

CHAPTER V

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL VISITS

Six junior high schools were selected for visitations to confirm and supplement data obtained from the two questionnaires. One junior high school that engaged in social studies grouping and one junior high that did not engage in social studies grouping were visited in each of the following enrollment classifications: (1) 1,000 or more pupils, (2) from 500 to 1,000 pupils, and (3) 500 or less pupils.

Four of the schools were located in large metropolitan cities or suburbs. Two schools, one practicing grouping and one a non-grouped school, were representative of small communities with a predominantly rural background.

The six principals of the junior high schools were interviewed by the writer. Seven teachers of grouped social studies classes and seven teachers of non-grouped social studies classes were also interviewed. Six teachers, three from schools practicing grouping and three from non-grouping schools, were in the enrollment classification of 1,000 or more pupils. Four teachers, two from grouped classes and two from non-grouped classes, were interviewed as representative of schools enrolling from 500 to 1,000 pupils. Four teachers, two from grouped classes and two from non-grouped

classes, were also contacted in schools enrolling 500 pupils or less.

THE PURPOSE OF SCHOOL VISITATIONS

Selected schools were visited to confirm and supplement data gathered from administrator and teacher questionnaires. Principals were interviewed to obtain additional information about the schools and the administrative provisions for individual differences. Social studies teachers of all ability levels in grouped classes and non-grouped classes were also interviewed. This was done to obtain information about their classroom instructional practices. Specific questions were asked of social studies teachers in the areas of (1) objectives or goals, (2) class organization, (3) methods, (4) materials, (5) evaluation, (6) skills, (7) content, (8) group and individual activities, (9) audio visual materials and equipment, and (10) suggestions. Teachers instructing grouped classes were also asked to indicate in what ways they provided differentiation for other ability levels they instructed.

SCHOOLS PRACTICING GROUPING IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Enrollment over 1,000 pupils. Of the junior high schools that practiced grouping in the social studies, the one enrolling over 1,000 pupils was located in a large metropolitan

city. The school enrolled 1,175 pupils and according to the principal, was one of the first junior high schools west of the Mississippi River (established in 1917). Grouping was introduced in this school about 1938 and has been used since that time. The school serves a socio-economic cross section and was located in an older section of the city. A number of ethnic groups were represented in the student body with about ten per cent being mexican and about six per cent negro.

Pupils were assigned to the groups by the counselors with reading scores and teacher recommendations being the two main criteria used. Grouping was accomplished subject by subject and provisions were employed for the transfer of misplaced students.

The principal expressed concern over the high faculty turnover which seemed to occur each year with about one-third of the staff leaving. He indicated a number of these were young women leaving due to pregnancy and men wishing to move into high school teaching.

In this school, social studies grouping was used only in the seventh and eighth grade classes with the ninth grade civics pupils placed in non-grouped classes.

Enrollment between 500 and 1,000 pupils. The junior high school visited that practiced social studies grouping and enrolled between 500 and 1,000 pupils was located in the suburbs of a large metropolitan city. This school enrolling

980 pupils was part of a county wide system.

The building was formerly a senior high school which was converted into a junior high school when a new high school building was constructed in 1960. Several new wings had been added to the existing building to accommodate the junior high school program.

The principal and assistant principal were both new to the school and neither had previous administrative experience. Pupils were assigned to the various ability groups by the guidance counselors. Teachers were asked to recommend pupils for the various ability levels. Once the group was established, the pupils were placed in that ability level for all grouped classes regardless of the subject discipline.

The school was predominantly Caucasian with about ten per cent being of Spanish American background. Only three negroes attended this school. The area the school served was basically middle or upper middle class with both white and blue collar workers. Many of the parents held aspirations of college for their children according to the principal.

It was indicated that a problem of attitude prevailed among some of the students. One teacher commented, "the pupils are quite ill mannered and display little respect." The building was illegally entered six times during the school year. There also appeared to be a problem of maintaining a

stable faculty since about one-third of the staff leave each year.

Enrollment of 500 or fewer pupils. The junior high school engaging in social studies grouping which enrolled 500 or fewer pupils was located in a small rural community. This junior high school with 383 pupils inherited its present building when a new senior high school was constructed several years ago. This school grouped in the areas of math, science, English and social studies. Teacher recommendations, previous school grades and standardized tests were used for placement of pupils into four ability levels. The principal indicated that, many times, placement in math and English was the determining factor in the pupils social studies placement. Track grouping was used with the pupils remaining in the same ability groups for all classes rather than subject by subject.

The principal was a former teacher in this junior high school and became an administrator when the junior high school moved into the old senior high building. According to the principal, the teachers were highly enthusiastic about the grouping program and definitely preferred it over heterogeneous groups.

Several minor problems were indicated by the principal relating to the grouping program. The junior high school shared several teachers with the senior high school which

complicated scheduling. Also, some parents with high expectations of their children put pressure on pupils to reach the top group. The school library was also woefully inadequate as it contained only about one volume for each pupil in the school. However, it must be noted that each classroom and department had a number of supplementary textbooks and materials which they could use.

There also appeared to be a problem of teacher turnover since eight out of the seventeen faculty members were leaving at the end of the school year. The principal indicated that the school system had gone to a form of merit pay for next year and a number of teachers were leaving for this reason.

SCHOOLS VISITED THAT DID NOT PRACTICE GROUPING IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Enrollment over 1,000 pupils. The junior high school visited enrolling over 1,000 pupils that did not group in the social studies was located in a suburb of a large metropolitan city. This junior high school enrolled 1,487 pupils. The school served an area that would be classified as middle or upper middle class. The majority of the people commuted to the nearby city to work. About seventy-five per cent of these youngsters who graduate from high school start to college according to the principal.

The school did group for the top pupils in math and

science in grades eight and nine. The principal was against grouping as he felt it was an artificial situation. He also stated, "you couldn't really rely on the sixth grade teachers recommendation if you had grouping." The principal also reported that grouping wasn't effective as you couldn't find strong teachers to instruct the various groups and it created many problems of pressure from parents. Another problem he envisioned was the difficulty in scheduling pupils and classes. He indicated flexibility in both scheduling and transfer of misplaced pupils was hard to attain with grouping. The principal also reported that the social studies was one place where pupils of all abilities should work together. He also indicated that you really didn't gain in teaching and that the learning situation was not necessarily enhanced by grouping.

Enrollment between 500 and 1,000 pupils. The school visited that did not practice grouping in the social studies and enrolled between 500 and 1,000 pupils was located in a county wide system bordering a large metropolitan city. The junior high school enrolled 890 pupils.

It appeared to the writer that this school has developed a unique program to meet the individual needs of pupils that seemed to exceed other attempts reported in the questionnaire or visitations. Not only had this school been able to introduce and implement this unique program, but the

system had also developed a summer in-service program to train teachers in the district to teach in similar situations.

This school which opened in a new building in 1961 has combined the flexibility of modular scheduling and team teaching to provide a highly flexible approach to instruction. The school district (originally funded by a Ford Foundation grant) was one of the early leaders in the experiment of staff utilization.

The key to the program in this school appeared to be a philosophy which stressed "process goals" instead of traditional "content goals." One distinct advantage of this arrangement seemed to be the flexibility which allowed teachers to coordinate their efforts and to provide articulation not only in specific disciplines but also in related disciplines. Another advantage of the approach in this school was the mobility of pupils who could be moved from one group to another and still be identified with the same teachers.

Enrollment of 500 or fewer pupils. The junior high school visited that did not group in social studies and enrolled less than 500 pupils was located in a rural area. This junior high school enrolled 305 pupils. The principal indicated that the community was comprised of middle class people primarily. A number of the pupils were from farm families as there was limited industry in the community. The city also contained a small liberal arts college which

the principal felt contributed greatly to the community and school.

Grouping was practiced several years ago in the social studies according to the principal but was dropped at the request of the teachers. Grouping in other academic areas has also been dropped at the request of the teachers according to the principal. The principal was a former teacher in the school at the time when grouping was abandoned, and he agreed with the faculty that grouping was not popular in this school. He gave several reasons for this belief. The school enrollment was too small which resulted in scheduling and transfer problems. In addition, there were insufficient books and materials to accommodate the necessary differentiation between various ability levels. He also reported that staff members were not specifically trained to teach various levels. These reasons combined with the belief of the faculty that they could do a better job of instructing in a non-grouped situation led the school to abandon the grouping program.

INTERVIEWS OF TEACHERS IN GROUPED SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES

Teacher information. Of the seven teachers interviewed, two were first year teachers, two had four years of experience, one seven years, one eight years, and one fourteen years of experience teaching social studies. Six of the

teachers held a Bachelor's degree and one held a Master's degree. All seven teachers indicated they taught more than one ability level in the social studies. Two teachers were social studies department chairmen. Two of the seven teachers held no membership in professional organizations and one of the teachers held membership in the National Council for the Social Studies.

Goals or objectives of grouped social studies classes.

Five of the seven teachers interviewed indicated they used the same basic goals or objectives for all ability levels they instructed. One teacher reported stressing more creative thinking for upper ability groups with more independent pupil work while lower group pupils needed to develop good citizenship. Another teacher felt the lower group pupils needed more teacher direction and should be taught to work together as good citizens while average and upper group pupils should develop problem solving.

Goals or objectives indicated by teachers were to understand the world in which we live, understand our American heritage, learn to distinguish fact from opinion, understand general concepts, becoming a good citizen and pupils learning to work on their own. One teacher reported, "I stress general concepts and not specific facts although the administration thinks you should just cover the book." Another teacher stated, "I just talk to the lower ability pupils. They want someone to talk to and history may go by the wayside."

I talk about problems they have. These pupils have been yelled at all day and they appreciate just being talked to."

Responses of the teachers interviewed indicated that a number of different goals or objectives are stressed by social studies teachers. However, most teachers have the same goals or objectives in mind for all ability levels they teach.

Organization used by teachers of grouped classes.

Units were employed as the basic organizational approach by all seven teachers. Five teachers indicated that they did not rigidly adhere to the suggested units which the school system supplied through a curriculum guide. Instead, they preferred to make variations and adjustments to fit their individual classes. Five teachers also indicated they used some problem solving and topical approaches for their better pupils. Three teachers reported that they stressed more chronology with their lower ability groups.

From the responses given, it would appear that teachers were using many of the same organizational approaches for all ability levels. The only apparent differences seemed to be in the methods, detail, depth, and amount of material covered.

Methods used by teachers of grouped classes. Teachers indicated they used discussion as the basic classroom method for all ability levels. Formal lecture was used sparingly and especially so for the lower ability levels. Teachers of

average and upper ability groups reported they used some independent study and project work while teachers of lower ability groups used more in-class group work. All seven teachers indicated that it was important to use a more teacher directed approach with lower ability groups. As the ability level increased, the methods became more conducive to pupil centered activities rather than teacher centered. Teachers of upper ability groups indicated they liked to use independent study with these pupils. One teacher of average ability classes indicated he experienced more difficulty in this level than in any other. He stated, "I have a motivational problem with average pupils and they are harder to handle. I believe average kids feel they are in a situation like back in grade school with some at the top and some at the bottom. I don't think they know they are grouped necessarily."

A teacher of lower ability pupils stated, "some pupils are in this group because of their citizenship and they do have the ability." Another pointed out, "lower groups need more teacher direction and the pupils must always have something in front of them." Still another teacher reported, "lower groups must be told more with more teacher guidance... We read in class together and discuss. I also use study sheets for these pupils." A teacher of lower ability groups stated, "I really don't vary what I do so much as by the way

I go about it. I guide the lower ability pupils into something. Sometimes I make smaller groups with a leader."

Materials used by teachers of grouped classes. Six of the seven teachers reported using the same textbook for all ability levels they taught. The other teacher indicated using a variety of paperbacks instead of a conventional textbook. However, the same paperbacks were used for all ability levels. Several teachers indicated they used paperbacks and pamphlets as supplementary materials. One teacher reported, "I reproduce materials as the district won't buy paperbacks as they are afraid they won't last." Another teacher stated, "I have a difficult time with textbooks as there are not enough copies so each individual pupil can have one. Instead all books must remain in the classroom as other pupils also use the same books." Five of the seven teachers indicated they had few materials or reference books available in their classrooms. Four of the teachers reported using current event papers or magazines while one teacher stated, "I don't believe in current event papers." One teacher indicated she had more supplementary materials and books in her room than did the library.

From the responses given, it would appear that about the same materials are used for all ability levels with differences of depth, difficulty, and amount being used to provide differentiation. As one teacher put it, "I use about the same materials for all ability levels but I water it down

for lower ability pupils and give them more things to do instead of letting them dig it out for themselves like better pupils do." This statement would seem to describe what teachers of grouped classes are doing in the use of materials.

Evaluation of pupils by teachers of grouped classes.

