

CHAPTER IV

INSTRUCTIONAL PROVISIONS REPORTED BY TEACHERS OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES

Two hundred and eighty junior high school social studies teachers were randomly selected and surveyed by questionnaire to identify prevailing instructional practices. Of this number, 197 taught grouped social studies classes and eighty-three taught non-grouped social studies classes. Of the 280 teachers sampled, 171 or 61 per cent returned the completed questionnaire. Table XXXIV shows the number of returns by grade and ability level.

TABLE XXXIV
NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS
BY ABILITY LEVEL AND GRADE

Grade	Upper	Grouped		Non- Grouped	Totals
		Average	Lower		
Grade 7	15	22	11	21	69
Grade 8	12	17	17	11	57
Grade 9	12	9	6	18	45
Totals	39	48	34	50	171

Completed questionnaires were returned by thirty-nine teachers of advanced or upper ability classes. Forty-eight teachers of average ability classes and thirty-four teachers of lower ability classes responded. Fifty teachers of non-grouped junior high school social studies classes also responded.

Since this study was concerned with instructional provisions made by teachers of various ability levels in social studies classes, information from this point on will be presented and discussed for the three ability levels (upper, average, and lower) as well as for heterogeneous or non-grouped classes.

TABLE XXXV

DEGREES HELD BY TEACHERS OF
GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Highest Degree	Grouped						Non-		Totals	
	Upper		Average		Lower		Grouped			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Bachelor Degree	29	74	33	69	21	62	43	86	126	74
Master's Degree	10	26	15	31	13	38	7	14	45	26
Totals	39	100.	48	100.	34	100.	50	100.	171	100.

Table XXV shows 126 teachers or 74 per cent of the 171 teachers reported their highest degree was a Bachelor's degree. Seventy-four per cent of the upper ability level teachers reported a Bachelor's degree; 69 per cent of the teachers of

average ability grouped classes; and 62 per cent of the lower ability grouped class teachers reported a Bachelor's degree. Forty-three teachers or 86 per cent of the non-grouped social studies teachers indicated they held a Bachelor's degree. Only 26 per cent of the 171 teachers of grouped and non-grouped social studies classes reported a Master's degree. Of this number, 26 per cent of the teachers of upper ability classes held a Master's degree. Thirty-one per cent of the teachers of average ability level classes and 38 per cent of the teachers of lower ability level classes reported they had earned a Master's degree. However, only 14 per cent of the teachers of non-grouped social studies classes reported a Master's degree.

Contrary to a common belief that upper ability level teachers may hold more advanced degrees, Table XXXV shows a higher percentage of teachers of lower ability level classes (38 per cent) and average ability level classes (31 per cent) holding Master's degrees. These figures may be compared to the 26 per cent reported by teachers of upper ability level classes.

Table XXXVI shows that 51 per cent of all the teachers responding have had five years of experience or less. Sixty-six per cent of the teachers of non-grouped classes reported that they had five years of experience or less. It would appear that teachers of grouped classes have had more years of

TABLE XXXVI

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE TEACHING SOCIAL STUDIES AS REPORTED BY
TEACHERS OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Years	Upper		Grouped Average		Lower		Non- Grouped		Totals	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-5	17	43	25	52	13	38	33	66	88	51
6-10	10	26	10	21	9	26	9	18	38	22
11-15	5	13	10	21	6	18	2	4	23	14
16-20	2	5					2	4	4	2
21-25	4	10			4	12	2	4	10	6
26 or more	1	3	3	6	2	6	2	4	8	5
Totals	39	100	48	100	34	100	50	100	171	100

experience teaching social studies than teachers of non-grouped classes. Table XXXVI would seem to indicate that teachers with more years of experience are assigned to the upper ability level and lower ability level groups. It has often been suggested that neophyte teachers are assigned the lower ability levels. However, the evidence presented in Table XXXVI does not support this contention. It would seem that the less experienced social studies teachers are more likely to be assigned to average ability level classes.

Table XXXVII indicates that preparation of teachers in both grouped and non-grouped classes at the undergraduate level is strongest in history. Teachers of all ability levels as well as non-grouped classes reported from thirteen to thirty-one or more credit hours of history. On the other

