67-3433

JOEKEL, Ronald Gene, 1934-

GROUPING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES.

The University of Nebraska Teachers College, Ed.D., 1966
Education, teacher training

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

GROUPING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES

by

Ronald G. Joekel

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The University of Nebraska in the Teachers College

in Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Education

Department of Secondary Education

Under the Supervision of Dr. Rex K. Reckewey

Lincoln, Nebraska

July, 1966

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
TEACHERS COLLEGE
ADVANCED PROFESSIONAL DIVISION

TITLE

GROUPING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IN

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES

BY

Ronald G. Joekel

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION DEGREE

APPROVED BY	**DATE**
Rex K. Beckewey, Chairman	July 28, 1966
Erwin Goldenstein	July 28, 1966
Wesley C. Meierhenry	July 28, 1966
Willis D. Moreland	July 28, 1966
Norman F. Thorpe	July 28, 1966

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to all who have contributed to this study. He is indebted to the many administrators and social studies teachers who furnished the data for this study. Sincere gratitude is especially extended to Dr. Rex K. Reckewey who not only gave much of his time and counsel during the completion of the writers program, but also gave invaluable assistance and guidance in formulating and preparing the dissertation.

The writer is also deeply indebted to his wife, Marjorie, and to his family for their patience and many sacrifices of family life during the course of this study.

R.G.J.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE AND THE PLAN OF THE STUDY

It appears that America's role in the coming era will depend on how well it exercises leadership in every field of human endeavor. Some educators have expressed concern about the over-emphasis on science and mathematics to the neglect of the social sciences and the humanities. As early as November, 1957, the National Council for the Social Studies met in Pittsburg and passed a resolution recommending that the social sciences and humanities should receive emphasis equal to that accorded science and mathematics. However, if students of all ability levels are to profit from programs in the social studies, it is important that these programs be of the highest quality. A major part of the problem to assure quality is how to organize the classes so as to best meet the needs of students with varying levels of ability.

> In our American democracy education is for all its youth. The superior child, the slow learner, the average child, and the handicapped are all to be served in such manner that each may have the opportunity for optimum development.[1]

The above quote from Leslie J. Nason aptly describes the dilemma facing educators today. Schools of today are

---

[1]Leslie J. Nason, Academic Achievement of Gifted High School Students (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1958), p. 1.

being called upon more than ever before to fully utilize and develop the potential of all our citizens. We have been faced with the need for better utilization of our most gifted students on one hand, and meeting the needs of all individuals of our society on the other hand. In their efforts to provide for the fullest development of all students, educators have been confronted with the problem of whether or not they should group students for instructional purposes.

Considerable discussion has taken place within the ranks of secondary educators over the practice of grouping students for instruction. As a result there are widely divergent opinions relative to the advantages and disadvantages of this much discussed practice. Although philosophies of education differ on this practice, educators are constantly faced with the responsibility of making decisions about the best methods for grouping students.

The problems associated with grouping are not confined to the senior high school social studies. As the number of junior high schools has increased and educators have attempted to develop a more satisfactory curriculum for the age groups, there has emerged a definite need for research related to the junior high school. As Gruhn indicated:

> The need for research on junior high school problems today is greater than ever before in the history of this school .... The number of junior high schools in the United States is increasing sharply each year. From 1952 to 1959, the number increased by more than fifty per cent.... The need for research on the junior high

> school today therefore, is especially urgent so that we may have information which may be used by communities in establishing new junior high school programs.[2]

A difference of opinion has long existed about the relative effectiveness of "homogeneous" and "heterogeneous" grouping in junior high school social studies classes. The majority of the claims made by the proponents of each approach have been based upon rather limited research or subjective observation. Unfortunately, there has been little evidence presented to show there are significant differences in the instructional practices employed in social studies classrooms that are "homogeneous" or "heterogeneous".

I. THE PROBLEM

Numerous studies have investigated the merits of various administrative devices for grouping, but little research has been reported that related directly to actual classroom practices in junior high school social studies. Therefore, it was the purpose of this investigation to examine the nature of current grouping practices in the junior high school social studies classes to ascertain what if any differences there were in the materials and instructional approaches used in grouped and non-grouped classes. More specifically, the objectives of this study were:

1. To ascertain the current curricular offerings in the junior high school social studies program and the extent

---

[2]William T. Gruhn, "Representative Junior High School Research Studies," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXV (April, 1961), pp. 366-367.

to which different courses are provided for students of various ability levels.

2. To determine the extent to which grouping is practiced in junior high school social studies classes and to discover the criteria used for placing students in grouped classes.

3. To ascertain teacher preparation and the criteria used for assigning staff to grouped and non-grouped junior high school social studies classes.

4. To discover if there were noticeable differences in the content covered, the materials utilized, and the instructional approaches employed in grouped and non-grouped junior high school social studies classes.

5. To review and analyze the literature on grouping to determine the chief advantages and disadvantages of grouping as cited by educational leaders.

6. To determine what administrators and teachers believe are the chief advantages and disadvantages of grouping for instructional purposes.

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS USED

The following terms were used extensively in the questionnaire and are used frequently in this investigation. Definitions of these terms were developed from Dictionary of Education, Carter V. Good, editor.

Junior high school. The term "junior high school" refers to grades seven, eight and nine, organized and administered as a separate unit of the school system, having its own administrative head and corps of teachers.

Heterogeneous grouping. The term "heterogeneous grouping" refers to the classification of pupils for the purpose of forming certain groups having a high degree of dissimilarity. Such an approach could produce classes with all the variations of individual differences.

Homogeneous grouping. The term "homogeneous grouping" refers to the classification of pupils for the purpose of forming instructional groups having a relatively high degree of similarity in regard to certain factors that affect learning. Commonly used criteria include interests, chronological age, intelligence quotient or ability, and past achievement.

For the purposes of this study, the term "homogeneous" will be used synonymously with "grouped", and the term "heterogeneous" synonymously with "non-grouped".

III. SCOPE AND DELIMITATIONS

This study included only public junior high schools in an eight state area organized on a 6-3-3 basis. The study did not attempt to evaluate or compare individual schools and teachers in any sense. The study did not attempt to

examine grouping practices and problems in the senior high school social studies. For the reader who is interested in these grouping problems, the writer would recommend the examination of a companion study being undertaken at the same time as this study.[3]

The study is primarily of the descriptive survey type. No statistical treatment of the data has been attempted. Only tabled summaries of the information gathered expressed in number and percentages were used.

IV. PROCEDURES

Survey of the literature. The initial step in the study was a thorough investigation of the literature. Previous research studies were reviewed to develop a comprehensive list of factors relative to the desirability or undesirability of grouping practices in the curriculum, particularly in the social studies program at the junior high school level.

Identification of schools to be included in the study. The junior high schools included in this study were located in eight midwestern states; Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Wyoming. Since grouping is probably more common in larger schools, only schools of a

---

[3]Fred Splittgerber, "Grouping Practices and Procedures in Senior High School Social Studies," (Doctoral Dissertation in Progress, 1966).

6-3-3 organization were included in the study. The State Departments of Education in each of the eight states were contacted to identify junior high schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis. In Iowa, the North Central Association Quarterly for Summer, 1965, also helped in the identification of schools. A total of 484 junior high schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis were identified for inclusion in the initial phase of this study.

Determination of social studies offerings and grouping practices. The first step to obtain this information was to prepare a general questionnaire to be completed by the building principal in each of the junior high schools included in the study. A pilot questionnaire was developed and tested with several junior high school principals in Nebraska as well as members of the staff of Teacher's College at the University of Nebraska. The revised questionnaire was eventually mailed to principals of the 484 public junior high schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis in the eight states.

The questionnaire sought general information about each school. Included were items to discover (1) the name and location of the school, (2) the enrollment by grades, (3) the curricular offerings by grades, (4) the required and elective social studies courses, (5) the number and designation of the various grouping levels used, (6) the number of sections for each level, (7) the average class size for each level, (8)

the administrators evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of grouping, (9) the extent to which block-time classes were used, (10) the administrative problems associated with grouping, (11) the policy for assignment of teachers, (12) the criteria employed for assigning pupils to each level, (13) the names of teachers of grouped and non-grouped classes and the levels they are teaching, and (14) the schools willingness to participate further in the study.

From the data obtained in the general questionnaire, different patterns of grouping in the junior high school social studies appeared. Also, schools that did not group in junior high school social studies were identified.

Determination of instructional procedures used in grouped and non-grouped junior high school social studies classes. In order to obtain specific information from teachers of grouped and non-grouped schools relative to their instructional practices and provisions, a second questionnaire was developed. This teacher questionnaire was developed and tested with a number of junior high school social studies teachers in Nebraska. The revised questionnaire was eventually mailed to 280 selected junior high school social studies teachers in the eight state area.

Teachers selected to answer this questionnaire were randomly chosen from the general questionnaire returned by the building principals that provided the following

information: (1) names of all junior high school social studies teachers, (2) the grade level and name of the subjects they taught, (3) specific ability levels they taught such as upper, average, lower or non-grouped classes, (4) willingness to participate further in the study by giving permission to questionnaire selected teachers and visiting the school. Teachers were then assigned a number from 1 through 1,123. Also listed was the grade level, subject and specific ability levels taught. Every fourth teacher was selected for inclusion in the study to obtain further data about classroom instructional practices. Of this number, 197 taught grouped social studies classes and eighty-three taught non-grouped junior high school social studies classes.

Teachers were asked to answer items on the questionnaire only for a specific ability level and subject designated by the writer in the case of grouped schools, or to reply only for a specific subject and grade level in the case of non-grouped schools. Teachers were asked to indicate only what they actually did in the specific level and class rather than what they preferred to do or what they thought they should do. The teacher questionnaire included such items as: (1) teacher preparation and experience, (2) basic organization or types of approaches used, (3) specific methods employed, (4) materials and resources used, (5) primary evaluation procedures, (6) programs for the development of

social studies skills, (7) the nature of emphasis on content, (8) group and individual activities used, (9) audio visual materials and activities employed, (10) advantages and disadvantages of grouping, (11) comments for improving grouping practices, and (12) in the case of teachers of grouped classes, how they varied their instructional procedures for the different levels.

Visitation of selected schools. In order to supplement and confirm the responses made by teachers on the questionnaire the writer visited six selected junior high schools. Various sized junior high schools were included in this final phase of the study. They fell into three categories: (1) over 1,000 pupils, (2) from 500 to 1,000 pupils, and (3) under 500 pupils. Grouped and non-grouped schools were selected in each of the above enrollment classifications.

The six schools were selected on the basis of (1) their willingness to participate and (2) their geographic location.

During the visitation, data were collected through interviews with administrators and selected social studies teachers representing both grouped and non-grouped social studies classes. Specific questions were asked about procedures for individualizing instruction and any variations made in the content covered. Methods, materials, group and individual activities, evaluation techniques, skill development,

and audio visual resources employed at the various ability levels were also investigated. In addition, printed materials such as curriculum guides, courses of study, resource units and lesson plans were collected.

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The following chapters of this dissertation report the findings of the study. Chapter II presents a review of the literature on grouping and related methods for accommodating individual differences. Chapter III presents data regarding grouping programs and procedures in 350 junior high schools. Chapter IV presents the responses of 171 randomly selected junior high school social studies teachers of grouped and non-grouped classes. Chapter V reports the data gathered from administrators and teachers during the school visitations. Chapter VI consists of a summary and conclusions drawn from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The problem of this investigation was outlined in Chapter I. Chapter II will discuss the literature related to the problem. Material presented in this chapter will pertain to literature and research concerned with the broad area of grouping and specifically with the junior high school. This chapter has been divided into two major parts. The first part presents research which consists of the historical background of grouping, conflicting research on grouping, and grouping and the social studies. The second part of this chapter presents an analysis of current practices and procedures of grouping. Included in part two are the junior high school and current grouping practices, concomitant proposals for meeting individual differences, criteria for selection of groups, and arguments concerning grouping.

THE HISTORY OF GROUPING

Modern educational theory accepts the belief that individuals differ in a number of ways, and postulates that educational practice must take these into account in its attempts to develop the individual to his maximum capacity.

These ideas are not new and date far back into mankind. The Greek philosophers were keenly aware of the existence of individual differences.

An early leader in the recognition of human differences was Comenius. He admonished teachers to consider the pupils' ages, intelligence, and knowledge. He besought teachers to accept "nature," to adjust methods and materials accordingly, and to start instruction at the pupil's level. Children he observed, excel in memory and curiosity, adolescents in reasoning and adults in "the what and the why."[4]

Instruction was originally an individual affair and remained so for centuries because education was available only for the favored few. The grouping of students was probably first recognized when the number of students became almost impossible to instruct. Hence, group instruction was devised as a matter of economy and resulted in extension of educational advances to the masses of the people.

Bell and Lancaster conducted schools in England in which pupils were educated in large groups. This system of monitorial instruction was tried and later discarded in the early educational history of our nation. Students were eventually organized into levels called grades in most

---

[4]V. Jelinek (trans.), Jon Amos Komensky, The Analytical Didactic Comenius (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 160-164.

American schools by the time of the Civil War. Changes from ungraded schools to graded schools provided for a reduction in the range of differences in academic ability within each class. This took place primarily in urban communities about 1850-1870. Subject matter mastery standards were instituted to retain some control over this range. The result was a high failure rate with many teenage children retained in elementary schools. In 1909, a study by Ayres shocked the public with its survey showing schools averaging more than a third of the pupils repeating last year's grade.[5]

Other educators pointed out that "repeating" did not ordinarily increase a pupil's subject matter mastery as much as going forward would have. Hills and others found that retardation does not decrease the range of variability in a room.[6] Problems in parent reactions and in undesirable social effects became prominent, particularly when nationwide studies showed the results of such practices.

Soon thereafter, the levels of grouping were made more flexible by the use of rapid promotions for bright, quick learning pupils. The leaders in this movement were Dr. W. T. Harris in St. Louis and W. J. Shearer in Elizabeth, New Jersey.

---

[5]Leonard P. Ayres, Laggards in Our Schools, The Russell Sage Foundation, 1909, 220 pp.

[6]James A. Hills, and others, "What Research Says About Nonpromotion," California Journal of Elementary Education, XXI (August, 1952), pp. 7-24.

Holmes and others developed numerous methods providing for rapid promotions. These methods were often labeled "plans" such as the Elizabeth Plan, the Cambridge Plan, the Double Tillage Plan, and many others. Grouping as a design for improvement in instruction was thus conceived around 1900 and implemented in such plans as stated above. Its growth initially was slow but the tempo soon increased as it became more widely known and accepted.

The grouping of pupils underwent another modification when plans were devised leaving the pupils in the same grade, with little emphasis on rapid promotions, but giving the students an enriched curriculum. Large scale individualization was seen by some as a possible solution to the problem. The leaders in this movement were Van Sickle, Preston Search, Spaulding, Burk, and many others. Plans initiated during this period were labeled the Santa Barbara Plan, the Shifting Group Plan, the Baltimore Preparatory Center Plan, the Pueblo Plan, the Newton Massachusetts Plan, the Bativa Plan, the San Francisco Plan and others.

A third type of grouping practice to develop in the early part of the twentieth century provided for individual differences through individual study and instruction. Between 1890-1920, many plans for individualization of instruction were proposed and carried out. They generally provided for a series of assignments, units, or classes which could be

completed at a different rate by each student. Probably the two outstanding plans of this type were the Dalton Plan introduced by Helen Parkhurst in Dalton, Massachusetts, and the Winnetka Plan initiated by Carleton Washburne in Winnetka, Illinois. Another well known plan was that of Morrison's Unit Plan introduced at the University of Chicago High School. This resulted in teachers being overwhelmed by tutorial responsibilities because group instruction was minimized. Exclusive attention to subject matter mastery came to be considered as too narrow in scope for a well rounded education. No conclusive evidence was obtained to show that these approaches or methods were more effective educationally.[7] Perhaps the major drawback of these "laboratory plans" was that what they individualized was chiefly only rate of progress and they actually did little to adapt to individual needs.

The question of what to do with pupils of below average ability was further complicated in the 1920's and 1930's by a number of rather extensive researches which cast serious doubts upon the true effectiveness of failing and retaining pupils whose performance fell below expected levels.[8] The

---

[7]Delmo Della-Dora, "What Research Says About Grouping," Michigan Educational Journal, XXXVIII (April, 1960), pp. 513-542.