Teachers reported that upper and average ability groups were evaluated by objective and essay tests primarily. Lower ability groups were evaluated on objective tests, oral participation, subjective evaluation, and effort. As the ability of the pupil increased, more emphasis was placed on essay questions and developing organization and expression. Three teachers reported they gave the same tests for all ability groups but expected less from average and lower ability pupils. Teachers generally indicated that they didn't fail pupils in lower ability groups if they did the best they could. These teachers indicated they often read test questions to lower ability pupils since they had such a definite reading problem.

From the responses given by the teachers, it would seem that many of the same evaluation techniques are used for all ability levels. However, essay questions or problem solving questions were generally used only with average and upper ability pupils. Also, teachers were quick to point out that they gave fewer tests to lower ability groups, expected less, and placed more emphasis on subjective evaluation and oral

responses with these pupils. Teachers in two schools visited reported that it was recommended by the administration that specific grades should be assigned to pupils in each ability group. However, the teachers indicated that this was not enforced and they had given other than the recommended grades for all ability levels.

Social studies skills stressed by teachers of grouped classes. The teaching of critical thinking or logical reasoning was reported by all seven teachers as skills they worked to attain. Communication skills, human relations, and being a good citizen were also reported as being important in the social studies. Two basic patterns were reported by teachers as they stressed more critical thinking for upper ability levels and being a good citizen for lower ability groups. Teachers of lower ability levels also indicated that these pupils had distinct reading problems and much time was devoted to reading in class. Six of the seven teachers interviewed reported they felt the same social studies skills were important for all pupils. However, they did qualify this by indicating that the degree of sophistication in developing these skills distinctly differed between ability levels.

Content used by teachers of grouped classes. The content used by teachers was basically the same for all ability levels. All seven teachers indicated they used about the same content for all ability levels but varied the amount

of teacher direction, amount of content, and depth it was covered to accompany specific ability levels. There appeared to be much confusion among the teachers as to what content actually was. Many teachers spoke of content in terms of methods or organization.

From the responses given, it would seem that the same basic content was used for pupils of various ability levels. However, some attempts were being made to vary methods and materials in presenting this content for different ability levels.

Group and individual activities used by teachers of grouped classes. The teachers reported they used more independent study, individual reports and papers, and more in-depth study for upper ability pupils. The average ability pupils were also given individual independent study according to the teachers while lower ability pupils were exposed to more in-class group work and projects. Only one teacher reported using the same group and individual activities for all ability levels taught. Interestingly, teachers of all ability levels indicated they had experienced little success in using panels or debates with their pupils.

Responses given by the teachers indicated that as the ability of the groups increased, less teacher direction was given and more emphasis was placed on individual work by the pupils. The group and individual activities used by pupils in lower ability classes were much simpler and less detailed.

It would appear that the teachers interviewed did make specific attempts to differentiate in the types of group and individual activities they used for various ability levels.

Audio visual materials and equipment used by teachers of grouped classes. Films were used extensively by all seven teachers for all ability levels. Six teachers indicated they also used filmstrips for all ability groups they taught. The other teacher remarked, "kids don't like filmstrips, so I don't use them." Four teachers reported they experienced problems in getting films and filmstrips when they would be most appropriate to the material covered. Six of the teachers also reported that pupils of all ability levels saw the same films and filmstrips when they were available. One teacher reported, "the lower groups get more from audio visual materials so I use more of it for these pupils."

Responses given by the teachers interviewed would seem to indicate that the same basic audio visual materials and equipment were being used in social studies classes.

Suggestions for improving instruction by teachers of grouped classes. Four teachers indicated they felt more careful placement of pupils in ability levels and greater flexibility in transferring misplaced pupils would benefit the grouping program. Four teachers also indicated they felt colleges should do more to prepare teachers to deal with various ability levels. As one teacher stated, "college

teachers in education always talk about individual differences but never really tell you or show you how to teach them."

Four teachers reported they felt student teaching was the most beneficial experience they had in their teacher preparation program.

All seven teachers indicated they were happy with grouping and would not go back to teaching heterogeneous groups if they had a choice. As one teacher put it, "I am all for grouping and I have taught both grouped and non-grouped social studies classes. I wouldn't go back to non-grouped classes if I had a choice."

INTERVIEWS OF TEACHERS IN NON-GROUPED SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES

Teacher information. Of the seven teachers interviewed, one had two years of teaching experience in the social studies, two had four years of experience, one six years, one thirteen years, one fifteen years, and one twenty years of experience teaching social studies. Six of the teachers held a Bachelor's degree and one had obtained a Master's degree. One teacher was a former elementary school teacher and another had withdrawn from teaching for a period of time to work with scouting. All seven teachers were members of at least three professional organization. Two were members of the National Council of the Social Studies.

Goals or objectives of non-grouped social studies classes. Five of the teachers indicated there appeared to be some confusion in their social studies departments as to goals and objectives. In contrast, the two teachers who taught at the school involved in flexible scheduling and team teaching had definite clear concise objectives defined. Most of the teachers stated goals or objectives of understanding general concepts, appreciation of our country and its heritage, being good citizens, and developing logical reasoning. The teachers involved in team teaching stated, "this may sound like a pious hope but our goal is to find where each pupil is and take him at that point and make him as productive as possible."

It would appear, with the exception of the two teachers involved in team teaching, that social studies teachers of non-grouped classes were not certain as to what their specific goals or objectives were.

Organization used by teachers of non-grouped classes. The predominant organizational approach reported by all seven teachers of non-grouped classes was the use of units. Five teachers indicated they were supplied with a curriculum guide that suggested units. However, they replied that they preferred to make revisions and adaptations of the units to fit their individual classes. Problem solving, topics, and chronological approaches were also frequently mentioned by teachers. Two of the teachers indicated that they liked to

involve the pupils in logical or rational reasoning and thinking.

It would appear from the data furnished by the teachers that the same basic organizational approaches were employed for all pupils. Five teachers did report that they made attempts to adapt the methods and amount of material covered to the pupils abilities.

Methods used by teachers of non-grouped classes. All seven teachers indicated using discussion as their basic method. Three reported using some informal lecture of a brief nature. All seven teachers indicated they used group and individual reports or activities as methods of individualizing instruction. One teacher stated, "I explain more thoroughly for slower pupils. This probably bores others but it is the only way I know how." Another teacher reported, "I use a spelling list and give a lot of art work and drawing for slower pupils." Another indicated, "I give problems to answer and talk about them in class. I give the same assignments for all pupils." One stated, "I give the same basic assignments to all pupils but I expect less from the poorer pupils." Still another teacher replied, "I try to think what I can do to interest slow learners." Two teachers indicated they used a great deal of independent study or seminars for the better pupils and provided more structured assignments for slower pupils. For example, they never have homework but do the work in groups or individually in class where it can

be handed in and checked immediately. This way it can be handed back if it is wrong and the pupils can find the correct answers.

From the responses given, it would seem that teachers were aware of various ability levels in their classes and had made a few attempts to meet these differences. However, the successfulness of these methods probably leaves much to be desired.

Material used by teachers of non-grouped classes. All seven teachers reported using a basic textbook. Five of the teachers also indicated that the textbooks were written at the same ability level. Three of the teachers indicated they made much use of paperback materials. All seven teachers reported using supplementary textbooks and materials for their classes. Four of the teachers revealed that they made references in class discussion to other books or materials. Four teachers also reported using current event papers or magazines in their social studies classes.

Five teachers indicated a lack of materials in their specific classrooms and three indicated their school library did not provide books for various ability levels. One teacher reported, "we have a shortage of supplementary or reference books in our room so I must assign individual topics and the pupils check out books and take them home." Another stated, "I make references to other books and use the room encyclopedias very much. The good pupils do bring

in much outside material on their own." One teacher replied, "I use a few supplementary texts and materials. However, extra work is not looked upon favorably by pupils as they feel why should I do it when no one else is doing it." Two teachers remarked that not only did they have an adequate supply of books and materials but also the school library was outstanding.

Evaluation used by teachers of non-grouped classes.

Five teachers reported using the same basic tests for all pupils. However, three qualified their answers by stating, "I grade the top pupils harder and expect less of the slower pupils." One teacher reported, "I give all pupils the same tests. I must admit I give grades by what the pupil does in relation to ability. I use much teacher judgment."

All seven teachers used objective and essay tests as their basic means of measurement. One teacher reported using a standardized test. Written work in the form of reports, book reviews and answering study guide questions were reported by all seven teachers also. One teacher pointed out she stressed a great deal of creative writing in her classes.

The two teachers instructing in team teaching reported they structured their tests on different levels covering the same general areas but with more of a process centered approach. For example, better pupils have thought provoking questions while the poorer pupils have questions where they have to refer to the atlas, encyclopedia and other sources

to get the answer. They quickly pointed out this was most beneficial as the papers were evaluated at the end of the period rather than waiting three or four weeks after a test to find out how well the pupils did. In their opinion, this was a distinct advantage of the team teaching approach combined with flexible scheduling. These two teachers also indicated they used much pupil self-evaluation in their independent study projects.

Social studies skills stressed by teachers of non-grouped classes. Critical thinking, communication skills, appreciation of our country, and human relations were all stressed by the teachers. Five of the teachers indicated they stressed the same basic skills for all pupils. They did indicate however, that they made attempts to vary their methods in developing these skills. One teacher summarized the problem that most of the teachers were facing by commenting, "I try to vary my approach by using a word list at the end of the chapter and drilling on vocabulary list but it is boring to better pupils."

Two teachers stressed that they placed a great deal of emphasis on process goals or skills in their classes. The teachers were involved in the teaching team and indicated the team outlined and evaluated specific process goals or skills each week. The writer had an opportunity to read reports from these meetings and it was evident that the careful planning resulted in coordinated efforts to attain

these skills.

From the teachers responses, it would appear that only the two teachers involved in the team teaching were going beyond the traditional approach of stressing the same basic skills for all pupils. The other five teachers were making few variations in developing social studies skills according to pupil's abilities.

Content used by teachers of non-grouped classes.

Five of the teachers reported using about the same basic content for all pupils but varying the depth of it for individual pupils. There appeared to be a great deal of confusion in the minds of most of the teachers as to what content they actually used. Three of the teachers indicated they used units from the schools curriculum guide or outline. When asked to explain any adjustments they made in content to pupils abilities, teachers generally indicated they made differences in explanations, depth and expectations. One teacher summarized what appeared to be the feelings of the teachers when he reported, "I use the same content for all pupils but I water it down for slower pupils and enrich it for the better students."

Once again, the two teachers involved in team teaching reported that emphasis in their school was first placed on process goals and then on content. After examining copies of their semester outlines and lesson plans, the writer felt they did an exceptional job in planning, implementing, and

evaluating content for their classes.

Group and individual activities used by teachers of non-grouped classes. All of the teachers interviewed indicated they used group and individual activities of one type or another. These ranged from small group activities to reports, research, projects and independent study. Five of the teachers reported using panels and debates but the pupils did not react very favorably to them. Examples of projects used by these teachers were: a group project on investing play money on the stock market, a dramatization of a United Nations General Assembly session, and role playing important events or persons. From the responses given by the teachers, a majority of them were using the same group and individual activities for all pupils. It was indicated however, that they believed individual projects, papers and research were some of the best ways of providing for individual pupil's abilities.

Five teachers indicated they liked to form small groups within their classes. One teacher reported, "I have found that pupils tend to group themselves and leaders emerge naturally." Another stated, "I don't use much group work as I have found that pupils tend to seek their own level and don't mix themselves very well."

Once again the teachers who were a part of team teaching appeared to be making attempts to provide for individual differences. They both reported breaking the class into

small groups by ability for specific group work. One teacher reported of a seminar on taxes, using a resource specialist, and the other teacher told of a seventh grade independent study in geography. In the geography project, the teaching team selected 100 better pupils who had a C+ or above grade average for a four week independent study project. Much teacher and pupil planning went into this project as evidenced by the plans viewed by the writer. Self pacing was used by the pupils and the teachers evaluated each pupils progress daily. Once a week the pupils met as a group with a leader and recorder. Each week the pupils wrote a self-evaluation on their progress. At the end of the four weeks, each pupil reported to the entire group on their specific project. Discussions were held after each report with all pupils entering in and the teacher acting only as a consultant. The pupils were each asked to write a final evaluation of the independent study project. Almost without exception, the pupils reported they enjoyed the experience and loved the self motivation and independence according to the teacher. After examining some of these pupil reports, the writer was quite impressed with the level of sophistication displayed by the pupils in describing their project and evaluating the independent study. The writer selected two of these pupil evaluation reports for inclusion in this study since they so adequately state the pupil's feelings. The first report was written by a seventh grade girl who participated in this project.

First, I would like to say I really appreciate the time given me for this independent study. For the first time in my life I actually enjoyed making an outline. I was thrilled to have such a collection of information and books at my fingertips because good geography books are so difficult to find. Getting together with the class and being able to discover the outline really aroused my interest in France. Everyone had so much to contribute I could have listened for hours. Working without the usual amount of teacher guidance agreed with me greatly. I like to work on my own gathering my own information, without having to keep up with my classmates. Miss ... led us with just enough drive to keep us enthusiastic. To me a good teacher is the most important factor in learning.

