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A Note from the Editor:

We have now received 56 manuscripts for review and possible publication in TRSE.

The study of history is becoming fashionable again among political leaders and school critics. What should be our professional contribution to the clarification of the school study of the past of this and other nations? What does our scholarship have to offer? What are fundamental questions about human activities in the past and the stories we call history that are written about them that we should address in this journal? In our professional work? In our scholarship?

What study of the past is appropriate for elementary and secondary schools? We must learn self-consciously to notice that history is a written account of some selection of human activities that have taken place at other times. History is concerned with what people have done and what they thought about what they were doing. To "understand" the past one must come to some awareness of how people in other times experienced the world in which they lived. One may pay attention to family life, commerce, slavery, childhood, science, art, literature, scholarship, education, wars, politics, crime, health care, the environment, or religion in France, or Japan, or Mexico or the United States or ancient China. It has been the fashion of western male historians to pay a great deal of attention to wars and politics and to pay much less attention to science, art and social life. Different historians have different interests. There can never be one correct history of human activities of the past because women and men being born today may in time consider the infinity of past human events from some new perspective. History, telling stories about the past, is a vital ongoing activity in which men and women in different circumstances of life may choose to reveal what certain human beings have been by describing what they have done. Accounts of what people have done reveal to some extent what people are. The men and women who write history uncover human incidents that may involve wisdom, or courage, or torture, or honor, or deception, or folly, or artistic activity, or scientific ingenuity or the exercise of political power. The histories that are written are not plans for the future; they are accounts of human life and travail that may be considered as we seek to make sense out of our present circumstances and to deal with the social and political challenges that we face today.

This reality suggests a number of principles:

1. The "past" of nations, cities, art, science, technology, families, marriage, wars or politics does not become "history" until someone writes it.
2. There are various kinds of history that must be considered:

   The histories that male or female historians write.
   The histories that television creates.
   The histories that are to be found in school textbooks.
   The histories that popular films create.
   The histories that newspapers create.
   The histories that official government pronouncements (whatever the government) creates.
   The histories that passionate ideological groups produce.

   How are students to be helped to discriminate among these different sorts of history? How may these different histories be appraised? What sense of history should we encourage students to develop?

3. Studying history in some sense means doing history, that is, writing about human activities in the past based on both primary and secondary sources. What histories should students be called upon to write in school?

4. Studying history in some sense means reading accounts of the activities of human beings in the past. Strategies of reading historical accounts may include helping students learn how to:

   1. Identify the type of account of the past that they are reading or examining.
   2. Identify the personal, cultural, gender characteristics of the person who wrote a particular account? For what audience? From what life circumstances? Man or woman? Asian or African?
   3. Determine when was it written?
   4. Discover or notice what is being called to attention in the account?
   5. Discover or notice what or who is being ignored? What do the omissions mean for the story being told?
   6. Analyze what all of this means for the account being read and examined?

   These are fundamental questions for those who would appraise the work of women and men who write history.

   In one sense, history is the business of men and women who write about the past. Writing about the past has a distinguished intellectual legacy. But many citizens of this and other countries never read historians. Students in
school seldom learn of the work of historians. Students read school textbooks that are usually politicized documents produced by national governments or by private corporations that have interests unrelated to historical scholarship. Adults watch television and read newspapers. How should these different histories be considered in schools? How should students be invited to think about history? One reason that school history is often unsatisfactory and typically boring is that fundamental ideas of history, the legacy of history as scholarship, is rarely identified and examined. There may be no more important mission of social studies scholarship than the study of history and how it is written and what is involved in the study of that writing. The study of history confronts the paradox of human efforts to make sense of or to understand what others have done in the past in this and in other nations of the world.

Fundamentally, a history is a story that some man or woman, some Christian, or Jew, or Buddhist or Muslim, some Black or White or Asian has written about human actions in the past that took place in private homes, or public streets, or office buildings, or temples, or parks or government facilities. Until students learn what history is they cannot begin to construct an intelligent view of the past of this country, its art, science, families, patterns of childhood, schooling, personal relationships, poetry, government, past system of slavery, status of women, toxic waste disposal, deforestation or United States adventures in Iran, Guatemala, Chile, Nicaragua, Vietnam or Grenada. It is even more difficult to learn of such aspects of life in other nations.

Our scholarship should clarify the relationship between the past in the sense of all of the different social activities of human life, and history in the sense of the stories that are actually written and published. The past does not become history until someone writes it. Our scholarship should identify models of what students might do as they "study history." What do we want to teach students how to do? Are the above questions fundamental issues of educational scholarship? How should they be addressed? Are these issues being faced today in graduate study for which we are responsible? Or, does graduate study cripple our students' capacity to notice or be aware of fundamental issues of our time?

Millard Clements
Editor, TRSE
Letters

Vietnam

As you suggest in your “Note from the Editor,” “it has not been our tradition to seek to pose and investigate fundamental questions in education,” and I would add, particularly in the social studies. For too long, we have simply accepted a curricular structure which has remained virtually unchanged since the era of committee reports, touching it up a bit now and then, but seldom posing the fundamental questions about the nature of the structure itself. Where should the boundaries of the academic disciplines be positioned, we might ask, or should they even exist?

In my view, Vietnam offers us an opportunity to pose these questions. As you write about Ehrhart’s poems, “they poignantly suggest fundamental issues of social studies education that cannot be addressed through our traditional research customs.” And in the poetry of Bruce Weigl, another Vietnam veteran,

“Into the black understanding they marched
until the angels came
calling their names.” (from Song of Napalm, 1988:70 “Elegy”).

I have written in a previous article that “Vietnam . . . might also be viewed as a critical juncture, as an opportunity to understand the American educational process through the glare of a merciless war, and to reconsider the tenets upon which this process is based.” If Vietnam is to be taught primarily within the context of the traditional course on U.S. History, and is to be shortchanged in the process, then what does this tell us as social studies educators about how curriculum is organized for instructional purposes? And what are we teaching our students, and those who will teach our students, about Vietnam, about war, about life?

What might distinguish TRSE from the mechanical and the mediocre is the opportunity it will provide for educators to reconsider the tenets, to question the structure, to address the fundamental issues. “What fundamental questions should we be addressing in our research today?” It is this very question which might provide cohesion and integrity to the journal and the articles to be included.

David Berman
University of Pittsburgh
School of Education
Department of Instruction and Learning
4C18 Forbes Quadrangle
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
I have read three recent issues of TRSE and I am very impressed. I especially like the "Notes From The Editor." In Issue #2 you so rightly raised what are to me the vital perspectives that ought to be the thrust of social studies. It seems to me that those concerns could become the themes for different issues of TRSE. How better to challenge the thinking of your readers?

Then, again, in Issue #3, you raised what are to me some key questions about our concepts of research in the social studies. After years of sitting in doctoral examinations and hearing meaningless products of "research" I am fed up with the so-called research posture. Granted that statistics can be useful, such technical tools have become ends in themselves. I have sat in too many orals where the candidate had done all the "right" procedures but had gotten unimportant, and uninteresting results. Often I have had to say, "You asked the wrong questions to begin with." Or, "Your methods were inappropriate to the task." Does TRSE want to focus on such sterile procedures? Or, is TRSE to strike out and explore, speculate, move into new ways to develop theories and experiment with practice? Years ago, Uri Bronfenbrenner said that Americans only research that for which they can find proven answers. He said Europeans did research to generate questions, to postulate new theories.

I think the focus on doctoral dissertations can lead to conventional publication. The format is dull. Who wants to read all of the methodological details? If you want to encourage those researchers, why not get them to write articles that are speculations drawn from their research?

I found Faye Duchin's comments on the two studies on economic education most pertinent. Those two studies illustrate what I mean by "asking the wrong questions." You could have a very lively issue that took off from Duchin's comments, using proponents of different approaches to economic curricula. Invite someone like Susan Helburn as a provocative contributor.

I especially liked Jane White's article on social studies texts. I also liked her overview of her proposed book review program and her choice of books and reviewers.

Not only is better content needed, but the editorial role of publishers—of what they permit and omit—should be examined. Furthermore, questions should be raised about the place of texts in social studies programs. In too many classrooms, the text is the curriculum. I could see an entire issue devoted to the above problems.

I am old enough to be historical. I look back at the 1930's and the Progressive Education period. It was an exciting time. Not because it was always on target, but because there were believers and experimenters. It was exhilarating to visit schools where teachers and students were deeply involved in curriculum development. They dared to try things out!
The 1930's was also when Building America was launched. The idea of presenting social issues and their pro and con dialogues was refreshing. The McCarthy period smashed that. Then, after Sputnik, the federal funding of social studies projects brought forth people like Harold Berlak, who had an exciting project on Cities and Urban Life, and, Howard Mehlman and his American Political Opinion Course. We need to dare—to propose lively imaginative theories and possible practices.

Do not let the conventional research posture deaden the journal. David Berman’s article on Vietnam is the kind of thinking I admire. We need to pick up his challenge.

Fannie Shaftel
Emeritus Professor
Stanford University
2969 Kalalaua Ave. #406
Honolulu, HI 96815

Your “Note from the Editor” is well taken. You have raised the right questions. On the basis of your remarks, I want to advance this suggestion:

Convene four or five of your friends-seniors in the field-to talk and, then, prepare papers for a special issue of TRSE on the general topic: Research in Social Studies Education: Search Comes First, or some such. Certainly, methodological areas like ethnography and critical theory should be included. I would nominate, as well, history and biography, literary and rhetorical analyses, and “mindful practice.” Others would constitute different sets. The explicit purpose of the group would be to join their reputations and scholarship to assertions of the power of methodologies other than psychological empiricism, in probably very personal essays. (Like, I have “chi-ed” as many “squares” and testing as many “t’s” and “F’s” as most in our field, but I decided years ago that such research led only to dead ends. It neither revealed enough or penetrated sharply enough; it was unseemly arrogant, condescending, and contemptuous of experience and other research. And it lost it’s “fun”, e.g., so what that “teachers talk more than pupils?”

O. L. Davis, Jr.
The University of Texas at Austin
College of Education
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Austin, Texas 78712-1294
Vocabularies, Knowledge and Social Action in Citizenship Education: The Highlander Example

Sandra Brenneman Oldendorf
Western Carolina University

Introduction

Highlander Folk School,¹ was founded in 1932 in Monteagle, Tennessee, by Myles Horton and Don West; its purpose then and now is to help adults confront the social, political, and economic issues that affect their lives. Influenced by their work at Highlander, students have become leaders in organized labor struggles in the South, the civil rights movement and in advocating the rights of Appalachian residents. Highlander encourages citizens to identify issues affecting their lives, to ask questions about the differences between the ideals and realities of living in a democratic society, and to act to change society to reflect universal principles of freedom, justice and equal opportunity for all. These goals for effective citizenship are similar to those of the reflective inquiry tradition in social studies education. This tradition emphasizes decision-making in a democratic society, critical thinking in examining historical and contemporary issues, and active participation in the democratic process. Although participation is a goal for social studies education and Highlander Folk School, at Highlander the vocabulary of social change predominates, and social action is the measure of success. The purpose of this essay is 1) to build a rationale for encouraging social studies teachers to become critically aware of the vocabularies they use; 2) to examine the history and vocabulary of the Highlander Folk School, an institution established to upset the status quo; and 3) to encourage social studies teachers and educators to use the Highlander example to add new life to the discourse in the social studies about the nature of knowledge and the role of social action.

¹ Today Highlander Folk School is Highlander Research and Education Center located in New Market, Tennessee.