TABLE XXXVII

HOURS OF UNDERGRADUATE PREPARATION IN VARIOUS SOCIAL SCIENCE
COURSES REPORTED BY TEACHERS OF GROUPED AND
NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Hours	No. of Teachers at each level	Levels*	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level by Subject						
			Anthropology	Economics	Geography	History	Pol. Science	Psychology	Sociology
0	39	U	69	36	31		21	8	13
	48	A	73	19	25	2	17	10	21
	34	L	74	32	26	3	24	12	26
	50	NG	72	30	26	2	16	6	16
1-6	"	U	13	36	23	8	36	33	38
		A	19	54	40	4	19	40	27
		L	21	44	41	6	44	29	44
		NG	22	40	40	2	44	34	56
7-12	"	U	8	5	23	13	23	33	18
		A	2	15	17	4	19	40	27
		L		6	12	21	21	32	21
		NG		16	14	20	22	38	16
13-18	"	U		8	8	23	5	8	18
		A		2	8	19	13	6	4
		L		9	6	21	3	12	3
		NG		2	6	34	4	14	2
19-24	"	U			3	13	3	5	
		A		4	2	19		4	2
		L		3	6	12	2	2	
		NG			2	14	8	3	
25-30	"	U		3		18	3	3	3
		A			2	19	2	4	
		L			3	18		3	
		NG			4	8			2
31 or More	"	U		3	3	15			
		A				25	4	2	
		L				15		3	
		NG		4	2	14		2	2

* U = Upper; A = Average; L = Lower; NG = Non-Grouped

hand, the table shows the hours in all the subject areas except history fall within the range of one to twelve credit hours. Table XXXVII also shows teachers at all ability levels of grouped classes as well as non-grouped classes have had very limited undergraduate preparation in anthropology. None of the responding teachers reported more than twelve hours credit in anthropology. It would appear from the table that no discernible differences in undergraduate preparation by subjects or hours can be made between the various ability level classes or non-grouped classes.

The respondents were also asked to report graduate hours they had taken in the social sciences. However, so few courses were reported that it was felt a table with hours and percentages would be of little value. The responses did reveal 72 per cent of the teachers of upper ability classes had earned graduate credit in the social sciences. Sixty-three per cent of the teachers of average ability groups reported graduate credits, and 68 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups indicated graduate credits earned in the social sciences. Twenty-three teachers or 46 per cent of the teachers of non-grouped classes had earned graduate credit in the social sciences. A majority of the graduate credits for all groups were earned in history courses with psychology, economics, geography, political science, sociology and anthropology courses following in that order.

Table XXXVIII reports the courses indicated by teachers of upper, average, and lower ability groups as well as non-grouped classes that specifically helped them in instruction of the respective classes they teach. Because teachers frequently mentioned more than one course as being beneficial, the totals do not add up to 100 per cent for each ability level.

Table XXXVIII shows teachers at all levels of grouped classes as well as non-grouped classes reporting subject matter courses as being most beneficial. Methods of social studies ranked second in value at all levels except upper ability level where educational psychology and related psychology courses were rated slightly higher. Educational psychology and related psychology courses were also considered beneficial by teachers at all ability levels. It may be noteworthy that little mention was made of reading courses by teachers of lower level classes.

It would appear from Table XXXVIII that content courses were more beneficial than any single course pertaining to methods of instruction. This pattern prevailed for teachers at all of the ability levels in the junior high school social studies except those working with the lower ability groups. However, the totals for all "education" courses was greater than that for the combined content courses. Apparently teachers found both types of courses valuable.

TABLE XXXVIII
BENEFICIAL COURSES REPORTED BY
TEACHERS OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Course Designation	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level			
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)	
Subject matter content courses	49	48	24	64
Methods of social studies	8	19	24	20
Ed. Psychology and psychology	10	15	12	14
Exceptional children	8	6	18	6
Core in the junior high school	3	4	6	6
Reading or remedial reading	3	2	6	6
Junior high & junior high curriculum		8	6	2
Student teaching		2	3	8
Measurement and testing	3		6	4
Secondary education courses	5		3	4
Audio visual courses		2	3	2
General education courses	3			4
Guidance and counseling	3	2		
The culturally deprived	5			
Social studies curriculum			6	
Workshop & course on slow learner			6	
Individualized instruction	3			
Science & aerospace	3			
Seminar on unified studies				
Mental retardation		2		
Delinquent behavior		2		
Diagnosis of language difficulties		2		
Improvement of instruction		2		
Junior high psychology from Home Ec.				2
Travel around the world				2

Table XXXIX presents evidence that units by themselves or in combinations with other common approaches are the predominant instructional arrangement used by junior high school social studies teachers. The table reveals that units; units in combination with chapters, chronology, and problem solving comprise the major approaches used by teacher of various ability level grouped classes as well as non-grouped classes. It would appear that an almost unlimited number of combinations are used by teachers of both grouped and non-grouped classes. These data further indicate that there is no significant difference in the basic organization or approach used by teachers of various ability levels or non-grouped classes.