[8]Douglas Lawson, "An Analysis of Historic and Philosophic Consideration for Homogeneous Grouping," Educational Administration and Supervision, XXXXIII (May, 1957), pp. 257-270.

Encyclopedia of Educational Research for the year 1950 summarizes these studies by indicating in general, that retention does not result in significantly increasing the rate of learning among slow pupils; that it does not build better morale among pupils nor assure mastery of subject matter; that it does not increase grade achievement averages nor reduce the variations of achievement among individual classes; and that it does not improve the personality adjustment of the retained child.[9] As a result, schools were seeking something to take the place of failure for slow learning pupils. Homogeneous grouping seemed to offer promise of aiding the solution of this problem.

The growth of public education in the present century with its ever increasing enrollment brought with it a demand for successful methods of organizing students for instruction. This in turn pointed out the need for adequate measuring devices for recognizing or discovering various types of levels of ability. The development of measuring instruments for these abilities was spearheaded by Terman, Monroe, and many others. Widespread use of intelligence tests came about during World War I. Numerous studies were undertaken on the great variation among human beings. Scientific measurement

---

[9]M. R. Sumption and T. A. Phillips, "School Progress," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Rev. Ed. (New York: MacMillan Company, 1950), p. 1123.

took the center stage of the educational world with the intelligence quotient and mental age seizing the spotlight. Many believed in the validity of such tests for measuring learning ability and ability grouping was probably a natural outgrowth. Accordingly, Detroit in 1919 gave the plan its first large scale tryout. Quickly thereafter, A,B,C and X,Y,Z grouping along with a number of other variations sprang up throughout the nation. Intelligence tests and/or standardized subject matter achievement tests then became the basis for most of the grouping practices tried between 1919-1935. Unfortunately, a number of these measures grouped solely on the basis of intelligence tests and gave little or no consideration to other factors. In some plans this meant little more than putting pupils with high intelligence in one room and of low intelligence in another room, both groups being taught in the same way by teachers who had no specialized training for work with varied groups and both groups being given identical assignments. This of course was soon recognized as a farce and grouping seemed doomed to failure.[10]

If one wished to review the many studies attempting to measure the outcomes of grouping, he may well want to start by reading Part I of the Thirty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.[11] Wilhelms summarizes

---

[10]Douglas Lawson, op. cit., p. 264.

[11]The Grouping of Pupils, Thirty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1936).

this literature with the following observations:

1. Grouping in the period from 1919 to about 1935 was keyed chiefly to the concept of ability. Typical is the advice of one educator to group by I.Q. (combined, of course, with M.A.), unless the I.Q. was badly out of line with the pupil's record--in which case the first thing to do would be to retest the I.Q.: Later there was more agreement on the use of combination of the best index of mental ability and maturity with the best index of academic success.

2. The chief goal was efficient teaching of subject matter, and measurement of outcomes was almost solely in subject matter terms. There was always mention of "other" factors, usually with a statement that they could not be measured. But, to this reader at least, the tone of the literature suggests something more fundamental than inability to measure: far less commitment to personal-development goals than we now take for granted.

3. Even measured in delimited subject-matter terms, the evidence for or against ability grouping remained vague and equivocal. Some studies went one way, others, the other. If the evidence on subject-learning clearly favored ability grouping in any case, it was with reference to the lowest-ability group. Perhaps more significant, even if the data did give some small edge one way or the other, there was virtually never that striking rise in efficiency which a prior reasoning had led--and still leads--many educators and the lay public to expect.

4. Perhaps most important of all, the ability-grouping studies of the 20's and 30's--and they are the ones of which we have qualified data--never included any really radical adaptations of content and methodology. Grouping was not accompanied by much differentiation. About all the studies could show was that teaching approximately the same subject matter in approximately the same way produced fairly nearly the same results whether ability grouping was used or not. The possibility remains open that ability grouping might produce quite different outcomes if the content and methodology were radically modified to fit the abilities and needs of each group.

5. Generally speaking, studies which solicited opinions showed ability grouping tended to be popular with most parents, pupils, teachers, and administrators who were involved in it. (At least one later study showed, though that pupils and the parents of pupils in the low groups tend to be more critical of their schools than is normal.)[12]

Between the years 1935 and 1950, the research regarding grouping became minimized as grouping apparently subsided. After this downswing in the later 1930's and 1940's, grouping appears to be on the increase. However, many educators still spoke in favor of grouping during the years when many felt it was receding. Wilson in 1939 spoke in favor of homogeneous grouping in a report to the Regents of New York State.[13]

Henry Holmes likewise presented the case for homogeneous grouping when he stated, "the very heart of the matter is that we ought not to give all young people the same education--not in amount, nor in kind, nor in result. ... There are, in short, diversities of gifts. Yet the youth of America must be offered an education which is equal in the sense that it is adequate...to each individual's need as a

---

[12]Fred T. Wilhelms, The Nature of Classroom Grouping for Learning, Background for ASCD Discussion Group H-7, 1958, p. 3. (Mimeographed.)

[13]Howard E. Wilson, Education for Citizenship, Regents' Inquiry into the Character and Cost of Public Education in the State of New York (New York: McGraw Hill, 1939), pp. 158, 229.

citizen in a democracy--in this democracy."[14]

The apparent resurgence of grouping in the 1950's prompted Wilhelms to make the following observations pertaining to grouping:

1. There appears to be a genuine search for the kind of group in which a pupil will do best and grow in a well-rounded manner. This commitment to individual pupil welfare is on the increase today.

2. There is more weight being given to the judgment of teachers and counselors in placing students in groups. The criteria for placement have been broadened and there is less classifying pupils once and for all.

3. There is a growing recognition of variability in pupils. Although students may be classified according to one factor, there may be a great deal of variability in another trait. The hazard still remains that a teacher will stereotype pupils as belonging to a certain group and not treating each pupil as an individual.

4. Some view grouping as a concession to mediocre teaching. They believe it would be better not to group, if teachers were as able as they should be to handle a wide range.

5. Some schools, particularly elementary, are once more trying out the nongraded approach. Grades and promotion are played down and pupils are treated according to his needs.

6. There is a tendency at the senior high level to limit ability grouping to certain areas. There appears to be pressure to hold the whole school population together in some way, and social studies are often not grouped and some people hold this diversity to be a source of strength in social studies.

---

[14]Henry W. Holmes, "The Nation Challenges the School," Atlantic Monthly, CLXV (January, 1940), p. 21.

7. There is a considerable increase in concern for differentiation of content and method at the several levels. Much literature suggests the high ability pupils need little drill, can handle abstractions, can generalize across wide areas, and greatly need opportunities to do independent, problem solving work. Low ability pupils learn concretely, need more drill, and must be guided more particularly.

8. The addition in many states of "special" classes for the mentally retarded has reduced the need for further grouping in the regular classroom.

9. It is very likely that much of the pressure for ability grouping has grown out of the tremendous concern for the very bright.[15]

SURVEY OF RESEARCH ON GROUPING

From the reports of research on grouping, it is apparent there is much conflicting evidence. Several attempts have been made to review research on grouping and its ensuing conflicting claims.

One of the earliest critical analysis of research was made by Rock who viewed only those studies he considered "scientific." He concluded, "that these studies fail to show consistent, statistically or educationally significant differences between the achievement of pupils in homogeneous groups and pupils of equal ability in heterogeneous groups. This failure to realize one of the important advantages claimed

---

[15]Fred T. Wilhelms, op. cit., pp. 5-7.

for ability grouping is not, however, evidence that homogeneous grouping cannot result in increased academic achievement. Neither do the experiments show that other claims made for grouping cannot be attained under proper organization."[16]

Twenty studies were summarized by Miller and Otto in 1930 who criticized the methodology used in the studies and the experimental designs. Their conclusions were as follows:

1. While the evidence is contradictory, at least two of the studies suggest that ability grouping is quite ineffective unless accompanied by proper changes in method. Unless adaptation of methods and materials is a necessary correlate to ability grouping, one of the purposes of the project is defeated.

2. So far as achievement is concerned, there is no clear cut evidence that homogeneous grouping is either advantageous or disadvantageous. The studies seem to indicate that homogeneous classification may be effective if accompanied by proper adaptation in methods and materials.[17]

An analysis of grouping research in 1931 prompted Turney to conclude that most of the studies to evaluate grouping proved nothing regarding grouping but only added evidence bearing on the nature and extent of individual differences. He further pointed out that much of this research was inadequate but that it did point out the importance of adapting

---

[16]Robert T. Rock, Jr., "A Critical Study of Current Practices in Ability Grouping," Education Research Bulletin, IV nos. 5-6, Catholic University of America, 1929, 132 pp.

[17]W. S. Miller and H. J. Otto, "Analysis of Experimental Studies in Homogeneous Grouping," Journal of Educational Research, XXI (February, 1930), pp. 95-102.

teaching methods and curriculum to the pupils.[18]

Rankin felt that the experimental evidence used to compare homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping has been inadequate, but they have pointed out the importance of adapting teaching methods and curriculum to the pupil.[19]

While reviewing 108 experimental or practical studies of grouping which appeared in the literature between 1917-1928, Billett listed 102 as "uncontrolled," two "partly controlled," and four as "thoroughly controlled." Of the 102 "uncontrolled studies," 88 were favorable to grouping, ten were doubtful, and four unfavorable. One of the "partly controlled," studies was favorable, the other doubtful. Two of the four "thoroughly controlled," studies were favorable to grouping, one doubtful, and one unfavorable.[20]

Writing in the Thirty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Cornell reported that the experimental evidence used to compare homogeneous and heterogeneous grouping has been inadequate, but they have pointed

---

[18] A. H. Turney, "Status of Ability Grouping," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVII (January, February, 1931), pp. 21-42, 110-127.

[19] P. Rankin, "Pupil Classification and Grouping," Review of Educational Research, I (June, 1931), pp. 200-230.

[20] R. O. Billett, "Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion," National Survey of Education Monograph, Bulletin no. 17, (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1933), p. 6.

out the importance of adapting teaching methods and curriculum to the pupils.[21]

Otto writing in the 1950 Encyclopedia of Educational Research, reviewed the studies through 1950 with the following observations:

1. The evidence slightly favors ability grouping as contrasted with heterogeneous grouping, particularly where adaptations of standards, materials, and methods are made.

2. The evidence regarding the attitudes of teachers toward ability grouping is that most teachers prefer to work with "homogeneous" rather than mixed groups.

3. The evidence regarding the relative merits of various types of adaptations of standards, materials, and methods is inadequate to form a judgment.

4. The evidence indicates greatest relative effectiveness for dull children, next greatest for average children, and least (frequently harmful) for bright children.

5. The evidence regarding the particular grade levels or subjects in which ability grouping is particularly effective is inadequate for forming a judgment.

6. The evidence regarding the effects of ability grouping upon characteristics of pupils other than knowledge and skills is highly subjective and cannot be said to be conclusive, although one study shows that the great majority of pupils are happy and satisfied in schools using ability grouping.

---

[21]Ethel L. Cornell, "Effects of Ability Grouping Determinable From Published Studies," in The Grouping of Pupils, Thirty-Fifth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1936), pp. 289-302.

7. On the whole, where grouping is used, parents are favorable to its use. The majority of parents believe that children are at least as happy as in other groupings, do better work in school, and are correctly sectioned according to ability.

8. The indications are that in general, the variability in achievement (which is an index of difficulty of teaching and the need for instructional adjustments) in ability groups, in grades which have three groups each, is about 83 per cent as great as in unselected groups. In grades having two groups each, the variability in achievement in ability groups is about 93 per cent as great as in unselected groups. These percentages are reduced to about 74 and 84 respectively if the plan of ability grouping is accomplished by a multiple track of promotion.[22]

In 1954 Otto again stated that the evidence slightly favors the use of ability grouping, particularly where standards, materials, and methods are adapted to the group. According to him, the greatest relative effectiveness of homogeneous grouping is indicated for dull children, next for average children, and the least benefit and frequently harm occur for bright children.[23]

In an analysis of research on grouping, Seagoe reported, "... when ability grouping is used in relatively normal ways, as in classroom grouping, or in grouping within the class, when the specific objective of grouping is well

---

[22]H. J. Otto, "Elementary School Organization and Administration," Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Rev. Ed., (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950), pp. 377-378.

[23]H. J. Otto, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), pp. 201-202.

defined, and when the instruction is clearly differentiated for the group, learning in ability groups seem to be slightly superior. In terms of social gains or losses, however, there is no evidence.[24]

In a review of the literature in 1959, Ekstrom found thirteen studies on experimental homogeneous grouping which found differences favoring homogeneous grouping; fifteen which found no differences or which found grouping detrimental; and five studies which gave mixed results. Ekstrom concluded that, "no consistent pattern for the effectiveness of homogeneous grouping related to age, ability level, course content, or method of instruction."[25]

Ekstrom in School Review reported of experimental studies on grouping falling into four different classifications according to their design and purposes. These four areas were: (1) specific attempts to keep the content of the courses and the methods and materials used the same for all groups at all ability levels; (2) keep the methods of instruction constant by using the same teachers for all sections, homogeneous as well as heterogeneous; (3) deliberate attempts to adjust the

---

[24]May V. Seagoe, "Research on Ability Grouping: A Critical Analysis," for Discussion Group 9, ASCD Convention, 1957, p. 10. (Mimeographed paper)

[25]Ruth B. Ekstrom, Experimental Studies of Homogeneous Grouping, (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, April, 1959), p. 26.

course content, materials, and methods to levels appropriate to each of the sections; and (4) organizing special, separate homogeneously grouped classes for children of superior intelligence, with teachers planning for maximum adaptation of instruction appropriate to this level. After reviewing studies in these areas, Ekstrom concluded that many of the experiments failed to reveal significant findings due to failure to control the studies and poor design. Only when specific attempts were made for differentiation of teaching methods, materials and course content, did results tend to favor homogeneous grouping.[26]

In a review of research related to grouping, Humphrey reported a wide divergence of opinion regarding grouping. Some writers have pointed out the criticism of grouping on the grounds of being undemocratic and that complete homogeneity was impossible. Others have felt some type of grouping was an absolute necessity because it made it possible to challenge all of the children. Some research has pointed out that grouping could benefit both top and bottom groups by allowing the various groups to progress at their own rates in a proper atmosphere. Another criticism of grouping has been that it results in maladjustment of students. Research has

---

[26]Ruth B. Ekstrom, "Experimental Studies of Homogeneous Grouping: A Critical Review," School Review, LXIX (Summer, 1961), pp. 216-226.

refuted this claim finding that the situation would have existed regardless of whether the classes were homogeneously or heterogeneously grouped. Humphrey believed many people profess to support grouping but are not clear on the form or nature of the grouping.[27]

Wilhelms and Gibson in reviewing research on grouping believed that it has many shortcomings. They concluded:

1. There is no evidence that ability grouping taken by itself, leads to improved mastery of subject matter.

2. Even taking the most favorable position that there is a slight balance of evidence in favor of ability grouping, the difference is miniscule.

3. Again, if grouping has an advantage, it has rarely gone to the ablest group on whose behalf it is sponsored.

4. If any group has gained, it has been the low group.

5. Teachers have tended to see grouping as easing their problems of instruction, a perception not to be taken lightly.[28]

A summary of research on grouping by Eash in 1961 concluded as follows:

1. Ability grouping in itself does not produce improved achievement.

2. Ability grouping may be detrimental to children in average and lower groups.

---

[27]J. W. Humphrey, "Dexter Plan for Ability Grouping," Clearing House, XXXV (March, 1961), pp. 423-426.

[28]Fred T. Wilhelms and Dorothy Westby-Gibson, "Grouping: Research Offers Leads," Educational Leadership, XVIII (April, 1961), p. 430.

3. Ability grouping at an early age seems to favor unduly the placement of children from the higher socio-economic class in higher ability groups.

4. Research evidence does not support the assumption that college achievement is improved by ability grouping in high school.