Correspondence: Sandra B. Oldendorf, Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, North Carolina 28723
A Rationale for Considering New Vocabularies in the Social Studies

Although Highlander and the social studies both promote citizenship education, they use different vocabularies. The vocabulary of Highlander is that of an institution outside the public school system which promotes conflict by challenging injustice, authoritarianism and inequality in society. The dominant vocabulary of the classroom promotes national loyalty and is grounded in the traditional social sciences, mostly history. A social studies vocabulary in the Dewyan tradition is reflective inquiry which focuses the curriculum on contemporary issues (Metcalf, 1986; Barr, Barth & Shermis, 1977). A more radical vocabulary which criticizes the political agenda in social studies education is found in the writings of Giroux (1983), Nelson and Stanley (1986) and Cherryholmes (1985).

Richard Rorty in Consequences of Pragmatism (1982) asserts, “there is no way to think about either the world or our purposes except by using our language” (p. xix). The wisdom of this statement is not obvious in the social studies literature. Cleo Cherryholmes points out that language and speech are rarely mentioned in the social studies as subjects of study: “this is interesting because social life, knowledge of it or teaching about it cannot exist without language or speech” (1985, p. 395). According to Cherryholmes, social studies teachers go through a program of study which permits them to participate in a discourse about social studies. Their teachers “make statements that are valid in terms of social studies practice” (p. 397). These statements reflect both what is acceptable in the field of social studies and to society. As a result of this “selective description”, divergent views about history, developing countries, minority peoples, and institutions outside the mainstream U.S. culture are often not included. Unaware of the power of language, social studies teachers are controlled in what they teach by the vocabularies they use, and, in turn, their vocabularies control what their students learn (p. 399).

Social studies teachers should be aware that their vocabularies are not value-free. Citizenship, for example, has varied and sometimes contradictory meanings. It can mean membership in society, the goal of social studies education, or a norm for good behavior. The definition of citizenship as membership often means belonging to a nation or other political entity with the responsibilities and rights that go with that membership. It is often taught as something that immigrants to the United States desperately want and natural-born citizens are fortunate to have. Citizenship is also defined to mean the focus of social studies education by the National Council for the Social Studies [NCSS]. This goal is to help students become responsible,
participating members of national and world society (NCSS, 1979). Many teachers, however, teach only for citizenship in American society according to Carole Hahn, past-president of the National Council for the Social Studies. “The prevailing concept of ‘citizenship education’ continues to be one of knowledge transmission for nationalistic goals” (1984, p. 240). A third use of the word citizenship is to judge standards of behavior. Citizenship as behavior means obeying the rules and performing service to others, first at school (‘good citizenship’ awards) and later in society. But for some people in the 1960’s, being a good citizen meant not obeying the rules (serving in Vietnam) and challenging unjust laws (segregation). Based on these three definitions, citizenship is obviously not a value-free word; yet, many social studies teachers use it as if it needs no explanation, assuming instead “everyone knows what citizenship means.” Both Beverly Armento (1986) and Wilma Longstreet (1985) have called for research to clarify concepts such as citizenship.

Catch words of education reform movements also contribute to the problem of unexamined language in the social studies. A current example is the word “excellence.” A Nation at Risk (1983) implies that our society should strive for absolute standards of excellence. Manifestations of excellence are high scores on standardized tests, high national literacy rates, and being the best student, school or country. These outcomes are supposed to reduce “the risk to our nation.” All teachers have felt the pressure from states and the U.S. Department of Education to achieve excellence in education. But does excellence only mean skill proficiency? Not according to Prakash and Waks, who point out that excellence also means “disciplinary initiation,” “self-actualization” or “social responsibility” as well as proficiency (1985, p. 79). They argue that excellence for social responsibility should be our national goal in view of current risks, such as nuclear war, that face our society and the rest of the world (p. 80). Yet, the word excellence continues to mean exemplary achievement test scores to the press, large segments of the public, and to state legislatures, even though many teachers question that narrow view. Social studies teachers who say that they are teaching for responsible citizenship should seriously consider the Prakash and Waks argument for excellence as social responsibility.

Cultural literacy is another term that should be examined by social studies educators. E. D. Hirsh’s book Cultural Literacy (1987) has been heavily criticized by Arnowitz and Giroux (1988) because “There is a totalitarian unity in Hirsch’s view of culture that is at odds with the concept of democratic pluralism and political difference” (p. 186). For example, Rosa Parks does not appear on Hirsch’s list, but Cinderella does.

The over use of social studies textbooks contributes to the problem of unexamined language. Traditionally, Giroux points out, social studies is characterized by text material that attempts to be value free and unproblematic (1978, p. 297). Students and often teachers perceive text...
material as determined by "immaculate perception" instead of human perception. Therefore, they often do not question the perspective, accuracy or omissions of the texts (pp. 299-301). Giroux argues that students and teachers should be aware that text writers go through a process of selection for both language and content. Writers select "facts" based on their values, the dominant values in society, and the values of textbook selection committees. According to Giroux, what passes as a set body of knowledge called history is actually information which has been processed in order to remove the more controversial aspects of the past. In other words, values affect what is perceived as fact, and therefore, Giroux concludes, facts and values should never be viewed as separate categories. Through critical examination, social studies teachers can realize that the language used in social studies texts is not value-free and that language can limit the growth of knowledge.

Angene Wilson (1982) describes different kinds of language that social studies teachers and researchers use and how language affects their development of theories about the social studies. The teacher who uses growth metaphors, for example, probably thinks of learning as a developmental process. The teacher who talks of "working in the trenches" and "surviving the battle" apparently perceives the student-teacher relationship as an adversarial one (p. 91). Languages overlap and become tangled, Wilson points out. Out of the languages we use come the theories on which we base our knowledge. Wilson concludes with a garden metaphor: "Language may be the compost out of which our theorizing grows. What opportunities await." (p. 101). Wilson’s conclusion leads us to believe that adding new languages to the compost may lead to new theory building about the social studies.

If language is not examined, then teachers and their students may fail to see the origin of knowledge. Facts, the language used to describe them, and theory are often treated as separate from each other. Yet, according to Giroux, "theoretical frameworks and facts are an inseparable part of what we call ‘knowledge’" (1978, p. 298). Facts are filtered through a theoretical framework. He points out that the same facts can lead to different conclusions based on the theoretical framework and the language of the teacher. For example, moving from the North to the South made this author keenly aware of the different conclusions one can reach about the "facts" of the Civil War depending on the perspective of geography. What Northerners called a rebellion, Southerners called "the great Northern aggression." Knowledge, based on Giroux's perspective, is dependent on the perspectives of time and place and by the language used to describe it.

Based on their views of language and theory in the social studies, Wilson, Giroux, and Cherryholmes view knowledge in the Deweyan sense, as a creative process, and not as a record of knowledge (Dewey, 1916, pp. 186-87). If the record of knowledge is mistaken for knowledge, then "the acquisition of information becomes an end in itself and the student spends
his time absorbing what other people have done, rather than having experiences of his own.” (Romberg, 1983, p. 122). Social studies teachers who use the word “know” to mean learning facts, dates, and documents are defining “to know” as a record of knowledge. Social studies teachers who use “know” to mean learning through community-based experiences where students become actively engaged in social problems are defining “to know” as a creative process.

Knowledge, according to this view, is based on our experiences, and the words we use to describe these experiences. Our vocabularies, in turn, help us shape the way we see the world. According to Richard Rorty, John Dewey and other pragmatists see vocabularies as “instruments for coping with things rather than representations of their intrinsic natures” (Rory, p. 198). Vocabularies enable us to try to understand phenomena, but not to find the ultimate Truth. Phenomena can be transformed by applying new vocabularies from different perspectives. New words may come from a different culture, a different discipline, or a different period of history. When new vocabularies are applied to phenomena, “new and better ways of talking and acting” may result (p. xxxvii).

Developing new vocabularies is part of the process of reflective inquiry, one of three teaching traditions of the social studies as analyzed by Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1977). With its roots in the works of John Dewey, inquiry is defined as “the active process of transforming the existent situation” (1920, p. 177). The existent situation is that, in spite of the voices of progressivists and reconstructionists, social studies is still predominantly taught as cultural transmission. Transforming the existent situation encourages examining new vocabularies, looking for deeper understanding, and adding new life to the discussion. One source for new vocabularies and perspectives is the study of exemplary programs in the social studies. According to James Leming:

the primary focus of social studies research should be on the study of exemplary programs as judged by the enthusiasm of students, teachers and community... a focus on exemplary programs offer greater potential for understanding social education and communicating that understanding to practitioners, public, and policy makers (1986, p. 150).

From the perspective of a social studies which would “transform the existent situation,” Highlander Folk School is an exemplary program in adult citizenship education worthy of examination by social studies researchers and educators in order to encourage new and better ways of talking and acting (Oldendorf, 1987).

At first the differences between Highlander and social studies education appear to be too large to draw any connections. Highlander’s work is with impoverished adults; social studies education is designed for students of diverse economic and social backgrounds and ability levels, K-12. High-
lander programs have a radical image, encouraging people to question authority and to gain control over their own lives; social studies teachers often try to perpetuate patriotism through loyalty to the nation and its leaders. Highlander focuses on the present, on burning issues in the lives of its students; often social studies education is history, the less controversial the better.

Although separated by these differences, Highlander and social studies education also have many commonalities. Both have effective citizenship in a democracy as a major goal. Both recognize that literacy and decision-making skills are necessary in order for citizens to function most effectively. Both work with students who may be reluctant to learn or who have had negative schooling experiences in the past. Both Highlander and the social studies have developed a tradition of inquiry and a commitment to address social problems through education, ideas which are rooted in the works of Dewey. At Highlander the views of John Dewey and George Counts influenced the thinking of Myles Horton, Highlander's founder. In the social studies, progressive views have been furthered by Counts, Edgar Wesley, Harold and Earle Rugg, Alan Griffin, Lawrence Metcalf, Maurice Hunt, Shirley Engle and many others (Metcalf, 1986).

Vocabularies, Knowledge and Social Action at Highlander

The language of Reinhold Niebuhr and John Dewey influenced the thinking and actions of Myles Horton, co-founder and director of Highlander for 50 years (Adams, 1975). Horton, born in 1905 in Savannah, Tennessee, developed a strong commitment to social justice through his readings and work while a student at Cumberland University and as secretary for the Tennessee State YMCA after he graduated. From 1929-1932 he attended Union Theological Seminary, the University of Chicago and visited folk schools in Denmark. At Union Horton took classes with Niebuhr, who at that time called himself a Christian Marxist. Niebuhr pointed out that comfortable middle class people do not suffer enough to want to change social injustices but oppressed people do. According to Niebuhr, "the fight for justice in society will always be a fight" (1957, p. 38). Horton took Niebuhr's words seriously and became a leader in that fight.

While Myles Horton was at Union, John Dewey worked across the street at Columbia. Although Horton took no courses with Dewey, he was influenced by Dewey's words. Horton's copy of Democracy and Education has the following passage underlined, "It is the aim of progressive education to take part in correcting unfair privilege and unfair deprivation, not to perpetuate them" (Dewey, 1916, p. 140; Horton, A., 1971). Horton took these words literally and built Highlander on the principle that education should help people confront injustice, address problems in a democratic society and expand participation in that democracy. Highlander's statement
of purpose calls for ending injustice and discrimination based on race, religion and poverty. It advocates active involvement, "affirmative action" to end these problems (HFS, 1950).