Teachers of grouped social studies classes were also asked to indicate whether they used the same basic organization or instructional approach with other ability levels they teach. Table XL shows that 77 per cent of the teachers of upper ability level classes used the same basic organization or approach with other ability levels they teach. Sixty-five per cent of the teachers of average ability groups indicated that they used the same basic organization while 59 per cent of the teachers of lower ability level classes reported using the same basic organization or approach for other levels taught. These data indicate that teachers of grouped and non-grouped social studies classes tend to use the same basic organization or approach for other ability levels they teach.

TABLE XXXIX
BASIC ORGANIZATION OR APPROACH
USED BY TEACHERS OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Organization or Approach	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level				
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	Totals (N=171)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Units	13	27	3	24	18
Units-chapter	15	10	24	10	14
Units-chronological	10	10	18	4	10
Units-problem solving	8	4	6	8	6
Chapter	5	2	9	8	6
Chapter-chronological	5	4	9	6	6
Chronological	10			4	4
Units-topical	8	2	3	2	4
Chronological-topical	3	6		2	3
Units-chapter-topical-problems		4		6	3
Topical		2	9		2
Chronological-problems		6		2	2
Units-topical-chapter	5			4	2
Units-problems-chronological		2	3	2	2
Problems-topical		2	3	2	2
Problems-topical-units	3			4	2
Units-topical-chronological	3	4			2
Units-chapter-chronological	3			2	1
Units-chapter-chronological-topical		4			1
Units-problems-topical		2		2	1
Units-chapter-problems				4	1
Others mentioned only once	10	6	15	4	8

TABLE XL
PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED
CLASSES WHO USE THE SAME ORGANIZATION OR
APPROACH WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS TAUGHT

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same approach	77	65	59
No, different approach	23	35	41
Totals	100	100	100

Teachers were asked to identify the specific variations they made, if any, for the other ability levels they taught. The responses were so varied that it was impossible to report them in any meaningful tabular form. However, at all levels the major variations centered around differences in: (1) the content or material, (2) the depth of the students inquiry, (3) the teacher expectations, (4) the rate of progress or speed, (4) the difficulty and length of assignments, (5) the teacher expectations, and (6) the amount of teacher direction or guidance provided.

It was frequently reported that more problem solving and topical approaches were used for the upper level and average ability classes. Lower ability classes were more often textbook centered with chapter or chronological approaches

employed. Typical of the comments made by the responding teachers were: "variations in amount of ground covered and difficulty of assignment and materials are made" and "I teach my average and high classes the same but I have a different grading scale for each class."

TABLE XLI
METHODS USED BY TEACHERS OF GROUPED
AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES.

Methods Used	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level				Totals (N=171)
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Discussion	77	81	64	80	77
Group and individual activities	69	77	62	68	70
Lecture	64	40	56	48	51
Recitation	26	21	38	26	27
Study questions	3	2	24	10	9
Outside reading	3	2	6	4	4
Workbooks	3		6	4	3
Others indicated only once	10	10	9	2	29

Table XLI presents data about the various methods employed by teachers of junior high school social studies. The use of discussion was the most prevalent method employed by teachers of all ability levels and non-grouped classes. However, teachers of upper and average ability groups and non-grouped classes made more extensive use of discussion

than did the teachers of lower groups. Few discernible differences in the methods used by teachers of the various ability levels are apparent with the exception of the lower groups. The teachers of lower groups reported using more recitation and study questions than did teachers of other ability levels or non-grouped classes. Group and individual activities were the next most frequently reported method by teachers of all grouped and non-grouped classes. Lecturing was most common among the teachers of upper ability levels. However, close examination of the data revealed that the lecture was used in a wide variety of combinations and it is evident that lecture is made use of frequently by teachers of all ability levels as well as non-grouped classes. Overall it would seem that there are few noteworthy differences in methods employed by the teachers of various ability levels. Moreover, there are no striking differences between the methods used in non-grouped social studies classes when compared to grouped classes.

TABLE XLII

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS WHO REPORTED THEY USE THE SAME
METHODS WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same methods	44	44	15
No, different methods	56	56	85
Totals	100	100	100

Table XLII reveals that 44 per cent of the teachers of upper or average ability level classes use the same methods for other levels they teach while 56 per cent use different methods. Only 15 per cent of the lower ability level teachers reported they used the same methods for other levels taught while 85 per cent used different methods. It would appear that teachers of grouped classes do make some attempts to vary the methods they used for other ability levels they teach. This is particularly evident by teachers of lower ability level classes where 85 per cent reported using different methods.

