7-1-1985

Theory and research in social education 13/02

National Council for the Social Studies. College and University Faculty Assembly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Becoming an Elementary Social Studies Teacher: A Study in Perspectives</td>
<td>Goodman and Adler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship: The Phantom Core of Social Studies Curriculum</td>
<td>Longstreet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconsidering Social Studies Curriculum</td>
<td>Cornbleth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Value Analysis Discussions on Students' Political Attitudes and Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>Hahn and Avery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry and Curriculum Change: Perceptions of School and College/University Faculty</td>
<td>Jantz, Weaver, Cerricione and Farrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Overview of Social Studies Dissertations, 1977-1982</td>
<td>Hepburn and Dahler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOK REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Concepts: A Systematic Analysis</td>
<td>Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note to Authors</td>
<td>Editors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theory and Research in Social Education

Volume XIII Number 2 Summer 1985

TRSE is the official journal of the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. Published quarterly, it is a general review open to all social studies educators, social scientists, historians and philosophers. A general statement of purpose, and submission, subscription and advertising information may be found at the end of the journal. © 1985 by the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. All rights reserved.
The National Council for the Social Studies
Officers 1984-85

President: Donald H. Bragaw,
New York State Department
of Education, Albany

President-Elect: Paul Shires
Glendale-Nicolei High School
Milwaukee, WI

Vice President: Jan Tucker
Florida International University

Executive Director: Frances Haley

Reviewers for this Issue of TRSE

The editors wish to express special appreciation to the following scholars
who served as referees of manuscripts submitted.

Beverly Armento, Georgia State University
Mary Jo Brown, University of Georgia
June Chapin, College of Notre Dame, Belmont, California
Charles K. Curtis, The University of British Columbia
Richard Diem, University of Texas at San Antonio
Janet Eyler, George Peabody College for Teachers, Vanderbilt University
Patrick Ferguson, University of Alabama
John Haas, University of Colorado
Mary Hepburn, University of Georgia
Wayne Herman, University of Maryland
Richard Hunnicutt, Georgia Pacific Corporation
Milton Kleg, University of Northern Illinois
Sandra Lesourd, Washburn University
Gerald Marker, Indiana University
Fred Newmann, University of Wisconsin
Paul Robinson, University of Arizona
James P. Shaver, Utah State University
Mark Schug, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Ronald VanSickle, University of Georgia
Elmer Williams, University of Georgia
Contents

Jesse Goodman and Susan Adler
Becoming an Elementary Social Studies Teacher: A Study in Perspectives 1

Wilma S. Longstreet
Citizenship: The Phantom Core of Social Studies Curriculum 21

Catherine Cornbleth
Reconsidering Social Studies Curriculum 31

Carole L. Hahn and Patricia G. Avery
Effect of Value Analysis Discussions on Students' Political Attitudes and Reading Comprehension 47

Richard K. Jantz, V. Phillips Weaver, Joseph M. Cirrincione and Richard T. Farrell
Inquiry and Curriculum Change: Perceptions of School and College/University Faculty 61

Mary A. Hepburn and Alfred Dahler

Book Review

Bruce Smith
Social Science Concepts: A Systematic Analysis 83

Editors
Note to Authors 86
Abstract

Student teachers' perspectives toward social studies education are analyzed in this paper. Sixteen elementary-level student teachers were selected at two university teacher education programs. One year's observations and interviews with the student teachers and their colleagues provided the data. The 16 participants held one or more of six perspectives. They viewed social studies as a nonsubject, as human relations, as citizenship indoctrination, as school knowledge, as the integrative core of the elementary curriculum, and as education for social action. A case study of a representative student illustrated the complexity of how perspectives develop. These findings suggested that official conceptions of social studies have little to do with student teachers' beliefs and actions in the classroom and that methods courses should address this discrepancy.

Throughout the 20th century, educators have sought to create an overarching statement of the definition and purposes of social studies education. Such statements, abstracted from classroom practice, comprise the conceptions of social studies held by scholars. Despite differences among educators in their views of what social studies is or ought to be, several conceptions persist. The most dominant is social studies as citizenship education. The 1916 report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on Secondary Education of the National Education Association described social studies as the subject that develops in young people the skills and attitudes necessary to good citizenship (Clements, Fielder, & Tabachnick, 1966, p. 6). Citizenship meant active participation in community and national decision making. This conception of social studies has remained important. In the 1981 statement on the Essentials of the Social Studies, the National Council for the Social Studies affirmed:
Citizenship participation in public life is essential to the health of our democratic system. Effective social studies programs help prepare young people who can identify, understand, and work to solve the problems that face our increasingly diverse nation and interdependent world. (p. 2)

Other conceptions of social studies are often portrayed as supporting this overall goal. An example of such a conception is social studies as reflective inquiry or decision making (e.g., Clements et al., 1966; Engle, 1960; Hennings, Hennings, & Banich, 1980; Massialas & Cox, 1966; Pagano, 1978). Here the emphasis is on the process of inquiry to formulate and solve social problems. Another conception is social studies as social science. Emphasis is placed on having students learn the facts, concepts, and processes of the social science disciplines (Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977, p. 62). Pupils would, for example, learn the structure of anthropology by participating in anthropological inquiry to discover anthropological concepts. Still another conception places emphasis “on how most people participate in . . . society” (Superka & Hawke, 1980, p. 574): Social studies content should deal with the major roles people play in their lives and with learning to understand, value, and function creatively in these roles.

But how are these conceptions of social studies played out—or not played out—in classroom practice? Although teachers may use the terminology found in the literature, evidence indicates that these conceptions have little bearing on practice (e.g., Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979). How then do practitioners, rather than scholars, give meaning and purpose to social studies? Meanings, in the context of classroom teaching, are not abstract conceptions removed from the act of teaching. Rather, meaning is what Beard (1934) referred to as the frame of reference on which thought and action are consciously or unconsciously based. The concept of teacher perspectives is useful for capturing this notion of meaning.

Teacher Perspectives

The concept of teacher perspectives captures the ideas, behaviors, and contexts of particular teaching acts (Becker, Geer, Hughes, & Strauss, 1961; Cornbleth, 1982; Grace, 1978; Hammersley, 1977; Janesick, 1978; Sharp & Green, 1975). Unlike more abstract constructs, perspectives are set in the concrete world of actual situations and refer to particular actions. 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.

Several studies (e.g., Becker et al., 1961; Lortie, 1975) found that perspectives are formed early in a career. It follows, then, that a crucial period for examining the development of teachers' perspectives is during their preservice education. In general, literature relating field experiences to social
studies has not been very illuminating. We have learned little about how students' incorporate, or fail to incorporate, their thinking about social studies into actual practice.

An exception to this generalization is a study by Adler (1984) in which she examined the perspectives of four students. In this study, the work of Berlak and Berlak (1981) was used to provide a linguistic framework for an analysis of perspectives. They suggested conceptualizing teachers' acts as ongoing resolutions to a set of competing demands or dilemmas. The use of dilemma language provides a way to capture the complexity, connections, and contradictions of teachers' behaviors and ideas. It allows the researcher to move beyond the assumption that perspectives can be adequately captured by static dichotomies such as traditional vs. progressive, conservative vs. liberal, or reproductive vs. transformation. Using Berlak and Berlak's framework, Adler described the students' patterns of dilemma resolution toward social studies and teaching. As suggested in Adler's article, these descriptions only began to explore the perspectives that students might hold or develop.

As Glaser and Strauss (1967) noted, one of the values of ethnographic data is that their depth provides researchers with the opportunity to reanalyze data and reevaluate conclusions. Analysis is not a static product. Instead, it is "an ever-developing entity" (p. 32). Analysis is open to modification by the originator as well as other scholars. Indeed, verification of such reports is a continuous process, and one important—but all too often neglected—aspect of verification is the reviewing of data with colleagues to establish intersubjective consensus, as well as the extending of studies to include more informants and richer data.

In addressing the preceding point, this article reports the findings of a reanalysis and extension of the original Adler (1984) study. Through this examination of new data and reexamination of original data, Adler's report has been refined in several ways.

First, as is discussed subsequently, an additional sample of 12 students was investigated. Unlike Adler's (1984) group, which was carefully screened, this new group was randomly chosen. This extended data base was useful in cross-referencing and developing new analytical categories.

The second distinction lies in the level of analysis. The emphasis of Adler's article is to describe the components of perspectives held by four focal students. In increasing the sample from these four to sixteen, six patterns of perspectives emerged from this new analysis. From what began as a description of individuals, we built conceptual categories. In this way, our insights into the relationship between people's beliefs and actions have crystallized.

Third, rather than using a predetermined linguistic framework as the basis of analysis, we formulated the perspectives reported in this paper more directly from the informants themselves. In this sense, the analysis has be-
come more grounded in social reality (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Although this new analytical framework does not contradict the dilemma language originally used, it more accurately describes the range of perspectives found in our sample groups.

Finally, the development of this grounded framework required richer and more detailed reporting of field notes than in the previous work. As a result, the lived quality of these perspectives has been enhanced.

This reanalysis and extension of Adler’s (1984) original report is important for two reasons. First, as it stands alone, this article contributes to a growing body of literature that is helping us gain an understanding of what it means to become a teacher. Second, in relation to Adler’s original article, it exemplifies the process of extended analysis for those researchers interested in ethnographic methodology.

In addressing these points, the paper is divided into four sections. After a discussion of the methodology used, we describe the perspectives that emerged from our analysis of the field data. This section does not quantify the numbers or percentages of students who held each perspective. Rather it provides a base for understanding the kinds of perspectives students developed. Furthermore, each of our informants showed evidence of holding a perspective other than a dominant one. Hence, the next section is a portrayal of one individual. Through this portrayal, the complexity of students’ perspectives is illuminated. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of this research for educators.

Methodology

The rationale for choosing one methodology over another is connected to the nature of the subject studied and the underlying goals of the research. Weber’s (1977) notion of verstehen was particularly helpful in outlining our purpose. Through empathic understanding and direct experience of the social world, we gain insight into a given social phenomenon. Because this study explored the complex interconnection between people’s beliefs and actions and the effect of this connection on the social studies education found in classrooms, we felt it was necessary to use a methodology that incorporated the existential experience of the participants themselves—their actions, thoughts, feelings, and perceptions—as a major focus for investigation and interpretation. Therefore, the methods used were those associated with ethnographic field studies (e.g., Bruyn, 1966; Glaser & Strauss, 1967). As Blumer (1969) emphasized, this methodology permits the researcher to meet all of the basic requirements of an empirical science: to confront the social world being studied; to raise abstract questions about this world; to discover relations between categories of data; to formulate propositions about these relations; to organize these propositions into an analytical scheme that others can understand; and to test the questions, data, relations, propositions, and analysis through renewed examination of the social world.
Methods and Sample Selection

As already noted, this paper extends Adler's (1984) study through a reanalysis based on additional data. Hence this study is somewhat unusual in that it contains two disparate samples. Although the methods used to collect data were similar, they were not identical. In both cases, observations and interviews—formal and informal—were the main methods of data collection. Other data sources such as questionnaires, student logs, completed assignments, course syllabi, and official program literature were used as part of our final analysis. Data were recorded in field notes during two university quarters for Sample A and one semester for Sample B.

Sample A was located in an elementary teacher education program at a large, southeastern state university. Approximately 75 students were enrolled in this program while the fieldwork was conducted. Twelve randomly chosen students were observed as they participated in university courses, seminar meetings, and practicum experiences. Ten students were placed in early field experiences while they attended university classes, and two were student teaching full time. Field placements ranged from first through sixth grades. All of these students attended the same weekly seminar meetings. They were observed in their practicum sites one to four times, and each observation lasted between two hours and the entire school day. Approximately 40% of their university class sessions were observed during the fall and spring quarters, and each of the sample group’s seminar meetings were observed during this time.

Sample B was located in a large midwestern state university. During the semester before the fieldwork began, the researcher informally observed the university social studies methods courses. From the 64 individuals in these classes, 4 representative students were chosen as the focus of study. The selection of these 4 students was based on (a) their student-teaching placement in upper elementary grades, (b) their scores on the Conceptions of Social Studies Inventory given to all students prior to their student teaching, and (c) recommendations by their social studies methods professors. Each student was extensively observed at least five times during the student-teaching semester.

The purpose of these observations was to discover what actually happened in the field placements, university courses, and seminar meetings. Rather than predetermining items to look for, we used a number of general questions to initially guide these observations: How is each setting organized? What kind of interpersonal dynamics exist? How do the students, cooperating teachers, faculty members, and pupils act? What activities occur in each setting? What topics are discussed, and what information, opinions, and beliefs are exchanged among the participants? More specific observation questions, particularly about the teaching of social studies, were developed from reviewing notes as the fieldwork continued. These observations not only illuminated what happened in each setting, but they also
were used as the focus for in-depth interviews about the nature and meaning of the participants' actions.

Scheduled interviews were conducted weekly or biweekly with each student from both samples. Each social studies methods faculty member and each cooperating teacher were also interviewed. In addition, other students not in the sample groups were informally interviewed. Students were interviewed before and after each field placement observation, and students and faculty members were often interviewed immediately following a given class session.

Much of this interviewing was conducted using Glaser and Strauss's (1967) theoretical sampling and constant comparative method of analysis. Interviews were not organized into predetermined questions. Instead, they were structured around areas of concern: the purpose of teaching a given lesson; perceptions of what happened in a given situation; individual responses to the organization, people, activities, and topics addressed in a given situation; and perceptions of the relationship between beliefs and actions. After reviewing field notes, more specific questions emerged and were then asked during interviews to gain deeper insight into situations and to clarify misconceptions and ambiguities. Responses from students within the sample groups were cross-checked with other students enrolled in these programs. The purpose of interviewing was not only to listen to the words, but also to derive meanings, motivations, and conflicts—often hidden by surface conversation—that lay behind behavior. Interviews were designed to discover how individuals interpreted the social world around them and how these interpretations were used as the basis for their actions.

Analysis

As a result of these observations and interviews, the analysis examined the students' perspectives of social studies education. Throughout the fieldwork, interview and observation notes were reviewed daily. Incidents and bits of information were at first coded into tentative conceptual categories. As these categories emerged, questions arose that were used to guide further investigation into the field. The findings from these investigations were then compared to the initial categories. Early analysis by Adler (1984) was modified when data from both sample groups were pooled. Special attention was given to data that seemed to challenge original conceptualizations. Through this constant comparison of data, theoretical categories crystallized. For example, initially it seemed that there were five major perspectives that students had toward social studies education. However, further investigation clarified that some data did not easily fit into these existing categories. Although data to support the development of an additional category were sparse, we felt that they were significant, and thus a sixth category emerged. This return to the data source, followed by modification or generation of ideas, continued until the findings could be presented in some detail. Finally, the participants were given an opportunity to respond to the initial analysis before a final draft of the study was written.
As suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967), the analysis presented in this paper takes a narrative form, using examples from the data to clarify concepts and to demonstrate the interrelationship between analysis and social reality. The data presented in this paper are not designed to prove the infallibility of the study's results. Rather, the goal is to illuminate concepts and thus provide a basis for further discussion and debate. Presenting the analysis in narrative form reflects its ever-developing nature.

**Perspectives of Social Studies Education**

As described previously, this study examined student perspectives toward social studies education. Six major perspectives were expressed through these students' beliefs and actions. These perspectives were neither static nor mutually exclusive. Although individual students held a dominant perspective, careful observation revealed that students also expressed qualities of other perspectives as they taught. In addition, a number of individuals altered their perspectives during their field experiences. In describing these six perspectives, we have temporarily frozen life, and the dynamic character of people's beliefs and actions is muffled.

**Social Studies as a Nonsubject**

Unlike the other perspectives described in this paper, social studies as a nonsubject was limited to the students within Sample A. Many of these students did not consider social studies a major subject within the curriculum. Social studies content was rarely observed being taught in Sample A's practicum sites. Reading and math dominated the curriculum in most classrooms. Students often said that they had taught nothing but these two subjects in their early field experiences. In grades 1-3, social studies even lacked an official time slot during the day. Fourth-grade teachers taught social studies for half the year and science the other half. However, these lessons were often taught only if there was enough time at the end of a day. Little continuity, organization, or thought were put into these lessons. Debra, who was placed in a fourth-grade classroom, summarized the experience of a number of students.

Well, in the afternoon, if we have some time to kill, we might show a filmstrip or movie on some social studies topic. We're supposed to teach it more often, but there are too many other things to do. (interview with Debra)

Many students said that their cooperating teachers were under pressure to raise the nationally standardized reading scores of their pupils, and as a result, little time could be devoted to other educational goals. For many of these students, social studies did not exist as part of the curriculum. Although social studies was taught in the middle level grades, compared to other subjects such as reading, it was not considered important.

What is most surprising is that students and many faculty members in Sample A seemed to take for granted the dominance of reading over other
elementary subjects. This crucial issue was never discussed in any of the university classes observed. Whatever their answers when asked if they felt this dominance was educationally sound, students all said it was the first time anyone had asked them that question.

Social Studies as Human Relations

Other students also failed to view social studies as a field of knowledge; they saw it as teaching children techniques of human relations. Rather than using history, anthropology, sociology, political science, or some other social science to explore the nature of human beings and the world around them, these students emphasized teaching children about themselves and how to cooperate with the other children in their class.