Dewey also said that the school curriculum "must take account of the adaptation of studies to the needs of the existing community life; it must select with the intention of improving the life we live in common so that the future shall be better than the past" (1916, p. 225). One of the key principles followed at Highlander is that in order to improve the life we have in common the perceived needs of all community members must be considered and, in turn, that expanding participation in a democracy will mean a better life for all. Dewey’s problem-solving approach also appealed to Myles Horton (Horton, A., 1971). Early in Highlander’s history, he said: “What is too big for one person to handle can be figured out by all of us together. We will have a new kind of school—not a school for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, but a school for problems” (Tjerandsen, 1980, p. 139). Influenced by Dewey and other reformers, Horton viewed knowledge as something that is created in the learner by sharing experiences with others, addressing common concerns, and acting on these concerns. Dewey (1933) expressed his enthusiasm for the school and Horton’s ideas.

Having gone over the work and plans of the Highlander Folk School, I wish to say I am much impressed with the intelligence, sincerity and devotion of the plan and those who are engaged in carrying it out. It is one of the most hopeful social-educational plans I know of.

The language of George Counts, a colleague of Dewey’s, also influenced Horton. Encouraging schools to build a democratic spirit is the theme of Count’s seminal work, Dare the School Build a New Social Order? (1932). Counts, a member of Highlander’s first advisory board, advocated an active role for the school in building a democratic society. He was especially concerned that as society changed, the goals of democracy would need to be constantly examined. In 1933 Counts wrote Highlander in support of Horton’s work.

I had a most interesting talk with [Mr. Horton]. It seems to me that he is carrying on a most excellent piece of work. I am glad to enclose a small contribution for the continuance of the institution. I only wish that it might be more (Counts, 1933).

In 1939 he argued that the school itself must be democratic. According to Counts, if the school is authoritarian in a democratic society, then democracy loses. These ideas reinforced the notions of Myles Horton. In a sense he answered Count’s question in 1932 by starting Highlander in order to “build a new social order.” Horton believed, as did Counts, that there
was too much talk about injustice and not enough action. In 1981, for example, he told Bill Moyers that race relations would never improve if left up to white people "because they don't want to change the structure, they want to do it by having meetings another hundred years, [by] praying another hundred years" (Moyers).

By the 1930s, Highlander was embroiled in controversy, especially labor issues in the South. But taking a stand was not a matter of debate; it was a way of life. And it was dangerous. Highlander supported the United Mine Workers (UMW) beginning in 1932 with a coal miner's strike in Wilder, Tennessee, and later supported other struggling unions in the Southeast (Glen, 1988). Supporting the unions meant that some people got hurt; some people got killed. But Highlander believed that in a democratic society, workers had a right to be heard. Through the work of Zilphia Horton and later, Guy Carawan, workers have been heard through their songs at Highlander workshops over the years. One song, written by Florence Reece during the violent UMW strikes in Harlan County, Kentucky, in the 1930s, expresses the importance of taking a stand. The power of language is demonstrated in the song, "Which Side are You On?" (Carawan, 1982, p. 119):

They say in Harlan County
There are no neutrals there;
You'll either be a union man
Or a thug for J. H. Blair.
Which side are you on?
Which side are you on?

Issues such as racial injustice, Appalachian land disputes, and apartheid in South Africa, all reflect this kind of choice according to Highlander. In the view of Horton, to remain "neutral" is choosing a side, the acceptance of "what is."

In the 1940s Highlander was drawn into the issue of racial discrimination in the South. By 1950 Highlander was fully committed to fighting this injustice. Reflecting on the role of decision-making at Highlander, Horton (1973) wrote that adults in labor unions or in civil rights struggles "have little confidence in academically formulated solutions to what they know to be really tough problems" (p. 335). He criticized schools for training students to let someone make decisions for them. Radical educators, Horton said, are needed to help people unlearn this helplessness and learn to effect their own destiny. For example, blacks in the 1940s and early 1950s were afraid to challenge authority because they feared for their jobs and often their lives.

By 1965 Highlander students were so involved in social action that the school was considered a serious threat to the status quo in the South. At a Senate hearing Highlander was charged with promoting communism (U.S.
Congress, 1965). During the 1950s and 1960s Martin Luther King, Jr., Julian Bond, Stokley Carmichael and Andrew Young attended Highlander workshops. Rosa Parks went to a Highlander workshop just a few weeks before she refused to give up her seat to a white person on a Montgomery bus. The song “We Shall Overcome” was rewritten into the modern theme of the civil rights movement by Zilphia Horton, Myles wife, and Pete Seeger at Highlander (Adams, 1975; Bledsoe, 1969). In 1957 Highlander helped establish the South Carolina Sea Island Citizenship Schools to address a “really tough problem”: the literacy test. Through the leadership of Myles Horton, Esau Jenkins, Septima Clark and Bernice Robinson, these schools taught blacks to read and write in order to pass the South Carolina literacy tests for voter registration. The schools were received enthusiastically by the students, teachers, and the black community in the South in the 1950s and 60s, and the schools eventually spread throughout the South. An estimated 100,000 black adults learned to read, write, and register to vote through the Citizenship School program. On the Sea Islands, community projects in political education, housing, economics and social welfare grew out of the Citizenship Schools. Highlander’s critics were right to accuse Highlander of upsetting the status quo, but they were wrong to accuse them of promoting communism. Highlander was promoting participation in government, equality, and justice, the basic tenets of democracy (Oldendorf, 1987). (See also Horton, M., 1982.) Highlander Research and Education Center continues work for these principles through studies and workshops on outside land ownership in the Appalachian region and human rights as a global issue.

Commonalities and Differences

There are parallels in the vocabularies of some social studies educators and the actions at Highlander. In 1932, the year Highlander was founded, George S. Counts wrote Dare the School Build a New Social Order? The Rugg brothers and Edgar Wesley in the 1930s advocated that the social studies be organized around contemporary issues at the same time that Highlander became embroiled in the right of southern workers to organize (Nelson, 1982; Wronski, 1982). About the time “Which side are you on?” was written, Harold Rugg (1936) argued that teachers must take a stand on social injustice because to remain neutral meant supporting injustice. In the 1940s Alan Griffin asserted “We need not merely to get acquainted with our culture, but to make judgements about it in terms of the democratic ideal” (1943, p. 51), and in the 1950s Hunt and Metcalf (1955) challenged social studies teachers to focus on “closed topics” in our society such as race, sex and prejudice. Highlander, in the 1940s and 1950s challenged racial discrimination, a practice which made a mockery of democratic ideals. In 1960 Shirley Engle said that content in the social studies should promote decision-making. Making the decision to challenge segregation brought Highlander into conflict with the state of Tennessee in the 1960s. In 1972
Newmann and Oliver argued that inquiry and critical thinking skills could only be learned through direct experience in the community; Highlander’s programs had been grounded in the community since 1932.

In the 1980s, Giroux, Nelson, Stanley and others advocate reconstruction and transformation of society and are critical of the Deweyan tradition. Henry Giroux (1978; 1983) argues that the reflective inquiry tradition has not gone far enough in challenging history as cultural transmission. He points out that critical questions need to be asked about the ways our schools are organized in a democratic society. William Stanley and Jack Nelson (1986) advocate a curriculum in which students engage in the “processes of critical thinking, ethical decision-making and social participation” in order to transform society (p. 532). The ultimate goal in Stanley and Nelson’s curriculum would be participation in “social improvement activities” (p. 533). Guyton (1988) raises the point that since schools themselves are undemocratic institutions, then merely encouraging critical thinking and positive attitudes about civic participation will not result in social action.

As an independent adult education school, Highlander has moved beyond rhetoric and acted on its beliefs to transform society in a way that social studies teachers in the public schools cannot. The obvious difference is that Highlander answers to itself, its board and its supporters. Social studies curriculum in the public schools, on the other hand, is heavily influenced by state legislators, departments of education, textbooks, standardized tests, the media and other political groups. Because of its independence, Highlander has used a vocabulary that encourages citizens to address their own problems and to implement social change. Highlander’s philosophy and vocabulary are, therefore, dominated by the view that the most important way of knowing is through direct experience.

The vocabulary of Highlander emphasizes action: “fighting for justice,” “upsetting the status quo,” “teachers as enablers,” “cultivating the spirit as well as the mind,” “creating dissonance,” “maladjusting people to an unjust system,” and “empowerment.” (Tjerandsen, 1980; Moyers, 1981; Horton, 1973). The reflective inquiry tradition in the social studies emphasizes a similar vocabulary: “democratic beliefs,” “building a new social order,” “world-wide relationships,” “confronting closed issues,” “reflective inquiry,” “asking questions about our society,” “transforming the curriculum” and “civic action” (Griffin, 1942; Counts, 1932; NCSS, 1981; Hunt & Metcalf, 1955). However, social studies practice has been dominated by a vocabulary that includes “scope and sequence,” “history,” “geography,” “economics,” “government,” “thinking skills,” “map skills,” and “national loyalty” (NCSS, 1981; In Search of. . , 1984). Social studies, as practiced in the vast majority of schools, is based on the
vocabulary of a discipline inside the school system, a discipline constantly called upon to reflect the values of mainstream society. Highlander used the vocabulary of a people "outside the system," a group asking "Which side are you on?" and singing "We shall overcome."

**New Life for Citizenship Education Discourse**

The purposes of this essay have been three-fold: to build a rationale for encouraging social studies teachers to become aware of the language they use, to describe the history and vocabulary of Highlander Folk School and to use the Highlander example to add new life to the discourse in the social studies about the role of citizens in a democracy. In summary, Highlander emphasizes 1) using a radical vocabulary that challenges the status quo, 2) creating knowledge by asking questions, sharing experiences and working together, and 3) promoting social action that attempts to turn the ideals of a democratic society into realities. At Highlander vocabularies and actions have supported the southern labor struggle, the civil rights movement, and the rights of Appalachian people. The Highlander example applied to social studies would focus on the identification of social, political and economic issues, on increasing skepticism of political rhetoric and easy answers, and on the responsibility of all citizens to work to improve the "common good."

In an age when key issues are not discussed in political campaigns, when slogans and images have more impact than dialogue, and when accumulation of material goods is the highest goal for many young people, then perhaps a citizenship education program aimed at "upsetting the status quo" is not so radical after all.
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Developing worthwhile curriculum materials and getting them into the hands of teachers willing to use them is a challenge for educators. The production of curriculum materials is a complex system that links textbook publishers and other producers of curriculum materials with schools. In discussing the complexity of the schoolbook market, De Silva (1986) notes that producing new books is enormously expensive and can be risky. Commercial publishers, many of whom have had experience in producing excellent books that did not sell, are reluctant to take a chance on producing a book that schools would reject. Moreover, there is a need for more careful analysis of instructional materials (Superka and others, 1980). Thorough curriculum reviews are one way that teachers and researchers can encourage producers to improve their products. There seems to be little hope of improving the textbooks until schools demand and purchase better products.
Purpose of the Study

The overall goal of this study is to encourage teachers to raise the standards they use in selecting curriculum materials. We decided that a step toward achieving this goal would be to design a study involving classroom teachers in using research-based criteria to evaluate specific curriculum materials. We believed that this kind of effort would stress the important role that researchers and classroom teachers can perform to improve curriculum materials. The more specific outcome of this study would be the provision of new information that teachers and other educational leaders can use to judge how existing curriculum products measure up to a specific set of criteria.