Teachers of grouped classes were also asked to indicate the nature of the variations they made for other ability levels. The responses were quite divergent but several patterns seemed to prevail. More individual pupil centered activities were used with upper groups while lower ability groups were reported to be more teacher centered and directed. Greater use was made of the lecture as the ability of the pupils increased. As implied above, the use of individual pupil research projects or activities increased as the ability level rose. One teacher reported that you "spoon feed" material at the lower level with more recitation. Another reported "more drill and written work for the lower groups." A number of teachers reported using the same methods but varying the amount of content to be covered. It would appear that as the ability of the pupil increases, the

methodology moves from a teacher centered approach with less content and lower expectations to a highly pupil centered approach with emphasis on individual activities, research, group work and higher level lectures and discussions.

TABLE XLIII
TEACHING MATERIALS USED BY TEACHERS OF
GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Materials	Per Cent of Teachers at Each Level				Totals (N=171)
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Textbooks	82	83	91	82	84
Supplementary materials	67	42	71	66	60
Reference books	69	75	32	52	58
Supplementary textbooks	46	48	65	42	49
Audio Visual materials	59	38	26	66	49
Current event papers	28	19	9	62	32
Multi-textbooks	8	10	6	14	10
Maps and globes	3	13	6	2	6
Study sheets or worksheets	5	2	6	4	4
Workbooks	3	4	6		3
Reading labs and materials			6	2	2
Speakers	8			2	2
Programmed instruction	3	2			1
Television		2	3		1
Others mentioned only once	10	6	3	4	6

Table XLIII presents data about teaching materials employed by teachers of grouped and non-grouped social studies

classes. Textbooks were employed by 84 per cent of the teachers. This was the most commonly used material reported by teachers of all ability levels and non-grouped classes. Over one-half of the teachers of upper ability groups reported using supplementary materials, reference books and audio visual materials. The use of reference books, supplementary textbooks, supplementary materials, and audio visual materials by teachers of average ability groups was also evident. Over one-half of the lower ability group teachers reported using supplementary materials and supplementary textbooks in addition to a textbook. Instructors of non-grouped social studies classes appeared to be making much use of a variety of materials as over one-half of them indicated they used supplementary materials, audio visual materials, current event papers, and reference books. It has frequently been suggested that teachers of lower ability groups used a number of audio visual materials. However, the evidence revealed in the table shows that only 26 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups used audio visual materials. The teachers of non-grouped classes reported making much more extensive use of current event papers than did teachers of grouped classes.

Upon close examination, it appears the most commonly used materials are textbooks, supplementary materials, reference books, supplementary textbooks, audio visual materials, and current event papers. These materials are used

frequently by teachers of all ability levels as well as non-grouped classes. The variation in use of these materials would seem to be more in the combinations in which they are used than differences in the materials themselves.

A number of interesting comments were made by teachers of both grouped and non-grouped classes. One teacher stated, "in lower classes we depend mostly on textbooks or audio visual aids. I have found that with lower levels "seeing" helps a great deal." Another teacher reported, "I feel we lack proper and adequate materials for those in below average groups." Still another reported the use of reading laboratories from Science Research Associates and Webster, Tach X and controlled readers for use with lower ability pupils. A number of teachers of lower ability pupils also reported they used the Follett Basic Learning Program.

TABLE XLIV

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED CLASSES WHO
USE THE SAME MATERIALS WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same materials	26	50	38
No, different materials	74	50	62
Totals	100	100	100

Table XLIV shows that 26 per cent of the teachers of upper ability classes use the same materials for other ability levels they teach while 74 per cent use different materials. Fifty per cent of the teachers of average ability level classes used the same materials for other ability groups taught. Obviously, 50 per cent also used different materials. Thirty-eight per cent of the teachers of lower ability classes reported they used the same materials with other levels while 62 per cent used different materials for other ability levels.

It would appear from the evidence in Table XLV that many teachers of grouped classes are cognizant of the need for differentiating material for the various levels of ability and make an attempt to do so. However, the table also suggests that teachers of average ability groups are not as aware of the need for using different materials for various ability levels as are teachers of upper and lower ability groups. Unfortunately, there are significant numbers in all three categories who do not differentiate greatly their teaching materials.

Teachers of grouped classes were asked to explain the variations they made in materials for other ability levels. A variety of explanations were given but generally they appeared to follow several well defined patterns. A number of teachers indicated they used different textbooks with the various ability levels. Also, there was less reliance on the

textbook as the ability of the pupils increased. As might be expected from the above comments, more reference books, supplementary textbooks, and supplementary materials were used as the ability of the pupils increased. In addition, there were frequent statements about differences in depth and difficulty of content at the various ability levels. Most teachers indicated greater sophistication accompanying increases in ability. At the other extreme, teachers indicated they used more audio visual materials as the ability of the pupils decreased.