Making an in-depth report was the best part of the independent study as far as I was concerned. I learned many new facts on Degas and Renoir. I enjoyed research work on these two artists. Also, I got a wealth of information from my classmates' reports from the very varied subject range. One thing I liked and appreciated was that the atmosphere was informal, so giving a report was not as hard as usual. I wish more teachers would latch onto being more informal as it would help everything quite a bit. On the whole, I really enjoyed working in and with this group and I hope every student will have a chance to work in this type of group. I only wish they would use this independent study as a regular way of teaching many of the subjects.

The following report was written by a seventh grade boy who had participated in the independent study project:

I think being in the independent study group while we were studying the country of France was a real challenge for myself and the other students who were in the group. I think the students in the independent study groups actually learned a great deal more about France than the other groups. It was harder, much harder, to look up the information for our own outline not in just one book but in many to find everything we could. This was not as easy as listening to a lecture by a teacher and copying information of the book and so forth to make an outline.

I really enjoyed it and learned a lot at the same time doing my independent study. I thought Miss ... coming around each day writing down my progress report kept me on my toes so I wouldn't fall behind. I knew she would put it down if I was slacking off, thank you Miss ... I thought getting together all the group was good for I left out somethings other students brought up. I also think having a secretary and group teacher and a different group leader each time was interesting and helpful. One thing I thought I enjoyed and learned a lot from was the informal discussion when we all sat in a circle.*

Audio visual materials and equipment used by teachers of non-grouped classes. Films and filmstrips were used by all seven teachers of non-grouped classes. However, four of the teachers indicated they had experienced much difficulty in scheduling films when they needed them. One teacher reported she had over 3,000 colored slides from her many trips around the world which she used extensively with her geography classes.

Five teachers reported using the overhead projector with extraordinary results and three teachers indicated they used the opaque projector. Records and tapes were used by six of the teachers. Two teachers indicated they had access to a television set which was used for special programs such as the space launches.

Five teachers reported they used the same audio visual

* Permission granted by principal and teacher for inclusion in this study.

materials for all pupils or classes. Two reported they attempted to vary the depth of the audio visual materials they used according to the abilities of the pupils.

From the responses given, it would appear that many of the same audio visual materials and equipment are being used for all pupils. Some attempt was made by a limited number of teachers to vary the depth of these materials according to individual abilities.

Suggestions for improving instruction by teachers of non-grouped classes. Three teachers indicated they felt teacher training institutions could do more to prepare teachers to meet pupils individual needs. One teacher remarked, "there is a need to learn how to provide for individual differences in colleges instead of just hearing that differences do exist." Another stated, "colleges should be more practical instead of so theoretical in training teachers." "I always hear about you need to provide for individual differences in your classes but never how in education courses," reported another teacher. Three teachers indicated they would like to try grouping in the junior high school social studies. One a former elementary teacher stated, "when I taught fourth grade, I did a lot of grouping in the classroom. If provided with a lot of varied materials, I think it would be good." She evidently did not realize it was still possible to establish groups in her classroom as a means of meeting individual needs or abilities. Another

teacher replied, "I would like to try grouping as it is the best way to meet individual needs I believe."

Four teachers pointed out that more and better materials for all levels of ability would be a great help in their teaching. The two teachers involved in team teaching suggested that all teachers need to spend more time in planning "process goals" rather than "content goals" and using a more pupil centered approach instead of a traditional teacher centered one.

The teachers were asked to summarize how they specifically instructed their classes to provide for individual differences of pupils. Five of the teachers had a great deal of difficulty in answering this question. These five after a long thoughtful pause, replied with a variety of explanations. For example, one stated, "you see, I know that I am not reaching all of the pupils." Another replied, "I sometimes feel I direct my work to better or lower pupils and neglect the others. It is so easy to forget about the average pupils." Still another reported, "I could use help or some college courses in working with pupils of various abilities. I also have a problem of not enough books or materials to do a great deal of individualization." Still another teacher indicated, "not too much really. In class discussion I try to get all pupils to make a contribution. I give more facts for the slower pupils even if they can't generalize and analyze." "I don't expect as much from slower pupils. I

use a lot of art work for the slower pupils. I also individualize by assigning papers and reports which pupils do at their own level and speed," reported another teacher.

Once again, the two teachers involved in team teaching appeared to be the only teachers in non-grouped schools who made detailed planned attempts to individualize instruction. By establishing smaller groups, using the resource center and independent study previously reported, the writer felt they were making commendable efforts for individualization of instruction.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

The purpose of the visitations were to confirm and supplement data obtained from the administrators and teacher questionnaires. The information supplied from the questionnaires and the data gathered from the interviews were almost identical. It would seem that responses from the questionnaires were accurate indicators of the grouping practices and procedures as observed during the interviews.

The data gathered from the interviews would appear to show that few significant discernible differences occurred between teachers of grouped and non-grouped social studies classes in goals, organization, methods, materials, evaluation, skills, content, group and individual activities and audio visual activities. Of course there were some variations made by individual teachers but generally there were

few significant differences.

If there was any noteworthy pattern that seemed to appear from the interviews, it was that teachers of grouped classes may be more conscious of the fact that they were dealing with groups of varying abilities. However, it must also be pointed out that they were equally stymied as were teachers of non-grouped classes in how to best meet these differences.

The most interesting and revealing segment of the interviews was the conversation and observation of the flexible scheduling and team teaching program employed by one of the non-grouped schools. This program was so thoroughly organized that it appeared to stand above other attempts of providing for individual differences. This school combined many of the strengths of both grouped and non-grouped classes to attain their goal.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. RESTATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purposes of this study were to examine the nature of current grouping practices and procedures in the junior high school social studies classes, and to ascertain what, if any, differences there were in the materials and instructional approaches used in grouped and non-grouped classes. 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 to which different courses are provided for students of various ability levels.
2. To determine the extent to which grouping is practiced in the junior high school social studies and 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.

7. To discover what provisions respondents believe will strengthen educational opportunities when grouping is employed.

II. REVIEW OF PROCEDURES

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 social studies curriculum at the junior high school level. The findings from the literature also furnished the basis for the design and construction of the administrators' and teachers' questionnaires.

The junior high schools included in the study were located in eight midwestern states: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, South Dakota and Wyoming. A total of 484 junior high schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis were identified for inclusion in the initial phase of the study.

Two sets of questionnaires were developed to gather

data for the study. The first questionnaire was designed for junior high school administrators. The second questionnaire was designed for teachers in both grouped and non-grouped social studies classes.

The questionnaire used with the administrators sought general information about each school. Included were items to ascertain (1) the name and location, (2) the enrollments by grades, (3) the curricular offerings by grades, (4) the required and elective social studies courses, (5) the number and designations 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 ability level, (13) the names of teachers of grouped and non-grouped classes, and (14) the schools' willingness to participate further in the study. These questionnaires were sent to 484 administrators in the eight states. Three hundred and fifty schools or 72 per cent completed and returned the questionnaire.

The questionnaire designed for use with classroom teachers of both grouped and non-grouped junior high school social studies classes were selected at random and solicited the following information: (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) provisions for the development of social studies skills, (7) the nature of emphasis on content, (8) group and individual activities, (9) audio visual materials and equipment 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. Of the 280 teachers selected at random 171 or 61 per cent returned the completed questionnaire.

In order to supplement and confirm the responses made by the administrators and teachers on the questionnaires, the writer visited six selected junior high schools. Various sized junior high schools were included in the final phase of the study. The schools visited fell into three enrollment classifications: (1) over 1,000 pupils, (2) from 500 to 1,000 pupils, and (3) under 500 pupils. A junior high school practicing grouping in the social studies and a junior high school that did not practice grouping in the social studies was selected in each of the enrollment classifications.

The findings of the study of grouping practices and procedures in junior high school social studies obtained through the review of the literature, the administration of two questionnaires, the visitations to six junior high schools,

and the analysis of the collected data are summarized in the following sections.

III. SUMMARY OF THE LITERATURE

The recognition that individuals differ in a number of ways dates far back into the history of mankind. The Greek philosophers were keenly aware of the existence of individual differences. Prior to 1900, attempts to meet individual differences centered around retardation and acceleration of pupils. Grouping as a design for the improvement of instruction was probably conceived around 1900 and implemented through various plans to provide rapid promotions. Early in the twentieth century emphasis was placed on enrichment, laboratory plans, individual study, differentiated assignments, and units of work which could be completed at a different rate by each student.

In the 1920's and 1930's, educators were still seeking new and better answers to the age old problem of adapting instruction to individual needs. Increased school enrollments and the availability of new measuring devices resulted in a rather widespread trend, which saw various ability tests used to determine ability groups. Unfortunately, few schools differentiated the instruction or curriculum for the various groups established by such tests.

Between the years 1935 and 1950, the research on grouping apparently subsided. However, after 1950, grouping

appeared to gain in popularity and many publications devoted more space and attention to this much discussed practice.

It would appear from an investigation of the research studies that there is still considerable confusion about the effectiveness of various grouping practices. It has not been shown conclusively that grouping does or does not result in a greater degree of academic achievement. It would seem that the results depend somewhat upon how the research was organized and reported. However, numerous studies have pointed out the need for differentiation of content, methods, and materials in order for grouping to be most effective.

The question of whether to group or not to group in the social studies is apparently one to which no final answer can be given. Again, the literature does not show conclusively that grouping in the social studies does or does not result in a greater degree of academic achievement. One can only conclude from the literature that there are distinct advantages and disadvantages to grouping in the social studies. Recommended practices were however reported for instructing rapid learners, average learners, and slower learners in the social studies.

It would appear from the literature that there was a definite trend toward increased use of grouping in the junior high school. In recent years the Concant recommendations and the pronouncement of the Educational Policies Commission have apparently prompted more junior high schools to move in this

direction. Other studies also support this conclusion. Although the evidence is inconclusive and contradictory, and the arguments over the alleged advantages and disadvantages continue, the fact remains that there appears to be a trend in this direction.

The literature did reveal a number of relatively new proposals for increased individualization of instruction. Most of these proposals dealt with one or more of the following: (1) rearrangement of the school organization and variations in class size, (2) changes in the instructional program to insure more effective use of staff, time, and space, (3) wider use of differentiated instructional materials and modern technology, (4) curriculum modifications for the various ability levels, (5) differentiation of assignments and activities, and (6) reorganization of the graded structure into multigrade or nongraded arrangements.

A number of criteria and procedures were suggested for use in grouping of pupils. Some of the most frequently mentioned devices were: achievement test scores, aptitude tests, intelligence tests, teacher recommendations, previous grades, and reading ability. The schools that report the greatest satisfaction with grouping seem to be increasingly more cognizant of the many factors that can and probably should be considered when forming groups.

The review of the literature did indicate that while

grouping may have some limitations, it may be better to try to reduce the range of abilities rather than do nothing.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The major findings of this investigation are as follows:

(1) Approximately three-fourths of the schools included in this study enrolled 501 or more pupils. This evidence was consistent with other data about the size of schools organized on a 6-3-3 basis.

(2) Sixty-eight per cent of the schools practiced some form of grouping in the junior high school social studies.

(3) More than three-fourths of the schools that engaged in grouping in the social studies enrolled 500 or more pupils. In contrast, 18 per cent of the schools enrolling 500 or fewer pupils employed grouping in the social studies.

(4) Grouping was practiced most extensively in grade seven (96 per cent), was next most common in grade eight (93 per cent), and utilized least in grade nine (71 per cent). Sixty-six per cent of the schools engaged in social studies grouping employed this practice in all three grade levels.

(5) Block-time or multiple period classes for language arts-social studies were most prevalent at the seventh grade level with 39 per cent of the schools engaging in grouping and 33 per cent of those schools having non-grouped classes reporting its use. Twenty-two per cent of the schools

practicing grouping and 20 per cent of the schools with non-grouped classes employed block time in grade eight. Only 6 per cent of the schools that grouped and 9 per cent of the schools with non-grouped classes engaged in block-time classes for grade nine.

(6) The advantages and disadvantages of grouping given by administrators and teachers of grouped and non-grouped schools closely paralleled those cited in the literature. Few discernible differences were evident between respondents of grouped and non-grouped situations.

(7) The most frequent reason given for not grouping in the social studies was that respondents felt grouped classes did not represent a lifelike situation and they wanted the school to reflect a true picture of society.

(8) Usually several criteria were used by schools employing grouping in the social studies for the placement of pupils. The most frequently reported criteria were teacher recommendations, previous scholastic achievement and grades, and results of standardized tests.

(9) Seventy-one per cent of the administrators in schools that employed grouping reported they had experienced no major administrative problems with grouping. In those instances where problems were identified, they were most often related to scheduling and grading.

