procedures. The research question was formulated in accordance with the methodological goal. How are teachers' responses to an attitude survey instrument comparable to or contrastive with the attitudes which they express in a nonschedule interview?

Theoretical Perspective

The substantive aspect of this study was initially conceived as an attempt to discern teacher attitudes. As analysis of the interview data progressed, a need for a broader conceptualization of the meanings generated became apparent. Attitude, defined as a positive or negative predisposition toward a social object, did not account for all the participant meanings obtained in the interviews. The classical social-psychological framework of Thomas and Znaniecki (1927) serves as an appropriate theoretical guide.

Thomas and Znaniecki described attitude as a subjective phenomenon which interacts with the objective features of a social situation to form an individual's definition of the situation. Attitude is conceptualized as a process of individual consciousness which may influence action toward a social object. Attitude alone, without consideration of the social context, does not provide adequate explanation for behavior.

Each social situation contains social objects toward which attitudes are directed. Social objects have culturally recognized objective features which Thomas and Znaniecki describe as content. In addition, individuals ascribe meanings to social objects as a consequence of their personal association with the objects. The total definition of the situation, described as the interplay between the objective content and meaning of social objects and individual attitude toward the objects, determines behavior. Individuals act in accordance with their definition of the situation which includes the content and meaning of social objects and attitude toward the objects.

The definition of the situation provides a relevant theoretical perspective for interpretation of the interview data, because it appeared that the teachers were cognizant of a situation as they spoke. Their descriptions of classroom interaction, as they had experienced it, were definitions of social situations. The teachers introduced content and meaning associated with social objects and predispositions to act toward those social objects as they described influences upon decisions made prior to and during the teaching
process. They relied upon a definition of their own situation when asked to express their attitude toward the instructional strategies presented in an in-service course.

The theoretical perspective is relevant to an analytic method, typological analysis, used in the study. The framework, definition of the situation, provided a unit of analysis for the categories which constitute the empirical generalizations resulting from the study. The theoretical base increases the replicability of the study by providing typological categories for subsequent attitude assessment investigations.

Research Setting

The research project was conducted during a university summer school graduate education course in methods of teaching social studies in the middle school. The course was taught by a social science education professor on the faculty of the university. As a graduate student intern, I attended all the class sessions and taught a few of them. There were 14 students enrolled in the course, 7 experienced teachers and 7 undergraduates in pre-service training. It was not possible to interview all 14 students in the limited time available for the study. I decided to use the experienced teachers as research participants because their responses were likely to provide a greater amount of data, and because they were being presented with choices they could accept or reject during the following school year.

The course content was a review of instructional techniques which could be implemented in grades four through eight. Instructional purposes and implementation procedures were discussed. Each strategy was demonstrated with the teachers simulating student roles and, in effect, experiencing each instructional procedure through class participation. Participation in the course assured that each research participant was familiar with the strategies to be presented in the attitude assessment.

By occasionally joining in small group work, by answering individual questions as the teachers worked, and by talking with them about their teaching background during coffee breaks, I developed an informal relationship with the teachers. By the end of the 4-week course, the teachers appeared to be accustomed to me as an intern and assented willingly to be research participants.

Methodology

The procedures included the construction and administration of an attitude survey form, an unstructured interview with each participant, and analysis of the data. The data analysis involved a comparison of the data yielded by the survey and the interviews and classification of the interview data to form empirical generalizations.

Attitude Survey. The first data collection procedure, construction and ad-
administration of a survey form, typifies attitude research in the quantitative tradition. The semantic differential was chosen as the measurement instrument because it is a highly controlled method of attitude assessment. Respondents indicate their attitude on scales defined by researcher-selected adjectives. Semantic differential responses provide a measure of the direction and intensity of the respondent’s evaluation of a social object. However, the respondents are limited to the assumed meanings built into the semantic differential by the researcher, and their own meanings cannot be inferred. There is no opportunity for them to reveal the complexities of their attitude by describing the factors of consciousness which determine their response.

In the semantic differential technique, the respondent judges a concept against a series of bipolar, seven-step scales defined by opposite adjectives. The response to each scale, indicated by a check mark, is assigned a numerical value (e.g., −3 extremely bad, +1 somewhat good). An attitude index is formed by averaging the respondent’s ratings on the various scales (Osgood, Suci, & Tannenbaum, 1957; Pelto & Pelto, 1978).

Five instructional strategies presented in the social studies methods course were selected as concepts for the semantic differential. The selected strategies were making graphs, inquiry teaching, concept development, directed reading, and values clarification. The strategies represented social objects toward which attitudes could be directed. Ten adjective pairs (valuable . . . worthless, unsuccessful . . . successful, meaningful . . . meaningless, regressive . . . progressive, important . . . unimportant, inept . . . skillful, approve . . . disapprove, harmful . . . beneficial, willing . . . unwilling, useless . . . useful) were selected from those which Osgood et al. (1957) report as appropriate for attitude assessment.