The following comment summarizes some of the teachers feelings about attempts at varying the materials used at the various ability levels. One teacher reported, "the course and material is considerably watered down." Another stated, "I use the same materials for all classes, ... let me stress however, that some classes do not really utilize these teaching materials. These students are only exposed to these materials. I do feel that all classes should be given the opportunity to at least "see" the teaching aids that are made available to teachers in the school." Another teacher remarked, "in lower classes we depend mostly on textbooks or audio visual aids. I have found that with lower groups, "seeing" helps a great deal." One of the common problems associated with using different materials for various ability levels was presented by one teacher as follows: "I use materials designed for upper elementary levels and seventh grade for the

slow group. There are not enough materials published which have an interesting format that are not yet too difficult for these kids. Usually the easier material is in larger type and in other ways looks "babyish" when it shouldn't."

TABLE XLV
EVALUATION TECHNIQUES USED BY TEACHERS OF
GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Evaluation Technique	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level				
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	Totals (N=171)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Reports	64	79	50	66	66
Objective and essay tests	74	69	47	64	64
Written work	56	71	62	58	62
Quizzes	46	73	35	54	54
Maps	46	63	35	50	50
Discussions	54	52	29	38	44
Projects and research	31	25	3	24	22
Objective tests	13	21	18	20	18
Standardized tests	5	2		14	6
Notebooks	8	2	12	4	6
Teacher observation	5		15	4	5
Essay tests	3	4		6	4
Self evaluation	3	2		2	2
Others mentioned two or less times	8	8	25	10	14

The evidence presented in Table XLV suggests there were some variations in the evaluation techniques used at the different ability levels. Seventy-four per cent of the teachers of upper ability groups reported they used objective

and essay tests for evaluation purposes. In addition, over one-half of them also reported using projects, written work, and discussion for pupil evaluation. Seventy-nine per cent of the teachers of average ability groups used reports for evaluation. Also, over two-thirds of the teachers of average ability groups indicated they used quizzes, written work, and objective and essay tests. The table shows that 62 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups used written work for evaluation of pupils. Fifty per cent also used projects and 47 per cent used objective and essay tests. Interestingly, only 29 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups reported using discussion as a technique for pupil evaluation. The teachers of non-grouped social studies classes reported that 66 per cent of them used reports for evaluation. Sixty-four per cent reported using objective and essay tests, 58 per cent written work, 54 per cent quizzes, and 50 per cent maps.

Teachers of upper, average, and non-grouped social studies classes appeared to place greater emphasis on reports and objective and essay tests for pupil evaluation than did teachers of lower ability groups. The teachers of lower ability groups employed more written work and reports for pupil evaluation. Also, more emphasis was placed on teacher observation and notebooks by teachers of lower ability groups. Few teachers reported that they used standardized tests extensively for evaluation purposes.

TABLE XLVII

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED CLASSES WHO USE THE SAME
EVALUATION TECHNIQUES WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same evaluation techniques	15	60	26
No, different evaluation techniques	85	40	74
Totals	100	100	100

The data presented in Table XLVII suggest that teachers of upper and lower ability groups felt they were making an attempt to use different evaluation techniques for other ability levels they instructed. Eighty-five per cent of the teachers of upper ability groups and 74 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups indicated this in the study. However, only 40 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups were making attempts to employ different evaluation techniques for other ability levels.

When the respondents were asked to indicate the nature of the variations made in techniques of evaluation, a wide variety of responses were received and it was almost impossible to organize these responses in a meaningful table. However, several overall trends emerged. A significant number of teachers reported they expected more of better students and placed more emphasis on knowledge of content. Others varied

the number and increased the complexity of questions as the ability of the groups increased. Generally there were more essay type tests, increased outside reading assignments, and less oral work as the ability of the pupils increased.

One teacher of upper ability groups stated, "lower groups may need their grade padded to pass but I require the same basic knowledge to obtain an A-B-C in all groups." Another teacher reported, "I grade in comparison to the pupil's ability for other levels." A teacher of average ability classes indicated, "I assign more individual work for upper level groups and use more short answer type tests with lower level groups." A teacher of lower ability classes reported, "I rely on less subjective evaluation for other levels." Another teacher of lower ability groups stated, "for other ability levels I teach, more emphasis is placed on test scores than on effort as in the lower level groups." Still another lower level teacher stressed how she made variations by stating, "I use more essay tests, harder assignments, and place more stress on concepts for other levels I teach."