(10) A substantial majority of administrators reported that teachers were assigned to several ability levels rather

than to one specific ability group.

(11) There was no clear cut pattern or prevailing policy for assigning teachers to specific ability groups in junior high school social studies. Schools that did have a policy reported that it took into consideration the following items: the experience, the maturity, the knowledge of subject matter, and the capacity of the teacher to teach a certain level.

(12) Eighty-nine per cent of the schools that practiced grouping in the social studies reported that they had a policy permitting the transfer of pupils from one level to another. The most frequent criteria used for such transfers were the pupils performance and the teachers recommendation.

(13) The majority of the schools engaged in grouping have done so without obtaining objective research evidence that grouping has resulted in higher achievement or improved classroom performance. The limited number of schools that reported they had secured some evidence on their grouping practices, reported that it was primarily of a subjective variety.

(14) Almost two-thirds of the administrators indicated that grouping in the junior high school social studies did not promote conceit and snobbery among student of above average ability.

(15) The administrators were about evenly divided on whether social studies grouping stigmatized pupils as dull,

average, or bright. Apparently this had been a problem in many schools that employed grouping.

(16) The social studies curriculum in grouped and non-grouped schools closely paralleled the "typical" offerings reported in the literature. The most common social studies courses at each grade level were: geography in grade seven, American history in grade eight, and a course in government and citizenship at grade nine.

(17) The most common number of ability levels for all grades of the junior high schools employing grouping were three. However, the number of groups ranged from two to six.

(18) A variety of names or labels were used to identify the various ability levels in schools practicing some form of grouping. The most common designations reported for three ability levels were "advanced-average-slow" and "high-medium-low". The most common labels applied in schools with two ability levels were "advanced-average" and "average-slow".

(19) A majority of the schools reported the average class size for upper ability groups was between twenty-six and thirty-five pupils. Very few classes of twenty pupils or less were reported. While the literature suggested that such classes should have fewer pupils than "regular" classes, the study did not reveal this to be the case in the schools included in the study.

(20) A substantial majority of the schools reported the average class size for average ability groups was also

between twenty-six to thirty-five pupils. Again, there were almost no schools operating classes for these students with less than twenty pupils.

(21) The most frequently reported average class size for lower ability groups was in the twenty-one to thirty pupil range. It would appear that schools included in the study did make an effort to maintain classes smaller than "regular" groups as suggested in the literature.

(22) The average class size for schools that did not group students in the social studies was between twenty-six to thirty-five pupils. There were very few classes that enrolled less than twenty pupils or more than thirty-six pupils.

(23) The Bachelor's degree was the highest degree held by 74 per cent of the social studies teachers included in this study. Few noteworthy differences in academic qualifications were apparent between teachers of various ability levels. However, a slightly higher percentage of the teachers of non-grouped classes (86 per cent) reported their highest degree was a Bachelor's degree.

(24) The majority of the teachers of both grouped and non-grouped classes had ten years of experience or less. Few discernible differences in years of experience were evident between teachers of upper, average, and lower grouped classes. However, slightly more of the teachers of non-grouped social studies classes had only from one to five years of experience.

(25) No significant differences in hours of undergraduate preparation in the social sciences were discernible between the teachers of various ability levels or non-grouped classes. The largest number of social science undergraduate hours earned by all teachers were in history, psychology, geography, and political science. The teachers in both groups were less well prepared in anthropology and economics.

(26) Over one-half of the teachers instructing grouped classes had earned some graduate credit in the social sciences. However, 46 per cent of the teachers instructing non-grouped classes had earned such graduate credits. The majority of the hours earned were in history, psychology, economics, geography, and political science.

(27) Teachers of grouped classes at all ability levels and teachers of non-grouped classes reported that courses in subject matter content and methods of instruction were equally beneficial to them.

(28) Although the review of the literature indicated that lower ability pupils often had reading problems, very few teachers of lower ability groups reported that courses on the teaching of reading had been highly beneficial in their work with these pupils.

(29) Teachers of all ability groups and non-grouped classes reported extensive use of the unit approach as the basic class organization. In most instances, units were used in combination with other approaches.

(30) Teachers of grouped classes at all ability levels used essentially the same basic organization or approach with other ability levels they instructed. If any differences were made by teachers they were variations in the depth which they accorded the content.

(31) The use of a variety of instructional methods was reported by teachers of all ability levels. However, discussions, or discussion in combination with other methods were most common instructional approaches reported. Use of the lecture as the only method was rather uncommon but it was used by a significant number of teachers at all ability levels in combination with other methods.

(32) There were few noteworthy differences in the methods employed by teachers of the various ability levels or non-grouped classes with the exception of lower ability group teachers who reported greater use of recitation and study questions than did other teachers.

(33) Although the above evidence did not lend strong support to their contention, the teachers indicated that they did attempt to vary the methods they used for other ability levels they taught. Over one-half of the teachers of upper and average groups reported they attempted to vary their methods while 85 per cent of the teachers of lower ability groups suggested they varied the methods employed. In most instances the teachers indicated that as the ability of the pupils increased, they attempted to move from a teacher

centered approach to a more highly pupil centered approach. This shift usually involved greater emphasis on individual activities, research projects, and "higher level" discussions.

(34) The materials most commonly used by teachers of all ability levels were textbooks, supplementary materials, reference books, supplementary textbooks, audio visual materials, and current event papers. There was little evidence that the teachers differentiated extensively the materials used with the various ability levels. The most obvious differences seemed to be the way in which the materials were employed rather than in the materials themselves.

(35) Again, the evidence seemed to be somewhat inconsistent and contradictory. Most teachers of both upper and lower ability groups indicated that they attempted to differentiate the materials they used with other ability groups. Teachers of average ability classes apparently made less effort to vary materials for other ability groups. Again the most frequently reported variations seemed to be differences in the depth which the materials were accorded or the degree of sophistication accompanying increases in ability. On the other hand, there was some evidence that the teachers tended to use more audio visual materials as the ability of the pupils decreased.

(36) Few discernible differences in evaluation techniques were evident between teachers of various ability levels and non-grouped classes. The majority of the teachers used

projects, objective and essay tests, written work, reports, quizzes, maps, and classroom discussion in various combinations to evaluate pupils. Teachers of lower ability groups appeared to place more emphasis on teacher observations and notebooks than did other instructors.

(37) Instructors of upper and lower ability grouped classes apparently made a more concerted effort to use different evaluation techniques for other ability levels they taught than did the teachers of average ability groups. The major differences between teachers of lower and other groups was in the amount and quality of the work expected. As the ability of the pupil decreased more emphasis was placed on oral participation and less on essay questions.

(38) Few discernible differences in the development of social studies skills were evident between teachers of various ability groups or in contrast to non-grouped classes.

Teachers at all levels indicated they stressed the development of critical thinking, communication skills, human relations, and responsible citizenship. Teachers of lower ability groups were making more attempts to develop communication skills than did teachers of other ability groups or non-grouped classes.

(39) Over one-half of the teachers of average and lower ability groups indicated that they tried to develop the same social studies skills for other ability levels which they instructed. However, 59 per cent of the teachers of

upper ability groups reported that they attempted to develop different skills for other ability levels. Teachers of upper level groups tended to strive for greater depth in all of the skills and to promote more independent study for better pupils. Teachers of lower ability groups apparently gave more attention to developing communication skills.

(40) Teachers of all ability levels were in agreement that there should be differences in the content, the materials, the instructional procedures, and the evaluation techniques for various ability levels. However, the evidence did not indicate that an awareness of this need necessarily meant that the teachers were always willing or able to provide adequately for differences in ability levels.

(41) Teachers of all ability levels and non-grouped classes reported using essentially the same group and individual activities. However, teachers of lower ability groups seemed to stress oral work, take more field trips, and utilize less complicated activities.

(42) No noteworthy differences in the use of audio visual materials and equipment were evident between teachers of various ability groups or non-grouped classes. Teachers of all ability levels reported regular and extensive use of films and filmstrips, records and tapes, overhead projectors, charts and graphs, and maps.

(43) The major recommendations made by teachers of grouped and non-grouped social studies classes to improve

their programs were: (a) attempt to improve the initial placement of pupils in groups, (b) provide for greater flexibility in transferring pupils and involve teachers more extensively in such decisions, and (c) strive for smaller classes at all levels but especially for lower ability groups.

(44) The purposes of the visitations were to confirm and supplement data furnished by the questionnaires. Almost without exception, the visitations disclosed the same general trends as revealed by the questionnaires.

(45) There were no noteworthy differences in the instructional practices in the schools that employed grouping and those that did not group students. In addition, there were few discernible differences between the instructional provisions for the different levels of ability in grouped classes. A significant majority of all teachers indicated they attempted to differentiate the instruction for the various ability levels by altering the depth, the assignments, the expectations, the rate, and the comprehensiveness of the materials and methods used.

(46) In the case of schools practicing grouping in the social studies and those that did not, individualization of instruction depended upon the classroom teachers. A few teachers were attempting to employ instructional measures which appeared to better recognize and provide for the individual student. This was particularly true in the school engaging in flexible scheduling, variable sized grouping, and team teaching.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions and recommendations are offered.

A significant number of the administrators and teachers surveyed in the study were convinced of the merits of grouping. Moreover, the literature revealed that many leading educators have recommended ability grouping and a definite trend appeared to be developing in this direction. However, there was disturbingly little research evidence available as to what specific instructional provisions are most likely to insure more adequate instruction in grouped classes. At the same time most authorities contend that the effectiveness of grouping and the extent to which one actually is able to individualize instruction is directly related to the teachers ability to differentiate the content, the methods, and the instructional materials from one ability level to another. Despite this admonition and recommendation, few social studies teachers of either grouped or non-grouped classes appeared to differentiate significantly in the organization, the methods, the materials, the evaluative techniques, the content, the group and individual activities, or the audio visual materials and equipment employed.

In view of the above evidence, it is recommended that additional research and experimentation be conducted to reveal those instructional provisions and practices that are

most effective in individualizing instruction whether the student is placed in a grouped or non-grouped class. Even though the research evidence at the moment is not complete or conclusive, teachers of grouped and non-grouped junior high school social studies classes should probably make a greater effort to plan how they will actually differentiate the instruction provided youngsters with varying abilities, interests, and needs. This planning should include more attention to the specific goals, supplementary materials, instructional techniques, and means for evaluating pupil progress at each ability level.

Although grouping was widely practiced, there appeared to be some confusion among administrators and teachers as to the specific goals or objectives to be achieved by grouping. Indeed, some administrators seemed to have mixed feelings as to whether grouping should be practiced in the social studies. Part of the uncertainty revealed by these educators seemed to be due to poor communication and/or a lack of cooperation between the administrators and the social studies teachers. The responses of the teachers suggest that this problem might be the result of inadequate departmental organization and/or a poorly coordinated program in the social studies. The problem of adequately individualizing instruction seemed to be further complicated by the difficulty of defining terms, large class enrollments, questionable grouping procedures, inflexible scheduling, and inadequate equipment and facilities.

Moreover, few schools made adequate provision during the school day for planning, preparing, and evaluating what was being done in the social studies curriculum. All of these factors in various combinations seemed to restrict or limit the teachers in their efforts to achieve totally effective instruction in both grouped and non-grouped social studies classes.

It is recommended that school administrators should be increasingly cognizant of their responsibility to provide essential leadership in working with the teachers to establish a basic philosophy of instruction, the general and specific objectives to be attained at each ability level, and the means by which the varied abilities, interests, and needs of students in social studies classes can best be accommodated. Certainly, specific attempts should be made to improve the lines of communication among administrators, social studies teachers, and the other instructors in the school. It would also appear that greater use might be made of the guidance personnel in assessing, assigning, and otherwise meeting the needs of students of various abilities. Finally, it is strongly urged that administrative provisions be made so that social studies teachers will have adequate time to plan, to prepare, and to evaluate the social studies program and their instructional practices.

Although multiple criteria were usually taken into consideration in assigning pupils to grouped classes, one

factor that seemed to be almost completely neglected was the individual students interest or motivation. Most schools apparently assumed that students were all equally interested or motivated to pursue the same courses in the social studies. The few elective courses that were available seemed to be open only to advanced students at the ninth grade level. One can only conclude from the evidence produced by this study that the schools are generally satisfied with the overall junior high school social studies curriculum.

Admittedly, the present social studies curriculum at the junior high level may be basically sound and defensible. At the same time it is possible that major or minor curriculum revisions may improve the effectiveness of the program for some students not now adequately motivated or challenged by what is currently taught. Therefore, it is recommended that administrators and social studies teachers examine their curricular offerings more carefully and critically. It would also appear that the school might give greater consideration to the possible interest and motivation of the individual student when assigning pupils to social studies courses and/or ability groups.