These, of course, are lofty goals. The study required a narrower focus in order to be practical. We decided to concentrate on one subject—economics—at one grade level—the middle school. Middle school economics was selected because of the growing interest that publishers seem to be expressing in this area (Davis, 1987). In addition, a review of the literature revealed that there has been no systematic effort at evaluating the quality of these materials.

Selection of Curriculum Evaluation Criteria

Davis (1987), with the assistance of a national panel of resource people, reviewed the literature on teaching economics at the middle school grades. Among other things, this report presented criteria for teaching middle school economics that have found support in the literature. According to the findings of this study, curriculum materials for middle school economics should:

1. Stress developing students' economic reasoning abilities (Saunders and others, 1984; Wentworth and Leonard, 1986).

2. Recognize that economic reasoning can be applied to a variety of situations including the local community (Saunders and others, 1984; Walstad and Soper 1982; Wass, 1965).

3. Provide instruction that is attractive and challenging to students; that takes account of students' personal, social, and cognitive development; and includes a simplified but accurate explanation of how the economy operates (Wentworth and others, 1977; Schug, 1983; Kubelick, 1977; Leming, 1981; Banaszak, 1985; Bybee, 1982; Vygotsky, 1978).

4. Provide topics and examples about our economy that are recognizable to the young adolescent and should be used to engage students in exploring beyond surface characteristics (Banaszak, 1985).

5. Stress the active involvement of the learner (Furth, 1980; Patrick, 1982).

This report concluded with a series of recommendations about how to improve the teaching of economics at the middle school level. One recommen-
dation called for the careful evaluation of middle school economics curriculum materials.

Instrument Development
The results of the Davis (1987) study were reviewed carefully and elaborated for application in the current study. We assembled a series of generalizations for teaching middle school economics. These, in turn, were translated into a set of criteria that became the basis for the development of the instrument used in the study. The criteria are listed in Table 1.

The original version of the instrument was constructed by the researchers based on the work of Davis (1987). It was then submitted to three nationally recognized scholars for their suggestions. Instrument reviewers included individuals from various parts of the country with backgrounds in economics, economics education, and developmental psychology. The recommendation of the reviewers became the basis for making revisions in the instrument. Next, a team of three teachers were invited to spend one-half day using the instrument with some sample curriculum materials. The results of this piloting of the instrument were used to make further changes.

Table 1
Criteria for Reviewing Middle School Economics Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Product Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attractiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ease of use/manageability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completeness of teacher directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equity considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Economic Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Uses economic concepts and generalizations accurately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstrates logical economic reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identifies values underlying the American economic system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Middle School Student Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Stimulates student curiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Content relates to student economic experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stresses involvement of people in the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Encourages student to reason abstractly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Pedagogy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provides a variety of instructional techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specifies clear, obtainable objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Encourages active student involvement in learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Provides in-depth instruction on a few, selected economic concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Selection

Teachers in North Carolina, Washington, and Wisconsin participated in this study. These states were selected to provide some balance from regions of the country. Local communities within each state were selected to provide some balance between teachers in rural, urban, and suburban public school districts.

Selection and Training of Teachers

Three teams of five teachers were assembled at each site. We established four criteria to help select the participating teachers. Each teacher should:
1. Have five years of teaching experience at the middle school level.
2. Be currently teaching at the middle school level—grades six through nine.
3. Have had previous training in economics education, such as attending a recent workshop or having taken a formal course on the subject.
4. Have the recommendation of the social studies curriculum coordinator in the teacher’s school district.

Officials in local school districts at each site were contacted. Through their cooperation, we established the teams of reviewers.

After 15 teachers were selected, it was necessary to provide them with training about the purposes, design, and instrument criteria to be used in this study. A one-day training session was run for the teachers at each site. Each training session had a common design. The emphasis was to introduce the teachers to the criteria used in the review instrument and to provide an opportunity for them to practice using the instrument with materials not selected for examination in the project. In addition, the teachers discussed the details of how the teaching materials should be shared at the local sites and taught. A second session was run for the teachers at the conclusion of the project to collect the results of their work and to debrief their experiences.

Materials Selection

A key part of this study was the identification of potential teaching materials to be included in the review. Fourteen separate bibliographic sources were checked. These included running an ERIC search (yielding 97 potential items) and reviewing the Social Science Education Consortium Data Book and materials published by the Joint Council on Economic Education. In addition, letters were written to 128 profit and non-profit producers of economics curriculum materials. These efforts produced 109 print materials, including texts and supplementary materials. Several principles were established to help us make decisions about which materials should be included in this review. These principles included the following:
1. Since teachers tend to depend heavily on print materials to guide their teaching, the study was limited to print material only.
2. The material stressed economics content. Materials which were solely consumer oriented were omitted.

3. The material provided student materials as well as teacher directions.

4. The material was currently available to teachers. The oldest copyright date allowed was 1976. Given the time limits of this study, materials available after January, 1987 were not included.

5. There was evidence that the material was intended for use with middle school students. This would include a textbook recommended for grades 7–12, but would exclude a textbook clearly intended for grades 10 and above. More difficult to judge were upper elementary materials. If the publisher provided some evidence that the material was intended to be appropriate for grade 6 or above, the material was usually included.

Application of these five principles resulted in the selection of 27 materials. Thirteen of the materials were textbooks and 14 were supplemental materials.

Data Collection and Analysis

Two decisions helped guide the data collection. First, due to the limited number of reviewers, we decided that all 15 teachers must be involved in the review of all materials. Second, we decided that all of the materials must be actually taught by at least one participating teacher.

Materials were ordered from the publishers and distributed to coordinators at the sites. Classroom sets of the materials that teachers were to use in their classrooms were randomly assigned with nine packages going to each of the three sites.

Several steps were used to collect data. First, teachers examined the selected curriculum materials and scored them using the instrument designed for this study. Second, teachers wrote a precis about the material that they taught, and participated in a debriefing session in which they discussed their experiences in reviewing and teaching the materials. Finally, the teachers were interviewed at the conclusion of the study in order to gather their informal impressions of the quality of the materials and their views on participating in a study of this type.

The survey data from each of the three sites were aggregated. This was done for two main reasons. First, in designing the study, three different sites were selected in order to provide some regional balance. In other words, the data only make sense when they are viewed in combination. Second, an inspection of the data revealed that, in fact, there were few meaningful differences among the sites. After the data were collected, analysis of variance tests were run to check for differences among the mean scores by site. On 15 variables in the instrument, statistically significant differences were found on six variables by site. These differences were judged to be so small as to have no practical effect. (For example, the F score was never
Based on these two observations—one before the fact and one after—it appeared reasonable to aggregate the data.

The aggregate survey data were analyzed in three main ways. First, we wanted to know which materials did well according to the criteria specified in the instrument. Mean scores were calculated and ranked in order to tell how materials rated according to the criteria selected for this study. Second, analysis of variance tests were run to check the meaningfulness of any differences between the ratings of supplemental and text materials. Finally, regression analysis was performed to factor out product characteristic effects from the overall rankings.

**Overall Rankings of Selected Teaching Materials**

The first step in the analysis was to measure how the materials in the study compared with each other. Perhaps the most sensitive measure for ranking the materials was on the basis of the combined mean score using all the individual variables in the questionnaire. Table 2 presents the results of this first ranking. Materials produced by the National Education Association, Center for Teaching International Relations, Houghton Mifflin, New Readers Press, Joint Council on Economic Education, EMC Publishing and Visual Education Corporation, Addison-Wesley, Coronado, and USA Today are ranked in the top one-third according to this analysis. There appears to be little meaningful differences between the products in terms of being text or supplemental materials. In the 18 highest ranked materials, there is an even distribution between text materials and supplemental materials.

Another ranking was constructed on the basis of one criteria—the teachers' overall recommendation. This ranking represents the teachers' overall judgment of the material rather than a combination of the individual scores. The strength of this measure is its reflection of judgment rather than a mathematical artifact. This ranking is also presented in Table 2 and is similar to the first ranking based on combined mean scores. For example, 16 of the top 18 products are the same materials. While the ordering of the top one-third shifts, seven out of nine products remain at the top. Again, there is a near equal distribution between text materials and supplemental materials in the top 18.

A Spearman Rank Order study correlation was calculated to examine the relationship between the rankings in Table 2. The correlation of .89 shows that the two rankings are quite similar.

**Supplemental Materials Versus Textbooks**

We thought that it would be useful to examine differences between supplemental and text materials. Table 3 shows some of these findings. None are particularly surprising. Textbooks were rated as significantly better on variables that might be interpreted as involving greater care in production process, such as providing more visuals and conducting extensive reviews to
check the accuracy of the concepts. For example, Table 3 shows that textbooks out-perform supplemental materials on such variables as attractiveness, equity considerations, and accuracy of the economics content. Textbooks were also rated as presenting economic content more accurately and identifying economic values more often than supplemental materials.

Supplemental materials, however, were rated as having other advantages, most of which are related to improved teaching methods. For example,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>38.08**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ease of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Completeness of Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>9.95**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equity Considerations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>22.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Accurate Economic Concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>5.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Logical Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Economic Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>10.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stimulates Student Curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relates to Student Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Involvement of People in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Encourages Abstract Reasoning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Text Materials and Supplemental Materials (Cont.)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>17.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Specifies Objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Active Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>33.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In-depth Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>9.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - .01
** - .001

Table 3 shows that supplemental materials provide more complete teacher directions, instructional variety, active student involvement, and in-depth instruction on a few concepts.

There were some variables where there was little difference between the ratings for textbooks and supplemental materials. For example, there were no differences in the stress on logical reasoning. Perhaps more surprising was that there were no significant differences on the emphasis on student economic experiences. As might be expected, the mean scores favored the supplemental materials. The mean rating of the texts was a seemingly low 2.96 on a 5 point scale. However, the 3.20 mean of the supplemental materials was not significantly better. One conclusion might be that few instructional materials stress the economic experiences of young people to use as a teaching device.

Readers are encouraged to use caution in interpreting the meaningfulness of some of the statistically significant findings reported in Table 3. The differences between the means should be considered in relationship to the size of the standard deviations which are always close to a score of 1. Some of the statistically significant differences on such variables as completeness of teacher directions or accurate economic concepts probably have little real or practical effect. When effect size is taken into account, the most meaningful differences between textbooks and supplemental materials are on the variables of attractiveness and equity, which favor textbooks, and on variety and active involvement, which favor the supplemental materials.
Product Characteristics Versus Other Criteria

We were also interested in examining how the product characteristics may have influenced the overall rankings of the materials. In other words, we asked: When product characteristics are factored out, does the ranking of the material change? To answer this question, we did a regression analysis in which the product characteristics were used to predict the ratings of the other variables. Residuals from this regression analysis were used to give an estimate of the overall produce score, free of the influence of the product characteristics.

Table 4 presents the ranking of the materials by these residual scores. It reveals a pattern which varies somewhat from the earlier rankings. In this ranking, for example, textbooks do somewhat less well. Only three textbooks, for example, are in the top one-third compared to five textbooks that placed in this category in the combined score ranking in Table 2. The Spearman Rank Order Correlation between the combined mean score ranking in Table 2 and the residual ranking in Table 4 is .43. The differences in these rankings suggest that the reviewers may have been somewhat influenced by a "halo effect" that favored textbooks over supplemental materials.

Debriefing the Reviewers

A group interview was conducted with the teachers at each site to gather their informal impressions of the materials in this study. Overall, the teachers felt that the materials were not very strong. One problem was that the material did not "fit" very well with middle school students. One teacher said, "The level was too high for average middle school kids, actually, even for the bright middle school students." Another teacher agreed when she said, "I think that only about three pieces of material were definitely at grade level." One teacher estimated that 85 percent of the materials were for the upper grade levels.