5. Grouping may accentuate attainment of goals of narrow academic achievement to the extent that broader desirable behavioral goals are jeopardized.[29]

In a review of research on grouping, Passow reported that there are some eight difficulties in generalizing from the research. These are: (1) variations in scope of aims and purposes; (2) differences in number of students, number of groups, and size of classes involved; (3) differences in duration; (4) differences in the means of matching experimental and control groups; (5) differences in curricula and methods of teaching; (6) differences in the development of teachers; (7) differences in the instruments and techniques used in evaluating changes in pupils; and (8) failure to assess the effects of grouping on teachers and administrators.[30]

The Sixty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education pointed out that no single perfect scheme for meeting individual differences has been discovered.

---

[29]M. J. Eash, "Grouping: What Have We Learned?" Educational Leadership, XVIII (April, 1961), p. 430.

[30]A. Harry Passow, "The Maze of Research on Ability Grouping," Educational Forum, XXVI (March, 1962), pp. 281-288.

However, we cannot justify a do-nothing policy and it is not unjustifiable to say that in most schools individualized instruction can be increased as much as 10 per cent or 20 per cent, and this through the use of one or another of the plans for homogeneous grouping which have been described in the literature. Moreover, this modest gain would be of the greatest practical significance and might amount almost to a miracle in educational history.[31]

In a 1963 review of the research on grouping, Franseth made the following observations: (1) research results are inconclusive and indefinite; (2) factors other than grouping probably account for the differences found; (3) regardless of the type of grouping used, there is evidence of no pattern in the results; (4) on the average, achievement gains made by pupils in classrooms representing more than the usual range of differences among pupils were higher than the average gains made by pupils in ability grouped classrooms. The number of such situations examined, however, is too limited for a conclusion statement.[32]

---

[31]Fred T. Tyler and William A. Brownell, "Facts and Issues: A Concluding Statement," in Individualizing Instruction, Sixty-First Yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 320.

[32]J. Franseth, "Grouping Children for Instruction, A Conference Points the Way: Symposium," School Life, XXXXV (June, 1963), p. 6.

Shores in a review of the research noted also the many claims and counterclaims regarding the pros and cons of grouping. Many discrepancies have resulted in the foregoing studies. Wilhelms and Westby-Gibson indicate there may be a slight advantage for grouping while Franseth favors heterogeneous grouping and Ekstrom reports no difference. Each concluded that grouping may be detrimental to children in average and lower groups while Wilhelms and Westby-Gibson felt that if any group gains, it is the low group. In summarizing the literature through 1964, Shores reported that grouping by classes is an administrative device designed to enable teachers to better provide for individual differences. However, he related that studies to date show grouping on the basis of verbal intelligence or achievement has resulted in improved achievement. Grouping is no more than a first step in providing for individual differences. If improved instruction is to take place, this improvement will result only from the ability of teachers to change their organizations, methods, and materials to meet the abilities of the group being taught. Few studies indicate whether teachers changed their methods or materials after groups were arranged according to ability. Both objectives and content should also change when instructing groups at different ability levels. It is likely that research results will remain inconclusive until tests are designed to measure the objectives for each ability group.[33]

[33]J. Harlan Shores, "What Does Research Say About Ability Grouping?" Illinois Education, XXVII, No. 4 (December, 1964), pp. 169-172.

GROUPING AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Philosophy of homogeneous grouping in the social studies. According to DeZafra, "the single most important objective, and the test of all other objectives, is the cultivation within our schools of intelligent, humanitarian habits and actions."[34] Social studies teachers must skillfully set the stage so that situations will be created in which the right actions on the part of the pupils will repeatedly take place until habits of honesty, responsibility, cooperation, and humanity become entrenched. Social studies teachers must first be convinced that the curriculum is appropriate for the students at any given level and not simply diluted variations of a single subject theme. The teacher must be enthusiastic and the agent that brings students and curriculum together into a harmonious combination.[35]

In order to achieve this philosophy, homogeneous grouping in the social studies has been offered as a compromise in an educational system where we are concerned with preventing defeatism of the slow pupil, and sufficiently challenging the more brilliant pupils. If we were to directly meet the needs of each individual student, it would

---

[34]Carlos DeZafra, Jr., "Homogeneous Grouping in the Social Studies," Social Education, IV (November, 1940), p. 495.

[35]Ibid., p. 495.

require a thousand teachers for a school of a thousand students. Opposed to this would be a school of a thousand pupils with but one curriculum and but one type of instructor. Grouping into various levels such as students of superior ability, those of average ability and those of below average ability has been a common way of achieving this compromise. However, it must be recognized that within each level or group there will be some range and that careful adaptation of the curriculum to each of these ability levels is extremely important.[36]

Advantages of grouping in the social studies. Lewenstein reported the following as being common arguments in favor of grouping: (1) recognition that differences in students' abilities to learn do exist and that classes with this wide range of mental age, reading skills, etc. compound the problem of meeting individual needs of pupils; and (2) educators who practice ability grouping in all classes point out that democracy cannot be defined by appealing to the lowest common denominator.[37]

Educators who favor grouping point out that where instruction is geared to the majority of students in a class,

---

[36] Ibid., p. 494.

[37] Morris R. Lewenstein, Teaching Social Studies in Junior and Senior High School (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), pp. 534-538.

both the slow and the fast learners are neglected. They further believed that each student can be helped more effectively, be led to success at his own level, and be taught under conditions more conducive to good mental health than if competing with students from all levels. These educators pointed out that identity of opportunity is not equality of opportunity and the latter is most nearly provided when the classroom is tailored to a narrower range of ability than in a typical heterogeneous group.[38]

Arguments against grouping in the social studies. The following arguments against grouping in the social studies have often been given: (1) the goals of the social studies emphasize the development of socially accepted attitudes and civic behaviors, as well as the teaching of factual information. Some feel grouping is far short of developing socially accepted attitudes and civic behaviors and emphasize that workaday contacts with persons of different abilities and interests is necessary to develop desired citizenship skills and attitudes; (2) the existence of grouping establishes a caste system that has negative effects on the mental health of all students; (3) opponents of grouping believe that differences in ability will be more realistically and positively

---

[38]Dorothy Fraser and Edith West, Social Studies in Secondary Schools (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961), p. 252.

accepted if treated as one of several kinds of differences to be found in any group of students; (4) some educators point out that arguments for homogeneous grouping imply a conception of teaching that calls for uniform plans, assignments, and treatment of all students in a class, despite the wide range of individual differences present even in a homogeneous class; (5) differences of ability, like many other characteristics, are best provided for through the use of a variety of learning materials, flexible assignments, and the use of subgroups within a heterogeneous class; (6) the goals of the social studies are conceived in terms of behaviors and attitudes and not merely factual information. These attitudes and behaviors can best be met in a heterogeneous situation which is a more real life experience.[39]

Criteria for grouping in the social studies. There have been many factors used as the basis for determining groups for the social studies. Too often groupings are made on the basis of social status according to DeZafra. Intelligence tests provide a better basis for determining groups but is too frequently used as a single criterion. DeZafra believed that if a single criterion were to be used, reading ability would be the most applicable since social studies depends so much upon reading. However, he does not advocate

---

[39] Ibid., p. 253.

using only one criterion for grouping but strongly recommends using a variety of factors correlated with reading ability and intelligence test scores. If the optimum placement of each individual pupil is to be achieved, the following must be taken into account in addition to the above criterion: (1) mental age; (2) child's aptitude and affinity for the subject; (3) past records in the subjects; (4) the child's general physical stamina; (5) psychological mindsets; (6) personality adjustments between pupils and teacher; (7) number of subjects the pupil is carrying; (8) amount of home and out of school responsibilities of the pupil; (9) emotional state due to home conditions; and (10) pupil's qualities of intellectual leadership or following.[40]

A successful program must be founded on the philosophy that all placements are subject to change as the child matures, as he benefits from experiences, and as various other influences affect him.

Individualizing instruction in the social studies. Individualizing instruction means knowing the students as individuals and organizing the classroom situations, assignments, and experiences so that there is flexibility to insure students working individually at some times and as a group at other times. Individualizing instruction in the social studies

---

[40]C. DeZafra, Jr., op. cit., pp. 494-495.

entails offering students choices of materials and activities and helping students to learn to make choices in terms of what they do.[41]

To provide for individual needs of students in the social studies, Krug and Anderson proposed the following: (1) differentiation in amount of time spent on particular units or bodies of subject matter; (2) differentiation in amount of subject matter taught for mastery; (3) variation in number of activities; (4) simplification of subject matter; (5) supervised study; (6) grouping within the class; (7) homogeneous grouping; and (8) provision of longer class periods.[42]

Teaching rapid learners in social studies. The rapid learners are the intellectual leaders with whom we dare explore our society and its accompanying evils, and are capable of reforming these evils. These students can develop a vision of the future, the power of analysis, the ability to interpret and to think critically. Pupils in this group are capable of comprehending abstractions and of arriving at generalizations with which they will be able to measure and to evaluate all

---

[41]D. Fraser and E. West, op. cit., pp. 255-258.

[42]Edward Krug and G. Lester Anderson, (editors), Adapting Instruction in the Social Studies to Individual Differences, Fifteenth Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1944), p. 156.

civilizations. As these pupils are on the college prep level, it is imperative that they be given opportunities in writing term papers which entail research as well as creativity.[43]

McLendon proposed that teachers need to provide more challenging verbal instructions with the rapid learners. The rapid learner gains more from a good lecture than the average or slower learner. He also placed a great deal of emphasis on interpretation and ideas in subject matter rather than a simple recall of facts. Students should develop concepts or generalizations along with critical thinking and relationships. Rapid learners should be given opportunity to stress originality and take part in lively group discussions. Opportunities for working with fellow rapid learners and helping the slower learners are valuable experiences for them. These pupils should be encouraged to do independent study of interest and in depth with the teacher acting as a consultant. With the major role the social sciences will play in the future of our society, the rapid learners must be encouraged to pursue this talent and develop their skills in human relationships.[44]

The rapid learner must have a well planned curriculum with adequate instruction to meet their capabilities.

---

[43]C. DeZafra, Jr., op. cit., pp. 495-496.

[44]Jonathan C. McLendon, Social Studies in Secondary Education (New York: the Macmillan Company, 1965), pp. 247-251.

Instruction should be geared to various kinds of skills, developing abstractions, deep mental activity, cause and effect, independent study of great depth and breadth.[45]

Teaching the average learner in the social studies. The average learners are intellectual followers. Many of these pupils will be leaders who put into practice many of the ideas arrived at by the more rapid learners. This group has a definite need to understand the world as it really is. They will then be better prepared to follow intelligently. To attain this objective, the chronological textbook method, wherein political facts are studied, the cultural and sociological facts emphasized, and the laboratory method used as much as possible may be followed. The unit approach with as much of the laboratory method as possible is also used with this group of pupils.[46]

Teaching the slow learner in the social studies. The slow learner reads but at a slower rate if the material is at all abstract. He experiences difficulty in coordinating two or more mental functions, such as reading and evaluating what he reads. The slow learner assimilates new ideas and facts slowly. He learns most readily from simple, concrete, practical materials and activities. The slow learner often has

---

[45]M. Lewenstein, op. cit., pp. 536-538.

[46]C. Dezafra, Jr., op. cit., p. 496.

developed deep feelings of insecurity and inadequacy in academic work which is often accompanied by a dislike of such work.[47]

A study of the problems of the slow learners by the Baltimore County School System resulted in the following recommendations for the social studies: (1) the curriculum should center about the home, school, and community; (2) the curriculum should utilize demonstrations, films, and trips; (3) throughout the grades the slow learning pupils should receive planned social and cultural experiences that will equip him to function at an increasing level of effectiveness within the community; (4) the use of a single text and short concrete units is recommended; (5) immediate, exciting, and real are the basic characteristics of appropriate instructional materials for the slow learner.[48]

Burton and Brueckner recommended the following provisions for the slow learner: (1) a single environment with fewer changes and interruptions than is common is desirable; (2) first hand, concrete experiences is essential, with generalizations and abstractions introduced more slowly; (3) real-life situations with the environment providing ideal instructional materials; (4) guidance must be sympathetic and

---

[47] E. Krug and G. Anderson, op. cit., p. 56.

[48] Sylvia E. Harrison and Robert J. Solomon, "Reviews of Research in the Teaching of Social Studies," Social Education, XXVIII (May, 1964), p. 288.

rather continuous; (5) every opportunity for success should be provided; (6) there is as yet little valid evidence about methods of instruction but we do know that "bringing them up to normal" is an idle dream, and detrimental as well; and (7) confinding the program to drill on skills is equally undesirable.[49]

THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AND CURRENT GROUPING PRACTICES

According to such noted junior high school educators as Briggs, Koos, Gruhn and Douglass, Bossing and Cramer and Smith, the junior high school developed in the 1920's with the recognition of individual differences one of the primary functions. Administrators and supervisors responding to an opinionnaire by Lounsbury in the 1950's reported the role of the junior high school as a changing one. They rejected the function of providing for homogeneous or ability grouping.[50] The late 1950's and the 1960's however, revealed a conflict with the purposes and functions of the junior high school as revealed by Lounsbury's study. One of the chief proponents of

---

[49]William H. Burton and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision A Social Process, 3rd. ed., (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955), pp. 475-476.

[50]John H. Lounsbury, "The Role and Status of the Junior High School," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee, 1954), pp. 217-218.

providing for individual instruction through grouping in the 1950's was the Educational Policies Commission who issued the following statement:

> A democratic society has an obligation to provide opportunities for individuals to develop and use their talents, and the interests of society require that such opportunities be made attractive, but no one in a democracy can be compelled to use the opportunities available to him. The role of education in this connection is to equip the individual to use the opportunities that will best utilize his abilities and to guide him in making decisions that will serve both his own interests and those of society.[51]

This same commission in 1956 took an even stronger position when they reported, "the commission, weighing all factors, believes that some grouping of students by ability is desirable policy."[52]

Paul Woodring in his book, A Fourth of a Nation, emphatically endorses the practice of grouping students for instructional purposes on the basis of learning capacity. However, he believes they should not be grouped for social activities. Woodring also stated that the criticism of grouping based on it being undemocratic is unwarranted. He also believed much of the opposition to grouping from parents

---

[51]Educational Policies Commission, Education of the Gifted, National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, (Washington, D. C., June, 1950), p. 3.

[52]Educational Policies Commission, Manpower and Education, National Education Association (Washington, D. C., 1956), pp. 104-105.

represents only a small vocal minority and reports of a survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion for the Ladies Home Journal and published in October, 1954. This survey indicated that grouping on the basis of the child's ability in each particular subject had the approval of 71 per cent of the parents, while only fourteen per cent think it would be a poor idea, and fifteen per cent are undecided.[53]

It was further pointed out by Woodring that many teachers would welcome ability grouping but often give reasons for not doing so by referring to research as proving grouping to be unsound. He unequivocally pointed out that research has proven nothing of the sort, unless we accept garbled versions of research and make value judgments of a kind which research evidence never warrants.[54]

Two recent publications in the form of recommendations for improving education have been given nationwide circulation and may serve as an impetus to the trend toward grouping and further stimulate schools already practicing it. One of the main reasons some schools have been reluctant to adopt the practice of grouping pupils for instruction is that the charge has been frequently presented that it is undemocratic to treat youngsters in classrooms other than equally. The Rockefeller

---

[53]Paul Woodring, A Fourth of a Nation, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957), pp. 130-131.

[54]Ibid., p. 131.

Brother Report spoke quite frankly on this matter:

> By insisting that equality means an exactly similar exposure to education, regardless of the variations in interest and capacity of the student, we are in fact inflicting a subtle but serious form of inequality upon our young people. We are limiting the development of individual excellence in exchange for a uniformity of external treatments. Too many of our school systems have fallen into a chronological lock step under which all young people start off together at a given age and march forward one grade per year. Because many educators resist the idea of grouping by ability, the ablest students are often exposed to educational programs whose content is too thin and whose pace is too slow to challenge their abilities.[55]

The authors of this report further pointed out that in those schools where ability grouping has been adopted, they "have made far more progress in identifying different levels of talent than in the development of programs for these different levels."[56]

The other much publicized report, revolves around Conant's recommendations for Junior and Senior High schools of America. Probably the greatest boost given to grouping was his wholehearted endorsement of grouping in his widely publicized books, The American High School Today, and Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years.

Recommendation number 7 in Recommendations for Education

---

[55]The Pursuit of Excellence--Education and the Future of America, Rockefeller Brother Report, Panel Report V of the Special Studies Project, (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958), pp. 22-23.