The basic or overall objectives of the social studies are reasonably well established in the literature. There may however, be some question about how effective individual schools or teachers are in achieving these goals--especially since they are so difficult to assess or evaluate. Clearly,

the social studies people have been charged with the development of each individual students potential to become a functioning and effective citizen regardless of his ability. However, the literature and this study did not provide much help as to how teachers could effectively deal with students of diverse ability, interest, and need. Most of the suggestions for individualizing instruction in the social studies were largely descriptive and rarely based on empirical evidence about their effectiveness. In fact, little supportive research was found to indicate conclusively that grouping in social studies does or does not result in a greater degree of academic achievement. Most of the recommendations or descriptions available centered around general attempts to accommodate a small group of slow and advanced pupils or groups with little emphasis focused on meeting each individual pupils needs.

Both the review of the literature and the evidence gathered in this study suggest that the most neglected students may be the average ability pupils even though they make up the largest number of the pupil population. Certainly one gets the feeling that the learning experiences provided for average ability pupils were largely teacher directed with little responsibility being given to the student. In many instances, the teachers appeared to underestimate the ability and the potential contribution that these pupils are capable of making. Whether bright, average, or slow grouped classes

or non-grouped classes were being examined, one discouraging aspect of this study was that little evaluation was being made by the schools surveyed as to whether they were or were not adequately meeting the needs of individual pupils. The majority of the schools were making only limited use of the available techniques of highly subjective analyses of their social studies programs. It was equally discouraging to find so few schools considering any significant revisions in their grouping procedures or instructional practices.

It is recommended that educational leaders, boards of education, administrators, and teachers attempt more experimentation in their instructional procedures and broaden their efforts to evaluate the existing programs. Teachers should also make a greater effort to develop the potential of the large number of "average ability" students who have previously been overlooked in social studies classes.

Many administrators and teachers seemed to be rather perplexed and uncertain about the instructional approaches and materials that were most effective for the individualization of instruction. There was vague agreement that a sizeable number of materials, a variety of methods, and some differentiation of content in the social studies should be employed if individualization of instruction was to be successful. But disconcertingly few teachers of either grouped or non-grouped social studies classes were differentiating their instructional approaches to provide for the various

ability levels or individual differences in their classrooms. It appeared that teachers in schools that practiced grouping were often more cognizant that they were dealing with pupils of varying abilities than were teachers of non-grouped classes. However, it did not necessarily follow that they were doing a better job of individualizing instruction since they seemed to be as uncertain as were teachers of non-grouped classes about how to organize effectively and proceed with their classes. Both on the questionnaires and in the interviews, teachers had great difficulty in explaining how they actually differentiated the depth, the content, the expectations, the sophistication, or the comprehensiveness of their instruction to accommodate the wide range of ability in their students. Greater emphasis on more complex subject matter and more challenging materials were stressed for above average and average ability groups but little consideration of individual pupil differences within these classes was evident. Fortunately, some attempts were made to provide differentiation for lower ability groups and pupils. Unfortunately, there seemed to be a shortage of supplementary social studies materials in the classrooms. The teachers likewise indicated that there were weaknesses in both the quantity and quality of social studies materials in the school library. Teachers divulged that they were sometimes hindered in their efforts to employ a wide range of materials because of these materials were not always readily available in the library.

It is essential that greater emphasis be given to equipping social studies classrooms and libraries with more instructional and supplementary materials appropriate to all ability levels. Consequently, this could enhance the optimum development of all pupils. It would behoove all social studies teachers to make attempts to work with librarians to obtain and make available those materials deemed necessary. Teachers must make specific planned attempts to develop the many social studies skills through their classroom instruction.

The schools efforts to individualize instruction were further impeded by the teachers inability to clearly define or employ the instructional provisions which might be most effective. This was shown by the number of teachers that were not clear about the most effective means for insuring skill development, utilizing audio visual materials and equipment, providing group and individual activities, and developing suitable evaluation techniques for the various ability levels. For example, a significant number of teachers assumed that skill development was a process that indirectly and automatically occurred through normal classroom procedures. As a result, few teachers deliberately included plans for developing specific social studies skills into their lesson plans and classroom instruction.

Virtually all teachers recognized the potential value and importance of utilizing a wide variety of audio visual

materials and equipment. Unfortunately, however, a restriction was imposed upon their effectiveness by a lack of facilities and equipment. In a few instances, it was questionable whether the teachers were able to use them most constructively to enhance the learning situation. Many teachers were agitated because they could not obtain films and other audio visual materials when they paralleled their classroom plans. Again, the teachers made few variations in the use of audio visual materials and equipment for the various ability levels.

If audio visual materials and equipment are to contribute to the educational program, they must be available when they most aptly parallel the lessons being undertaken. Learning may also be enhanced by specific planned attempts to use audio visual materials and activities commensurate with the pupils abilities.

A large number of teachers suggested that individualization of instruction was adequately accomplished through the process of individual projects or research activities. Nevertheless, it is still highly questionable that individualization will occur only through rate of progress.

Although individual projects and research assignments are commendable efforts to individualize instruction, it must be recognized that this alone will not provide the necessary differentiation to adequately provide for the various levels of ability. Individual projects and research

should be planned to provide for individual differences by serving only as one of the many steps leading to the development of pupils abilities.

It was apparent that a majority of schools were inconsistent in their grading philosophy. This was particularly prevalent with the pupils of below average ability who were expected to measure up to a standard of performance achieved by other ability levels. It would seem that if emphasis is placed on the individual student, then evaluation should take into consideration the limitations and potential of each individual.

All schools could benefit from a well defined, consistent grading philosophy and policy. In all probability, pupil evaluation should take into account the limitations and potential of each individual student rather than expecting them to conform to predetermined standards of performance. It would seem advantageous to develop a grading plan that acknowledges the accomplishments of pupils at the various ability levels.

Schools reported a definite problem in obtaining teachers with adequate preparation and experience who were willing to instruct pupils of lower ability. The study exposed a lack of academic preparation in the social sciences with the exception of history. Interestingly, teachers were often critical of their teacher preparation programs. Teachers disclosed a concern over their lack of insight into dealing

with individual differences. The teachers reported that scant information and help was available from their teacher training preparation to adequately individualize instruction. However, teachers of both grouped and non-grouped classes indicated they looked favorably upon their student teaching experiences.

It is recommended that teachers of junior high school social studies seek to improve their academic and professional background so as to provide for individual differences. This may best be accomplished through professional education college courses, in-service programs, workshops, institutes, or similar programs. Not only do teachers need a broader background in the social sciences but more emphasis should be placed upon teachers educational preparation for methods in providing individualized instruction. This is especially imperative since the individual teacher still determines to a large extent the instructional provisions provided in the classroom.

It was most enlightening to the writer to have visited a school that practiced flexible scheduling, variable sized grouping, and team teaching. It seemed that this school embodied many of the characteristics necessary for effective individualization of instruction. As additional information on these new innovations becomes available, it should be carefully examined by administrators and teachers alike as a possible means of accommodating individual differences.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the Association of the National Education Association. Individualizing Instruction. 1964 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: 1964.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the Association of the National Education Association. The Junior High School We Need. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1961.

Ayres, Leonard P. Laggards In Our Schools. The Russell Sage Foundation, 1907.

Beggs, David, and Edward Buffie (ed.). Independent Study. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1965.

Billett, R. O. The Administration and Supervision of Homogeneous Grouping. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1932.

Borg, Walter R. Ability Grouping in the Public Schools. Madison: Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc., 1966.

Bossing, Nelson L., and Roscoe V. Cramer. The Junior High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1965.

Briggs, Thomas H. The Junior High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

Brown, B. Frank. The Nongraded High School. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.

Burton, William H., and Leo J. Brueckner. Supervision A Social Process. Third Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955.

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

Commings, W. D., and Barry Fagin. Principles of Educational Psychology. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1954.

- Conant, J. B. Recommendations for Education in the Junior High School Years. Princeton: Education Testing Service, 1960.
- Conant, J. B. The American High School Today. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
- Douglass, Harl R. Modern Administration of Secondary Schools. New York: Ginn and Company, 1954.
- Ekstrom, Ruth B. Experimental Studies of Homogeneous Grouping. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1959.
- Fraser, Dorothy McClure, and Edith West. Social Studies in Secondary Schools. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1961.
- Gruhn, William T., and Harl R. Douglass. The Modern Junior High School. Second Edition. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1956.
- Hansen, Carl. Four Track Curriculum. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1964.
- Harris, Chester W. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Third Edition. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1960.
- Inlow, Gail. Maturity in High School Teaching. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.
- Jelinek, V. (trans.). Jon Amos Komensky. The Analytical Didactic Comenius. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Koos, Leonard V. The Junior High School. New York: Harcourt Brace and Howe, 1920.
- Lewenstein, Morris R. Teaching Social Studies in Junior and Senior High School. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.
- McLendon, Jonathan C. Social Studies in Secondary Education. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.
- Monroe, Walter S. Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Revised Edition. New York: MacMillan Company, 1950.
- Nason, Leslie J. Academic Achievement of Gifted High School Students. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1958.

- National Education Association. Department of Superintendence. The Junior High School Curriculum. Washington, D. C., 1927. (Fifth Yearbook)
- National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators. Educational Policies Commission. Education of the Gifted. Washington, D. C., 1950.
- National Education Association. Educational Policies Commission. Manpower and Education. Washington, D.C., 1956.
- National Education Association. National Council for the Social Studies. Adapting Instruction in the Social Studies to Individual Differences. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1944. (Fifteenth Yearbook)
- National Education Association and the National Society for Programmed Instruction. Department of Audiovisual Instruction. Trends in Programmed Instruction. Washington, D.C., 1964.
- National Society for the Study of Education. Adapting the Schools to Individual Differences. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company. (Twenty-Fourth Yearbook)
- National Society for the Study of Education. Individualizing Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Sixty-First Yearbook)
- National Society for the Study of Education. Report of the Committee on the Education of Gifted Children. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company. (Twenty-Third Yearbook)
- National Society for the Study of Education. The Impact and Improvement of School Testing Programs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Sixty-Second Yearbook)
- National Society for the Study of Education. The Grouping of Pupils. Bloomington: Public School Publishing Company. (Thirty-Fifth Yearbook)
- Otto, H. J. Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- Passow, A. Harry, Miriam Goldberg, Abraham J. Tannenbaum, and Will French. Planning for Talented Youth--Considerations for Public Schools. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.

- Project on the Instructional Programs of the Public Schools. Schools for the Sixties. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1963.
- Rockefeller Brothers Report. Panel Report V of the Special Studies Project. The Pursuit of Excellence--Education and the Future of America. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1958.
- Ryan, Herber, and Philipine Crecelius. Ability Grouping in the Junior High School. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1927.
- Saylor, J. Galen, and William M. Alexander. Curriculum Planning for Modern Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Schoenfeld, Clarence, and Neil Schmitz. Year-Around Education. Madison: Dembar Educational Research Services, 1964.
- Shaplin, Judson, and Henry Olds, (ed.). Team Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Smith, Edward W., Stanley W. Krause, Jr., and M. M. Atkinson. The Educator's Encyclopedia. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Smith, William. The Junior High School. New York: MacMillan Company, 1927.
- Sullivan, Harry S. Conceptions of a Modern Psychiatry. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1947.
- Sumption, M. S. Three Hundred Gifted Children. Yonkers on the Hudson: World Book Company, 1941.
- Thelen, Herbert. Education and the Human Quest. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Van Til, William, Gordon F. Vars, and John H. Lounsbury. Modern Education for the Junior High School Years. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1961.
- Wiles, Kimball, and Franklin Patterson. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development of the Association of the National Education Association. The High School We Need. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1959.

Willis, Benjamin C. Report on the Progress of the Gifted Child to the Chicago Board of Education. Chicago: Chicago Teachers College, 1957.

Wilson, Howard E. Education for Citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

Woodring, Paul. A Fourth of a Nation. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1957.

B. PERIODICALS

Abramson, David A. "The Effectiveness of Grouping for Students of High Ability," Educational Research Bulletin, XXXVIII (October, 1959), 169-182.

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

Breidenstine, A. G. "The Educational Achievement of Pupils in Differentiated and Undifferentiated Groups," Journal of Experimental Education, V (September, 1936), 91-135.

Brahman, R. V. "Grouping in the Junior High School," National Education Association Journal, XLVIII (September, 1959), 22-23.

Bray, A. E. "Ability Grouping in Irvington, High School," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIV (October, 1962), 129-132.

Brown, Virginia. "The Problems of Grouping in the Social Studies; A Junior High School Teachers Viewpoint," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), 42-45.

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

Byers, L. "Ability Grouping: Help or Hindrance to Social and Emotional Growth?" School Review, LXIX (Winter, 1961), 449-456.

Cawelti, G. "Homogeneous Grouping Fills Individual Needs," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVII (March, 1963), 34-39.