The instrument was administered during a class session 5 days before the end of the course. I gave instructions for responding to the instrument and described its purpose as an assessment of the teachers’ attitudes toward some of the strategies taught in the course. The following question was addressed to the teachers: “What is your attitude toward these instructional strategies?”.

Interviews. The second data collection procedure, unstructured interviews with the seven participants, is a technique commonly used by qualitative researchers. The nonschedule standardized interview format discussed by Denzin (1978) was chosen as the appropriate alternative for this study. Since the purpose of the study was a comparison of the information obtained from two data collection procedures, a less structured procedure was needed to contrast with the highly structured survey instrument. Also, participants’ meanings are more likely to be revealed in a less structured interview than in a highly formalized interview with a predetermined question format (Becker & Geer, 1960; Schatzman & Strauss, 1973).

In the nonschedule standardized interview the same type of information is sought from each participant, but the interviewer varies the wording and
sequence of questions to fit the participant's response pattern (Denzin, 1978). To maintain equivalence of meaning between the two data collection procedures, the opening interview question corresponded to the semantic differential instructions: "What is your attitude toward these instructional strategies?". The interviews approximated a conversational style in which the participants were given opportunity to volunteer any information which occurred to them as they discussed the strategies.

Situational factors may affect the reporting of subjective data in interviews and pose serious threats to reliability and validity (Dean & Whyte, 1958; Denzin, 1978; LeCompte & Goetz, 1982). A potential researcher-setting interaction effect was the prime situational threat to this study. Because I occupied a status position within the group, participants may have sought my approval or tried to appear knowledgeable about their profession. I attempted to control for these threats by asking essentially the same question in different ways, checking with the participants several times to give them a chance to change, amplify, or clarify their meanings, and avoiding the introduction of researcher bias by giving no indication of agreement or disagreement.

The interviews were conducted privately during the last two class sessions in a conference room adjacent to the classroom in which the course was taught. I explained how the information collected was to be used and identified the purpose of the interview as the same as the purpose for the semantic differential: a procedure for collecting information about teacher attitudes. The interviews were taped and transcribed verbatim.

Data Analysis. A recording system was devised for listing the data in two columns thus achieving a simultaneous display of instrument and interview data for each participant. This format satisfied the requirements of the methodological purpose of the study.

Comparing the data yielded by the two research methods required a reduction of the data to forms suitable for systematic inspection. The semantic differential data were recorded using a simple arithmetical averaging procedure, and a process of summarizing incidents was used for the interview data (Becker & Geer, 1960; Osgood et al., 1957; Pelto & Pelto, 1978). The following steps were used.

1. Each teacher's average semantic differential score was derived for each of the five instructional strategies and for all the strategies combined.
2. Each teacher's interview script was examined for statements which were clearly evaluative and for statements which indicated a rationale for the evaluations. This involved dividing the data into separate incidents.
3. Each incident from the interview data was summarized in succinct language while maintaining the participant's meaning.
4. On a paper divided into two columns, each semantic differential score was recorded in the first column and the interview summary state-
ments which pertained to each strategy were recorded opposite the corresponding score in the second column.

5. The scores and summary statements were compared across columns to determine their degree of correspondence.

Following is an example of the data reduction achieved through this analysis technique. In Column 1, one participant's semantic differential responses to inquiry teaching are listed. Reduction of these data required a simple averaging of the responses to the 10 adjectival scales. In Column 2, the same participant's verbatim interview transcript was reduced by delimiting and summarizing separate verbal incidents. A manageable comparison across columns is facilitated by the reduced data. In the example, the positive attitude toward inquiry teaching indicated on the survey is supported by the meanings expressed during the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1 Survey Data</th>
<th>Column 2 Interview Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjectival Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meaningful . . . meaningless</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inept . . . skillful</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing . . . unwilling</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regressive . . . progressive</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important . . . unimportant</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harmful . . . beneficial</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable . . . worthless</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useless . . . useful</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approve . . . disapprove</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unsuccessful . . . successful</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Survey Response = +2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high density of participant meanings in the interview data became apparent during the data reduction process. A potential emerged for discovering empirical generalizations about teacher attitude toward social studies instructional strategies. Additional analysis strategies were needed for the purpose of interpreting participant meanings and constructs in the interview data (Goetz & LeCompte, 1981; Lofland, 1971). Analytic induction involves examining the relationships among data for the purpose of creating categories. Typological analysis involves organizing data using a predetermined unit of analysis. The definition of the situation, described by Thomas and Znaniecki (1927) as the interaction between the objective content and meaning associated with social objects with a subjective attitude toward the objects, was the unit of analysis for the typological classification. The following steps were used to discover empirical generalizations in the interview data.
1. All the interview summary statements were analyzed for participant meanings, organized into categories, and relevant category names were listed (analytic induction).
2. The derived category names were coded, further categorized, and labelled on the basis of their similarities and differences using definition of the situation as the unit of analysis (typological analysis).
3. Empirical generalizations were formulated by consulting the summary statements included in each labelled category.

