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A Note From The Editor:

In order to facilitate the development of school-to-school, teacher-to-teacher, and environmentalist-to-environmentalist communications across national boundaries, NYU and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in New York have established a "computer conference" on EcoNet called, "unep-nyu.youthforum."

On May 11, 1990 a UNEP Youth Forum was held in the General Assembly room of the United Nations. Four thousand students attended. Students reported on environmental projects in which they had been engaged. The student accounts described projects dealing with toxic waste, recycling, water pollution, and other environmental issues.

Statements of young presenters at the May 1990 UNEP Youth Forum are being placed on the computer conference, unep-nyu.youthforum. In addition, information about the May, 1991 conference will be placed on this EcoNet computer conference. Schools, organizations and individuals in the United States and around the world may 1) check the conference in order to see what was reported about 1989-90 environmental activities of schools, children, teachers and what is being planned for the UNEP May 1991 Youth Forum, 2) make suggestions and comments about the May, 1991 conference, and 3) consider sending a group of young people to participate in the May 1991 Youth Forum in New York City. Students last year came from California, the Midwest, the South, Latin America and Canada. Next year, students may come from Japan, Europe, Africa, and Southeast Asia.

CUFA members may join this effort individually, through their social studies programs, through the schools with which they work, and the organizations in which they are active.

Organizations, schools, and individuals around the world, who now use EcoNet and its affiliated systems, are being invited to the UNEP/NYU computer conference (unep-nyu.youthforum) to the attention of teachers, students, schools, and other organizations concerned with youth and the environment. Some children will be able to come to the May 1991 Youth Forum in New York, but many more may participate to some degree by 1) reading about the projects and activities of others, 2) placing on the conference reports of activities in which they have been engaged, 3) writing directly by e-mail on Econet to schools, organizations and unep-nyu.youthforum.

New York University, Department of Environmental Conservation is taking responsibility for facilitating this conference in cooperation with UNEP in New York.

EcoNet is a non-profit computer telecommunications system with affiliations in Australia, Europe, Canada, Brazil, and Nicaragua. EcoNet may be accessed through a local telephone call using a computer and a modem.
is a $10 monthly fee which includes one free hour of off-peak usage. Further use costs $5 per hour for off-peak use (6:00 p.m. to 9:00 a.m.) and $10 per hour for peak use (9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.). For more information, contact:

EcoNet  
Institute for Global Communications  
3228 Sacramento Street  
San Francisco, California 94115  
(415) 923-0900

Computer telecommunications can be a powerful means of communications among young people today; environmentalists, social studies teachers, those concerned with sex equity, peace, and social justice may learn to use these systems in their struggle to preserve the environment and understand its global character.

For information about participating (electronically or otherwise), in the May 1991 Youth Forum you may write to Dulcie de Montagnac, UNEP, New York, NY 10017, FAX# (212) 963-4363.

Millard Clements  
Editor, TRSE  
EcoNet:mclements
Letters to the Editor

An Open Letter to the Membership of NCSS

I take this highly unusual action of writing because I have become frustrated with what I consider to be the National Council’s shrinking from democratic principles widely accepted in society, in social studies education, and in the standard literature of the NCSS. The principles I speak of include protection of minority interests, openness of debate, fairness and due process in treatment, and exploration of divergent views because there is no single truth. The recent situations I identify where the NCSS has exhibited decline in the use of these principles are two: the effort to produce a particular scope and sequence for a recommended social studies curriculum; and the apparent unwillingness to recognize strong criticism of the 1989 National Commission on the Social Studies Task Force Report on curriculum.

During the nearly 30 years of my active membership in NCSS, I do not recall a similar time when the NCSS seemed so determined to squelch debate and to deny controversy in what appears to be a concerted effort to place an extraordinarily traditional and conservative stranglehold on the social studies. I do not know the reasons for this censorious and anti-intellectual effort. It may be the result of a lack of commitment to or understanding of the principles above, a longing for recognition by the AHA or other scholarly associations, a belief that the NCSS leadership should “know best”, too little time for the Board to think through its action or inaction, too limited an involvement of the Board in the day-to-day activities of the Council, confusing signals from the membership, or some other reasons. Whatever the cause, the message I and others have received is that the NCSS is not committed to free expression divergent views, and equality of treatment when it comes to the most important question in the field—what is social studies knowledge?

To illustrate my point in these two situations:

Scope and Sequence Proposals

The Council, in response to a House of Delegates resolution, appointed a task force to develop a scope and sequence. That task force, limited by budget to a single state, presented a proposal which properly became subject to debate only after the Curriculum Committee forced the issue and appeared before the Board to argue why the debate should occur. Following this, open opportunity was made available for other proposals. This produced six other scope and sequence proposals, including one on which I was co-author. After they were published in Social Education, and without notice to the authors, the Board apparently decided to stage a competition among them by establishing a task force to select three proposals using criteria the task force would determine. The authors of the proposals were not notified.
of the competition, the task force, the criteria, or any opportunity to modify the proposal. This, I submit, was neither fair nor did it follow normal rules of due process. I was sent a letter by NCSS President Don Schneider notifying me that ours was not among those selected; those which were selected had the opportunity to modify their proposals before further distribution, an opportunity not provided to those not selected. I wrote a letter of protest to Don and received a letter explaining the process used, but not responding to my claims that the process itself was basically unfair and illegitimate. The announcement of the winners in *Social Education* did not indicate any dispute with the process or the result and readers must have assumed that the authors of the original proposals had been given equal opportunity and information about the competition, the criteria, the task force charge, and the ability to modify. This situation denies the standard processes of fairness we teach students in social studies classrooms.

**National Commission on Social Studies Task Force Report**

The Commission was apparently established by the AHA and joined by the NCSS. The Curriculum Task Force prepared a draft report which was circulated. As one of the recipients, I wrote a long and strongly negative response and received a letter which thanked me and indicated that I would not like the final report any better. When the final report appeared, I wrote a letter of protest to NCSS President Mary McFarland and proposed that the NCSS follow Shirley Engle's proposal to disavow the Report. The response from Mary was friendly but not agreeable; it suggested that the Report was considered too narrow but that she hoped it would be forgotten soon without making it an issue. I understand that Mary received seven or eight letters from prominent NCSS members, suggesting that the issue was more important than the Board may have suspected. I understood that the Board was going to take up the matter at a meeting last winter, but that did not happen.

I assumed that the 1989 NCSS meeting in St. Louis would feature discussion and debate about the scope and sequence proposals, the National Commission Task Force Report, and the new work of the NCSS Curriculum Committee because I consider them interrelated. What I discovered, however, at the meeting was a high visibility evening session featuring Professor McNeill explaining the Task Force Report and providing no critical respondents. The report document was withheld from the audience until after McNeill spoke, as though the audience could not grasp the written word without oral interpretation. I was personally disturbed by McNeill's presentation and its "teacher-proof" mentality, but I was pleasantly surprised by the large number of disgruntled attendees leaving and muttering about the poor presentation and their view of McNeill's lack of awareness of schools and social studies. The next morning was a session misidentified in the program as "Reactions to the Report". I thought we might finally hear some critics, but I was
mistaken, since the entire panel was composed of writers and advocates of
the report. At that session the panel was very defensive, admitting that
McNeill's presentation was not what they had hoped. The room was
crowded and all but one of the audience participants (another member of
the Commission) were negative about the Report. At that session at least
three former National Council presidents spoke strongly against the report
and disparaged the NCSS involvement in it.

The Task Force Report was easily the most controversial part of the NCSS
Conference, and among the most controversial topics in the past quarter cen-
tury. I fully expected to see reflections of the dispute in the NCSS publica-
tions, but nothing has appeared. *The Professional* treated the conference as
though it was as bland as usual and as though the Report reflected the NCSS
view, and *Social Education* has yet to treat the controversy. The members
of NCSS have all received a copy of the Task Force Report, presumably
because NCSS gave its mailing lists to the effort; those who did not attend
the annual meeting sessions must have the impression that it is a formal NCSS
document and the best thinking of NCSS on what the curriculum should be.
NCSS has made no other statement. Indeed, I was appalled—after I had got-
ten the letter from Mary McFarland indicating that she presumed it would
all just blow away—to receive my dues notice from NCSS this spring and
find an order form to buy copies of the Task Force Report. That represents
advocacy without dissent. There has been no separation of NCSS from the
Task Force Report for the vast majority of NCSS members, and no idea
of dispute about the report and its recommendations.

I have tried to get criticism of the Report into the NCSS literature by con-
tacting Fran Haley and Sam Natoli, and by sending a long criticism to Sam
several weeks ago. I understand that an issue of *Social Education* may con-
tain critical views, but that the issue will have Commission members write
a prologue (I agree that this is appropriate), but that the critical article
authors are to send copies of their manuscripts to Commission members who
will draft responses before publication. That has the facade of fairness, but
it means the Commission gets first and last statements without opportunity
for rebuttal by critics, in addition to the excessive publicity provided to the
Report by the NCSS at the national conference and in the mailings. Thus,
I advocate publication of the criticisms with Commission members able to
respond after the issue is published, in a manner similar to the treatment
of critics to this point.

I would also expect to have the dispute as a feature of the upcoming na-
tional conference in California. Yet, I and other critics I have corresponded
with have not heard from the program committee to secure program status.
Clearly, the McNeill and "Reaction" panels were selected by the program
committee last year as a featured attraction and not through standard pro-
posal forms; I do not think it fair to ignore the critics or to give them a ses-
sion in competition with many others at an inconvenient time. It is my
presumption that the program is probably set and that the dispute is not featured. If true, it will be more evidence of an effort to squelch debate and cover up the issue.

There is an interesting irony in all of this. The Commission and Task Force get all the publicity, with obvious support of the NCSS, while the historic and lengthy body of NCSS literature about sound social studies, the recent NCSS scope and sequence proposals, and the NCSS Curriculum Guideline revision seem to be forgotten. NCSS seems to be working against itself, or in great confusion, in regard to thoughtful consideration of curriculum proposals.

The reason I write to you as Board members is to seek your actions in restoring fairness and diversity to their proper status in the NCSS. NCSS should not be the witting or unwitting participant in academic imperialism that forces ideas on the field without dissent. It should not even provide that impression, and should strive to recognize and publicize dissent as necessary to progress in a democracy. I ask that the Board undertake actions in that regard, to wit:

Coordinate the various NCSS-related curricular actions without giving any one preferred treatment, have the Curriculum Committee review all proposals before NCSS publicizes them, and provide for dissent in materials published and distributed;

Reinstitute an open process for scope and sequence proposals on the grounds that a dynamic field is better than a static one and rescind the unfair competition previously held; or substitute a new competition on announced criteria;

Send a special and significant notice to all NCSS members of the dispute(s) and of the separation of NCSS from the Task Force Report and Recommendations and include information on the scope and sequence proposals as well as the curriculum guidelines;

Provide a featured session or more for critics and advocates of the Task Force Report to dispute publicly at the NCSS meeting in Anaheim;

Request that the NCSS newsletter and journal convey dissenting views on these and other matters of concern to the field;

Seriously consider actions proposed by Shirley Engle to Mary McFarland last year;

Convene a task force of appropriate members to consider the policies and practices of NCSS in regard to the protection of principles of fairness and diversity in NCSS operations.

Jack L. Nelson
The State University of New Jersey-Rutgers
Graduate School of Education
10 Seminary Place
New Brunswick, NJ 08903
Mary McFarland's Response

It has been reported to me that you are considering the publication of a letter written to the Board of Directors of the National Council for the Social Studies on May 24, 1990 by Jack Nelson. Jack Nelson is critical of the handling of matters related to the National Commissions' Curriculum Task Force Report and states in his letter, "Indeed, I was appalled—after I had gotten the letter from Mary McFarland indicating that she presumed it would all just blow away. . . ." In another part of the May 24 letter, he states that I (McFarland) "hoped it (the report) would be forgotten soon without making it an issue." I want to advise you that these statements attributed to me in Jack Nelson's letter are untrue. I understand and appreciate from our telephone conversation of 6/19/90 that you have agreed that any form of publication of Jack Nelson's letter of May 24, 1990 will be accompanied at the same time by the enclosed background statement and the actual letter I wrote to Jack Nelson (the letter to which he refers in his May 24th letter and the only letter or communication of any kind that I ever have had with Jack Nelson).

I have placed Jack Nelson's May 24th letter on the agenda of the next regularly scheduled meeting of the NCSS Board of Directors. The letter will be mailed to board members prior to the meeting and a full airing of his position will be possible at the next scheduled board meeting, July 27-29, 1990.

Mary A. McFarland, President
National Council for the Social Studies
Parkway School District
12657 Fee Fee Road
St. Louis, MO 63146

Background Statement

Jack Nelson is critical of the handling of matters related to the National Commissions' Curriculum Task Force Report and states in his letter of May 24, 1990, "Indeed I was appalled—after I had gotten the letter from Mary McFarland indicating that she presumed it would all just blow away. . . ." In another part of the May 24 letter, Jack Nelson states that I (McFarland) "hoped it (the report) would be forgotten soon without making it an issue." I want to advise readers that these statements attributed to me in Jack Nelson's letter are untrue and I provide a copy of the only letter I have ever written to Jack Nelson. It is, in fact, the only communication of any kind that I ever have had with Jack Nelson.

I include my letter for publication along with Jack Nelson's letter. In this way readers may examine my exact response to concerns raised by Jack Nelson in his letter sent to me last November. I would also refer interested readers
to the President's Message in *The Social Studies Professional—the Newsletter of the National Council for the Social Studies* for January/February, 1990, "Are We Mending Fences or Exploring Open Territory," and for March/April, 1990, "Questions, Questions and Then Answers," both of which present my positions on curriculum processes in my own words.

**Ms. McFarland's Original Letter**

Dear Shirley and Jack:

Thank you both for your letters and especially for your kind remarks with regard to my presidential address. It makes me pleased that persons whom I hold in such high regard found my thoughts worthwhile. I was pleased with the annual meeting—especially the record attendance and cooperative St. Louis weather. Within a couple of days after the conference, however, I caught the upper respiratory version of the flu, from which I am still recovering.

I also appreciate your comments about the report of the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission. It is predictable that the report and the process are being met with mixed feelings, as has been the case with each and every effort addressing the issue of scope and sequence. As you know, NCSS has taken two parallel paths—involvement in the commission and development by social studies professionals of an array of excellent models. You may also know that the Board has requested the development of a curriculum packet which will make reference to all available options.

It has been my personal position that multiple options are desirable. My next message for TSSP (draft included) explores the advisability of multiple options and promotes continued review of all options and planning by social studies teachers, as opposed to the uncritical acceptace of any model suggested by others. I have also been quoted in *Education Week* (November 29, 1989) as supporting multiple options—"different outstanding ways" that schools can work toward improved social studies education.

Thoughtful critiques of all ideas are welcome, whether expressed in sessions at the annual meeting or published in *Social Education*. However, I believe that NCSS is best served by focusing our critique and discussion on multiple options, have supported the concept since I first ran for election to the NCSS Board, and continue to do so through interviews and publications.

Again, thanks to you both for your strong contributions to improved social studies education.

Very truly yours,

Mary A. McFarland
President, National Council for the Social Studies
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Teachers' Backgrounds and Beliefs: 
Influences on Learning to Teach 
in the Social Studies

Marilyn Johnston 
Department of Educational Theory and Practice 
Ohio State University-Columbus

Abstract

This paper reports an interpretive case study of two certification students involved in a one-year, elementary school post-baccalaureate teacher education program. It describes how students' background knowledge, beliefs, experience, and personalities influenced what they learned in a social studies methods course and their consequent learning to teach. The paper describes the partial and differential ways in which the methods course and certification program influenced the students' beliefs and teaching practices.

Introduction

Increasingly, researchers are turning their attention to the influence of teachers' background knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes on teaching. In the Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (Travers, 1973), Lortie commented: "We have too few studies which explore the subjective world of teachers in terms of their conceptions of what is salient" (p. 490). In the recent Handbook of Research on Teaching (Wittrock, 1986), an entire chapter is devoted to studies that "seek to understand how teachers make sense of their work" (p. 505). In social studies, however, relatively little attention has been paid to teachers' backgrounds and beliefs as they influence the teaching of social studies.

We know little about how practitioners, rather than scholars, give meaning and purpose to social studies and how these meanings, rather than scholarly definitions, give direction to classroom practice. We know little about the intentions and beliefs which underlie practice. (Adler, 1984, p. 13)
The present study considered teacher certification students and how they construct meaning and purposes related to the social studies; in particular, how their background, knowledge, beliefs, and previous educational experience influenced the outcomes of a social studies methods course and their consequent teaching practice. The study follows two certification students involved in a one-year (four-quarter), post-baccalaureate teacher certification program through their course work, field teaching, student teaching, and into their first year teaching.

The Social Studies Methods Course and Certification Program

A brief overview of the objectives of the social studies methods course and certification program provides a context for examining students’ beliefs and teaching practices. The certification program emphasized a developmental approach to understanding children’s capacities and learning, promoted a hands-on and integrated curriculum, a literature based/whole language approach to reading and writing, and encouraged reflective teaching. The goals of the social studies methods course included:

1. Providing an historical overview of the social studies as well as current trends, as a context for students to define their own teaching aims.
2. Practice of critical thinking as well as discussion of issues related to critical thinking as a goal of the social studies.
3. Critically examining a variety of approaches and perspectives in the social studies (social sciences, moral education, multi-cultural/global education) and using the field teaching placements to assess them in practice.
4. Developing curriculum which reflected students’ point of view and critiquing how it worked in practice.

Research Study

Participants

The case study students were volunteers from a group of students asked to participate on the basis of scores on the Defining Issues Test. The D.I.T. (Rest, 1979) indicates levels of moral reasoning and has been found to relate to differences in teachers’ understandings of teaching (Johnston, 1989 & 1986; Lubomudrov, 1982; Oja & Smulyan, 1989; Wheaton, 1985; Witherell, 1978). Students in the upper and lower quartile of scores were considered; gender, race, and field placement assignments were also considered. Further, students’ in-class writings about their experiences and educational beliefs related to the social studies were studied. The objective was to identify students who were different on a number of dimensions (levels of reasoning, backgrounds, beliefs) and also to achieve some balance related to gender and race. Five of the six students who were asked to participate agreed to do so. They included: three women, two men; four caucasians, one black. All participants were teaching in the same school for their field placement for the social studies
methods course, and there were differences in D.I.T. scores, backgrounds and beliefs. The two case study students discussed in this paper are both men, one black and one Caucasian; both were in the lower quartile of the D.I.T. scores.  

Data Collection

The data collected for this study included:

1. A lengthy interview given during the third week of the first quarter and at the end of the certification program. The interview focused on background knowledge, beliefs, and teaching experience related to the social sciences and social studies.

2. Weekly individual discussions (during the first quarter) and bi-weekly discussions (in following quarters) focusing on participants' understandings of the course content and their field experiences and student teaching.

3. Weekly classroom observations (during the first quarter) and monthly observations (in following quarters) of field teaching experiences with follow-up discussions.

4. Two videotaped segments of students' teaching followed by stimulated recall interviews.

5. Course work over the four quarters of the certification program.

6. Weekly classroom observations and discussions as they begin their first year teaching.

The interviews and classroom observations focused on students':

1. "Common-sense" knowledge (what cognitive psychologists call script knowledge) of the social sciences and of teaching and what they learned from experience in schools.

2. Subject-matter knowledge from course work in the social sciences, and its influence on their beliefs and teaching practices.

3. Principles and exemplars of professional knowledge as formally presented in the social studies course and subsequent course work in the certification program as it influenced their beliefs and teaching practices.

4. Ways in which they applied, extended, and consolidated personal and professional knowledge in the context of supervised professional practice.

5. Ways in which their personal beliefs and school experiences influenced participation in and use of ideas presented in the social studies and other methods course.

6. Ability to reflect on personal beliefs, knowledge, and practice and the influence of such reflection on subsequent beliefs and teaching practices.

Data Analysis

The data from each case study was analyzed by identifying emergent themes and topics in the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 347-351). Themes included beliefs and attitudes that were consistent throughout the case study; topics were more specific categories that frequently appeared in the data. The themes
were typically different for each case; for example, control as central to the
teacher's role or an emphasis on developing children's self-concept. Many
of the topics were similar across cases (integrated curriculum, management
techniques, teaching strategies used in social studies), often reflecting topics
discussed in the certification program or in the interview questions. The data
were coded to these themes and topics. Interpretive accounts of each case
were then written that incorporated the larger themes as well as the more
specific topics. As these interpretive accounts were being constructed, they
were shared periodically with the student collaborators for "member checks"
(Lincoln & Guba, 1985, pp. 314-316) and revisions were made in response
to their comments. These suggestions had a significant influence on the in-
terpretations, and yet it is clearly a researcher-dominated text. The author-
ity of the researcher perspective in these interpretations and in the written
form of the text is acknowledged.

**Researcher Perspective**

The theoretical perspective that grounds the research is philosophical
hermeneutics (Bernstein, 1985; Rorty, 1979). On this view, reality must always
be interpreted. Reality is not out there to be objectively discovered, rather
it must be interpreted through one's "preunderstandings" and the historical
assumptions in which they are grounded (Gadamer, 1975). Similarly, in this
type of research, the goal is not an "objective" account of a reality outside
the researcher, but an explication of the researcher's understandings of a real-
ity of which she is a part. From this point of view, a researcher's explication
of her assumptions is essential to understanding the research results.

In this research project I understood my work to be a process of inter-
pretation. This meant that I was not aiming to describe my case study students
in an objective way; rather I would be learning and changing in the process
of trying to understand what they meant as they talked to me. In this respect,
I tried to keep in mind Gadamer's (1975) sense of the "fusing of horizons"
during conversations with my student collaborators. Gadamer asserts that
meanings are constructed as the different understandings of reader and text
(or persons in a conversation) are negotiated. On this account, my interpretive
account of changes in the students' beliefs and teaching practices would reflect
my evolving understandings of them.

My role as researcher and teacher in this project is also important to
understanding my interpretations. I taught the social studies methods course
and supervised the students' field teaching, as well as conducted the research
project. This dual role gave me increased access to the students' learning,
but also meant that I was in one sense researching my own teaching. This
may have unknowingly made me less open to diversity in what students were
learning, and/or made students less willing to be critical with me about what
they were learning. I tried to keep the problematic character of this dual role
in mind both in collecting and analyzing the data.
Results

The most general conclusion that can be reached from my interpretations of these case studies is a two-faced one. One is that the certification program in general, and the social studies methods course in particular, had an influence on the students' educational beliefs and teaching practices. The other face is that this influence is not uniform. The students' background knowledge, beliefs, prior educational experience, and personalities shaped what they took from the program and how they used it in their evolving teaching practice. Also the context of the schools in which they do their field placements, student teaching and first-year teaching were influential, but again the influence is partial and differential. It is the complexity of these interacting influences and the differences between the two student collaborators that are described in these case studies.

Case Study Interpretation: Tom

Tom enters the certification program as a 32-year-old white male, married, with twin pre-school age daughters. His undergraduate major was business. Before college he was in the Marine Corps for four years; after college he worked in his father's printing business, had his own business, and then worked as a management trainee at Penneys. He entered teaching because he was looking for a job to "settle into." He wanted a long-term involvement in a profession rather than an unsettling movement from one job to another.

Background Related to Social Studies

When Tom talked about his own background in the areas of the social studies it was mostly negative. On the pre-program interview I asked him:

What background or experience do you have that will influence your teaching in the social studies?