Table XLVII shows that 69 per cent of the teachers of upper ability groups reported critical thinking and communication skills were the most important social studies skills they attempted to develop. Over one-half of the teachers of average ability classes and non-grouped classes also reported

TABLE XLVII
SOCIAL STUDIES SKILLS DEVELOPED BY TEACHERS
OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Skills Developed	Per cent of Teachers at Each Level				
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	Totals (N=171)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Critical thinking or problem solving	69	69	41	64	62
Communication skills	69	40	71	56	57
Human relations	33	54	44	48	46
Responsible citizenship	26	25	53	30	32
Sense of place and space	23	17	21	28	22
Sense of time and chronology	21	19	21	20	20
Appreciation of American heritage	10	8	6	8	8
Understanding the role of social studies	10	8	3	8	8
Developing values and attitudes	10		12	8	7

critical thinking as the most important social studies skill they attempted to develop. However, 71 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups reported the most important social studies skills they attempted to develop were communication skills of reading, listening, writing, and speaking. Forty-one per cent of the instructors of lower ability classes indicated they placed emphasis on critical thinking for lower ability groups. The next most frequently reported skill by teachers of lower ability groups was

responsible citizenship (53 per cent). Teachers of lower ability groups were far more conscious of developing responsible citizenship than teachers of any other ability group or non-grouped classes. Although an almost endless number of combinations were designated by the respondents, it would appear that conscientious attempts were made to develop critical thinking, communication skills, human relations, and responsible citizenship. With the exception of lower ability teachers, few discernible differences are evident from Table XLVII as to the most important social studies skills teachers attempt to develop with their various ability levels or non-grouped classes.

TABLE XLVIII

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED CLASSES WHO DEVELOP THE SAME SOCIAL STUDIES SKILLS WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, develop the same skills	41	58	59
No, develop different skills	59	42	41
Totals	100	100	100

Table XLVIII shows that 59 per cent of the teachers of upper ability groups attempt to develop different social studies skills for other ability levels they taught. However,

over one-half of the teachers of average and lower ability groups reported that they attempted to develop the same social studies skills for other ability groups.

Teachers of grouped social studies classes were also asked to explain how they approached the problem of developing different social studies skills for other ability levels they taught. Many teachers reported they varied the emphasis on depth, detail, time spent and content. As the ability of the groups increased, more emphasis was apparently placed on critical thinking or problem solving, independent research, and developing a more pupil centered approach. Also less emphasis was placed on in-class activities of reading, writing, and listening as the ability of the pupils increased. One teacher summarized the responses indicated by many other respondents when she stated, "with lower groups the development of critical thinking is difficult. My most pressing problem is getting them to read--first to master the mechanics so they can understand the material." Another teacher stated, "I don't think I attempt to provide for different attainment of social studies skill."

The data presented in Table XLIX indicate that teachers of all ability groups as well as non-grouped classes are making considerable use of individual reports, projects and research. The next most frequently reported activity was group reports and projects. However, teachers of lower ability groups reported making greater use of this activity

TABLE XLIX

GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES USED BY TEACHERS
OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Group and Individual Activities	Per Cent of Teachers at Each Level				Totals (N=171)
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Individual reports, projects, and research	87	94	94	92	92
Group reports and projects	56	65	91	82	73
Outside readings	44	48	35	44	43
Panels	49	42	24	48	42
Field trips	38	29	24	28	30
Debates	21	29	9	20	20
Oral reports	5	6	24	8	10
Guest speakers	13	4	6	10	8
Role playing	8	8	9	2	6
Workbooks		2	2		2
Creative writing	10				

than teachers of other ability levels. Ninety-one per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups reported using group reports and projects. The teachers of lower ability groups also indicated that they used more oral reports than did instructors of other ability levels or non-grouped classes. The teachers of upper ability level groups reported using guest speakers more than did other social studies teachers. Table XLIX indicates that with the exception of the teachers of lower ability groups, there were few differences in the use

of activities. The same types of activities were used by all teachers with the major difference occurring in the emphasis placed upon the particular activity or the combinations of activities employed.

TABLE LE
PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED CLASSES
WHO USE THE SAME GROUP AND INDIVIDUAL
ACTIVITIES WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same group and individual activities	28	48	29
No, different group and individual activities	72	52	71
Totals	100	100	100

Table LE presents evidence that the teachers of all ability level grouped classes attempt to use different group and individual activities with different ability levels. However, teachers of average ability groups did not indicate they differentiated activities as extensively as teachers of above or below average groups. It may be that teachers of upper and lower ability groups are more aware of the need for differentiation in the activities for other ability levels than are teachers of average ability groups. It would appear from the comments that the variations being made

in group and individual activities center around the amount of work assigned and the expectations of pupils at the various levels of ability. One teacher of upper ability classes reported, "you can't start a fire where there is no spark." A teacher of average ability classes stated, "it depends on the group as to whether I use more or less individual or group work and the degree of difficulty." Still another teacher of lower ability classes indicated, "if I can get these kids involved in any kind of group or individual activity no matter how simple, I feel I have accomplished something."