The teachers state that the materials tended not to stimulate student interest. The materials seemed to be bland. Teachers commented that they needed to bring a lot of their own ideas and enthusiasm into their teaching to make the materials effective. One teacher said, "If I were to pass this out, they would look at it and that would be all that would happen."

Another criticism was that the writers of the materials assumed too much background knowledge on the part of the teachers. Some teachers believed that effective use of economics materials at the middle school level requires additional teacher training. One teacher commented, "I would recommend inservices to give the teacher some comfort in working with these materials." Another teacher commented, "I had to bring in vocabulary that was not in the unit itself and draw on my own limited background" in order to teach the materials well.

We also asked teachers about their impressions of participating in the review process. Some teachers commented on the importance of using
research-based criteria as a way of discriminating between materials and making informed judgments. The process of training teachers to apply research-based criteria in combination with field testing seemed to be a reasonable way to help teachers decide which materials were strong and which were weak.

**Conclusions**

The following are some tentative generalizations based on the results of this study:

1. Economics education materials at the middle school differ signifi-
cantly in their quality. Teachers are able to discriminate between teaching materials—both textbooks and supplement materials—according to how well they meet research-based criteria. This seems to be helped when teachers are provided with special training and an opportunity for field testing.

2. Supplemental materials are stronger in providing opportunities for improved instruction than are textbooks.

3. Textbooks tend to present more accurate economic content and are more attractive than are supplemental materials.

4. Most of the economics materials designed for use at the middle school grades are bland, uninteresting, and do not draw on the economic experiences of young adolescents. It appears that these materials generally are not very appropriate for students in this age group.

5. Successful use of economics education materials at the middle school level depends in part on a strong inservice education program for teachers.

Limitations
There were, or course, several limitations in this study. First, while it can be argued that involving 15 teachers in a study of this type is an appropriate number, we would have preferred to have included more teachers and to have broader geographic representation. Second, it would have been better if we could have included more types of materials in the project. For example, films, microcomputer software, and simulations were ruled out of the study in favor of print materials. Moreover, some materials were not included because they came out before or after the time limits of this study. Finally, while the instrument developed for this project was research-based and reviewed by teachers and experts in economics education, no reliability check was conducted.

Implications
Based on the interviews with teachers in this study, it seems clear that teaching materials for middle school economics are not very strong. The teachers concluded that only a few materials seemed to meet the criteria identified for this study. It seemed, for example, that many materials which were identified as being appropriate for grades 7–12 are really only appropriate for the upper grades, perhaps 9–12 or 10–12. We might ask how typical this is of middle school teaching materials beyond economics. There may be a need to develop curriculum materials in social studies, for example, which have a better “fit” to the middle school youngster. Educators for the middle school must effectively articulate demand for products specifically designed for middle school.

The design of the study which included development of a research-based instrument, training for teachers, and field tests of materials, seemed to work well. It seems reasonable to conclude that this type of process would
work well for others types of curriculum materials, including films, videotapes, filmstrips, and software.

Many critics in education complain about the poor quality of the teaching materials in schools. The long-term solution to poor quality teaching materials is to encourage teachers to demand better quality products. An implication of this study is that social studies curriculum committees, school districts, and state departments of education should give serious attention to how teachers on a larger scale can be trained to be more selective in the types of products they demand from producers. Careful identification of materials, selection of research-based criteria, examination of the materials, including systematic field testing, all seem to be important components producing higher expectations for the products we use. These increased expectations will encourage producers to develop higher quality products. We think that this is an important message to send to consumers as well as producers of educational materials.

References


CURRICULUM MATERIALS REVIEWED
(By Publisher, Title, and Publication Date)


Alberta Education Center, *Teacher-Student Activities in Economics*, 1982. (S)

Allyn and Bacon, *Introduction to the Social Sciences*, 1985. (T)

Center for Teaching International Relations, *Teaching About the Consumer in the Global Marketplace*, 1985. (S)


Georgia State University, *Keeping Up With the Jones’ Kids*, n.d. (S)


J. Weston Walch, *Understanding Our Economy*, 1977. (T)


Teachers College Press, *Economic Issues*, 1981. (S)


The purpose of this study was to explore further the validity of a theory as to the causes of student attitudes toward the subject of social studies. The theory developed by Haladyna, Shaughnessy, & Redsun (1982) proposed that student attitudes toward the subject of social studies are determined by: (1) the teacher, (2) the classroom environment, and (3) student history. Their correlational research showed that the environment accounted for more variance in attitudes than did any other factor, and they encouraged researchers to examine the environmental variables that influence these attitudes. This should be of particular importance to social studies educators because of the relatively low esteem of the subject of social studies in the minds of students (Shaughnessy and Haladyna, 1985).

This study replicates a research design and statistical method from a previous study conducted on this theory (Fouts, 1987). Educational research in general, and research in social studies education in particular, has been criticized for being conducted in isolation and for not being related.
to previous research. Replication of studies is not a common practice, and is usually the rare exception. Several researchers in social studies education have articulated this weakness. They have recommended that the replication of previous studies is necessary and desirable to build a cumulative body of knowledge over a given area and to improve the generalizability and reliability of the results (Jantz & Klawitter, 1985; Leming, 1985; Nelson & Shaver, 1985; Fraenkel, 1987).

The original study was a causal-comparative design and its purpose was to further explore environmental determinants of attitudes toward the subject of social studies. The classroom environments of 27 senior high school social studies classrooms were assessed and grouped by type using cluster analysis. The views or attitudes of the students toward the subject of social studies were compared among the three types of classroom environments. The findings of the study gave support to the Haladyna et al. theory and showed that students in certain types of classroom environments have more positive attitudes toward social studies than do students in other environments, and that these environmental dimensions are, to a large degree, under the direct influence of the classroom teacher.

For this study an attempt was made to follow the research design of the original study as closely as possible. Sampling procedures, instrumentation, data collection techniques, and statistical design were identical. The one notable exception was that where the population and sample of the original study was the senior high school (grades 9–12), this study focused on the junior high school (grades 7–8).

Research Design

A sample of junior high school social studies classrooms (491 students) was selected from three junior high schools in two suburban West Coast school districts. One class was selected at random from each teacher in the schools who taught social studies. This resulted in a sample of 20 classes out of a total of 52 classes. Classes designated as an “advanced class” for honor students, or as a “basic skills class” for remedial students were eliminated from the sampling procedure. These accounted for approximately 10% of the social studies classes in these schools. The remaining population of classes were “regular” social studies classes, consisting of 7 U.S. History classes, 2 world geography classes, and 11 classes where social studies (primarily world geography) was in a block with language arts taught by the same teacher. The average class size was 24.6 students, with a class size range of 15 to 31 students. Of the 491 students in the 20 classrooms, 79% were white. Ten of the teachers were male and 10 were female. Eight of the 20 teachers had social studies as their primary area of certification or training, while the professional preparation of the other 12 teachers was in an area other than social studies.

As in the original study, this study used the Classroom Environment Scale (CES; Moos & Trickett, 1974) to assess the classroom environments.
The theoretical basis for such assessment is traced to Murray's needs-press theory. This theory holds that to understand a person's behavior it is important to understand a person's perception of their environment. It is believed that it is this environmental perception that dictates behavior, and that the collective view of a group of individuals is an adequate representation of that environment. On the CES students are asked to respond to a series of questions about their perceptions of the classroom environment. From a theoretical perspective (Murray, 1938) and from empirical results (Chavez, 1984; Haladyna et al., 1982) such perceptions are related to affective and cognitive outcomes.

The CES consists of nine environmental dimensions or scales: (1) Involvement, (2) Affiliation, (3) Teacher Support, (4) Task Orientation, (5) Competition, (6) Order and Organization, (7) Rule Clarity, (8) Teacher Control, and (9) Innovation. The responses of the students are pooled to develop classroom profiles of the environments, with interpretations of the various scale scores provided in the manual. There are 10 response items for each scale, resulting in a mean scale score from zero to 10. The authors report Kuder-Richardson Formula 20 internal consistencies for the scales ranging from .86 to .67, and six week test-retest reliabilities ranging from .90 to .72. Intercorrelations of the subscales average about .25, indicating related but yet distinct aspects of the environment. Content and concurrent validity were established through correlational studies and classroom observations and interviews, and summarized by Moos (1979).

The students completed the CES in their social studies classrooms in group settings during the months of March and April. At the same time, the students also completed the identical forced-choice questionnaire used in the original study and based on questions asked by Schug, Todd, & Beery (1984) while interviewing social studies students. This questionnaire asked the students to identify their favorite and least favorite subject, and to identify the subjects they view as their most important and least important subject.

To categorize the varying classroom environments by type, I performed a cluster analysis on the environmental data. In this procedure the classroom is used as the unit of analysis with the nine CES mean scale scores as the variables used in the clustering procedure. As in the original study the clustering procedure used was the Euclidean distance and the nearest centroid sorting method with cluster centers estimated from the data, and the number of clusters (three) decided a priori (Anderberg, 1973, p. 160). A general explanation of cluster analysis and of this particular procedure is presented in the original study (Fouts, 1987, pp. 107-108).

Results

Table 1 displays the classification cluster centers formed by the 20 junior high social studies classroom means on the Classroom Environment Scale. Table 2 displays final cluster centers (means) and Euclidian distances be-
Once the clusters are formed, they may be analyzed by comparing the means and variances of the variables used in the clustering procedure. In this case, by comparing the final cluster centers (means) and variance partitioning of the CES environmental dimension scores, it is possible to identify

### Table 1
Classification Cluster Centers Formed by the Classroom Environment Scale and Twenty Social Studies Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Dimension (CES)</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>8.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Organization</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Clarity</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Control</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>4.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2
Final Cluster Centers (Means) and Euclidean Distances Between Final Cluster Centers Formed by Twenty Social Studies Classroom Means on the Classroom Environment Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Dimension (CES)</th>
<th>Cluster 1</th>
<th>Cluster 2</th>
<th>Cluster 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>8.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>6.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order &amp; Organization</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Clarity</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Control</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

between those final cluster centers. Three classes are in Cluster 1, 13 classes are in Cluster 2, and 4 classes are in Cluster 3.
the distinguishing environmental characteristics of the classrooms in the three clusters. It is also possible to compare the clusters on variables not used in the clustering procedure to identify other distinguishing characteristics.

Since the purpose of cluster analysis is to form clusters by maximizing between-cluster variance and by minimizing within-cluster variance, the expectation is that the cluster CES mean scores would be significantly different on one or more of the variables used in the clustering procedure. Table 3 provides the analyses of variance results of the CES means (Table 2) for the three clusters. The cluster mean square figure represents the between cluster variance, with the error mean square representing the within cluster variance. These variance partitions and resulting F ratios indicate which environmental dimension scores were most instrumental in the formation of the clusters. The clusters differ most on the environmental dimensions of Rule Clarity, Involvement, and Competition scales. All of the resulting F ratios were significant at the .05 level, and eight of the nine F ratios were significant at the .01 level.

Student responses to the forced choice questionnaire pertaining to their least and most important subject and to their favorite and least favorite subject were analyzed using the cluster as the unit of analysis. Crosstabs of these data showed that none of the 65 students in the Cluster 1 classrooms identified social studies as their most important subject, whereas 5% of students in Cluster 2 classrooms and 6.8 percent of students in Cluster 3 classrooms did so. Chi-square analysis of this distribution was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 4.28, p < .12$. Crosstabs of the least important subject responses showed that 32.3% of the students in Cluster 1 identified social studies as their least important subject, followed by Cluster 3 students and Cluster 2 students, with 25.2% and 23.3% respectively. Chi-square analysis of this distribution was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 2.40, p = .30$.