Probably no experience, nothing in school or college that I can remember that helped me want to teach things like that, geography, origins of man, history was the same thing. It was all memorization. Nothing was very interesting to me except one teacher who made economic history interesting. It was like he lived during this period of time, and he knew these people, who's having sex with whom. This guy was fantastic. It was like listening to a gossip column. He made it interesting. (Pre-interview, p. 11)

Tom saw his educational experience, both in the social sciences and his schooling in general, as boring and focused on the memorization of facts. When asked if he thought that he would teach as he had been taught, he responded with conviction:
If you can go through this program and still do that, then you weren't listening. No way. Maybe when I'm student teaching, I might do things I wouldn't normally want to do. I want to be on record that I don't want to teach the way I was taught. (Conversation, 10/17/88, p. 11)

Statements like this have a sound of certainty and in them the influence of the certification program is apparent. And yet Tom vacillates; his earlier school and learning experiences have their influence.

**Influence of Background Knowledge and Educational Experience**

What Tom knows and had experienced in schools influenced his educational beliefs and teaching practices as they evolved throughout the certification program. Two themes—control and basic skills—grounded Tom's thinking about teaching. His participation in the program influenced his understandings of these, but only partially. These themes contrast somewhat with the findings of Wilson's (1986) study of secondary social studies teachers. She described the influence of disciplinary knowledge on learning to teach in secondary social studies. She found that students’ disciplinary backgrounds were an important influence on how they transformed their knowledge of subject matter for teaching. Tom had views about subject matter in the social studies, but they were not framed by a particular disciplinary perspective. This may be explained by his undergraduate business major rather than a disciplinary area of study; it may be influenced by his teaching experience having been primarily in lower elementary grades.

Control and basic skills were themes more from his prior educational experience than perspectives supported by the certification program. In some cases, Tom struggled to resolve this contrast. At other times, he was consistent and unquestioning of his beliefs.

**Control**

Tom was convinced of the importance of control and adult authority. Teaching children to be respectful and compliant came before allowing initiative and child-initiated decisions. He had several ways of justifying the need for control in the classroom:

I think the other students feel safe when there’s a heavy hand controlling. That’s why we have a police force, sort of . . . I guess it’s the same thing, what you’re really doing is policing, you can show that you do mean business, you can show that you can be fair, that everyone’s going to be treated the same and that’s fair. (Conversation, 5/4/89, p. 10)

For Tom, control was a way of promoting fairness. If there was someone in charge, he or she could maintain an environment that protected individual rights.

At another discussion, also during his student teaching, he talked about control as it related to security.
In the classroom you need to feel secure that you can go in there and you don’t have to worry about your teacher being bullied, which also makes the children feel like they’re being bullied. They have no one to turn to, they feel insecure. (Conversation, 5/30/89, p. 7)

Authoritarian teachers typically do not encourage challenges to their ideas or authority. Tom appeared to make some distinctions here. He supported questions and challenges to ideas or procedures, but not to his authority related to classroom control and management. His support of student questioning showed up in a discussion of a 7th grade girl who argued fervently with him about a point in the lesson. I asked:

*Did it feel negative when she was arguing with you?*

I loved it, I don’t see it as negative. I’d want every kid in that room to disagree with me if they thought something I said was wrong. I’m sure some people do think it’s negative, but I don’t. (Conversation, 1/30/89, p. 6)

Tom’s support of student questioning may have been encouraged by his own self-perception that he has always been a questioner.

As Tom and I discussed this article, he was concerned about the tone of my interpretations related to control. We had the following discussion:

I guess I see myself, like everyone is or should be, if you don’t sometime say this is the way it’s going to be, then you’re going to be run over for the rest of your life, and the kids are going to be out of control. But you can’t possibly control every little thing. So what I’ve been doing is whenever I see something that I can back off of, then I do. If they’re on the floor or moving around the room, it’s not that important to me. They know when they’re supposed to be in their seats and when they’re not. I have certain times when I want them doing seatwork in their seats.

*Compared to the beginning of the year, there is a lot more talking and movement around the room. Maybe in the paper I need to describe these changes. Would I have it right to say that control is still important to you even though there’s more freedom for students—that it’s important for you to feel like the control is there and that you can have it when and where you want it?*

Right, just say that. The paper sounds like every minute of the day I’m controlling the kids. What you just said is what I’d like it to say. (Conversation about the paper, 12/6/89, p. 3)

My perspective on this concurs with Tom’s wishes. There was considerably more interaction among children and more student decision-making as the school year progressed. But he remained firmly in control and could easily bring the students back “into control” when he needed or wanted to.
I asked Tom, if he were to start the year over, would he be as controlling as he was at the beginning of this year. He responded:

I would start exactly the same way as I did this year. I would not change a thing mainly because I'm satisfied with the way things are going. You can look around the room, there are no problems, the kids are playing and doing things, it's noisy, but there aren't any problems. (Conversations, 12/6/89, p. 5)

Basic Skills

A second theme was Tom's belief in the primacy of teaching "the basics." By basics he meant reading, writing, and mathematics. Other areas were important and he thought education should be well-rounded, but if push came to shove, he dug in and focused on the basics. He considered these to be prerequisite to all other learning.

Tom's commitment to teaching the basic skills was evident when he visited an alternative school during his student teaching quarter. The school used a whole language reading and writing approach, had an international focus, and was in an open space building. It was an active learning environment with student projects displayed everywhere. Tom responded negatively. He summarized his reaction:

I think all they do is spend time trying to impress people with their artwork. . . . I can't say which technique [teaching approach] is better. I just think that maybe getting back to some of the basics is a better idea than trying to make the school look like a show piece. If they spend the majority of their time producing extensions, how can they be reading and writing? (Conversation, 6/1/89, pp. 4-5)

Tom's response implies that the extensions [projects that extend a concept or topic] do not teach students the basic skills. The philosophy of the alternative school was that basic skills should be taught in the context of projects that were meaningful. In contrast, Tom understood basic skills instruction as separate from extensions, and that such extensions were nice but not necessary.

Tom's emphasis on the basics and teacher control reflected beliefs he brought into the program, and they were only partially altered by his participation in the certification program. In other areas, the influence of the certification program was more apparent. These included the idea of integrated curriculum, a developmental perspective on children's abilities, hands-on approaches to teaching (particularly in science and math), and reflective teaching. There were also aspects of Tom's thinking where the influence of the social studies methods course was evident.

Social Studies: Definition and Goals

Tom's definition of social studies vacillated. He began the program giving a typical definition of social studies: "It's history, geography, and facts."
By the middle of the second quarter when he was taking the social studies methods course, his definition reflected a broader definition more in concert with that proposed in the course. But he had his own way of describing it:

It [social studies] qualifies for a catch-all category . . . it hovers over such a wide range of things, even its title, social studies, you can’t be narrow and say social studies is just this or that. It’s just up to the teacher to decide what the curriculum should be, given time restraints. (Conversation, 10/17/89, p. 7)

I asked him whether the methods class had influenced his thinking in any way. He responded:

I think a lot, especially attitude. I came in thinking that the teacher was the body of knowledge that the students all take something from. I still sort of hold to that. I think we have a lot to offer, otherwise we'd let the kids teach. . . . On the other hand, letting the kids talk, letting them participate. I think that’s very important. I think I’ve learned that. . . . All I did in high school was memorize. I didn’t have to do anything, no studying or thinking, but I still got good grades. It was sort of a joke. I think that’s a shame because even if the teacher did make me memorize, maybe he could have made me think more by posing a few questions. (Conversation, 11/28/88, p. 1)

Tom reported that his changing attitudes toward student participation had expanded his sense of what should go on in social studies, but his definition of social studies at that point (five weeks after the previously quoted definition) reflected his earlier view. I asked him:

You thought before that social studies was primarily history, geography and facts. How do you define it now?

It’s not too different from that. Like I said I still want children to know dates, but also know how they relate to history. I wouldn’t go in there and make kids memorize, I am totally against that. (11/28/88, p.1)

This definition was a narrower, more traditional definition than his earlier "catch-all" definition, though he was still opposed to memorization—the approach of his own school experience. In its place he talked about relevance.

If you were studying the Middle East, it wouldn’t be that important to know the names of the countries, their leaders, it's too much, but sort of lay out their relationship in the world . . . and what effect they have on the rest of the world. (Conversation, 11/28/89, p. 2)

At the beginning of his first year of teaching, Tom's definition of social studies was again a very broad one—he saw much of what was happening in his classroom as social studies. He was teaching in an alternative school that emphasized self-concept and community building. The school was
organized into "communities" identified by color name and marked in the halls by large colored bands that connected the classrooms in each community. Tom considered the focus on self-concept and community to be an integral part of his social studies curriculum.

Two months into his first year teaching a kindergarten/first grade, I asked him what he thought the goals of social studies should be. He responded:

To broaden the children's minds and make them aware of the world around them—the world in which they live. I try to do that. Even talking about the fire station [during Fire Prevention Week], that's social studies. We talked about the different occupations, and what you need to do to get that job. I think social studies can overlap everything, it can kind of creep into everything. It's like a octopus, it puts its tentacles into every subject matter. Memorizing times tables doesn't have a lot to do with social studies, but social studies can always have something to do with math. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 8)

Tom's definition evolved to the point where social studies permeated everything. I asked him how the social sciences fit into his definition of social studies. He responded:

Just that—they're the social sciences. They're specific headings unto themselves. . . . Social studies to me is like a giant puzzle with an infinite number of pieces. And all the little sciences are just pieces of the puzzle. There's never an end, there's never just one picture to the puzzle. It's just all pieces that interconnect. Almost like if every piece had a square cut out and there were male and female pieces that fit together. It doesn't go anywhere because you can just keep adding. Social studies is that whole big block and those little blocks—one unit or one total. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 10)

I tried later in this same conversation to check whether his broad definition of social studies disqualified it as one of the "basics."

You have all along been strongly committed to teaching the basics. Where does social studies fit, is it a basic?

Well there you go—you're pigeonholing it. I'm not going to let you do that because social studies is too broad. But you need something for your research, right? [chuckle] I just don't separate the basics that way.

But you do push the basics and you talk about them, particularly related to math and reading.

Yes, but social studies is different, it's broader than that . . . you're back into what's social studies—how it creeps into things because language is social, everything is social. You can capture so many things
in social studies because it’s not so focused. I like social studies probably better because of that.

Because it’s so vague?

Yeah, but it’s not too vague—I can pin it down to where it is in everything. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 12)

Tom’s conception of social studies was very broad—“it is in everything.” Therefore it was not really a “basic subject.” When he boasted about how well his children were doing, it most often was related to math and reading.

We do math manipulative for 40 minutes a day and they’re really going to know this stuff [addition]. They’re getting a little bored with it so I have to change the activity, but it’s really coming along. When I get better at doing this in a few years, I’m going to have kindergarteners doing third grade math by the end of the year. (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 6)

Relevance is a theme that grounded much of what Tom’s thinking about social studies. His perspective on this showed up early. He concluded in one paper he wrote the second week of the quarter:

I hope I never pass up an opportunity to make teaching relevant in a student’s life. . . . It [social studies] should be relevant. I feel anything that affects our everyday lives should be studied. (Paper for social studies methods course, 9/28/88)

An example of the importance of relevance came up in a discussion of geography. The topic was whether students should be required to learn place names.

I guess in my mind this is a ridiculous thing to store. Although there are times when I wish, like when someone says Rumania, I’d like to know exactly where it is without getting a map out. I would never teach something like that in lieu of something that is relevant like when we did the Chernobyl activity in your class. It made more sense to talk about what happened and the issues related to it than learning which is farther east, Chernobyl or some other city. (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 9)

Tom’s broad definition of social studies was a mixed blessing. It meant that the content was more open-ended and he liked the flexibility, but then social studies was relegated to a position of lesser importance. Social studies encompassed many things he thought were important to teach, but then it paled in importance compared to the basics which were clearly defined and mattered most when test scores were evaluated.

The influence of the methods course can be seen in his expanding definition, but he developed his own way of explaining it that did not directly refer
to how it was discussed in class. Tom’s commitment to relevance paralleled attitudes expressed in the methods course, but this attitude was one he brought to the program. He held a broad definition of social studies, but did not talk about the various factions or approaches that were discussed at length in the course. He did not in the end identify with or use any of the labels or categories discussed in class—citizenship education, social sciences approach, multi-cultural/global education. When asked directly, he conceded that they are part of the social studies, but he rarely used them to define his social studies objectives.

Influences on Learning to Teach in the Social Studies

The development of Tom’s teaching encompassed some diverse practices and influences. During the two quarters he was taking the methods courses, his teaching reflected the perspective of the certification program as he fulfilled requirements for his courses. For example, he developed a unit for the social studies methods course that integrated science and social studies which focused on weather and its influence on people. The field teaching placement for his team was a first grade. As he moved into his student teaching his approach looked more traditional and less like the approaches advocated by the program. Occasional statements from Tom supported this: “I think I am basically a conservative teacher;” “I have to admit to being too controlling.”

By the last week of his student teaching, two weeks before the end of the school year, the influence of the classroom and pressures from the school and cooperating teacher were readily apparent. During a field observation that week, the instruction was totally teacher-directed and skill-oriented. During the morning, Tom had first graders working in a direct instruction, whole group math and spelling lesson for a continuous $1\frac{1}{2}$ hours. The math was a review of addition; the goal was to get students ready to take end-of-the-year achievement tests. He was teaching addition by setting up patterns that the students modeled rather than the conceptual approach he had learned at the university. The children worked as a whole group, followed directions, and did problems at the board or on their papers as they were directed. They raised their hands to speak; they did not get out of their desk without permission. Tom handled the group expertly. He was sensitive to the students’ moods, changed strategies to provide variety, and encouraged them as well as demanded their attention and good work. The weather was hot and muggy, the school had no air-conditioning, and it was the end of the school year. I was impressed. But most of what he was doing was antithetical to what he “had been taught.” On reflection, he spoke of feeling pressured by the upcoming tests and the school’s ranking at the bottom in the district. He was not sure why he was doing math in the way he was—as patterns rather than teaching for understanding. There had been no time in the schedule for social studies for weeks.
As Tom began teaching in his own classroom, his teaching likewise looked quite traditional. His primary purpose was to get children “socialized.” I observed him on a morning the second week of school. The children were very controlled and most things were done in a teacher-directed manner. His interaction with students was replete with comments like: “This is how we do this” and “Let’s practice how to do that again.” There were also frequent rhetorical questions with students responding in unison:

Tom: What do we do when we want to talk?
Students: Raise our hands.

Tom: What do we do when I turn off the lights?
Students: Be quiet.

When rules were broken, students were asked to stand against the wall until they were ready to “make a contract” with Tom. Sometimes they decided when they were ready; sometimes Tom did. When they left the wall, they quietly told him what they were going to do so they would not have to stand against the wall again.

Tom was convinced that work on socialization was necessary before anything else could happen. Readings in the methods course that suggested negative consequences of school socialization did not make sense to Tom at the time, nor did they seem to have influenced his thinking about teaching. He saw socialization as a primary aim of teaching. It was part of social studies because it had to do with social interaction, rules, and working together.

By the second week of school more curricular activities were included, but there were still constant reminders about how things were to operate. Tom tried to have them work in centers, but concluded that it was too unstructured: “They’re not ready for centers yet.”

After two months of school many things had loosened up. Students worked on activities while Tom did reading groups. There was considerable interaction and student helpers circulated to assist those who needed it. At other times, students worked in centers. In general, there was less time spent on discussing rules and procedures, but if there was a problem Tom took time to reiterate his expectations.

Continuities, Contrasts and Partial Influences

As Tom relaxed the degree of teacher control, the tensions between his beliefs and goals and those of the program were more apparent. It became more evident where the certification program and social studies methods course had, and had not, an influence. When he was focused on socialization, there was little questioning of his goals. As his curriculum and objectives expanded, there was more evaluation of what he thought he should be doing.

There were aspects in his teaching practice that, at least theoretically, were contradictory. They represented both his previous attitudes experience, and
things he learned in the certification program. One way he dealt with this was to describe himself as an "eclectic." For example, in reading he did reading groups and worked with basal readers as well as had children write in journals and do creative writing projects. He saw problems with the basal readers (the stories were bland), but he used them because he felt required to teach particular skills on which students would be tested. The emphasis in the program on language-based reading and writing had influenced his teaching somewhat, but criticism of basal readers was not something he accepted wholeheartedly.

While Tom was supportive of textbooks in general and used them in other subjects, he did not use the social studies textbook—"It's the worst." In contrast to his reasons for using reading textbooks, he felt that he could cover social studies without a text.

*Have you been using the social studies textbook?*

Nope, it's terrible, I used it in my student teaching. You might be able to go through and find an idea, a springboard. But to go through it page by page—I hope I'm not doing these children a disservice . . . (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 4)

Doing children a disservice refers back to the idea that there were things that should be covered, something that they might miss if he did not use the textbook.

The influence of the certification program and social studies methods course were interactive with Tom's beliefs, background knowledge, and educational experiences prior to the program. Sometimes the program supported the attitudes he previously held; sometimes his prior beliefs persisted in contrast to the program's philosophy; other times there was change in his beliefs and teaching practices in the direction of the program. The continuity and contrasts are set in the context of being a first year teacher where the pressures and norms of the school milieu must be considered as well. The result is a complex and fluid set of pressures and ideas that do not sit still.

**Case Study Interpretation: David**

David is a 27-year-old black male, married, with a son who was born during the third quarter of the certification program. He completed an undergraduate major in public relations, taking a number of courses in political science, public relations, and psychology. He was particularly interested in political science and thought at one time about going into politics. After graduating, he worked as a bank supervisor and then for the Department of Defense in procurement. Five years later he decided to go into teaching and was accepted into the post-degree certification program.

**Views on the Social Studies**

David's aims and teaching practices in the social studies were influenced by a number of things: his experiences as a student; his educational goals;
and his teaching experiences. The social studies methods course influenced his thinking, but the influence was partial and interactive with his goals, experience, and teaching.

**Influence of Educational Experience**

David's criticisms of his own educational experience in schools influenced his goals for social studies. He was not as critical of his education in terms of content or approach as was Tom, but he felt that there was little individual attention and little push to excel.

Because I wasn't a behavior problem and I was passing all my classes, no one really pushed me. When I would go to a counselor, there would be a choice of basic math, intermediate math or you could take advanced math. I would say I'm not dumb so I won't take the basic but I'm not smart either, so I'll take the middle—the intermediate math. Well, that counselor did not say, why don't you try this. They let me slide right on in. When I looked back at my education I think if I'd been pushed, or challenged or even made to take those higher level courses, it would have helped me a great deal. It was disappointing that that challenge was not there.

*From that you have goals to do that for your students?*

Right. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 3)

From his experiences as a student, he was strongly committed to the personal development of his students. He was determined to encourage excellence, positive self concept, and to treat students as individuals with particular needs and interests. Another goal that he brought to the certification program also influenced his thinking in social studies—he wanted to be a role model for his students. He felt that he did not have role models when he was going through school. There was no one to emulate or encourage him to strive for excellence.

I look back on my school life and I can't ever recall being motivated to excel by my teachers, nor my parents—not to put them down, my father quit school to support his family which had 18 kids on the farm. They understood the importance of an education, but you need to make money too. They said go ahead and graduate and if you go to college, get your degree, but in terms of emphasizing grade points and excelling, I never really had that kind of encouragement. After I graduated I found out that was important . . . . It's not just a matter of getting a diploma, you have to prod yourself into being the best. Shoot for the stars, and if you only grab a cloud that's better than shooting for a cloud and falling back to earth. (Pre-interview, p. 1)

David was committed to being a role model for all his students, but particularly for black students.
I would love to see black kids feel good about themselves and see a black man who’s come up like they have and has created something positive. Kids today can tell you about crack, pimps, etc. Those are their role models. I want them to understand that there are more things to life than that. (Conversation, 2/23/89, p. 10)

David’s desire to be a role model for his students, and to encourage excellence, positive self-concept, and personal development influence his teaching practice in general, but in particular inform his thought about the purposes of the social studies.

Social Studies: Definition and Goals

David’s definition of social studies evolved. In the beginning he defined social studies in a typical way, “It’s history, geography, and government.” He discussed topics in his first interview that many would include in social studies, but David did not. For example, he made statements like:

I would be personally challenged to have my kids attack almost any political issue.

Black history and studies—that’s something I plan to emphasize a lot.

I want to get kids connected to and to appreciate their heritage.

Initially David did not understand these purposes to be part of social studies. By the middle of the second quarter (when he was taking the social studies methods course), his definition expanded to include the goals he brought into the program. He came to see the study of cultures, political issues, and black studies as legitimate topics in the social studies. He did not get to do much with black studies and political issues during his student teaching in the certification program, but he continued to feel they were important.

When he began teaching in his own classroom, half of his students were black. During the certification program, the schools he taught in had predominantly black students. With a more mixed ethnic student population, his views on the issue of black studies shifted.

At the schools I taught in during the masters program, I would have felt strongly about the need to emphasize black history. In my school now, I have taken a new perspective.

Why?

I guess because of the kids. It’s no longer a predominantly black situation so I think now—I don’t want this to sound racist or anything—but I think more in terms of a multi-cultural approach.

Would that be true if most of your students were black?

No, I would be thinking more about black history and African-American studies. I would also be doing multi-cultural things, but my emphasis would be different. (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 10).
David shifted his goals in response to the ethnic backgrounds of his students. He also modified his position on teaching political issues, particularly controversial issues. This change came about, not because of the students’ backgrounds, but because of his experience in the schools.

In terms of critical thinking and politics, I think there are some issues I would back away from. The abortion issue right now, I don’t know if I would deal with that.

Before the program you would have done that, have you changed your mind?

I think before the program I probably would have been more inclined to bring up controversial issues. Now I’m not so sure.

Because?

I guess because there are tough issues about what you can and cannot do in schools, for example, prayer in schools, saying the pledge.

You seem to be mentioning issues where we don’t have societal consensus—the controversial issues.

Right, for me to do something like that I would require a lot of feedback from parents before attempting to address those sorts of issues. If I got the okay from the parents I would feel all right.

Has student teaching and being in schools made you more cautious in this respect?

Yes, there are many controversial issues in schools. For example, during winter quarter, I had to go to the restroom so I just went into the boys’ restroom. I came out and Tom [his teaching partner] looked at me as if I was crazy. He brought up all these potential law suits, etc. I sat there like, “What are you talking about?” But then I thought about that. As harmless as that may seem, who knows what could come out of a situation like that. So I think I’m becoming a bit more sensitive to how I am in the school. That goes back to touching kids, I’m more aware of what I’m doing. (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 3)

One way to interpret these changes in David’s goals is to say that he was making professional rather than individual decisions. He came into teaching with a strong commitment to teach black children and to help them understand their ethnic heritage. Similarly he was concerned that his students be aware of political issues and what was going on in the world. When he thought about the shift in his thinking, he worried that he had become less committed to his original aims. A positive interpretation would be that he had become more sensitive to wider ethnic issues, to the students with whom he worked, and to problems of dealing with controversial issues. His views have become more professionally oriented and less personal and ideological.
After a couple of months of teaching in his own classroom, a fourth grade, I asked him about his current definition of social studies. His response represented an even broader sense of what was included in social studies.

It's a study of people, places, and issues—that is broad, isn't it?