I think social studies should help children become more aware of themselves and how to get along with others. [She was asked how these goals should be accomplished.] I think the best way is to have them do things that make them more aware of their feelings and values. We use T.A. [Transactional Analysis] for Kids a lot. It's a great book for improving children's self-image and helping them communicate better. (interview with Jean)

Students with this perspective did not plan and implement units of study around a given body of knowledge, but instead taught interpersonal communication, problem solving, or self-concept lessons.

Jill had her third-grade class make Me Mobiles. Each pupil had to paint faces that reflected feelings they often felt. After the period was over, Jill and her cooperating teacher collected the plates and later made mobiles out of them and hung them up around the room. When asked to explain the meanings of this activity, Jill responded, "We have them do this kind of stuff every Tuesday and Thursday. Each time we pick out a different activity from one of these books [She pointed to three books on teaching children about human relationships.] that helps them get in touch with themselves or other kids in the class. Personally, I think this stuff is a lot more meaningful than the traditional social studies I had as a kid." (observation of and interview with Jill)

The predominant characteristic of this perspective is that all these activities were conducted under the general heading of human relations. No real content was explored, nor was there a context into which these activities were placed. For example, the preceding activity was not part of a unit on what it means to be a human being or even a unit on human emotions, but was simply one of many activities that the children participated in twice each week. Like social studies as a nonsubject, this perspective portrayed social studies as devoid of any substantive content.
Social Studies as Citizenship

This perspective saw social studies as the means to teach children the value of being a good citizen. Unlike the conception of social studies described in the introduction of this paper, the term good to these students did not imply thoughtful, involved, and socially active individuals. Instead, it meant an uncritical loyalty to the economic and political institutions and customs of our society. For example, Barb taught her first-grade class to memorize the Pledge of Allegiance as one of her social studies activities. In these lessons there was no attempt to help the pupils understand what it means to pledge allegiance or what the flag might symbolize to different individuals (observation of and interview with Barb).

A few students expressed the view that setting up classroom rules was social studies in that it helped pupils become better citizens.

Sooner or later kids have to learn that they can't do everything they want. Learning to obey rules and how to get along in society is just part of growing up, and it's important for teachers to teach these things to kids. So in this way I teach some social studies indirectly. (interview with Tom)

In teaching subject matter, students encouraged children to emulate individuals who exemplified this unquestioning loyalty.

Pupils were giving their oral reports on famous Americans in history. While there were numerous reports on presidents, military heros, and sports figures, there were virtually no reports on controversial individuals or outspoken critics of American society. The only social activist mentioned was Martin Luther King, and the emphasis of this report was on Dr. King's peaceful, nonviolent intentions and his loyalty to America. The fact that individuals in the civil rights movement openly defied state and federal laws, spoke against the injustices within our society, and often spent time in jail was never really explored in this report. Neither Andy nor his cooperating teacher raised these points at any time during or after the pupils' presentations. (observation of Andy)

When Andy, who was placed in a sixth-grade classroom, was asked why there were few social critics among the reports, he responded:

This is a pretty conservative community, and that kind of stuff I don't think would go over real big here. [He was asked if he agreed with this point of view.] Yes, I guess so. There's no better place to live in the world today, and I think we should teach these kids how lucky they are instead of always focusing on the negative. (interview with Andy)

This perspective also promoted the notion that to be an American citizen was intrinsically best. When compared to other cultures, for example, there
was often a subtle but consistent message that our governmental institutions, production of consumer goods, written laws, wealth, city size, or scientific discoveries meant that our society was more advanced than other nations of the world. These messages were often evident in lessons of history, political science, sociology, as well as anthropology.

Social Studies as School Knowledge

In this perspective, social studies was seen as textbook knowledge; a major concern of students who held this perspective was the need to cover the material. These students depended on textbooks and such textbook-like materials as mimeographed handouts in their teaching. Learning was defined as the passive acquisition of information, with little time given to questioning, challenging, or critically analyzing this school knowledge. Whether the information was the names of state capitals, the causes of the Civil War, or the effects of the Industrial Revolution, pupils were expected to memorize specific information for a specified time period. Proof of learning was limited to successful scores on tests of recall and comprehension.

Students with this perspective often became dependent on the textbooks and rarely questioned the information found in them.

Ann was verbally quizzing the children in preparation for their test on chapter six in their textbook, which compared democracy to communism. She asked various questions about the characteristics of each system, and if a child missed the question, the pupil had to look up the answer in the text. (observation of Ann)

Ann was later asked if she thought the comparison between communism and democracy was an accurate approach to take because one reflects a political system and the other an economic system. Her response was typical of students with this perspective.

Maybe that kind of questioning is appropriate for college, but I don’t think these kids [sixth-graders] can handle it. Besides, if I spend a lot of time discussing every little point, we won’t finish the chapter in time. (interview with Ann)

When asked why they were teaching what they were teaching, students who held this perspective commonly gave one or more of the following answers: (a) the cooperating teacher told me what to teach; (b) the lesson was next in line in the textbook; (c) this curriculum was required by the principal, the school board, or the state; or (d) this is what the teachers in the next grade would expect pupils to know. These students had a deferential attitude toward curriculum experts, textbook authors, and professors; they know what to teach and it is the job of teachers to follow the plan accordingly. Social studies was limited to the official knowledge found in professionally developed curriculum materials.
The effects of covering the material were dramatic. Instead of instruction being an activity in which teachers and pupils explore and share knowledge, stimulate interest, and work together toward a commonly arrived at intellectual goal, teaching became an activity or a problem of management.

When I look back at my field experiences, the thing that strikes me most is just how little actual teaching went on. [She was asked for clarification.] You know, where you sit down with the kids and teach them something [content]. Mostly, you just organized the day—made sure everyone was doing what they were supposed to do, passed out worksheets, and graded tests. No one seemed to teach much; we just set things up for kids to work. (observation of Susan's final conference with her university supervisor)

The most important managerial concern for these students was discipline. Students were observed experimenting with various techniques such as turning lights on and off, counting down from ten, and putting names on the blackboard. These techniques were used to keep the pupils on task, maintain order, and "ensure that work is being done and that learning is taking place" (interview with David).

**Social Studies as the Great Connection**

Social studies as the great connection or core of the curriculum was the dominant theme in the perspectives of a few of our informants. Students who held this perspective emphasized the integration of knowledge; they taught as if there were no hard boundaries between school subjects. An observer in the classroom might be unsure what subject was scheduled for a particular time. For example, during observations of Peter's teaching, a math lesson on measurement included measuring map distances to various national parks and was tied to a social studies unit on John Muir.

Students who held this perspective were independent of textbooks. Not only did they see knowledge as integrated, but they also viewed knowledge as coming from many different sources, both inside and outside the school.

The most interesting thing I did was plan a unit on ecology. I did a lot of my own research on the topic. . . . Instead of having the kids read only textbooks and fill out worksheets, I had them make an art display illustrating the balance between all things; they saw a movie about the habitats of wild animals and how they are being destroyed; I brought in a guest speaker from a local environmental group and from the local utility company; and I had the kids read newspaper articles and children's books that dealt with endangered species and man's relationship to the earth. I ended the unit by having the students . . . write poems about this topic. It was neat deciding what to teach and how to teach it. (interview with Judy)

These students were more than managers of predetermined curriculum. In
interviews they expressed the importance of teachers developing curriculum based on their own and their pupils' interests. They believed that they could best promote inquiry and reflection among their pupils if they could exercise more control over the curriculum in their classrooms. They suggested that by integrating subjects, they got their students more involved in learning.

Social Studies as Social Action

This last perspective is similar to the preceding one. Like the great connectors, the two students who held this perspective developed their own curriculum and promoted reflective inquiry among their pupils. However, this perspective emphasized a more critical stance toward textbooks, the role of the teacher, knowledge, and the sociopolitical contexts within which schools exist. As part of their case histories, both Kate and Peter mentioned being influenced by the civil rights and antiwar movements of the 1960s and 1970s. They saw the relationship between the dominant political, social, and economic forces within the United States and the role schools play in perpetuating the existing order. Each expressed a desire to, in some small way, help change our society through their teaching. They wanted their pupils to become more critical and to question many of our social norms.

What I'd like to be doing in social studies does definitely reflect what I think people, as thinking members of society, need to be able to do—that is, question things they read and the prevailing tides [sociopolitical ideologies] of the country. (interview with Peter)

As a result of these beliefs, Peter and Kate chose topics of study that would increase their pupils' sociopolitical awareness and would stimulate them to become more socially active citizens.

The textbook covered the aging process, and generally, it did a pretty good job of pointing out some of the problems old people face in our country. However, we [Kate and her cooperating teachers] felt that it [the textbook] lacked a sense of real life. So we had the kids visit a nursing home down the block from the school. The kids got really involved. They started to adopt grandparents from the home, and we took numerous field trips there. When they [the grandparents] died, the kids wrote letters to their relatives and in some cases even went to the funerals. So we started talking about death with the kids. But then we realized that we were focusing only on the problems of the elderly. So we started talking about how some elderly people regain their childhood in their last years. Some travel and develop hobbies; some learn how to really enjoy life. This is something the textbook totally ignored. We discovered that a big factor in enjoying one's later years was health and having enough money. So we ended the unit by writing to the President, local congress people, and Representative Pepper to find out what
the government does or does not do to ensure proper care for the elderly. (interview with Kate)

From this perspective, social studies was a means to increase pupils' sense of social responsibility and, as a result, promote a more humane society. Although this perspective was dominant in only two students, its effect in the classrooms observed was clearly noticeable.

Portrayal of Sally

The six perspectives capture and freeze the beliefs and actions of two groups of student teachers. But these perspectives were not as static or clear cut as the preceding descriptions imply. Each student observed was involved in the dynamic life of the classroom; each was faced with processing, consciously or unconsciously, classroom activities, events, and people; each had to confront a role as a teacher. Although each student manifested a consistent pattern of social studies teaching captured by one of the six perspectives, each occasionally taught in inconsistent or contradictory ways. Each occasionally displayed some characteristic of holding, or being attracted toward, other perspectives. In some cases, we observed students move from one dominant perspective to another. Thus, the following portrayal is intended to capture some of this dynamic quality by describing the evolving perspectives of one student teacher, Sally.

Sally was, in some ways, typical. She began her student teaching feeling nervous about taking charge of a class, worried about how she would manage fifth-grade students, and unsure of her role as a teacher. Social studies was, however, an interest of hers and something she looked forward to teaching. Her academic focus in history and her involvement in community politics may help explain why she showed little attraction toward the first three perspectives. She was even critical of the first perspective, social studies as nonsubject. Not enough time, she said, was being spent on social studies, and she was indignant that it was the subject dropped when room was needed in the school day for extra activities.

Sally's dominant perspective, during the first part of the semester, was social studies as school knowledge. She expressed concern about having enough time to cover all the material and confided that she was reluctant to be too innovative in her teaching lest the pupils become disorderly and waste time. She taught from the textbook and seemed to depend on expert knowledge as the basis of her social studies curriculum. But even while she worried about covering the material, she began to express doubt about the meaningfulness of textbook learning.

To memorize facts is too easily forgotten. When you do things, you tend to remember them more. Especially if it's some exciting sort of activities that the kids can be proud of and that they can learn from. . . . I want them to start thinking about and to start doing their own thing. (interview with Sally)
Furthermore, her conceptions of social studies even at the beginning of the semester expressed, albeit vaguely, a view of social studies as something more than covering the material. When asked to define social studies, Sally said:

To me there is no set definition because it involves so many things and covers such a wide area. Practically any topic in the classroom can fit under the heading social studies. Basically, I see social studies as learning about ourselves and the world, very broad. (interview with Sally)

An observer, watching Sally early in the semester teaching textbook lessons and listening to her contradictory talk about the importance of having pupils start thinking and getting actively involved, might have concluded that her talk was mere empty rhetoric, a rhetoric she acquired in a methods class but was unwilling to put into practice. Her early perspective, characterized by a concern for order and covering the material, might also have been a reflection of her overriding concerns about classroom management rather than a conception of social studies as the knowledge of experts passed on to the younger generation.

As her practicum experience continued, Sally found her solution to keeping order in the classroom to be less than satisfactory. She talked about wanting her students to enjoy social studies, about the importance of getting them actively involved, about wanting them to develop empathy for other people. Her cooperating teacher encouraged her to take chances— to try new activities and approaches.

I think I've given Sally the security to go ahead and try what she wants . . . . She didn't have to worry about what my reaction was going to be because she knew I was supporting her. (interview with Sally's cooperating teacher)

As the semester progressed, Sally began to incorporate a variety of activities into her social studies lessons that reflected movement toward the last two perspectives described in this paper. She got her pupils involved in small group research projects and began to help them analyze and evaluate the information they were finding. “Check more than one book,” she told one group, “they don't always give you the same information.” (observation of Sally)

I've learned that we never trust the textbook alone to do a good job of teaching. . . . I like to provide kids with a lot of different sources, to get them in the habit of looking at more than one thing and not just going by their books. (interview with Sally)

Sally began to apply her belief that providing structure to a lesson did not necessarily mean all pupils had to do the same things and that ways could be found to give pupils choices. To Sally, structure came to mean that the
teacher should create an orderly learning environment, providing experiences which would stimulate and encourage pupil learning. Her concern for establishing and maintaining order was balanced by a concern for stimulating the children's interest in social studies.

By the end of the semester, Sally had moved away from social studies as school knowledge and toward a view of social studies as the great connection. Her lessons began to tap her pupils' personal experiences, to encourage their creativity, to help children see connections between past and present. She began to talk about how social studies should be "more a part of the whole classroom" and wanted to try "integrating it with other courses." Finally, Sally began to talk about social studies as social action.

I adamantly believe that too many of us don't care about what's going on and because of that we [our society] are in a mess. I think [sociopolitical] awareness is a really big thing and learning that there are ways to act on that [is important]. (interview with Sally)

It cannot be said that Sally's perspectives toward social studies at the end of the semester were characterized by social action. Although she was abstractly committed to helping students learn to think critically and then act on the stands they take, she was unsure how to go about teaching the skills necessary to do so. It had not occurred to her that there were social action skills involved in social studies until one of us raised the point in question. However, slowly and unsystematically she was beginning to offer her pupils opportunities for critical inquiry as she encouraged them to seek out new sources, evaluate the data they uncovered, and draw their own conclusions based on that data.

By the end of the semester, Sally had gained more confidence in herself as a teacher, and in the process her perspectives toward social studies had evolved away from a concern with school knowledge and strict order. Not surprisingly her teaching was still marked by some uncertainty, and her perspective remained open and fluid.

**Conclusion and Implications for Practice**

The findings reported in this paper built on Adler's (1984) article as we sought to extend our knowledge of teachers' perspectives toward social studies education. These findings raise concerns that deserve consideration among social studies educators. As discussed in the introduction of this paper, similar conceptions of social studies education are held by many educators. Social studies should promote inquiry, active participation in society, and an understanding of social science. Given these goals, two concerns emerge from the findings of this study.

First, the findings suggest that official conceptions of social studies have little to do with students' beliefs and actions in the classroom. Even when students' conceptions of social studies are similar to our idealistic notions,
as is the case with Sample B, their perspectives provide a more accurate portrayal of the work these students do and the meaning they give to this work. Rather than focusing on our own conceptions of what social studies education should be, we need to put more effort into understanding the perspectives toward social studies education that students develop during their professional preparation. It does little good to expose students to innovative ideas if they view social studies as a nonsubject.

If the preceding implication is correct, we need more research that illuminates the perspectives students generate during their professional education. Traditional analysis and categorization of students' beliefs and actions into predetermined continuums such as conservative-liberal tell us little about how the informants themselves give meaning to and act on the professional world they are about to enter. This study, then, reaffirms the value of ethnographic methods of descriptive analysis in helping us gain insights into the complex process of becoming a social studies teacher. Are these perspectives common in other programs? If so, why; if not, why not? Just as additional data prompted the reanalysis of Adler's (1984) study, additional research may uncover more subtle perspectives missed in this study. If we are to improve the professional education of social studies teachers, then we need research that helps us understand students' perspectives toward this activity.

In addition to discovering what perspectives students have, we need research that investigates how their perspectives have developed. As the description of Sally demonstrates, students' perspectives are complex, interacting in unique ways under specific circumstances. This study suggests that a number of factors contribute to the development of student perspectives: conceptions of social studies education growing from childhood experiences; significant individuals such as family members, cooperating teachers, and university faculty members; institutional expectations found in the practicum sites; and social forces outside the classroom such as the accountability movement and social demands for higher reading scores.

In examining these forces, we also need to ask why some perspectives seem to dominate over others. For example, in our samples the first four perspectives were much more common than the last two. A number of educators have argued that schools are a major force in perpetuating a technocratic, utilitarian, and object-oriented national ideology (e.g., Apple, 1982; Giroux, 1983). They argue that this ideology lacks concern for human inquiry, values, and needs. These individuals might suggest that the dominance of the first four perspectives in our study reflects the influence that this ideology has on those individuals going into the teaching profession as well as the reproductive force they play in our schools on entering the profession. These educators recognize, however, that individuals are not merely shaped into a uniform mold by this ideology. The presence of our last two perspectives supports this notion. To various degrees, students
chose which beliefs and actions they thought were worthwhile. Some students acted on their practicum environment as well as conformed to it. However, these findings and theoretical notions are inconclusive. More research into the external forces that influence students' perspectives and the students' responses to these forces would give educators insights into the professional socialization of future teachers.