- Clark, L. H. "Ability Grouping, A Third Look," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVII (December, 1963), 69-71.
- Clem, O. M., and L. F. Wroath. "Practices in Homogeneous Grouping in Junior High School," Educational Method, XIII (January, 1934), 206-210.
- Cooke, E. "Ability Grouping," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXVI (January, 1952), 79-93.
- Davis, O. L., Jr. "Grouping for Instruction: Some Perspective," Education Forum, XXIV (January, 1960), 209-216.
- Della-Dora, Delmo. "What Research Says About Grouping," Michigan Educational Journal, XXXVIII (April, 1960), 513-542.
- DeZafra, Carlos, Jr. "Homogeneous Grouping in the Social Studies," Social Education, IV (November, 1940), 495.
- Eales, J. R., Harold Read, and Claude Wilson. "Grouping Practices in the Secondary Schools of Los Angeles County," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), 54-57.
- Eash, M. J. "Grouping: What Have We Learned?" Educational Leadership, XVIII (April, 1961), 430.
- Ekstrom, Ruth B. "Experimental Studies of Homogeneous Grouping: A Critical Review," School Review, LXIX (Summer, 1961), 216-226.
- Essex, M. "How Good Is Ability Grouping?" National Parent Teacher, LIV (September, 1959), 14-16.
- Franseth, J. "Does Grouping Make a Difference?" Educational Digest, XXVIII (January, 1963), 15-17.
- Franseth, J. "Grouping Children for Instruction, A Conference Points the Way; Symposium," School Life, XLV (June, 1963), 5-12.
- French, J. W. "Evidence from School Records on the Effectiveness of Ability Grouping," Journal of Educational Research, LIV (November, 1960), 83-91.

- Gillespie, T. M. "What Recent Developments in Grouping Students for Effective Instruction?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIV (April, 1960), 49-60.
- Gilmore, I. "Grouping in Junior High School," Clearing House, XXXVII (November, 1962), 163-164.
- Gowan, May S., and others. "Symposium on Current Theory and Practice in Grouping of Pupils in Secondary Schools," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), 22-59.
- Gowan, M. "Why Homogeneous Grouping," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXX (January, 1955), 23.
- Gray, H. F. "What Recent Developments in Grouping Students for Effective Instruction?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLIV (April, 1960), 49-60.
- Gruhn, William T. "Representative Junior High School Research Studies," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (April, 1961), 366-367.
- Harrison, Sylvia E., and Robert J. Solomon. "Reviews of Research in the Teaching of Social Studies," Social Education, XXVIII (May, 1964), 288.
- Hartman, G. "The Next Step in Homogeneous Grouping," Educational Method, XII (December, 1933-34), 141-144.
- Hay, M. E. "Effective Learning Through Grouping in Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXII (January, 1957), 11-13.
- Herkner, M. W. "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (April, 1961), 59-64.
- Hills, James A., and others. "What Research Says About Nonpromotion," California Journal of Elementary Education, XXI (August, 1952), 7-24.
- Holmes, Henry W. "The Nation Challenges the Schools," Atlantic Monthly, CLXV (January, 1940), 21.
- Hood, C. E. "Do We Expect too Much From Ability Grouping?" Clearing House, XXXVIII (April, 1964), 467-470.

- Hughes, W. H. "Provisions for Individual Differences in High School Organization and Administration," Journal of Educational Research, V (January, 1922), 62-71.
- Hull, J. Dan. "Curricular Design-Strengths and Weaknesses of The Track System," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (April, 1961), 287.
- Humphrey, J. W. "Dexter Plan for Ability Grouping," Clearing House, XXXV (March, 1961), 423-426.
- Kaufman, Burt, and Paul Bethune. "Nova High--Space Age High School," Phi Delta Kappan, XLVI (September, 1964), 9-11.
- Lauchner, A. H. "A Study of Trends in Junior High School Practices in Twenty-Four States," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXV (December, 1951), 120-125.
- Lawson, Douglas. "An Analysis of Historic and Philosophic Consideration for Homogeneous Grouping," Educational Administration and Supervision, XLIII (May, 1957), 257-270.
- Matlon, John C. "The Advanced Placement Program in Edina-Morningside Senior High School," Social Education, XXIII (November, 1959), 323-326.
- Miller, W. S., and H. J. Otto. "Analysis of Experimental Studies in Homogeneous Grouping," Journal of Educational Research, XXI (February, 1930), 95-102.
- Mott, K. "Case for Ability Grouping," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (November, 1961), 52-62.
- Omans, A. C. "Provisions for Ability Grouping in Junior and Senior High School," American School Board Journal, XLV (October, 1922), 55-58.
- Passow, A. Harry. "The Maze of Research on Ability Grouping," Education Forum, XXVI (March, 1962), 281-288.
- Ramey, Arthur G. "A New Look at Ability Grouping in the Junior High School," California Journal of Secondary Education, XXXI (May, 1956), 289-291.
- Rankin, P. "Pupil Classification and Grouping," Review of Educational Research, I (June, 1931), 200-230.

- Reeve, William. "The Problems of Varying Abilities Among Students in Mathematics," The Education Digest, XXI (May, 1956), 430-431.
- Riley, Fay C. "Grouping Gives Each Child a Chance," Nations Schools, LVIII (August, 1956), 51-55.
- Rock, Robert T., Jr. "A Critical Study of Current Practices in Ability Grouping," Educational Research Bulletin, IV, nos. 5-6, 1929.
- Ross, W. C. "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (April, 1961), 59-64.
- Sand, Ole, and Richard I. Miller. "Curriculum Innovations," Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVII (May, 1963), 121-122.
- "Sectioning in High School," School and Society, LXXXVII (December, 1959), 518.
- Shores, J. Harlan. "What Does Research Say About Ability Grouping?" Illinois Education, XXVII (December, 1964), 169-172.
- Spain, C. H. "How Much Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLV (April, 1961), 59-64.
- Stimson, Paul, and Paul Petrick. "How Can Students Best Be Grouped for Teaching and Learning?" Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals, XLVI (September, 1962), 78-90.
- Symonds, P. "Mental Health Through Education," Progressive Education, XXVI (March, 1949), 145.
- "Teacher Opinion Poll," National Education Association Journal, L (April, 1961), 62.
- Tillman, Rodney. "Is Ability Grouping Taking Schools in the Wrong Direction?" Nations Schools, LXXIII (April, 1964), 70.
- Turney, A. H., and M. F. Hyde. "Attitude of Junior High School Pupils Toward Ability Grouping," School Review, XXXIX (October, 1931), 597-607.

- Turney, A. H. "Status of Ability Grouping," Educational Administration and Supervision, XVII (January, February, 1931), 21-42, 110-127.
- Wilhelms, Fred T., and Dorothy Westby-Gibson. "Grouping: Research Offers Leads," Educational Leadership, XVIII (April, 1961), 410-413.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- Bidna, David B. "Social Studies Programs for Academically Talented High School Students," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Southern California, 1961.
- Culbertson, W. P. "An Evaluation of an Accelerated Program in the Junior High School," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Maryland, 1961.
- French, W. W. "The Effectiveness of Ability Grouping in Seventh Grade Core Classes," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Kansas, 1962.
- Gruhn, W. T. "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, The University of North Carolina, 1940.
- Gruhn, William T., and Harl Douglass. A Survey of Practices in Junior High School. (Mimeographed.)
- Lambson, B. RG. "An Evaluation of Academic Placement Practices of Seventh Grade Students in a Santa Monica, California Junior High School," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Oregon State University, 1963.
- Leland, R. D. "Grouping Practices Providing Differentiated Education in California Junior High Schools," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Southern California, 1963.
- Lounsbury, John H. "The Role and Status of the Junior High School," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The George Peabody College for Teachers, 1954.
- Mahler, Fred L. "A Study of Achievement Differences in Selected Junior High School Gifted Students Heterogeneously or Homogeneously Grouped," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Houston, 1961.

- Martin, W. H. "The Results of Homogeneous Grouping in the Junior High School," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Yale University, 1927.
- Phillips, James Archibald, Jr. "Ability Grouping and Teacher Abilities: An Experimental Study of Junior High School Teachers and Their Commitment to Ability Grouping," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Michigan State University, 1961.
- Phillips, James E. "An Appraisal of Social Studies Instruction in Single and Double Periods, and in Core-Like and Non-Core Like Classes in Selected Junior and Senior High Schools of St. Paul, Minnesota," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Indiana, 1961.
- Purdom, T. L. "A Scientific Study to Determine the Value of Homogeneous Grouping Made on the Basis of Intelligence Tests," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Michigan, 1924.
- Saville, Anthony. "A Survey of Ability Grouping Programs in Missouri High Schools," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Missouri, 1961.
- Seagoe, May V. Research on Ability Grouping: A Critical Analysis. Guide for Study-Discussion, ASCD Convention 1957. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a Department of the National Education Association, 1957. (Mimeographed.)
- Severson, O. B. Jr. "A Study of Academic Achievement and Personal-Social Development of Junior High School Pupils as Affected by Ability Grouping," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Denver, 1956.
- Stoakes, D. W. "An Educational Experiment With the Homogeneous Grouping of Mentally Advanced and Slow Learning Students in the Junior High School," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Colorado, 1964.
- Tauber, Mildred Colter. "An Experimental Study of the Relationship Between Certain Selected Social and Emotional Factors and Ability Grouping of High School Students," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Northwestern University, 1962.
- Tidwell, Charles H. "A Study of Grouping Practices in Large American High Schools," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Nebraska, 1959.

Torgelson, J. W. "A Comparison of Homogeneous and Heterogeneous Grouping for Below-Average Junior High School Students," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, The University of Wisconsin, 1963.

Wilcox, J. "A Search for the Multiple Effects of Grouping Upon the Growth and Behavior of Junior High School Pupils," Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Cornell University, 1963.

Wilhelms, Fred T. The Nature of Classroom Grouping for Learning. Background for ASCD Discussion, ASCD, 1958. Washington, D.C.: a Department of the National Education Association, 1958. (Mimeographed.)

D. PUBLICATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT, LEARNED SOCIETIES,
AND OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

Ability Grouping. National Education Association Research Memo. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1962.

Administration: Procedures and School Practices for the Academically Talented Student in the Secondary School. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960.

Billett, R. O. "Provisions for Individual Differences, Marking, and Promotion," National Survey of Education Monograph. Bulletin No. 17. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1933.

Dean, Stuart E. Elementary School Organization and Administration. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 1960, No. 11. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

Ferriss, E. H., and others. The Rural Junior High School. Office of Education Bulletin 1928, No. 28. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

Jewett, Arno, J. Dan Hull, and others. Teaching Rapid and Slow Learners in High School. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 1954, No. 5. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1954.

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

Wright, Grace S., and Edith S. Greer. The Junior High School. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 1963, No. 32. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Wrightstone, J. Wayne. Classroom Organization for Instruction. What Research Says to the Teachers, No. 13. American Educational Research Association and Department of Classroom Teachers. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1957.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

INITIAL LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

DEPARTMENT OF
UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL

October 25, 1965

Dear Sir:

As Junior High School Principal and former social studies teacher and supervisor, I have long been interested in grouping practices in Junior high social studies. The need for research in this area has prompted me to select the topic, "Grouping Practices and Classroom Procedures in Junior High School Social Studies," for my Doctorate Dissertation at the University of Nebraska. The collection of data for this dissertation includes: An Administrator's Questionnaire, A Questionnaire for Teachers of Grouped and Non-Grouped Social Studies Classes, and Personal Visitations to Selected Schools. At this point I am requesting your cooperation in completing the Administrator's Questionnaire. It is hoped that the results of this study, can be used by schools to assess and improve their program.

I realize that the initial weeks of the new school year are particularly busy and thus I have waited until now to seek your help. The questionnaire is designed so that it may be answered with a minimum of time on your part. It deals specifically with your present grouping practices, and your candid observations and opinions about this problem.

The second stage of the study is a questionnaire directed to selected social studies teachers. This questionnaire will seek to identify the classroom practices and procedures used in grouped and non-grouped social studies classes. The final stage will involve a limited number of visitations to selected schools. Whether or not you are able to participate in the later phases of this study, I hope you will complete and return the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest convenience. All information obtained will be kept in the strictest confidence.

Because your cooperation and assistance at this time is essential to the successful completion of this study, a prompt return of the questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. I thank you very much for your cooperation in filling out and returning the enclosed material.