*That sounds like it could include everything that happens in schools.*

Yeah, I guess if you think hard enough, whatever you teach has some social relevance. Kids are interacting with each other socially, and that's social studies too. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 6)

David's evolving definition of social studies seemed to be influenced by a number of factors; the methods course, his teaching experiences, and the sustaining aims he brought into the certification program. It is also likely that the continued discussion of his thinking and teaching as he participated in the research project may also have influenced his responses. Like Tom, his expanding definition of social studies moved in the direction proposed in the methods course, and yet he did not overtly attribute the change to it. Rather it seemed to develop from his teaching experience and in response to his personal beliefs and goals.

Also like Tom, David did not use categories or distinctions from the methods course to describe how he thought about teaching the social studies except in the case of some particular strategies (for example, involving students in moral dilemma discussions). To check this out, I asked him specifically about citizenship education. This was something discussed at length in the methods course. The supremacy of his original goals over the influence of the course was apparent. I asked him whether his social studies aims included preparing students to be "good citizens." He responded:

I think right now they're [his goals] more personal development. I want them to become good citizens. I think that's the goal of the school. As an alternative school it's focused on doing a lot of problem solving, sharing of thoughts and feelings, and discussing issues—that will help students become better people and better citizens. To keep in line with the schools' philosophy, yeah, citizenship is important. But for me, right now, I'd have to say I'm striving more for personal excellence and development of a positive self concept. (Conversation, 10/23/89, p. 3)

David's personal goals take precedence over goals proposed by the methods course and the alternative school in which he taught. Both advocated citizenship education as an important goal. David accepted this, but his personal goals are primary and remain the focus of his attention.

*Influences on Learning to Teach in the Social Studies*

David's field teaching and student teaching experiences had a direct influence on his teaching in the social studies. The approaches to social studies
he observed in his field and student teaching classrooms were different from the approaches advocated in the methods course. In order to accommodate these differing points of view, he appeared to adopt an eclectic approach. This eclecticism encompassed some aspects which at first glance appeared contradictory. This was strikingly apparent in his continuing support of "traditional education" coupled with his enthusiasm for the more liberal approaches advocated in the certification program. Speaking about traditional education in his pre-interview, he said:

I can’t say anything’s wrong with traditional education. . . . Millions of people have been raised on it, and I believe that traditional education and traditional ways of teaching have been successful. (Pre-interview, p. 3)

On the other hand, he saw himself as a "willing indoctrinee" of the program’s philosophy. He said:

I don’t have any problems with that [the program’s philosophy], and again I guess that’s because I didn’t come in with a specific opinion or a philosophy on how education should be. . . . I think it’s a challenge to try and take on this philosophy and see if it works for me and for the kids. (Conversation, 1/19/89, pp. 6-7)

Throughout the program, David continued to be uncritical of traditional approaches as well as willing to adopt many of the attitudes/approaches proposed in the program. He came to favor integrated curriculum, hands-on activities, discovery learning, cooperative learning, and to think of students in developmental terms. He also used textbooks and homogeneous groups for reading instruction. The former demonstrated the influence of the program; the latter a continuation from his own experience as a student and more traditional approaches to teaching.

Looking back on his participation in the program, he was sure that he would have taught as he was taught—"the teacher gives the information and students learn it"—without the influence of the program. During his field and student teaching, he continued in an eclectic mode. He tried a number of things and then decided whether or not they "worked for me and the kids." He experimented with things he learned in the program/courses, but also tried things he saw going on in classrooms.

The unit he developed during the social studies methods course was on Native Americans. He focused on activities that he thought would be engaging for the students and yet he had some definite objectives in mind. He and his partner used the social studies textbook and other resource materials, had students do library research in cooperative learning groups, and work in cooperative teams to do activities related to myths and languages. Activities were arranged to emphasize positive attitudes and participation. The objec-
tives were neither trivial nor particularly fact oriented. Rather, he and his partner were interested in developing some big ideas—appreciation for other cultures, appreciation for communication problems between tribes that spoke different languages. The influence of the methods course was apparent in how the unit was developed, but then there were course requirements to fulfill.

During student teaching David followed the classroom teacher's plan for social studies. This included chapters in the textbook on pioneers and the "westward movement." He worked carefully and skillfully through several chapters. His primary focus was to make the material relevant and to work on basic concepts and vocabulary. He frequently tied a vocabulary word or concept to students' experience to help them understand it. There was a lot of discussion and varied activities that followed each lesson. He experimented with traditional activities (answer the questions at the end of the chapter) and less traditional ideas (group projects, discussions) and then evaluated their effectiveness. His evaluation criteria included students' enjoyment, what they learned, and whether it felt good to him.

Continuities and Partial Influences

Some of the strategies that David incorporated in his teaching had links to the methods course/certification program (hands-on activities, integrated curriculum, relevance, teaching for "big ideas"), but his approach also reflected more personal priorities (teaching the content of the textbook through vocabulary and concepts, encouraging positive attitudes, exciting students about learning). Not that these latter priorities are in conflict with the attitudes of the methods course, but they seem more directly tied to the goals which he brought into the program.

One aspect of David's approach to teaching that remained constant, and was supported by his school teaching experience, was his reliance on the textbook for much of his social studies instruction. This continued even as he became more critical of them. When the principal asked the teachers which textbooks most needed revision, David put the social studies text at the top of the list. David's criticisms of the textbook were not necessarily the ones offered in the methods course (issues related to bias, fact orientation, superficiality). He did mention that they "touch on one thing and then they're off to another." But he seemed to have discovered this from using the textbook and from watching the students' reaction to them, rather than explicitly connecting it to the methods course. He also thought textbooks were unstimulating—"The textbook doesn't seem like anything that would stimulate me." Even with these criticisms, David continued to favor its use. As he said a couple months into his first teaching assignment:

I just happen to believe in the textbooks. My thinking is that schools have put all that money into them and therefore they value them. I think it's great for teachers who don't use them and can still get across what they need to, but I like them and a lot of my ideas come from textbooks.
I'm not the most creative person but if I see something in a book, I can build on that. I use the textbooks a lot, but more in a sense of helping to develop a lesson or introduce a lesson or idea. Also I think I can take a dry textbook and expand it and bring it to life for the kids.

*I think that's something you do very well.*

Especially the social studies textbook. Some of that stuff is really dry. I like to try and bring that to life.

*What does that mean?*

Just make them interested and so they will want to read and talk about the ideas. (Conversation, 10/22/89, p. 6)

For David, the textbook provided a useful guide for what and how to teach. He thought the limitations could be ameliorated. For example, he thought the textbook did not include enough information on blacks and women in history, so he proposed:

... when we get into history more, we can talk about advances that were made, I will bring in the contributions that blacks made, that women made. The textbook will only give them a feel for what we're talking about. My plan is to use a vast amount of outside material to get across my point of view, what I think is important. I want to bring in facts of history that aren't there, like there were black cowboys. There were black people here who weren't slaves, they were free. There were black people here before Christopher Columbus. ... I want to bring in some reality to the discussion ... hopefully it will expand their understanding. I want to give black children a pride in their heritage and where they came from, and white children as well. (Conversation, 10/27/89, p. 4)

David came into the post-degree certification program with particular beliefs, goals, experiences, and background knowledge which interacted with the ideas and experiences he had in the program. Some of his understandings changed, others remained constant. The purpose of the case study has been to explicate them—how they changed, where they remained the same, and the influences on them. Of course, this is difficult in so few pages, but I am hopeful that the examples and interpretation give the flavor of the constancies, changes, and complex influences.

**Discussion**

During this project, I have consciously tried to hold my interpretations tentative, and to question my conclusions in an ongoing way. When I have felt uncertain about an interpretation, conversations with Tom and David have been helpful. But then their input also had to be interpreted. In addi-
tion, both Tom and David were in the process of changing their minds about things, and, as might be expected, they were not always aware of the changes while they were occurring. Most of the time after extended conversations we came to agree on the interpretations, but occasionally we did not. Sometimes difference in interpretations resulted from the differences in our roles (researcher and teacher). But there are also differences in our personal philosophies, particularly between Tom and me. As Tom said to me recently: "You're really more on the liberal end of the continuum than I am." These differences in our philosophies may have encouraged more in-depth questioning that would have been the case if our intuitions and beliefs were more similar. By contrast, I found David's case somewhat less puzzling. The case is no less complex and evolving, but we had more shared ideas and I felt more secure in my interpretations. This, however, has caused me to wonder whether I may have read too much into David's case, stating my own perspective rather than his.

I have tried to consider these questions throughout the writing of these cases. The fact that such questions exist points to the inherent interpretive aspect of this type of research and my position that as researchers we should be explicit and reflective about our assumptions and research methods.

Conclusions

The anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1973) argues that it is necessary to first describe the particulars, the "richly textured details," before general truths, "the grand realities," can be ascertained. These case studies provide "richly textured details" and suggest some conclusions, some "grand realities," but do not establish them.

There are two conclusions, and they are related—that the influence of the methods course/certification program had a partial and differential influence on Tom and David's beliefs and teaching practices; and that this influence was interactive with their backgrounds, beliefs, personalities, and experiences. The result is an array of constancies, changes, and complex interactions.

First, the influence of the course/program was partial. There are clear indications that the methods course and certification program had an influence on both students, and that the influence on both was in the same direction. Tom and David came to adopt a number of attitudes proposed in the program. For example, they both argued strongly for an integrated curriculum and hands-on approaches to teaching concepts subsequent to the course; and there was evidence that they could think reflectively about their teaching. But the influence was partial. For example, they supported teaching with hands-on activities because it was developmentally appropriate for young children, yet both found it impractical, even unnecessary, to do this as much as they thought was advocated by the program.

The influence of the program was also differential. Even where Tom and David shared attitudes that evolved during the program, they often had dif-
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ferent ways of understanding them. For example, both supported the value of integrated curriculum, but Tom thought that everything should be integrated; and David thought some things were best taught in isolation. Tom thought integration increased relevance; David thought more in terms of its usefulness in promoting better learning. They both used textbooks—David because they gave him a framework and teaching ideas; Tom because they contained what children were supposed to learn.

The first conclusion is related to the second—the influence of the program was partial and differential because the new ideas were interactive with students’ backgrounds, beliefs, and personalities. New ideas came in contact with prior assumptions and experiences, and the latter informed how the former were interpreted. Subsequent ideas were then considered in light of these newly constructed understandings.

For example, take Tom’s support of integrated curriculum. He came into the certification program committed to making education relevant. This influenced how he came to understand the idea of integrated curriculum—an integrated curriculum was one that demonstrated to children the practical application of knowledge and skills. In addition, Tom saw things in practical terms and learned best himself when things were put in context and demonstrated concretely. His own approach to learning and his belief that learning should be meaningful influenced his support of integrated curriculum. This valuing, however, stood in contrast to another of Tom’s prior beliefs—that teachers should be in control and that their role was to teach things. A directive approach was not necessarily supportive of learning that was relevant and meaningful to students. Tom came to support student decision-making theoretically, but rarely in practice. As he said two months into teaching in his own classroom, “I can’t remember the last time I did that [let students make their own decision].” By December, he responded to this section of the paper by saying:

What you say here came from me, you didn’t interpret it wrong, it just needs to be clarified. These guys come up with all kinds of things and if it’s an idea that’s on track with what we’re doing, then I go with it. It would be stupid to ignore something that has their interest. (Conversation about the paper, 12/6/89, p.3)

This evolution of Tom’s beliefs and practices demonstrated the program’s partial influence.

The influence of the schools in which the student did their field and student teaching was also partial and differential. For example, David’s evolving beliefs and teaching practices were influenced by his field and student teaching experiences. His support of traditional teaching approaches and the use of textbooks was affirmed by his cooperating teachers, and stood in contrast to the perspective of the program. Yet the core of his approach to working with textbooks (focusing on concepts, vocabulary, students’ experiences,
and making it “fun and interesting”) was his own construction and did not directly reflect input from courses or teachers. His personal goals (to motivate and model excitement for learning), ideas proposed in the methods course (presenting multiple perspectives and supplementing the text), and the perspectives of the schools (support for textbook instruction) interacted in ways that show the partial influence of each.

Laments from theorists and researchers (Zeichner & Tabachnick, 1981, review this literature) that the traditional perspectives of the public school override the influence of teacher education programs were not borne out by these cases. Neither were proposals that students will teach the way they were taught in their long years of experience in traditional classrooms (Lortie, 1975; Maddox, 1968; Petty & Hogben, 1980; Wright & Tuska, 1967). It may be that these critiques miss the point. Learning to teach may not be a matter of one influence overpowering all others; it may be more a matter of interactions and continuities. These case studies suggest that any influence, whether program, school or persons, will be partial and differential. There are multiple influences that interact in any teacher education program; beliefs will be reconstructed in individual ways by persons with different histories and personalities. Students’ backgrounds and personalities provide a complex of beliefs and assumptions that will interact with new influences in unpredictable ways.

This conclusion calls less for despair than humility. It cautions teacher educators against simple expectations or conclusions. Students will reconstruct what we offer them in ways that reflect what they bring to our programs. As teacher educators we need to know what understandings students bring to our courses, and how they interpret new ideas. This calls for sensitivity to differences and interactions with students in ways that are dialogic rather than didactic. It suggests that we can learn from our students and they from us. It also suggests that we may enhance the influence of our programs if we better understand the way in which students’ understandings are influenced and constructed.

Endnotes

1. The program used various developmental theories to encourage students to consider the physical, social, and cognitive needs of children. Integrated curriculum was defined as an approach which involved working across different subject areas to teach concepts, generalizations or themes. A literature based/whole language approach included using children’s literature as a basis for developing a language program and teaching reading, writing, and oral skills in the contexts of meaningful language activities. Students were encouraged to be reflective about their teaching through the use of journals and group discussions about their teaching experiences.
2. The relation of D.I.T. scores and participants’ understandings of teaching is not discussed in this paper. To deal with this topic in addition to the focus on the paper would have required significantly more space. See forthcoming papers for a discussion of topic.

3. The two collaborators discussed in this paper were chosen because they were the only two of the five case study participants who got teaching positions.
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Abstract

The purpose of this study is to document the historical background contributing to the confused state of social studies skills in the United States today. A study of the historical literature spanning some 70 years documents how the current situation of chaos relative to skills came about. Terminology has always been a problem as the history presented here reveals. From the end of the 19th century to the present, there have been philosophical disagreements over a definition of skills resulting in confusion that continues to plague the field. The various skills movements include those of citizenship, inquiry, study, and thinking skills, often intertwined with one another.

The testing movement and the interest in propaganda play a role in the history of skills as the place of skills over the decades is described for the past 70 years. Particular attention is given to the efforts of the National Council for the Social Studies regarding social studies skills; the study relied heavily on documents from the library of the National Council for the Social Studies.

Introduction

Currently there seems to be little agreement on priorities for the instruction, organization, and definition of social studies skills. Even in the research related to the social studies skills, discrepancies are seen with regard to the scope of areas discussed. In one study (Cousins, 1976), broad general categories of data gathering and thinking skills were cited as the most important social studies skills. In another study (Guenther, 1973), the following somewhat narrower skills were described as the most important: (1) distinguishing between fact and opinion; (2) discriminately reading newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets; and (3) applying problem solving and
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critical thinking skills. While these studies indicate a lack of agreement over which skills have priority for instruction, they also illustrate lack of uniformity in skill categorization. These areas of confusion also reflect a general lack of semantical agreement by professionals as to social studies skill terminology. How did this confusion come about?

**The Study**

This study examines the history of the definition of social studies skills from the late 19th century to the late 1980s. The sources used for the study were drawn from university libraries, the ERIC data bank, the University of Michigan data bank on theses and dissertations, and the Library of Congress. Of particular value for the study was the library of the National Council for the Social Studies.

There are several difficulties for a researcher engaged in historical review of literature on social studies skills. Comprehensive literature on the history of the social studies skills appears to be non-existent. References to skills, however, can be found in general literature of the social studies, covering the past 100 years. Such references increase through the decades to an overabundance of sources existing on the social studies skills today. Therefore, the researcher, lacking any comprehensive histories of the skills, must engage in broad, diverse, and time-consuming reading of considerable material.

**Terminology Always a Problem**

Since the inception of social studies, its educators have disagreed over terminology as well as primary purpose. Arguments began early (and have continued) over guiding philosophy, curriculum, instructional methods, and need for reform efforts, as well as the effect of various reform movements on the profession. Educational history relative to the social studies, approximately from the end of the 19th century to present time, illuminates the philosophical disagreement and resulting confusion that has plagued the field, inhibiting improvement and progress. However, the most critical problem has been, and remains, communication hindrances.

**The “Skills” of Citizenship**

Beginning at the turn of the century, industrialization and increased immigration produced tremendous concerns over protection of American values. Thus, concomitant to the creation of “social studies” as an academic field came one of the earliest identified social studies goals involving skills: (participatory) citizenship. However, confusion over the terms “social studies” and “social efficiency” was echoed in early debate surrounding the advocacy of teaching the skills of “citizenship.”

Acceptance of the need to inculcate the knowledge and skills of citizenship by founders of the social studies was incorporated in reports disseminated by professional groups such as the National Education Association (NEA), the American Historical Society (AHA), and National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS) that were organized during the earliest attempts to define
and set goals for the social studies. Most educators during the Progressive Era accepted good citizenship as a teaching goal, but debate continued as to the definition of what was an appropriate education of citizens (Hertzberg, n.d.).

The Skill Called ‘‘Inquiry’’
The confusing terminology regarding social studies ‘‘inquiry’’ skills surfaced early on. ‘‘Inquiry’’ is one of the most recognizable, albeit confusing, terms used for social studies skill designation. Currently, this skill has numerous names and identities as well as an array of interpretations of its meaning and application. Inquiry has been advocated in some form in every major social studies reform movement. It was advocated as early as 1883 in the first methods textbook, edited by psychologist G. Stanley Hall: Methods of Teaching and Studying History (Hertzberg, 1981). Previously, the skill had been a tool of a generation of American historians trained in the German Seminar Method; such scholars made use of the ‘‘scientific’’ method in using primary or original sources. These historians believed that the testing and weighing of historical evidence allowed the writing of the best historical narration. Using university-based seminars, they promoted the idea of scientific research training beyond the natural sciences.

As the recommended borrowing from the methodology of the sciences for historical research took hold, the skill of inquiry began being referred to as the ‘‘laboratory method’’ (NEA, 1916, p. 169). This was promoted by the NEA whose Committee of Ten produced the famous Report of the Committee on Secondary Social Studies, (1916) which recommended teaching the sciences by the laboratory method. By that time, inquiry as a method of teaching had several appellations—the objective or inductive method, the scientific method, and the laboratory method (NEA, 1893, pp. 105, 119, 169).

Use of the laboratory method in the sciences led social studies educators to apply its principles to the teaching of history (Hillman, 1935). NEA (1893) made a mild suggestion of this sort by saying: ‘‘The value of history is increased if it is looked upon in part as a laboratory science, in which pupils learn to assemble material and from it make generalization’’ (p. 169).

In the 1880s and 1890s, the laboratory method was used as a method of teaching history. The ‘‘source method,’’ as it was called, meant that students selected and evaluated historical evidence and practiced the writing of history (Hillman, 1935, p. 65).

By 1900, enthusiasm for the source method had faded. When interest revived again, around 1910, the teaching procedure and philosophical emphasis changed. By that time, more than a dozen volumes of readings and sources were available for classroom use by teachers and students (Wesley, 1950, pp. 470–471). Interpretation of the source method meant that published collections of readings and selected sources were used as enrichment rather than application of the historian’s technique (p. 465). According to Wesley, ‘‘. . . sources were used to enrich and vivify the condensed accounts given
in textbooks" (p. 464). Hillman (1935) indicated that in the early phase of the source method, both historians and teachers were motivated to use the inquiry method to stimulate thinking and the formation of judgment (p. 65). While this early goal did not fade, the point of emphasis changed. After 1909, teaching procedures involved teaching "some history from the sources rather than teaching history by the source method, as was the case in the original source method" (p. 71). This meant that students would be exposed to original sources, but such materials were supplemented by textbooks written by historians, and were not the only source of information. The switch in emphasis promoted much disagreement among social studies leaders.

In 1897, the American Historical Society met to address issues regarding the source method. One side wanted to leave practice of the source method to university scholars and historians, while the other side wanted students to learn history by learning to use the actual process of the source method. As reported by Keohane (1949), leaders opposed to general practice of the source method in public schools won out and "the last chance that the source method would be one of the most common approaches to the study of history in American Secondary schools was lost for at least half a century" (p. 216).

**Thinking Skills**

The inquiry, objective or inductive, scientific, laboratory, source, or historian's method became part of the confusion regarding "thinking skills." Many early leaders in the social studies advocated efforts to improve students' ability to think. As noted above, 19th century proponents of inquiry were concerned with stimulation of thinking via the source method. One of the earliest proponents of thinking skills was John Dewey. To Dewey (1933), it was important to develop an individual capable of "reflective thinking"—which he termed "a better way of thinking" (p. 4). Today, some educators would refer to "reflective thinking" as "critical thinking." John Dewey defined reflective thinking as "(1) a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity, mental difficulty, in which thinking originates, and (2) an act of searching, hunting, inquiring, to find material that will resolve the doubt, settle and dispose of the perplexity" (p. 12). Isadore Starr (1963) called Dewey's two part definition "the class definition of critical thinking" (p. 35). In the preface of his book *How We Think* (1933), Dewey acknowledged his own problems with terminology, explaining that the revisions of his earlier edition were made because he wished to increase "definiteness" and restate ideas "found by teachers to give undue trouble in understanding" (p. iii). In any case, Dewey's theories regarding reflective thinking, as well as his "steps" in the thought processes, merged with later educators' ideas on the thinking skills.

Dewey (1933) advanced a theory that the complete act of thought occurred in five steps between prereflective and postreflective states: (1) suggested possible solutions; (2) intellectualization of the problem; (3) the use of hypothesis; (4) reasoning; and (5) testing the hypothesis by overt or imag-
inative action. Since Dewey's time, numerous other studies (e.g., Starr, 1963) involving the sequence theory of critical thinking argued against his "five" steps—presenting anywhere from three to nine steps (p. 36). Other researchers, reported Cornbleth (1985), argued that "critical thinking" is not linear, or sequential, at all (p.18).

The 1920s

During the 20s (and 30s), the influence of the 1893 and 1916 reports by the NEA and the 1899 report by the AHA which were executed by professionals in the social studies field during the Progressive Era, spread throughout American education. Hertzberg (1981) wrote that “social studies was clearly in transition” with many influential factors contributing to the rapid growth of public education, curriculum development, and standardized, diagnostic testing (p. 40).

While organizations such as NEA and AHA began reform efforts during the Progressive Era, their impact became most evident during the 1920s. Such national organizations began reform practices; examining existing curricula, deciding upon desirable modifications, and recommending a more or less specific program for schools (Wesley, 1950, p. 79).

That concern for skills existed during the 20s is largely illustrated in studies on testing during the era. Elston (1923), for example, reported on evidence that map skills were being tested. The Vannest Diagnostic Test in Modern European History contained knowledge items and test items on “time sense, place sense, power to evaluate facts, and power to reason” (p. 300). Elston referred to the desirability for diagnostic testing during the first few weeks of school to determine whether students can use a map, dictionary, reference book, and can read with comprehension (p. 303).

During the 1920s, other fields were engaged in pioneer work in testing. Theories began to develop regarding testing procedures for psychology and intelligence measurement. Subsequent developments in the social studies would involve other instances of borrowing from these fields such theory, techniques, and terminology deemed useful to the social studies skills.

