

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This was produced from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure you of complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark it is an indication that the film inspector noticed either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, or duplicate copy. Unless we meant to delete copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed, you will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed the photographer has followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For any illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and tipped into your xerographic copy. Requests can be made to our Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases we have filmed the best available copy.

**University  
Microfilms  
International**

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106  
18 BEDFORD ROW, LONDON WC1R 4EJ, ENGLAND

7906226

KOLOWSKI, RICHARD LEE  
THE EFFECTS OF AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES  
PHILOSOPHY AND CURRICULUM RATIONALE  
STATEMENTS UPON SELECTED NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY  
SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SOCIAL  
STUDIES STUDENTS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA - LINCOLN, PH.D.,  
1978

University  
Microfilms  
International

300 N. ZEEB ROAD, ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

THE EFFECTS OF AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES PHILOSOPHY AND CURRICULUM  
RATIONALE STATEMENTS UPON SELECTED NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY SECONDARY  
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENTS

by

Richard Lee Kolowski

A DISSERTATION

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College in the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Secondary Education

Under the Supervision of Associate Professor Ronald G. Joeke1  
and Professor Willis D. Moreland

Lincoln, Nebraska

August, 1978

**TITLE**

**THE EFFECTS OF AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES PHILOSOPHY AND CURRICULUM  
RATIONALE STATEMENTS UPON SELECTED NEBRASKA UNIVERSITY SECONDARY  
TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM SOCIAL STUDIES STUDENTS**

**BY**

**Richard Lee Kolowski**

**APPROVED**

**DATE**

**Ronald G. Joeke1**

**August 3, 1978**

**Willis D. Moreland**

**August 3, 1978**

**Udo H. Jansen**

**August 3, 1978**

**James O'Hanlon**

**August 3, 1978**

**SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE**

**GRADUATE COLLEGE**

**UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writing of this paper was not simply the result of a concentrated year of study on a sabbatical leave. In reality it is the culmination of a short lifetime of contact with many teachers, preachers and significant others who had cared enough to touch my life and share themselves with me in my own quest for understanding. To my Creator, the Maker of all life, I am thankful for the opportunities placed before me and for the directions they have led me.

I am especially indebted to many individuals over the last year who helped to make the year a tremendous learning experience. Some of them are:

Ron JoekeI - whose direction on the writing of this paper was most appreciated and whose sound advice over the years has proven very accurate.

Will Moreland - my academic advisor, whose advice and brilliant classroom example has assisted in guiding me through six growth years at UN-L.

Udo Jansen and Jim O'Hanlon - the remainder of my supervisory committee, who supported and encouraged me throughout this process.

Clarice Ramsey and Bill O'Rourke - my friends and teaching colleagues whose support and listening helped me through many dark hours of the past year.

Wayne Glidden - my long time friend, who did so much to help me dream dreams I never thought possible for me.

My Mother and Father who gave me life - especially to my Mother, Edith Mae Gunn, whose lessons on perseverance and love will stay with me for the rest of my life, and also to my Stepfather, Harold Gunn, who taught me more than he will ever realize.

It is to my best friend and wife, Bonnie and to our son, Jason, that I thankfully dedicate this work. To Bonnie, whose love, encouragement, counsel and trust did so much to get me through this year as she has through the past twelve years. To Jason, whose color crayons, building blocks and other tools of the world of a two-year-old combined with loving hugs to help me keep all things in their true and proper perspective. They are my reasons for living, loving, and learning.

R. L. Kolowski

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION. . . . .	1
Background and Need for the Study . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem. . . . .	7
Research Hypotheses . . . . .	7
Definition of Terms. . . . .	8
Assumptions . . . . .	11
Limitations . . . . .	12
Organization. . . . .	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITEARATURE. . . . .	14
Introduction. . . . .	14
Educational Philosophy in General . . . . .	14
A Definition of Social Studies. . . . .	18
Programs in Social Studies Teacher Education. . . . .	26
Related Social Studies Documents. . . . .	34
Instruments Valuable in Social Studies	
Education Research. . . . .	40
Educational Values Inventory (EVI). . . . .	40
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale . . . . .	43
Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory. . . . .	51
Interaction Analysis System . . . . .	53
Summary . . . . .	59
III. CONDUCT OF THE STUDY. . . . .	60
Introduction. . . . .	60
Hypotheses. . . . .	60
Design of the Study . . . . .	61
Population and Sampling . . . . .	62
Treatment . . . . .	63
Collection of Data. . . . .	64
Data Analysis . . . . .	68
Summary of the Chapter. . . . .	70
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	72
Introduction. . . . .	72
Statistical Tests of the Hypotheses . . . . .	75
Post Hoc Comparison of Means. . . . .	80
Educational Values Inventory. . . . .	81
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E . . . . .	81
Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory. . . . .	82
Interaction Analysis System . . . . .	82
Summary . . . . .	84