[56]Ibid., p. 23.

in the Junior High School Years, presents Conant's thinking on grouping.

> ...interestingly, though grouping is a controversial subject, I have found considerably less objection to it in grades 7, 8, and 9 than I found three years ago in the senior high school. Many educators feel that by the time of the seventh grade the spread of pupil achievement has become so great that only an unusually competent teacher can provide suitable instruction for a cross section of the grade. Complete homogeneity can never be attained, but a necessity is seen to reduce the range of individual differences in a given class if suitable instruction is to take place.
>
> I personally recommend three groups in academic courses with the bulk of the pupils in a particular grade in a large middle group. Preferably, the grouping should be accomplished subject by subject, except, of course, in those subjects combined in block time classes. I have been especially impressed with the emphasis educators place on reading ability as one of the major criteria for grouping. Perhaps my principal argument for grouping in academic areas rests on the fact that in every school there is a certain fraction of pupils who read well below their grade level. These pupils need special books and teachers. To my mind, to mix in an English class boys and girls reading three years below grade level with those reading three years above grade level is to do everyone concerned an injustice. Of course any grouping arrangement assumes differentiated materials and teaching methods.[57]

The emphasis on grouping was also prompted by the Russian launching of "Sputnik" and the ensuing space programs initiated by the United States and Russia. This shifted American attention to programs for the talented or gifted students with grouping being a large part of the American

---

[57] J. B. Conant, Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1960), pp. 25-26.

educational scene. So great was the impact that the United States Federal Government financially supported programs geared to meeting the needs of the academically talented. After this initial surge, the educational pendulum has leveled off somewhat as America has become concerned not only with the needs of society and the gifted pupil, but also in meeting the needs of all pupils.

The practice of grouping has not been completely settled in the minds of educators or citizens. However, there is evidence to indicate a trend has developed in recent years toward revival of this practice which had been tried but abandoned by many schools some thirty years ago. With more and more schools adopting some form of grouping, the problem of choosing appropriate instructional provisions is as persistent as ever; however, it is now more generally held that differentiated instructional methods are indeed pertinent to the success of any grouping program.

Evidence of the revival of grouping can be obtained by examining various national and regional surveys. The Encyclopedia of Educational Research for 1950 reported a study by Ferriss in 1925 as indicating that 49 per cent of the rural junior high schools he surveyed were employing some form of grouping.[58]

---

[58]E. N. Ferriss and others, The Rural Junior High School, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin 28 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1928), 79 pp.

A study by Billett in 1932 reported 32 per cent of 8,594 schools surveyed using grouping. Some 55 per cent of the schools enrolling 251-500 pupils were using grouping and 72 per cent of schools enrolling 1,000 or more pupils were using grouping.[59]

Studies by Billett[60] and Gruhn,[61] indicated that approximately two-thirds of the junior high schools employed the practice of grouping.

In a survey of 80 principals of junior high schools in cities of 100,000 population or over, the conclusions reported were: (1) seventy-one practiced homogeneous grouping; (2) a number of factors were used in grouping with I.Q. ranking number one; (3) initial sectioning was not permanent and several factors were used for re-classification; (4) the course of study was basically the same for all groups; (5) definite plans were employed to differentiate instruction to ability levels; (6) subjective reactions of principals relative to the

---

[59]R. O. Billett, The Administration and Supervision of Homogeneous Grouping (Columbua, Ohio: Ohio State University Press, 1932), p. 159.

[60]Roy O. Billett, "Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion," National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph 13, Bulletin no. 17 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1932), 471 pp.

[61]W. T. Gruhn, "An Investigation of the Relative Frequency of Curriculum and Related Practices Contributing to the Realization of the Basic Function of the Junior High School," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of North Carolina, 1940).

effects of grouping predominantly favored grouping.[62]

In a 1948 study, Otto reported that 53 per cent of 1,595 city schools were using grouping and that over 72 per cent of the cities having a population of more than 100,000 were using ability grouping.[63]

The Encyclopedia of Educational Research in 1950 summarized studies on the junior high school curriculum and individualization by indicating that they individualized by: (1) adapting courses and curriculum, (2) by employing teaching methods that meet individual differences, (3) providing special attention to gifted and dull pupils, (4) adapting courses of study to the various interest and abilities of pupils, (5) providing remedial instruction.[64]

Lauchner in 1951 studied junior high schools in twenty-four states and reported the following trends: (1) a majority use the block-time system for scheduling, (2) they practice grouping to a greater or lesser degree, (3) do not depend upon a single textbook for class use, (4) give marks based upon a pupils individual ability rather than a single standard, (5) establish special classes for slow learners, and

---

[62] O. M. Clem and L. F. Wroath, "Practices in Homogeneous Grouping in Junior High School," Educational Method, XIII (January, 1934), pp. 206-210.

[63] H. J. Otto, op. cit., p. 202.

[64] Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Rev. Ed. (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950), p. 641.

(6) pay special attention to gifted pupils.[65]

In a 1954 survey, Jewett and others reported that of 795 junior and senior high schools surveyed, 48 per cent reported they were using grouping. The percentage increased as school size also increased.[66]

Eales, Read and Wilson found that in 42 secondary schools of Los Angeles County, 36 practiced some form of ability grouping.[67]

It was suggested by Brahman that one of the best ways to promote democracy and still provide an opportunity for individual instruction is to place pupils in home rooms alphabetically and schedule them homogeneously for skill subjects.[68]

School and Society reported a study by three Wisconsin high schools by the University Cooperative Educational Research and Services organization in 1959 directed by Prof. Herbert J. Klausmeier of the School of Education. The study

---

[65]A. H. Lauchner, "A Study of Trends in Junior High School Practices in Twenty-Four States," Bulletin of National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXV (December, 1951), pp. 120-125.

[66]Arno Jewett, J. Dan Hull, et al., Teaching Rapid and Slow Learners in High School, U. S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare, Bulletin no. 5 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954), p. 11.

[67]J. R. Eales, Harold Read, and Claude Wilson, "Grouping Practices in the Secondary Schools of Los Angeles County," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), pp. 54-57.

[68]R. V. Brahman, "Grouping in the Junior High School," National Education Association Journal, XXXXVIII (September, 1959), pp. 22-23.

showed that 82 per cent of the juniors and seniors who had separate classes approved of them, and that 92 per cent of the teachers favored continuing them.[69]

Dean in 1960 reported after a survey on organizational practices that of the 4,307 urban places with populations of 2,500 or more, 34.4 per cent grouped homogeneously in grades seven and eight. There was agreement by schools who used a policy of homogeneous grouping and those who didn't, that there would be an increase in homogeneous grouping in the future.[70]

The question of grouping in junior high school was considered as the main topic for nine regional drive-in conferences in Illinois in 1959. The results of about 800 teachers and administrators thinking was reported by Baughman and Schoonmaker as follows: (1) in general, there was acceptance of ability grouping as the best means now available for meeting individual instructional needs of pupils in classes; (2) due to many problems of individual scheduling, across-the-board grouping by homerooms is more prevalent than subject matter grouping; (3) three levels of ability are commonly used: (4) consensus favored homogeneous grouping in academic

---

[69]"Sectioning in High School," School and Society, LXXXVII (December 19, 1959), p. 518.

[70]Stuart E. Dean, Elementary School Organization and Administration, U. S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 11 (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960), pp. 67-72.

subjects and heterogeneous grouping in homerooms and all other subjects; (5) grouping within each class by teachers was desirable regardless of the make-up of the class or the organization of the school; (6) flexible movement of pupils from group to group is essential; (7) low achieving students should be placed in smaller than average classes; and (8) many different ways of marking and grading in groups were used.[71]

A questionnaire answered by junior high school principals in and around Philadelphia in 1960 on homogeneous grouping revealed that about three-fourths of these schools grouped by general ability in academic subjects in grades seven and eight. In addition, about one-half had heterogeneously grouped homerooms.[72]

A study by the U. S. Office of Education on the Junior High School in 1959-1960 reported that a survey of 4,595 junior high schools of grades seven, eight, and nine, with enrollments of 75 pupils or more reported that 74 per cent of the junior high schools practiced homogeneous grouping

---

[71] M. Dale Baughman and D. Schoonmaker, "Grouping Patterns in Junior High School," Clearing House, XXXVI (October, 1961), pp. 111-114.

[72] C. E. Buell, "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXIV (April, 1960), pp. 257-262.

and that 60 per cent of the junior-senior high schools used it.[73]

In a nationwide teacher opinion poll conducted by the National Education Association in 1961 on grouping according to ability, the results were as follows: (1) in elementary levels, 57.6 per cent of the teachers approved of grouping, 33.1 per cent disapproved, and 9.3 per cent didn't know; (2) of secondary teachers reporting, 87.3 per cent approved of grouping, 8.6 per cent disapproved of grouping, and 4.1 per cent didn't know.[74]

Ross believed parents and pupils of slower groups appreciate the fact they are competing on their own level and get more individual help. Teachers of slow groups also like and enjoy working with these pupils and he recommended specialized teachers at each level of grouping.[75]

Some of the newest ideas on grouping include not only the grouping of pupils but the grouping of teachers according to Spain. He concluded "that any school plan, of whatever kind, if it is created by the people who will work with it, is good. It is good because it will set a standard of

---

[74]"Teacher Opinion Poll," National Education Association Journal, L (April, 1961), p. 62.

[75]W. C. Ross, "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXV (April, 1961), pp. 59-64.

thoroughness which the teacher will exact from himself and demand of his students."[76]

A study of achievement differences of gifted students in heterogeneous and homogeneous classes concluded: (1) students should be grouped homogeneously for reading classes; (2) the study indicated that there was no advantage in homogeneous grouping for arithmetic classes; (3) grade level was not a factor in the achievement gain of the students; (4) students in the three junior high schools located in different areas of the school district made approximately the same achievement gains; and (5) sex was no factor in achievement gains made by the students.[77]

One educator suggested that all schools have some form of grouping. The junior high school itself is a form of grouping according to Herkner. He feels we must distinguish between segregation and grouping however. While we group by some criteria in certain areas, we integrate in others like homerooms, student councils and social activities.[78]

---

[76]C. H. Spain, "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXV (April, 1961), pp. 59-64.

[77]Fred L. Mahler, "A Study of Achievement Differences in Selected Junior High Schools Gifted Students Heterogeneously or Homogeneously Grouped," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Houston, 1961).

[78]M. W. Herkner, "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXV (April, 1961), pp. 59-64.

Gilmore described the grouping program in Grove City, Pennsylvania junior high school as one functioning smoothly with teachers feeling that grouping has been successful, although they realize it has made their work more difficult.[79]

A study of the effectiveness of ability grouping in seventh grade core classes concluded: (1) ability grouping did not produce significant changes in pupils' attitudes toward themselves or their peers, (2) based on pupil responses the average effect of the experimental factor was not significant in areas of peer behavior, learning needs, and teacher-pupil relationships, (3) responses of pupils on the anxiety scales indicated significant increases by the experimental group in both test anxiety and in general anxiety, (4) insufficient evidence was secured to indicate that ability grouping procedures hindered or enhanced pupil development in academic skills; in attitude toward self and others; and in attitudes toward the school situation in areas of peer behavior, learning needs, and teacher-pupil relationships.[80]

The effect of grouping upon the growth and behavior of junior high school pupils was studied by Wilcox with the following conclusions: (1) there was evidence of a more

---

[79] I. Gilmore, "Grouping in Junior High School," Clearing House, XXXVII (November, 1962), pp. 163-164.

[80] W. W. Fick, "The Effectiveness of Ability Grouping in Seventh Grade Core Classes," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Kansas, 1962).

positive self-concept among pupils in the intelligence strata below I.Q. 90 as they were more homogeneously grouped, (2) attitude toward the school was more positive among pupils in the intelligence strata below I.Q. 104 when they were more homogeneously grouped. Attitude toward school was more negative among upper socio-economic class pupils of I.Q. 105 and higher when they were more homogeneously grouped, (3) all analyses of variance failed to show any significant relationships between homogeneity of grouping and achievement in critical thinking, (4) in an analyses of the total sample population the mean level of achievement was found to improve, and standard deviations in achievement were narrower, among schools grouped most homogeneously. Schools loosely grouped for homogeneity of mental age had a lower mean level of achievement than schools which assigned randomly.[81]

In a study of below-average junior high school students, Torgelson concluded "that grouping homogeneously for below-average junior high school students was not superior to heterogeneous grouping. Although it appears to have some advantages, most of the comparisons made showed no significant differences between the two methods."[82]

---

[81] J. Wilcox, "A Search for the Multiple Effects of Grouping Upon the Growth and Behavior of Junior High School Pupils," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Cornell University, 1963).

[82] J. W. Torgelson, "A Comparison of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Grouping for Below-Average Junior High School Students," (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1963).

One of the best summaries on grouping in the junior high school was presented by Van Til, Vars, and Lounsbury in their book, Modern Education for the Junior High School Years. They reported that it is hard to reach a conclusion concerning grouping. Over the years, homogeneous grouping has battled heterogeneous grouping without a definite decision being reached. They reported that in the 1950's junior high school faculties seemed to be saying, "let's ability-group for these kinds of experiences, but definitely not for these other kinds of experiences." In addition to the more conventional ability-grouping practices, many junior high schools had organized special classes for the retarded and gifted pupils.[83]

The National Education Association Project on Instruction reported that ability grouping as a trend developed upward into the 1960's. The project's survey of 1,500 elementary and secondary principals resulted in, among others, the following findings:

> The trend toward grouping students according to achievement and/or ability rather than age or grade has increased in 52 per cent of the large elementary schools and in 81 per cent of the large secondary schools, the principals reported. As schools decreased in size, however, so did the percentage of ability grouping reported.[84]

---

[83]William Van Til, Gordon F. Vars, and John H. Lounsbury, Modern Education for the Junior High School Years (Indianapolis: the Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 56-57.

[84]Ole Sand and Richard I. Miller, "Curricular Innovations," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVII (May, 1963), pp. 121-122.

The most comprehensive recent survey of practices in junior high school education was conducted by Gruhn and Douglass in the spring of 1965. One segment of their survey dealt with provisions for individual differences. Replies were received from 423 three year junior high schools with 300 pupils or more. The following responses were reported by the authors:

1. Of the 423 schools who replied, 404 practiced ability grouping.

2. For grade seven, 380 schools grouped by ability; grade eight 381 schools; and grade nine, 350 schools.

3. Subjects in which grouping by ability occurred were mathematics 376 schools; English 334; science 289, social studies 261; foreign language 170; music 57; other subjects 57; art 41; home economics 40; industrial arts 37; physical education 26.

4. Criteria reported for ability grouping ranked according to frequency were teachers' ratings; I.Q. scores; previous marks in academic subjects; reading skills; other criteria; previous marks in all subjects.

5. The levels of ability not including honors or remedial ranked in order of frequency were three levels; two levels; as many levels as class groups; number of levels varies from subject to subject; four levels; no one practice.

6. Pupils were placed in different ability groups for different subjects by 232 schools. Pupils were placed in the same ability groups for all subjects in 119 schools while 27 schools reported other practices.

7. There was no designation used by 163 schools to designate the various ability levels. Numbers were used by 118 schools as a designation and letters were used by 72 schools.

8. Pupils were not informed as to what their group was in 112 schools while they were informed of such grouping in 108 schools.

9. Schools reporting moving toward more ability grouping in the last five years numbered 179. No change in emphasis was reported by 147 schools, and 50 schools reported moving toward less grouping in the last five years.

10. In answer to what percentage of the teachers in social studies group pupils regularly within a class group? No teachers do this was indicated by 132 schools; 126 schools estimated from 1-25 per cent of the teachers did this; 47 schools reported from 26-50 per cent of the teachers grouped within the class; 43 schools indicated from 51-75 per cent of the teachers grouped within the class; and 40 schools reported from 76-100 per cent of the teachers in social studies grouped within the class.[85]

CONCOMITANT PROPOSALS FOR MEETING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES

Some of the proposals seek to modify the horizontal structure of the school's administrative organization as a more efficient means of providing for individual differences. One of the more comprehensive recommendations for revamping the horizontal organization came from the survey of secondary school principals made by Trump and Baynham. The three components of their proposals are: (1) flexible scheduling, (2) team teaching, and (3) variable sized groups.[86]

---

[85] William T. Gruhn and Harl Douglass, A Survey of Practices in Junior High School, p. 14 (Mimeographed.)