Evidence in the 1920s of growing attention to what would later be termed “the social studies skills” was shown in articles written at that time. Rugg (1923, November) referred to an analysis of some 59 books, articles, courses of study, and teacher-made tests done in 1917. Rugg classified this data into “aims and outcomes” of the study of history using contemporary terminology in reference to skills: “methods of studying, use of books; training certain ‘powers,’ such as memory, judgment, and imagination; broadening the pupil’s point of view; training in seeing causal relationships” (p. 325). Despite having addressed what would later be termed “skills,” Rugg discussed the “fact” that the subject area of history must be thought of as a content area rather than a skill subject, and that educators should concentrate on methods to help pupils remember facts, which was the primary goal of the field (p. 325,
emphasis mine). Hardy (1923) pressed for development of tests that would measure several types of "achievement," in addition to factual retention. Her comments suggested that skill evolution for the social studies was under way. Hardy wrote that "the ability to read with understanding, the ability to classify, and the power to detect an incorrect statement and at best to tell in what respects it was wrong" must be measurement goals in testing (pp. 327-328).

In summary, if the researcher were to deal only with literature of the social studies field of the 1920s, one might conclude that little occurred in the development of the social studies skills—that leaders, reformers, and educators were far too engrossed in building curriculum according to Progressive Era reform innovations and unifying public school education to meet the needs of a rapidly growing school population. However, examination of developments in the field of psychology and testing reveals important history relative to skill designations, measurement, and goals of the social studies.

The 1930s: Testing and Propaganda

Work continued during the 1930s on testing of the study skills. Morse and McCune (1940) prefaced their work in the NCSS Selected Items for the Testing of Study Skills with a commentary on the history of study skills as well as the evolution of testing (pp. 9-17). Morse and McCune substantiate the view that the social studies, at that time, accepted the historical method as a social studies skill and recognized work done in testing, originally for other fields, as applicable to the social studies. The authors indicate that researchers of the period referred to "work habits and study skills" but not to "the social studies skills" (p. 9). By 1940, NCSS had published its first comprehensive skills bulletin listing some 23 unclassified items referred to as "study skills" (p. 9). In 1953, NCSS published an expanded version of the 1940 bulletin and referred to the social studies skills in the title: Skills in the Social Studies (Carpenter, 1953). The designation "social studies skills" had arrived.

During the 1930s some of the work on testing was motivated by statistical reports concerning freshman failures at the college level. Boyington (1932) explored experimentation with tests developed for use as diagnostic instruments in North Carolina and in New York (p. 132). North Carolina developed a test to administer to high school seniors to try to predict future college success probabilities. Morse and McCune (1940) reported that New York teachers developed a work skills diagnostic test which contained such items as "use of general references; newspaper reading; interpreting a chart, pictures, graph, and table of statistics; summarizing and outlining" (p. 13). Much of this terminology, then applied to test items, would become part of the terminology of the social studies skills.

Probably more significant than testing to the evolution of skills, was the interest in propaganda. Ellis (1937) found that World War I, the rise in the 1930s of Hitlerism, and the New Deal focused public attention on the poten-
tials of opinion management (pp. 2–3). With the spread of democracy, the extension of suffrage, and increase in literacy, public opinion became more and more a matter of government concern (pp. 3–4). The burden of providing a "realistic civic education" regarding propaganda with teachers giving the "necessary guidance for their students" became part of social studies responsibility (p. 170). The 1937 NCSS yearbook issue, *Education Against Propaganda*, was devoted to the subject of propaganda, highlighting the seven most commonly used devices: cardstacking, transfer, bandwagon, glittering generalities, name-calling, testimonial, and plain folks. Later on, the ideas explored in this yearbook would be tied to ideas for teaching critical thinking.

The 1940s

References to skills during the 1940s was exemplified by works published by NCSS in the early years of the decade. In the NCSS yearbook, Wrightstone (1941) identified objectives relative to "social studies information" and "work and study skills" (p. 232). These skills included "reading maps, graphs, charts, tables; using index and library; drawing conclusions in critical thinking" (p. 232). Wrightstone, who had written a test for critical thinking, advocated efforts to evaluate critical thinking as a "prominent objective of the natural and social sciences" (p. 238). His own test measured the following: first, "abilities to obtain facts from graphs, maps, references, newspapers and magazines; second, abilities to draw conclusions from given facts and data; and third, abilities to apply generalizations to social studies situations" (p. 238).

Increased interest in critical thinking was evident when NCSS devoted the entire 1942 yearbook to this subject. The issue, entitled *Teaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies*, contained very general articles that avoided defining the term, or specifying sub-skills, or recommended methods of evaluation. The preface referred to an unspecified "hierarchy of skills" included under the umbrella of "critical thinking," and charged teachers with the ultimate responsibility to "determine the specific skills which are part of this general skill" (Anderson, 1942, p. vii). The yearbook suggested certain steps involved in this thinking process: "(1) defining the problem; (2) locating, selecting, and organizing information; (3) evaluating the information; (4) drawing conclusions; (5) presenting conclusions in an acceptable form; (6) reconsidering conclusions" (pp. 7–41). During the 1980s, educators dispute these steps, and some argue that critical thinking and problem-solving are different processes (Beyer, 1984, April). Wesley (1950) referred to these steps to critical thinking as being closely allied to the methods used in building up a defense against propaganda. Further, he reported that the crux of the 1940s critical thinking movement was an effort (again) to popularize and teach the principles of the historical method. Wesley defined critical thinking as a "new synthesis of elements from language, logic, grammar, and philosophy" (p. 106).
Skills in the 1950s

Jarolimek (1981) referred to the time since World War II as three “approximate” segments: (1) pre-curriculum-reform: 1946–1960; (2) period of curriculum reform: 1960–1974; and (3) postreform period: 1974 to present (p. 6). He characterized the pre-reform period as a continuation of the progressive education philosophy, with new interest in culture studies and an international perspective in the social studies by the close of the war. In spite of a status quo in general educational changes, characteristics of the era included reform-generating criticism, increased interest in curriculum development, and continued exposition on skills.

A textbook used at college level during the 1950s, Teaching Social Studies in the High School, contains some illuminating comments regarding skills. Wesley (1950) discussed the changes in this third edition of his textbook. He remarked in the preface that he had to give his textbook a new title, as the previous editions had dealt with both elementary and secondary social studies. This new edition included new features and discussions on such things as developing concepts, generalizations, and the teaching of map skills (p. v). Wesley included two chapters on skills; one on reading and study skills, and one on the source method. His reading and study skills chapter specifically classified some 36 items as “reading” skills including such things as: to recognize the denotation of a word; to evaluate the reliability of a statement; to relate effect to cause; and to read graphs, tables, and diagrams (pp. 250–251). His chapter on the source method was largely exposition of its past history and included a listing of published collections of sources. There was no attempt at a “how-to-teach-using-sources” explanation and Wesley avoided any advocacy of teaching social studies via the inquiry method.

The 1953 NCSS yearbook edited by Helen M. Carpenter entitled Skills in the Social Studies, a landmark publication, was so well received that NCSS reissued the original document, made several revisions, and published new editions. The first yearbook effort on skills classified them in two main divisions: Part I-Skill Development In Relation to Society, The School, and The Learner; and Part II-Skill Development Through The Total Social Studies Program. Part I was subdivided into two chapters: Skills Needed For Democratic Citizenship, and Skill Development in Reference to Human Development. Part II was subdivided into several chapters on such topics as: critical thinking and problem-solving, locating and gathering information, reading and listening, writing and speaking, interpreting maps and globes, interpreting graphics, developing a sense of time and chronology, and participating in group undertakings. In this 1953 publication, “skills” had come to have a broader meaning.

Skills in the 1960s

Hertzberg (1981) found that advocacy of the social studies skills reached its zenith during the 1960s reform period amidst warning about the weaknesses
inherent in the "new social studies" package. She reviewed several articles in *Social Education* (1965) by Fred M. Newman, Byron Massialis, Richard Gross, William Cartwright, and Carl O. Olson, Jr. that perceived problems in the new approach. Hertzberg found evidence that in actual practice the implementors (ordinary classroom teachers) were "modifying" but not replacing the old curriculum, and that most classroom teachers "had no more than passing acquaintance with national reform" (p. 115). Reformers had not looked at what schools were already doing well, or closely examined what it was like to be a classroom teacher, or felt the heavy demands on teacher time made by the newer "inquiry" methods (p. 117). Also, reform had focused on the above average student, ignoring the rest, and some criticized the assumption that "what was good for the social scientist as researcher was also good for the child or adolescent" (p. 113).

The 1963 NCSS yearbook, focusing on skills, while yet another revision of the popular 1953 yearbook, contained some noteworthy changes. With the same editor, general subject area, and basic organization, the new edition had 13 new chapters and a suggested guide to grade placement of skills as an appendix. Authors Johns and Fraser (1963) cautioned that "almost no research evidence exists to guide the proper grade placement of skill instruction" and that "it is impossible to set a particular place in the school program where it is always best to introduce a specific skill, and one cannot assume a child has learned a particular skill after being exposed to it" (p. 312). In the foreword, editor Carpenter discussed "education in the 1960s" and "increased emphasis given to skills for listening, writing and reading," and development of critical thinking (p. vii). The yearbook was divided into three parts: Part I-Skill Development in Relation to Society, the School, and the Learner; Part II-Skill Development Through the Total Social Studies Program; Part III-Measurement and Synthesis of Skills in Social Studies.

Two other NCSS publications of the 1960s are noteworthy. The 37th yearbook, published in 1967, was devoted to clarifying what is meant by "thinking," and the 39th yearbook (1969) was devoted to clarification of problems regarding social studies objectives.

The 37th yearbook, *Effective Thinking in the Social Studies*, contained exposition on the problems educators encounter in trying to develop effective programs on thinking. Editors Fair and Schaftel (1967) deplored the "vagueness" and "confusion" generated by educational as well as research literature regarding thinking skills (p. 26).

The 39th yearbook, *Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems*, addressed the lack of consensus in the social studies in order to clearly define and cite specific goals. A review of the history of social studies for instruction cited "persisting general concerns . . . of ethical values, effective citizenship, and 'thinking abilities'" (p. 41). Editor Fraser (1969), while basically advocating "inquiry" as a mode of instruction, nevertheless deplored the fact that "inquiry has long been sacrificed to coverage of data"
However, while extending much exposition to the whys and hows of this methodology, Fraser admitted that "while substantial agreement may exist concerning those objectives related to inquiry, there is not similar agreement concerning the meaning of the term" (p. 47). Generally speaking, the literature of that time indicated educators were in disagreement over what was meant by thinking, inquiry, and the organization or classification of the skills.

Jarolimek (1963), who wrote a chapter entitled "The Psychology of Skill Development" in the 1963 NCSS yearbook, divided the social studies skills into three classifications: work study skills (reading, outlining, map-reading, etc.); thinking skills (critical thinking and problem solving); social skills (cooperating with others, group work, etc.). Other educators of the period used different divisions. Rubin (1969), for example, referred to primary and secondary skills—"primary" meaning life skills vital for emotional and physical well being, and "secondary" meaning less significant, modifiable, and replaceable skills such as note-taking (p. 20). In the next two decades more disagreement would emerge on skill designations, definitions, and classifications.

Skills in the 1970s

Besides lack of acceptance within the "real world" of the average classroom as reported by Hertzberg (1981), other forces caused the "new social studies" movement to lose steam in the 1970s due to social upheaval typified by the civil rights movement and the divisiveness over the Vietnam conflict. Many educators focused on the "relevance" of current social concerns, on black history, and the meanings of cultural pluralism. Grassroots support arose for a "back to basics" curriculum, for citizenship education, and law-related education. Attention shifted to the inculcation of American values; concerns largely ignored by the reformers of the "new social studies."

Literature of the 1970s on the social studies skills reflected ambivalence toward the "new social studies" as some writers continued to echo its philosophy while complaining about the state of confusion and lack of consensus over the skills. Chapin and Gross (1973) wrote a book entitled Teaching Social Studies Skills which included chapters on reading, listening, speaking, viewing, language, and time-space orientation skills. They devoted three separate chapters to "inquiry," a basic teaching goal advocated by leaders of the "new social studies." However, authors Chapin and Gross caution that "we in the social studies are not clear in which direction we are moving" (1973, Preface). Beyer (1979) referred to the "scores of articles and books [on inquiry and inquiry teaching] that had been published; and to the numerous curriculum projects and instructional materials and programs based on inquiry" (p. iii). He also cited the "confusion and misunderstanding about inquiry teaching" and indicated this is what provoked his own writing efforts to produce a practical book for teacher use (p. iii). Fraenkel (1973) re-
ferred to the "lack of clarity and confusion over the nature of thinking" (p. 189). He tried to categorize the skills and to indicate which were the most important. He classified learning skills as thinking skills, academic skills, and social skills. He identified the most important ones as reading, viewing, speaking and listening, note-taking, reading and interpreting maps, construction of time lines, and writing.

Research literature published during the 1970s documents the confusion over the skills. In 1977, NCSS in collaboration with ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Sciences Foundation, and Social Science Education Consortium issued a review of empirical, or scientific, research materials on social studies education. This review by Hunkins, Ehman, Hahn, Martorella, and Tucker (1977), entitled *Review of Research in Social Studies Education, 1970-1975*, presented a concise overview of research executed during this period on "cognitive learning and instruction, values education, teacher education, and diffusion of innovations in the social studies" (p. 1). Illustrative of the concerns of the 1970s, the work documented problems regarding language of the social studies.

**Skills In The 1980s**

As to the 1980s, Hertzberg (1981) wrote that "if there is any definite, identifiable trend in the social studies . . . it is a search for coherence . . . for understandable explanations" (p. 183). In addition to continued confusion over identification and definition of the social studies skills, much of the current literature alludes to disagreement over "thinking skills." Arguments abound over whether direct teaching of thinking skills is possible, whether they can be taught independently of content, or even whether they should be taught at all.

An important recent contribution (Stanley, 1985) to an understanding of the skills was the NCSS publication *Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976-1983* which was an effort to "make some sense of a field divided by conflicts regarding rationales, content, values, and approaches to research" (p. iii). Chapter Three was devoted to review of research in critical thinking and cognitive process research relative to social education. Author Cornbleth (1985) argued that current ideas are based on erroneous and untested concepts, assumptions, and beliefs.

Cornbleth's first concern was that educators have historically accepted critical thinking as a goal in principle "without bothering to define the term precisely" (p. 11). Furthermore, "while much has been written in the name of critical thinking, the intended meaning of the concept is rarely made explicit" (p. 12). Cornbleth expressed concern that "educators seem to assume that critical thinking is inherently knowable and, further, that all of us would recognize it when it appeared. Taking critical thinking for granted and assuming a doubtful consensus has served to obscure rather than clarify its meaning and implications" (p. 12). Cornbleth referred to several studies to sup-

As seen throughout this study, the National Council for the Social Studies has been active in the evolution of the social studies skills. In 1984, NCSS published the results of a study by a special Task Force relative to a new Scope and Sequence in *Social Education* (April). The proposed changes reflect differences from the 1963 version published in the NCSS Yearbook, *Skill Development in Social Studies* in skill terminology, classification, and emphasis. In the 1963 version, there were some 229 skills and subskills listed. The 1984 matrix of skills contained just over 100 items. In 1963, skills were classified in two parts: skills which are a definite but shared responsibility of the social studies and skills which are a major responsibility of the social studies. The 1984 skills and subskills were simply categorized under identifying headings. Based on the number of items included, the most important skills in the 1963 version were those relating to locating information and to interpretation of maps and globes. There were 53 map and globe skills specified in 1963; the newest matrix of skills listed only 13. There were six reading skills specified in 1963; the 1984 matrix lists 18 reading skills.

**Conclusion**

Clearly, the past century has seen a great increase of interest in the general topic of social studies skills. Unfortunately, this expansion has been accompanied by a greater diversity of views as to the scope and definition of such skills. While many in the education profession can agree on the need for the teaching of some form of social studies or generic skills, there seems little movement toward any common agreement as to their definition or nature.
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Abstract

This study investigated the personal practical theories of an experienced secondary social studies teacher and the impact of her personal theorizing upon curricular and instructional decision making. Data were collected through classroom observations and from formal and informal interviews with the teacher participant. This data collection and the ongoing data analysis followed the canons of naturalistic research.

The findings include: (a) the teacher had five basic personal practical theories (PPTs) which were related to her view of herself as a professional, and two sub-theories which were related to her view of the subject matter; (b) these PPTs guided her curricular and instructional decision making; (c) these PPTs were arrayed in conflicting theoretical frameworks; (d) the participant had no explicit knowledge of these PPTs and the frameworks prior to the study; and (e) the participant viewed the curriculum as units taught and curriculum development as a formal task which was externally imposed and which detracted from her professional role.

A curriculum development model which depicts the role of personal practical theories in curriculum development is derived from this study and proposed as a heuristic device for teachers, researchers, and teacher educators. Implications from this naturalistic study for qualitative methodology and for teacher education are discussed.

Introduction

Teacher thinking research has increased considerably during the past decade and has contributed significantly to the research community’s understanding of various aspects of teacher cognition (Clark, 1988; Clark & Peterson, 1986). These studies have advanced the notion of the teacher as a “thoughtful professional” (Peterson, 1988, p. 5), and have illustrated the complex nature of teacher decision-making.

This image has been intensified by concurrent studies of the role of the teacher in the implementation of curriculum innovations and change. These recent investigations illustrate the central role of teachers in curriculum implementation and have led to the rejection of the mechanistic curriculum im-
plementator view of the teacher (Berman & McLaughlin, 1976; Fullan, 1982; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977). Miller and Seller (1985) summarize this “teacher-as-active-curriculum-agent” perspective by stating that “Individual teachers will implement a new program in ways that are consistent with their own beliefs and practices” (p. 239).

These beliefs and practices have been investigated by teacher thinking researchers. These investigations have been placed by Clark and Peterson (1986) into three basic categories: 1) teacher planning (preactive and postactive thoughts); 2) teacher interactive thoughts and decisions; and 3) teachers’ theories and beliefs (p. 257). Those teacher thinking studies which identify teachers’ personal knowledge (Clandinin & Connelly, 1986) have augmented the conception of the thoughtful practitioner and substantiated that teaching is a practical, contextually-driven endeavor composed of practical problems (Reid, 1978; Schwab, 1969). Parker (1987) cites the seminal nature of Schwab’s *The practical: A language for curriculum* (1969), for the growth of this perspective in contemporary times. He submits that,

In this and succeeding papers, Schwab turned the attention of some in curriculum away from the field’s traditional regard for scientific management and generalized implementation to the project of comprehending phronesis. Schwab thus heralded the old notion that today remains oddly iconoclastic: Teachers are reflective practitioners, their practice is an art, and their curriculum agency is necessarily eclectic and context-bound. (p. 11)

As a result of this practical context, teachers turn from more formalized (generalized, scientific, theoretic) principles of teaching and learning and develop practical theories of teaching to address these problems. Sanders and McCutcheon (1986) suggest the importance of practical theorizing by teachers:

Practical theories of teaching are the conceptual structures and visions that provide teachers with reasons for acting as they do, and for choosing the teaching activities and curriculum materials they choose in order to be effective. They are principles or propositions that undergird and guide teachers’ appreciations, decisions, and actions. (pp. 54-55)

These practical theories are requisite for any practical action to occur (Carr & Kemmis, 1983).

Two researchers’ investigations of these practical theories (Clandinin, 1985; Elbaz, 1981) have contributed significantly to the development of the notion of personal practical knowledge, a construct that Connelly and Dienes (1982) state is “action oriented” and one where the “attention is on the individual teacher’s practical knowledge and not on generalizations about practical knowledge” (p. 184). Elbaz (1981, 1983) gathered data for her study of the practical knowledge of a teacher by conducting five interviews followed by two-hour observations with a secondary English teacher. She determined
that the teacher’s practical knowledge had three basic forms: rules of practice, practical principles, and images. These forms provided the conceptual framework for the teacher’s thinking. Clandinin (1986) built upon the Elbaz findings, and investigated teacher images held by two primary teachers. Through observation and interviews she concluded that,

Upon reflection, I found that teachers had fairly well worked out, although not articulated, ideas regarding their purposes and intentions in the classroom. They had, for the most part, notions about themselves as teachers; notions about what worked for them instructionally; notions about children, including specific children and children in general; ideas about their school milieu and themselves in relation to that milieu as well as about the instructional content that would allow them to fulfill their purposes.

There has been a dearth of studies which address teacher thinking about curriculum and instruction and which utilize field-based methodologies (Corbett, 1987a). Two qualitatively-oriented investigations by Hyland (1985) and Evans (1988) will be briefly discussed because of their potential comparative value with this author’s investigation.

Hyland (1985) studied four eighth-grade social studies teachers utilizing classroom observation and interviewing techniques. He found that teachers focused on control issues, relied heavily upon textbooks for their instruction, stressed low level tasks for students, and largely ignored student initiation as a basis for curriculum decisions. Most significantly for the current study, Hyland found a lack of congruence between stated teacher beliefs and actual teaching practice.

Evans (1988) utilized interviews and field notes from non-participant classroom observation to determine the subject matter conceptions of three intern, high school, American history teachers. This investigation yielded differing conceptions for each of the teachers, yet concluded that these conceptions impacted on the transmitted history curriculum.

With the exception of these findings, little is known about the beliefs that guide the actual classroom practice of secondary social studies teachers. Perhaps this is because of the lack of utilization of naturalistic research methodology (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and of other interpretive approaches by social studies researchers (Armento, 1986; Evans, 1988). Naturalistic investigations can be designed to portray the beliefs of teachers and the manifestation of these beliefs in practice. Such research requires extensive field work in the actual classroom and intensive interaction with the teacher to portray this personal theory and practice connection.

Because it has been demonstrated that teachers’ practical knowledge and personal theorizing impacts on classroom practice and significantly determines what students have the opportunity to learn through the explicit, hidden, and null curricula, it seems apparent that researchers, teacher educators,
and teachers concerned with the social studies can benefit from investigations which explicate these practical theories and their representation in teacher’s curricular practice.

The purpose of this paper is to present the findings of one such naturalistic investigation of teacher thinking which portrays the underlying personal practical theories (PPTs) guiding the curricular and instructional decision-making of a secondary social studies teacher. The teacher beliefs are labeled personal practical theories because they represent contributions from her personal experience (outside the classroom) and from her practical experience (directly associated with her teacher experience). They are called theories because they are a very systematic set of beliefs. Those PPTs will be delineated and examples of each PPT as manifested in the teacher’s practice will be provided. In addition, the teacher’s perspective of curriculum and curriculum development as it relates to her senior government classes will be revealed. As a result of these findings, a curriculum development model has been developed and will be explained. Methodological concerns concomitant with naturalistic inquiry techniques will be discussed, and recommendations for ethical guidelines will be suggested. Finally, the implications of this investigation, and of teacher thinking research in general, for preservice and inservice social studies education will be discussed.

Methodology

This investigation was designed to obtain the participant’s perspective of the personal practical theories guiding her curricular and instructional practice. As a result, naturalistic methodology (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) was selected which would enable the researcher to obtain that perspective in the natural classroom and school setting.

The teacher participant, Ms. Sue Chase, was selected by purposeful sampling (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), a technique designed to yield the most appropriate data for the investigation. Sue was chosen because of her teacher reputation as determined by prior information obtained by the researcher, a purposeful sampling method supported by Patton (1980). Sue had characteristics which Elbaz (1983) defines as requisite traits for teacher thinking research participants. Sue was highly reflective, had the ability and willingness to share these reflections, and possessed a strong commitment to her work.