Results

Methodological Comparison. The results of the quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures were compared. While similarity of results was manifested in the comparison, some unanticipated meanings were expressed in the qualitative procedure. The results of both research methodologies indicated a positive attitude toward the social studies instructional strategies. In addition, the qualitative results introduced some teacher reservations about effective implementation of the strategies.

The semantic differential scale ranges from $-3$ through $-1$ indicating a negative evaluation, to 0 indicating neutrality, to $+1$ through $+3$ indicating a positive evaluation. Teachers placed most of the check marks at the $+2$ or $+3$ position on the scale. The average score for the group of respondents was $+2.6$. A dominant rationale for the positive response, relating to the usefulness of the instructional strategies, appeared throughout the interview data. It is typified by the following statement.

They're very useful. And I don't think it requires somebody who is an experienced teacher either. An experienced teacher could incorporate easier, but anybody can do these things I think.

Nineteen check marks from the total of 350 were placed at the 0 and $+1$ positions. They were the only exceptions to the dominant highly positive rating. Two teachers, who checked the neutral position, reported instrument ambiguity, not a negative attitude, as their motivation.

When I started thinking about skillful and inept, I was wondering does that mean that I have to be skillful to teach it? If I'm inept, I'm not going to do it well. Or is it something that requires skill on the part of the students? I was afraid my answer would be interpreted in the wrong way. I didn’t know what you meant by those adjectives. When I come to one when I'm afraid that if I go to one end or the other it's going to be totally misinterpreted, then I'll just put it in the middle.

On the semantic differential there might have been some confusion in my mind about what exactly I was evaluating. Was it the course? Was it the instructor? Was it my way of dealing with this particular thing in my own classroom?
When examined independently, the semantic differential scores suggest a uniform and enthusiastic attitude toward the instructional strategies. However, a qualification of this attitude is evident when the interview data are examined. Even though the teachers supported their positive evaluation during the interviews by citing the practicality and flexibility of the strategies, they also expressed a number of reservations about successful implementation. The reservations relate to the realities of their teaching situation. The following are examples.

With values clarification I think you have to be careful about the topic you choose. Abortion might be a topic I might not choose because, depending on the community, parents might not like that.

If you have a good library in your area, the inquiry would flourish. If you do not have other resources outside the textbook, you're going to have a little bit of trouble with your inquiry.

Sometimes in inquiry teaching it's hard to get them to cooperate with discussion. You'll have 4 or 5, but the majority are going to sit there. They're not going to volunteer any information or participate.

I'm in favor of inquiry and concept discussions if the teacher can keep control and not let it get completely out of hand.

Additional Interview Results. The analysis of the interview data revealed participant meanings which were obscured by the structure of the semantic differential. The teachers were asked how they felt toward the instructional strategies named on the instrument. I had assumed the interview responses would be derived from the group's common experience, that is, their membership in the university summer course. However, the teachers introduced different content and meaning. They chose instead to express their attitudes by citing the objective conditions operative in the classroom situations where the strategies are to be implemented. A suitable interpretation may be that the teachers were referring to their own definitions of situations and reacting to content which they knew to be operative in those situations.

When the interview data were analyzed to discern the teachers' situational definitions, three categories emerged. Summaries of the content of the three categories constitute the substantive generalizations generated by the typological analysis.

Student needs. Teachers believe they have a responsibility for fulfilling the diverse intellectual needs of students and adjusting instruction to accommodate group and individual differences. Following are some relevant statements.

The adolescent child goes from a concrete basis, at about age 10, to a more formal thinking basis at 13 to 15. Value clarification gives them a chance to develop by forming their own opinion.

I've used directed reading as a tool for slow learners more than I do for accelerated learners. In a regular classroom situation, the acceler-
ated students might tend to be a little bored by the directed reading.

You're going to have students with a very wide background and stu-
dents with limited background. So in concept development you will
have to choose concepts which fit the background of your students.

Teacher responsibility. Teachers show a concern for the interaction be-
tween strategy and teacher. They are keenly aware that successful implemen-
tation is dependent upon the teacher as well as upon the presumed effec-
tiveness of procedure. This concern is evident in the following statements.

Not every teacher can handle values clarification. I think if some-
body's uncomfortable with it, they shouldn't do it.