CHAPTER	PAGE
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. . . . .	86
Summary . . . . .	86
The Problem . . . . .	87
The Hypotheses. . . . .	87
The Review of Research and Literature . . . . .	88
The Procedures. . . . .	89
The Findings. . . . .	90
Conclusions . . . . .	90
Implications and Recommendations. . . . .	94
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	97
APPENDIX A - NUSTEP Information. . . . .	109
APPENDIX B - Experimental Group Information. . . . .	123
APPENDIX C - NUSTEP Students: Group, Age, Sex, and Setting. . . . .	133
APPENDIX D - Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B . . . . .	136
APPENDIX E - Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E . . . . .	145
APPENDIX F - A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers . . . . .	152
APPENDIX G - Interaction Analysis System . . . . .	159
APPENDIX H - Data Collected on Control and Experimental Groups . . . . .	163



## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
2.1 Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines . . . . .	36
2.2 Summary of Categories for Interaction Analysis . . . . .	56
3.1 Experimental Group Meeting Dates, Times and Topics . . . . .	65
4.1 Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control Group Scores on the Educational Values Inventory . . . . .	75
4.2 Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control Group Scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale. . . . .	76
4.3 t-Test of Experimental and Control Group Scores on the Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers . . . . .	77
4.4 Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control Group Scores on the Interaction Analysis . . . . .	78
4.5 Post Hoc Comparisons of Means. . . . .	80

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE STUDY

The American educational system has rarely been without its critics. These critics have tried to show us the system's faults and suggest recommendations for correcting the situations as they have observed them. Few individuals have had the sweeping impact that Silberman has had in his book, Crisis in the Classroom. Silberman's major premise is summarized in the following quotation from his book:

. . . . What is wrong with elementary and secondary education . . . has been less to do with incompetence or indifference or venality than with mindlessness.<sup>1</sup>

Silberman defined this mindlessness as:

. . . the failure or refusal to think seriously about educational purpose, the reluctance to question established practice . . . .<sup>2</sup>

He concluded this critique of his observations by stating his opinion as to the educational profession's lack of solid foundations:

If mindlessness is the central problem, the solution must lie in infusing the various educating institutions with purpose, more important, with thought about purpose and about ways in which techniques, content, and organization fulfill or alter purpose . . . . We must find ways of stimulating educators--public school teachers, principals, and superintendents; college

---

<sup>1</sup>Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

professors, deans, and presidents . . . to think about what they are doing, and why they are doing it. And we must persuade the general public to do the same.<sup>3</sup>

The social studies profession itself is not without its own internal critics who have voiced a position similar to Silberman's. Gross gave the profession his diagnosis in the Winter, 1976 edition of the Social Studies Supervisors' Association Newsletter. In this inhouse evaluation he completed his list of fifteen factors currently disturbing the social studies profession with the following:

Lastly, I wish to challenge the relativism that we have let sap our "convincability." In the name of objectivity, we have allowed a kind of neutral leukemia to take hold in our classrooms wherein the boys and girls are lead to wonder if we stand for anything and if anything is worth standing for. I am of the opinion that these and other such basic qualities need to be carefully built back into our programs. The failure to maintain ethical value-oriented emphasis in the social studies where youth may come to understand why they hold certain beliefs inviolate and how to work to extend them, as well as gain the strength to stick by them when need be, may, indeed, for young people and the nation, let alone ourselves, be the greatest of our failure in mounting a viable program of social education that is worthy of maintenance.<sup>4</sup>

The social studies profession again heard from Gross in the March, 1977 edition of Social Education, where he reported the findings of his national survey of the status of the social studies in the United States. Gross condemned the social studies profession for its lack of a basic social studies framework in the following quotation:

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Richard E. Gross, "The Social Studies in Their Golden Years: An Inhouse Medical Assay," Social Studies Supervisors' Association Newsletter, 5 (Winter, 1976).