The researcher verified the existence of these traits in Sue’s teaching during the previous spring semester. During this period, Sue collaborated with the researcher (then in the role of university student teaching supervisor) as she fulfilled her role of cooperating teacher for a student teacher. It was evident to the researcher through informal observation and interaction that Sue displayed the requisite qualities listed by Elbaz. Researcher interactions with students, administrators, and other teachers also indicated that she was viewed
as an effective teacher. This is significant because it may be unethical to study a known negative exemplar of teaching through naturalistic methodology, since this approach will yield a detailed account of that inadequate practice, without providing ongoing assistance to that teacher for improvement of instruction. In effect, the researcher in this instance would be akin to the supervisor who tells teachers of their inadequacies, but fails to offer technical and emotional assistance for teacher change, certainly a morally questionable approach. This appears to be ethically indefensible behavior for a researcher as well if he/she intends to withdraw from the site and participant following the reporting of the research (Cornett, 1987, 1989).

Sue began teaching social studies subjects in the middle of the school year in 1969. During this period of employment she received a master’s degree in the sociology of education from her undergraduate institution. Shortly thereafter, she moved to another region in the state and began teaching at a middle school, continuing in this capacity for four years. From there she transferred to that community’s high school where she began teaching senior government (hereafter “Problems of Democracy” or “POD”) and has continued in that assignment ever since, for a total of ten years at the outset of the investigation.

The site of the study was not a major determinant in the research design. Of course, as in any teaching situation, the characteristics of the school influenced the teacher. The suburban high school had approximately one thousand students in grades 10-12, with roughly 98% of these categorized as white, and a nearly equal number of males and females. Sue was the only female on a staff of seven social studies teachers.

Both sections of her Problems of Democracy course were observed by the researcher throughout the second semester. The second-period class had 29 students (13 female, 16 male) and the fourth-period class had 34 students (20 female and 14 male).

The design of the study was naturalistic in orientation and the initial guiding questions were considered to be tentative until actual observation was conducted. This period of tentativeness and emergence of design is necessary from the qualitative researcher’s perspective, because the researcher “does not assume that enough is known to recognize important concerns before undertaking the research” (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982, p. 30).

The initial research questions (see Table 1) were helpful in the preliminary focusing of the research. The major thrust of the study became the identification of Sue’s theories and their manifestation in her practice.

The time line of the study was as follows: 1) two weeks of preliminary investigation to focus the investigation and to desensitize the participant and students to the researcher’s presence (January 5–16, 1987); 2) nine weeks of observation and interviewing to tentatively ground the inquiry (January 20–March 20, 1987); and 3) a period of continued data analysis, member
Table 1
Guiding Questions for the Study of Teacher Thinking*

1). What does the teacher view as the explicit law-related curriculum in the American Government classes at X high school?

2). What role does the teacher believe she plays in the development of that curriculum?
What does she mean by curriculum? Curriculum development?
What role does she believe others play?
How does her perceived role differ from other content areas which she teaches?

3). What theories guide her practices?
What does she mean by theory?
What does she believe is the degree of congruence between her stated theories and her actual practice?
Does the particular subject matter or the particular group of students affect those theories and the degree of congruence?

4). What does the teacher consider when she is planning a lesson?

5). What does the teacher view as an opportunity (support) or as a constraint for curriculum/instruction within the interactive phase when student initiated substantive and managerial communication occurs?
What is the impact of this thinking upon her actions?
What is the impact of this thinking upon her planning and curriculum development efforts?

6). What impact does the researcher have upon the degree of reflection of the teacher as perceived by the teacher?

*(Cornett, 1987a).

checks of data categories, writing of the case study report, and participant confirmation of the final report (March 20-June 30, 1987).

Data were collected from nonparticipant observation, formal and informal interviews, and collection of curricular artifacts. Audio-tape recordings (and transcriptions of selected tapes) were made of classroom interactions and formal interviews. Extensive field notes of both were taken by the researcher who served as the primary instrument of data collection.

Data analysis was an ongoing process conducted throughout the study (Bogdan & Taylor, 1975; Miles & Huberman, 1984). It involved,
a reconstructive process whereby original data are reviewed; constructions are created, revised, and synthesized; and as a result, a more holistic
and grounded view of the participant’s practice is obtained. (Cornett, 1987a, p. 108)

This inductive method is often utilized in teacher thinking studies (e.g., Clandinin, 1986; Elbaz 1983) and is characteristic of naturalistic investigations (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

The trustworthiness of the data and subsequent interpretations was established through attention to Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) elements of trustworthiness. These included the following: 1) prolonged engagement at the site (two weeks of preliminary data collection followed by an additional nine weeks where both classes were observed on the same day 20 times, and where alternate sections were observed singularly on other days, depending on the teacher’s lessons and school and researcher schedules); 2) persistent observation (the researcher was engaged intensively in fieldnote recording); 3) triangulation of data collection (audio-tapes and transcriptions, fieldnotes, artifacts); 4) peer debriefing (researcher’s principal advisor, Dr. Gail McCutcheon; researcher’s spouse and fellow graduate student, Vicki Cornett); 5) negative case analysis (ongoing search for exceptions to emergent categories conducted throughout the data collection and data analysis period); 6) establishment of archived data (some audio-tapes were not initially analyzed, analysis followed the establishment of categories, these categories remained viable); and 7) member checks (Sue was asked to confirm or discredit researcher interpretation of data on a daily basis). In addition, Sue was asked to read and critique each draft of the report as a final means of establishing the trustworthiness of the study which attempts to portray the teacher’s perspective.

A Teacher’s Personal Practical Theories

In order to determine the personal practical theories underlying Sue’s practice, the researcher observed both periods of her POD classroom practice for three weeks before a formal interview was conducted to directly discuss her belief system. Extensive field notes of these three weeks of classes were taken, and audio-tapes of her interaction with students were recorded and analyzed. Before second period, during her third-period conference time, and/or after fourth period, Sue and the researcher had daily “informal conversations” about her thoughts during the preactive, interactive, and postactive phases of instruction. During these periods, questions were asked to determine her plans each day (how they were derived and if any changes were proposed from the earlier written draft), her thoughts about the interaction during instruction, and her thoughts following instruction. A typical question following second and fourth periods was, “What do you recall thinking during the lesson?” This became so routine, that Sue quickly stopped expecting researcher judgments of “good” or “bad” performance, and instead would talk about her perspective during planning, instruction, and
reflection. This is viewed as significant since Sue had previously experienced little interaction with any outsider during her years of teaching (including supervisory personnel). Almost all of the feedback on her practice had come from students. She naturally wanted some feedback from a fellow professional on the quality of her practice. The researcher reminded her this judgment of quality would come only from her interpretation of the findings of the investigation, and not from researcher judgments of the positive or negative decisions or beliefs evidenced by her practice.

While Sue generally took the lead in these informal interviews, some elements of these discussions would be prompted by comments from the researcher’s field notes. For example, both second and fourth periods typically discussed the same basic concepts in the same basic order. This occurred even though the second period students were significantly higher achievers and were generally college bound, while most of the fourth period students were non-college bound. One example where the researcher asked a specific question from the field notes occurred after observation of her instruction of second period and fourth periods and in comparison with her lesson plan. It became clear that she had shifted her fourth period approach somewhat, an atypical action. When questioned about this, Sue indicated she had developed a new plan during her conference period between the classes. She had forgotten to give the researcher the revised plan. When the alternate plan was analyzed it was determined that the changes were quite minor and that there continued to be a significant congruence between the outlined concepts in her plans and the concepts presented to the classes. In this case, she had made a very minor adjustment to increase the clarity of her instruction.

Through this daily teacher-researcher interaction and careful observation of her instruction, categories that might be guiding her decision-making began to emerge. At the end of three weeks, the researcher had developed a tentative set of Sue’s possible PPTs. These were outlined in the field notes as illustrated in Figure 1. At this point, it is clear that the researcher had developed a notion of an obvious shifting between basic theories as indicated by the drawing of the balance. On one side of the balance, motivation and interest, emergent notions, and student initiations was portrayed. On the other side the preplanned curriculum, “cut and dried” subject matter, “golden oldies” (e.g., illustrative government stories used year after year), and student response to the preplanned curriculum were stressed. There appeared to be a shift between these rough frameworks dependent upon the period of the semester and the aspects of the curriculum discussed.

The semester change after the first two weeks of observation brought some new students to her classes and subsequent explanations of expectations for student behavior and performance. It is interesting to note that the end of the first semester was dominated by apparent “coverage of content” concerns, while the beginning of the second semester was dominated by apparent “motivation of student interest” concerns.
At the end of the next week of observation, a formal interview session which lasted nearly three hours was held. During this time, Sue was asked to respond directly to the questions portrayed in Table 1. When question three, "What theories guide her practices?" was asked, the researcher requested a definition of theory by Sue. She replied,

Well, first of all in the context that you’re asking me, I am thinking what is my theory of teaching. Okay. And in that sense it means my basic set of beliefs about what I am as a professional. (From 1/30/87 interview transcript)

The researcher then asked Sue to discuss what she felt were her "basic set of beliefs". The beliefs which followed are labeled as personal practical theories because they represent contributions from her personal experience.
(outside the classroom) and from her practical experience (directly associated with her teaching experience). These theories are also labeled as personal practical theories because they reflect theoretical knowledge elements (such as theories one and two from her study of Carl Rogers), contextual knowledge (of her students, the POD curriculum in her classes, and the milieu), and personal knowledge (of her values and beliefs). These teacher beliefs or personal practical theories which followed are portrayed in Figure 2, utilizing Sue's language from the interview. The order of the theories reflects a minor reconfiguration of the sequence of these theories so that the tension between the frameworks might be more effectively portrayed. The sub-theories are listed as such because they were less evident in her practice and because they were not stressed during the interview as basic beliefs. It is interesting to note that the five theories reflect learning and pedagogical type theories (e.g., her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY 1: Unconditional Positive Regard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treating kids well under all circumstances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY 2: Empathic Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treating each student as individual, being prepared to understand what's going on in their lives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY 3: Teacher as Human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trying to show them who I am as a person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY 4: Learning and Teaching as Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting and highly interactive discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEORY 5: Organized &amp; Systematic Presentation of Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organized and systematic teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-THEORIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Students as responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students as active participants in society, providing community service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Students as informed citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of current events and basic components of 'the curriculum'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Participant's Personal Practical Theories as Defined by the Teacher Participant (adapted from Cornett, J., 1987a).
view of herself as a professional), while the sub-theories of being responsible and being informed are reflective of the content of social studies objectives she held for her students.

Sue's statement about her first belief was stated in a "serious, almost reverent tone" (Cornett, 1987a):

I think some things guide me and some of them, not all that many specific things came out of my "teacher education," but some things that I was exposed to, by Carl Rogers, really did, and one was unconditional positive regard. (From transcript of 1/30/88 interview)

Theory 1, unconditional positive regard, consisted of:

...treating the kids well under all circumstances. Simply stated to me, it means separating behaviors from the individual. Being able to say to the kid, you know, I love you or I like you. I'm a little concerned about this behavior, but the behavior and you are two different things. That's the real personally important thing. (From transcript of 1/30/87 interview)

Sue's utilization of the term came from her teacher education coursework and she was influenced by this aspect of her graduate work, especially. While it was evident that Sue's practice contained this theory which she had adapted, it was more difficult to pinpoint a particular example. It was so prevalent a part of her practice that it permeated it totally. The researcher portrayed this as a "non-negotiable" theory (and thus a permanent frame) because regardless of the content of her lesson, or her class period, or influences upon the curriculum and instruction practice of the day, there were no instances observed when Sue did not afford unconditional positive regard to her students. The manner of Sue's receipt and solicitation of student interaction contained no personal negative appraisals. While this consistency may seem implausible, the researcher continually sought to find negative exemplars that might indicate that this theory was a negotiable one. No such evidence was found during the duration of the study.

Theory 2, empathic understanding, was defined by Sue as: "I think it's really important to treat each student as an individual, to be prepared to understand what's going on in their lives, especially if there's special circumstances that they're dealing with." Numerous examples existed in her practice that illustrate the prevalence of this theory. These typically dealt with some aspect of student personal events, school pressures, health, or even student fatigue. For instance, Sue talked with a student at the end of one class as other students were leaving the room. The interchange was as follows:

Sue: You look like you were struggling to stay awake, but my God, you did.
Female student (giggling): I want to go to bed.
Sue: Are you feeling sick?
This somewhat typical exchange illustrated her concern for the individual students and their inability at times to focus on POD class. Sue tried to understand each student as an individual whenever she could. Obviously, this is a difficult task when subject matter needs to be covered and the POD classes have large numbers of students as well.

Theory 3, teacher as human, abounded in her teaching as well through informal discussions with students about movies they all had seen, comments that Sue's teachers had made a "million years ago" when she was a student, references to her family life, admissions that she did not know an answer, or by showing her true emotions about a tragic current event (e.g., the anniversary of the Challenger disaster). Perhaps the most striking instance of this theory in practice was exemplified by her discussion of the rules at the onset of second semester. While explaining that gum chewing was allowed, she said she had "some in my mouth now," then she took it out while stretching it and stated, "See, there it is." When asked about this example later on, she indicated this was a way to show she was a "real person."

Theory 4, learning and teaching as fun, was explained by Sue as follows: "I think learning in a context of fun is important. I think that people are more relaxed and they're more receptive" (as a result). This element was most evident when student and teacher exchanges were highly interactive and interesting, in her view. Sue had a typically high energy level and animated voice which she utilized to make the learning environment more "charged" and "fun." After one especially spirited class, she posed the question to the researcher, "When you were a teacher did you ever get the feeling that if you said 'boo' they would discuss it?" Sue enjoyed these types of discussions and felt that students did too, resulting in increased learning.

Theory 5, organized and systematic presentation of material, was the most saturated category in terms of raw data. This may have been because it was easier to identify. This theory was defined as important, because presenting material in an organized and systematic fashion, was extremely helpful to kids. It makes it easier for them to learn, which also, I suppose, leads me to some other things. I mean, you can see the way I run my classroom, like I give review sheets. Well, I give review sheets probably because a part of my theory is I don't set myself up as an adversary. There is a body of material to be mastered and I don't think there should be any secrets about that. Here it is. My job is to give you some explanation, to add to it, to respond to your questions, to be a resource person, and your job is to assimilate and understand, and hopefully to be able to use the material in some way. And when
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I test you on it, that is what you are going to have to know. And, if you're willing to take the time to review those things, you'll be fine.

This theory was evident in her syllabus and the list of guidelines which she distributed at the beginning of the semester. These documents were highly detailed accounts of the topics to be covered, the corresponding pages in the textbook (where applicable), guidelines for late work, grading procedures, and attendance policy. Sue discussed these elements at length with her students in a linear fashion, covering each point in detail. In addition, this theory was generally evident in each lesson typically begun with a reminder of what was discussed the previous day, and an indication of the direction of the current lesson. Also, as indicated in the quotation, she provided students with review sheets so they would be systematically (and fairly) prepared for the tests.

The sub-theories were deemed less important because they were not mentioned in this interview as a basic belief, were less observable in her practice, and appeared to be more narrowly focused, subject-matter related beliefs. Sue verified that these sub-theories were significant parts of how she viewed the role of the government curriculum for her students, but were less important than the other theories in her decision-making.

The first sub-theory, students as responsible, was apparent in her frequent encouragement of students to be actively involved in community service. Sue gave extra points for the donation of blood, voter registration, community work projects, perfect school attendance, and for students who volunteered for major roles in the mock trial held in her classes.

Her second sub-theory, students as informed citizens, was apparent when she stressed current events such as the "State of the Union" and "State of the State" addresses. These discussions were an attempt to make her students realize the connection between POD and current events in the "real world."

The Balance And Tension Among Theories

There was a tension in Sue's practice which resulted from the conflicting array of theoretical frameworks (see Figures 3, 4, and 5). Frame One consisted of theory 5, organized and systematic presentation of material. Frame Two consisted of theory 2, empathic understanding; theory 3, teacher as human; and theory 4, learning and teaching as fun. These theories are depicted within frameworks to illustrate their periodic conflict as represented in her practice. Theory 1, unconditional positive regard, was "non-negotiable" and is depicted in a Permanent frame because it was consistently present, no matter what the balance of her remaining theories and resultant practices.

The tension resulted in a feeling of guilt when Sue believed a particular lesson had been too structured and thus not fun, with less demonstration of empathy and teacher as human qualities (see Figure 4). Guilt also occurred when she perceived that there had been too much concern with fun
and affect and not enough emphasis on concept coverage (see Figure 5). This tension is illustrated, in part, when Sue states:

Here I have this body of subject matter that I intend and want to teach today and that has been assigned to read, etc., and then something happens—a news event, or even a question coming out of the material. And suddenly, everything I had planned for the day goes down the tube. And I think as time goes on that I feel more and more comfortable when those things happen.

It is also apparent when she worried about dealing with too many student concerns which were sometimes potentially “off the subject”:

Well, I suppose it’s a combination of things. One is that it might be a perception of how the students are viewing this. Is this, you know, time to get me off the subject? Does it become a game, that kind of thing? I think I’m pretty astute at recognizing that. I feel, especially in one class [second period], I have some people who are real interested. I feel like their questions are always, you know, they really want to know.
A common example of this tension between being "on the subject" and "off the subject" occurred when Sue had spent Friday discussing with both classes the suicide of a prominent politician, along with other current events in that day's news. The students were highly interactive and the discussion was free-wheeling. However, it was not the scheduled lesson. On Monday, therefore, she reacted to her subsequent "guilt" by reverting to theory 5, organized and systematic presentation of material. The following transcription of Sue's introduction to the day's activity reveals this switch:

I'm glad to see you guys are so wide awake on a Monday morning. That's great. We need to channel this energy in the right direction. Like, towards the American judicial system. Yea! This section two of the chapter, which we actually were going to discuss Friday, but that dumb guy committed suicide and totally threw us off. Way to go bud!

It should be noted that Sue was certainly not insensitive to the suicide, as her Friday discussion revealed. But the tension of her theoretical frames caused her to feel the need to switch to dominance, as well as to explain this switch to the students. When frame one dominated for too long, Sue made comments to her students that the material was "cut and dried," or that "I know this is really boring," and commented to the students, "let's do
this and get it over with." It should not be assumed that Sue always covered the concepts in her syllabus in a fashion that caused her to make these comments. But when the theory became too dominant and the interaction of the commonplaces of teacher, student, subject matter, and milieu produced her feeling of guilt, Sue sought to balance her practice by inclusion of more of frame two. The tension was certainly not always evident in her practice and many lessons were appropriately balanced. The emphasis of one frame over the other was dictated by the contextual factors. However, conflict existed frequently enough to include it as a major theme in the study.

In summary, Sue's practice often exhibited tension between her belief frameworks, dependent upon the curriculum-in-use and factors such as level of student interest, time during the semester, importance of a current event, or interruptions for school assemblies. This tension was resolved temporarily by resorting to the opposite theoretical frame for the basis of planning and interaction. When this frame was over-emphasized, as determined by Sue's perception during the interactive or reflective phases of her instruction, she would again adjust her practice through attempting to balance the theories by either resorting to the opposite frame solely, or relying more heavily upon it.
This tension between theories was evident as well in the Elbaz study (1983) and in Pape's (1988) analysis of student teacher thinking, and as such may represent the contextually driven, eclectic nature of teacher practice, where unexamined theories guide practice. Because of their tacit (unconscious) level, this results in conflict and tension for the teacher.

When it was identified that this tension might exist because the organized and systematic dominance was typically manifested during the coverage of the explicit (i.e., syllabus) curriculum, and the dominance of theories 2, 3, and 4 was prevalent during the informal aspects of the course, Sue became aware that this tension might be reduced. Because both the formal and informal curriculum were important to Sue, she might formalize the informal by simply stating in her syllabus and to her students that the periodic casual discussion of current events, or student concerns was a legitimate part of the curriculum. In addition, she might reduce the tension by consciously planning lessons that integrated the theories instead of counterbalancing them.

The Teacher's Conception of "Curriculum" and "Curriculum Development"

Sue's conception of "the curriculum" may be inferred from the previous discussion, but it will be directly discussed in this section. When asked to define curriculum in her language, she stated:

Well, in my mind, whenever I hear curriculum, yeah, it's the stuff that I teach. It's that list of major topics that I hit. That's my curriculum. You know, it's a unit of voting, and it's a unit on election, and it's a unit on the Presidency. That's my curriculum. (From transcript of 1/30/88 interview)

This curricular content was based upon the textbook to a large extent (as in Hyland's study, 1985). Additional elements of Sue's explicit curriculum included court cases from a written sourcebook and the utilization of a videotape of the Gideon v. Wainwright case (the video was entitled "Gideon's Trumpet" and starred Henry Fonda). Sue commented that this was a highly interesting and organized manner to discuss the right of the accused to an attorney (thereby illustrating a balanced theoretical approach).

Sue invited guest speakers to share their expertise throughout the semester. For example, a district attorney discussed a number of topics with both classes for the entire period, including adult and juvenile law, civil and criminal law, plea bargaining, and the rights of the accused. A further indication of Sue's attention to theory 5 was that she provided the speaker with a list of student questions to be discussed. These resulted from her request for written questions from students the previous day.

Sue's main digression from the textbook occurred as a result of the mock trial enacted by both classes. This trial followed generally scripted roles provided from a published law-related education sourcebook. Sue and the
students spent approximately one week in preparation for the trial and one week in its enactment and for the follow-up debriefing by Sue. This activity was also evidence of a degree of balance of theories 4 and 5, because Sue believed it was a fun way to learn and that it was a carefully structured sequence of events.

Although it is apparent that Sue's theories and her perception of their interaction with the commonplaces had a major influence on what the students had a chance to learn, Sue did not view herself as a curriculum developer. When asked about her thoughts when she heard this term she stated emphatically:

As little as possible. Curriculum development has bad connotations to me. It's all those things that people make you spend hours doing that could take hours away from being a good classroom teacher. You know, that might be real unfair. But, periodically in my career, I've had to sit down and do things the way someone else wanted me to do them in a very detailed way and in a way that I never use in the classroom. So, it doesn't have a good connotation for me.

In her view then, curriculum development translated to an externally imposed mandate; busy work which distracted from her teaching.

As a result of her participation in this study, her tacit theories were raised to consciousness (as well as a metaview of their interaction). Sue realized the tremendous impact of her theories and decision-making upon "the curriculum." As a result of this study, it is believed that the impact of the teacher's personal practical theories on curriculum and the perceived teacher role in curriculum development needs further exploration. The next section of this paper proposes a model derived from researcher reflection upon this study. The model may prove useful in future investigations of teacher theories and their manifestation in practice.

A Proposed Curriculum Development Model

The impact of the teacher's personal practical theories on curricular and instructional decision-making is depicted in the model in Figure 6 (for this discussion, Sue will be utilized as an example, but it is believed this model may have heuristic potential for teachers, researchers, and teacher educators as well).

In this model, the teacher's beliefs or personal practical theories (Figure 6, E) influence her initial deliberation about the make-up of the curriculum. When she first considers what and how she will teach when she is assigned the role of a POD teacher, she considers her college coursework, her high school experience, and her evolving personal view of government among a host of other factors. This is personal experience, since it is based upon non-teaching experiences. This conception is influenced by forces external to the individual (Figure 6, F). These might include prior teachers, current event
Prior experience as a teacher was significant. In Sue’s case, she had previously taught non-POD courses at the middle school level. These experiences helped to shape her views of herself as a teacher and her view of students. These practical components of her theories were affected by other teachers, students, administrators, community members, publishers, and guest speakers, to name a few external influences.