Directed reading can have a big pitfall in it if teachers use it simply as
busy work. In other words they would not necessarily motivate the stu-
dent. They would put questions on the board and ask the students to fill
out the questions without really guiding them.

Using open-ended questions may be a good way of getting 7th grad-
ers involved. Especially if they know their teacher is not going to hold it
against them for what they say and put them down for what they say.

Instructional utility. Teachers expect to achieve results with a new teach-
ing procedure. The participants emphasized their expectation that a strategy
prove useful, but did not define usefulness or elaborate on methods of as-
sessing usefulness. Following are typical statements in this category.

Most of my attitudes about teaching go back to the actual experience
of working with the children and seeing what works and what does not
work.

When you have tried something and you see that it works, and then
you get in a course with other people and they talk about that it works,
then you go back and use it again because you see that there's results.

I would judge a strategy by whether it does what I wanted it to do in
the first place, and if the kids enjoyed it and learned something from it.
If it was beneficial to them, I would continue to do it.

The classical social-psychological construct, definition of the situation,
was used as the theoretical base for the substantive analysis. Three empirical
generalizations, containing meanings of apparent importance to the re-
search participants, were generated by a typological analysis. The generali-
zations were labelled student needs, teacher responsibility, and instructional
utility. In brief, teachers' attitudes toward instructional strategies are influ-
enced by the diverse intellectual capabilities of their students, the role which
the teacher plays in implementation, and the expectation that implementa-
tion will produce results. Teachers appear to judge social studies instruc-
tional strategies by considering the realities of the teaching situation.
Discussion

Discussion of the conclusions must be qualified by the limitations of the study. The small number of participants and the possible researcher-setting interaction effect are two limitations upon the generalizability of the findings. However, as an exploratory project in research methodology, this study illustrates the value of using more than one data collection procedure to investigate an educational question. The validity of the findings was enhanced by the combined methods approach.

Administration of the semantic differential provided an index of the direction and intensity of teachers' attitudes. However, had I relied upon the attitude survey alone, the outcome of this study would be deceptive in its simplicity. Clearly, the interview data provided a more detailed portrayal of the teachers' attitudes. The interview data extended the survey results by introducing an entirely new set of participant meaning, conceptualized as the definition of the situation. This study's methodological comparison suggests that the opportunity for free expression produces richer data and introduces meanings which may not be discovered in a researcher-controlled data collection procedure.

The semantic differential results contributed to the study by providing a rationale for the unstructured interview format. Strong positive attitudes were reflected in the semantic differential results. Avoiding the use of specific questions in the interviews was a test to determine if the obtained ratings indicated a real attitude. The unstructured interviews contributed to the study by serving as a validity check upon the survey instrument.
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Kieran Egan believes that social studies should be allowed to die quietly. In his words, the aims of social studies are so vague and unfeasible that social studies "has not worked, does not work, and cannot work." (1983, p. 195) He advances three arguments to support his view: 1) that social studies is based on incorrect theories of child learning, 2) that social studies aims to "socialize" (where history aims to "educate"), and 3) that the idea of social studies is confused. Consequently, Egan writes, students ought to be taught academic history rather than social studies. These are serious charges—both for social studies educators and for curricularists generally—and I would like to deal with each in turn.

Social studies, Egan asserts, is based on misguided notions of children's cognitive development. To blame for this widespread misunderstanding of what and how children learn best, Egan says, are the child-centered psychological theories popular at the turn of the century and a misguided application of the "expanding horizons" truism. Significantly, at this early stage of his argument, Egan refers to the educational theories of John Dewey and identifies these theories as the source of many mistaken notions about education.

* I would like to thank Nel Noddings and David Flinders for their assistance in the writing of this paper.
I will quote John Dewey as the source of ideas influential in structuring the social studies curriculum. This is a dangerous procedure, as Dewey is interpreted so variously by different people. (1983, p. 197)

But Egan does not leave it at that, as his references to Dewey are interspersed with comments on how Dewey's theories have been interpreted.

Egan's stance on Dewey, of course, makes it next to impossible to argue against his interpretation of Dewey and Dewey's influence. Certainly Dewey has been the subject of many conflicting interpretations and misinterpretations. But Egan's facile movement between what Dewey said and how Egan claims that Dewey has been interpreted, leaves Egan free to make any claims he wishes about Dewey's supposedly deleterious influence. As Egan's article is sprinkled with epigrams such as "the usual interpretation" (p. 198) and "the typical interpretation" (p. 198) the reader has no way of assessing these claims. Moreover, as I shall point out below, I believe Egan himself has made some serious errors in his reading of Dewey.