The second concern that emerges from this study addresses recommendations for social studies education courses. Although it is important to have clear conceptions of and goals for social studies education, it is also necessary to focus on how these goals and ideals can be manifested. The juxtaposition of the perspectives; social studies as human relations and school knowledge against social studies as the great connection and social action, suggests that students need to learn more than just how to teach from the textbook or even how to supplement it. The work of such students as Peter, Kate, and Judy suggests that preparation courses should focus on the skills of curriculum development and implementation. Students need to learn how to develop curriculum based on their own and their pupils' intellectual interests. Preparation courses should teach students to choose worthwhile topics of study; develop the themes, concepts, or areas of content that make up this topic; research these themes to increase their own level of knowledge on this topic; discover resources that children can use to explore these themes; develop activities that illuminate the themes of this topic and promote creativity and thoughtfulness among pupils; and organize these themes, resources, and activities into a coherent unit of study.

Developing curriculum is similar to writing a documentary or an article. It requires interest in the subject matter, motivation and skill to research relevant information, energy to discover new sources, and the ability to organize the findings of this work into a form that other people can understand and enjoy. Although most students want to teach because they like children (e.g., Buchmann, 1982; Goodman, 1983; Tabachnick, Popkewitz, & Zeichner, 1979–80), this study suggests that preparation courses must attempt to stimulate students' curiosity toward the world of knowledge and the dynamics of learning.

It is not enough, however, to teach students only how to develop their own curriculum. Perspectives such as social studies as a nonsubject, as human relations, and as citizenship suggest that preparation courses need to examine underlying purposes and principles of social studies education. As part of these courses, we need to examine the relationship between our students' beliefs and actions, explore the perspectives that students have and what forces influence them, and discuss the relative merits of these various perspectives. Integrated into these courses should be questions such as: What role should social studies play in the elementary and middle schools? Who should decide what content is taught? What criteria should be used to determine worthwhile social studies content and activities? What kind of
learning should be emphasized during the teaching of social studies? What is the relationship between social studies content found in the classroom and the sociopolitical forces found within the broader society? As Beyer and Zeichner (1982) suggest, underlying questions of practice do not have to be limited to foundation courses. To the contrary, this study suggests that this level of analysis should be central to preparation courses.

Finally, as Stake and Easley (1978) emphasized, it takes more than good intentions and the existence of viable alternatives to change school practice. The institutional demands found within the practicum sites seem to have a strong influence on students' perspectives. As a result, preparation courses need to ask students to consider the importance of becoming change agents in the schools. As Kohl (1976) said, students should be exposed to the politics of teaching. Preparation courses should have students consider the problems of initiating substantive change without needlessly alienating administrators, other staff, and parents. Planning for short-term and long-term change, creating freedom within constraints, developing a support system within the school and the community, writing proposals for curriculum change, and presenting ideas for curriculum design and implementation at local and state conferences are some of the strategies that can be examined within preparation courses.

Becoming an elementary social studies teacher is a complex human endeavor. It often involves subtle, and at times, contradictory beliefs and actions. In our attempts to best educate these future teachers, it is mandatory that we begin to penetrate this complexity of human life. Developing innovative conceptions of social studies education is important—after all, if we don't dream, we will stagnate. It is equally important to examine how our ideals can be concretely manifested. Preparation courses are not a panacea for the problems that face social studies education; however, based on careful research, useful and substantive strategies for these future teachers can be developed.

Endnotes

1. To enhance the reading of this paper, the following word guide is provided: Educator—one who teaches in a university teacher preparation program or conducts research into social studies education; Student—one who is enrolled in a college-level teacher education program; Pupil—a child enrolled in an elementary or middle school.

2. For a complete discussion of the rationale, theoretical principles, and methods used to collect and analyze the data, see Goodman (1983) and Adler (1982).

3. This selection procedure was used to find students who appeared to hold conceptions of social studies education deemed desirable in the social studies literature: the importance of teaching social studies, orientation toward critical thinking, integrated curriculum, social interaction, and involvement. For a more detailed discussion of the selection criteria and process, see Adler (1982, 1984).

4. Because of the selection process, each student in Sample B believed social studies was an important subject to be taught, and they were given more opportunities to teach it. Because students made special efforts to teach them, we observed more social studies lessons being taught.
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Citizenship: The Phantom Core of Social Studies Curriculum
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Abstract

The relationship of citizenship to the social studies curriculum is explored. Several well known curricular designs for the social studies are reviewed and the fundamental differences in their treatment of citizenship noted. It would appear that the development of knowledge about citizenship and the development of a curriculum for citizenship have become indistinguishable in the field of social studies education. There is need for a base of knowledge about citizenship independent of curriculum development, and the establishment of a scholarly discipline of citizenship is proposed.

In the field of social studies education, there appears to be widespread agreement that the development of good citizenship is the central purpose of social studies instruction in the schools (Engle, 1982; Jarolimek, 1982; Remy, 1978). It is indeed perplexing that from so much agreement there could be such a stalemate of disagreement. This paper will explore the problems that have developed in relating the study of citizenship to the social studies curriculum. It will posit the scholarly study of citizenship as the base for social studies curriculum development.

Defining the social studies has been a long-standing endeavor of the field. As Engle (1982, p. 1) noted: “We seem to have a persistent problem of saying just what the social studies is about and how it is distinguished from other parts of schooling.” Some twenty years earlier, Metcalf (1963, p. 930) had complained that a “detailed listing of social studies aims” was very similar to a listing of the aims of education. More recently, Barr, Barth and Shermanis (1977, p. 2) noted that the content of the social studies was a smorgasbord. Clearly, we seem to be unclear about what content is relevant to the development of good citizenship. Even if we were able to remove the value orientation implicit in the concept of citizenship (with or without the term good), the conundrum of what content is most relevant to the study of citizenship would remain.

The concept of citizenship appears to function at numerous levels simultaneously, and there has been scant effort to clarify the different levels and
the ways they interact with each other. In some curricular designs for the social studies, the world of work and its importance to the community take on a central role: Indeed, forming the proper attitudes and skills necessary to performing well at work became a major social studies topic in the 1970s under the rubric of career education (Jarolimek, 1982, p. 184). Similarly, the need to train citizens to be good purchasers (who, incidentally, would not become tax-draining wards of the state) promoted consumer economics as a major segment of the social studies. Conserving energy and protecting the environment are among the so-called emerging issues (Jarolimek, 1982, p. 173) that also have commanded a place in recent social studies curricular designs. In a draft of a paper in preparation for The Educator's Handbook, Shaver (1983) noted that the social studies, unlike other school subjects, does not refer to a commonly recognized field of study, but rather embraces history, geography and civics. In recent years, other social sciences such as anthropology and sociology have been added to the melange of disciplines. Curriculum developers have an array of possibilities to choose from. Since there does not appear to be a recognized knowledge base with regard to citizenship, if the content selected involves human behavior in society it is assumed to lead to the promotion of citizenship and thus is justified.

Citizenship may be widely accepted as the core of the social studies, but it is a phantom core. Whatever is happening in the curriculum—whether it be the traditional study of American history or some personally-oriented exploration of career choices or a demonstration of how to fill out Federal tax forms—the reason given for doing what we do is ultimately related to the development of good citizenship. Citizenship is a phantom figure whose form is so unclearly perceived that it may be used to encourage whatever is happening in the curriculum to go on happening.

Even when lack of knowledge about citizenship is granted, as Superka and Hawke (1980) do in their discussion of Project Span, new curricular designs are proposed that ostensibly promote citizenship based upon whatever the curriculum developer's conceptualization of citizenship may be. Superka and Hawke, who were collaborating with Morrissett, spend several paragraphs discussing the general disagreements and confusions about citizenship. They then propose a curriculum, developed under Project Span, based on the roles of citizens interacting with political entities. Among the roles of citizens are worker, consumer, family member and friend (Superka & Hawke, 1980, p. 579). Exactly why the role of worker is more politically oriented or better suited to the promotion of citizenship than the role of manager or store owner is unclear.

Newmann's (1977) Citizen Participation Curriculum Project posited still another curricular conception of the study of citizenship. To quote Newmann, Bertocci and Landsness (1977, pp. 3–4), "the purpose of civic education, as opposed, for example, to aesthetic, economic or psychological education, is to teach students to function in a particular relationship with the
state.” After having premised constitutional, representative democracy as the basis of “the particular relationship with the state,” Newmann et al. (1977, p. 4) suggested that, “the most fundamental civic competence is the ability to exert influence in public affairs.” The project concentrates on the skills useful in exerting such influence, but does little to clarify the nature of citizenship or of the social studies. For instance, is being a productive worker part of the “particular relationship with the state,” to be included in studies of citizenship, or would that be properly included in some other kinds of study, such as the study of roles as defined in sociology? In similar fashion, is being a competent consumer, or a good parent, or an ethical business person, or whatever, an appropriate part of that “particular relationship?”

Newmann et al. (1977) open the social studies content to whatever area of advocacy a given set of students decide to pursue; this could encompass such varied causes as wanting air bags for increased passenger safety, lobbying in order to censor a public library’s choice of books, waging an anti-poverty campaign, and even eliminating all failing grades from the local school’s register. The interpretation of the citizen’s relationship with the state is placed clearly within a democratic sphere, but is otherwise unspecified.

The authors are well aware of the goal diffusion embedded in their curricular conception (Newmann et al., 1977, p. 192), but they believe that their central purpose of developing in students the abilities necessary to exert influence in public affairs will keep the curriculum from becoming fragmented. Perhaps under Newmann’s leadership that would be the case; it does, however, appear to this observer that the curriculum design could include any action that happens to be undertaken in a planned fashion by a group for the purpose of influencing public affairs. In the normal course of real world schooling, diffused goals would be the result. Public affairs may be interpreted at a global level, a national level, or even at the classroom level, as though the differences in these levels and the contexts they imply were not significant for the meaning of citizenship. I must agree with Broudy, Smith and Burnett (1964, p. 233), “Not all problems are equally useful for pedagogical purposes. Simple problems involving only one dimension of knowledge may not be adequate preparation for dealing with multidimensional problems.”

Without a doubt, developing in students the skills that would help them to be participants in public affairs is desirable. However, the areas of concern within which students will learn to exercise their skills is at least as important as the exercise of the citizen action skills themselves. Everyone would agree that developing problem solving skills is important, but these could be learned utilizing an adding machine or a microcomputer. A student could conceivably achieve considerable problem solving skills with an adding machine, while still remaining essentially ignorant of the unique configurations of the micro and of the questions that are fundamental to its
operations. In like fashion, a student could become skillful in influencing
the public affairs of the local community, while giving almost no attention
to the national scene where participation leads to less immediate gratific-
tions. The content selected for the social studies curriculum could be such
that major questions on the national scene would be overlooked while the
student is developing citizen action skills. The omission is significant and is
not necessary to the development of citizen action skills (any more than is
learning problem solving skills with an adding machine). Since, as Meyer
(1979, pp. 11-19) found, there is little agreement "about the meaning of
citizenship," or about "the nature and scope of the citizen role," the selec-
tion of content could easily become a hit or miss affair, even in such a well
thought effort as the Citizen Participation Curriculum Project.

Unless we can develop a knowledge of citizenship that clarifies the dif-
ferent ways in which citizenship functions, how these ways interact with
each other, how personal life and citizenship life function both separately
and interactively, and in what ways citizenship becomes more or less signifi-
cant in social life, the goal of promoting citizenship will continue to be a
phantom core of the social studies curriculum leading all too frequently to
a hodgepodge of content selection. Clearly, I am referring to more than a
denotative definition of citizenship easily found in the dictionary or an en-
cyclopedia; I am referring to a full-blown effort to develop scholarly knowl-
dge about citizenship in all of its complexities and nuances.

As I have reviewed the work of numerous social studies educators includ-
ing my own, I have come to realize that we have been trying to define
simultaneously the nature of the social studies and the nature of citizenship
via the process of curriculum development. Without having a knowledge
base about citizenship independent of the social studies, curriculum de-
velopers each establish their own rationale for the design and selection of
content. In effect, if the curriculum establishes that learning to be a good
worker is learning good citizenship, then work is part of the definition of
citizenship. If, instead, the curriculum establishes that having knowledge of
history and the social sciences is important to exercising citizenship, then,
at the least, work takes on a diminished importance for the definition of
citizenship. A shared history or a command of certain social scientific pro-
cesses become more central to the definition of citizenship. My point is
there does not appear to be any place outside curriculum development
where citizenship is studied as an area of scholarship; where the attributes
and functionings of citizenship are thoroughly explored; where research
methodologies and objective knowledge about citizenship can be collected,
organized, challenged, reorganized; and where a clearer understanding of
the nature and definition of citizenship can be developed in an ongoing
fashion much as, say, the anthropologists work on their understanding of
culture.

Engle (1982, part 2, p. 5) called for such a scholarship of citizenship and
recognized its centrality to the definition of the social studies when he stated, "Before we are on top of the problem of definition in the social studies, there must be developed a scholarship of the citizen. . . ." What I add is that we need to distinguish the process of developing a scholarship of citizenship from the process of developing a course of study in the social studies that would promote citizenship.

To clarify with an example, there is growing support for the inclusion of global education in the social studies curriculum. However, the adjectives global and national have a profound effect upon the meaning of citizenship. While we can be simultaneously citizens of the earth and citizens of a nation, there are major, even contradictory differences between these two kinds of citizenship, differences needing extensive research. They ought not be ignored simply because they do not fit the definition of the social studies, or some curriculum developer's conception of appropriate social studies content.

The points I am making go to the heart of our efforts as social studies educators to define our field. One of the better known, most frequently cited efforts at defining the social studies was published by Barr, Barth and Shermis (1977). They suggest that three different views of the nature of the social studies have persisted simultaneously throughout the sixty odd years of its history. While largely overlapping, the distinctions among the traditions are sufficient to allow a clear delineation of the instructional methods and content each would support. In fact, in their discussion of the three traditions (i.e., citizenship transmission, instruction about the social sciences, and reflective inquiry), Barr, Barth and Shermis (1977) describe at length the instructional methodologies and types of content that would be associated with each, asking how good citizenship could best be promoted in the context of each. Brubaker (1977, p. 100) called their presentation of these traditions, "conceptual model building." I certainly concur that the authors are engaged in a heuristic process, but, in my view, one better suited to curriculum development for the social studies than to the establishment of the nature of the field. As Shaver (1977, p. 116) notes, "The categories are a means of analyzing, not of organizing the field . . . ."

Barr, Barth and Shermis (1977) have analyzed the social studies with the logic of curriculum developers. That is, in distinguishing among the traditions, they have defined each by indicating how the purpose of promoting citizenship takes on a unique form; then they proceed to relate instructional methods and content to the purpose. Although in a related work, Barr, Barth and Shermis (1978) do deal with variations of the definition of citizenship as per the traditions, they do not appear to conceive of citizenship as a study in its own right, having the potential for a considerable knowledge base. Instead, they propose their own definition of the social studies as "the integration of social sciences and humanities for the purpose of instruction in citizenship education" (1978, p. 18), without any attempt to deal with the
scope of citizenship and the different qualities the concept may take as it moves from global to local; from tribal to national; from one kind of democracy to another. Basically, what they have done is analyze the history of the social studies curriculum and, by organizing curriculum practice into three categories, they have made that history more comprehensible.

Barr, Barth and Shermis seem to have accepted that a knowledge base for citizenship does not exist except as social studies curriculum. This, if taken to its logical conclusion, would mean that both the promotion of citizenship and the defining of good citizenship would be established by the school curriculum. This, at the very least, assumes a domination of the schools over other institutions certainly far from reality in the United States and quite unusual, thankfully, elsewhere in the world.

In all other school subjects, there is a recognized knowledge base as well as a system for developing new knowledge that stand apart from the processes of curriculum development. The curriculum developer is likely to ask what the state of knowledge is in a field; or how that knowledge can be best conveyed; or how relevant the knowledge is to the school’s purposes; it is not likely that the developer of the curriculum would also be the developer of the knowledge. Certainly, this is not a desirable state of affairs since it leaves us with the unsatisfactory situation of having the schools control what they will accept as actually being knowledge about citizenship, as well as determine how good citizenship should be defined and promoted in the schools.

Such a closed situation between knowledge and curriculum development occurred during the Nazi regime when history was rewritten by educators to portray the Germanic people “as the natural superior race” (Hovenier, 1983, p. 392) and instruction was designed to “deliver loyal, committed, unquestioning, physically able and . . . ruthless, self-sacrificing citizens” (Hovenier, 1983, p. 395). Since the scholarly study of history remained independent of the curriculum development fostered by the Nazis, there was eventually a check and reevaluation of the curriculum.

The way we are developing social studies curriculum without a scholarly base of study about citizenship leaves us with scant means for ascertaining the validity of the curricular content. It cannot be said that there are no checks at all; political science, sociology and economics do provide us with checks that are indirectly relevant; so too do our own experiences immeshed in a potpourri of activities that comprise our daily lives. Let us remember that political science does not have citizenship as its central concept, but rather, power. Indeed, little has been done by any of the existing social science disciplines to map out the scholarly domain of citizenship. Let us not illude ourselves into believing that the numerous surveys of voting behavior or consumer behavior are of a breadth and depth sufficient to be the base for establishing a scholarly domain.

If the schools ought not be, and probably cannot be the primary source of
knowledge about citizenship, and the social sciences remain reluctant to
deal directly with citizenship, then there is a need for the establishment of a
discipline of citizenship. Without such a discipline, it is most unlikely that
the definition of the field of social studies can be accomplished, depending
as it does so heavily on the goal of achieving good citizenship.