TABLE LII

AUDIO VISUAL MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT USED BY TEACHERS
OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Audio Visual Materials and Equipment	Per Cent of Teachers at Each Level				Totals (N=171)
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Films	97	96	97	96	96
Overhead projector & overlays	77	73	82	82	78
Charts and graphs	74	73	76	62	71
Records and tapes	44	54	50	46	49
Maps	41	29	53	60	46
Filmstrips	36	44	50	46	44
Opaque projector	13	15	15	6	35
Slides	10	8	9	20	12
Bulletin Board	13	6	18	6	10
Television	5	2		12	5

Table LI indicates that the teachers of all grouped and non-grouped social studies classes made extensive use of films. In addition, over three-fourths of the teachers reported making wide use of the overhead projector and overlays. A significant number of teachers at all ability levels reported using charts and graphs. It is also apparent from the evidence in Table LI that the teachers of grouped classes also made extensive use of records and tapes. Few discernible differences are apparent between various ability levels or non-grouped classes in the use of audio visual materials and equipment.

A number of interesting comments were reported on the questionnaires which illustrate the role which the use of audio visual materials and equipment play in many classrooms. One teacher reported, "films, maps, graphs, some tapes consume about 20 per cent of our time." Another teacher replied, "I believe remedial pupils are able to learn more when the teacher employs the use of the overhead projector and other visual aids." A teacher of non-grouped classes indicated, "I have over 3000 colored slides I took on my many trips around the world which I use." Another lamented the fact that she was allowed to order only six films a year. One teacher reported, "I would like to rely more on films, but I can't darken my classroom so it means I have to exchange classrooms with another teacher." "About fifteen assignments out of thirty-six are visual activities" reported

another teacher. One teacher summarized the feelings of many social studies teachers when she commented, "God save the audio visual aids department."

TABLE LIII

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS OF GROUPED CLASSES WHO USE THE SAME AUDIO VISUAL MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT WITH DIFFERENT ABILITY LEVELS

Yes or No	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)
Yes, the same audio visuals	64	75	71
No, different audio visuals	36	25	29
Totals	100	100	100

Table LIII shows 64 per cent of upper ability level grouped class teachers used the same audio visuals for other levels they teach. Only 36 per cent of teachers of upper level ability classes used different audio visuals for other levels they teach. Teachers of average ability level classes reported that 75 per cent use the same audio visuals for other levels while only 25 per cent used different audio visuals. Teachers of lower ability classes reported 71 per cent using the same audio visuals for other levels while 29 per cent use different activities.

Table LIII indicates that teachers of the various ability levels do not significantly vary the audio visuals

they use with other ability levels.

Social studies teachers of grouped classes were asked to explain what variations they made in the use of audio visual activities with other ability levels. A majority of those furnishing these data indicated they used more films and filmstrips and other audio visuals for lower ability classes. Two examples of teachers' comments on this item include: "the brighter students get bored with too many films and filmstrips so I use fewer and try to select just certain filmstrip frames which pinpoint the major ideas." Another reported, "I find filmstrips more useful in lower groups because I can stop and give more explanation."

Table LIII shows teachers of the various ability levels generally agreed on the advantages of grouping. Teachers of non-grouped classes also appear to be in agreement with teachers of grouped classes as to the advantages of grouping. Thirty-four per cent of the teachers from all levels of grouped classes as well as non-grouped classes reported grouping to be advantageous in reducing individual differences and providing for these differences by competing at the pupil's own level. Twenty-eight per cent of the teachers of both grouped and non-grouped social studies classes indicated grouping was advantageous because it allowed the upper groups to be challenged by content and materials which could be covered in greater depth. Eighteen per cent of the teachers of grouped and non-grouped classes indicated grouping

TABLE LIII

ADVANTAGES OF GROUPING GIVEN BY TEACHERS
OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Advantages Cited	Per Cent of Teachers at Each Level				
	Grouped			Non-Grouped (N=50)	Totals (N=171)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)		
Reduces individual differences and fits individual pupils needs to compete at own level.	33	50	44	12	34
Upper groups challenged better with content & material more in depth	46	33	39	22	28
Easier to gear content & material to pupils' level better.	38	8	9	16	18
Poorer students not discouraged and frustrated.	21	21	13	10	17
Pupils get more individual attention	8	2	15	14	11
Better attitudes for all and fewer discipline problems in the school.	13	8	13	4	10
Easier to plan activities and assignments	15	8	3	4	8
More efficient use of teacher & pupil time.	5	8	6	2	5
Teaching is easier and more effective	8	4		2	4
Keeps teacher from teaching to average pupils as in heterogeneous classes.	8				2
Learn life as it is & respect others' abilities.	3	2		2	2
Better pupils don't get lazy & complacent.	5				1
Smaller classes are better for individual activities and work.	3		3		1
More efficient use of facilities and equipment.		4			1
Pupils feel more secure with their peers		2		2	1
Less apathy & boredom in pupils	5				1
Other responses mentioned only once	3	4	9	6	5