One particularly important idea that Egan attributes to Dewey's influence is the formulation of the "expanding horizons" model for social studies. This model posits that children should move from the known to the unknown. Consequently, in the lower elementary grades children should learn about what they are already familiar with (e.g., families, local neighborhoods). After children make conceptual sense of what is familiar, the exotic world outside children's direct experience is then added to their conceptual frameworks. Egan is correct in asserting that the expanding horizons model has been an important influence in the design of social studies programs. But in his quest to discredit the "expanding horizons" model, Egan's analysis is shallow. More specifically, Egan fails to offer a satisfactory stipulation of what he means by "knowing." Indeed, his entire argument rests upon his contention that he has an explanation that in some way is better than Dewey's of how children come to know.

Egan says that children come to school already knowing the most "fundamental categories" of thought. (p. 199) He contends that children "know love and hate, pleasure and pain, . . ." (p. 198) Such a claim is the crux of Egan's epistemological argument. Yet surely, this epistemological claim is, at best, odd; we do not normally talk about "knowing" feelings (except perhaps in an idiomatic fashion). We may well "know" that certain of our emotions are associated with particular behaviors. For example, when you are angry you may "know" that it is best to watch your temper. But to say, for instance, that one "knows" love would be a strange epistemological claim: What would such a statement mean? That one "knows" what love is? That one has experienced love? That one "knows" the definition of love? Despite the strangeness of his epistemological claim, Egan continues that children have direct access to "knowing" such emotions as love and hate. How seriously can we take Egan's claim that children "know" these things?

Egan confuses feeling various emotions with knowing these emotions.
While feeling and knowing are associated, they are not the same. Children do feel, for instance, pain, and yes, children also express jealousy. But surely to make sense of these concepts, children need to do more than feel. Do children organize their emotions in a fashion that makes coherent intellectual sense? Are children capable of providing reasoned explanations of their feelings of love and anger? It is precisely because children do feel emotions that we need to lead children to reason about them.

The categorization of their emotions that children do perform is intellectually haphazard; the way they feel about their emotions is precisely the major difference between their way of knowing and a more mature way of knowing. Children need to be educated about their emotions because they have no deep understanding of what emotions mean and how they have affected the course of human life. Now, this may be just what Egan meant, but if it is he needs to say so, and most important of all, he needs to tell us what he means by “knowing.”

Egan’s second group of arguments focuses on his belief that social studies “socializes” while history “educates.” He states this as a dichotomy: the aim of socialization is making people more alike; the aim of education is making people more different. (p. 202) Egan posits that history provides a sound basis for children’s educational development. He argues that history, with its eye on past human experiences, holds educational potential—while social studies, with its eye on present concerns, is an agent of socialization. How valid is the dichotomy that Egan has constructed?

There are at least two crucial questions that must be answered if Egan’s case is to be sustained: 1) What does he mean by “socialization” and “education”? 2) How accurate is his argument concerning the role of history in education?

Egan believes that “socialization” and “education” are incompatible; this incompatibility stems from their disparate aims. Curiously, as Egan’s thesis for his entire essay rests upon upholding a distinction between “socialization” and “education,” he offers little stipulation of what he means by either term. But, this matter aside, why and how are the aims of “socialization” and “education” disparate? Egan asserts that “socialization will lead to its products sharing attitudes and values, and images of their nation.” (p. 202) Such outcomes are at odds with “education.” What remains quite unclear, however, is why (beyond Egan’s assertion that they are) “socialization” and “education” must necessarily be at odds. Are they mutually exclusive processes? Dewey thought not:

Any education given by a group tends to socialize its members, but the quality and value of the socialization depends upon the habits and aims of the group. (1916, p. 83)

Dewey’s insight here raises the crucial issue, which is not whether school programs should aim to “socialize” or to “educate,” but what types of “so-
cialization" and "education" should be adopted—surely any planned school program will include both "socialization" and "education." The difference between the two becomes greater or lesser depending on the nature of the community.

Now, Egan may object that this attack on his socialization/education dichotomy is an abstract avoidance of the real issue—that schools, since Dewey, have neglected rigorous "education" for trivial "socialization." In such a light he may dismiss Dewey's claim that socialization and education are ideally one as starry-eyed dreaming. It may be true (although Egan offers little evidence in this regard) that a multitude of sins have been committed in Dewey's name. But surely the objections that Egan raises, such as basing curricula on the child's experience alone, represent *gross* distortions of Dewey's ideas. Dewey went to great lengths to correct his more misguided "disciples" on this issue. For instance, he makes quite plain that the child's experience is "only the first step" in curriculum planning. (Dewey 1938, p. 73) Moreover, Egan makes the assumption that certain types of subject-matter (e.g., ancient Greek houses, p. 198) are *inherently* trivial. At least two remarks need to be made here: First, Dewey made quite clear that, while the child's experience was a starting point, this must be balanced with *progressive organization of subject matter.* (1938, chapter 7) Second, subject matter, whether it be ancient Greek houses, the Civil War, or atomic physics has no inherent educational value unless it can be made meaningful to the student.