There is precedence for developing a discipline of citizenship, provided
that there is an awareness of the need. Broudy, Smith and Burnett (1964,
p. 237) note “our culture has developed disciplines for most of the typical
problems that are closer to practical concerns than are the basic sciences.”
Agriculture, medicine and urban studies are among the practical disciplines
that have been developed, side by side, with such basic sciences as chemistry
and physics.

Broudy, Smith and Burnett (1964, p. 237) go on to say, “each profession
organizes material from the basic sciences so that they are relevant to cer-
tain tasks: medicine to the problems of health, law to the problems of
justice, education to the problems of schooling, military science to the prob-
lems of warfare.” These applied disciplines or professions all yield material
benefits not only as a result of the research done, but as a reward to the
researcher. What rewards would there be in a scholarship of citizenship?
What tasks of citizenship would serve as fulcrums, around which materials
from the basic sciences and from other fields would be organized?

There are an array of questions that might be explored. Do the tasks of
citizenship change depending on the degree of technology present in the
society? How does the interaction of technology and democracy or tech-
nology and dictatorship affect citizenship? Moving toward greater com-
plexity, how would globalism influence the relationship of citizenship,
technology and national governance?

More importantly, is the development of a theory of citizenship possible
that would be capable of predicting, albeit limitedly, changes in the nature
of the tasks of citizenship resulting from the functioning of such major
phenomena as, let us say, technology and a managed economy? Could an
organization of interrelated concepts, such as community and authority be
developed that would subsequently form the underlying bases for theoriz-
ing? And, of course, what research methodologies could be devised that
would support the collection of data in a way consistent with the exercise of
citizenship?

Obviously, creating a discipline of citizenship where none exists, in an
historical period that has witnessed a steep decline of interest in the topic
among intellectuals, poses major though not insuperable problems. The
first half of this century was replete with scholarly efforts to explore the
meaning of citizenship. From the likes of Dewey (1929) and Counts (1952)
to Marshall (1950) and Brogan (1960), the discourse on the nature and
meaning of citizenship has diminished to little more than a whisper.

On the other hand, the development of a discipline implies the existence
of a community of scholars. As Raup, Axtelle, Benne and Smith (1943, p. 20) stated some 40 years ago, "No intellectual method is ever created outright at a particular time and place by a particular person or group." The conceptualizations to be developed and the methods of research to be employed cannot be established by any one of us.

I am not at all certain where the scholars will come from to establish a discipline. Perhaps from political science; perhaps from law; perhaps from social studies, although the kind of study I am referring to needs to move, however imperfectly, toward being value-free. What I hope is that social studies scholars may create the impetus, the felt need for the establishment of a discipline of citizenship. This, I believe, is the immediate challenge.
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Abstract

In this interpretive essay review of social studies curriculum, the intent is to examine how social studies curriculum has been conceived, formed, and enacted. First, meanings and implications of social studies curriculum as technical project and as social process are explored. Justaposition of the dominant technical view with a social process alternative highlights the major features and limitations of each. Consideration is then given to the broader implications of prevailing conceptions and practice of curriculum, and an alternative conception is suggested that integrates technical, social, and critical dimensions.

How we conceive of curriculum is important to the social studies education made available to students. Our conceptions and ways of reasoning about curriculum reflect and shape how we think and talk about, study, and act on matters of social education. The major purpose of this essay is to question the prevailing conception of curriculum as a document or plan and of curriculum construction as a technical project. Foreshadowing the conclusions of my inquiry, I find this conventional curriculum wisdom, which is a primarily technical view, inadequate to the challenge of social studies curriculum change and improvement. Consequently, a second purpose is to propose a reconstruction that incorporates social and critical as well as technical dimensions.

First, I explore the meanings and implications of the prevailing technical project view of curriculum and the competing social process view. To make the presentation manageable, I have synthesized particular instances to present a composite that reflects the spirit and substance if not the particulars of individual cases. In the technical view, curriculum is a tangible product such as a document or a package of materials accompanied by directions for its use. Curriculum construction is typically seen as a technical development task. The task is to produce the curriculum product to guide classroom teaching and learning. Development is accomplished by specialists at curriculum development centers or by teacher committees after school hours or during summer vacation.¹ The curriculum thus produced outside the classroom is then disseminated to be implemented by teachers in their classrooms.
The social process view portrays curriculum construction as an ongoing social activity that is shaped by various contextual influences within and beyond the classroom and accomplished interactively by teachers and students. Curriculum, in this view, is not simply a tangible product but the actual, day-to-day classroom interactions of students, teachers, ideas, and materials. The curriculum is the curriculum-in-use. Curriculum as product or object, the conventional view, is seen as one aspect of the context that shapes curriculum-in-use.

Justaposition of the dominant technical view with the social process alternative is intended to highlight the major features and limitations of each. Consideration is then given to broader implications of curriculum conceptions and practice, and a third possibility is suggested that integrates technical, social, and critical dimensions.

Curriculum as Product and Curriculum Construction as Technical Project

A technical project conception of curriculum is procedural. One follows a predetermined set of procedures in order to develop a curriculum. The procedures are the means to produce the curriculum end product; development is seen as separate from implementation. Typically, the curriculum product consists of a course of study or syllabus indicating the selection and organization of content to be taught and learned, accompanying materials such as books and maps, and directions for classroom use. The step-by-step development procedures suggest that curriculum is composed of discrete components (e.g., objectives, content, materials, activities, means of evaluation), which can be separately constructed, often in a linear sequence, and then assembled to make a coherent curriculum. The procedures are intended to provide efficient management and control of development resources and activities once curriculum policy decisions have been made by others (e.g., legislatures, school boards, administrators). Thus, the procedures are assumed to be value neutral, devoid of social, political, or ethical consequences, while the curriculum developers are usually seen as disinterested specialists.}

These procedures for curriculum development seem to be derived from outdated perceptions of how successful businesses operate, i.e., a rational management model. In its simplest form, a rational management model is objectives focused. Objectives to be obtained by students are specified; then content, activities, and accompanying materials are identified or created; and then means of assessing student attainment of the objectives are devised. Change is seen as a function of the curriculum document. To change the nature and effects of students' social studies experiences, one constructs and implements a different curriculum. Not only is curriculum seen as the vehicle for change, but it is conceived largely in terms of a management system; management systems become curriculum forms (also see Goodman, 1984).
The 1983 edition of the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC) publication, *Planning a Social Studies Program: Activities, Guidelines, and Resources* (Davis, 1983), illustrates a rational management model of curriculum construction. Intended for local school personnel, the SSEC model is also appropriate to larger scale or national projects seeking a rational management scheme for curriculum development and is similar to models advocated for use by teachers in their daily planning.

Among the assumptions underlying the SSEC model and other rational management models of curriculum is that curriculum construction is largely a planning task. An additional assumption is that systematic, step-by-step planning is rational (e.g., reasonable, logical, thorough) and therefore desirable. It is further assumed that such rational planning will enable precision and control over the otherwise haphazard nature of curriculum and teaching (see Apple, 1982; Reid, 1978). Curriculum construction, thus conceived as a technical project of efficiently managing resources to produce a tangible project, gives the appearance of being scientific, which tends to enhance its appeal to funding agencies and the general public as well as participants and users. This appeal is similar to that noted by Popkewitz, Tabachnick, and Wehlage (1982) in their study of the Individually Guided Education (ICE) curriculum reform. Like other management-oriented curriculum reforms, the technical project approach to curriculum conveys images of efficiency, effectiveness, and benevolence. Further, "the rituals, language styles, and ceremonies can create a feeling for both professionals and public that things are getting better, that professionals are competent, and that the social organization of schooling is progressive and responsive" (Popkewitz, 1982b, p. 13).

**Questions of Practice**

Despite widespread advocacy and the claims made in its behalf, observations regarding the use of a rational management model raise questions about its viability. First, rational management models do not seem to be widely used in practice by national projects, local committees, or individual teachers. Also, the curriculum products produced under the auspices of the model do not seem to be widely used as intended by their developers.

Evidence that a rational management model of curriculum construction has not been widely used in practice is provided by studies of curriculum projects (e.g., Reid & Walker, 1975) and teacher planning for social studies (McCUTCHEON, 1981; Peterson, Marx, & Clark, 1978) as well as informal observations and personal experience with social studies curriculum development projects in the 1960s and 1970s. In practice, the model is awkward, and its imposition tends to be resisted or rejected altogether. Experienced teachers tend to perceive the model as cumbersome and impractical; yet, teacher planning appears to be anything but simple (McCUTCHEON, 1981). Although teachers can follow such planning models when required to do so, most seem to abandon them at the first opportunity. Even when a rational
management planning model is institutionally mandated and supported, it is not widely or consistently used (Neal, Pate, & Case, 1983).

That the planning procedures of rational management models of curriculum construction are perceived as unnatural and often abandoned should not be surprising insofar as they represent a reconstructed or idealized logic rather than a practical, logic-in-use (Kaplan, 1964). That is, the procedures do not reflect what actually occurs when curriculum is constructed. Rational management models of curriculum construction thus resemble idealized accounts of the scientific method. The actual logics-in-use of science, i.e., methods of science, differ from the post hoc, reconstructed logic that is often presented as scientific method, particularly in school textbooks.

In addition to evidence that rational management models are not widely used, there is also ample evidence that the curriculum products produced under the auspices of these models are not widely used or used as intended by their developers (see Fullan & Pomfret, 1977, for a review). While estimates vary, it appears that by 1977 (10 years after their first commercial publication) new social studies curriculum project materials were used by fewer than 25 percent of social studies teachers in the United States (Cornbleth, 1980; Haas, 1977; Hertzberg, 1981; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1978). Accounts of social studies and other project materials use (e.g., Cornbleth, 1982a; Hamilton, 1973; Sarason, 1971) portray considerable discrepancy between intended and actual use, suggesting that new curriculum and materials are often adapted to preexisting beliefs and practices.

Explanations of the limited use and misuse of social studies curriculum project materials include reasons similar to those offered to explain rejection of the model under whose auspices they were produced, particularly the mismatch between recommended procedures on the one hand and prevailing beliefs, practices, and social conditions on the other (Hertzberg, 1981; Shaver et al., 1978). Implicit in the curriculum projects’ focus on materials production was the assumption that classroom practices could be changed by changing curriculum materials. Existing patterns of school organization and classroom interaction seem to have been largely ignored as were underlying values and interests.

To varying degrees, authors and interpreters of recent field studies have suggested that the teacher is the key to the actual classroom experiences of elementary and secondary students (e.g., Fancett & Hawke, 1982). Although it is unlikely that teachers are as autonomous as these conclusions might imply, teachers are day-to-day mediators of the school curriculum encountered by students. Within the bounds of perceived constraints, which are differentially perceived even by teachers in the same school, teachers interpret the curriculum to students. At times, their interpretations are faithful to the letter or spirit of the official program; at other times, they resemble neither.
Teachers' major concerns appear to be with student socialization, which includes learning an accepted body of knowledge, and "teachers tend to rely on, and believe in, the textbooks as the source of that knowledge" (Shaver et al., 1978, p. 10). In many social studies classrooms, it would appear that the textbook is "the dominant tool of instruction—the basis for recitation, discussions, and for student testing" (Shaver et al., 1978, p. 7). While teachers are the ultimate determinants of course content and organization, many seem willing if not eager to delegate much of this responsibility to text authors and text selection committees. Others, however, create many of the materials they use or borrow from several sources and, in effect, develop their own curriculum. In a study of suburban middle school teachers and their classes (Cornbleth, Korth, & Dorow, 1983), we found that none of the teachers relied on or even followed a single textbook. Multiple curriculum materials, including teacher-made materials, were frequently used. The curriculum-in-use in each classroom seemed to be shaped less by courses of study, textbooks, or planning models than by institutionally sanctioned teacher beliefs and teacher-student interactions.

Rather than not working, at least as planned by their developers, technical curriculum change efforts can be seen as serving to sustain and reaffirm existing beliefs and practices. Just as IGE curriculum reform, referred to earlier, was selectively adapted by school people in ways that supported and maintained preexisting school priorities and patterns of conduct (Popkewitz, 1982b), so too might other technical curriculum change efforts. In effect, they serve to legitimate the status quo.

Questions of Value

Beyond questions regarding the viability of rational management models of curriculum construction and their curriculum products are questions regarding the underlying assumption of objectivity or value neutrality. A rational management model seems to be apolitical and nonideological. The curriculum is to be freely developed according to presumably neutral procedures or decision steps. In effect, rational management models offer a curious form of problem solving or decision making wherein problems and solutions are predetermined. The problem is usually taken to be that not enough students are learning enough of whatever is considered desirable for them to learn (e.g., geographic facts, graph reading skills, commitment to national principles). The solution is to change the curriculum to include or emphasize whatever it is that students are to learn. The model simply specifies the decision points (e.g., course sequence, materials) and procedures by which this solution is to be obtained. The major curriculum decisions, however, have already been made (Kliebard, 1979; Reid, 1978).

When curriculum construction is conceived as a technical project, questions regarding the nature of knowledge and how it can be and should be made accessible to students, how the social organization of schooling af-
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fects attempts to educate, and how a particular selection, organization, and evaluation of knowledge benefits some interests and not others (Popkewitz, 1982a) are not raised. Particularly when the intention and justification of school curriculum is to foster democratic belief and equitable social practice, as in social studies education, consideration of these questions is crucial. Awareness of the values conveyed by a social studies curriculum, and the social groups and interests that are served or disserved by those values, would enable critical evaluation of the appropriateness of curriculum and examination of alternative curricula and their implications (see Kliebard & Franklin, 1983). By ignoring questions of value as well as the conservative values implicit in rational management procedures themselves, technical project views of curriculum construction tend to perpetuate myths of curriculum neutrality and benevolence. 

In sum, curriculum construction is largely a procedurally structured planning task within the technical project perspective—following rational management procedures as the means to developing a tangible end product, e.g., a curriculum document. Despite the limitations of the technical project view, the role of planning and product development ought not to be discounted. As noted, planning involves crucial choices regarding the nature, selection and organization, distribution, use, and evaluation of knowledge to be made available to students. Planning, however, regardless of how it is undertaken, at best provides only an inert curriculum skeleton. Curriculum comes to life, so to speak, as it is enacted by teachers and students in the context of their school and classroom milieu. This enactment, curriculum-in-use, is the focus of the social process view.

Curriculum-In-Use and Curriculum Construction as Social Process

While seemingly of recent origin and less prominent in the general education and social studies literature, a social process view of curriculum and its construction draws on an extensive intellectual heritage (see e.g., Waller, 1982). The reemergence of social process conceptions during the past decade is attributable less to disenchantment with rational management models of curriculum development, or a desire to improve upon them, than to concern with what actually occurs in classroom practice. With a social process conception of curriculum, the focus shifts from intentions and planning to realization.

In contrast to the technical project view, a social process view does not separate curriculum policymaking, construction, and implementation. Instead of assuming a linear sequence of discrete events, a social process view assumes a dynamic, interactive relationship among policy, planning, enactment, and their sociocultural context, i.e., curriculum is constructed and reconstructed in practice. A social process view is more inclusive and complex.

These differences in emphasis, scope, and complexity reflect different
conceptions of curriculum as well as its construction. In the technical project view, curriculum is instrumental to practice—a tangible product, usually a written document, which specifies course topics and organization and materials. In the social process view, curriculum is the contextually shaped activity of students and teachers. Curriculum documents and materials are seen as part of the context that shapes the socially (rather than technically) constructed curriculum-in-use. In contrast to the technical project view of curriculum as instrumental to practice, a social process view assumes that curriculum exists in practice, not independent of it. The curriculum is the curriculum-in-use, encompassing both subject matter and social organization. Social organization, including teacher and student roles (and attendant rights and obligations) and patterns of interaction, provides a setting for academic activities that can extend or constrain students' learning opportunities. Recitation activities, for example, reflect the super- and subordinate roles of teachers and students respectively, and the limited communication patterns found in many social studies classrooms. Learning opportunities are constrained by the recitation organization insofar as students are discouraged from pursuing ideas, raising questions, or offering comments.

Not only does social organization have academic effects, but the ongoing construction of curriculum-in-use communicates normative messages including meaning of authority, responsibility, knowledge, work, and success (see Cornbleth & Korth, 1984). Within a social process perspective, attention may also be directed toward prevailing conceptions of knowledge and classroom knowledge-in-use (i.e., the nature of knowledge and its sources, selection and organization, distribution, evaluation, and use) so that values and interests can be made explicit. Attention to norms, values, and interests is typically for the purposes of understanding rather than prescription or critique.

In contrast to the technical project view, which tends to be prescriptive of classroom practice, the social process view is descriptive and interpretive. While curriculum as product is intended to guide and thereby change and presumably improve practice, viewing curriculum as process is intended to explain and thereby increase awareness and understanding of practice. Insofar as studies of curriculum-in-use increase our awareness of conditions that seem to impede or facilitate curriculum reconstruction to foster desired values, they may support reform efforts.

A further distinction between the two views of curriculum to be considered here concerns their conception of causality and change. Underlying the technical project view is the assumption that change in practice is accomplished by changing the curriculum product. From a social process perspective, causality and change are more complex and problematic. Causality and change (or stability) are seen to involve the interplay of various contextual features—personal and professional, institutional, his-
Illustrative Studies of Curriculum-in-Use

Whereas studies of curriculum as product typically focus on product development and level or fidelity of implementation, studies of curriculum-in-use focus on ongoing classroom practice. In the middle school study cited earlier (Cornbleth et al., 1983), we sought to understand how teachers and students created the curriculum-in-use in their classrooms at the beginning of the school year. With respect to subject matter, we found an emphasis on basic skills, e.g., vocabulary in science and social studies, spelling and grammar in English. Study skills such as outlining and map and graph reading also had high priority. Skills, however, were often addressed in isolation from subject matter. For example, during the first month of the school year, students in a seventh grade social studies (geography) class were reading and constructing bar, line, circle, and pictographs. One set of graphs in their book showed the average annual income of black and white families in the United States, 1964–76, clearly illustrating the increasing gap between them. In a review activity, workbook questions about the graphs were asked and answered without any mention of the substance and meaning of the information presented.