The teacher’s perception of what counts as the curriculum of POD was then filtered through her personal practical theories. While Sue has many theories which have not been discussed or identified by this research, this paper has addressed major ones evident at the time for the study.

When Sue transformed this general conception of POD into lesson plans (both written and mental, Figure 6, B), these plans resulted from her deliberations filtered through her PPTs, as evidenced by her attention to organization and to providing fun learning activities. This planning was in turn influenced by external influences, such as time and available community resources.

Figure 6. The Impact of a Teacher’s Personal Practical Theories on Curriculum and Instruction (Cornett, in press).
When Sue implemented the plan during the instructional interactive phase (Figure 6, C) her decision-making was influenced once again by her personal practical theories (which theory to stress) and external influences (e.g., current events related by students). The interaction of the human (student), material (textbooks), and temporal resources was guided by teacher actions which were in turn guided by her PPTs. These theories were in turn affected by this interaction so as to strengthen, weaken, or create theories to deal with the practical context of teaching.

Following this phase, the teacher recreated portions of the lesson through her reflection (Figure 6, D). Her recall of this lesson was filtered through her personal practical theories. For example, she may have reflected upon, with great satisfaction, the highly charged class that was very interactive, and therefore "fun." Or she may have recalled with guilt, the boredom associated with a highly structured and inactive lesson. These reflections generated her notion of what took place (i.e., the enacted curriculum), which in turn colored her perception of what constituted the evolving POD curriculum (Figure 6, A).

This evolving process continues throughout her teaching career. Her personal practical theories will continue to alter as she interacts with the commonplaces of practical experience and as her personal experience changes as well. The teacher, then, is an active constructor of curriculum and a significant curriculum developer. As a result, the teacher significantly shapes what students have the opportunity to learn.

Discussion

Some Methodological and Ethical Implications of the Study

The utilization of naturalistic techniques enabled the researcher to portray the teacher's theories. However, there are certainly limitations to the methodology. The researcher could not account for or document all possible PPTs. Others certainly exist but may not be as evident as those observed in practice or may not be as conscious as those revealed during interviews.

The resultant case study is not generalizable. Readers are reminded that detailed, thick description of a particular context is the aim of this naturalistic study, not generalizability. Sue's decision-making was portrayed carefully and with great attention to elements of trustworthiness in data collection, analysis, and reporting. The resultant degree of transferability to other contexts rests with the readers of this report, as it does with any naturalistic study (see Lincoln & Guba, 1985, for a detailed discussion of transferability).

In addition, the reporting of the case study for the purposes of this paper was necessarily restricted because of space limitations. Additional examples of theories and explanations of the methodology are found in the original report (Cornett, 1987a).

This study relied heavily upon the researcher's fieldnotes and on the techniques of member checking and participant confirmation. The latter served
to enhance the trustworthiness of the report, and was unlike the findings reported by Tobin, et al. (1988), where the exemplary science teacher participant was angry because he did not recognize himself in the findings. He stated as a result, "Never will the classroom teacher and the University professor see eye to eye. University professors have no idea what occurs in a real school situation" (p. 434). By contrast, Sue was convinced of the accuracy and appropriateness of the findings. Perhaps this was because Tobin et al. "started the study with a mindset that we would observe an experienced science teacher creating an environment which was conducive to learning science in a meaningful way" (p. 434). These researchers had apparently predetermined what was effective practice and held the teacher to that standard. In contrast, Sue was told that there would be no judgment of "good or bad" practice from the researcher’s perspective. While social studies educators (and maybe even Sue) may have benefited from such insights in this case, the researcher was not stating "what ought to be" but attempting to capture the participant’s perspective of her curricular and instructional actions.

This point is also an ethical one. Tobin’s participant might not have allowed the research to continue had he known how negative the result would be, and if he had a clear path to deny future access. In Sue’s instance, the researcher asked her if she wanted to continue and discussed the possible implications of continued cooperation if she did. However, even this attempt to provide ongoing informed consent and the opportunity to withdraw that consent may need additional visibility. As proposed elsewhere, a formal periodic ethics check is suggested so that this crucial element of informed consent is attended to on a daily basis. This check might take the form of a simple document which asks the participant if she is aware of the risks and benefits of continued participation, and whether or not she is receiving adequate communication from the researcher. If so, she signs the document. If not, the researcher attempts to fill in the gaps. If this is unsuccessful, the study is discontinued. It should be remembered that this type of investigation is highly intensive and provides deep insights for the teacher if done correctly. This reflection may prove to be too much for some teachers and they should have the opportunity to withdraw without fear of reprisal and without any loss of dignity.

Finally, it is believed that if the participant has had the opportunity to react to the research process and actively influence it, it should be her option at some period to be identified as the participant, and to relinquish her anonymity. It is after all, a report of her life as a teacher.

Implications For Teacher Education in The Social Studies

According to Clark (1988), the impact of teacher thinking research upon teacher education is unclear at this point. It is suggested here that such research may inform the field in the following manner: (1) social studies
researchers may actively engage in further teacher thinking research to test the assumptions described in this paper and to develop others; (2) social studies teacher educators may provide both undergraduate and graduate stduents with reports of case studies of teacher thinking to illustrate the impact of the teacher’s personal practical theories on the curriculum and curriculum development; (3) social studies teacher educators may examine the relationship between social studies methods of choice (e.g., inquiry), and actual teacher practice, while recognizing that methods must be transformed by teachers in practical situations; and (4) social studies teacher educators may encourage their students to examine their own theories through creating assignments which encourage this type of reflection and which utilize qualitative forms of data collection and analysis.

Conclusion

While this research attempted to portray the personal practical theories of Ms. Sue Chase, it nevertheless remains an interpretation based upon researcher/participant interactions over a six-month period. The researcher tried to accurately represent Sue’s perspective of these events and to establish the trustworthiness of the data collection, analysis, and reporting. The research is necessarily limited by the perceptive capabilities of the human instrument.

It should also be noted that the process of this investigation has significantly increased the reflective capacity of both teacher and researcher. With continued opportunities for this type of reflection, that capacity should evolve even more. Practicing teachers can study their own practice utilizing similar qualitative methods and benefit from this reflection (Cornett, in press).

It was apparent that Sue was previously unconscious of the tacit nature of her theories. She was not informed about her significant role as a curriculum developer and how these theories affected that role. Unlike Hyland’s findings (1985), Sue’s theories and practice were highly congruent. What she believed was quite evident in her practice. As in the Elbaz (1981, 1983) and Pape (1988) investigations, there was a tension in her practice as a result of the alignment of these theories. As a result of the information provided by the study, Sue was able to develop an action plan to adjust these theories and practices. Unlike the Evans study (1988), Sue’s conceptions of curriculum and instruction were driven by her view of her personal role as a professional, and were not heavily tied to her subject matter. Those theories dealing with subject matter directly were considered minor theories and labeled sub-theories.

Further investigations may help to refine the connection between teacher personal practical theories and teacher practice. The “thoughtful practitioner” may be more thoughtful as a result, and those outside the classroom may further appreciate the extremely complex curricular and instructional decision-making of the social studies teacher.
Endnotes


2. This definition of curriculum is adapted from G. McCutcheon’s in her article: What in the world is curriculum theory? Theory Into Practice, 21(1), 18–22.

3. Sue has relinquished her anonymity as a result of an informed decision. While the literature suggests that participant confidentiality should be protected, it is believed that if the participant has had significant time to reflect about participation in the study that she has the right to be acknowledged directly. Toward this end, Sue and I are currently engaged in writing several articles and will be making a conference presentation as well. Commentary from the field is welcomed on this decision to “go public.”

4. J. Hough and K. Duncan (with J. Belland) define personal negative judgment as (underlining in the original): “Any manifest behavior (spoken, unspoken or mediated) that responds or reacts to a person (self or other), an antecedent behavior of the self or another, or to a product of such behavior (appearing in the instructional situation) by expressing a personal, negative judgment about the person, behavior or product of behavior, the criteria for making the judgment are personal and arise from the feeling states or value preferences of the person doing the judging.” In Category definitions and descriptions of The Observational System for Instructional Analysis. Unpublished manuscript, The Ohio State University, Columbus, p. 16.
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Knowledge Transmitter, Social Scientist or Reflective Thinker: Three Images of the Practitioner in Western Australian High Schools

D. S. G. Carter
University of Western Australia

Abstract

A psychometrically derived typology of teaching styles or preferred approaches to teaching social studies was presented. Separate case studies of teachers, each of whom represented a type were reported. The purpose of this was to flesh out and ascribe meaning to the psychometric data previously collected by schedule-based systematic observation. The latter is necessarily restricted to behavioral observation and description.

Qualitative data collection and analysis methods together with rating scales were employed, within a symbolic-interactionist framework, to capture the intent and meaning behind the cognitive interactions observed and of the temporal and contextual conditions under which they occurred.

It was found that the teachers were conscious of their preferred approach to teaching social studies, and could account for their style in terms of the construction of social studies knowledge and aspirations they held for their students.

Introduction

Any field of research is concerned with some aspect of reality, the delineation of which defines its territory. Ideally, research in a discipline aims at the creation of an increasingly refined map of its territory and typically, research in a new field begins with a description of its territory (Kallos & Lundgren 1975). In a study seeking to map an under-researched aspect of the territory of teaching processes in social studies classrooms, Carter and Hacker constructed a typology of teaching styles using instrument-based systematic observation as the principal method of data collection, and cluster analysis to group teachers exhibiting similar teaching profiles. This research, based on a sample of 40 teacher-class units, is comprehensively reported by Carter and Hacker (1988).
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A typology of social studies teaching processes was delineated and the profiles constituting the typology resolved from the clustering process—a major outcome of the 1988 study—were characterized as ‘pen-portraits’ which are repeated below.

Data involving the structured observation of 40 teacher-class units were collected by means of the Social Studies Lesson Observation Schedule (SSLOS; see Appendix 1), and cluster analyzed. A typology of three teaching styles was resolved from the clustering process and characterized as pen-portraits, thus:

**Group 1 (n = 15): The Knowledge Transmitter**
This is a teacher-centered didactic style. Undifferentiated content with respect to pupil abilities and needs is presented as material to be learned and understood. Tight structuring and pacing of lesson material affords little opportunity for pupil initiated questions. When these do occur the correct answer is invariably given by the teacher.

The form of the interactions is dominated by teacher-initiated questions and statements. Extensive use is made of multi-media materials either for whole class use or independent study. The function of the interactions is epitomized by an emphasis on the acquisition of facts and development of convergent problem solving.

**Group 2 (n = 22): The Social Scientist**
Interactions are characterized by a ‘scientific’ orientation with an emphasis on skills development. The introduction and practice of cognitive skills is functionally related to content selected from the parent social science disciplines. This is mediated to the pupils who internalize it as they acquire and refine syntactic elements related to a substantive body of content.

The form of the interactions illustrates the practical involvement of pupils and teacher with resource material. References to the teacher and to other pupils for assistance and/or comment frequently occur. The function of the interactions is principally the practice and development of cognitive skills, using a number of data forms (maps, diagrams, graphs, tables and pictures), while concurrently acquiring knowledge of social studies facts and concepts.

**Group 3 (n = 3): The Reflective Thinker**
This is a process orientation which emphasizes intellectual and personal development through the active engagement of teacher and pupils in probing social issues. The learning of social studies content is instrumental to this purpose and provides a basis for decision making.

The form of the interactions provides a high degree of teacher questions and statements as well as the active involvement of pupils with each other as social resources. Teacher questions are mainly divergent in order to raise issues, help pupils clarify underlying problems, and analyze value stances. The teacher adopts a responsive approach to the needs and concerns of pupils,
with the initiative for lesson development often appearing to be held by the pupils. The function of the interactions focuses on high order speculative abilities involving both convergent and divergent problem solving. Interactions high on category 13 (see Appendix 1) indicate a highly rational approach to decision-making and critical thinking.

The purpose of the research reported here is to illuminate and interpret the intent behind the cognitive interactions which typically occur in classrooms in which each teaching style, as identified above, was dominant. Qualitative techniques are employed, within a symbolic interactionist framework, to study in more detail three teacher-class units identified from the clustering process. These were selected by their immediate proximity to the group centroid of each cluster and are, therefore, representative of each ‘style’ or ‘type’.

Interaction analysis using systematic observation may accurately describe classroom behaviors, but it lies outside the scope of the method to ascribe meaning and intention to the behaviors observed and described. Whereas the categories of an observation system are pre-specified and unchangeable once established, categories and concepts which emerge during the research, and are grounded in the data, are sometimes required to sort out and illuminate the particular characteristics of individuals. This type of research activity requires different techniques such as those drawn from ethnography. The position is aptly summarized by Stubbs and Delamont:

Systematic observation schedules can provide convenient data on certain aspects of classroom interaction; they can show, for example, that different teachers have different ‘profiles’, i.e., different overall characteristic ways of teaching. But such an observation technique can never show why teachers differ on such measures. Such questions are, by definition, beyond the scope of the method. (Stubbs and Delamont, 1976, p. 101)

Thus, because of the observer’s concern with description and his/her own interpretation of intention without reference to the actor’s intention, perceived or otherwise, there is an inherent danger that systematic observation using the techniques of interaction analysis may miss or neglect underlying but nevertheless meaningful features.

No single method can hope to capture the complexity of classroom life. Thus participant observation, field notes, lesson video-recording, and interviewing were the main qualitative techniques employed in which the data gathering sources were triangulated using the observer, the teacher, and multiples of students selected at random from the classes observed.

A symbolic interactionist approach was applied to the study of the three teacher-class units selected. Each is treated as a separate case study in which it is possible to acknowledge both the particulars and universals of classroom life.
Symbolic Interactionism

This is a theory that seeks to explain human behavior in terms of its meaning and is derived from the earlier works of theorists such as Cooley and Mead. One of the clearest statements of this sociological theory is presented by Blumer (1969). Central to it is the notion of a self possessed by humans. Individuals are self-interactive and reflexive. They act according to their interpretation of the meanings that certain things have for them. People act according to the way they perceive or construct their worlds within the broad limits of acceptable or tolerable social behavior. The self is not a rigid concept frozen in time. Rather it is characterized as a dynamic and changing process. Individuals think about what they are doing—internal psychoanalytic states are crucial to the way people react to, and interact with others, according to the way they construe a social situation.

Paraphrasing Spradley (1980, p. 8), Blumer develops symbolic interactionist theory from three premises.

1. “Human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). It is the symbols credited with special meanings to which people react and with which they interact rather than the things themselves. Often the latter are culturally derived behaviors and/or artefacts.

2. Arising out of, or derived from the social interaction one has with one’s fellow human beings is the shared system of meanings which are acquired, maintained, and revised in the context of the social interaction that occurs.

3. “Meanings are handled in, and modified through, an interpretive process used by the person dealing with the things s/he encounters” (Blumer, 1969, p. 2). Implied here is that the individual’s construction of the world and/or perception of reality is not necessarily accurate or error free. The basic notion is that when individuals interact they are constantly interpreting their own and others’ acts. They continue reacting and interpreting in the light of subsequent perceptions and constructions of each other’s behavior.

While in the main the symbolic interactionist framework has been applied to institutional settings other than schools, there is no reason why this should necessarily be so. However, as Delamont (1983) notes:

When the symbolic interactionist approach is applied to classrooms, certain consequences follow. The classroom relationship of teacher and pupils is seen as a joint act—a relationship that works, and is about doing work. The interaction is understood as the daily ‘give and take’ between teacher and pupils. The process is one of negotiation—an on-going process by which everyday realities of the classroom are constantly defined and re-defined. (p. 28)
When first confronted with a strange social situation, individuals learn how to conduct themselves by watching, listening, and asking questions. Symbolic interactionism, although oversimplified by this analogy, is paralleled by doing research of a similar nature, sometimes labelled participant observation or ethnography.

However, symbolic interactionists are unified by more than their methodological assumptions. They share a theory, or set of theories, from which they seek to explain the social world and account for the mechanisms of social behavior.

Research Procedures

Intensive study of the three teacher-class units was conducted during the course of a single school term, with observations and interviews conducted between teacher and class in sequence across each 'type'.

As well as proximity to the group centroid, resulting from the clustering process, the final selection of teachers for further study was made with reference to other sources of data.

Individual behavioral profiles derived from SSLOS data were compared for congruity with the median profiles which emerged. Supplementary anecdotal data, collected during the observations (Carter & Hacker, 1988), of the initial sample (M = 40) were visually inspected for characterization of the style delineated in the 'pen portraits'. Possible choices of teachers, subject to their willingness to participate further, were finally made on the basis of discussions with the two observers who collected the SSLOS data—each interviewed separately. Teachers were contacted individually by the researcher and the first choice from each group representing The Knowledge Transmitter, The Social Scientist, and The Reflective Thinker types agreed to participate when so requested.

In each of the participant-observation periods, the researcher spent time in the classroom simply getting the class used to the presence of an observer. Lessons were then selected for qualitative data collection. One of the former for each teacher was video-taped and analysed through discussion and stimulated recall. Narrative logs of lesson interactions, teacher and student interviews, and the completion of rating scales by students and their teacher completed the data collection procedures for this study.

Students were interviewed in multiple sets of three or four in the expectation that this would reduce shyness and allow students to trigger each other's response to questions and prompts. Transcripts of teacher and student interview data are presented in full elsewhere (Carter, 1986). During typing the tapes were 'cleaned up' slightly to remove sounds which were either extraneous or indecipherable, provided they did not alter the sense or flow of communication. The original audio-tapes are held by the researcher.
Triangulation

According to Webb (1970), triangulation provides a means of self-monitoring by researchers. This is effected in data collection by drawing simultaneously upon multiple measures hypothesized to overlap on theoretically relevant components, but not on measurement errors specific to individual methods. By using multiple data collection methods and combining these in a controlled way it is possible to minimize bias in qualitative research. Webb (1970, p. 450) claims that triangulation is a research strategy in which the multiple operationalism of data collection contributes to research rigor. Consequently internal validity is preserved.

In seeking to enhance the rigor of qualitative research design some of the criticisms leveled at single methods research are countered. Participant observation when used exclusively as a single data collection method, for example, may be subjected to criticism over sampling procedures, low construct validity and the acceptance of impressionistic accounts of behaviors difficult to verify (Zelditch, 1962, p. 496).

For this study, using Webb's (1970) terminology, methodological triangulation of the between-method type using participant observation, field reports and interviews of informants plus stimulated recall of video-taped lessons was employed.

Three Case Studies*

Knowledge Transmitter:
Teacher—John Manning

John is in his late 40s and teaches in a large metropolitan senior high school located in an inner suburb of the Perth metropolitan region. The school has a large ethnic population and caters to a wide range of ability. The school, now comprehensive, boasts an academic tradition in keeping with that of the English Grammar Schools. Tangible evidence of this *inter alia* includes images and artefacts, such as photographs of old boys and honor rolls, which line the walls in the central administrative area.

John Manning is a senior member of staff and Head of Faculty. His dress, manner and personal front are conservative and he appears to be somewhat forbidding to younger pupils.

The Classroom Setting

John conducts all his classes in a single room to which students come for their social studies lessons. Apart from a few Education Department charts and a single environmental conservation poster, the walls are bare.

The furniture consists of flat-topped tables separated by a single aisle down the middle of the room. A wall of blackboards appear at the far end and

---

*In reporting these case studies the ethnographic present is used throughout and fictitious names given to the teachers observed in order to preserve confidentiality.*
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a single flat-topped table supporting an overhead projector and a globe is located at the rear of the room.

The grade nine glass being observed (with students aged 14-15 years) file into the room and quietly take up their allocated seats. They are evenly balanced between male and female students. None appear to wear the school uniform in toto, but parts of it are worn by some. According to their teacher, the majority of students are fairly average in ability and not highly motivated. They present no discipline or managerial problems to him.

*The Teacher Interview and Participant Observation Data*

John has clear conceptions of the purpose of social studies and the benefits students derive from a study of the subject. He also holds certain aspirations for student learnings as a consequence of his teaching and gains professional satisfaction from teaching the subject.

**Interviewer:** . . . as you indicated earlier you have been teaching for quite some time . . . can you actually describe the things you enjoy in your lessons, giving a couple of examples if you can?

**Teacher:** The kids themselves and their responses to the particular social activities and social science areas of knowledge and concepts and also trying to inculcate within them an appreciation of social studies. (Transcript 4A, p. 2)

The teacher views social studies as a circumscribed body of content to be learnt as evidence by his response when asked about this.

**[T]:** No! I think there is a body of knowledge which must be mastered so that you can build on and reach the more esoteric higher order skills. (Transcript 4A, p.3)

As well as acquiring certain understandings he places a high value on the acquisitions of social skills.

**[T]:** I think it is essential that the students leave school with certain social skills. Behind these social skills they know why they have to acquire the knowledge why they've got to vote, what is their place in society, how they can possibly influence their place, what social values they should have and the skills they really need to occupy a place in society. (Transcript 4A, p.3)

He is, however, somewhat hesitant in the values area:

**[T]:** It's most difficult to evaluate values and values change, because most students have already, from their parents and their peer group, a set of values which is very difficult to change, although one can hopefully make them aware of other values apart from their own. (Transcript 4A, p. 4)

†The Teacher Interview Schedule is presented in Appendix 2A.
With respect to constraints on what he teaches and how, John has clear and fixed ideas about this. He regards his personal autonomy in this area as sacrosanct, and, while acknowledging the existence of superordinate administrative structures and their significance, pays little attention to their influence at the classroom level. This becomes evident in the interview data.

[I]: Are you continually conscious, or not very conscious, of the BSE\(^1\) levels of your pupils?

[T]: I wouldn’t say continually conscious of it, but I am conscious of their levels and their attainment of the indicated levels.

[I]: Do the BSE assessment requirements affect what you do?

[T]: Not really. For example, in certain years we may have an indicated number of students studying at advanced level, or who should be, but are not actually performing to that level. (Transcript 4A, p. 3)

[I]: To what degree do you conceive the Education Department’s current social studies curriculum to be a constraint on what I would loosely call, your teaching style.

[T]: None at all.

[I]: Thinking back on your approach to social studies teaching, what do you prize most in your teaching and, if you had to, would defend at all cost?

[T]: The freedom to do as I wanted. The freedom to tackle the course in the way I see fit. (Transcript 4A, p. 4)

In the negotiation of meaning, the daily ‘give and take’ between students and teacher, the teaching style is captured through participant observation data and summarized as direct or active teaching. Data from a narrative log\(^2\) of a representative lesson are included here, since they capture the classroom interactions which typify John’s style. The observations were pre-figured with a focus on cognitive interactions, but managerial and social-emotional transactions were periodically recorded if they were difficult to partial out from the former, or appeared relevant to the interpretation of events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher/Student</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.04</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>John formally commences lesson by description of the executive role of Federal Government. Talks about defence, foreign policy, taxation whilst putting summary notes on the blackboard. Students copy. Teacher elaborates whilst students write. Class attentive and well drilled. Some quiet asides by two or three students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>Teacher question</td>
<td>What haven’t I included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student answer</td>
<td>Education!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Right! [Puts on blackboard.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student answer: Inflation? Hospital benefits? Teacher picks up points and discusses these with class.

Teacher statement: OK! Let's have another one!

Student answer: Currency!

Teacher: . . . Right! [pause] Right! Let's take these ten functions in turn.