History, Egan says, allows escape from preoccupation with the present. He believes that the attention to the concerns of the present in the teaching of history (as happens in social studies) robs history of its educational worth. Here Egan has simply gone too far. Is he seriously arguing that history, any history, can be written or taught without reference to contemporary society? As E. H. Carr put it:

> we can view the past, and achieve our understanding of the past, only through the eyes of the present. (1964, p. 24)

Apparently Egan does not agree, for he states that:

> in the study of history students' opinions are irrelevant, what they think about the past does not matter. What matters is what happened, what someone else's opinion was, what other people thought. (1983, p. 203)

Egan is claiming, in effect, that students need not reach their own interpretations of history. How can children (or anyone else) make sense of human experience unless they process others' experience in the light of their own? Egan's view of the educational potential of history remains obscure.

Egan's third group of arguments is concerned with what he sees as confusion in the "idea" of social studies. Again he resorts to his dichotomy between socialization and education. (p. 205) Here we see in full flower Egan's
failure to specify who holds the extreme view that social studies is "socialization" divorced from "education." I know of no social studies educator who holds such a view. Notably, Egan refrains from quoting Dewey at this point in his argument. Perhaps this is because Dewey specifically warned that if history is used for the type of "socialization" purposes that Egan attacks that it would have no educational benefit. Lest the reader should think I exaggerate, allow me to quote Dewey:

using history as a kind of reservoir of anecdotes . . . [produces at best] a temporary emotional glow. . . . (1916, p. 217)

Yet, Egan seems to have missed this entirely. His final stab at Dewey makes the point for me:

My argument is that the betrayal [of North American societies] has been wrought by Dewey's style of socializing social studies, . . . (Egan 1983, p. 212)

In conclusion, let me summarize my chief objections to Egan's arguments. First, Egan's definition of "knowing" is unclear—he rejects one explanation of how children come to know, but never satisfactorily explains or argues for what "knowing" entails. Second, he thinks history would do a better job of educating youngsters than social studies. In this argument, he fails to make plain how students make sense of history, and why history is more "appropriate" in educational terms than social studies. Third, Egan believes that the "idea" of social studies is confused—here his evidence is based on unspecified applications of Dewey's theories and his arbitrary dichotomy between socialization and education. For such an ambitions task as the killing of a major component of the North American curriculum, Egan is poorly armed.
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The response of William B. Walstad and Michael W. Watts to my recent article, "Secondary Economics Textbooks and Ideological Bias" (TRSE, Spring 1983), sets forth several interesting challenges and accusations. I'd like to offer some commentary regarding their concerns.

Their first point of contention centers around the question of consensus in economic education. To begin with, I see this as a minor point in my paper and it leaves my general thesis intact. Pages 4-5 of my article discuss the nature of economics and demonstrate that as a discipline there is no solid consensus world wide.

If the discipline lacks consensus, I fail to see how one can then leap to a consensus for the economic education of American youth. I realize that my critics are satisfied because they cite Joint Council on Economic Education and AEA pronouncements on the matter. However, that represents an authoritarian mentality I reject. I have no quarrel with the JCEE, but my critics' position is equivalent to proving the earth is flat by relying on the declarations of the Flat Earth Society. Another analogy would be to claim that massive nuclear build-up is wise and correct because that's the way the military "experts" see it.

What's more, the texts themselves demonstrate that there isn't a consensus. The offerings in each text vary widely and it isn't simply a matter of using different examples to make the same point, as Walstad and Watts allege. At bottom isn't the question of consensus but what is reflected through the consensus. In many parts of the world, curriculum and economics "experts" also restrict their guidelines to the "consensus."
On a related point, Walstad and Watts hurry to illustrate that most texts include coverage of other economic systems and then misrepresent my rationale completely. Social studies educators have long realized that the global dimension is a fundamental aspect of sound social education across the disciplines. If we accept the posture that it's unnecessary to include other systems in a high school text—the position of Walstad and Watts—that's fine. My point is only that once a text broaches a subject it is obligated to give an unbiased treatment to the subject. The point my critics never seemed to grasp is that "how" things are treated in a text is as important as "what" is included.

Another objection they levy refers to my concern that some texts lead students to conclusions about "free enterprise economics" instead of providing them with economic literacy. Walstad and Watts then present their biases regarding the nature of economic literacy and distort my position. For the record, I have no objection to emphasizing positive economics. I do object to the notion that a positive approach guarantees conclusions that are objective. My critics chose to ignore my reference to positivist assumptions.