[86] J. Lloyd Trump and Dorsey Baynham, Focus on Change, National Association of Secondary School Principals Commission on the Experimental Study of Utilization of the Staff in Secondary School (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1961).

Flexible scheduling individualizes the student's schedule into different modules of time varying in length for each subject during each day of the week. The length of time needed in a given course, depends on what the course requirements demand as necessary for fulfilling accreditation and what will best meet the individual pupil's needs.[87]

Another provision of the Trump Plan was team teaching. Team teaching advocates flexibility in instruction to varying sized groups, and at the same time giving the teachers more opportunity to specialize in their subject matter areas, but yet, devote more time to individual students.[88]

The third suggestion of the Trump Plan involves variable sized grouping. Three groups proposed are namely, large group instruction, small discussion groups, and independent study. The ultimate goal of team teaching, flexible scheduling and variable sized groups, is to provide the individual with independent study time. The concept of individual study time involves study carrels or special provisions for research. Under individual study students are encouraged to read, listen to records and tapes, review, experiment, examine and consider evidence, analyze, investigate, write,

---

[87]Robert Bush and Dwight Allen, A New Design for High School Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964).

[88]Judson Shaplin and Henry Olds, (eds.), Team Teaching (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).

create, and to use self-appraisal with a minimum of teacher supervision.[89]

Another proposal to modify the school organization to provide flexibility of instruction was the year around school. Schoenfield and Schmitz proposed a year around school with extended opportunities for summer school, summer institutes, extra period programs, Saturday and evening programs from Kindergarten to college.[90]

Other experimentation has taken place in classroom organization for establishing special sections to meet the individual differences. Some experimentation has taken place with honor's sections. These are usually on a voluntary basis geared to the highly talented student.[91]

Remedial instruction or special instruction designed to overcome particular learning difficulties, have been experimented with as an additional way of providing for individualized instruction. However, instruction in a particular area is only undertaken after the diagnosis indicates

---

[89]David Beggs and Edward Buffie, (eds.), Independent Study (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965).

[90]Clarence Schoenfeld and Neil Schmitz, Year-Around Education (Madison, Wisconsin: Dembar Educational Research Services, 1964).

[91]H. F. Gray, "What Recent Developments in Grouping Students For Effective Instruction?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXIV (April, 1960), pp. 49-60.

the evidence of a specialized educational problem.[92]

While remedial instruction was found in many of the larger school systems, Thelen proposed that youth of all ability levels should be given laboratory experiences in skill development.[93]

Another approach was differentiation of the instructional program through enrichment, advanced placement, promotion and acceleration.

Still another approach was the development of correspondence courses. The development having been chiefly centered at the University of Nebraska, has resulted in the production of a wide range of offerings to enrich, supplement, and adapt the curriculum to the individual student. Wilhelms stated: "correspondence education is, by its very nature, the epitome of individualization. Its range of offerings can be very great, and one student is taught at a time."[94]

---

[92]Theodore Clymer and Nolan Kearney, "Curricular and Instructional Provisions for Individual Differences," in Individualizing Instruction, Sixty-First Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), pp. 273-275.

[93]Herbert Thelen, Education and the Human Quest (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), pp. 184-187.

[94]Fred Wilhelms, "The Curriculum and Individual Differences," in Individualizing Instruction, Sixty-First Yearbook of the National Society of the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 64.

Instructional materials have been improved and new ideas of how to best utilize modern technology have also been considered as ways of individualizing instruction. Instructional materials and resource centers consisting of a library and audio visual center have been established in some school systems. In addition, educational television and radio are being widely researched and experimented with as aids to individualizing instruction.[95]

The introduction of the innovation programmed learning has also been suggested as a means of providing for the progress of learners with widely divergent abilities.[96]

By far the most significant advances in the past decade have been made in interclass grouping within the classroom. Seagoe analyzed the research on interclass grouping for skills and general grouping practices within the classroom. She urged teachers to use varying sized groups with different membership and that differentiated materials, assignments, syllabi, and activities be used to provide individualization.[97]

---

[95]Project on the Instructional Program of the Public Schools, Schools for the Sixties (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963).

[96]Gabriel Ofiesh and Wesley Meierhenry, Trends in Programmed Instruction, Department of Audiovisual Instruction of the National Education Association and the National Society for Programmed Instruction (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1964).

[97]M. Seagoe, op. cit., pp. 7-8.

Vertical reorganization of the school using nongraded and multi-graded approaches are other alternatives to the traditional graded school. Careful examination and experimentation has been given to these alternatives as a means of providing flexible programs.[98]

Another modification of the vertical approach was proposed by Hansen who has established a four track curriculum in the Washington, D. C. public schools. The four tracks provide the student with four levels of instruction ranging from the honors track to the basic track.[99]

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF GROUPS

The criteria used for determining membership of groups appears to vary from one criteria to many criteria depending on the given school. Baldwin in 1923 surveyed 68 school systems and found that the student's ability was measured on the basis of intelligence tests, teacher's judgment, and educational achievement. Rarely were such factors as chronological age, social development, health, or emotional stability taken into account.[100]

---

[98]B. Frank Brown, The Nongraded High School (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964).

[99]Carl Hansen, Four Track Curriculum (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964).

[100]Bird T. Baldwin, "Methods of Selecting Superior or Gifted Children," in Report of the Committee on the Education of Gifted Children, Twenty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1924), pp. 26-27.

Ryan and Crecelius went further in their research and listed other measures or bases for grouping. They would take into account chronological age, mental age, intelligence quotient, pedagogical age, anatomical age, social age, height, weight, general condition of health, and rank in class.[101]

Almost three decades later, Riley listed general achievement, reading ability, intelligence quotient, creative ability or originality, and good judgment as criteria for selection of groups.[102]

Various measures such as intelligence tests, achievement tests, reading ability, teacher's marks, have all been used as criteria according to Wrightstone. He pointed out that experience and research have shown that any one of these factors when considered alone, is seldom satisfactory. In addition, several factors used together do not reduce materially the range of differences in a class of 30 or more. It is doubtful that any "perfect" combination of factors exists although various types of grouping within the classroom have value.[103]

---

[101]Herber H. Ryan and Philipine Crecelius, Ability Grouping in the Junior High School (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1927), pp. 49-50.

[102]Fay C. Riley, "Grouping Gives Each Child a Chance," Nations Schools, LVIII (August, 1956), pp. 51-55.

[103]J. Wayne Wrightstone, Class Organization for Instruction, Department of Classroom Teachers, American Educational Research Association of the National Education Association (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1957), p. 6.

Jewett and Hull in 1954 found the following factors or devices as criteria for grouping: In descending order they were (1) school marks, (2) group intelligence tests, (3) estimates by teacher, (4) standardized test of achievement, (5) physical health, (6) counselor's evaluation, (7) vocational plans, and (8) reading habits and interest.[104]

Tidwell reported in a 1959 research that the most commonly used factors for grouping in the social studies in descending order were: (1) mental ability, (2) previous grades earned in the subject field, (3) recommendations by previous teachers, (4) achievement test scores, (5) choice of high school curriculum or courses, and (6) reading scores.[105]

The Educator's Encyclopedia for 1961 reported that standardized achievement test results, intelligence tests scores, records of child's progress during the preceding school years as well as current school year, records of parent-teacher conferences, anecdotal records, and teachers reports and recommendations are all information to be considered when selecting groups.[106]

---

[104]A. Jewett and D. Hull, op. cit.,

[105]Charles H. Tidwell, A Study of Grouping Practices in Large American High Schools (unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, 1959), pp. 135-136.

[106]E. Smith, S. Krause, and M. Atkinson, Educator's Encyclopedia (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1961), p. 74.

The National Education Association research division in a report on ability grouping pointed out that no single factor constitutes ability. According to them, intelligence tests and aptitude tests are the most common tools used in identifying ability. They further pointed out that the school must have an organized guidance service to help identify talent of all kinds and to help interpret the results of tests. They also stated that the following factors must be considered in the identification of ability: (1) chronological age, (2) physical and social maturity, (3) mental age, (4) reading readiness, (5) intelligence quotient, (6) specific skills, (7) work habits, (8) emotional maturity, and (9) range and level of educational achievement. In addition they proposed that such factors as teachers opinions, the belief of parents as to whether the child belongs in grouped classes, and the pupils' ability to adjust to new situations and demands must also be considered.[107]

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOR OF GROUPING

There have been many reasons given both for and against grouping. Frequently, what was originally given as an advantage by one person, is held to be a disadvantage by

---

[107] National Education Association Research Memo, National Education Association Research Division (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, September, 1962), p. 11.

someone else and vice versa. No attempt is made here to defend one or the other point of view but to merely present some of the more frequent claims and counterclaims made.

The following assumptions or claims have been advanced as advantages of grouping.

Grouping individualizes instruction. The arguments advanced for this contention are varied and numerous. Gillespie contended that, first, the range of individual differences is reduced to where the teacher can more nearly reach the pupils in the class; second, the methods and materials can be adjusted to the abilities of the group; and third, members of the group will progress at more nearly the same rate.[108]

Methods and materials used with grouped classes are more applicable because of the similarity of pupils. Grouping allows children to proceed at their own rate with children of the same ability. Furthermore, children are challenged to do their best to remain in the group to which they are assigned.[109]

Saylor and Alexander reported that an advantage of grouping is, "that it enables the school to gear the

---

[108]T. M. Gillespie, "What Recent Developments In Grouping Students for Effective Instruction?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXIV (April, 1960), pp. 49-60.

[109]E. Smith, S. Krause, and M. Atkinson, op. cit., p. 73.

curriculum and instructional program to the capabilities and the achievement levels of its pupils. The school is better able to adapt the curriculum to the needs and competencies of individual pupils, thus individualizing instruction to a much greater degree."[110]

Grouping promotes learning. Inlow maintained that students who are segregated with others of like abilities and attitudes should logically learn more. In addition, the mental health of the students improves when they are not forced to compete unequally with their more capable associates.[111] Franseth contended that grouping children according to their abilities fosters the development of desirable attitudes and healthy self-concepts.[112] Grouping promotes better adjustment and as a result raises the scholastic morale of all groups according to Hartman.[113] Grouping reduces failure and increases the retention of students. Because success and a feeling of achievement are important factors in the development of a well adjusted personality, grouping promotes the

---

[110]J. Galen Saylor and William M. Alexander, Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), p. 349.

[111]Gail Inlow, Maturity in High School Teaching (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963), p. 235.

[112]J. Franseth, "Does Grouping Make a Difference?" Educational Digest, XXVIII (January, 1963), pp. 15-17.

[113]G. Hartman, "The Next Step in Homogeneous Grouping," Educational Method, XIII (December, 1933-34), pp. 141-144.

chance for a better adjusted personality.[114]

Grouping facilitates instruction. Grouping permits the better utilization of staff since each teacher is assigned to the level of pupils with which he can work most comfortably and effectively. Teaching is made easier because individualization of small groups is possible.[115] In support of improved instruction, Gillespie agreed that when the range of individual differences is reduced, it is more possible for the teacher to reach all the students in his classes.[116]

The Educational Policies Commission suggested that while the differentiation of instruction to meet individual differences requires less variety in teacher preparation, a good teacher must still individualize and provide a variety of activities for the student. Grouping permits the assigning of teachers to instruct a particular group for which they are most qualified to teach. Thus grouping does not make the work of the teacher easier but provides teachers with the opportunity for more individualization of instruction.[117]

Grouping was possible. Children can be grouped by interests, ability, achievement, and aptitude according to

---

[114] A. Turney, op. cit., p. 123.

[115] Ibid., p. 23.

[116] T. M. Gillespie, op. cit., pp. 49-60.

[117] Educational Policies Commission, Education of the Gifted, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

Franseth. Testing and measuring devices can adequately measure a child's learning potential. While it is not impossible to organize homogeneous groups, the problem arises as to how to obtain similar or commensurable individuals in groups and also greatly reduce the differences between the highest and lowest in each group.[118]

Grouping was democratic. There are numerous arguments advanced to prove that grouping is undemocratic. Mott stated: "What is undemocratic about finding the God given qualities and abilities in all students and giving them the divine privilege of associating and working as nearly as possible with the type of people with whom they have equal mental ability and desire?"[119] To further support this contention, Cooke believed there has been no feeling of superiority or inferiority among students.[120] The National Education Association Research Division reported that because children generally form their friendships and peer groups on the basis of shared interests and abilities, the problem of snobbishness can be even more acute in the heterogeneous than in the

---

[118] J. Franseth, op. cit., pp. 15-17.

[119] K. Mott, "Case for Ability Grouping," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXXV (November, 1961), pp. 52-62.

[120] E. Cooke, "Ability Grouping," Bulletin National Association Of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (January, 1952), pp. 79-83.

homogeneous class where there is a broad enough basis of similarity to insure that no child gets an inflated view of his worth. The competition in a homogeneous class is seen by its proponents to be of greater value than in a heterogeneous class because it is within narrow enough limits as to be meaningful for all pupils.[121]

A homogeneous group is the only one in which a student can first begin to learn the democratic processes, according to Sullivan.[122] Society is built upon homogeneous groups and that group feeling expresses itself more easily in homogeneous groups.[123]

Lawson contended that it is not undemocratic to recognize individual differences and to make provisions for them. He maintained that every child is entitled to an education he can handle at his own ability level. Many of the so-called misfits of society would be able to remain in school and profit from it if grouping were homogeneous.[124]

Snobbishness and stigma are products of the teacher's attitude towards grouping and are not necessarily the result of having varying ability groups.[125]

---

[121]National Education Association Research Memo, op. cit., p. 4.

[122]Harry S. Sullivan, Conceptions of a Modern Psychiatry (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1947), pp. 59-60.

[123]M. Gowan, "Why Homogeneous Grouping?" California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), p. 23.

[124]D. Lawson, op. cit., p. 265.

[125]P. Symonds, "Mental Health Through Education," Progressive Education, XXVI (March, 1949), p. 145.

Grouping was best for the slow learner. Children with less ability are able to receive more individual attention from the teacher when they are placed together in a classroom.[126] In addition, the slower student is spared the sense of frustration and defeat which comes from the daily reminders of inferiority in the classroom.[127] Students participated more when not eclipsed by those of higher ability. Competition may operate as an incentive. The confidence of the slow pupil may be restored when not overshadowed by pupils of much higher ability. It is often stated that grouping reduces failures among the slow learners. Children do not feel the sense of failure nearly as badly in a group in which they can compete as in a group in which they are inferior even to the average students in the class.[128]

Grouping was best for the gifted student. The arguments for grouping superior students have been discussed from many viewpoints. Grouping provides stimulating competition for leadership and offers the opportunity to display leadership qualities. Grouping permits gifted students to progress at their own rate commensurate with their abilities.[129] The

---

[126]E. Smith, S. Krause, and M. Atkinson, op. cit., p. 73.

[127]G. Hartman, op. cit., pp. 141-144.

[128]M. Gowan, op. cit., p. 26.

[129]A. Turney, op. cit., pp. 21-42, 110-127.

Educational Policies Commission suggested that grouping maintains the interests and incentive of the gifted pupil with less boredom and develops more efficient work habits.[130]

Grouping was best for all levels of learners. The position that grouping is best for all levels of ability in learners was advocated by Reeve. He stated that it offers opportunities for maximum challenge to each student and therefore leads to a more effective use of abilities.[131]

ARGUMENTS AGAINST GROUPING

The following arguments have been advanced as arguments against grouping by some educators.

True grouping was impossible. Some hold that any particular factor used for such groupings may be the only real point of similarity in the class. They advocate that true grouping is impossible.[132] Washburne asserted"that children do not fall into homogeneous ability groups and that even the best ability grouping does not fit schools to individual differences."[133]

---

[130]Educational Policies Commission, op. cit., pp. 52-53.

[131]William Reeve, "The Problem of Varying Abilities Among Students in Mathematics," The Education Digest, XXI (May, 1956), pp. 430-431.

[132]E. Smith, S. Krause, and M. Atkinson, op. cit., p. 73.

[133]Carleton W. Washburne, "Comment on Study by Ward and Others," in Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences, Twenty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1925), pp. 158-159.