The separation of skills and subject matter trivialized and reified both. Typically, subject matter was treated as an archive of bits of predetermined knowledge to be acquired while skills were to be applied mechanistically to obtain right answers. The priority given to discrete facts and skills seemed to constrain students’ learning opportunities, particularly by discouraging divergent thinking about academic matters and the expression of student ideas and beliefs. The possibility that skills might be used to question information presented by authorities such as textbooks or to create knowledge was not entertained.

Much of the time was spent in a form of recitation (teacher questions, student answers, and teacher elaborations) and teacher directed individual seatwork, both intended to foster the acquisition, recall, and application of factual information. The importance to teachers of establishing an orderly flow of activities and maintaining their authority in the classroom social order appears to have precluded open-ended activities. Among the normative messages that might be communicated by the observed curriculum-in-use are that students’ thoughts and feelings are unimportant, that patience and passive compliance are rewarded while initiative and originality are not, and that learning (or work) occurs primarily in situations structured and directed by others.

Recent studies of elementary and secondary social studies classrooms (McCutcheon, 1981; McNeil, 1981; Stake & Easley, 1978; White, 1980, 1983) also reveal the interrelation of classroom social organization, aca-
demic activity, and treatment of subject matter. These studies vividly illustrate how teachers' management and socialization concerns play a major role in shaping the curriculum-in-use. They also indicate the key role of the classroom teacher in the process of curriculum construction and suggest how teachers create and mediate curriculum. Teachers seem to be more powerful determinants of students' actual classroom experiences than are curriculum documents and materials. Yet, while teachers reject the passive-compliant role accorded them by a technical view of curriculum construction, they are not autonomous actors. It seems clear that curriculum-in-use is shaped by its milieu as well as by its participants and that changing the curriculum-in-use would be a complex undertaking.

In sum, whereas the curriculum as technical project view and associated rational management models appeal to faith in science and presumably objective procedures, the appeal of the curriculum as social process view lies in its focus on human interaction and social conditions and its attention to everyday classroom practice. Curriculum conceived as technical project promises to improve classroom teaching and learning by changing course content, materials, and guidelines for their use. Curriculum conceived as a social process promises to illuminate classroom practice so as to better understand its nature and conditions associated with stability and change. The social process conception assists understanding of the complexity of what is learned in school and how it is learned by focusing attention on the logic-in-use of curriculum, on the mediation of school knowledge, and on the contradictions of school experience (see Cornbleth, 1984, on curriculum mediation and contradiction). Thus, the social process view illustrates the limitations of the technical project assumption that curriculum construction ends with the development of a tangible product. It also points to the arbitrariness of separating curriculum construction from implementation and calling the former curriculum and the latter instruction.

Toward a Reconstruction of Curriculum Conceptions and Practices

Although the social process view of curriculum can be seen as extending the technical project conception, there are still unacceptable limits to constructing curriculum and its construction as curriculum-in-use. The social process view offers a fuller and more dynamic picture of curriculum, but tends to take curriculum-in-use as is; it does not necessitate confronting assumptions, implications, and possibilities of practice or considering what may yet be. Further, crucial curriculum questions seem to be neglected in both technical project and social process views of curriculum. Neither approach, for example, requires that philosophical, social, and political questions regarding what is taught, how, and to whom be explicitly addressed.

With respect to what is taught, when curriculum construction is approached as a technical project, content tends to be taken for granted with little direct attention to its nature or implications. Instead, attention is
directed to how selected topics are to be organized (scope and sequence) and the format of their presentation in the curriculum document. For example, in considering a history curriculum, attention is likely to be directed to the relative emphasis on contemporary history and whether topics are arranged chronologically or thematically. Less likely to be considered are questions such as: Whose history is included—the history of political and military leaders and/or the history of ordinary people? To what extent is history presented so as to serve perceived national interests? Is history presented as a descriptive record of the past or as an interpretive account?

The procedures of technical curriculum construction serve to deflect attention from questions regarding the nature of knowledge and its distribution, use and evaluation. Consequently, values and interests served by the nature of the content selection and organization tend to remain implicit and unexamined. Analyses of new social studies curriculum project materials of the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Popkewitz, 1977), for example, indicate that some of the project materials tended to ignore diversity and conflict in presenting a consensus account of social science and a mechanized version of social inquiry. The materials not only misrepresented social science, but suggested that this is the way social science should be and that the creation of knowledge is best left to recognized experts.

The authority accorded to the textbook in social studies classrooms lends urgency to these philosophical, social, and political questions with respect to the nature of textbook knowledge and the manner of its use by teachers and students. With few exceptions, social studies textbooks present views endorsed by dominant social groups or consensus views (i.e., traditional beliefs, folklore; compromise interpretations intended to avoid offending organized groups). In so doing, textbooks accounts minimize historical, social, or intellectual conflict and offer presumably certain, authoritative knowledge for transmission to presumably naive, receptive students (Anyon, 1978, 1979; Apple, 1971). Consequently, the texts tend to support maintenance of the political and socioeconomic status quo, which might discourage teachers and students from taking an active role in shaping their own knowledge, lives and society.

Curriculum issues such as these are not integral to either technical project or social process views of curriculum construction. Adherents to social process views may be more amenable to their consideration, however. For example, some studies of curriculum-in-use do address questions of opportunity, equity, and social justice in ways that indicate an interest in reform that would extend the range and accessibility of these values, even though these questions are not essential to a social process view as it is typically conceived. Both technical project and social process perspectives tend to be ahistorical and conservative of the status quo. In discussing the self-serving, ritualistic nature of technical curriculum reform activity, Popkewitz (1982b) observes that the acceptance of technical language
has important implications for the development of consciousness about the purposes, practices, and outcomes of schooling. This language filters out critical thought about the underlying values of school work by focusing upon the surface qualities of the procedures. (pp. 20–21)

The same might be said of the social process view. Here, the language enables us to filter out critical thought by focusing upon social interaction and celebrating practice.

If the public commitment to democratic social education is to be more than cosmetic, there is a need to reconceptualize the relation among curriculum product, process, and context in a way that integrates curriculum policy, planning, and enactment (Reid, 1975) and that confronts rather than obscures questions of value and interest. For example, to separate curriculum and instruction, where curriculum is plan and instruction is classroom practice more or less as planned, seems to obscure important issues and deny curricular responsibility for classroom practice. Separating curriculum policy-making, construction, and implementation has similar effects. The fragmentation and decontextualization of curriculum segments also tends to distort our understanding of any one and of the curriculum whole. Such division of curriculum labor puts us as the blind persons to the elephant.

A viable, enlightening social studies education available to all students requires a dynamic, multidimensional conception of curriculum. Instead of separate or competing conceptions—technical or social—technical and social elements would be brought into a critical curriculum framework (see e.g., Goodman, 1984). A conception of curriculum with technical, social, and critical dimensions would give attention to planning, including product development, and practice in relation to one another and to their historical and sociocultural contexts. It would directly address questions of value and interest, recognizing the interplay and tensions among history, biography, and social structure (Mills, 1959), rather than burying them under a veneer of pseudo-scientific rationality and benevolence or a celebration of the intricacies of classroom practice.

The fragmentation, specialization, and technification of curriculum language and activity, which I have questioned here, is not surprising. It can be seen as part of a larger trend toward occupational specialization and professionalization. The price of this specialization has been too high in curriculum and other fields. In curriculum, it includes the rather arbitrary division of curriculum labor and distortion of curriculum segments considered in isolation, evasion of responsibility for curriculum experience and effects, limited understanding of curriculum past and present, and unnecessarily narrow visions for the future. In other fields, efforts to reverse the trend toward overspecialization and technification have already begun. Witness, for example, the modification of assembly line procedures and the emergence of holistic medicine. If we begin to eschew fragmentation, over-
specialization, and technification by reconstructing our conception and practice of social studies curriculum to integrate technical, social, and critical dimensions: curriculum planning, and the construction of curriculum materials, informed by curriculum practice and attention to questions of value and interest, could become more responsible and consistent with democratic social ideals; curriculum construction, seen as extending into the classroom and involving the interplay of product, process and context, could become more practical and effective in fostering desired learning outcomes; greater awareness of crucial curriculum questions and how they have been answered, sometimes by default, could prompt substantive reform of curriculum-in-use.\(^6\)

**Endnotes**

1. While acknowledging differences in the form and substance of curriculum activities at the national, state, and local (district, school, and classroom) levels, I do not find consideration of such differences germane to exploration of the broader question of curriculum meanings and implications. Conceptions span organizational levels.

2. The mechanization of curriculum construction and the separation of curriculum policy-making and development inherent in the technical view stand in contrast to a craft view of curriculum construction. A craft view implies a holistic conception of curriculum products as well as an appreciation of creativity in their construction. Craftsmanship acknowledges both technical skill and personal responsibility in curriculum construction. The values and particular aims of the curriculum developer as artisan are seen to guide the imaginative use of procedure and technique. Procedure is thus subordinated to purpose, and the curriculum artisan is personally involved in determining both. From a craft perspective, curriculum construction as technical project is not unlike painting by number. From a technical perspective, curriculum construction as craftsmanship is inefficient and perhaps surrealistic.

3. Tyler (1949) offered the best known rational management model of curriculum, which was subsequently elaborated by others. While perhaps the most influential, Tyler was not the first to propose a rational management model of curriculum development in the United States. A student of Franklin Bobbitt, Tyler seems to have revived and refurbished ideas current in the 1920s. See Seguel (1966). On misconceptions of how successful business operate, see Peters and Waterman (1982).

4. Other models, such as a craft model (see Note 2) or Walker's (1971) naturalistic model, do attend to normative assumptions and implications as well as the complexity of practice. However, they still view curriculum construction largely as a product development task. See Short (1983) for an inventory of various curriculum product development strategies and Walker (1979) for an alternative categorization and examples.

5. The prescriptive or interpretive quality of product and process views of curriculum construction is not an inherent characteristic. For example, one could imagine a technical process view oriented toward prescriptive behavioral management and a social product view oriented toward craft or naturalistic modes of product construction. Further, all of these views are at least implicitly evaluative insofar as they suggest what the curriculum could or should be.

6. An earlier version of this paper, entitled Social studies curriculum construction as technical project and social process, was presented to the Joint Seminar on Social Education in Japan and The United States, Kyoto, Japan, November 28–December 1, 1983. Revision has been spurred by the thoughtful comments of my colleagues, especially Tom Popkewitz, Aki Tanikawa, and anonymous reviewers.
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Effect of Value Analysis Discussions on Students' Political Attitudes and Reading Comprehension

Carole L. Hahn and Patricia G. Avery
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Abstract.

This study investigated the effects of value analysis discussion and of reading controversial news articles on students' political attitudes and reading comprehension. Fifteen intact classes were selected randomly and assigned to one of three treatments: Value analysis of controversial issues, reading without analysis, and control. A cloze test and a political attitudes scale were used in a pretest/posttest design. Analysis of covariance demonstrated slight, but not statistically significant differences between groups on the reading test. Students in the group that regularly discussed controversial issues using a value analysis approach showed gains on the measures of Political Confidence, Political Interest, and Social Integration, but not on Political Trust.

Social studies has a major responsibility for citizenship education and a secondary responsibility, shared with all curriculum areas, for developing abilities such as reading comprehension. The purpose of this research was to determine if one teaching method, value analysis, would contribute to the dual goals of citizenship education and improved reading comprehension. We were also interested in determining whether a reading only (reading controversial issues without discussion) treatment would contribute to the same goals.

Citizenship Education and Political Attitudes

The success of democracy depends upon having informed citizens who can make sound judgments and who want to take part in public policy decisions. While students' knowledge of politics and government increases as a result of schooling, their willingness to participate in the body politic is not affected by instruction (Ehman, 1980; Patrick, 1972). The critical factor for developing positive political attitudes appears to be whether students have an opportunity to discuss controversial public issues in an open atmosphere.

In their cross-national study of civic learning in nine nations, Torney, Oppenheim, and Farnen (1975) concluded that students are more politically
knowledgeable, more politically interested, and less authoritarian if they regularly participate in classroom discussions in which they are encouraged to express their opinions. Students who passively receive their civic instruction solely in the form of lectures and recitation are less interested in politics and tend to be more authoritarian (Torney, et al., 1975).

Similar findings were obtained in research on high school students in the United States. Grossman (1974) and Ehman (1970, 1972) found that when controversial issues were discussed, students were more likely to exhibit positive attitudinal changes. Further, in a second longitudinal study, Ehman (1977) found that when more than one side of an issue was examined and students felt free to express their opinions, students demonstrated increased social trust, social integration, political confidence, and political interest.¹

The previous research underscored the need to validate the claim that democratic attitudes are promoted when students regularly discuss controversial issues in an open and supportive atmosphere. A primary weakness associated with all of the studies was a reliance on students' self-report measures. The present study, utilizing direct classroom observation, was an effort to further explore the relationship between democratic attitudes and controversial issues discussions.

Survey of the Literature

Value Analysis

Value analysis is advocated by many social studies professionals as a means of discussing controversial issues in the classroom (Silver, 1976). The purpose of value analysis is two-fold: to help students use logical thinking and scientific investigation to decide value issues and questions and to help students use rational, analytical processes in interrelating and conceptualizing their values (Banks, 1973).

While there is no one model for value analysis and decision making, there are some elements that are common to most models (Banks, 1973; Fraenkel, 1980; Hunt & Metcalf, 1968). Many advocates of this cognitive and rational approach to understanding value conflicts recommend that students: identify the issue or describe the problem; identify alternative solutions to the problem or alternative positions on the issue; hypothesize and/or collect data on the likely consequences of each alternative; make a decision; and justify the decision. Most of the models also suggest that students consider the values that will be furthered by the various alternatives and that they reflect upon their own values in arriving at a decision.

Many social studies methods textbooks suggest that value analysis strategies should be used to give students classroom practice in investigating controversial issues (Banks, 1973; Ehman, Mehlinger, & Patrick, 1974; Fraenkel, 1980; Hunt & Metcalf, 1968; Nelson & Michaels, 1980). This grows out of the long philosophic tradition in the profession which emphasizes that in a democracy, students should have the opportunity to in-

**Reading Comprehension**

While citizenship education is the primary purpose of social studies, this discipline shares with all curriculum areas a need to develop students' reading skills. To a large extent social studies learning is dependent on students' abilities to read printed material.

The literature implies that reading comprehension skills can be taught. Further, it suggests that high-level questions and class discussions may act to improve reading comprehension (Barrett, 1967; Barrett & Smith, 1974; Caskey, 1970; Hunkins, 1968; Le Pere, 1975). Spache (1963) recommended that teachers allow students to debate and discuss controversial subjects as a means of enhancing critical reading skills. The value analysis approach, which uses high-level questions, class discussions, and controversial issues might facilitate reading comprehension, but no studies could be located which tested that hypothesis. Two studies, however, investigated the effects of value clarification lessons on reading comprehension. By values clarification we mean the particular approach developed by Louis Raths and advocated by Sidney Simon and others (Raths, Harmin, & Simon, 1966; Simon, Howe, & Kirschenbaum, 1972).

Fitzpatrick (1975) concluded that students who participated in value clarification sessions showed gains in reading achievement and self-concept. Similarly, Pracejus (1974) found that value clarification exercises improved reading comprehension with eighth grade students. Since value analysis, like clarification, involves the use of inferential and evaluative questions in classroom discussions, it seemed plausible that regular, systematic value analysis discussions would increase student reading comprehension.

While both values clarification and the value analysis techniques can be applied to controversial issues, the values clarification approach has been criticized for its use with personal rather than public policy dilemmas (Banks, 1973; Shaver & Strong, 1976). The value analysis approach, on the other hand, deals directly with the decision-making process in matters of social and public policy. Further, the value analysis approach requires students to investigate alternative sides of issues, while some values clarification strategies omit that step.

The review of the research suggests that controversial issues discussions in an open and supportive atmosphere may promote positive political attitudes. The value analysis approach, based on students' active involvement in examining issues, encourages such a climate. The research also suggests that high-level questions, such as those used in value analysis discussions, may improve students' reading comprehension. The present study therefore investigated the possible effect of the value analysis discussions on students' political attitudes and reading comprehension.
Research Question, Hypotheses, and Definitions

The major question of this study was: What effects do controversial issues discussions based on the value analysis technique have on students' political attitudes and reading comprehension? In response, the survey of the literature suggested that the following hypotheses be tested:

1. Regular value analysis discussions will increase students' social trust, social integration, political confidence, and political interest, as compared to a reading only, and a control group.
2. Regular value analysis discussions will increase students' reading comprehension, as compared to a reading only and a control group.

Value Analysis is operationally defined in this study as the Banks (1973) value analysis model and/or the LaRaus and Remy (1978) decision tree. Both approaches require students to identify the problem or issue, identify alternative solutions or positions, hypothesize about the consequences of alternatives, and decide what they would do if faced with the dilemma. 