Next is the matter of the framework I used for evaluating bias. A difficulty I confronted in selecting categories for examination was that the texts contained such varied contents. Again, it's difficult to see how a positive approach could yield such wide ranging points of focus. Nonetheless, it isn't necessary to examine each text from every possible category to glean bias. Since Walstad and Watts suggest that a large number of categories could be used, the issue turns into little more than a debating point.

When I used an example of bias from a text or several texts, I cited the example and listed the texts. On each point, texts which couldn't be included weren't listed. Or, in the case of the "right to work" issue, texts which were silent on the matter weren't categorized in any way—they were simply labeled as silent. Again, for the record, I didn't select "right to work" as a yardstick for bias as my critics charge. I assessed how the concept of labor was treated and discovered that "right to work" was important to some authors and not to others. Am I now to assume that "right to work" is included in some texts merely as a "positive economic conclusion," to quote Walstad and Watts?

Is it the position of these professors that the texts are not biased? Or, are they holding open the option that a more thorough analysis than mine (or one more intelligently constructed in their view) would yield a more convincing case? Is it the findings that are most upsetting, or a preference for particular methodology and format? Is it the message or the messenger that's really at issue for them?

If they're certain they want to stake out the position that no bias exists, let me share a discovery made after my analysis of the texts was completed. In a discussion with a publisher of one of the texts I was informed that it was the purpose of the text to promote "free enterprise." That's a curious approach to economic literacy it seems to me and it means bias was not only
present, it was intended. Can that be used to support my case, or was that
datum collected with a methodological flaw?

There are numerous other points I could address from their “response,”
but there comes a juncture where nothing further is served by it. For what-
ever reason, several parts of my article, as described by my critics, weren’t
even recognizable to me; my thoughts had been either completely misunder-
stood or grossly misinterpreted.

I make no claim to have offered the definitive statement on ideological
bias in economics textbooks. Rather, I’ve attempted to contribute to a
growing array of similar analyses (many using similar methodologies) that
have pointed to bias in other social studies texts. I encourage social studies
educators to examine these texts to determine for themselves if ideological
bias is in fact to be found.

My concern about the issue of bias relates to my interest as an educator. I
realize that I have biases of my own, yet I’ve not met the person who doesn’t
have them including authors of textbooks and college professors. The issue
hinges on how bias is managed in a text, for at stake is the intellectual in-
tegrity of the young. As I indicated in my article, bias can be avoided in
great measure by providing various perspectives when addressing topics that
are open to dispute.

Through all this I’ve come to see the virtue in John Kenneth Galbraith’s
assertion that the main reason for studying economics is to avoid being de-
ceived by economists. But my hope is that through the process of focusing
on important issues such as ideological bias, social education can be im-
proved.

I want to thank the Editors of Theory and Research in Social Education
for the opportunity to respond to the critique of my article.
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Here is yet another publication dedicated to the proposition that our educational system is in need of fundamental reform. Arons, a lawyer and educator at the Center for Law and Education at the University of Massachusetts, contends that our educational system is so devoted to the task of engendering commitment to the conventional values of American society that school authorities act to repress the constitutional rights of those who seek to avoid or resist this indoctrination. Has Arons provided us with new insights into the problems of reform and socialization?

In presenting his case Arons discusses three areas of conflict; censorship, home-based education and private schooling. A major section of the book is devoted to each of these topics followed by the author’s assessment of the constitutionality of our majoritarian-based system of public education. After a short introduction, the author devotes nearly one-third of the work to a discussion of censorship or, as he prefers to describe it, “the war over orthodoxy in the public schools.” Arons presents interesting interpretations of some the well-known, as well as the less publicized, censorial incidents of the last decade. There is an in-depth analysis of the Warsaw book-burning incident as well as reference to a number of other censorial incidents including Island Trees, Mailloux and several of the creationist cases.

Educators, predisposed to believe that they are the defenders of intellectual freedom will probably find fault with the proposition that what educators refer to as censorial attacks are in actuality battles among ideologues over whose orthodoxy will prevail in the schools. Goldstein (1976), Carlson (1978), Hocutt (1983) and others have already challenged the assertion that educators have the exclusive right to determine what is taught in the public schools. While Arons essentially reiterates the arguments advanced in these earlier works, he does shed some new light on the subject by discussing the problem within the context of the state’s asserted right to compel public orthodoxy.