Grouping was undemocratic. This is probably the most often heard argument against grouping in any form. Some educators opposed grouping on the grounds that it is undemocratic by giving opportunities to some and making a distinction by ability.[134] The National Education Association Research Division pointed out that some educators feel it is undemocratic to single out of any one group in the educative process; and that such groupings breed snobbishness and the ultimate breakdown of democratic ideals. These educators feel that the separation of pupils on the basis of various talents is a deterrent to equal opportunity for success.[135]

Some claim grouping fosters "class-education" that tends to carry over into adult life an undesirable acceptance of social stratification. It does not provide an environment for growth that includes interplay of individuals of widely varying interests and abilities deemed necessary by some in a democratic society.[136]

Lack of stimulation of brighter students. There are some who believe that grouping leads to the lower students missing the stimulation of the brighter pupils as found in

---

[134]Educational Policies Commission, Education of the Gifted, op. cit., p. 53.

[135]National Education Association Research Memo, op. cit., pp. 1-2.

[136]Educational Policies Commission, loc. cit.

heterogeneous groups.[137] Tillman reported this as a definite factor accompanying grouping and as a result spoke strongly against the practice of grouping.[138] Commins and Fagin also reported this as a common argument against grouping and indicated that it presented psychological problems.[139]

Grouping develops conceit and snobbery in rapid learners and stigmatizes pupils. Eales, Reed, and Wilson reported that a considerable number of people feel that grouping contributes to a feeling of segregation in the school which is detrimental to the learning process. The brightest students may think of themselves as a kind of elite group and the less able as the "dumbell class." An unhealthy social situation often arises due to this placement in a slower or faster group.[140] Tillman reported that frequently youngsters are given undesirable labels that have far reaching implications. A stigma is attached to the lower sections, operating to discourage and not stimulate the pupils in these groups.[141]

---

[137]G. Inlow, op. cit., p. 237.

[138]Rodney Tillman, "Is Ability Grouping Taking Schools in the Wrong Direction?" Nations Schools, LXXIII (April, 1964), p. 70.

[139]W. D. Commins and Bary Fagin, Principles of Educational Psychology (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1954), p. 418.

[140]J. Eales, R. Read, and C. Wilson, op.cit., p. 57.

[141]W. D. Commins and B. Fagin, op. cit., p. 418.

Teachers assume children are all the same and don't individualize. Some criticize grouping on the grounds that teachers assume grouping has resulted in homogeneity and as a result they don't have to differentiate materials and assignments for the recognition of individual differences.[142] There is a strong feeling that although students might be ideally selected and grouped, the success of any resultant learning situation still depends upon how and what each group is taught. Too many times teachers do not individualize within the group but assume that the pupils can progress at the same rate and achievement.[143]

Administrative problems connected with grouping. Practically, grouping of any kind creates many problems of finance and facilities for the schools. There are many small schools where grades organized on the basis of some criteria for grouping would make almost impossibly small classes, and the gifted and slow learners, of main concern in grouping, would normally account for only a small proportion of the total school population.[144]

Test data may vary from one situation to another and grouping depends too much on the validity of these data

---

[142] E. Smith, S. Krause, and M. Atkinson, op. cit., p. 73.

[143] National Education Association Research Division, op. cit., p. 2.

[144] Ibid., p. 2.

creating problems of placement. The instruments for the selection of the personnel for the classes or groups are held to be inadequate to do justice to all children. Not enough data is gathered to make sound judgments upon.[145]

Some teachers object to teaching various sections creating problems of staff assignment and utilization. Teachers often want to teach the fast learning groups but are not enthusiastic about teaching the slow learner groups.[146] Status teachers move into teaching fast learners in many situations and more inexperienced teachers get slower learners. Teachers attitudes toward the groups they are assigned greatly influence their effectiveness according to Tillman.[147]

Another problem frequently facing schools is related to the movement of pupils from one level to another as the need arises. Sometimes it is difficult to move pupils from one level to another because each program is adapted to a particular group.

Scheduling difficulties are complicated by placing each individual in the section that best fits his level of ability. The size of the school is a barrier also in scheduling as it is a program for larger school systems

---

[145] M. S. Sumption, Three Hundred Gifted Children (Yonkers on the Hudson: World Book Company, 1941), p. 22.

[146] M. J. Eash, op. cit., pp. 429-434.

[147] R. Tillman, op. cit., p. 70.

primarily. Accompanying this problem is the question of marking or grading of pupils in various sections or groups. A number of weighted systems have been developed of which some are quite complicated.

Another major problem is one of obtaining appropriate textbooks, supplementary materials, and reference books for each section or level. Even though teachers wish to differentiate instruction for the various levels, they are often handicapped by the lack of appropriate materials.

Grouping is inconsistent with the psychology of learning. Some educators claim that separating pupils by ability levels brings with it an accompanying loss of stimulation and motivation that is necessary in a learning situation, and more so for the slow pupil.[148] There are some educators who hold that grouping is inconsistent with certain psychological principles and learning theories.[149] The use of a general intelligence measure, it is claimed, does not adequately serve for grouping, for there are specialized intelligences that reveal themselves in students being brighter in some subjects than in others.[150]

---

[148]Benjamin C. Willis, Report on the Progress of the Gifted Child to the Chicago Board of Education (Chicago: Chicago Teachers College, 1957), p. 41.

[149]J. Easles, R. Read, and C. Wilson, op. cit., p. 57.

[150]R. Rock, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

CHAPTER III

A SURVEY OF GROUPING PRACTICES AND PROCEDURES IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES

In order to obtain data concerning grouping practices and procedures in junior high school social studies a questionnaire was constructed and mailed to 484 principals in schools of a 6-3-3 organization in a eight-state area. Included in the mailing were ninety-six Colorado junior high schools, sixty-two in Iowa, eighty-one in Kansas, one-hundred and two in Minnesota, seventy-one in Missouri, forty-six in Nebraska, sixteen in South Dakota, and ten in Wyoming.

Of the 484 schools originally contacted, 350 schools or 72.31 per cent responded by completing and returning the questionnaire. An additional eleven schools returned the questionnaire too late for inclusion in the study. The responses by states were as follows:

State	Number Contacted	Not Responding	Total in Sample
Colorado	96	29	67
Iowa	62	10	52
Kansas	81	30	51
Minnesota	102	24	78
Missouri	71	23	48
Nebraska	46	14	32
South Dakota	16	2	14
Wyoming	10	2	8
Totals	484	134	350

Although the initial questionnaire was sent directly to the principal of each junior high school, the administrator delegated the completion of the questionnaire to another staff member in forty-two schools. Among this group were ten assistant principals, ten counselors, nine social studies teachers, six social studies department heads, six junior high school coordinators, and one director of secondary education.

The junior high schools responding ranged in size from 77 pupils to 2,850 pupils. The size of the junior high schools in the sample is reported in Table I.

TABLE I

SIZE OF SCHOOLS

Size of Schools	Colorado	Iowa	Kansas	Minnesota	Missouri	Nebraska	South Dakota	Wyoming	Totals	Percentages
Under 300	6	7	4	6	3	2			28	8
301-500	9	6	6	8	8	10	2	1	50	14
501-750	13	19	16	16	12	11	5	3	95	27
751-1,000	16	11	14	22	7	5	5	2	82	24
Over 1,000	17	6	9	26	16	3	2	2	81	23
Not Given	6	3	2		2	1			14	4
Totals	67	52	51	78	48	32	14	8	350	100

Schools falling into the category of 501-750 pupils comprised 27 per cent of the total sample. However, 74 per cent of the total enrolled 501 or more pupils. This evidence is consistent with other data which show that schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis enroll the largest number of students.

The number of schools who practice grouping in junior high school social studies is shown in Table II. A total of 237 schools or 68 per cent of the schools responding practiced grouping in the social studies. In contrast, 113 schools or 32 per cent did not group in junior high school social studies.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

	Colorado	Iowa	Kansas	Minnesota	Missouri	Nebraska	South Dakota	Wyoming	Totals	Percentage
Grouped	46	44	31	46	35	21	8	6	237	68
Non-Grouped	21	8	20	32	13	11	6	2	113	32
Totals	67	52	51	78	48	32	14	8	350	100

Of the schools who practice grouping in junior high school social studies, sixty-eight schools or 29 per cent enrolled between 501-750 pupils, sixty-one schools or 26 per

cent enrolled between 751-1,000 pupils, and fifty-five schools or 23 per cent enrolled over 1,000 pupils. It has often been suggested that grouping is more likely to take place in schools enrolling 500 or more pupils. Table III would tend to support this contention as a total of 184 schools or 78 per cent fall into this category.

TABLE III

SIZE OF SCHOOLS WHO GROUPED IN SOCIAL STUDIES

Size	Colorado	Iowa	Kansas	Minnesota	Missouri	Nebraska	South Dakota	Wyoming	Totals	Percentages
Under 300	4	5	2	2	1					6
301-500	5	6	1	5	5	5	5	1	28	12
501-750	11	15	10	8	10	8	3	3	68	29
751-1,000	9	10	10	14	7	5	4	2	61	26
Over 1,000	13	6	6	17	10	2		1	55	23
Not Given	4	2	2		2	1			11	4
Totals	46	44	31	46	35	21	8	6	237	100

The extent of grouping by grade levels and combinations of grade levels is shown in Table IV. A total of 227 schools or 96 per cent practice grouping in seventh grade social studies, 221 schools or 93 per cent practice grouping in eighth grade social studies, 167 schools or 71 per cent practice grouping in ninth grade social studies.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS WHO GROUP BY GRADE LEVELS

Grade (N=237)	Colorado	Iowa	Kansas	Minnesota	Missouri	Nebraska	South Dakota	Wyoming	Totals	Percentages
Grade 7	45	43	29	43	33	20	8	6	227	96
Grade 8	45	44	26	41	33	18	8	6	221	93
Grade 9	37	30	20	26	28	16	5	5	167	71
7 Only			3	4	1	2			10	1
7 and 8	9	14	7	15	6	3	3	1	58	3
7 and 9	1		1		1				3	1
7, 8, and 9	35	29	18	24	25	15	5	5	156	66
8 only			1	1					2	1
8 and 9	1	1		1	2				5	1
9 only			1	1		1			3	1

Table IV also shows that 156 schools or 66 per cent group in all three grades of seven, eight, and nine. These data indicate that a majority of the schools practice grouping in all three grades with the greatest amount occurring in grade seven and the least in grade nine. It would appear from the table that when a school is committed to grouping, it tends to engage in this practice through all grade levels.

Since block-time or multiple period classes for language arts-social studies have been suggested by a number of educators, the questionnaire sought to determine the extent of this practice and the effect it had on the composition of grouped classes. The extent of this practice is shown in Table V. Block-time or multiple period classes were most prevalent at the seventh grade level, where ninety-two schools or 39 per cent engaged in this practice. Only fifty-three schools or 22 per cent practice block-time instruction in grade eight, while fifteen schools or 6 per cent used block-time instruction at the ninth grade level.

TABLE V

EXTENT OF BLOCK-TIME OR MULTIPLE PERIOD CLASSES FOR LANGUAGE ARTS-SOCIAL STUDIES IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Block Time or No Block Time	Grade 7	Percentage	Grade 8	Percentage	Grade 9	Percentage
Block Time	92	39	53	22	15	6
No Block-Time	145	61	184	78	222	94
Totals	237	100	237	100	237	100

The practice of block-time or multiple period classes in non-grouped schools is presented in Table VI. Only thirty-seven schools or 33 per cent used block-time instruction in the seventh grade. The eighth grade shows only twenty-three schools or 20 per cent using block-time while only ten schools or 9 per cent practice block-time for grade nine. The table would tend to indicate that block-time or multiple period classes in the language arts-social studies are found in about the same percentage as the grouped schools.

TABLE VI

EXTENT OF BLOCK-TIME OR MULTIPLE PERIOD CLASSES FOR LANGUAGE ARTS-SOCIAL STUDIES IN NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Block-Time or No Block-Time	Grade 7	Percentage	Grade 8	Percentage	Grade 9	Percentage
Block-Time	37	33	23	20	10	9
No Block-Time	76	67	90	80	103	91
Totals	113	100	113	100	113	100

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate if block-time or multiple period classes for language arts-social studies altered the composition of grouped classes. Of the ninety-nine schools who indicated that they used block-time

grouping, thirteen indicated that block-time classes do alter the composition of grouped classes. However, eighty-six respondents indicated that block-time classes had no effect on the composition of grouped classes in the junior high school social studies.

Since much of the literature contained discussion of the advantages or disadvantages of grouping, respondents were asked to state what they felt were the advantages and disadvantages of grouping. The number of persons citing advantages of grouping is presented in Table VII for both grouped and non-grouped schools. Only items reported by five or more administrators are presented in this table. One hundred and forty-eight respondents felt that grouping reduced the range of ability in classes and allowed the pupils to progress and compete at more nearly the same level and speed. One hundred and forty-seven persons indicated that grouping helped the teacher to vary materials, methods and techniques of instruction. One hundred and thirty-five believed grouping permitted individualization of instruction so students of the same ability were together. Challenging the better pupil and providing depth and enrichment for them was given by seventy-four persons. Forty-seven respondents felt grouping provided the slower student an opportunity to attain some satisfaction by competing at his own level. Grouping challenged students at their own level and capitalized on pupil's interest was cited by twenty-eight principals

TABLE VII

ADVANTAGES OF GROUPING
GIVEN BY GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Advantages	Grouped	Non-Grouped	Totals
It reduces the range of ability and pupils can progress or compete at more nearly the same level and speed.	94	54	148
Helps teacher to vary materials, methods, and techniques to each level.	126	20	147
Permits individualization of instruction so students of same ability are together.	97	38	135
Challenges the better pupil and makes possible greater depth and enrichment.	54	20	74
Opportunity for success of slower pupils and they compete at own level.	35	12	47
Challenges students at his own level and capitalizes on his interest.	28		28
More individual attention is possible and allows for smaller classes.	26		26
Better utilization of teachers and pupils time	2	12	14
Better meets needs of pupils with reading problems	10	2	12
Reduces pupil failure and helps drop out problem	7	2	9
Brings out leadership that would not occur in regular classes.	5	3	8
Makes it possible to use materials suitable to reading levels.	6		6
Others reported less than five times	9	4	13

and twenty-six others felt grouping made it possible for more individual attention and allowed for smaller classes. The advantages given by the respondents in Table VII closely parallel those cited in the literature.

The disadvantages of grouping as reported by respondents of both grouped and non-grouped schools are shown in Table VIII. Again, only items reported by five or more administrators are presented in this table. That grouping stigmatizes both the rapid and slow learner was reported by one hundred and ten respondents. Ninety-two persons felt grouping removed the leadership and stimulation of better pupils from the group. Grouping is unrealistic and as a result pupils don't learn to accept their peers and superiors was given by sixty-two respondents. Fifty-one persons felt there was a lack of trained teachers willing to work with the various groups and especially the slow learners. Forty-three people felt that grouping placed the discipline problems into one group and forty-one respondents indicated that grouping presented scheduling difficulties. Twenty-nine persons indicated that teachers really don't vary methods and materials for the various levels they teach and twenty-eight people felt that snobbery and conceit occurred in pupils and parents of the advanced sections.

It can be seen from Table VIII that many of the disadvantages of grouping that were given in the literature were also mentioned by respondents in this survey.

TABLE VIII

DISADVANTAGES OF GROUPING
GIVEN BY GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Disadvantages	Grouped	Non-Grouped	Totals
Stigmatizes both the rapid and slow learner.	60	50	110
Removes the leadership and stimulation of better pupil	58	34	92
It is unrealistic and pupils don't learn to accept their peers and superiors.	38	24	62
There is a lack of trained teachers willing to teach various groups and especially the slow learners.	38	13	51
Discipline problems are often placed in one group.	31	12	43
Presents scheduling difficulties.	28	13	41
Teachers don't vary methods and materials for the various levels or groups.	21	8	29
No valid means with which to determine groups.	21	7	28
Snobbery occurs in pupils and parents of advanced groups and there is a social prestige to it.	26		26
Lack of proper materials for various levels.	17	3	20
Problems in evaluation and grading of pupils.	15	4	19
Stereotypes learner and especially the slower pupils.	15		15
Undemocratic	12	2	14
Lack of challenge in slower sections.	10		10
Parental attitudes and pressures that result.	6	4	10
Classify pupils and often they can't move out of it.	7		7
Denies opportunity for leadership in upper groups.	5	1	6
Too often track group in all subjects.	3	2	5
Others reported less than five times.	10	5	15

Schools that did not practice grouping in the junior high social studies classes were asked to respond why they did not group. The reasons given for not grouping and their frequency is presented in Table IX. Once again, only items reported by five or more principals are presented in this table.