Teacher question: What's the most important one? [No response]. Teacher eventually indicated taxation. More rapid fire questions to 'draw out' students and stimulate thinking about functions of Government as both money users and money spenders. Questions all convergent.

Teacher exposition: Further elaboration of information under each of the blackboard headings. Students taking extra notes from teacher exposition—almost like dictation.

The pattern of verbal questioning and presentation of information, with the teacher drawing on one or two current events to add relevance and force to his exposition, continues until 9.26 a.m. or approximately two-thirds through the lesson. The class was then directed to individual silent reading from their textbook.

Teacher Directive: Take out Koutsoukis and read pages 219-222. Then revise the question on how Government raises money. [Puts the instructions on the blackboard.] The class is quickly on task and teacher moves around class dealing with individual members. Speech is in very subdued tones. Teacher exhibits high degree of 'withitness' in monitoring seatwork.

Teacher Directive: Focusses class.

The former questioning pattern is resumed until 9.36 a.m. after which a few more notes are dictated until 9.40 a.m. when the class is dismissed.

Extended observations show John's approach to be fairly consistent with this class. Some variation was introduced with the use of audio-visual material and work-sheets. Reliance was placed mainly on the use of the blackboard, overhead projector, and the textbook. (Functionally related graphing and data handling skills were addressed in a subsequent lesson.)

Discussion and stimulated recall of a further lesson, which was video-taped, indicates that this teacher is conscious of the expository nature of his teaching and the reception learning this appears to induce in his students. His teaching style or preferred approach becomes meaningful in the context of his
epistemological view of the subject matter of social studies and its instrumental role in student learning. This is supported by the anecdotal data collected from the initial sample (M = 40) by Carter and Hacker (1988), and by observation and field notes data also derived during the latter study.

Student Interviews

The interview schedule for students was devised, trialed, and modified. The final version adopted appears in Appendix 2B. It was designed to elicit student views regarding social studies and abbreviated but patterned on the teacher interview schedule. Interviews were conducted with three or four students present which would encourage students to participate more fully in the interview; would canvass different views by allowing students to converse with each other as well as the interviewer; and make the situation less threatening than would occur in a single face-to-face interview with a stranger.

From the student point of view John presents a lot of written work and assignments. However, the students are 'now' oriented and their response may have been affected by the immediacy of a lot of note taking and dictation—as evidenced in the most recently observed lesson.

[I]: . . . So, thinking back on your social studies programme this year, what do you think it’s all been about? (pause) What sort of things have you been doing this year in social studies—can you think way back?

Respondent: Well the first topic was Malaysia and other countries there, we learned about their lifestyles and stuff. (pause) History of Australia . . . (pause)

[I]: Well, if you can’t remember the topics what sorts of things have you been doing a lot of? What sorts of activities?

[RI]: Mapping—we went over to Jarrahdale on an excursion—Pinjarra mining town—lots of assignments. (Transcript. 4B, p.3)

Student interview data further illuminates John’s teaching style, although relevant responses are fragmented and scattered throughout the interview.

In response to a question with reference to the lesson just taught, which asked if that was fairly typical of the way Mr Manning teaches social studies, the students indicated frequent use of the overhead projector and affirmed the teacher used a lot of questions and statements. The students, however, felt that they had learned the subject matter of the lesson and that it was presented to them in a clear manner.

[I]: (with reference to the lesson just concluded). And how much of that do you think you can remember?

[RI]: Quite alot of it.

[I]: Do you think it was clear?

[RI]: Yes. (Transcript 4B, p.2)

The lesson objectives were also evident to the students.
[I]: What can you remember on that about the last lesson? (pause) What sorts of things? (pause) Well, If I gave you a voting card now do you think you could fill one in?

[R]: Yes.

[I]: What do you think Mr Manning was trying to get you to do throughout the lesson?

[R]: To get to know how to fill out a ballot sheet.

[I]: You think that was his main purpose? Anything else?

[R]: How to count votes. (Transcript, 4B, pp. 2-3)

Student views on the subject matter of social studies were mixed, varying from actual dislike of ‘history’ and ‘politics’ to a matter-of-fact acceptance of what was presented to them. However, there was a tendency to return to the current topic and lesson just concluded and difficulty in recalling any specific detail about their current social studies program and social studies in general.

**Teacher/Student Rating Scales**

Both teacher and students completed rating scales related to, and developed from, the anecdotal summary chart located on the reverse of SSLOS (Carter & Hacker, 1988). The additional rating scale developed specifically to gauge teacher estimates of the extent to which SSLOS function categories are used by each of them is treated in a discrete section at the end of this paper.

Data for John Manning and his students are presented below. Median scores are shown against the students’ rating of categories in Figure 1.

In response to ‘other activities please list’, at the bottom of the instrument, each student included ‘taking notes of the board’ and one included ‘dictation’.

Within the limitations characteristic of rating scales (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 549) some features in the data require comment when the ratings across teacher and students are compared. Both acknowledge the high frequency of teacher talk (cf. Flanders, 1970) and the frequent occurrence of reading in this class. At the opposite end of the scale teacher and students rate as ‘infrequent’ the use of audio-tapes, small group work, experimentation and observation. Surprising discrepancies occur between the high ratings given to ‘question and answer/quiz’, ‘audio-visual presentations’, ‘project work/library research’, ‘excursions’ and ‘picture studies’. Minor discrepancies between the low use of some categories, and the nil use of the same categories by students, are accounted for by the latter’s orientation to the present. When these data are compared vertically with participant observation logs and interview data, there is a high degree of congruence between the teacher’s self estimate of teacher led and teacher directed activities and observation data. This also tallies with the nil or infrequent use of student centered learning activities.

Data derived from students support their view that the teacher talks a lot, avoids small group discussion, and engages the class in selected skills develop-
Figure 1. Teacher and student ratings of (in bold) frequency of use of selected learning activities. **Teacher—John Manning.** (Categories not rated signify not used to date in the academic year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>Frequent</td>
<td>Infrequent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher talk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Question &amp; answer/quiz</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Class discussion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Debates</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audio-visual presentations (Video/movie film/filmstrip/slides)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Listening to audio tapes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lectureettes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Game/simulation/role play</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Small group discussion/committee work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project work/library research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual work/private study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mapping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Picture studies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Experiments/making observations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Model building</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Excursions/fieldwork</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Guest speakers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ment using map and graphical data forms. Data collected from multiple methods lend support to the student ratings of frequent reading of textual material normally conducted on an individual (silent) basis.

**Conclusion**

The image of a ‘knowledge transmitter’ emerges from this classroom and adds further depth to the pen portrait of this teaching style which is described in the introduction to this paper. From the case study of this ‘type’ it is evident that the teaching pattern is not idiosyncratic, but is recognized by John Manning and is intentional in its application. Meaning can be attached to John’s style when referenced to a particular view of social studies.
subject matter held by him. Of significance for the implementation of externally developed social studies curricula is the extent to which this teacher values his classroom autonomy and the fixed relationship of his teaching style.

Social Scientist:
Teacher 2—Russell Hay

Russell is in his mid-30s, tall, neatly attired, and well presented in a conservative style. He communicates well and relates easily to both his peers and students. His concern for the comfort and well being of his students is obvious, and he appears to be popular with many adolescents in the school—not only those in classes that he teaches. He exhibits a high profile in the extra-curricular activities of the school, including its pastoral care programme, and enjoys working with youth. He moved into teaching from a previous occupation as a youth worker and has taught social studies in high schools for 12 years. He is currently engaged in part-time studies in education leading to a further professional qualification.

Russell teaches in a large senior high school on the borderline between Perth and Fremantle. This location is not quite inner suburban but certainly ‘inner metropolitan’. The school is adjacent to a major highway connecting Perth and Fremantle.

The school, like other state schools, is comprehensive, offering a curriculum with a wide range of subjects and catering to a broad range of needs and interests. Ethnicity is less obvious here than in John Manning’s school, although there is some overspill from Fremantle of students with parents of southern European descent. The students are rather more obvious in their wearing of the school uniform although the latter is by no means ubiquitous throughout the school population.

The architectural style of the school is functional in grey brick. It is a two storey structure built in a box pattern with first floor balconies facing inwards onto two separate grassed quadrangles.

The Classroom Setting

Russell Hay, as an established member of staff, has his own classroom to which students come for their social studies lessons. The classroom has windows lining the whole side of the wall opposite the door, making the room light and airy. Access to the room is via an upper storey balcony. There is a small storeroom leading from a door at the back of the classroom. Blackboards line the wall at the front. Several pin boards take up the remaining wall space on which are placed samples of students’ work. The room is carpeted and furnished with single desks arranged in rows and in lines of two. There is ample space between desks for monitoring seatwork by the teacher. Like the school architecture, the classroom exudes an air of being simply functional, but not uncomfortable.

The grade nine class walk in and seat themselves, chatting with each other and taking out files and books from their bags, while the teachers busies
himself at the front of the room before focussing the class to start the lesson. This entry behavior was fairly constant throughout the two week period of observation.

Russell's rapport with the class is good and the informality of the students is not perceived to be threatening to the classroom management of this teacher. Classes are normally of 40 minutes duration.

**Teacher Interview and Participant Observation Data**

Russell gains immense personal satisfaction from interaction with his students. In response to the question about what he actively enjoys in his lessons the reply is as follows:

**[T]**: I enjoy seeing the kids developing in their thinking and understanding and I really love to see them—you see some of the kids for instance very shy and very hesitant to talk in class. They have a very low view of their own ability and I really enjoy seeing these kids developing, being able to participate actively in the class and discussion and really feel they are making a contribution. I like to see kids develop. (Transcript, 5A, p.2)

With respect to the value of social studies for the grade nine class he was teaching, Russell has clear conceptions of this and aspirations for his students as follows:

**[I]**: Next question, and this is particularly with respect to the year nine class that I have seen today, what value do you see in the study of social studies for this group of pupils?

**[T]**: I would say the most important thing for these kids is to get skills, get some confidence in themselves to realise they can gather information. Not only can they gather it—they can use and make sense of it. I think if those kids can develop those skills plus the social skills they are developing in the course, to me that would be the most important use.

**[I]**: And related to this, what do you hope this same group of pupils will take away from your course at the end of this year?

**[T]**: Well I hope they will take away some skills that they can apply to their studies next year, but I also hope that these kids can start to make sense of the world we are living in. They've got a better understanding of the way of approaching problems and that they can apply some of the things that they have learnt here. (Transcript 5A, pp. 6-7)

In response to the question of placing knowledge and understandings, values, cognitive and social skills into some priority ranking, Russell stated that he would rate knowledge the lowest, although he indicated such rank ordering was somewhat temporal. Probes with respect to values and valuing were met with hesitance.

**[I]**: . . . Have you seen any change in the values-set?

**[T]**: The only way is in the way the kids discuss things.

**[I]**: Do you look for that or does it comes intuitively after a period of time?
[T]: Before values education was spelled out to us I guess you always used to look and hope that kids would change their attitudes towards things. To a lot of kids it seems to be an intuitive thing. (Transcript 5A, p.5)

The teacher is conscious of institutional and administrative constraints and their implications for classroom practice. This appears to be most acute in the area of assessment procedures for accountability purposes.

[T]: I think it a problem how much of the assessment is actually based on pencil and paper. Generally, because you've got to keep the BSE in mind, and give results, you have to be aware of those marks and most of them have to be checked up on and verified. Therefore it goes back to the quizzes and tests and assignments again.

[I]: You are partly into the next question. I'll ask it anyway. Are you conscious or not very conscious of the BSE levels of the pupils?

[T]: Yes I am! You have got to have a series of marks and they have to be validated and have to compare with other people's results so the kids get a fair assessment...

[I]: Well again that leads in doesn't it? The next one, do the BSE assessment requirements affect what you do—that's both the content and the methods you use? Well, that's the first part of the question.

[T]: It does because, obviously, if you are going to get right or wrong answers you have to be objective in what the kids have done and what they have achieved... (Transcript 5A, pp. 2-3)

In addition to formal assessment requirements the externally developed social studies curriculum is perceived as another restriction on Russell's classroom autonomy.

[I]: Next question—I don't want to distinguish here between the incoming K-10 and the previous course, I just want you to think of the social studies course itself and I'll ask you the question—to what extent do you see the Education Department's current curriculum itself to be a constraint on your approach to teaching?

[T]: In a way it is a constraint and it's also a launching off point, and I think in that way you recognize its values. When you are teaching certain levels in kids at times they find an area that really interests them, but because it doesn't fit into the course it's not actually specified you can't even pursue it as far as you would like to pursue it... (Transcript 5A, p. 5)

The emphasis, by this teacher on cognitive and social skills and a concern with student self-concept, is a recurrent theme throughout the data. In spite of external constraints (perceived or real) the teacher is consistent in pursuing these priorities. He is also aware of his teaching style, having studied the raw data coded in the observation instrument from a related research study (Carter and Hacker 1988).
If you recall just before the interview we looked at the raw data that was recorded earlier in the year and you examined it. As you recall it can you (a) tell me if that pattern is representative of the way you teach and, if so, (b) possibly try and articulate why you prefer to teach that way?

Well with these kids, it is definitely the way I teach. I like the kids in the class to realise their importance as individuals, and I'm not just teaching a group of kids, and I like them to know my interest is in them not just progress . . .

It's a fairly highly interactive pattern with a lot of pupil activity and your activity is quite intense as well, and that's intended?

Yes! Probably my background of working with kids in youth clubs I think. (Transcript 5A, pp. 7-8)

The interactive, but teacher centered, style of Russell Hay is captured in field notes and the participant observation log. Data summarizing a lesson consistent with Russell's teaching style throughout the period of observation is presented below. Observations were prefigured on cognitive interactions, and recording of the flow of these is presented in narrative style, interspersed with the actual words used by teacher and students. The lesson is located within the grade nine social studies topic 'Australia in the International Community', which is based upon a study of international affairs since World War I. The teacher is developing a perspective on the countries of the Middle East while getting the students to practice data handling skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Teacher/Student</th>
<th>Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Gives out worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.48</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Foreshadows nature of task for this lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>statements</td>
<td>Builds up summary overview of Middle East—reminds class of content from last lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>Teacher question</td>
<td>What do we understand by population? Probes further until satisfied the class understands the concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>Teacher question</td>
<td>Where is Bahrain? Several pupils respond in quick succession. Teacher takes these replies and builds on them presenting further information at same time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Student question</td>
<td>Teacher responds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.51</td>
<td>Teacher directive</td>
<td>Students now completing summary grid of selected characteristics of Middle East countries as class discussion proceeds. Teacher reinforces and summarizes using the black board. Teacher also draws on students' prior research with respect to current task.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| .56    | Teacher question| What is the name of the government of Iran? Student calls out Majlis—teacher nods. Basic data for blackboard
summary being supplied to teacher by students for each country [area, government, religion . . . ] Teacher elaborates periodically whilst building summary.

1.02 Teacher directive *Pens down and listen!* Teacher holds class and uses probe questions to check class understanding.

.03 Teacher question *What's a constitutional monarchy?* eventually draws answer out of student responses.

Teacher question Emirate. Makes connections between Emir and emirate.

1.13 Convergent problem solving activity continues.

.16 Teacher question *What's the use of this chart? Why are we drawing it up?* Students look blank—some half-hearted replies.

1.17 Teacher statement Draws inferences from the data and foreshadows other data yet to be included.

.18 Teacher question *When you have all this data what will it help you to do? Get more knowledge of Middle East.*

Student reply *Yes! Good! Anything else?* (Further questions of a speculative nature.)

Teacher question Returns to chart. *Apart from Social Studies any other way we could use chart?* [no reply]. *Where in your life could you use information in this form?* (Teacher trying to get students to generalise—gets slightly frustrated—gives clues).

Teacher question *What about car types?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Blackboards Types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and compares chart axes

.23 Teacher directive *Tonight think about further uses for this grid!*

1.23 Asks class to pack up and dismisses students.

In the subsequent lesson, the data initially researched individually by country and recorded collectively across countries on a ‘master chart’ was transformed into pie-diagrams. An excerpt from the log follows:

---

1.31 Teacher Recaps with students technique of drawing a pie-graph in context of current task. Blackboards procedure.

1.34 Teacher directive *Using your data [sheet] do your calculations first then draw pie-graphs.*

1.35 Class on task. Teacher monitoring seat work—assists individuals. Pattern continues until end of lesson

1.57 Teacher Focusses class.

Teacher directive *Those who’ve not completed finish off this exercise for homework.*

1.59 Dismisses class.

---

The graphs and tabulated data were used in subsequent lessons to build, inductively, a picture of the way of life in the Middle East.
The shared interpretations of the interactions between teacher and students for the outcomes of this lesson allowed the teacher to conclude that he had achieved with the students what he wanted to, in spite of earlier difficulties, because some of the students did not understand what was required of them, or were deficient in pre-requisite skills for the task set.

**Student Interviews**

The students, all girls, were shy and self-conscious during the interview with the tape running. They were a little more relaxed and forthcoming during the brief informal discussions which preceded and followed the interview. A feature which became obvious during the interview, and is crystallized in the data, is their orientation to the present topic and lesson. They could only recall in vague generalities parts of the social studies programme implemented earlier in the year.

**[I]:** Can you think back, way back, and tell me some of the topics you have been doing this year?

**[R]:** Geography of Australia and other countries. History of . . .

**[I]:** When did you do that? Right at the start of the year?

**[R]:** Yes.

**[I]:** Anything else you can remember? Any other topics you have done? What have you been doing this term?

**[R]:** Middle East . . . (Pause)

**[I]:** Nearly all term? Can you remember what you were doing before that?

**[R]:** Consumer in the economy.

**[I]:** So that was economics—history, geography, and economics. So that was part of your social studies programme. Thinking back on those topics, which topics did you prefer?

**[R]:** Consumer and the economy . . . (Transcript 5B, pp. 1-2)

The students appear to enjoy the interactive nature of Mr Hay’s teaching style, indicating that they enjoyed the class discussions in response to the question ‘What do you enjoy most in social studies?’ Negotiation of meaning between students and teacher as they interpret each other’s behavior seems to have resulted in a high level of satisfaction for both parties in these transactions. The students were aware of the objectives for the lesson just concluded prior to the interview. Its relative success appeared to be not as high for these students compared with the teacher’s perceptions and those of the participant observer.

**[I]:** . . . What did you think he wanted you to know by the end of the lesson?

**[R]:** How to draw graphs.

**[I]:** It might sound obvious to you but that was probably what he did want . . . Was he very successful, as far as you were individually concerned, in getting you to do that?
[R]: Not me.
[R]: Sort of.
[R]: Yes and no!

[I]: So he had a varied success. How do you feel about it now that the lesson has gone? (pause). Do you feel relieved or sorry, or would you like to have gone on for a bit longer—or was it satisfactory?

[R]: Liked to have gone on a bit longer to finish the task. (Transcript 5B, pp. 4–5)

However, Russell’s strategy for the topic appeared to be making some progress since the students claimed they knew more about the countries, religions, governments, and population when asked about their knowledge of the Middle East before they started the topic.

Teacher/Student Rating Scales

These data are summarized in Figure 2. Four students completed the rating scale and their median scores are presented. The spread of scores is therefore not fully recognized on the student data and has resulted in a centralising tendency on categories 4, 10, 16 and 17 in particular. No further data were recorded by students and teacher in the ‘other categories’ underneath the rating scales.

Comparing the data for each category across teacher and student ratings there is a high degree of similarity in the estimates of frequency of use by both teacher and students. There is general agreement over the frequent use of ‘teacher talk’, ‘class discussion and small group discussion’, ‘project and individual work’, and ‘mapping’. It is estimated by both teacher and students that listening to audio tapes and the use of guest speakers occurs infrequently. There are discrepancies over whether or not simulation games, model building, or excursions occurred at all. This may be attributed to the reluctance of most of the students to leave a blank against categories. Even so they were recorded as ‘infrequent’ by the students. Divergence between the teacher’s self rating of ‘5’ on question and answer/quiz and the students rating of ‘3’ may be accounted for by students confusing this with class discussion. The difference between student and teacher ratings on the ‘demonstrations’ category is more difficult to account for and is not revealed in other data sources such as the participant observation log, interview data, or informal anecdotal summaries compiled by observers in the earlier phase of this study. There may be a tendency here for the teacher to overestimate and the students to underestimate the use of this category. However, further observations are needed to reach a firmer conclusion about this.

When these data are compared longitudinally with other sources, including logs, teacher discussions, and the observer’s perceptions, the highly interactive nature of classroom events structured by this teacher come to the fore. Student involvement with curriculum material is also high and there appears to be an emphasis on the development of cognitive skills. There is a tendency
Figure 2: Teacher and student ratings (in bold) of frequency of use of selected learning activities. **Teacher—Russell Hay.** (Categories not rated signify not used to date in the academic year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher talk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Question &amp; answer/quiz</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Class discussion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Debates</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audio-visual presentations (Video/movie film/filmstrip/slides)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Listening to audio tapes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lecturettes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Game/simulation/role play</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Small group discussion/committee work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project work/library research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual work/private study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mapping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Picture Studies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Experiments/making observations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Model building</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Excursions/fieldwork</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Guest speakers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

to avoid creative and expressive activities, and to allow values and valuing processes to develop informally through social interaction in the classroom, rather than through more focussed learning activities such as debates, simulation, and role-playing.

**Conclusion**

The portrayal of Russell Hay interacting with his grade nine social studies class, captured in these data, aligns with the characterization of this teaching style in the pen portraits derived from the cluster analysis of SSLOS data. Russell displays a preference for inductive thinking but somewhat paradoxically in a closed way. Elements of ‘structured heurism’ (Holly, 1971) emerge
in the nature of his questioning and his involvement of pupils with curriculum material.

Attempts to get students to generalize, based on data and research, are less evident for this teacher than might have been anticipated in the SSLOS median profiles for this ‘type’. The focus on a narrow range of cognitive skills is confirmed by participant observation data.

Russell recognizes, and can account for, his teaching style which appears to be related to his view of social studies and in particular the aspirations he holds for this group of students. He is aware of institutional and other constraints upon his teaching and professional autonomy, but these appear to be perceived rather than real. Whether he is conscious of these constraints or not, they appear to be passively resisted by the persistence and pervasiveness of the preferred teaching style which emerges and which is intentional on the part of the teacher. This requires more explicit acknowledgement by curriculum developers when considering the personal decision-making of teachers as they implement externally developed curricula.

Reflective Thinker:
Teacher 3—Fiona Goldsworthy

Fiona is in her late 20s or early 30s, physically quite small and with rounded features. She has a lively personality and a friendly outgoing ‘no-nonsense’ nature and dresses in a smart but casual way in keeping with current fashion.

The school in which Fiona teaches is a large comprehensive senior high school located just north of the Perth Central Business District. Students from a variety of ethnic backgrounds feature in the school population. The curriculum is varied and incorporates academic, vocational, and expressive offerings, supported by the State Education Department, to cater to the needs and interests of the thousand plus students enrolled there.

Entry to the school is through an imposing façade which belies the single storied lines of classrooms, the windows which face each other between grass strips, at the rear of the administration block. This architectural style is broken by the larger nuclei of staff room, a gymnasium, hall, and drama theatre. At the rear of the ‘lines’ of classrooms is a large car park for staff. While the front facade is painted white with dark tinted glass in large imposing windows, the rest of the structure is built in grey brick, occasionally softened by the planting out of foliage or small garden beds.

School uniform is worn in a piecemeal fashion by a majority of the students and not at all by the remainder. The school day and timetable are organised into six 50-minute periods over the five day week. Part-time technical education facilities using school resources are available to the community in the evenings during the term time.