Sincerely,

Ronald G. Joekel
Assistant Principal
University High School

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNED BY JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

SURVEY OF GROUPING PRACTICES IN JUNIOR
HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES CLASSES

240

The following questionnaire seeks information about grouping practices in junior high school social studies. It contains questions about your social studies curriculum, administrative provisions for grouping students in these classes, and your professional opinion about grouping practices. For the purposes of this study, "grouping" is defined as the process of placing students in similar groups on the basis of some predetermined criteria. When the questionnaire is completed, please return it in the self-addressed, stamped envelope to RON JOEKEL, UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

Name of Person Completing Questionnaire: _____

Position: _____ Enrollment: Grade 7 _____

Name of School: _____ Grade 8 _____

Address: _____ Grade 9 _____

City, State: _____ Total _____

1. Do you practice some form of grouping in your social studies classes?
Grade 7 ____Yes ____No Grade 8 ____Yes ____No Grade 9 ____Yes ____No
2. Do you employ any form of block-time or multiple-period classes which combine the Language Arts--Social Studies instruction under one teacher in an extended period of time?
Grade 7 ____Yes ____No Grade 8 ____Yes ____No Grade 9 ____Yes ____No
3. If you utilize any form of block-time instruction, does this practice alter the composition of your grouped classes?
____Yes Explain: _____
____No _____

4. Whether or not you employ any form of grouping in your junior high school social studies classes (include multiple-period classes) please complete parts a and b on this item.

a. Please indicate what you believe to be the chief advantages of grouping.

b. Please indicate what you believe to be the chief disadvantages of grouping.

5. The primary reason(s) your school does not practice any form of grouping in junior high social studies classes are: (If your school employs grouping, omit)
- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

If you DO NOT group, please turn to page 3 and complete questions numbers 16-19 inclusive and the chart on the last page of this questionnaire.

If your school DOES employ grouping please complete all the remaining items.

6. Which of the following grouping plans do you use?
- ___a. "Track" or curriculum areas (honors, college prep., etc.)
- ___b. Grouping by subjects (English, Social Studies, Math, etc.)
- ___c. Others (specify) _____

7. Have you encountered any major administrative problems as a result of your decision to practice grouping in your social studies classes?
- ___Yes Explain: _____
- ___No _____
- _____
- _____

8. What criteria or evidence do you use to determine the membership of your required social studies classes? Please list these items in their order of importance.

Criteria	Approximate Percentage Weight Attached to This Item
(1) _____	. . . _____
(2) _____	. . . _____
(3) _____	. . . _____
(4) _____	. . . _____
(5) _____	. . . _____
(6) _____	. . . _____
(7) _____	. . . _____

9. How are your junior high school social studies teachers assigned to their classes? (more than one response may be checked)

- ___a. Teaches only grouped classes at one level
- ___b. Teaches only heterogeneous groups
- ___c. Teaches grouped classes at two or more levels
- ___d. Teaches heterogeneous and grouped classes
- ___e. Other (specify) _____

10. Do you have any particular policy for assigning teachers to the different groups in your junior high social studies classes?

___Yes Explain: _____

___No _____

11. Are students transferred from one group to another during the semester?
☐ Yes If yes, explain criteria used: _____
☐ No

 12. Approximately how many social studies students have you transferred from one level to another during the current school year? _____ number.
 13. Have you secured any evidence that indicates grouping of students in your social studies classes has resulted in higher achievement or improved classroom performance?
☐ Yes Explain: _____
☐ No

 14. Based on your observations of students, do you believe the criticism that grouping promotes conceit and snobbery in rapid learners is valid?
☐ Yes If yes, explain why: _____
☐ No

 15. In your experiences with grouping, do you believe grouping stigmatizes or brands students as dull, average, or bright?
☐ Yes Explain: _____
☐ No

-
16. Would you be willing to participate further in this study by giving your permission to send questionnaires to all or selected social studies teachers in your school?
☐ Yes ☐ No
 17. If yes, please enclose a roster of your junior high social studies teachers with the questionnaire. Any duplicated list, schedule with teachers named, etc. will serve this purpose. Any designation of Miss, Mrs. or Mr. by the teachers name will be most helpful.
 18. The final phase of this study involves a personal visit to a limited number of selected schools. If your school were selected, would you give your permission for the researcher to visit one day with the social studies teachers in your building? The visits are tentatively scheduled for early in the spring semester and would require no more than one hour with each teacher.
☐ Yes ☐ No
 19. Is it necessary to contact anyone else to obtain permission to visit selected teachers in your school?
☐ Yes If yes, please enclose their names, title, and address:
☐ No
 Name: _____
 Title: _____
 Address: _____

20.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Please write in the space provided the name of the social studies courses for each grade level, whether it is required or elective, the number of levels, the name of each level, the number of class sections for each level, and the average class size of each level. (an example is given for grade 7)

Grade	Name of Course	Required (R) or Elective (E)	Number of Levels	Name of Levels	Number of Sections	Average Class Size of Each Level	Comments
7	American Studies	R	3	Advanced Average Slow	6 10 4	28 31 25	
8							
9							

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW UP LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
TEACHERS COLLEGE
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA 68508

245

DEPARTMENT OF
UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL

Dear Sir:

Late in October I sent a number of questionnaires concerning grouping practices in junior high school social studies to selected junior high school principals. The need for research in this area has been re-emphasized by the number of personal notes and comments from principals who have returned the questionnaire. Although the cooperation of principals in completing and returning the questionnaire has been gratifying, I hope to make the research as valid as I can by including as many schools as possible.

I realize that as an administrator your time is valuable and therefore the questionnaire may have been placed at the bottom of the pile. Some may have been overlooked or dumped as "junk" mail--of which we all get plenty. Needless to say, it is very important to me that I get as many returns as possible to provide sound data.

Would it be possible for you to complete the questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience in the self-addressed, stamped envelope? Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Respectfully,

Enclosures (2)

self-addressed envelope
questionnaire

Ronald G. Joekel
Assistant Principal
University High School
University of Nebraska

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO SELECTED JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL
SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA
TEACHERS COLLEGE
LINCOLN, NEBRASKA 68508

247

DEPARTMENT OF
UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL

Dear _____,

As Junior High School Principal and former social studies teacher and supervisor, I have long been interested in grouping practices in junior high school social studies. The need for research in this area has prompted me to select the topic, "Grouping Practices and Classroom Procedures in Junior High School Social Studies," for my Doctorate Dissertation at the University of Nebraska.

Your principal has re-emphasized the need for research in this area by previously completing a questionnaire on your schools grouping or non-grouping practices. He has identified you as a teacher of social studies who would contribute valuable data for this study. I realize you are on a tight time schedule, but I believe that as a professional teacher you are aware of the need for research in this area. Only with your cooperation can the data be gathered which will serve to give a comprehensive picture of classroom practices in junior high school social studies.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. If you are a teacher in a junior high school that does not group in social studies, complete the questionnaire as it applies to all classes you teach in social studies.
2. If you are a teacher in a junior high school that does practice grouping in social studies, it is of extreme importance that you confine your answers only to the level specified below. If you do not confine your answers only to this level but generalize for all levels you teach, the data will not be valid for comparative purposes.

ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE ONLY AS IT PERTAINS TO THE

_____ GROUPS YOU TEACH IN THE SUBJECT _____.

Because your cooperation and assistance at this time is essential to the successful completion of this study, a prompt return of the questionnaire in the stamped, self-addressed envelope will be appreciated. No attempt will be made to evaluate individual teaching practices and your replies will be held in the strictest confidence. I thank you very much for your cooperation in filling out and returning the enclosed material.

Sincerely,

Ronald G. Joekel
Assistant Principal
University High School
Lincoln, Nebraska.

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE RETURNED BY JUNIOR HIGH
SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

In responding to the items on this questionnaire, it is extremely important that you report what you actually do in your classes, even though it may not be what you prefer to do or what you think you should do. The results will be most valid if you can limit your responses to your experiences, divorced from opinions of your colleagues or other persons. You can make a definite contribution by a frank appraisal of existing conditions and practices. No attempt will be made to evaluate individual teaching practices and your replies will be held in the strictest confidence. When the questionnaire is completed, return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope to RON JOEKEL, UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. If you are a teacher in a junior high school that does not group in the social studies, answer the questionnaire as it applies to all your classes. Please complete page 1 and part A on questions numbers 4-11 inclusive, as well as completing page 6. You may omit part B on questions number 4-11.
2. If you teach social studies in a junior high school that does practice grouping, answer page 1 and parts A and B on questions numbers 4-11 inclusive as well as completing page 6. Confine your answers only to the _____ groups you teach in _____ DO NOT generalize for all levels but report only what you do with the above level.

1. Name: _____ Degrees Held: _____
School: _____ City & State: _____
Total Years Experience Teaching Social Studies Classes: _____

2. List the number of semester credit hours you have completed at the undergrad and graduate level in the following areas: (use 2/3 to convert quarter hours to semester hours)

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>	<u>GRADUATE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Anthropology	_____	_____	
Economics	_____	_____	
Geography	_____	_____	
History	_____	_____	
Political Science	_____	_____	
Psychology	_____	_____	
Sociology	_____	_____	

3. List specific courses, if any, you have taken that prepared you or have given you assistance in teaching the level for which you are answering this questionnaire. _____

In what way have these courses been beneficial for your classes at this level? (an example might be greater insight into the instructional techniques for slow, gifted, etc.) _____

SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

In responding to the items on this questionnaire, it is extremely important that you report what you actually do in your classes, even though it may not be what you prefer to do or what you think you should do. The results will be most valid if you can limit your responses to your experiences, divorced from opinions of your colleagues or other persons. You can make a definite contribution by a frank appraisal of existing conditions and practices. No attempt will be made to evaluate individual teaching practices and your replies will be held in the strictest confidence. When the questionnaire is completed, return it in the stamped, self-addressed envelope to RON JOEKEL, UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL, LINCOLN, NEBRASKA.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. If you are a teacher in a junior high school that does not group in the social studies, answer the questionnaire as it applies to all your classes. Please complete page 1 and part A on questions numbers 4-11 inclusive, as well as completing page 6. You may omit part B on questions number 4-11.
2. If you teach social studies in a junior high school that does practice grouping, answer page 1 and parts A and B on questions numbers 4-11 inclusive as well as completing page 6. Confine your answers only to the _____ groups you teach in _____. DO NOT generalize for all levels but report only what you do with the above level.

1. Name: _____ Degrees Held: _____
School: _____ City & State: _____
Total Years Experience Teaching Social Studies Classes: _____

2. List the number of semester credit hours you have completed at the undergraduate and graduate level in the following areas: (use 2/3 to convert quarter hours to semester hours)

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>UNDERGRADUATE</u>	<u>GRADUATE</u>	<u>COMMENTS</u>
Anthropology	_____	_____	
Economics	_____	_____	
Geography	_____	_____	
History	_____	_____	
Political Science	_____	_____	
Psychology	_____	_____	
Sociology	_____	_____	

3. List specific courses, if any, you have taken that prepared you or have given you assistance in teaching the level for which you are answering this questionnaire. _____

In what way have these courses been beneficial for your classes at this level? (an example might be greater insight into the instructional techniques for slow, gifted, etc.) _____

4. A. What basic organization and types of approaches do you use in teaching the specific level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as chronological, topical, problem, unit, contract, chapter, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same type of organization or approaches for other levels you teach? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Please explain what variations are made:

5. A. What methods do you generally or frequently use in teaching the specific level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as lecture, recitation, teacher or pupil-led discussion, group or individual activities, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same types of methods for other levels you teach?
☐ Yes ☐ No
Please explain how the use of these methods vary for other levels you teach:

6. A. Please explain the specific materials and resources you use in teaching the level for which you are answering this questionnaire. (such as textbooks, supplementary materials, reference books, multi-texts, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same materials for other levels you teach? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Please explain what variations in materials you make and how you use them:

7. A. What primary procedures do you use for evaluation in teaching the specific level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as types of tests, written assignments, oral reports, standardized tests, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same evaluative activities for other levels?
☐ Yes ☐ No
In what way do you vary the evaluative activities for other levels?

8. A. What do you consider to be the most important social studies skills that you attempt to develop in the level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as critical thinking; human relations; skill in reading, writing, speaking and listening; sense of place and space, sense of time and chronology, etc.)

What kinds of specialized activities do you engage in to develop these skills?

- * B. Do you try to develop the same skills for the other levels you teach?
_____ Yes _____ No
Describe in what ways you attempt to provide for different attainment of these skills:

9. In what ways does emphasis on content for the level you are answering this questionnaire differ from that ordinarily taught in your other levels? (examples might be fewer topics but greater depth or more generalizations and less abstractions, etc.)

10. A. What major kinds of group and individual activities do you use in teaching the level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as panels, debates, committees, field trips, reports, research, individual projects, required reading, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same group and individual activities for other levels?
 Yes No
How do you vary the nature and use of these activities for other levels?

11. A. What use do you make of unique audio-visual activities in teaching the level for which you are answering this questionnaire? (such as films, tapes, records, overhead projectors, television, graphs, charts, etc.)

- * B. Do you use the same audio-visual activities for other levels you teach?
 Yes No
What variations do you make of these?

12. A. From your experiences indicate what you believe to be the chief advantages of grouping:

B. From your experiences indicate what you believe to be the chief disadvantages of grouping:

13. From your experiences, what suggestions would you have for improving grouping practices and procedures in your school?