Attitudes supportive of democratic citizenship are those described by Ehman in his 1977 study. Trust refers to the belief that human behavior is consistent and governed by positive motivations. Cynicism is the opposite of trust. Integration refers to the belief that one is connected to one's social environment. Social alienation is the reverse of social integration. Confidence is defined as the belief that one's actions can have an effect on political activities. It is similar to, but more general than the widely used concept political efficacy. Interest refers to beliefs that predispose one to respond positively toward political situations. In this study, as in Ehman's, the attitudes of trust, integration, confidence, and interest are operationally defined by scores on the four scales of the Political Attitudes Inventory (Ehman, 1977).

Reading Comprehension is operationally defined in this study as the number of correct responses on a cloze test.

Methodology

Sample

Initially, the sample consisted of fifteen intact secondary United States history classes from a metropolitan county school district. All classes were selected randomly using a table of random numbers, and assigned to one of three groups: Value analysis group, reading only group, and a control group.

Prior to the treatment period, it was determined that a class would be excluded from the value analysis group if observations indicated that the teacher failed to adhere to the value analysis model. This happened in one case. Further, individual subjects were excluded for any one of three reasons: failure to complete both the pretest and the posttest, absenteeism, and extremely low-level reading ability. The final analysis involved 197 students.
for reading comprehension and 240 students for political attitudes. The subjects ranged in grade level from the tenth through the twelfth grades; the majority of the students were in the eleventh grade. The number of males and females represented in the study was approximately equal.

**Treatment**

The reading material for the experimental groups (value analysis and reading only groups) was *News/Views*, a bimonthly compilation of editorials about controversial issues from major newspapers throughout the country. To verify that the issues discussed by the students in the two experimental groups were in fact controversial, a panel of three social studies educators were used as judges. In their judgment, nearly all the *News/Views* articles were controversial.

The value analysis group consisted of four intact classes in which students read *News/Views* one day per week and participated in a structured value analysis discussion of one article each week over a ten-week quarter. Instructors of these classes had participated in an afternoon training session in teaching value analysis.

The reading only group consisted of intact classes in which students read and discussed *News/Views* articles at least one day each week over the quarter; discussions did not follow a particular structure or model. This group was used to ensure that any differences between the value analysis discussion group and the control were not attributable to the fact that students had simply read about controversial issues.

The control group consisted of five intact classes in which students were not assigned any particular news magazine to read, nor did they participate in any regular current events discussions over the quarter.

Each of the classes in the experimental groups was observed twice during the ten-week period. Observations of the classes in the value analysis group were made to verify that the teachers were using the value analysis models appropriately. Observations of the classes in the reading only group were made to ensure that the value analysis strategy was not being used. Teachers of the two experimental groups were required to keep a log of instructional methods and a record of attendance. Control group teachers were interviewed at the conclusion of the study to verify that they did not use the value analysis technique in their classroom discussions. The treatment was restricted to ten weeks because classes change on a quarterly cycle in the school system.

**Design**

A pretest/posttest design was used to measure reading comprehension and political attitudes. The analysis of covariance procedure was used with the pretests as the covariates. Dunn's multiple comparison procedure and a modified LSD test were used to test the reading comprehension and political attitudes hypotheses, respectively.
Instruments

The Political Attitudes Inventory, developed by Ehman and Gillespie (Ehman, 1977), was used to measure attitudes. The 31-item instrument resulted from two field tests. Previous factor analyses yielded factor structures which established the construct validity for the concepts of Trust, Integration, Interest, and Confidence. Comparison of the factor structures for the attitudes across the three data collection periods in the previous longitudinal study added further support for the construct validity of the four attitudes. Factor analyses for the present study generally supported the original factor structures specified by Ehman and Gillespie (1975, p. 40).3

A cloze test was used in this study to determine reading comprehension. The cloze procedure involves the deletion of every nth word from a reading selection; students fill in the blanks with words they deem most appropriate. Cloze tests are scored on the basis of the number of correct responses. The cloze procedure has been advocated as a means of measuring reading comprehension (Bormuth, 1969; Rankin, 1970; Russell, 1978).

Further, the cloze procedure was chosen for this study because it could be adapted to material that was similar in content to the editorials in News/Views. In addition, the test could be administered in a short period of time; thus, testing would cause a minimal amount of disruption in classroom activities. (A pilot test was administered to a group of students similar in age to those in the actual study.)

A standardized reading comprehension test was given to one class in the study. The scores from the comprehension section of the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (Forms E and F) were correlated with the scores from the cloze test in order to determine the concurrent validity of the cloze test used in this study. The two tests had a Pearson Product Moment Correlation of .77.

Results

As noted by Tables 1 and 2, there is some evidence to support the hypothesis that regular value analysis discussions have a positive effect on students' Social Integration, Political Confidence, and Political Interest. On the other hand, any conclusions at this time should be tentative, at best. While the value analysis group did score statistically significantly higher than did the reading only group, the difference between the groups is minimal. In addition, the control group scored significantly higher than did the reading only group on two of the measures. The results offer only modest and mixed support for Hypothesis I.

The second research hypothesis was not supported. When the adjusted mean reading comprehension scores were compared, no significant differences between groups were found (see Table 1).
### Table 1
Unadjusted Means and Standard Deviations for Pretests and Posttests, and Adjusted Means for Posttests by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value Analysis(^a)</th>
<th>Reading Only(^b)</th>
<th>Control Group(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Reading</td>
<td>25.98</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Reading</td>
<td>27.11</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>26.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Trust</td>
<td>12.02</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Trust</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Integration</td>
<td>21.24</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Integration</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>21.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Value Analysis

\(^b\) Reading Only

\(^c\) Control Group
Table 1 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Value Analysis&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Reading Only&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Control Group&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Confidence</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>24.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Confidence</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>26.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Interest</td>
<td>26.76</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>25.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Interest</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>23.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>N = 55 for reading comprehension, N = 66 for political attitudes.

<sup>b</sup>N = 47 for reading comprehension, N = 70 for political attitudes.

<sup>c</sup>N = 95 for reading comprehension, N = 104 for political attitudes.
Summary of Pairwise Comparisons Differences Between Groups: Political Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Adj. Mean</th>
<th>VA</th>
<th>RO</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis (VA)</td>
<td>13.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Only (RO)</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (C)</td>
<td>13.74</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis (VA)</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.83*</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Only (RO)</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (C)</td>
<td>20.91</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis (VA)</td>
<td>26.93</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.56*</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Only (RO)</td>
<td>25.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (C)</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis (VA)</td>
<td>25.87</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Only (RO)</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.80*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (C)</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Adjusted mean differences appear in upper right half of matrices; critical differences values appear in lower left half of matrices. The LSDMOD test of significance was used for all analyses.
*p < .05.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to test the hypotheses that the value analysis technique, as used in social studies classroom discussions of controversial issues, would contribute to positive political attitudes and increase reading comprehension. No relationship was found between the discussions and the measure of Political Trust. The results with regard to students' sense of Social Integration, Political Confidence, and Political Interest were positive. The results obtained in this experiment demonstrated no significant differences in reading comprehension between the groups. The use of the value analysis technique did not significantly improve reading comprehension.

Several factors should be considered when viewing the results. The short length of the treatment period, necessitated by the use of the quarter system in the school district, was recognized as a possible limitation prior to the study. Ehman's (1977) research, which found a relationship between controversial issues discussions and political attitudes, covered a two-year period.
Pracejus (1974) found significant improvement in reading comprehension through the use of the value clarification technique over a twelve-week period. In Pracejus’ (1974) study, the experimenter served as the instructor; presumably there was no lost time while the teacher mastered the teaching strategy. While a primary strength of our study was the involvement of regular classroom teachers, this factor may have affected the results. Two teachers in the value analysis group experienced some initial difficulty with the technique. Students in these classes showed the least actual mean gain in reading comprehension scores of all the classes in the value analysis group (see Table 3, classes 3 and 4).

Records from observations in these two classes indicate that the teachers did not demonstrate successful use of the technique before the fifth week of the study. While such difficulties may be expected when implementing a new teaching strategy, in this study it acted to shorten the length of the treatment period for students in these classes.

An examination of the other two classes in the value analysis group lends further support to this possibility. In these classes, observer notes indicated successful implementation of the technique at the beginning of the treatment period. For one of the classes, the actual mean gain in reading comprehension is greater than any other class in the sample; the other class demonstrated an actual mean gain in reading comprehension greater than eight other classes in the sample (see Table 3, classes 1 and 2). On the political attitudes inventory, the one class demonstrated actual mean gains greater than any of the experimental classes on three of the four factors.

Table 3
Unadjusted Mean Pretest and Posttest Scores by Class for Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Actual Mean Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value Analysis Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>28.41</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>28.42</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading only Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.35</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.44</td>
<td>24.72</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23.92</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An unexpected complication in this study was the failure of two teachers in the reading only group to administer the reading posttests. It is unknown what effect these scores would have had on the results of the project.

It should be noted that students in the reading only group scored the lowest of the three groups on Social Integration and Political Interest. This group also scored the lowest on reading comprehension, but the difference was not statistically significant. Observers' records had noted that in the absence of explicit instructions about questioning, teachers in the reading only group tended to ask literal level questions (who? what? where?) about news stories. One wonders if such questions have the effect of reducing students' Political Interest and Social Integration. Further, researchers may want to address the potential negative impact of literal level discussions on students' political attitudes.

Finally, although classes were randomly assigned to treatments, the five classes in the control group were located in high socio-economic areas, and the students in those classes scored the highest on reading tests. The reverse was true of the students in the reading only group; those classes were in low to middle class economic areas, and the students in those classes had the lowest reading scores both before and after the treatment. The value analysis group, on the other hand, contained one class from a high SES school in which students had fairly high reading scores and three schools in lower SES areas with students scoring mid-range on the reading tests. This points out the need to stratify populations and randomly assign treatments within strata. Without such a control, it is difficult to determine whether the differences between groups were primarily attributable to value analysis in social studies, differences in abilities, or the students' home and peer environment.

**Implications**

The central goal of the social studies is to equip citizens with the ability to make informed, rational decisions concerning social issues and public policy; value analysis is a technique advocated by social studies professionals as a means of developing decision-making skills. A second goal of the social studies is to help students develop political attitudes that are supportive of a democratic society. Third, social studies, along with the other curriculum areas, aims to improve students' reading abilities. In light of these goals, the findings of this study suggest the need for further research on the effects of using value analysis in social studies.

Further research should take into account that the value analysis technique may be difficult for some teachers to implement. As such, value analysis training sessions should give teachers extensive practice in using the strategy before the treatment begins. Future research should control for SES differences for the reasons discussed above. Future replications which address the limitations of the present study may yield similar results.
gardless of SES or the length of the treatment period, researchers may find no significant differences in democratic attitudes between treatment and control groups. However, if they also find as we did, significant differences between the groups that read controversial issues, such results would suggest that when social studies educators do discuss controversial issues in the classroom, the value analysis technique may promote positive political attitudes. Practicing democratic discussions in the classrooms, rather than merely preaching about democracy, may positively affect student attitudes of Social Integration, Political Confidence, and Political Interest. Openly discussing controversial public issues may also give students a more realistic view of political decision making, which may not necessarily lead to greater political trust.

The questions addressed in this study are central to the goals of social studies education. Unfortunately, the answers are far from simple; further research is needed to explore the relationships between instructional strategies, political learning, and reading comprehension. Further research should also examine how the value analysis technique may influence other dependent variables, such as critical thinking skills and political knowledge.

Endnotes

1. While Ehman's published article had reported a negative relationship with political confidence, correspondence from him said that was in error and in fact his data yielded positive relationships with political confidence.

2. Tables reporting the results of the analysis of covariance are available from the authors.

3. A full report of the factor loadings, the Cronbach coefficients for internal consistency and the correlations between the factors are available from the authors.
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Inquiry and Curriculum Change: Perceptions of School and College/University Faculty
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Abstract

This study examines school and college/university faculty perceptions concerning what has happened to inquiry and identifies some factors that might have influenced the implementation of inquiry as a curriculum innovation. The data presented on the perceptions of both groups indicate that inquiry strategies, for all their acclaim, were never widely implemented. There was a perceived problem with the availability of inquiry materials for classroom use and some concern about students' preparation and ability to use inquiry strategies. Teacher training programs appeared to be deficient in preparing teachers to use inquiry techniques.

Rarely have social studies teachers been as inundated with advice on teaching as they were during the 1960s and 1970s by advocates of inquiry. Workshops and institutes were conducted throughout the United States to teach the theory and methodology of inquiry. Many of the elementary and secondary textbooks of the period 1965–1975 were advertised as inquiry-based. Teacher training institutions incorporated inquiry into the undergraduate and graduate courses. Thus, the profession was presented with a curriculum innovation which, it seemed, could not fail. Something, however, apparently went wrong, and increasingly questions have been raised regarding the extent to which inquiry was accepted as a curriculum innovation. Equally important, recent statements published under the auspices of such organizations as the Council for Basic Education and the American Historical Association do not give cause for optimism about the future of inquiry (Howard & Mendehall, 1982; Hertzberg, 1980; American Historical Association, 1983).

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of those educators most directly involved with the development and adoption of inquiry
as a curriculum innovation: classroom teachers and college/university faculty. Answers were sought to the following questions:

1. What are school faculties' and college/university faculties' perceptions as to what has happened to inquiry?
2. What are school faculties' and college/university faculties' perceptions as to some factors that might have influenced the implementation of inquiry as a curriculum innovation?

Method

Population

The design of the study required the identification of two groups of respondents: classroom teachers and college/university faculty. The membership list of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) was utilized to identify a potential sample population of clearly defined social studies teachers representing various grade levels. It further provided a sample population that the authors could assume was professionally oriented and aware of curriculum trends in social studies. Through the services of the NCSS, a stratified random sample of members, exclusive of college/university faculty, was obtained. Stratification insured that each state was represented and that the target population was proportional to the geographic distribution of the membership.

A total of 402 usable responses, a return of 51%, was received from the initial mailing. Responses were received from 46 states and the District of Columbia. The dominant group was secondary school teachers (60%), followed by middle/junior high school teachers (20%). Elementary school respondents constituted 4% of the sample. Department chairpersons and administrators combined made up 9% of the sample. The remaining respondents did not designate a grade level or responsibility.

The primary teaching fields of the respondents were history (61%); civics/government (9%); sociology/anthropology/psychology (5%) and geography (4%). The remaining respondents did not designate a primary teaching field. The sample population reflected all grade levels. The median number of years of teaching experience was 16.6. The teaching longevity of the respondents meant that many should have been actively involved in the profession during the new social studies era.

The college/university sample population was derived by using the membership list of the College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) of NCSS. A total of 197 usable responses was received from the initial mailing, a slightly less than 50% return.

Of the 197 respondents, 79% indicated that they held positions at a college/university, 52% in a Ph.D. granting university and 27% at a four year college. The remaining 21% indicated other positions ranging from supervisors and consultants to editors and individuals in private industry.

Forty-four percent of the CUFA respondents identified secondary educa-
tion as their primary level of interest and 25% indicated elementary education. A sizable group (24%) indicated its level of interest spanned grades K-12. The remaining 7% did not identify a particular level of interest.

When asked to indicate the type of course each offered, 68% said they taught social studies methods courses. This was followed by supervision of student teaching (51%) and a general methods course (31%). The vast majority of the respondents, therefore, were teaching at colleges and universities, involved with undergraduate teaching, and responsible for the social studies methods course. Clearly, they represent a group directly involved with training and have the potential to influence social studies teachers. They also represented a group who received their advanced training during what is commonly called the new social studies era; slightly over 79% received their highest degree in the 1960s and 1970s.

One potential problem in using the NCSS membership list was that the sample might be biased with respect to the location of school (urban, suburban, rural) and student population (ability level and socio-economic status). The highest percentages of respondents in the classroom teacher group were employed in suburban areas (44%) and urban areas (34%). Eighteen percent were employed in rural areas. The remaining respondents did not indicate their location of employment. Most (61%) of the respondents indicated that they taught students of average ability while 22% stated that their students were above average and 12% below average. The distribution of the school/student characteristics as checked by the respondents indicated the dominance of suburban schools with average students. Respondents teaching students from higher and lower socioeconomic levels and with varied ability levels, however, were evident in the sample population.

Literature Citations

First it was important to document what has happened to inquiry in the professional literature as a basis for examining the responses of school faculties and college/university faculties about their perceptions of what has happened to inquiry. To document change in the number of listings employing inquiry in the professional literature, an analysis of the number of citations was undertaken. The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) provided the data base. In addition, information was collected on listings involving basic skills and social studies to determine if the interest in back-to-basics has been a possible contributing factor to change in the emphasis on inquiry. The percentages of inquiry, social studies and basic skills/social studies citations in the ERIC system were calculated for each of the years from 1967 to 1981.

The number of inquiry/social studies literature citations was the highest in the late 1960s and early 1970s with a gradual decline into the early 1980s. During this 15 year period there were 3,703 social studies citations with 328 or approximately 11% involving social studies/inquiry. Figure 1 contains data on the percentage of social studies/inquiry and social studies/basic
skills citations for the 15 year period. The data indicate a steady decline in the percentage of citations for social studies/inquiry and a slight increase in the percentage of citations involving social studies and basic skills.