made it easier to adapt content and material to the pupils' level. Seventeen per cent of the teachers reported grouping to be advantageous by helping the poorer pupil from becoming discouraged and frustrated. However, not all teachers felt grouping was advantageous. One teacher of lower ability classes stated "grouping is an advantage to administration as it looks good on paper and fools the public." Another teacher reported, "grouping is good for math and science but not for social studies."

Table LV shows teachers of all ability levels as well as non-grouped classes citing essentially the same disadvantages of grouping. Twenty-six per cent of the teachers of grouped and non-grouped classes indicated grouping stigmatizes pupils resulting in social problems. Twenty-five per cent of the teachers reported grouping as disadvantageous because it removes the leadership and stimulation of better pupils. Another 11 per cent of the teachers reported grouping resulting in lower groups giving up and developing feelings of inferiority. Ten per cent of the teachers felt grouping often places the discipline problems in one class. That grouping often results in misplacement of pupils was reported by 8 per cent of the teachers. Another 8 per cent felt grouping is not lifelike or was undemocratic. Five per cent of the teachers indicated grouping results in undue parental pressure for prestige leading to conceit and snobbery

TABLE LIV
DISADVANTAGES OF GROUPING GIVEN BY TEACHERS
OF GROUPED AND NON-GROUPED CLASSES

Disadvantages Cited	Per Cent of Teachers at Each Level				
	Grouped				Totals (N=171)
	Upper (N=39)	Average (N=48)	Lower (N=34)	Non-Grouped (N=50)	
Stigmatizes pupils & causes social problems.	18	35	38	16	26
Removes leadership & stimulation of better pupils who others learn from.	31	33	24	14	25
Lower pupils give up & feel inferior	18	8	12	8	11
Discipline problems often in one class.	8	10	18	6	10
Misplacement of pupils occurs frequently.	15	4	6	8	8
Undemocratic and not lifelike.	5	4	9	12	8
Parental pressure for prestige & grades causes conceit and snobbery.	15		3	2	5
Grading is difficult.	3	8	3	4	5
Teachers want top groups but no low groups.	3	4	6	2	4
Scheduling problems.	8	2		2	3
Not enough flexibility in transfers.		4		4	2
Classes are too large & especially for lower groups.	8	2			2
No school has the library to provide adequate research facilities & materials for all levels.			6	4	2
The misuse of it by "track" grouping instead of "subject" grouping.	3	4			2
Causes abnormal class size.			9		2
It defeats competition to learn.			6		1
Segregates social & economic groups.			6		1
Expect too much from top groups & pile it on.	3			2	1
Hard to prepare lessons and materials that differentiate when teacher has other levels.	3			2	1
No chief disadvantages in my opinion.	3		3		1
Teachers don't challenge lower pupils.	3				1
Lack of trained teachers for all levels.		2			1
No proof that grouping is best.		2			1
Advanced become complacent and superior.				2	1
It may make educators think they are doing a better job when they really are not.				2	1

among the better pupils. Another 5 per cent of the teachers felt grouping presents problems of grading. Four per cent of the teachers reported that teachers wanted top ability groups but not the lower ability groups.

A variety of comments were given by teachers of both grouped and non-grouped classes to improve grouping. A number of teachers were concerned about the placement of pupils and subsequent flexibility in the transfer of pupils when found to be misplaced. It was also suggested that teachers be involved more in the placement and transfer of pupils. Teachers of all ability groups indicated they believed smaller classes would be conducive to the improvement of instruction. Several teachers reported that they felt flexible scheduling, team teaching, and constant regrouping of pupils would aid in the improvement of instruction. Another frequent suggestion was the availability of more material appropriate to all levels of ability. One teacher suggested that a more willing attitude by the principal when teachers recommend pupils for transfer would be beneficial. Another teacher suggested that other criteria should be used in pupil placement than membership in band or orchestra. A teacher of lower ability groups advocated a separate grading system to reward the pupils' efforts. Another teacher of lower groups stated, "I would group alphabetically." Five teachers of non-grouped social studies classes said they

would like to see their school move towards grouping as it was impossible to learn with all ability levels tossed together. A teacher of non-grouped classes also reported that it was still up to the individual teacher to individualize instruction even in grouped classes.

It would seem from the responses given that the major suggestions for improvement of grouping include: more careful placement, flexibility in transfers, and more teacher involvement in placement and transfer.