Crosstabs of student responses as to their favorite subject showed that 25.2% of the students in Cluster 3 identified social studies as their favorite subject, followed by Cluster 2 students and Cluster 1 students, with 18.0% and 10.8% respectively. Chi-square analysis of this distribution was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 5.74, p < .06$. Crosstabs of the least favorite subject responses showed that 35.4% of the Cluster 1 students identified social studies as their least favorite subject, followed by Cluster 3 students and Cluster 2 students, with 23.3% and 20.1% respectively. Chi-square analysis of this distribution was significant, $\chi^2(2) = 7.18, p < .03$.

The class size means for Clusters 1, 2, and 3 were 21.7, 24.9 and 25.7 respectively. Analysis of variance of these means found no significant differences among the clusters, $F(2,17) = .87, p < .43$. A chi-square analysis of a cluster by teacher sex crosstabulation was not significant, $\chi^2(2) = 1.41, p < .49$. 
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Table 3
Analyses of Variance of the Three Clusters Formed by the Classroom Environment Scale and Twenty Social Studies Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Dimension (CES)</th>
<th>Cluster MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Error MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involvement</td>
<td>23.363</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Support</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.08</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order and Organization</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Clarity</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Control</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A cluster by teacher preparation crosstabulation showed that three of the four classes in Cluster 3 were taught by teachers whose professional preparation was in an area other than social studies. The remaining nine classes taught by these teachers were all in Cluster 2. The three classes in Cluster 1 were taught by teachers trained as social studies educators. Chi-square analysis of this distribution was not significant, \( \chi^2(2) = 5.34, p < .07 \).

**Discussion**

Examining the CES mean scores (Table 2) for Cluster 1 shows that the classroom environments in this cluster are characterized by low scores on the Order and Organization, Involvement, Teacher Control, and Rule Clarity scales. These low scores indicate an environment in which the students do not behave in an orderly and polite manner, and have little attentive interest in class activities or assignments. The teacher is seen as inconsistent in dealing with rule infractions, while the rules themselves are not clear or followed. In short, the distinguishing characteristics of these classroom environments appear to be primarily in the area of weak classroom management.

In contrast to these environments, the Cluster 3 classrooms appear to be classes in which the students are well behaved, usually remaining calm and quiet in well organized activities, are involved in class discussions, and even do additional work on their own. The teachers in these classes have established clear classroom expectations, and are consistent in enforcing the rules. However, the moderate scores on Teacher Control indicate that the teachers do not need to take enforcing action to any great extent.

These Cluster 3 classrooms also are differentiated from the Cluster 1 classrooms in that the students have a higher degree of affiliation with their fellow students (Affiliation) while still competing for good grades (Competition). They perceive their teacher to place more emphasis on learning and being on task (Task Orientation), and perceive the teacher to be more helpful and interested in their well-being both in and out of class (Teacher Support). However, when the cluster mean square figures and \( F \) ratios from Table 3 and the mean differences from Table 2 are considered, it appears that Cluster 1 and Cluster 3 are differentiated most by the amount of student involvement in class and teacher classroom management skills. The classes in Cluster 2 appear to provide varying degrees of the environmental characteristics that separate Cluster 1 and Cluster 3.

The results of the forced choice questionnaire suggest that students in the Cluster 1 classrooms have a more negative view toward social studies than do students in the other clusters. This is supported by the significant finding where over 35% of the students in the Cluster 1 classrooms identified social
studies as their least favorite subject. The analysis that approached significance is further evidence in support of this. Only 10.8% of the Cluster 1 students identified social studies as their favorite subject as opposed to 18% and 25.2% of Cluster 2 and Cluster 3 students respectively ($p < .06$). Indeed, while not statistically significant, the pattern of responses for the most important subject and least important subject indicates more negative views on the part of Cluster 1 students.

The findings of the original study using high school classes also found that students in certain types of classroom environments displayed differing views toward their social studies classes. Those findings were statistically significant, as well as supported by the pattern of the responses in statistically non-significant analyses. In the high school classes however, the clusters were differentiated by the amount of teacher support, student involvement and affiliation, and innovative and diverse teaching strategies. Students in classrooms with high scores on these variables had more positive views toward the subject of social studies than did other students. These findings were supported by Haladyna et al. (1982) using correlational research, and by Schug, Todd, & Beery (1984) using student interviews. The same is true among the junior high students in this present study. Cluster 1 classes have lower scores than Cluster 3 classes on all of these environmental dimensions.

While these data suggest support for the theory, the evidence is not conclusive. The mixed results of the statistical tests on the distributions of the forced-choice questions are noteworthy and deserve attention. These distributions and patterns may have been only chance findings. In such a case, they suggest a possible alteration of the causal theory of classroom environments and student attitudes.

In both this study and the high school study, statistical analysis of the distribution of responses for the forced-choice attitudinal questions showed a clear relationship between the classroom environment and a student's "least favorite" subject. Also, in both studies statistical significance was not found on the two questions dealing with importance of the subject. Even though there were expected patterns present in the data on these two questions in both studies, they may have been chance findings.

This indicates that the theoretical notion of the classroom environment as a determinant of attitude toward social studies may need to be revised as the construct of "attitude" is more specifically defined. While both "favorite" and "important" are indicative of an overall attitude toward a subject, they are clearly distinct constructs. Therefore, the data in this study and the high school study support the causal theory of the classroom environment as a determinant of a student's least favorite subject. The role of the classroom environment in determining how important a student views social studies is
less clear. The non-statistically significant findings indicate that a clear relationship has not been established and that there are other possible causes of the importance that a student attributes to social studies.

The large percentage of students who identified social studies as their least important subject is troublesome for social studies educators. Even in the classroom environments where a large percentage of students identified social studies as their favorite subject, a large percentage still identified social studies as their least important class. While the classroom environment may be a partial determinant of this attitude, there are undoubtedly other causes of these student views. Future research should focus on the relevancy of course content and subject matter, and on teacher effort and effectiveness in communicating this relevancy in the various classroom environments.

Involvement was the only environmental dimension that was a major differentiating characteristic common to the original high school study and to this junior high study. For the junior high classes, the environmental dimensions related to classroom management (Order and Organization and Rule Clarity) were more instrumental in the cluster formation. Those environmental dimensions did not emerge as important with the high school classes.

The analysis of the clusters by teacher preparation is a very similar finding as obtained in the original study with high school teachers. In both studies the less desirable Cluster 1 classrooms were all taught by teachers trained as social studies teachers. In both studies teachers not trained as social studies teachers were well represented in the most desirable Cluster 3 classrooms, and in this study that distribution approached significance \((p < .07)\). Haladyna et al. (1982) found only a low correlation between professional preparation and student attitudes toward social studies, and even a negative correlation between type of certification and attitudes toward social studies.

In both this study and the original study it appears that the teachers trained specifically as social studies teachers were not more effective in creating classroom environments that were related to more positive views of the subject of social studies. In fact, in both studies trends in the data indicate that they may have been less effective in this area. When the data from the two studies are combined, crosstabulated, and analyzed, statistical significance is achieved supporting this idea \(\chi^2(2) = 7.76, p = .02\).

**Summary and Conclusions**

The purpose of this study was to explore further a theory as to the causal relationship between classroom environments and student views of the subject of social studies. The research design replicated a previous study. Identical measures, data collection procedures, sampling procedures, and statistical design were used. However in this study junior high classes and
students were used instead of high school students and classes as used in the original study.

Generalizing from these results is limited by the nature of the sample. The sample of classes represented a suburban school district with limited ethnic diversity, and did not include basic skills or honors classes. These two sample limitations were identical with the original study. A third limitation of the original study was all male teachers. Following the same sampling process in the junior high schools resulted in an equal number of male and female teachers in the sample. However, teacher sex did not emerge as an influential factor.

The overall results of this study provide evidence in support of the Haladyna et al. theory as to the causal relationship between the classroom environment and student attitudes toward social studies. This theory was developed and supported by correlational research at grades four, seven and nine (Haladyna, 1982). Additional support was obtained through causal-comparative research at the high school level (Fouts, 1987). That model of causal-comparative research was employed in this study which provides further support for the theory overall and also at the junior high level.

The results of this study have lead to three specific conclusions. First, students in certain social studies classroom environments view the subject of social studies in a less favorable light than do students in other types of classroom environments. This conclusion is in keeping with the Haladyna et al. theory and was a conclusion of the high school study.

Second, common environmental dimensions emerged between the junior high and senior high studies as important for differentiating between classrooms with more positive attitudes toward the subject of social studies. In both studies classroom clusters identified by low scores on Teacher Support, Involvement, Affiliation and Innovation had students with more negative attitudes toward the subject of social studies than did students from the clusters characterized by high scores on these scales. And of these classroom dimensions, Involvement emerged as the strongest common element in the two studies.

Third, while common environmental dimensions emerged as important for developing more positive attitudes toward the subject of social studies, at the junior high level the environmental dimensions related to classroom management emerged as even more important than the common environmental dimensions. This element of the environment was not instrumental in distinguishing the clusters in the high school study, but was very important in the junior high study.

In addition, the data in this study suggest that "attitude" as a general construct needs to be defined more specifically, and that the classroom environment does not affect all manifestations of student attitude equally. For example, the environment does appear important in affecting student like and dislike of the subject of social studies. Conversely, the environment
may be less important in determining student views of subject importance, which may be influenced more by other factors, such as content relevance. Experimental research is needed on this theory before causation can be shown and before the theory can be accepted. These two studies have identified potential treatment variables for such experiments. Exposing students to various controlled classroom environments should result in improved attitudes toward social studies.

Specifically, it can be hypothesized that a treatment (classroom environment) involving one or more of the following will result in a positive change in attitude toward social studies at both the junior high and senior high levels:
- diverse teaching strategies and routines
- active student participation in the lesson
- cooperative learning activities among students
- positive interpersonal relations between teacher and students.

At the junior high level, the hypothesis would be altered to include strong teacher classroom management skills. The research also should focus on the desirable quantities of the environmental characteristics, as well as their effects in isolation and in interaction with the other variables.

The environmental dimensions mentioned in this study are classroom variables that are under the control of the teacher to a great extent. The social studies-trained teachers were not successful in creating environments associated with more positive attitudes toward social studies. This is a disturbing and perplexing finding and should be explored through further research. This may be a chance finding or due to some other unidentified factor. However, it also may mean that training as a social studies teacher did not provide the awareness and skills necessary for creating these more desirable environments.