Questionnaire
A questionnaire was developed as the major instrument for obtaining data from the NCSS and CUFA samples. The initial instrument was sent to a jury of experts consisting of selected college/university faculty members, school supervisors and teachers. Based on their feedback a preliminary instrument was produced and mailed to teachers in the state of Maryland. The instrument and the preliminary data were presented at the Northeast Regional Meeting of the NCSS in March 1982. Members attending the session reviewed the instrument and provided additional input. The final questionnaire consisted of six general questions concerning respondents' perception of the status of inquiry. This required a yes/no response to particular statements. The general questions were followed by 37 specific questions which dealt with the wide range of concerns of the classroom teacher using inquiry
in a classroom situation. In this case a Likert scale was employed with five categories ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. A summary of the six general questions, plus a seventh question which was asked only of school faculty, is contained in Table 1.

The first general question asked respondents whether they agreed with the statement, "A review of recent professional literature suggests that inquiry teaching strategies are now receiving less emphasis in social studies programs than they did during the 1960s and 1970s." Both the school faculty (85%) and the college/university faculty (90%) agreed with this statement. In the opinions of school faculty (66%) and college/university faculty (67%), the current back-to-basics movement has contributed significantly to the deemphasis of inquiry.

Two other general questions queried whether in the respondents' view inquiry was ever widely accepted and whether they had actually used inquiry on a regular basis. Again the perceptions of both faculty groups were similar. The college/university faculty group reported a higher use (91%) of inquiry strategies on a regular basis than did the school faculty group (70%). Neither group, however, perceived that inquiry was ever widely accepted as an instructional strategy in social studies. The college/university faculty group was more negative in their responses. Only 12% of this group believed that inquiry was widely accepted while 21% of the school faculty group agreed that inquiry was widely accepted as an instructional strategy. There appears to be a discrepancy between the reported personal use by NCSS members of inquiry and its general acceptance by the profession as a whole. This may indicate that ideas advocated by academicians and members of professional organizations do not always gain acceptance by the general population of classroom teachers.

The respondents were also asked if they had ever attended or taught post-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Questions</th>
<th>College/University Faculty (N = 197) % Agreement*</th>
<th>School Faculty (N = 403) % Agreement*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Literature review</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Classroom use</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Acceptability</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Back to basics</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formal instruction</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Projects materials</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supplemental materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Checked "agree" or "strongly agree"
graduate credit or noncredit workshops, institutes or college/university courses concerned with inquiry. For the school faculty group, 66% indicated that they had. This compares favorably with the responses from 70% of this group that they used inquiry on a regular basis. For the college/university group, 75% reported involvement in inquiry training programs compared to 91% who reported using inquiry on a regular basis.

There were differences between the two groups in the type of inquiry materials used. The school faculty group (81%) reported that they primarily used prepackaged materials such as the *High School Geography Project, Concepts in Inquiry* and *Man, A course of Study*. Only 35% of the college/university faculty group reported demonstrating such materials in their courses.

The last general question was asked only of the school faculty group, 68% of whom reported using inquiry materials as a supplement to standard textbooks.

The second major purpose of this study was to examine school and college/university faculties’ perceptions as to factors that might have influenced the implementation of inquiry as a curriculum innovation. The faculties were asked to respond to 37 specific questions which might have been influencing factors. The mean scores and percentage of agreement from the school faculty and the college/university faculty for each of the specific items are contained in Table 2.

One of the factors which might have affected the adoption and implementation of inquiry was the availability and quality of inquiry materials. As reported in the general question section, over two-thirds of the school faculties used inquiry materials primarily as a supplement to standard textbooks, but less than 50% of both the school faculty and the college/university faculty thought that inquiry textbooks were readily available (Item 1). The majority of the respondents (63% school and 73% college/university faculty) believed, however, that the teachers’ guides to published inquiry materials were useful (Item 5).

There may have been some problem with implementing inquiry strategies because of instructional constraints. When asked whether they believed that organizing materials for classroom use was too time consuming (Item 3) 52% of the school faculty agreed and 38% of them also reported that the actual teaching of inquiry lessons consumed too much time (Item 19). When given the statement, "Inquiry lesson plans did not demand more preparation time than traditional, textbook oriented lesson plans," only 16% of the college/university group and 18% of the school faculty group agreed with the statement (Item 17). In addition, less than 13% of the respondents thought that test items for evaluation purposes were easy to construct (Item 14) nor did they believe (20% school faculty and 26% college/university faculty) that inquiry-oriented examinations helped prepare students to do well on standardized and college entrance examinations (Item 16). Many
Table 2
Comparison of Mean Scores and Percentage Agreement Between College/University Faculty and School Faculty for Specific Items 1 to 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>College/University Faculty X Score</th>
<th>School Faculty X Score</th>
<th>College/University Faculty % of Agreement**</th>
<th>School Faculty Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.11*</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.50*</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.86*</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.04*</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.44*</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.50*</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.81*</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.43*</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.88*</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.47*</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.22*</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.73*</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.58*</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.49*</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.87*</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.92*</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.69*</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level (t-test)
**Checked “agree” or “strongly agree”
classroom teachers (42%) had a concern that classroom designs were not appropriate for inquiry lessons (Item 22). Problems with student behavior and discipline for the majority of all respondents were not perceived to be any greater with inquiry lessons than with traditional lessons (Item 21).

There were concerns with the ability of students to handle inquiry lessons adequately. While over two-thirds of the respondents reported that students were generally able to read inquiry materials (Item 6), the majority of school faculty (56%) and college/university faculty (70%) believed that students experienced difficulty in analyzing and interpreting data source materials for inquiry (Item 7). They also believed (58% and 50%) that students tended to demand a right answer (Item 10). Only 21% of the school faculty believed that students demonstrated a genuine interest in mastering inquiry skills (Item 12). This compares with 42% of the college/university group who reported agreement with this item.

The content preparation of the teachers and teacher training programs were other factors that might have affected the acceptance and implementation of inquiry as a teaching strategy. There was not strong agreement on the part of either the college/university group (20%) or the school faculty group (25%) that teachers generally had sufficient interdisciplinary academic backgrounds to teach issues appropriate to inquiry instruction (Item 24). There was agreement on the part of both groups (91% and 71%) that teachers experienced difficulty in translating the theory of inquiry into practice (Item 25). Both groups were also in agreement (88% and 84%) that teachers generally favored the structured organization provided by textbooks over the conceptual approach of inquiry (Item 32). This may be due in part to the perceptions of the school faculty group (53%) that teachers became disillusioned with the process of inquiry because of the ambiguity in terminology (Item 26). It may also be due in part to the fact that approximately two-thirds of both groups agreed that teacher training programs failed to prepare teachers to use inquiry (Item 27), and that over half of all of the respondents agreed that college and university faculty placed more emphasis on the theoretical framework of inquiry than on developing teaching strategies (Item 31). In addition there was little agreement on the part of either group (22% school and 35% college/university) that in-service programs helped teachers translate the theory of inquiry into practice (Item 29).

There were also some societal concerns with the role of inquiry in the school curriculum. Respondents perceived that little was done to educate the general public on the value of inquiry in the social studies curriculum. Only 6% of the school faculty and 14% of the college/university faculty believed that parents and the general public understood the purpose of inquiry. Neither group strongly believed that inquiry placed too much emphasis on value-laden issues (Item 30) or that inquiry teaching precluded emphasizing the traditional American heritage (Item 20). There was some
disagreement between the two groups on the item, "Parents objected more to the content of inquiry instruction than to the teaching strategies." Only 3% of the college/university group agreed with this statement while 25% of the school faculty believed that this might have been a problem. The data in Table 2 indicate areas of agreement and disagreement between the school faculty and the college/university faculty groups for each specific item. For 20 of the 37 items there were significant differences between the two groups based upon an independent t-test of the item mean scores.

Summary and Discussion

There has been a decline in the literature cited in the ERIC system containing descriptors involving inquiry and social studies during the period 1967–1981. Both school faculty and college/university faculty agree in their perceptions of this decline.

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of these two groups concerning what has happened to inquiry and to identify some factors that might have influenced the implementation of inquiry as a curriculum innovation in schools. It should be cautioned that the findings are based upon survey data from the profession. However, the data presented are reported perceptions of the respondents and as such can provide the profession with some insights as to what has happened to inquiry as a curricular innovation. Marker (1980, pp. 39–40) indicated "Research involving perceptions is complicated by the fact that the users’ perceptions are not often consistent with reality. However, in the case of adoption or abandonment decisions it is the perception rather than reality which is important. Potential adopters act upon what they perceive to be true." The perceptions of social studies professionals in the study seem to indicate the following:

1. The back-to-basics movements may in part be a factor contributing to the deemphasis of inquiry.
2. Inquiry strategies, for all their acclaim, were perceived by the respondents as not being widely implemented in their totality by the general population of social studies classroom teachers.
3. Both groups perceived a problem with the availability of inquiry materials for classroom use.
4. There was concern about students’ preparation and ability to use inquiry strategies.
5. Teacher training programs were perceived as deficient in preparing teachers to use inquiry techniques.
6. Though many claimed to have attempted, in part at least, to adopt inquiry, teachers, for a number of reasons, were not too supportive of inquiry as a classroom strategy.
7. The public may not have been educated as to the purpose and role of this curriculum innovation in the schools.

The findings from this study are consistent with many of the findings
from three National Science Foundation studies (Wiley, 1977; Stake & Easley, 1978; Weiss, 1978) on the status of social studies education. Shaver, Davis, and Helburn (1979) reviewed these NSF studies and reported their impressions in an interpretive paper for the social studies profession. They reported that inquiry teaching as well as experience-based curricula were rare and that the knowledge expected of students was primarily information oriented. The teachers are central in deciding the curriculum on a daily basis and their background knowledge and value systems affect their implementation of curriculum, giving them virtual veto power over curriculum changes which they do not approve. The instructional materials are the conventional textbook with only an estimated 10% to 25% of teachers using materials from the social studies projects of the 1960s and 1970s. The social studies curriculum is primarily history and government, with little emphasis on societal issues (Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979, p. 151).

Project Span (Social Studies/Social Science Education: Priorities Practices and Needs) was instituted as a follow-up to the three NSF studies. Project Span (Morrissett, Hawke, & Superka, 1980) identified six problem areas for social studies in the 1980s. These general problem areas are similar to the factors in the present study of the perceptions of classroom teachers and college/university faculty as to the current status of inquiry. These six problem areas identified by Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka (1980, p. 561–565) follow:

1. Student Learning: “Too many students fail to learn important social studies knowledge, skills, and attitudes and do not like or value social studies” (p. 562). In this present study, few of the teachers in the school faculty group believed that students demonstrated a genuine interest in mastering inquiry even though the majority of the teachers believed that their students could read the materials.

2. Teacher Instruction: “Instruction in social studies is generally characterized by lack of variety in teaching methods and evaluation practices, limited kinds of learning experiences and inattention to the implication of educational research” (p. 563). In the present study it was found that teachers believed tests were more difficult to construct and that lesson planning was more time consuming for inquiry lessons than for more traditional textbook oriented programs.

3. The Curriculum: “The present social studies curriculum does not contribute as much as it could to learning that is useful for helping students understand and participate more effectively in the current and future social world” (p. 564). As reported in this present study few teachers or college/university faculty members believed that inquiry materials were ever widely adopted by the majority of social studies teachers. When adopted they were used primarily as supplemental materials. It would appear that most teachers were still using the more traditional materials that have been criticized for their lack of attention to current and future societal issues.
4. The Profession: "The social studies profession is characterized by a lack of constructive interaction among the various participants, by limited opportunities for personal growth by teachers, and by confusing the role of social studies in the education of young people" (p. 564). This present study found that in general teacher training for inquiry was perceived as a failure. When inservice programs were attempted they normally focused too much on the theory and not enough on the practical applications needed for day-to-day instruction.

5. Culture of the School: "The culture and organization of the schools focus much of the energy of teachers and administrators on matters of management and control rather than on teaching and learning" (p. 565). This perception was evident in the teachers' responses about the time required for inquiry instruction. However, in this present study teachers did not believe that student discipline problems were any greater for inquiry instruction than for more traditional modes of instruction nor did they believe that inquiry required any special classroom organization. It may be that many inadequately prepared teachers were attempting to incorporate inquiry using traditional classroom approaches.

6. Public Awareness: "The public does not fully understand or appreciate the importance of social studies" (p. 566). Respondents perceived that little was done to educate the public on the value of inquiry; however, neither the school faculty group nor the college/university faculty group in the present study believed that inquiry placed too much emphasis on value issues that might be questioned by some segments of the public.

The problems that educators reported in the implementation of inquiry strategies as a curriculum innovation were similar to those problems faced by social studies educators in general trying to implement any of the new social studies programs in the 1960s and 1970s. Teachers determine the day-to-day curriculum. Teacher training apparently did not prepare teachers to use inquiry. Curricular materials incorporating inquiry were not widely adopted. The school climate for social studies was not perceived as widely accepting nor was the public sold on the need for reform.

These concerns need to be addressed in any curriculum implementation. They are interrelated and can influence the success or failure of curriculum change. The back-to-basics movement has had public support because it focused on student learning of vitally important skills and its structured curriculum appears to be more consistent with the teachers' view of a more traditional approach. Morrissett, Hawke, and Superka (1980, p. 568) conclude that the "result was that instruction and student learning have been more affected by the back-to-basics efforts than by the new social studies efforts." Inquiry may still become an effective instructional tool if we remember what is basic about the thinking process and what is basic about the implementation of a curricular innovation.
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Abstract

This article reports a summary of doctoral research activity in social studies education based on dissertation abstracts for the period, 1977 to mid-1982. The report is based on a study conducted in 1983 for the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Science Education. From the abstracts of 394 dissertations the types of research, the productivity of graduate institutions, topics, and subject categories were tabulated. Results showed that descriptive studies dominated, northeastern universities produced the most doctorates, the largest portion were studies of curriculum materials, and the largest number concerned broad field or general social studies.

Periodically, since the mid-sixties, searches for recent social studies dissertations have been conducted and summaries of the contents have been disseminated in published volumes (McPhie, 1964; Gross & de la Cruz, 1971; Chapin, 1974; Wrubel & Ratliff, 1978; Hepburn & Dahler, 1983). Based on the findings from the most recent of these volumes, this article provides a brief digest of information on social studies doctoral dissertation research 1977–1982 including topics, methods, and institutions where the studies were conducted.

It should be noted that the purpose of this overview is to provide descriptive rather than evaluative information about recent dissertations in the field. The data sources were restricted to the abstracts of dissertations, not complete dissertations. Therefore, critical reviews of the nearly 400 dissertations were not attempted. Nevertheless, the search and the summaries of each study provide a picture of the range of recent research interests and, when compared with previous volumes, some interesting historical data on patterns of graduate research.

Data Search

Computer searches of Dissertation Abstracts International (DAI) 1977 to mid-1982 for titles directly related to social studies/social science education
provided the initial data base for this study. The computer printout of titles and descriptors was used as a guide for selecting abstracts from DAI to be copied and read. After the first computer search, the authors examined the abstracts in the library and discovered on the same or adjacent pages, titles of social studies dissertations which were not on the computer list. This led to a revision and expansion of descriptors for subsequent searches. The resulting pool of abstracts was increased considerably. Nevertheless, it is likely that some social studies-related dissertation research was missed because of variations or limitations in the descriptors or simply because the dissertation titles did not reveal the social studies focus.

A total of 394 dissertations were identified. Of these, 69 were listed in 1977, 67 in 1978, 60 in 1979, 100 in 1980, 62 in 1981, and 36 in the first half of 1982. All of the dissertations were from U.S. universities, although, according to Dissertation Abstracts International, a few U.S. institutions are not cooperators to the dissertations data file.

**Method**

Each abstract was read to determine: (1) the problem addressed, (2) the research procedures followed, and, where available, (3) the overall results. Based on this information a summary was written for each dissertation. Each abstract was read by both authors, and differences of interpretation or categorization were discussed and decided jointly. The abstracts were then placed in categories and topic groups.

To determine the categories and topics of the dissertations, 100 of the dissertation abstracts were randomly selected and read, and from this sample five categories of social studies research were defined for this five and a half year period.

- Curriculum Materials
- Teaching Method
- School Organization, Curriculum Organization and School Climate
- Teacher Education and Teacher Characteristics
- Social Studies in Other Countries.

Within each of these categories dissertations were subdivided into topic areas which crossed the five categories. Eight topics were identified:

- General Social Studies Topics including K-12 and Elementary Education
- Citizenship, Law and Political Education
- Economic Education
- Geography and Global Studies
- American History and World History
- Behavioral Science, Ethnic, Multicultural, and Women's Studies
- Reading in Social Studies
- Values and Moral Education

Although some of these topics are rather broad, they allow clustering the
abstracts into groups of manageable size for tabulation. Some of the larger groups were later examined for subtopics which are described here. As each abstract was read it was summarized and placed into one of the five categories and in one of the eight topic areas.

Additional tabulations were made of the level of social studies education under discussion in the dissertation, the graduate institution, the apparent gender of the author (from the name), and the degree.

**Productivity**

An average of 80.5 dissertations per year was reported in the 1973–76 survey. That figure showed a decline of 19.5 from the average 100 annually reported in the Chapin study of 1969–73. Based on a 5.5 year time span for this study, there is a further decline to 71.6 dissertations annually. (Considering the dearth of college teaching jobs in the field, the authors actually expected to find a greater decline in numbers of doctorates in the field.)

The length of the dissertations ranged from 692 pages to 43 pages. The total number of pages in these 394 dissertations was 79,913, averaging 204 pages per dissertation, very close to the 201-page average reported for 1973–76.