In addition to her teaching duties, Fiona Goldsworthy is a ‘Year Mistress’. This attracts a higher duties allowance and involves her in the pastoral care program of the school as applied to a particular year band (grade level) of
students. She is therefore responsible for the discipline and welfare of all grade nine students in her school.

**The Classroom Setting**

Because Fiona has her own private office, in keeping with Year Mistress status, she is expected to move from classroom to classroom for the various classes she takes. The room where she teaches her grade nine class is slightly cramped for the 34 students who populate it. It is carpeted and there are windows only along one wall. Access is via a covered underpass and through a large sliding door. Blackboards line another wall and posters and notices are affixed to the two remaining walls above desk level. Single flat topped desks arranged in rows fill the room and restrict space around the teacher’s desk, the latter located at the front left hand side of the room.

The class is evenly divided on gender lines and the students are socially precocious. Fiona does not appear to mind the chatter and lively interaction that frequently and informally occurs between pupils, knowing that she can gain their attention and co-operation whenever she requires it.

**Teacher Interview and Participant Observation Data**

Ms Goldsworthy has a high regard for the subject she teaches and certain aspirations for her pupils.

[T]: . . . I get upset when kids put social studies down. When kids take science and math so seriously, and English and social studies they put down. That really annoys me because I honestly believe that social studies is the most interesting thing they can do in school, that it has aspects of all others in it . . . (Transcript 6A, p. 7)

In reply to a question about the value of studying social studies for the grade nine class she is currently teaching, Fiona responded as follows:

[T]: . . . With the group I’ve got at the moment I’m much more relaxed and I think I prefer it that way. The intermediate kids—very few of them are likely to go on to much higher work and I’m just trying through social studies to interest them in school, to interest them in the topic we’re doing at the moment—W.A. To interest them in their own State and to let them see they’ve got a part to play; so I do teach them a bit differently in that respect. (Transcript 6A, p. 5–6)

While Fiona does not devalue the importance of subject matter, she emphasizes processes in her classroom and this is a feature of her teaching style. This orientation appears in a desultory way throughout the interview data. Representative excerpts are included below illustrative of her process orientation.

[I]: Could you try and describe how you gauge your pupils’ progress in social studies?
[T]: There are certain things I feel like I should do, things like testing actual content, but apart from that I think, I'm not sure, but I think I tend to allow more on whether their skills in presenting what they think and what they know about and I go to that side of things more than actual content. (Transcript 6A, p. 2-3)

A further example of this aspect of Fiona's thinking is as follows:

[T]: ... Now that does require some cognitive skills of using resources and asking questions and formulating hypotheses and things like that, but I think I'd try and develop children as people first, people that are going to be interested in the world around them, rather than people who know about the world around them. (Transcript 6A, p. 4)

This teacher is concerned about teaching for values development which combines readily with her emphasis on processes. While affirming that values have an important place in her conception of epistemology of social studies, she is less certain as to the focus for teaching specifically in a values dimension and of evaluating pupil progress in this area.

[I]: With respect to the construction of social studies courses, if you had, and I emphasise had, to place knowledge and understanding, values, cognitive skills and social skills into some priority ranking, could you tell me what this would be, and having done that tell me why?

[T]: If I had to put a priority ranking, I would try to incorporate more values in the understandings ... and I think the understanding part, but more values oriented, would be my first choice and the skills follow on from those. I can't really differentiate at the moment between the understandings and the values ... (Transcript 6A, p. 3)

[I]: And the last one, it's a bit of a mouthful but this is gauging values, or the whole values set, or any change in values over a period of teaching, how would you gauge it?

[T]: That is very very difficult. Again it comes through in not directly asking them about certain questions but particularly I find in their discussion it's more attitudinal things that come up through other means.

[I]: Do you think you are systematically looking for that change over a period of time?

[T]: No, I don't think I am.

[I]: Not conscious of it?

[T]: No! I notice it if it happens but I'm not particularly looking for it. I'm fairly unstructured I suppose. (Transcript 6A, p. 4)

With respect to constraints on her teaching, neither external accountability requirements nor the Education Department's externally developed social
studies curriculum are perceived to restrict the types of classroom processes in which Fiona engages with her students. This is evident in the interview data.

[I]: Are you continually conscious, or in fact not very conscious of the BSE levels of your pupils in your daily teaching?
[T]: No! I'm not particularly conscious of it at all.
[I]: Do the BSE assessment requirements affect what you do? That's either in terms of content or methodology.
[T]: Only in so much as when it comes through the Department and the Senior Masters, you've got to have so many assessments in and they should be of a wide range and they've got to be in by certain dates, but that would be about all as a general thing. (Transcript 6A, p. 3)

Similarly with respect to the extant social studies course:

[I]: To what degree do you perceive the social studies course itself to be a constraint on your approach to teaching—what I have loosely called your teaching style?
[T]: The new course coming in, the K-10 syllabus, initially looks as if it's got an emphasis on the knowledge, the contents section, but within that I think they point out that you can develop it however you like and that's what I'll do . . .

[I]: I am inferring from that, as far as the current syllabus is concerned, you recognize it's there but you don't unduly see it as a constraint on you?
[T]: Oh no, I don't see it as a constraint. (Transcript 6A, pp. 5-6)

[I]: Taking a long term perspective on your teaching what do you prize most in it? In other words if you had to defend it at all costs what would that be?
[T]: What do I prize most? I think I defend most my control over how I teach and even to some extent what I teach within a particular topic. If anyone was saying 'you will teach it in this way and you will do these activities and this will be the assessment that you will follow', I couldn't handle that because I teach it differently. (Transcript 6, p. 6)

Participant observation data presented later in this section samples Fiona's teaching pattern and portrays the nature of the cognitive interactions that occur in a lesson that was observed. Significantly, however, Fiona recognizes her teaching style, summarized in previously acquired SSLOS data, and can ascribe meaning to it. This is captured in the interview data below:

[I]: Thinking back to about 15 minutes ago, when we had a preliminary look at the raw data which was picked up on your teaching earlier this year. Reflecting on those patterns, why do you think you teach or prefer to teach the way you do as evidenced in that data—and I am assuming here that it's representative of the way you teach. (pause) Firstly, is it representative as far as you can ascertain, and if so then secondly, why do you think you teach that way?
The pupil centredness is, I think, fairly representative of how I teach... But I prefer to teach that way because I need to have frequent feedback from the kids. I need to feel they are getting something out of being in my class for that period... I've got to get feedback from them that way. That would be the main thing. The other thing is that I don't think that I am clever enough to know all the answers and to give them all the answers. So I think we have a bit more inquiry—let's find out together approach. (Transcript 6A, pp. 7-8)

Fiona's epistemological stance which becomes manifest in the cognitive interactions that occur in her classroom is illuminated by the narrative log compiled through participant observation. Observations are pre-figured on cognitive interactions and once again recorded in the ethnographic present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time a.m.</th>
<th>Teacher/Student Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11.01     | Teacher statements Inform class about early discoveries around the Australian coastline and some reasons why settlers came to Western Australia. 
Teacher question *What do you think was their main reason for coming?* Draws several 'called' responses. Continues to build on these by turning them back into class re-framed in both open and closed fashion. |
| 11.04     | Teacher question *What do you think we'll be like in 15 years?* [Reference to Perth/W.A.] |
| .05       | Teacher Reads from a news report and frames several more speculative questions. Class discussion continues. |
| .10       | Teacher statements Points scenario of living condition in 15 years' time. Quickly revises with class 'basic needs' from previous lesson. Foreshadows speculative/imaginative exercise. Presents stimulus material. Goes over nature of task with class. |
| .12       | Teacher questions Several probe questions in quick succession. Class very responsive to teacher 'purposing'. |
| .14       | Teacher statements Crystallizes task. Monitors individuals—getting students on task by stimulating speculative thought processes. *What would you do—if... e.g.* |
| .16       | Students Some 'task oriented' small group discussions. Some individual work. Most of class 'on task'. |
| .19       | Teacher Focusses class. Gets student to give examples from their written work. Draws out general points interspersed with Socratic questions and pupil responses and further speculative questions. |
| .23       | Teacher Directive Class re-directed back to seat-work, teacher continues to monitor individual work assisting/clarifying/suggesting. |
Teacher Focusses class.

Teacher Directive *Turn to page 32 in Koutsoukis!* [The student text displays a passenger list for the SS Parmelia.]

Teacher/Students Read through list of first settlers interspersed with both teacher and student initiated question (largely convergent).

Teacher Directive *Pick out one trade and say why it would be useful in the Swan River Colony!*

Teacher/Students Back to small group/individual work on the second task.

Teacher Directive *Pens down and listen in!* Asks individual students to identify some people/trades from the passenger list—then justify the utility of their trade/profession to the new colony.

Teacher Sets another task (on basic needs). Explains further requirements (now convergent problem solving + clarification of issues). Class to complete an open ended diagram on blackboard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic needs</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Diagrammed on blackboard.)

Teacher continues to monitor/assist individuals.

Teacher Focusses class. Asks question—*Do you think the first settlers [in WA] were well prepared to start a new colony?*

Teacher/Students A lot of class discussion mainly student.

Teacher Directive *Right! Let’s complete the question. It’s on the board.*

Bell goes—one or two further questions then—*Okay—complete this for homework!* Dismisses class.

**Student Interview**

The students interviewed were socially precocious, articulate, and self-confident. They had a good relationship with their social studies teacher and were uninhibited when invited to talk about their teachers.

While oriented towards the lesson just completed, and summarized in the narrative log above, they could recall easily (and in some detail) aspects of their social studies programme implemented earlier in the year.

**[I]:** . . . Can you remember the topics that you’ve actually done?

**[R]:** Sociology!

**[R]:** In sociology we did all these sheets with questions on. She would read through twice—it was really good—She would read through twice, or until we understood, and then we would answer questions.

**[R]:** We were doing Western Australia.
[I]: What have you done this term on Western Australia?
[R]: Mapping exercises. The people that first discovered different countries and everything. Where they settled.
[R]: How Perth got started on.
[R]: Poor regions, and what the climate was like.
[R]: Studying rainfall and temperature of different places.
[I]: Thinking back to your social studies over this year again now, what parts have you enjoyed the most with Ms Goldsworthy this year? Can you try and give me one or two examples?
[R]: We saw a film last week on aborigines and how they started rock drawings.
[R]: We've seen a film once on how ladies are supposed to be really prim and proper and blokes just stand around with a beer in their hand talking, then they swapped over. The ladies were acting like guys the guys were acting like ladies. I quite liked that! (Transcript 6B, pp. 1-2)

The high student involvement, highly interactive style and the creative aspect of Fiona's teaching is supported by student interview data. Exemplars are drawn from different parts of the interview transcript.

[R]: I liked doing mapping exercises.
[R]: And when she asked a question you have to find out where it is in the book. Like we did a couple of days ago.
[R]: And after we have done questions, if we finish first, she gets you to write some questions down, and then she asks the class.
[I]: She involves you a lot doesn't she? (Transcript 6B, p. 3)

[I]: What do you think she wanted you to learn in that lesson?
[R]: About this land that this man had founded, and what you think the most successful thing to take, which type of people, you know, builders and plumbers, were needed.
[I]: Do you think she wanted you to solve problems?
[R]: Just work 'em out.
[I]: Work them through, yes! But using your imagination. Would you say that she was very successful in that from your point of view in getting you to use your imagination?
[R]: Yes! (Transcript 6B, pp. 5-6)

[I]: . . . Do you enjoy that sort of activity?
[R]: Yes!
[I]: How much of that do you do?
[R]: We always discuss things. She gets kind of different people's opinions. (General consensus here.) (Transcript 6B, p. 7)

Generally the students enjoy their relationship with the teacher, are productive in completing assigned work and interested in the subject as taught by Ms Goldsworthy.
The social interaction in this classroom can only fully be understood within the shared meanings which occur between Fiona and her class, and the negotiation and re-negotiation of those evident in the interview and participant observation data. Convergence between the intentions the teacher has for her class and the expectations held by students for their learning in social studies is a recurrent theme in the data.

Teacher/Student Rating Scales

Data for Fiona Goldsworthy and her students are presented in Figure 3. Median scores are featured for the students' rating of categories. Except perhaps for the categories which were unrated by the students (and rated as used infrequently by the teacher), there is a surprising degree of congruence between teacher and student ratings from a visual inspection of these data.

Comparison across teacher and students' ratings reveal a high frequency of use of teacher talk and class discussion. Other data sources, while acknowledging this, suggest that the nature of these interactions is qualitatively rich, with a large measure of student talk compared to teacher talk occurring in the interactions. However, this would require further direct observation, using an interaction analysis instrument such as FIAC (Flanders, 1970) or a derivative to assess more precisely the latter phenomenon.

The practice and development of skills across a number of data forms is evident in Figure 3, although the library/project work category appears not to be used frequently according to the estimation of both students and teacher. The frequency of use of rating scale categories rated as '2' or less by the teacher, of eleven out of twenty categories available, suggests a restricted range of methods employed by this teacher. Of these, ten are either rated similarly, or are unrated by the students, serving to confirm the view that Fiona adheres to a specific set of categories that characterize her pattern. The majority of these emphasize socially interactive learning opportunities.

Conclusion

Out of the data presented in this study is a teacher-class unit in which the interactions, which typically occur, characterize 'The Reflective Thinker' summarized in the 'pen portrait' of this teaching style. Fiona recognizes her teaching style and can account for it by reference to her view of the nature and purpose of social studies and the aspirations she holds for her students' learning of the former. The case study data illuminates this from a number of perspectives and exemplifies the strong process orientation deemed to be characteristic of this 'type'.

Fiona Goldsworthy values her classroom autonomy and does not perceive the Education Department's social studies curriculum as a constraint on her teaching style. Also, within established limits, she does not see the formal accountability requirements for student assessment as a significant constraint. This is an important consideration for change planners in centre-periphery
Figure 3: Teacher and student ratings (in bold) of frequency of use of selected learning activities. Teacher—*Fiona Goldsworthy*. (Categories not rated signify not used to date in the academic year.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher Infrequent</th>
<th>Teacher Frequent</th>
<th>Student Infrequent</th>
<th>Student Frequent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teacher talk</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Question &amp; answer quiz</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Class discussion</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Debates</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Demonstrations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Audio-visual presentations (Video/movie film/film strip/slides)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Listening to audio tapes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Lecturettes</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Game/simulation/role play</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Small group discussion/committee work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Project work/library research</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual work/private study</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Reading</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Mapping</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Graphing</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Picture Studies</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Experiments/making observations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Model building</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Excursions/fieldwork</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Guest Speakers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

education gap and for increasing implementation levels of centrally developed curriculum packages.

**Selected Teacher Self Ratings of Use of SSLOS Function Categories**

In addition to completing rating scales developed from the anecdotal summaries, which supplemented the direct observational data recorded on the SSLOS, each teacher was requested to complete a further rating scale derived from the SSLOS function categories. These data are presented in Figure 4.

Kerliner (1973) notes, in spite of limitations such as the 'halo' effect and the problem of central tendency, that rating scales are a useful adjunct to other research methods:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Teacher 1</th>
<th>Teacher 2</th>
<th>Teacher 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recalling, acquiring or confirming special information</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing and/or applying concepts</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Describing or explaining generalisations/law/principles/theories</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exemplifying specific information, concepts or generalisations by manipulation of artefacts/objects instruments and/or materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identifying or describing artefacts, instruments and/or materials</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identifying problems and/or clarifying social issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hypothesising or speculating</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Solving problems by manipulation of artefacts, instruments and/or materials and/or by observation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Making or describing observations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interpreting observed or recorded data</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Inferring from observed or recorded data</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Analysing and/or clarifying values</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Making reasoned value judgments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Teacher self-ratings (in bold) of use of SSLOS ‘function’ categories.

They have virtues that make them valuable tools of scientific research: they require less time than other methods; they are generally interesting
and easy for observers to use; they have a very wide range of application; they can be used with a large number of characteristics. It might be added that they can be used as adjuncts to other methods. That is, they can be used as instruments to aid behavioral observations, and they can be used in conjunction with other objective instruments, with interviews, and even with projective measures. (p. 549)

The purpose of the second rating scale was to provide data useful as further checks on the internal validity of the research design and construct validity of the SSLOS. Each of these research dimensions is appraised in turn with reference to a priori reasoning, SSLOS function categories and rating scale data.

Carter and Hacker (1988) make reference to a number of recognized orientations to social studies curriculum and instruction labeled by Barr, Barth and Shermis 1977 as ‘traditions’. These scholars identified three major traditions or epistemological stances for social studies labeled as ‘Citizenship Transmission’, social studies as ‘Social Science’, and social studies as ‘Reflective Inquiry’. Based largely on their scholarly research, ‘function’ categories were developed for the SSLOS and, in turn, rating scales were derived from these categories. For the internal validity of the design to be substantiated, a logical congruity between the conceptual framework, the SSLOS function categories, and rating scale data should exist.

It is posited that to capture classroom cognitive interactions which might be subsumed under the rubric of ‘citizenship transmission’ an observer using the SSLOS could be expected to check frequently the ‘function’ categories in rows 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 (see Figure 4). Under the label of ‘knowledge transmitter’ which identifies the tradition for the purposes of this study, median profiles derived from SSLOS data emphasise categories 1, 2, 4, 6, and 10.

Reference to the self ratings of teacher knowledge transmitter on use of SSLOS function categories, frequent use (i.e., rated 4 or higher) was scored on categories 1, 2, 6, 7, 9, and 10, with ratings of three on categories 4 and 8.

For interactions which might be subsumed under the rubric of social studies as ‘social science’, an observer using the SSLOS could be expected to check frequently the ‘function’ categories in rows 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Median profiles from SSLOS data emphasise categories 4, 8, 9, 10, and 11 for the ‘social scientist’ teaching style. While Teacher 1 (social scientist) scored 4 or higher on the rating scale on categories 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 11.

Those cognitive interactions which could be expected to be checked frequently by an observer under the rubric of ‘reflective inquiry’ include categories 2, 6, 7, 12, and 13. Median profiles from SSLOS data emphasise 6, 7, 12, and 13, while Teacher 3 (reflective thinker) scored herself highly on categories 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Cognizant of the caution by Hook and Rosenshine (1979), of discrepancies between teacher self reports of specific behaviors and information gained
by observers on the same behaviors and limitations on the use of rating scales (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 548), there is nevertheless a reasonable degree of vertical congruity between the derived theoretical position and empirical data against which this was tested. Visual inspection of the data, while not isomorphic, suggests a degree of convergence on relevant categories supporting further claims (when ethnographic data are included) for the construct validity of the SSLOS observation scheme developed for, and employed in, this study.

Conclusion

This study further investigated three teaching styles in social studies classrooms identified by Carter and Hacker (1988). The purpose of the study reported here was to portray and ascribe meaning to the typology of styles initially constructed within a behavioristic paradigm using systematic observation.

Examples of each of the three styles were recast in an interpretive framework for participant observation. In this context Erickson (1986. p. 119) uses 'interpretive' to refer to family of approaches to participant observational research that *inter alia* includes symbolic interactionism as a significant guiding conceptual framework.

In this investigation the teachers studied could recognise their teaching style or preferred approach to the teaching of subject matter; i.e., it was purposeful and not idiosyncratic. Further, they could account for it in terms of an epistemological position regarding their personal construction of social studies knowledge and the aspirations they held for their students. Both aspects were worked out in the day-by-day interaction of teacher with students and students with each other within the context, shared meanings, and the minutiae of classroom life.

Research is now needed to estimate the relative efficacy of each style and its effectiveness with respect to students' cognitive learning, their attitude toward social studies, and the promotion of their growth and social development.

End Notes

1. Since these data were collected the public education system in Western Australia has been radically restructured. Devolution of power allied to the autonomy of schools has occurred. The previously centralized operations of the now defunct State Education Department have been replaced by a Ministry of Education, with the latter mandated to support rather than control the work and functioning of schools. Credentialing of students, previously undertaken by the Board of Secondary Education (BSE) is now effected by the Secondary Education Authority (SEA) which has replaced it.

2. The data drawn from field notes are superficially more fluent than actual recordings, since hesitations and false starts are not included. They are
also incomplete insofar as they occasionally omit the exact words spoken in favor of their sense.
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Appendix 1
The categories of the SSLOS are delineated as follows

Forms of the Interactions

Verbal Interactions
Teacher Initiated
A. Question answered by:
B. Statement about
C. Directive to social/environment resources
D. Directive to multi-media resources

Pupil Initiated
E. Referral to the teacher
F. Consultation with the pupil

Non Verbal Interactions with Responses
Social/Environmental Resources
G. Teacher Interacts
H. Pupil Interacts

Multi-Media Resources
I. Teacher Interacts
J. Pupil Interacts

Functions of the Interactions
(The Intellectual Ability Being Practised)
1. Recalling, acquiring or confirming specifics.
2. Developing and/or applying concepts.
3. Describing or explaining universals.
4. Exemplifying specifics, concepts or universals by manipulation of artefacts, instruments and materials.
5. Identifying or describing artefacts, instruments and materials.
6. Identifying problems and/or clarifying social issues.
7. Hypothesizing or speculating.
8. Solving problems by manipulation of artefacts, instruments and materials and/or by observation.
9. Making or describing observations.
10. Interpreting observed or recorded data.
11. Inferring from observed or recorded data.
12. Analysing and/or clarifying values.

Appendix 2A
Teacher Interview Schedule
1. How many years have you taught Social Studies?
2. What different levels and year bands have you taught?
3. Are your classes streamed or unstreamed? Which do you prefer? Why?
4. How do you like to arrange your classroom? Why?
5. What length are most of your lessons? What length would you like them to be? Why?
6. Can you describe the things you actively enjoy in your lessons? Please give one or two examples.
7. How much do you draw on the outside world? Environment, places, world events, other people’s lives, media?
8. Would you try and describe how you gauge pupil progress in Social Studies?
9. Are you continually conscious, or not very conscious of the BSE levels of your pupils?
10. Do the board of Secondary Education (BSE) assessment requirements affect what you do? (Content and methodology.) If yes, please elaborate.
11. With respect to the construction of Social Studies courses—if you had to place knowledge and understandings, values, cognitive skills and social skills into a priority ranking what would this be? Why?
12. How do you gauge whether a pupil has acquired a particular
(a) concept?
(b) skill?
(c) value, values set or value change?
13. To what degree do you perceive the Educational Department’s current Social Studies curriculum itself to be a constraint on your approach to teaching? (Teaching style.)
14. What do you prize most in your Social Studies teaching? What would you defend at all cost?
15. What value do you see in the study of Social Studies for this particular group of pupils?
16. What do you hope this particular group of pupils will take away from your course at the end of the year?
17. (After studying the SSLOS raw data of the first five lessons with the teacher.) Why do you teach the way you do—as evidenced in the data pattern?
18. Is there anything else that affects Social Studies teaching that you want to tell me?

Appendix 2B
Student Interview Schedule

1. How do you feel having me in your classroom? Would you like to tell me how it all strikes you?
2. Social Studies is all about the study of people (us) in society. We all belong to our society so what do you think your Social Studies program is all about? (Probe—what does the program/unit/topic cover?)
3. That last lesson you had— how do you think that fits in with the general purpose of Social Studies.

4. What parts of Social Studies do you enjoy most? Please give one or two examples.

5. What parts of Social Studies do you think are most useful to you? Why?

6. Which parts of Social Studies do you dislike the most? Why?

7. Is there anything else that affects your learning in Social Studies that you want to tell me?
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