The second section of the book is devoted to a discussion of the recent controversy over home schooling. Arons contends that school authorities oppose home-based education out of a fear of losing control over the socialization process. He works so hard at convincing the reader of the validity of his compelling belief hypothesis that the result is a rather lop-sided interpretation of a select group of cases. There is no mention of the cases where
school systems have approved policies permitting and even facilitating home education as, for example, in Barnstable and Rockland, Massachusetts (Divoky, 1983). After reading this section on the controversy over home-schooling, the reader is likely to conclude that school authorities are singularly opposed to home education. Yet John Holt, one of the more prominent leaders of the home-schooling movement, has recently observed that while opposition to home schooling is widespread, there has been a shift away from recalcitrance to "grudging tolerance" and that resistance is largely a function of idiosyncratic and localized attitudes. (Holt, 1983). This would seem to be a more plausible assessment than Aron's contention that school authorities monolithically view the home education movement as a threat to public orthodoxy and the survival of democracy. Arons presents no evidence to support his contention and it could be just as cogently argued that, in this age of financial exigency, school officials oppose the home education movement out of a concern over declining enrollments or that they genuinely believe that compulsory public education guarantees that every student will be taught the skills requisite to the exercise of their rights of democratic citizenship and survival in our economic system.

Arons is right when he says that home education is still a highly controversial subject but his treatment, while informative, is much too restricted and slanted to serve as an accurate assessment of the current status of the home education conflict. Readers searching for an objective and comprehensive assessment of the current controversy over home education will have to consult other sources on the subject.

In the third section of the book Arons describes some of the altercations that have taken place between the state and various groups struggling to preserve their unorthodox views through the control of socialization in their own schools. The author recounts the endeavors of the Amish, a countercultural group and Christian fundamentalists, to establish control over the education of their children. It is Aron's view that the conflict over the regulation of non-government schools constitutes an attempt by the state to prevent the formation of competing ideologies and to thwart the creation of alien communities of belief. This reader was not convinced that the desire to control orthodoxy serves as the primary catalyst for the intolerant behavior displayed by the school officials in such cases. Arons does raise some serious questions about the motivation of the state in resisting the establishment of private schools but it is a complex question and it is doubtful that it can be solely attributed to the motives discussed in this book.

In the concluding chapter, Arons turns to a discussion of the purpose and function of compulsory schooling in a democratic society. He contends that the American public school operates in violation of the constitution by denying the rights of dissenters through the mechanism of majoritarian politics. Following a short discussion of the unsuccessful attempt to establish a tuition tax credit scheme in the District of Columbia in 1981, the book ends.
Disappointingly, the author offers no recommendations for moving toward a resolution of the problems of censorship, home-based education or private schooling nor does he provide any assessment of what the future holds with reference to the problems of socialization, reform or majoritarianism.

With reference to organization and mechanics an index is provided but there is no bibliography and only infrequent and incomplete citations provided for the few sources cited in the text.

Despite its shortcomings, this book maintains the reader's interest and presents some thought-provoking observations on the problems of socialization and reform in American education. It should be of particular interest to social studies educators who are charged with the chief responsibility for inculcating the majoritarian orthodoxy so roundly condemned in this book.
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An Analysis of the Impact of Teacher Training in Economics
Howard M. Schober

This study investigated the impact of inservice teacher training in economics on the achievement and opinions of participants and the students in subsequent economics classes that they teach.

A comparison design was used, with the teacher group consisting of participants in seven inservice workshops offered by the Louisiana Council on Economic Education during the summer of 1981. In addition, each economics teacher was asked to select one of his fall, 1981 economics classes for the study.

Achievement and opinions instruments were administered to teachers at the start and close of the workshops and to their students at the start and close of their fall semester economics course.

Ordinary and two stage least squares regression revealed a significant direct impact of the workshops on teacher participants' achievement and opinions and an indirect impact on achievement and opinions of their students.

A Field Study of Selected Student Teacher Perspectives Toward Social Studies
Susan Adler

This paper is the report of a field study conducted to investigate the perspectives toward social studies, and the factors which influenced those perspectives, of four pre-service teachers during their field experience semester. Perspectives were defined to include the behaviors and contexts of particular teaching tasks as well as the ideas and assumptions about those tasks. The perspectives expressed by the student teachers during their field experience were complex and varied. Social Studies teaching could best be understood in relation to several interconnected dimensions of perspectives toward teaching and learning rather than just perspectives toward social studies alone.

An Exploratory Comparison of Two Methods of Assessing Teacher Attitudes Toward Instructional Strategies
Sandra J. LeSourd

A study was conducted to compare data collected in quantitative and qualitative research procedures. Two methods were used to investigate practicing teachers' attitudes toward selected instructional strategies for teaching social studies in the middle grades. The attitudes of seven teachers were assessed, using first, a semantic differential instrument, and second, an unstructured interview. The data were analyzed to determine comparability between the evidence derived from the two methods. Positive attitudes indicated by the semantic differential results were supported in the interview data. In addition, the teachers introduced new meanings into the interviews which could not be detected in the semantic differential results. The meanings expressed in the interviews were conceptualized as the teachers' definitions of the teaching situation. Some empirical generalizations about implementation of the strategies were generated from the interview data.
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