**By Gender**

Of the total 394 dissertations we estimate 62% were written by male graduate researchers, and 38% or 148 were written by females. The percentage of studies by females represents an increase of 8% from the 1973–76 period and an increase of 19% from the 1969–73 period. (Since the estimates are based on names, there may be some error in these figures.)

**By Level**

The educational level discussed in each study was indicated on each entry. They were tabulated as *elementary, secondary, college,* or *general* (i.e., studies which span two or more levels). The tabulations revealed that 109 dissertations dealt with elementary social studies; 184 were on secondary social studies; 95 were general; and 6 were on college social studies education.

**By Degree**

The largest number (197 or 50%) of degrees granted to doctoral candidates from 1977 through mid-1982 were Ph.Ds. Ed.Ds comprised 47% (187), and there were four D.Eds and six D.As. These figures mark a change from previous reports where Ed.Ds predominated. The 1973–76 report noted an increase in Ph.D.’s by 7%, and in the 1977–82 period an additional increase of 4% was found.

**By Graduate Institutions**

Shown in Table 1 are 32 institutions which produced the most doctoral dissertations in the 1977 to mid-1982 study. Among the ten highest in this list, northeastern universities produced the largest number of doctorates.
Table 1
Number of Doctorates by Institutions: Top 32 in 1977–82 and Comparative Data from Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temple University</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin-Madison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri-Columbia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie-Mellon University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas State University</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with 45 (17 from Temple University, 16 from Boston University, and 12 from Columbia University). Southern graduate institutions followed with a total of 34 doctorates (13 from Florida State University, 12 from the University of Georgia, and 9 from the University of Texas). Midwestern institutions granted 27 doctorates to social studies researchers (14 from Indiana University and 13 from Ohio State University). Table 1 also provides a comparison with the numbers of dissertations from the 32 institutions shown in the tabulations of the two previous re-
ports. Many of these institutions showed notable fluctuations in numbers of dissertations.

**Types of Research**

This classification of research approaches is somewhat different from that used in the previous reports. Based on descriptive terms commonly found in recent research literature, the types were expanded from the three (descriptive, experimental, and historical) used in Wrubel and Ratliffe (1978) to six types. The six types of research used in this tabulation are as follows:

The *descriptive* classification includes textbook content analyses, survey research, and assessments which give an account of the status of some area of social studies education.

The *experimental* classification includes studies utilizing controlled and manipulated variables in experimental or quasiexperimental studies.

The *analytical* classification includes theory, model building, and critical analyses of the literature.

The *historical* classification includes recounting and analysis of events, or trends of the past in the social studies.

The *developmental* classification refers to research which involved the creation of curriculum materials, teacher education materials, curriculum design, and instruments of evaluation. Some studies in this category include the testing of the material developed.

The *ethnographic* classification includes anthropological studies, field studies, and various observation studies of student and/or teacher groups. These are descriptive studies using ethnographic techniques.

The numbers of dissertations in each of these categories are shown in Table 2. The largest cluster, descriptive studies, comprised 45% or 177 of the 394 dissertations. Wrubel and Ratliff (1978) used the term *descriptive* in their classification, and it accounted for 65.3% of their tally. However, their category included analytical studies and cannot be compared with the present category. It does appear that comparisons with past reports are warranted in the types titled *experimental* and *historical*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Research</th>
<th>177</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>394</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Our second largest type was made up of *experimental* studies which comprised 105 dissertations or 27% of the total. This figure is an increase from the 23% listed for 1973–76 and a marked decrease from the 36% listed for 1969–73.

Over the last 14 years *historical* research in dissertations increased slightly and then declined. In the 1969–73 report historical research comprised 6% of the total. In the 1973–76 report there was an increase to 11.4%. The 1983 figures show that historical research again accounts for 6% of the total.

The newer classifications of *analytical* (56 studies), *developmental* (29 studies), and *ethnographic* (5 studies) account for 22% of the recent research. Current educational research reported at meetings and in publications suggests that these areas of graduate research are likely on the increase in the social studies field and will show up in dissertation studies in the future.

**Dissertation Topics in Five Categories**

A tabulation of dissertations by category and topic is presented in Table 3. Before giving highlights of the tabulations in Table 3 with examples, the first topic area should be explained, especially since nearly 40% of the studies are classified in this category. The *general social studies* topic includes dissertations which are not focused specifically on one of the listed content or subject areas. A number of these dealt with K-6 or 1-6 elementary social studies. Others examined the K-12 curriculum. A few concerned interdisciplinary social studies programs. Others examined the K-12 curriculum. The other seven topic areas in Table 3 should be self-explanatory by title.

Reviewing tabulations in Table 3 by category, the largest number of studies (105) was concerned with social studies *curriculum materials*. These studies included content analyses of textbooks, development of materials, and the testing of new materials. Over half of the research on curriculum materials focused on the topic areas of history and general social studies. Another fifth dealt with reading skills and reading levels.

Research into *teaching methods* followed a close second with 100 studies. Forty percent of these concerned general social studies topics. Among the studies in this category were: structural analyses of differing classroom treatments; role-play and simulation experiments; studies of questioning techniques; experiments with effects of student awareness of instructional objectives; studies of effects of visuals and graphics; studies of teaching problem solving and other intellectual skills; research into the effects of combining social studies instruction with literature, drama, and other subjects; and theoretical examinations of inquiry approaches and concept learning.

The third most active category of recent dissertation research was *school organization, school climate, and curriculum organization*. Thirty-nine percent of these studies concerned citizenship and economics education, and an equal portion were in the general social studies topic area. Examples of
## Table 3
Dissertation Topics by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC AREAS</th>
<th>Behavioral Science, Ethnic, Multicultural, &amp; Women Studies</th>
<th>Reading in Social Studies</th>
<th>Values and Moral Education</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORIES</td>
<td>Social Studies General Subjects</td>
<td>Citizenships, Law, Political Education</td>
<td>Economic Education</td>
<td>Geography, Global Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Materials</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Methods</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Org. &amp; Climate, Curriculum Organization</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Ed. &amp; Teacher Characteristics</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies in Other Countries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dissertation subjects in this category are studies of the influence of a professional organization on school curriculum; comparative curriculum organization across states; case studies of the implementation of courses and curriculum plans; student social-political attitudes and their relationship to demographic factors and classroom variables; relationship of organizational climate to levels of moral judgment and values; and case studies of how curriculum decisions are made. For examples, dissertations in citizenship-law-political science in this category included studies of perceptions of citizenship education, research into effects of school environmental factors, assessments of student attitudes toward constitutional rights, and reviews of law-related education curriculum models.

The fourth most popular category of research in the period reviewed was teacher education and teacher characteristics with a total of 60 studies. The majority of the studies crossed all subjects and multiple grades and thus fell in the general social studies topic area. Examples are studies of teacher perceptions of social studies, teacher attitudes toward proposed techniques for improving social studies learning, teacher background characteristics and their relationship to vocational preferences, teacher perceptions of the utility of various inservice training programs, and the effects of exposure to instruction in the philosophy of social studies. Ten of the 60 teacher studies were in economics education, and 8 of these were evaluations of the effects of several types of in-service programs on teacher knowledge and attitudes. (Mixed results were reported; five found no significant change, three reported positive results.)

Research on social studies in other countries was the fifth largest category with 33 dissertations. This accounts for only 8.5% of the dissertations, but it is a notable increase from the 1973–76 study in which there was a yearly average of 3.5 foreign studies. An average of 6 per year was found, and the authors would estimate that number is increasing with the increase in graduate students from abroad. The countries involved in these 33 studies were: Nigeria 6, Thailand 4, Iran 4, Sierra Leone 3, Saudi Arabia 3, Canada 2, Israel 2, Australia 2, and 1 each concerning Kuwait, Liberia, Afghanistan, Libya, Greece, Brazil, and 1 on Palestinian curriculum. The emphasis was clearly on developing nations. Studies in this category ranged from descriptions of the status of social studies, to teacher surveys, to reviews of curriculum designs and/or rationales, and to experimental testing of especially developed materials.

Comments

Based on our reading of the abstracts, the authors are convinced that it would be worthwhile for scholars in the field to read and analyze the several works on a single topic for purposes of critical review, synthesis and evaluation. For example, similar studies of economics inservice education for teachers were conducted in the states of Kentucky, Texas, Michigan, Ohio,
Georgia, New Jersey, and Florida. A close look at those studies could provide information of common interest to economics educators and social studies supervisors in all states. Another example: in a three year period there were four dissertations on social studies in Thailand. One from Ohio State provided a comparative study of prospective secondary teachers in Thailand and the U.S.; a second from the University of Pittsburgh offered a model for curriculum analysis in Thailand; another from the University of Missouri presented a survey of secondary educators' priorities for social studies in Bangkok; and a fourth from Pennsylvania State examined probable results of integrating critical thinking techniques into Thai social studies. A synthesis of these several studies would provide a valuable resource to social studies educators working in and for Thailand's schools.

The difficulties of identifying dissertations which deal with social studies education were mentioned earlier. The search made us keenly aware of the importance of the choice of title and descriptors submitted with the dissertation abstract. Likewise, a well written abstract is a significant contribution to communication in the field. The importance of the abstract as a professional communication deserves discussion in the doctoral seminars of all graduate programs.

As noted earlier, the dissertation summaries cannot assess the quality of the research conducted. However, from the abstracts the reader can get a sense of the level or depth of the research questions addressed and the extent of the investigation. For example, while a dissertation in one institution was based on a questionnaire sent to alumni of a university's secondary social studies teacher education graduate program to obtain their ratings of courses and content of the program, in the same year in a nearby institution, a doctoral student was utilizing several questionnaires and extended observation data to examine the relationship between teacher sociability and pupil-talk initiation as well as the relationship between pupil-talk initiation and teaching social studies as reflective inquiry.

Among the historical dissertations, there was one in which the researcher utilized publications of three professional associations to prepare a chronology of activities of the Joint Council on Economic Education. A historical dissertation from another university in the same time period analyzed the political and social context of the Committee on Social Studies of 1916 to attempt to determine origins of its curriculum proposals. Even within the historical type of study a wide range of subjects and research approaches is found.

Some of the near duplication of studies suggests that graduate students and the profession would benefit from better communication across graduate institutions. Such communication would help graduate students and professors interested in the same research questions to define and plan research projects which more profitably contribute parts to a cogent body of knowledge on the subject.
While the authors cannot comment on the quality of the 394 dissertations based on the abstracts, it is clear from this review that social studies education has been an active, attractive field of doctoral research in recent years. Also, it appears that a significant number of worthy research questions are being addressed in doctoral dissertations. It is hoped that this summary will provide both a stimulus and a starting point for evaluation, synthesis, and dissemination of recent graduate research in various sub-areas of the social studies.
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Book Review


Reviewed by Bruce Smith, University of Cincinnati.

This book, which developed from the work of the Committee on Conceptual and Terminological Analysis of the International Social Science Council, presents a comprehensive and carefully reasoned set of procedures to analyze and construct concepts. The procedures are illustrated by detailed analyses of seven social science concepts: consensus, development, ethnicity, integration, political culture, power and revolution. Systematic analysis stands with two other approaches, attribute analysis (Klausmeier, 1980) and prototype analysis (Wittgenstein, 1953), as a useful tool for thinking clearly about the composition of concepts. With the recent interest in the nature of social studies concepts (Aumaugher, 1981; Fraenkel, 1983) and concern about the adequacy with which such knowledge is conveyed in social studies methods textbooks (Stanley, 1984), this book will be of interest to many social educators.

Sartori developed the analytical procedures to reduce collective ambiguity, which results when each scholar ascribes his or her own meaning to core concepts and which “can destroy a discipline as a cumulative fabric of knowledge.” Sartori argues convincingly that some common method of conceptual analysis is necessary because social science is a joint and incremental activity. He describes a procedure of analysis that is broadly applicable to social science concepts and, therefore, permits a “consistent and cumulative assessment of the state” of a discipline’s basic intellectual building blocks.

Sartori provides an insightful discussion of words and their effects on perceiving, thinking, and knowing. He constructs an analytical model based on the relationships among meanings, words and referents; the distinction between intensional (connotative) and extensional (denotative) definitions; and the problems of ambiguity (equivocation in the meaning—word relation) and vagueness (uncertainty in the meaning—referent relation). Since the cure for conceptual defects (ambiguity and vagueness) is the construction of adequate definitions, Sartori examines in detail the process of defining and develops a typology of definitions (declarative, denotative, precising, operational and ostensive), arguing that all are necessary to eliminate ambiguity and vagueness.

For dealing with ambiguous concepts, Sartori suggests an approach designed to handle two problems: 1) how to identify a concept’s characteristics
and 2) how to organize a maze of characteristics. The process includes collecting a set of authoritative and representative definitions, including both historical and contemporary sources, which are clustered to compound similarities among definitions and to clarify differences with related but distinct concepts. The crux of the analysis is to separate a concept's defining properties (the necessary, if not sufficient, characteristics) from any accompanying properties (contingent or accidental characteristics, e.g., flight is an accompanying but not a defining characteristic of birds). Finally, Sartori describes how to construct matrices to organize meaningfully the pool of attributes extracted from the definitions of a concept.

For dealing with vagueness, Sartori describes a method for analyzing a concept's extension. His techniques address three problems: (1) boundary indefiniteness, (2) membership indefiniteness and (3) cut-off indefiniteness. For the first two problems, Sartori suggests that "the boundlessness of a concept is remedied by increasing the number of its (defining) properties; and its discriminating adequacy is improved as additional properties are entered." Because he is concerned with linking the conceptual work of theorists with the empirical work of researchers in a discipline, Sartori gives careful attention to ascending and descending levels of abstraction. At the highest level of abstraction, a concept is connotated by only one highly inclusive characteristic. Such abstractions are functional tools because they provide the genus for subclassification, have explanatory and heuristic value, and enable organization of data. To descend a ladder of abstraction to meet research and verification needs, the number of defining characteristics must be increased to achieve greater discriminating power and establish adequate boundaries. Sartori acknowledges that there is no general solution to the problem of cut-off indefiniteness (e.g., when does a hill end and a mountain begin?). He argues that such decisions can be made only on a case-by-case basis in the context of operationalizing a concept. (Wittgenstein's concept of prototype analysis would have been a relevant and useful addition to Sartori's discussion.) Sartori suggests two tests to assess a concept's definition: adequacy and parsimony—"adequate in that it contains enough characteristics to identify the referents and their boundaries; parsimonious in that no accompanying property is included among the necessary, defining properties."

Since language is not only a means of communication but also a molder of thought, the choice of a term to designate a concept is an important consideration that Sartori discusses. Crucial to his discussion is the concept of semantic field ("a set of associated, neighboring terms that hang together under the following test: when one term is redefined, the other terms or some other term also needs to be redefined"). Sartori argues that reconceptualization must be considered in the context of the whole field in which a concept is embedded. One of several examples he gives is the concept of power and a set of associated words: influence, authority, coercion, force,
sanction, and persuasion. If power is defined as influence, and influence is power, then Sartori's guidelines require that the semantic field be reconsidered by showing that power is not coercion (because it is influence), by establishing what influence is without power, and by describing the relation of power-influence to authority, force and sanction.

Sartori concludes by raising and then refuting possible objections to his analytical procedures. He deals primarily with arguments based on the writings of Wittgenstein and Popper. Sartori's ideas are interesting and worthy of consideration.
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Note to Authors

Beginning with the Spring, 1985 issue of TRSE, the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association: Third Edition was adopted as the authority on format and style. The third edition of the Manual was published in 1983 and contains a substantial number of changes compared to previous editions. Authors who have not used the third edition should obtain a copy and become familiar with its contents.

When preparing manuscripts for submission to TRSE, special attention should be given to Chapter 4: Typing Instructions. Reference to several other sections of the Manual would also be useful to authors. Table 17, pages 118 to 133, provides examples of references in APA format. Figure 7, pages 148 to 154, contains a sample paper including title page, abstract, and reference list. Pages 83 to 94 contain useful suggestions for the content and format of tables. The inside covers of the Manual contain a manuscript checklist which should be consulted before manuscripts are submitted for publication.

Attention is called to the following statement, from the Manual, concerning authors’ responsibilities:

The author is responsible for the quality of presentation of all aspects of the paper: correct spelling and punctuation, accurate quotations with page numbers, complete and accurate references, relevant content, coherent organization, legible appearance, and so forth. If the manuscript is to be blind reviewed, authors are responsible for preparing the manuscript to conceal their identities. Therefore, authors must prepare the material for the typist exactly as it is to be typed. The typist should not be expected to edit. The author should not hand the typist the Manual and expect the typist to transform a . . . draft into a manuscript prepared according to APA style. (p. 136)
We are seeking critical reviews of scholarly works related to the concerns of social educators. This includes books on education, the social sciences, history, philosophy, research and any other works which might make a contribution to the field.

Essay reviews of two or more works on the same topic will be considered if they conform to manuscript guidelines for reviews. Reviews which exceed the guidelines for length must be handled on a case by case basis as space permits. Reviewers who have suggestions for reviews which might exceed the guidelines are urged to contact the book editor prior to submitting the review.

Reviewers should provide sufficient detail regarding the book's substance and approach, including positive and negative evaluations where relevant. Finally, the review should include the specific importance of the book for social educators.

**Manuscript Form**

The length may vary from 1,000 to 2,000 words; the manuscript must be typed, double-spaced (including quotes) on 8½" × 11" paper. The format is as follows for the top of the first page of the review, left side:

Author's Name (last name first), Date
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Total pages; list price (if known).
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Submit review manuscripts to the book review editor.
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