TABLE IX

REASONS FOR NOT-GROUPING GIVEN BY NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Reasons	Frequency
Grouping is not a lifelike situation and we want a true picture of society to exist in our school.	28
Limited staff and enrollment which would result in grouping for all courses the same way.	18
Teachers and administration do not feel a need for grouping	15
We group in other areas but feel social studies should remain heterogeneous.	15
Presents too large a scheduling problem.	9
Research doesn't show conclusively that grouping is superior	8
We believe students learn from students of other abilities also.	8
Lack of classroom facilities, space, and materials.	7
Disadvantages outweight advantages and we see no need for it.	7
Lack of trained personnel.	7
No valid criteria to determine the groups.	6
Teachers voted it out as they felt there was no outstanding advantage or gains in pupil achievement.	5
Others reported less than five times	12

The most frequent reason given for not grouping was that grouping is not a lifelike situation and the schools want a true picture of society. Twenty-eight schools gave this as a reason. Limited staff and enrollments which would result in across the board grouping was cited by eighteen schools as the reason why they did not group. School administrators did not feel a need for grouping and preferred heterogeneous classes in fifteen instances. Fifteen replies also stressed that they grouped in other areas but felt that social studies is one area that should remain heterogeneous. Scheduling problems were indicated by nine schools as a reason for not grouping. Eight schools felt research had not presented conclusive evidence that grouping was advantageous and eight felt students benefited from being with other students of varying abilities.

The questionnaire asked respondents to indicate what type of grouping plan they used in junior high school social studies. Table X shows the extent of track and subject grouping as well as a combination of the two. Track grouping was explained in the questionnaire as those approaches labeled such as honors or college preparatory. Subject grouping was explained as establishing new groups for each subject rather than being placed in the same ability group for all subjects.

TABLE X

GROUPING PLANS USED BY GROUPED SCHOOLS

Plan Used	Number	Percentage
Subject Grouping	165	70
Track or Curricular Area Grouping	37	15
Combination of Subject and Track	16	7
Other Grouping Plans	16	7
Not Given	3	1
Totals	237	100

The most common type of grouping plan was subject grouping as 165 schools or 70 per cent engaged in grouping by each individual subject. Track grouping or related approaches such as honors or college preparatory were used in thirty-seven schools or 15 per cent. A combination of track and subject grouping was used in sixteen schools or 7 per cent while other forms were employed in an additional sixteen schools or 7 per cent.

Table XI shows the most frequently used criteria for establishing the groups in junior high school social studies. It would appear from the responses given that a number of criteria are used in making grouping placement rather than any one single criterion. The most frequently mentioned criteria was the recommendation or evaluation of teachers. One hundred and seventy-one responses indicated that this criterion was given major consideration in placing pupils.

TABLE XI

CRITERIA USED TO DETERMINE GROUPS
FOR GROUPED SCHOOLS AND THEIR FREQUENCY

Criteria	(N=237) Frequency
Teacher recommendation and evaluation	171
Previous scholastic achievement and grades	146
Intelligence Quotient Tests	137
Standardized Achievement Tests	130
Reading Ability	63
Students attitude, desire, interests, work habits	32
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	27
Previous grades in Social Studies	18
Counselor recommendation and evaluation	16
Social adjustment and maturity of the pupil	13
All pupils must take social studies	9
Parental request and approval	9
Iowa Test of Educational Development	5
Grade assignment	5
Sequential Tests of Educational Progress percentiles	5

The previous scholastic record or grades received by the pupil were mentioned by 146 respondents. The results of intelligence quotient tests were used by 137 schools in placing pupils and the results of standardized achievement tests were used by 130 schools. The reading ability of the pupil was a consideration in sixty-three schools. The attitude, desire, interests, and work habits of the pupil were a factor in placement in thirty-two schools.

A number of other criteria are used as indicated by Table XII. Many of these involve some type of tests indicating aptitude, personality, maturity, skills, etc. of the

pupil. Interestingly, only eighteen schools indicated that the previous social studies grades earned by the pupils were taken into consideration when determining the groups. There were several unusual criteria given by some schools in placing pupils. For example, one schools indicated that the pupil's enrollment in foreign language determined his placement in social studies. Another school reported that intuition was used as a criterion. One school reported that a mathematics test was considered in determining pupil placement.

The principals were asked to indicate what they felt were the major administrative problems they had encountered in their experiences with grouping. Tables XII and XIII show the nature and extent of problems facing administrators relative to grouping.

TABLE XII

EXTENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Administrative Problems	Number	Per Cent
Yes	67	28
No	168	71
Not given	2	1
Totals	237	100

Of those schools that engaged in grouping, 168 or 71 per cent reported no major problems in administering their grouping plan. Problems were experienced by sixty-seven schools or 28 per cent.

TABLE XIII

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Problem Experienced	Frequency
Scheduling problems and especially electives	40
Problems associated with developing a suitable grading system.	10
Uneven class size	8
Problem of proper pupil placement	6
Shortage of materials for lower groups	4
Lack of materials and teaching aids	4
Difficulty in getting willing and competent teachers	3
Parental disapproval and complaints	2
Curtailment of individual schedules for pupils	2
Less flexibility	2
Puts discipline problems in one class	1
Overloads classes where we don't group	1
Some teachers find it difficult to teach upper groups	1
Problems of articulation at each grade level	1
Keeping slower classes small which loads up regular ones	1
Challenging the highest of the low learners	1
Small enrollment	1
Problems of developing leadership from top groups	1
Assigning teachers to the various levels or groups	1
Machine scheduling has complicated grouping	1

The most frequently mentioned administrative problem given was scheduling difficulties as forty schools reported this. Ten schools felt the development of a suitable grading system was a problem. Uneven class size was a problem in eight schools, while six felt the proper placement of pupils was a significant problem. A shortage of materials for lower groups was reported by four schools as a problem while four schools also reported a lack of appropriate materials

and teaching aids. The data would seem to indicated that schools who are practicing grouping in junior high school social studies are experiencing relatively few administrative problems.

The questionnaire asked the principals to report whether or not they had a policy for assigning teachers to various levels and/or groups. Tables XIV and XV present the data as furnished by those schools who practiced grouping.

TABLE XIV

GROUPS OR LEVELS TAUGHT
BY TEACHERS IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Teaching Assignment	Number	Per Cent
Teaches only grouped classes at one level	12	5
Teaches grouped classes at two or more levels	124	52
Teaches heterogeneous and grouped classes	66	28
Teaches grouped classes at one level and also heterogeneous classes	10	4
Teaches grouped classes at two or more levels and also heterogeneous classes	20	9
Not given	5	2
Totals	237	100

Teachers instructing grouped classes at two or more levels were reported by 124 schools or 52 per cent as shown in Table XIV. An additional sixty-six schools or 28 per cent indicated their social studies teachers dealt with both

grouped and non-grouped classes. Only twelve schools or 5 per cent reported teachers instructing grouped classes at only one level. Since the majority of schools have teachers instructing several levels of students, it would appear that there is a strong implication for teacher preparation in providing differentiated content, methods, and materials for the various levels.

Table XV reports the number of grouped schools that had a policy for assigning teachers to the various groups or levels. Schools that have a policy for assigning teachers to various levels numbered 131 or 55 per cent. Schools that do not have a policy for assigning teachers numbered 103 or 44 per cent. It would appear there is no discernable policy for assigning teachers to specific groups or levels in the junior high school social studies.

TABLE XV

SCHOOLS REPORTING A POLICY FOR ASSIGNING TEACHERS TO VARIOUS GROUPS OR LEVELS

Policy	Number	Per Cent
Yes	131	55
No	103	44
Not Given	3	1
Totals	237	100

Schools that reported a policy for assigning teachers to the various levels or groups in their junior high school social studies were asked to indicate the consideration they used. The responses given and the frequency of each response is reported in Table XVI.

TABLE XVI

POLICY FOR ASSIGNING TEACHERS TO VARIOUS LEVELS OR GROUPS IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Policy	(N=237) Frequency
Based on experience, maturity, knowledge of subject matter, and capacity to teach a certain level.	29
Each teacher is assigned a high, average, and low class	11
Assigned by teacher request and interest.	11
Rotation of groups among teachers.	11
The most successful and experienced teachers are given the lowest and the highest groups.	8
Try to match teachers to the various groups.	8
Teacher preference and preparation taken into account, plus the teachers performance.	8
Teacher personality, temperament, and ability are taken into account and especially for lower levels.	8
If a teacher has a lower level class, they also are given a top group.	6
Principal assigns teachers and careful not to place teachers who can't teach lower groups with these levels.	6
Give the best students to the best teachers	5
After a teacher-principal conference teachers are assigned according to the best benefit of teacher and pupils.	5
More experienced teachers given lower sections.	4
Balance teaching load and give teachers at least one advanced class with average or low class.	3
Department head assigns teachers with the more capable.	2
Teachers given the top classes	

The experience, maturity, knowledge of subject matter, and capacity to teach a certain level were the major considerations for assigning teachers in twenty-nine schools. Eleven schools assigned the teacher a high, average and low class. Teachers were assigned by request and interest in eleven schools. A rotation policy was used for assigning teachers in eleven schools. Eight schools reported the most experienced and successful teachers were given the highest and the lowest groups. Teacher preference and preparation plus teacher performance was used for assignment in eight schools. The personality, temperament, and ability of the teacher were taken into account and especially so for lower levels in eight schools. Five schools assigned the best students to the best teachers while four schools assign the most experienced teachers to the lower sections.

One school had an unique approach to get teachers to take the lower groups. They rewarded teachers who requested lower level classes with an additional salary of $400.00. Perhaps it is significant that a sizeable number of schools appeared to be more concerned about the teachers of the higher and lower level groups than about those who worked with the average sections or groups. Only one school reported that seniority played a role in the assignment of new teachers to the lower groups.

It was frequently indicated in the literature that one of the major problems associated with grouping was insuring

the mobility of pupils from one level to another when warranted. It was pointed out that grouping should not be so rigid and inflexible that transfers from one level to another could not be made. The administrators were asked to indicate whether students could be transferred from one level to another during the semester. Table XVII presents the principals' answers to this question.

TABLE XVII

SCHOOL PRACTICE ON TRANSFER OF STUDENTS FROM ONE GROUP TO ANOTHER DURING THE SEMESTER

Transfer	Number	Per Cent
Yes	211	89
No	22	9
Not Given	4	2
Totals	237	100

Of the 237 schools who practiced grouping, 211 or 89 per cent indicated that they had a policy permitting the transfer of pupils from one level to another. Only twenty-two schools or 9 per cent indicated that they did not transfer pupils. Table XVII shows that the grouping programs used by these schools allows for flexibility in moving students from one level to another. It would appear that these schools are meeting the criteria of transferring pupils as suggested in the literature.

To follow-up on the transfer practices, the respondents were asked to indicate the number of transfers in their social studies classes during the current semester. Table XVIII shows the number of pupils transferred from one level to another in the various schools.

TABLE XVIII

NUMBER OF PUPILS TRANSFERRED DURING THE CURRENT SEMESTER BY SCHOOLS THAT PRACTICE GROUPING

Number Pupils transferred	Number Schools	Per Cent
0	33	16
1-5	79	37
6-10	54	26
11-15	19	9
16-20	9	4
21-25	10	5
26-30	2	1
31 or more	5	2
Totals	211	100

Table XVIII shows that of those schools that practice grouping, and who indicated that they had a policy for transferring pupils, 16 per cent had not actually transferred any pupils during the current semester. Seventy-nine schools or 37 per cent indicated that they had transferred from one to five pupils in social studies to date during the first semester. Fifty-four schools or 26 per cent had transferred from six to ten students. The number of schools reporting

more than fifteen transfers per semester was limited.

The principals were also asked to identify the criteria they used in transferring pupils from one level to another. The criteria used in making transfers and the frequency of each criterion is reported in Table XIX.

TABLE XIX

CRITERIA USED FOR TRANSFER OF PUPILS IN GROUPED SCHOOLS

Criteria	Frequency
Based on performance (achievement)	55
Teacher recommendations	39
Teacher recommendations and pupil performance	33
Teachers and counselors recommendations	22
When found to be in the wrong group	9
Pupil or parental request and teacher recommendation	8
Teacher recommendation and approval of counselor and parents	6
Performance of pupil and teacher and counselor recommendation	6
Teacher recommends, then a meeting is held with the principal, counselor and teacher and principal decides	5
Conference of teacher, principal, parent and pupil	5
Others mentioned only once	8

The most frequently mentioned criteria for transferring pupils was the performance or achievement of the pupil. Fifty-five schools indicated that this factor was the sole criterion used in making transfers. Thirty-nine schools indicated that teacher recommendations were the sole source of making decisions pertaining to transfers. However,

when one looks at the number of times the recommendation of the teacher is used in a combination of factors, a total of 119 schools use the recommendation of the teacher as a basis for making decisions on transfers. Only two schools used the counselors' recommendation as the sole basis for making a decision to transfer. However, combinations involving counselors' recommendations or evaluations were used in forty-one schools as a determining factor in transferring a pupil.

Interestingly, very few responses were given indicating that parental or pupil request were the criteria used for making transfers. Only three schools responded that the administration was directly responsible for making the decision to transfer a pupil. From the evidence presented, it would appear that most schools use a number of factors in making decisions relative to transfers rather than relying on the judgment of one person or on a single criterion.

Much of the discussion in the literature centered around the conflicting evidence presented in the research on grouping. The questionnaire asked the respondents to indicate whether they had secured any evidence indicating grouping resulted in higher achievement or improved classroom performance; whether they had observed evidence of conceit and snobbery in the rapid learner; and whether they had observed the stigmatizing of pupils as dull, average or bright. The data furnished by the respondents to these questions are presented in the following tables.

TABLE XX

EVIDENCE INDICATING GROUPING
RESULTED IN HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT OR CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

Improved Performance	Number	Per Cent
Yes	102	43
No	131	55
Not Given	4	2
Totals	237	100

Table XX shows that 131 schools or 55 per cent reported that they had not secured any concrete evidence that grouping resulted in higher achievement or improved classroom performance. On the other hand, 102 schools or 43 per cent indicated that they had secured some form of evidence that grouping resulted in higher achievement or better classroom performance. Table XX suggests that the majority of schools have engaged in grouping without obtaining objective evidence that grouping has resulted in higher achievement or improved performance.

The principals were also asked to explain the type of evidence they had secured to show improved classroom performance or higher achievement. Table XXI presents the types of evidence they related and the frequency of each item. The primary form of evidence secured seemed to be of the subjective variety. Administrators in forty-five schools

indicated they felt grouping had resulted in higher achievement and improved classroom performance.

TABLE XXI

TYPE OF EVIDENCE SECURED BY SCHOOLS INDICATING GROUPING RESULTED IN HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT OR CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE

Type of evidence	(N=237) Frequency
Teachers and administration opinion	45
Fewer dropouts and pupils are happier and less discipline problems.	13
Upper groups are more subject matter conscious	9
I.T.E.D. median scores are all above 97% on a national comparison	7
Lower level pupils are able to read better	7
Staff research-test scores and teacher evaluation	7
Interest is much higher	6
Standardized test scores are higher	6
Grades are improved	6
Students report they like grouping	5
Better especially for lower groups	5
Projects are more sophisticated	3
Subjectively feel it has aided the learning process	2
Reports from senior high school indicate higher performance	2
Greater depth in courses	2
Dr. Charles Young former Principal did research on this and found in some cases, students actually raised I.Q. by being placed in honor sections.	1
Pupils scored above national norm on Stanford tests	1
Better attendance	1
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills reveal this	1
Less pressure on pupils	1
Attitude improved	1
Students happier and voted social studies favorite subject	1
More capable have no "millstones"	1
Testing done by Denver system supports grouping	1
Teachers are happy with arrangement and have lessons for each group that are different	1
Parents like it.	1

Respondents were also asked if they believed that grouping promoted conceit or snobbery in rapid learners. Table XXII summarizes the opinions of the respondents based on their experiences.