An important implication of this theory is that we social studies teachers may be creating the views students have of our subject matter by the teaching styles and techniques we employ, and by the types of classroom environments we create. We have the ability to modify teaching techniques and to alter classroom environments when necessary, thus changing student attitudes. The implication for social studies teachers is that we can create more positive attitudes toward our subject with conscious effort. With this in mind, vital areas for preservice and inservice training for social studies teachers become apparent.
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Reviewed by Tom Colwell, Philosophy of Education/Environmental Conservation Education, 737 East Bldg., New York University, Washington Square, New York, New York 10003

The study and teaching of history and the social sciences has, like every aspect of life and culture in the modern world, been dominated by the distinction between nature and culture. History ordinarily means human history, while the study of nature is conducted by science. The distinction seems perfectly self-evident: while humans live in nature and interact with it in countless ways, they are not nature itself. Nature is the non-human biophysical world—the world of sky, soil, water, plants, and animals (non-human animals)—and as such constitutes a supporting and interwoven but nevertheless different kind of reality from humanity. Thus, the distinction between nature and culture turns on the further and more profound philosophical distinction between humanity and nature, mind and body, as set out by the early modern philosophers and scientists in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. Their view was that humans are mind-operated bodies; and while human bodies, and all other bodies that make up the material world, may be studied and known by the quantitative methods of science, human minds and passions, and the individual and social life they generate, must be approached less exactly through the various humanities, including history. Hence, history as it is commonly understood today, reflects the philosophical dualism upon which the modern world was founded, a dualism setting apart what was, and largely still is thought to be, two quite different though unaccountably connected kinds of reality: nature and mind.

Since World War II and the rise of concern about environmental problems, the nature-culture dogma has begun to be questioned for the first time. Indeed, the environmental movement was virtually launched in the 1960s on the premise that humanity is part of nature, a premise which provided the philosophical justification for a wide range of ecologically inspired ideas: improved conservation of resources; less wasteful and less polluting technologies; more humane and respectful treatment of other forms of life; and ultimately the redirection of industrial civilization away from its course of rampant, mindless growth to a pattern of simpler, cooperative social arrangements more in tune with the ecological cycles which regulate the larger natural world. Yet, environmentalists have often been unclear just what it means to be part of nature. Does it include only
individual humans, or humans and their entire civilization—H-bombs, stinking city buses, and plastic trash, which seem to be anything but natural? In their earnest desire to defend nature against human depredation, environmentalists have wanted to draw a line somewhere between "pure" nature and human artifice—though unclear just where that line should fall—while steadfastly holding to the ecological dictum that humans are still part of nature. But the moment such a line is drawn, the dualism of humanity and nature they sought to escape, reenters by the back door. In this, environmental thought illustrates the very great difficulty anyone today experiences trying to make a clear break from the nature-culture distinction, which has maintained an unrelenting and unassailable hold on Western thought since the dawn of the modern world.

The intractability of the philosophical problem of humanity’s relationship to nature is, I suspect, a fundamental cause of the relative paucity of efforts on the part of historians and social studies educators to explore more extensively the relationship between human events and the forces of the non-human world, and the possibility of making their interconnections the central subject-matter of historical investigation, in contrast to the conventional anthropocentric framework. This is precisely the approach to history taken by Henry Hobhouse in his fascinating book, *Seeds of Change* (1986). It is a work in which the excitement of human agency is hardly diminished, but is looked at differently, in a setting which illuminates the determining influence bio-physical forces—in this case, plants—have had on the shaping of human events. Hobhouse makes it clear that this determinism has been very powerful indeed: the world would be a quite different place but for these plants, its history a different story altogether. History is a conjoint affair of mutual interaction; humans and plants are the single stuff of history, not the exaggerated exploits of humanity set against a passive backdrop of nature. While *Seeds of Change* foreswears philosophy and ideology, and therefore offers no solution to the nagging philosophical question of humanity’s relationship to nature, it might be said that no armchair solution to that question will be possible without first confronting the practical examples of the ecological approach to history this book contains. *Seeds of Change* will therefore offer both immediate satisfaction in its stimulating and freshly told tales, while displaying its material in a framework which will indirectly lead us to ponder the philosophical questions related to the nature-culture distinction.

*Seeds of Change* is by no means the first attempt to present history from an ecological perspective. In the post-war years, a very small body of writing has accumulated in this genre, of which I will mention those I have been familiar with. In the 1940s, a disabled London physician named Ratcliff Salaman, tiring of the ordinary pursuits of his new-found country retirement, began quite by chance to observe his gardener working the potato patch, and there and then inexplicably fell in love with potatoes. His

While *Seeds of Change* limits itself to five plants—quinine, potato, sugar cane, cotton, and tea—the historical ground covered is extensive and is based on careful survey of primary and secondary sources. It is therefore more up to date than the others mentioned and anything but limited in scope.

The story of human dealings with these plants that Hobhouse recounts is a grim one, to say the least. He does not downplay human accomplishment, but the overall impression I came away from the book with was of despair that so much of the civilization we value today was built on wholesale displacement and enslavement of countless millions of people, and serious disturbance, long before the environmental problems of our time, of significant areas of the earth. Even the simple pleasures we take for granted were obtained at great cost. Tea, for example, contributed to the decline of China. “The exchange of opium for tea over more than a century was a crime which no one even today acknowledges as the man-made catastrophe it was” (Hobhouse, 1986, p. xiv). Sugar, another daily pleasure for many, was the direct cause of the transatlantic slave trade, and a continuing source of discomfort for those who react adversely to it. “... after the acknowledged drugs,” says Hobhouse, “sugar is probably the most damaging of the commonly consumed addictive substances ...” (Hobhouse, 1986, p. xiv). And quinine, in providing widespread relief from Malaria, opened the tropics to European colonization, and caused the displacement of at least 20 million Indians and Africans in the cause of cheap labor. The tragic folly of humanity’s pursuit of these plants, and countless other of the earth’s resources, is perhaps best expressed in Montaigne’s poignant lament:

So many goodly cities ransacked and razed; so many nations destroyed and made desolate; so infinite millions of harmless people of all sexes, states and ages, massacred, ravaged and put to the sword; and the richest, fairest and the best part of the world topsiturved, ruined and defaced for the traffic of Pearles and Pepper... (Montaigne, 1965, p. 144).
But the real lesson of *Seeds of Change* lies not so much in recounting an unhappy past, as in the realization that "the traffick of Pearles and Pepper" continues unabated. The plants sought out and "hunted," as Cinchona was in the quinine trade, for the satisfaction of our pleasures and addictions, are often different in name, but the cost to human health and dignity, and the health and stability of the environment which supports both plants and humans, are greater than ever before. In humanity's deepening dependence on hard drugs and their plant sources, and in the continuing destruction of tropical forests—begun in the hunting of Cinchona—it is apparent that the seeds of change continue to bear bitter fruit. As Hobhouse remarks at the end of his chapter on quinine:

...the Amazon basin is being systematically destroyed, ironically a fate first made possible by the availability of quinine. Have naturally occurring chemotherapeutic agents already been destroyed which could cure cancer, which could be more effective than synthetics in helping depressive states, could prevent deformed fetuses, or multiple sclerosis, or disablement at birth? Are there many other plants containing cures for the ills of civilization? Should we not find out before we destroy their environment forever? (Hobhouse, 1986, p. 33).

If *Seeds of Change* is correct in its main argument that humans have misused their environment for short term gain, then it seems to me the responsibility of social studies educators lies in shifting the attention of their subject away from preoccupation with the human drama alone, to the interaction of humanity with the non-human biophysical environment. This shift does bring out the fact—which accounts, I believe, for the disturbing effect *Seeds of Change* has on the reader—that throughout most of human history humans have behaved irresponsibly, borne in large part because they have failed to consider plants, animals, soil, and water as equal partners in a cooperative enterprise. But an education which stresses ecological interconnectedness is anything but gloomy and pessimistic. It locates learning in the only true sources of hope and responsibility—the myriad sources of interdependency and nourishment which human life enjoys from the biophysical environment. Ignoring the need for this new location, education will continue to contribute to a sugar-coated history which will do little or nothing to prevent the tragic events recounted in *Seeds of Change* from being repeated. There can be no true social study that is not also environmental study, just as there can be no environmental study that is not also social study. Since the two are one, social studies educators should beat a path to the environmentalists and join ranks.
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Reviewed by Frances A. Maher, Wheaton College, Norton, MA 02766

This book represents a selection of recent work by a number of American radical sociologists of education, a group which over the past ten years or so has taken as its mission the study of American schooling as it reflects the class structure in our capitalist society. The book includes several theoretical chapters, including an overview of the field, and a number of studies of specific school populations. If you've been following the development of this literature and reading the work of Lois Weis, Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, Philip Wexler and others from the United States, as well as the work of Willis and other British sociologists of education, then you will find this book to be useful and also encouraging, summarizing their approach and showing some promising new directions. For example, its emphasis on gender and race as crucially salient categories of analysis and experience, irreducible to class, reflects real advances in thinking, with previous deficits in this arena acknowledged by Apple and McCarthy in their overview chapter.

If on the other hand, you are new to this body of literature, this book also serves as a helpful, clear and powerful introduction to its concerns. The authors of the individual essays, by and large, not only pick interesting groups to study such as visible, popular black students in an integrated high school, but they are clear and forthright about their methodological assumptions, concerns, and practices. Furthermore, the Apple and McCarthy chapter provides an extremely useful overview of the field, detailing the developments within the radical tradition, and compares these to the traditions of mainstream liberal research. The comparison of these two major schools of thought illuminates some strengths and weaknesses of both, a very useful exercise, since usually in educational research practitioners from different frameworks tend to simply ignore each other.

In this review I intend to summarize the topics discussed in the "Overview" chapter just mentioned, then describe some of the other contributions, most of which are specific research studies, and conclude with some ways in which the book might be useful to social studies educators. In their "Overview" chapter, "Race, Class and Gender in American Educational Research: Toward a Nonsynchronous Panallist Position," McCarthy and Apple describe a "stand off" between mainstream and radical researchers. They credit the liberal branch of the former with being responsible for "the present inclusion in the social studies curriculum . . . of themes of social justice, equity and multicultural education," but they criticize, I think rightfully, the liberal assumptions of "psychometric and individualistic frames of reference" and "the predominance of positivistic empiricist ap-
approaches to the analysis of educational and social phenomena” (p. 11).

Radical educators, they say, argue that “the liberal emphasis on the domain of values and individual achievement serves to divert our attention from the relationship of schooling to political economy and political power” (pp. 15–17).

Turning to radical approaches, the authors go on to trace the development of the radical critique from a basically functionalist or structuralist analysis of American education as a vehicle for the reproduction of the capitalist division of labor, to a more interactive model in which the working class and other oppressed groups actively resist, forming their own cultures and their own relations to the system. The earlier “reproduction” accounts, by overemphasizing the economic basis and class nature of capitalist forms of exploitation, made several key (and related) mistakes. First, they under-rated education as a “pale reflection” of deeper economic structures, and ignored the “specific and autonomous contribution of schooling to the nature of social life and social relations in general” (p. 18). Secondly, they needed to discover (and did in later work) that ideological and cultural processes (including education) were “relatively autonomous” from the society’s economic infrastructure. Finally, by emphasizing class, they ignored other categories of identity which are as important as class in shaping peoples’ lives—namely race and gender. To sum up, they say, “Of great importance, class—and later race and gender—was seen not only as a structure but as experience, as embodied in live actors and cultures. It did not simply “happen to people. It was a project” (p. 21). (Italics theirs.)

The authors conclude their overview with a call for a “paralllist” type of analysis within which race, class and gender are each and all looked at in each and all of the economic, cultural and political realms. I think this is a good start, but to say that “the dynamic relations of race, class and gender do not unproblematically reproduce each other,” “and that” “their intersections can lead to interruptions and discontinuities” does not quite capture the relationship of these categories in peoples’ lived experience. McCarthy and Apple still seem to think here that they are the same types of categories, in that they all reflect only aspects of our experiences of oppression and exploitation. In fact, feminist theory embraces issues such as sexuality, psychoanalytic constructions of the self, or “selves,” and the complex contexts of family life. All of these arenas of experience are more and different than just sites of oppression, making those who look at “gender” responsible for whole new categories of analysis beyond models of oppression and resistance. Furthermore, as the author of one of the subsequent essays in the book says in another context, these three categories are “nested” together—one does not experience her race, class and gender as parallel strands of identity but as some kind of (at least at times) integrated personhood. Gender and class, for example, determine the contexts within which people experience race. However, these are relatively minor points.
The overview is interesting, provocative and, as said earlier, accessible and illuminating to a wide range of educational theorists and practitioners.