14. In the space below, please comment on what suggestions you would make for assisting teachers to improve their instructional skills in the level for which you are answering this questionnaire.

APPENDIX F

FOLLOW UP LETTER TO SOCIAL
STUDIES TEACHERS

DEPARTMENT OF
UNIVERSITY HIGH SCHOOL

Dear Social Studies Teacher,

Early in January I sent a number of questionnaires concerning junior high school social studies to selected social studies teachers identified by their principals. The need for research in the area of grouping and organizing classes for instruction was previously emphasized by the principals who also completed a questionnaire. Seventy-two per cent of those principals contacted, responded to the questionnaire. I hope to make the research as valid as I can and sincerely hope to obtain a teacher response similar to the principals.

I realize that you have been very busy with semester examinations, grades, and the beginning of a new semester and therefore may have placed the previous questionnaire at the bottom of the pile or overlooked it. Needless to say, it is very important to me that I get as many returns as possible to provide sound data.

Would it be possible for you to complete the questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience in the self-addressed, stamped envelope? Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Respectfully,

Enclosures (2)

self-addressed envelope
questionnaire

Ronald G. Joekel
Assistant Principal
University High School
University of Nebraska

APPENDIX G

LIST OF 350 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS
INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

LIST OF 350 JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Arvada	Colorado	Arvada
Arvada	"	Drake
Arvada	"	*North Arvada
Aurora	"	North
Aurora	"	South
Aurora	"	West
Boulder	"	Base Line
Boulder	"	Casey
Boulder	"	Centennial
Boulder	"	Southern Hills
Broomfield	"	Broomfield
Canon City	"	Canon City
Colorado Springs	"	East
Colorado Springs	"	Horace Mann
Colorado Springs	"	North
Colorado Springs	"	South
Commerce City	"	Kearney
Conifer	"	West Jefferson
Craig	"	Craig
Denver	"	*Alameda
Denver	"	Baker
Denver	"	Belmont
Denver	"	Byers
Denver	"	Cole
Denver	"	Coronado Hills
Denver	"	Gove
Denver	"	Grant
Denver	"	Hill
Denver	"	Kepner
Denver	"	Kunsmiller
Denver	"	Lake
Denver	"	Morey
Durango	"	Smiley
Englewood	"	Charles B. Sinclair
Evergreen	"	Evergreen
Faountain	"	Fountain
Ft. Carson	"	Carson
Ft. Collins	"	Leshner
Ft. Collins	"	Lincoln
Golden	"	Bell
Golden	"	Golden
Greeley	"	Evans
Grand Junction	"	Grand Junction

*Indicates schools visited

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Ignacio	Colorado	Ignacio
Lakewood	"	Lakewood
La Porte	"	Cache La Poudre
La Salle	"	Valley
Leadville	"	Leadville
Littleton	"	Euclid
Littleton	"	Grant
Longmont	"	Longmont
Loveland	"	Loveland
Mead	"	Mead
Morrison	"	Morrison Red Rocks
Pueblo	"	Corwin
Pueblo	"	Freed
Pueblo	"	James Risley
Pueblo	"	John Keating
Pueblo	"	Lemuel Pitts
Pueblo	"	W. H. Heaton
Security	"	Sproul
Security	"	Watson
Timnath	"	Timnath
Vineland	"	Vineland
Westminister	"	Shaw Heights
Wheat Ridge	"	Wheat Ridge
Windsor	"	Windsor
Ames	Iowa	Central
Ames	"	Welch
Burlington	"	Horace Mann
Burlington	"	Oak
Cedar Falls	"	Cedar Falls Peet
Cedar Rapids	"	Franklin
Cedar Rapids	"	Roosevelt
Cedar Rapids	"	Woodrow Wilson
Charles City	"	Charles City
Clarion	"	Clarion
Estherville	"	Estherville
Ft. Dodge	"	Ft. Dodge South
Council Bluffs	"	Bloomer
Council Bluffs	"	Longfellow
Creston	"	Creston
Davenport	"	Frank Smart
Davenport	"	J. B. Young
Davenport	"	Northwest Williams
Davenport	"	Sudlow
Des Moines	"	Amos Hiatt
Des Moines	"	Ben Franklin
Des Moines	"	James Callanan.

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Des Moines	Iowa	May Goodrell
Des Moines	*	Nathan Weeks
Des Moines	"	Woodrow Wilson
Des Moines	"	Woodside-Saydel
Dubuque	"	Jefferson
Dubuque	"	Washington
Kellogg	"	Kellogg
Keokuk	"	Keokuk
Knoxville	"	Nell McGowen
Marble Rock	"	Marble Rock
Marshalltown	"	Central
Mason City	"	Monroe
Mason City	"	Roosevelt
Newton	"	Newton
Oelwein	"	Oelwein
Ottumwa	"	Evans
Ottumwa	"	Franklin
Rinard	"	Cedar Valley
Rudd	"	Rudd
Sioux City	"	East
Sioux City	"	North
Sioux City	"	West
Sioux City	"	Woodrow Wilson
Stanley	"	Stanley
Waterloo	"	Edison
Waterloo	"	McKinstry
Waterloo	"	West
Webster City	"	Webster City
West Burlington	"	West Burlington
West Des Moines	"	Stillwell
Arkansas City	Kansas	Arkansas City
Augusta	"	Augusta
Chanute	"	Chanute
Coffeyville	"	Roosevelt
Derby	"	Carlton
Dodge City	"	Dodge City
El Dorado	"	El Dorado
Emporia	"	Lowther
Fort Scott	"	Central
Fredonia	"	Fredonia
Great Bend	"	Harrison
Hutchinson	"	Central
Junction City	"	Junction City
Kansas City	"	Arrowhead
Kansas City	"	*Central

*Indicates schools visited

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Kansas City	Kansas	Coronado
Kansas City	"	Highland
Kansas City	"	Pierson
Kansas City	"	West
Lawrence	"	West
Leavenworth	"	Leavenworth
Marysville	"	Marysville
McPherson	"	McPherson
Newton	"	Chisholm
Newton	"	Santa Fe
Oakley	"	Oakley
Olathe	"	Olathe
Parsons	"	Parsons
Pittsburg	"	Roosevelt
Salina	"	Roosevelt-Lincoln
Salina	"	Salina South
Shawnee Mission	"	Broadmoor
Shawnee Mission	"	Hillcrest
Shawnee Mission	"	Hocker Grove
Shawnee Mission	"	Meadowbrook
Shawnee Mission	"	Old Mission
Topeka	"	Boswell
Topeka	"	Capper
Topeka	"	Curtis
Topeka	"	East Topeka
Topeka	"	Holliday
Topeka	"	Roosevelt
Wellington	"	Summer
Wichita	"	Allison
Wichita	"	Hamilton
Wichita	"	Jardine
Wichita	"	Marshall
Wichita	"	Pleasant Valley
Wichita	"	Robinson
Wichita	"	Roosevelt
Wichita	"	Truesdell
Alexandria	Minnesota	Central
Anoka	"	Coon Rapids
Anoka	"	Anoka
Austin	"	Austin Ellis
Bemidji	"	Bemidji
Brainerd	"	Franklin
Chisholm	"	Chisholm
Cokato	"	All District
Detroit Lakes	"	Holmes
Duluth	"	Lincoln

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Duluth	Minnesota	Ordean
Duluth	"	Woodland
Eden Prairie	"	Eden Prairie
Edina-Morningside	"	Edina
Elk River	"	Elk River
Ely	"	Washington
Fairmont	"	Fairmont
Faribault	"	Faribault
Fergus Falls	"	Washington
Fridley	"	Fridley
Grand Rapids	"	Grand Rapids
Hopkins	"	South
Hutchinson	"	Hutchinson
International Falls	"	Backus
International Falls	"	Falls
Little Falls	"	Little Falls
Mankato	"	Franklin
Mankato	"	Lincoln
Minneapolis	"	Anthony
Minneapolis	"	Bryant
Minneapolis	"	Folwell
Minneapolis	"	Franklin
Minneapolis	"	Jordan
Minneapolis	"	Lincoln
Minneapolis	"	Nokomis
Minneapolis	"	Northeast
Minneapolis	"	Olson
Minneapolis	"	Phillips
Minneapolis	"	Ramsey
Minneapolis	"	Sanford
Minneapolis	"	Sheridan
Minnetonka	"	East
Minnetonka	"	West
Moorhead	"	South
Mound	"	Grandview
Mounds View	"	Edgewood
Mounds View	"	Johanna
Nashwauk-Keewatin	"	Nashwauk
North St. Paul	"	Glenn
North St. Paul	"	Maplewood
Osseo	"	Brooklyn
Proctor	"	A. I. Jedlicka
Richfield	"	West
Robbinsdale	"	Hosterman
Robbinsdale	"	Robbinsdale
Rochester	"	Central
Rochester	"	Kellogg

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Roseville	Minnesota	Fairview
St. Cloud	"	South
St. James	"	St. James
St. Louis Park	"	Central
St. Louis Park	"	Westwood
St. Paul	"	Como Park
St. Paul	"	Mounds Park
St. Paul	"	Roosevelt
St. Paul	"	Hazel Park
St. Paul	"	Marshall
Sauk Rapids	"	Sauk Rapids
South St. Paul	"	South St. Paul
Stillwater	"	Stillwater
Tower-Soudan	"	Soudan
Wayzata	"	Wayzata
West St. Paul	"	Grass
White Bear Lake	"	Sunrise Park
Winona	"	Central
Winona	"	Jefferson
Winona	"	Washington-Kosciusko
Worthington	"	Worthington
Belton	Missouri	Belton
Berkeley	"	Berkeley
Clinton	"	Clinton
Columbia	"	West
De Soto	"	De Soto
Doniphan	"	Doniphan
Excelsior Springs	"	Lewis
Farmington	"	Farmington
Ferguson	"	Ferguson
Ferguson	"	Florissant
Festus	"	Festus
Grandview	"	Grandview
Jackson	"	Jackson
Jennings	"	Fairview
Jennings	"	Jennings
Independence	"	Palmer
Kansas City	"	Center North
Kansas City	"	Center South
Kansas City	"	Central
Kansas City	"	Geo. Caleb Bingham
Kansas City	"	Northwest
Kansas City	"	Southwest
Kirkwood	"	Nipher

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
Kirkwood	Missouri	North Kirkwood
Lee's Summit	"	Lee's Summit
Lebanon	"	Wallace
Lindbergh	"	Lindbergh
Lindbergh	"	North
Ladue	"	East Ladue
Ladue	"	West Ladue
O'Fallon	"	Fort Zumwalt
Parkville	"	Park Hill
Pattonville	"	Holman
Parkway	"	Central
Parkway	"	South
Potosi	"	Potosi
Raytown	"	Raytown
Raytown	"	*South
Ritenour	"	Ritenour
Rolla	"	Rolla
Salem	"	Salem
Sikeston	"	Sikeston
Steele	"	South Pemiscot
Thayer	"	Thayer
University City	"	Hanley
Waynesville	"	Wood
Webster Grove	"	Plymouth
West Plains	"	Central
Alliance	Nebraska	Alliance
Auburn	"	Auburn
Beatrice	"	Beatrice
Bellevue	"	Bellevue
Columbus	"	Columbus
Crete	"	*Crete
Gering	"	Gering
Grand Island	"	Barr
Grand Island	"	Walnut
Hastings	"	Hastings
Holdrege	"	Holdrege
Lexington	"	Lexington
Lincoln	"	Culler
Lincoln	"	Dawes
Lincoln	"	Everett
Lincoln	"	Irving
Lincoln	"	Millard Lefler
Lincoln	"	Whittier
McCook	"	McCook
Minden	"	Minden
Nebraska City	"	*Nebraska City
North Platte	"	Adams

*Indicates schools visited

<u>City</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Junior High School</u>
North Platte	Nebraska	Madison
Ogallala	"	Ogallala
Omaha	"	Bryan
Omaha Westside	"	Arbor Heights
Omaha Westside	"	Valley View
Omaha Westside	"	Westbrook
Ralston	"	Ralston
Scottsbluff	"	Scottsbluff
Sidney	"	Sidney
Seward	"	Seward
Aberdeen	South Dakota	Monroe
Aberdeen	"	Simmons
Belle Fourche	"	Roosevelt
Brookings	"	Brookings
Huron	"	Huron
Pierre	"	Pierre
Rapid City	"	North
Rapid City	"	South
Rapid City	"	West
Sioux Falls	"	Axtell
Sioux Falls	"	Whittier
Sturgis	"	Sturgis
Watertown	"	Watertown
Yankton	"	Yankton
Casper	Wyoming	Dean Morgan
Casper	"	East
Cheyenne	"	Carey
Cheyenne	"	Johnson
Cheyenne	"	McCormick
Riverton	"	Riverton
Torrington	"	Torrington
Worland	"	Worland