TABLE XXII

ADMINISTRATOR OPINIONS ON WHETHER GROUPING PROMOTED CONCEIT OR SNOBBERY AMONG RAPID LEARNERS

Promotes Conceit or Snobbery	Number	Per Cent
Yes	88	37
No	145	61
Not given	4	2
Totals	237	100

Eighty-eight persons or 37 per cent felt grouping promoted conceit and snobbery in rapid learners. However, 145 persons or 61 per cent believed that grouping did not promote conceit and snobbery in rapid learners. Table XXII indicates that the majority of respondents did not feel this was a valid criticism of grouping.

The respondents were asked to explain the manner in which grouping promoted conceit or snobbery in rapid learners. Table XXIII shows the responses given and frequency of each item. No clear cut pattern of response is discernible from the comments offered.

TABLE XXIII

ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS ON WHETHER GROUPING PROMOTED CONCEIT OR SNOBBERY IN RAPID LEARNERS

Comment	(N=237) Frequency
This is only a minor problem in our school	28
Parents are especially conscious of this	12
Pupil's know abilities in any situation and this also occurs in heterogeneous classes as well	11
This is only a problem when tracked in same group all day	8
The prestige of the top group is evident with some snobbery	4
This depends upon the administration and teachers' attitudes	4
This is more of a social problem than an academic one	3
This is especially true in the case of gifted students	3
Especially when teachers are reminded by labels and a group is set apart.	2
A vital problem in our school	2
Discipline cases are in lower groups and feel this	1
This is not a valid criticism of grouping	1
This is silly--rapid learners are always the most humble group	1
This is why we have gone to an enriched plan	1
Tearful interviews with parents and pupils acknowledge this	1
After nine years of experience with grouping, I believe "pigeon holing" will do this.	1
I have observed this feeling and also by pupil conversation	1
Some ninth graders get self-superior	1
This is why we don't track group	1

The opinions of respondents on whether grouping stigmatizes pupils as dull, average or bright are reported in Table XXIV. Opinions on this point are split about even with 112 schools or 47 per cent indicating that grouping

does stigmatize pupils, while 121 schools or 51 per cent felt that grouping did not lead to the stigmatization of pupils as dull, average or bright. Table XXIV reveals that a significant number of respondents felt grouping did stigmatize pupils. The literature suggested that many people have criticized grouping on this basis. Apparently, this had been a problem in many of the schools that practiced grouping as revealed by the data in this table.

TABLE XXIV

ADMINISTRATORS OPINIONS ON WHETHER GROUPING STIGMATIZES STUDENTS AS DULL, AVERAGE, OR BRIGHT

Stigmatizes pupils	Number	Per Cent
Yes	112	47
No	121	51
Not given	4	2
Totals	237	100

The questionnaire asked the respondents to explain the manner in which grouping tended to stigmatize students. The comments they gave and the frequency of each item is reported in Table XXV.

TABLE XXV

ADMINISTRATORS COMMENTS ON WHETHER GROUPING STIGMATIZED STUDENTS

Comments	(N=237) Frequency
Students already know where they fit before junior high school and will know this in any organization or plan.	54
Parents are more guilty of this than pupils and they don't understand grouping.	10
Teacher attitudes may lead to this.	9
Especially lower level pupils feel this	8
Tracking does this I believe	7
Too a certain extent, but you will always have some stigma	6
Some teachers, students, and counselors reported this	5
Pupils in lower classes constantly use the word "dumb"	3
Pupils must know their limitations sometime	3
Pupils believe what others say they are	2
This is a definite drawback to grouping, I believe	2
Extremes are noticeable in heterogeneous groups also	2
Anyone who doesn't think so is too biased to think rationally	1
We give scholarship points essential to graduation based on grades which encourages this.	1
Even changes in some pupils' personalities are noted	1
It is difficult to get from one level to another level and hence pupils are stigmatized.	1
The placing puts them into "ghettos" from whence they can't return.	1
Teachers want high groups, but not low ones	1
Grouping makes pupils aware of intellectual grouping	1
Advantages still outweigh disadvantages however even with stigma.	1

Table XXV shows that fifty-four administrators felt stigmatization was not a significant problem as junior high school pupils already know their abilities before they reach junior high. Ten felt the parents are more guilty of stigmatizing pupils than pupils are. Furthermore, they felt many parents don't understand grouping. There were some very interesting comments pertaining to stigmatization of students. One person replied, "anyone who doesn't think grouping stigmatizes is too biased to think rationally." Another replied, "the placing puts them into "ghettos" from whence they can't return." Overall the responses were so widely scattered that no definite pattern could be inferred.

The curricular offerings of grouped and non-grouped schools in junior high social studies are shown in Tables XXVI, XXVII, and XXVIII. The data furnished by the schools in the sample revealed that generally speaking, the typical social studies curriculum reported in the literature was followed. Table XXVI shows the seventh grade social studies curricular offerings.

Table XXVI shows that the most common curricular offering for seventh grade social studies was geography. The second most common offering was American History and the third most common offering was World Geography. It is interesting to note that twenty-four schools offered courses or combinations of courses at the seventh grade level that relate

TABLE XXVI

SEVENTH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES OFFERINGS IN GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Subject	Grouped	Non-Grouped	Totals	Percentages
Geography	56	16	72	21
American History	32	18	50	14
World Geography	19	12	31	9
Social Studies	11	10	21	6
Geog. Eastern Hemisphere	10	5	15	4
Unified Studies	9	2	11	3
Eng.-Social Studies Block	9	1	10	3
Old World Backgrounds	6	3	9	3
World History	6	2	8	2
American Studies	4	4	8	2
Geog. and World History	6		6	1
Old World Geog. and History	6		6	1
Colorado History and Geog.	4		4	1
Geog. and Kansas History	3	1	4	1
World Geog. and World History		4	4	1
Eastern Hemisphere	3		3	1
Colorado History	3		3	1
Geog. and Citizenship	1	2	3	1
American Studies & Iowa History	2		2	1
American History & Geog. Eastern Hemisphere	2		2	1
Area Studies	2		2	1
World Studies		2	2	1
Social Living		2	2	1
Geog. Eurasia-Africa-Australia		2	2	1
Others mentioned only once	14	10	24	7
Not Given	29	17	46	12
Totals	237	113	350	100

to their specific state's geography or history. This was probably the result of state laws requiring their inclusion in the junior high school curriculum. No discernible differences in the social studies offerings of the grouped and non-grouped schools was apparent.

The social studies offerings for the eighth grade are reported in Table XXVII. Once again, the most common

TABLE XXVII

EIGHTH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES OFFERINGS IN GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Subject	Grouped	Non-Grouped	Totals	Percentages
American History	128	56	184	53
Geography	13	9	22	6
World Geography	14	5	19	5
Social Studies	12	3	15	4
American Studies	5	4	9	3
Unified Studies	6	2	8	2
English-Social Studies Block	2	5	7	2
Civics	6	1	7	2
American and Colorado History	4		4	1
Our American Heritage	3		3	1
American Heritage & Geog.	3		3	1
Common Learnings	2		2	1
Social Living (Am. History and Communications)		2	2	1
Geography and Civics	1	1	2	1
Others mentioned only once	11	7	18	5
Not given	27	18	45	12
Totals	237	113	350	100

curricular offering, American History, coincided with that reported in the literature. Geography is the next most common offering at the eighth grade level.

Table XXVIII shows the most frequent curricular offerings for ninth grade pupils in social studies. A number of different titles are used to indicate what may be classified as offerings in government. When all courses dealing with civics, government and citizenship are combined, 182 schools fall into this classification. World geography and American History were the other most frequently mentioned courses. As might be expected at this grade level, there was considerable variety in the courses and content reported. Probably the many courses offered reflects the fact that not all school required social studies at the ninth grade level.

TABLE XXVIII

NINTH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES OFFERINGS IN GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED SCHOOLS

Subject	Grouped	Non-Grouped	Totals	Percentages
Civics	72	29	101	29
Citizenship	26	9	35	10
Social Studies	17	11	28	8
World Geography	13	9	22	6
American History	9	4	13	4
Civics and World Geography	9	2	11	3
World History	4	2	6	2
World Studies	2	4	6	2
English--Social Studies Block		6	6	2
Civics and World History	5		5	1
World History or Citizenship	5		5	1
Civics or Ancient History	4		4	1
Unified Studies	4		4	1
Govt. and Cultures of the World	3		3	1
Civics and Occupations	2	1	3	1
Minnesota History--Vocations--Driver Education--Community Living		3	3	1
Civics and Colorado History	2		2	1
Govt. and World History	2		2	1
Geography	2		2	1
American Government		2	2	1
Others mentioned only once	23	13	36	9
Not given	32	18	50	14
Totals	237	113	350	100

Table XXIX shows that the most common number of levels for all three grades is three. In the seventh grade, 111 schools or 47 per cent reported using three levels. In grade eight, 106 schools or 45 per cent reported using three levels. For grade nine, the number of schools using three levels declined to 66 or 28 per cent. Fifty-one schools or 22 per cent reported using two levels in the seventh grade. Forty-six schools or 19 per cent reported two levels in grade eight. At the ninth grade level, however, the second most frequently reported practice was the use of heterogeneous groups. Fifty-six schools or 24 per cent reported using heterogeneous groups at the ninth grade level.

TABLE XXIX

NUMBER OF LEVELS FOR SEVENTH, EIGHTH, AND NINTH GRADE SOCIAL STUDIES

Number of Levels	Grade 7	Percentages	Grade 8	Percentages	Grade 9	Percentages
Heterogeneous	7	3	17	7	56	24
2 levels	51	22	46	19	52	22
3 levels	111	47	106	45	66	28
4 levels	20	8	21	9	18	8
5 levels	7	3	6	3	1	.5
6 or more levels	3	1	4	1	1	.5
Not given	38	16	37	16	43	18
Totals	237	100	237	100	237	100

Respondents were asked to indicate the names of the various ability levels they used in grouped junior high school social studies classes. A wide variety of names or terms were used to identify grouping levels. As was indicated in Table XXIX, the most frequent number of groups established in the social studies were three and two ability levels. One hundred and thirty-four schools reported using the names "advanced-average-slow" for the three ability groups they employed. Twenty-five administrators indicated their school used the names "high-medium-low" for their three ability levels. Thirty-eight of the schools who reported using two ability groups used the names "advanced-average" for these two groups. Thirty-four schools indicated they used "average-slow" for the two ability levels they had established in the social studies.

The data presented in this study from this point on will be reported in terms of the three grouping levels upper, average, lower since this was the predominant classification indicated by the administrators and in the literature.

Table XXX shows the average class size for upper level groups by grades.

Over half of the schools reported their upper level classes in the seventh and eighth grade social studies contained between twenty-six to thirty-five pupils. Grade seven shows 130 schools or 54 per cent in this range. Grade eight

TABLE XXX

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE FOR UPPER LEVEL GROUPS BY GRADE

Average Class Size	Grade 7	Percentages	Grade 8	Percentages	Grade 9	Percentages
20 and Under	2	1	2	1	2	1
21--25	17	7	17	7	18	7
26--30	72	3	69	29	44	19
31--35	58	24	55	23	44	19
36 or More	7	3	6	3	1	1
Heterogeneous	7	3	17	7	56	23
No Upper Level	23	10	21	9	21	8
Not Given	51	22	50	21	51	22
Totals	237	100	237	100	237	100

had 124 schools or 52 per cent in this category, while grade nine had only 88 schools or 38 per cent in the twenty-six to thirty-five pupil range. The fact that over twenty per cent of the schools did not report the average class size of their upper ability sections was rather disturbing.

Table XXX also shows there were few classes of twenty pupils or less for upper ability groups at any grade level. As was pointed out earlier, there are a number of schools with heterogeneous groups at the ninth grade level. While the literature suggested that upper ability level groups should have fewer pupils than normal classes to better meet

the individual needs of the pupils, Table XXX did not reveal this to be the case in the schools included in this study.

Table XXXI reports the average class size for middle level groups as indicated by the responding principals.

TABLE XXXI

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE FOR MIDDLE OR AVERAGE LEVEL GROUPS BY GRADE

Average Class Size	Grade 7	Percentages	Grade 8	Percentages	Grade 9	Percentages
20 and Under	4	2	5	2	2	1
21--25	13	5	19	8	20	8
26--30	91	38	87	37	65	27
31--35	64	27	51	22	36	15
36 or More			2	1	1	1
Heterogeneous	7	3	17	7	56	24
No Middle Level	7	3	6	2	6	2
Not Given	51	22	50	21	51	22
Totals	237	100	237	100	237	100

Table XXXI shows that as in the case of the upper level classes, the most frequently reported class size for middle level groups in junior high school social studies fell within the twenty-six to thirty-five pupil range. In grade seven, 125 schools or 65 per cent were in this range. At grade eight, 138 schools or 59 per cent were in the twenty-six

to thirty-five pupil category. At grade nine, 101 schools or 42 per cent were in this range. It may be significant that over 20 per cent of the schools did not report the average class size of their middle ability levels. Again, very few schools reported classes with fewer than twenty students. The evidence in Table XXX and Table XXXI suggest there is little difference between the average class size of upper and middle level groups in junior high school social studies.

Table XXXII shows the average class size for the lower level groups by grades.

TABLE XXXII

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE FOR LOWER LEVEL GROUPS BY GRADE

Average Class Size	Grade 7	Percentages	Grade 8	Percentages	Grade 9	Percentages
20 and Under	40	17	47	20	26	11
21--25	57	24	41	17	34	14
26--30	43	18	50	21	37	16
31--35	19	8	14	6	9	4
36 or More	2	1	1	1	1	1
Heterogeneous	7	3	17	7	54	23
No Lower Level	18	7	19	8	28	11
Not Given	51	22	48	20	48	20
Totals	237	100	237	100	237	100

Table XXXII reveals that at the seventh grade level the most frequently reported class size for lower ability groups fell within the twenty-one to thirty pupil range. One hundred schools or 42 per cent reported their average class size in this range. At the eighth grade level the most common class size was also within the twenty-one to thirty pupil range with 91 schools or 38 per cent in this category. Forty-seven schools or 20 per cent reported an average class size of less than twenty students. At the ninth grade level, seventy-one schools or 30 per cent reported the average class size in the range of twenty-one to thirty pupils. Fifty-four schools or 23 per cent indicated their social studies at the ninth grade were heterogeneously grouped. Only eleven per cent of the schools reported classes averaging less than twenty students for below average students in grade nine.

When the data in Table XXXII are compared with Tables XXX and XXXI, it is clear that the average class size of lower level social studies classes is smaller than classes of upper and middle level groups. It was suggested in the literature that classes should be smaller for lower groups if effective instruction was to take place. It would seem that many of the schools furnishing data for this study made an effort to comply with this recommendation.

Respondents of non-grouped schools were also asked to indicate their average class size. Table XXXIII reports the average class size by grades as reported by the schools with

heterogeneous classes in junior high school social studies classes.

TABLE XXXIII

AVERAGE CLASS SIZE OF HETEROGENEOUS CLASSES BY GRADE

Class Size	Grade 7	Percentages	Grade 8	Percentages	Grade 9	Percentages
20 and Under	2	2	1	1	2	2
21--25	14	12	13	12	19	17
26--30	54	48	49	43	46	41
31--35	21	19	27	24	20	18
36 or More	2	2	3	3	5	4
Not Given	20	17	20	17	21	18
Totals	113	100	113	100	113	100

Table XXXIII shows that at all three grade levels, seventh, eighth and ninth; the average class size of heterogeneous classes in non-grouped schools fall primarily in the twenty-six to thirty pupil classification. At grade seven there were 54 schools or 48 per cent in this range. In grade eight, there were 49 schools or 43 per cent in the twenty-six to thirty pupil category and at grade nine, there were 46 schools or 41 per cent in this range. The second most common class size fell within the range of from thirty-one to thirty-five

pupils. There were very few classes that enrolled less than twenty pupils or enrolled thirty-six or more pupils. From Table XXXIII it can be readily seen that junior high school social studies enrolled the majority of pupils in classes ranging from twenty-one pupils to thirty-five pupils among those schools who did not practice grouping.