In fact, the rest of the chapters in the book by and large make up for these defects by showing, in effect, how each category informs the other in subjects’ lives. These pieces are divided into two groups, those which emphasize structural approaches in which unequal educational resources embedded in the structure of schooling lead to unequal student outcomes, and those which emphasize “cultural forms,” in which the focus of attention is the students’ experiences and the meaning and purpose they make of their schooling. Thus, Part I emphasizes how schools shape students’ futures (based essentially on schools’ reproduction of the capitalist division of labor) and Part II emphasizes the autonomy and activity (though usually not the political power or the success) of the students themselves. (In fact, study after study discusses unhappily the ways in which students formulate individual rather than collective solutions to the various forms of oppression they face.)

Among the chapters I found especially useful were Lois Weis’s own contribution, a study of the future expectations of a group of working class high school girls; John Ogbu’s essay on the salience of racial stratification for educational outcomes independent from class; and Stanlaw and Peshkin’s examination of a successful integrated high school. Weis discovers, through in-depth interviews with a group of high school juniors, that in sharp contrast to earlier studies in both Britain and the United States, her female subjects insisted on a career to give them financial independence as their most important future goal—eschewing or intending to postpone marriage. In a carefully nuanced analysis she points out that in cities of declining industrial employment, and therefore declining male wages, the girls are responding to both their fathers’ plight and also to aspects of patriarchy they see around them in the form of wife abuse, drinking, and divorce. Weis says they tend to seek individualized solutions and, and except for the college bound girls, opt for female ghetto jobs, such as hairdresser, that may in fact not lead to financial independence. However, the young women may also organize for better conditions eventually. Ogbu points to aspects of black identity formation, such as a rejection of academic success, that challenge white norms and therefore create propensities to failure among black youth. This chapter is in fact a good and useful introduction to his work, which has been influential in the field of multicultural education. Like the Weis article, the Stanlaw and Peshkin chapter reverses our expectations by portraying an interpreted school where the black population is the most respected group. Juxtaposing this chapter with Ogbu’s essay is fascinating—that the blacks in the Stanlaw/Peshkin chapter are not looked up to for academic success but for various other aspects of talent and style). The authors’ conclusion is also fascinating and a little disturbing—“Riverview High School students have
created a world relatively free of overt prejudice, . . . but the cause that they celebrate is, in real-world terms, lost’’ (p. 226). I hope not.

The book has many other chapters that shed a useful and interesting light on these issues, particularly the relation between school contexts and future expectations and possibilities. How might it be useful to us as teacher educators, social studies curriculum specialists and so on? First, as mentioned earlier, it is a clear and cogent overview of the present state of radical research in the sociology of education, and locates this research within the field of educational research as a whole. Secondly, its individual chapters will be very useful in education courses—in Adolescent Development courses, Foundations courses, Ethnicity and Education courses and others. The portraits it draws of various groups of students—their needs, aspirations, and possibilities—also strike me as accurate. Books such as this can help us continue to promote educational practices and programs that are fair, useful and relevant to students’ lives. In short, these overall analyses of schools as social institutions, and these particular portraits of specific groups of students, are both relevant to the concerns of social studies educators.

Reviewed by Gabriel Moran, Department of Cultural Foundations, New York University, New York, NY 10003

Nancy Lesko has written an interesting ethnographic study on an important theme: the tension between community and individualism within a Catholic high school. The choice of Catholic school arises from a paradox which many people have come to suspect; namely, that the Catholic school may be more public than the public school (p. 3). Lesko begins with this suspicion and her study tends to confirm it. She finds that the myths and rituals of her chosen school are at least an attempt to wrestle with the conflict inherent in contemporary schooling. In contrast, the American public school, in the author's opinion, comes down at present on the side of individualism.

In her introductory section, Lesko is critical of structural analysis and ethnography (pp. 29-33). However, she draws from both traditions while trying to adjust for their deficiencies. Most particularly, she tries to give priority to the students' experience, letting us hear their sense of the problem and their attempts at a solution.

The conflict that the book recounts is usually described as "caring versus contest." The conflict is shown by describing in detail an opening day orientation for freshmen in which themes of both caring and contest emerge. The conflict is further illustrated in the lives of students and the distinct subgroups within the school's population. Then the book gives us attempted resolutions both at the level of organizational ritual (a spirit assembly) and in the personal behavior of students.

The author wisely chose to study a coeducational school (most Catholic high schools are not). Otherwise, the peculiar mixture of caring and contest might be attributed to its gender composition rather than to the fact that it is Catholic. The particular midwestern school, called St. Anne's, under consideration is in the upper range of Catholic schools regarding economic class and academic quality. The student body is almost all Catholic and the faculty presumably is, too, although the statistics on that point were not given. These days one has to note that there are several kinds of Catholic schools. Unlike the 1950s when "the Catholic school" was fairly homogeneous, today there are Catholic schools which have a Catholic faculty in the minority and others in which the student body is 80% non-Catholic.

This rapid change in what "Catholic school" means is not the direct concern of this book although the author does try to provide background on the changing Catholic scene. Why St. Anne's is the way it is seems to be dependent on its being religiously Roman Catholic, but exactly how this
relation works is not clear. This lack of clarity may not be the author's fault. It is a question that Catholic school administrators are unclear about even though it is a very central issue in the church's efforts to stretch its educational resources. Within the year at St. Anne's, a school worship service has a prominent place in the spirit assembly, and during the freshmen orientation day there is a time for prayer. In this latter context, the "religious education coordinators" of the school are introduced (p. 55) but we hear little about the teaching of religion elsewhere in the book.

The author has done an excellent job in penetrating the high school world generally and the Catholic high school in particular. She had had previous experience teaching in a Catholic school. But to give us the facts and flavor of St. Anne's she had to spend a year of her life attending classes, sitting in the cafeteria, going to assemblies and talking to numerous people connected with the school. She brings together all this data in a clearly organized and well-balanced presentation that gives us a feel for life at St. Anne's.

I would like to raise two concerns which are not necessarily disagreements with the author but are reflections on the difficulty of getting a consistent and comprehensive language in this area. Symbolizing Society is a study of one school; it does not claim to report on all schools or even on all Catholic high schools. Still, the author's ambition is to uncover some implications about U.S. society today; and that involves making philosophic distinctions that structure the relation between one school and the universe that encompasses it.

My first concern is the use of the term "public" throughout the book. A section on pp. 4-6 is headed "Diminishment of the 'Public' Dimension." Reference for the author's meaning of public is given to Hannah Arendt's Human Condition. But Arendt's use of the term is far more provocative and paradoxical than the usage here. (This book, like most, blends together social and public, something that Arendt adamantly opposes.) If one is going to say that a private school can be more public than a public school, then one has to give considerable attention to the peculiarity of the term. I am unpersuaded that a public realm has recently been diminishing. "Public" has had a mostly negative meaning throughout U.S. history but the public realm has kept expanding. The conflict within the meaning of "public" is not the topic of this book, but I think the book's findings might be enhanced with more discussion of the peculiarity of the idea of public.

My second concern is more to the point of the argument presented. The most common way of stating the school's conflict is to refer to "caring versus contest." This formula is related to a conflict between community and individualism but I do not think care and contest are adequate to describe the school's activities. I was surprised by the next to last sentence in the book: "Both the contest and caring views of schools need to be preserved; the tension between them is productive, just as is the tension between public and private welfare" (p. 148). Throughout the book, caring and contest are
regularly described as incompatible and contradictory views of the school.

The choice to classify everything as either care or contest seems to blur the fact of many kinds of contests in classroom, ballfield, theater and elsewhere. Contest in the book usually means one kind of individualistic and unhealthy competition. The author seems to assume that a "religious based" school would cherish the group and be most concerned with moral character. Striving for academic excellence in the classroom, it seems, is an intrusion from the individualism of secular society. It is unclear to me why a caring community cannot and should not include within itself a contesting for academic, artistic and athletic excellence.

The inadequacy of contrasting care and contest as alternatives is indicated by a forcing of data into one category or the other. I give two examples. The author interprets student discontent at "favoritism" as revealing of an underlying individualism; that is, they want no favorites in a contest (pp. 40-42). This is a peculiar conclusion to draw from the actual comments. The students object to such things as someone getting better treatment because his or her parents have given a lot of money to the school or an athlete being given special treatment in the classroom. The students think a community (as well as any of its contests) should be fair, that is, it should not treat students according to how rich their parents are and it should not let athletics rule the classroom. Favoritism violates their sense of community. Similarly, some students object to teachers' "spoon-feeding" (pp. 42-43), a fairly common accusation against Catholic schools in the past. Here, too, the author assumes that the complaints manifest the choice of (individualistic) contest over caring. But the students might be saying that if the teachers cared more wisely they would not make students so intellectually dependent. The Catholic school in trying to help students may inadvertently stifle the creativity and intellectual excellence that schools should foster.

I realize that no contrast of categories carries the same connotations for everyone. Symbolizing Society has to work within some of the ambiguities that it is trying to analyze. Like the school it studies, it cannot offer perfect reconciliations. But also like the school, it gives us a valuable grasp of a concrete reality and invites us to continue the search for greater understanding.
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An Invitation

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to contribute to TRSE and to encourage friends or colleagues who are engaged in important research to do so as well.

It is my hope that during my editorship TRSE will publish many different kinds of scholarship concerned with social studies education. Publishing recent doctoral research is quite appropriate for the journal. Scholarship dealing with women's issues, racial issues, environmental issues, economic issues, peace issues, political issues, historical issues and or philosophical issues of social studies education are all appropriate for this journal. Scholarship concerned with curricular materials and instructional activities have an important place in this journal. My intention is to include rather than exclude different perspectives on research and scholarship.

We all share a common faith that something we think of as research is at least one way we should seek to improve social education. We, as social studies teachers, want our students to come to some understanding of society and history, to be effective citizens, to avoid the aberrations of racial, religious and sexual prejudice. Through social studies education we hope to contribute to the development of a saner, more just, less polluted, less violent world.

Whatever this hope and aspiration, the actual world we live in presents a darker aspect: savage conflicts in Central America, Africa, the Middle East, Sri Lanka, The Philippines, and East Timur. Torture, assassination, arms races, world wide environmental degradation and homelessness, poverty and despair in many United States cities are everyday realities. Often torture and assassination are claimed to be progress, or the defense of democracy or a struggle for social justice. The truths of our planet are infinite and many of them are painful. On our troubled planet what is wisdom in social studies education?

What research is vital to our professional concerns? What should we seek to know that we do not know? About social studies education? About human society? About being human? About the conduct of social inquiry? What research is relevant to our highest aspirations and yet grounded in an awareness of our human condition? What issues should be explored in TRSE?

I would like to invite all readers of this journal to join in the exploration and clarification of ways we may seek to make social studies more honest in its treatment of issues, more significant in its intellectual challenge, more important in the lives of students.
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The deadline for submitting proposals is 2-1-89. They may be sent to either of the above along with questions or suggestions for the program. Program theme: Social Studies: Gateway to the Nation and the World.