Are there not some unique insights about human beings and democratic society that should accrue through social education? Are there not some essential competencies that the social studies experience should help develop? Are there not key shared values of the culture that the socio-civic curriculum needs to help maintain and extend? Lewenstein and Tretten, previously cited, came to the discouraging conclusion in their research that social studies teachers "have given up on any attempt to agree on what their students should learn." If this situation cannot be reversed, we are in a hopeless situation.<sup>5</sup>

Gross concluded his survey with the projection as to the two possible future directions the field of social studies education may take in the future. He stated:

One possible future includes a steadily declining curriculum field, diffused and balkanized, often turning backwards and up panacea alleys, increasingly delimited because of its own lack of purpose and direction and by the failure to agree upon a core of socio-civic learnings. It is staffed by personnel who seem to have little professional concern or elan, let alone much faith in what they are doing, who have lost the vision and the will to forge a comprehensive and articulated social studies program functioning at the heart of a liberating education for young Americans.

Another option promises renewed and unified efforts at convincingly defining the fundamental contributions of the field toward helping meet essential individual and societal needs. In this future, teachers, parents, and concerned civic organizations and agencies collaborate in developing efficacious programs which can be evaluated, and in extending timely offerings which attract pupil popularity and increasing enrollment. This surge of interest reflects the enthusiasm of mentors who know where they are headed and why, for they are certain that the social studies are more basic to the maintenance

---

<sup>5</sup>Richard E. Gross, "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 200.

and extension of democratic values and to the future of this nation than is any other disciplinary area.<sup>6</sup>

A more recent and not less critical condemnation of the social studies profession came from the 1976 National Council for the Social Studies president, James Shaver. In the April, 1977 Social Education printing of his Presidential Address delivered at the November, 1976 meeting in Washington, D.C., he was critical of the profession's lack of an established rationale. He built upon the "mindlessness" position of Silberman in the following quotation:

The failure to address in a comprehensive way the questions of purpose and the impact of methods and content on purpose, to explicate the assumptions--empirical and philosophical--upon which we build curricula and teach, and to examine what we do for its hidden implications--that is, our mindlessness and, therefore, our lack of professionalism in its most important sense--is that basic shortcoming of American public schooling and of social studies in particular.

Much of the blame rests at the college and university level, where we should be especially reflective. Social studies courses too often involve much time spent in teaching prospective teachers to write objectives and make lesson plans (without addressing the more important question of the rationale for the objectives) and in familiarizing them with new curricular materials, and too little time spent in grappling with the tough questions of purpose and justification of purpose. The same is true of courses for inservice personnel.

Those who are going to teach social studies or develop social studies curricula, or who are now doing so, and who do not get stimulation and help in rationale-building from their social studies methods and/or curriculum courses, are not likely to get it elsewhere on campus. University professors in the "academic" area are generally notoriously unreflective about the assumptions underlying

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 205.

their own course content and teaching techniques. And philosophy of education courses tend to be too abstract and artificial to be of much assistance in the very real job of building a teaching and/or curricular rationale. The result, although I dislike saying it, is that social studies is to a large extent the epitome of mindlessness in American education.<sup>7</sup>

A great deal of the criticism of the social studies profession concerning the lack of this philosophical, rationale or purpose base is placed at the foot of the social studies methods class. Silberman, like many critics before and after him, was extremely critical of the methods classes he observed. Patrick, in a 1973 publication entitled "Reforming the Social Studies Methods Course," outlined some of the various reform efforts underway as a result of the numerous criticisms of college social studies methods courses. Patrick's findings are summarized as follows:

The three major reforms being examined include competency-based teacher education, the value analysis (normative) approach to teacher education, and the human relations approach to teacher education. Competency-based courses develop among future teachers precisely stated teaching skills, defined as observable, measurable performances that bring about student learning. They tend to underplay the development of personal charisma or of particular fundamental personality characteristics. The value analysis approach stresses the identification of issues and the appraisal of responses to pertinent central questions such as (1) What should be the goals of social studies instruction? (2) What knowledge is of most worth? (3) How should lessons be organized and presented? and (4) What teaching strategies are of most worth? The human relations approach stresses personality development through the mastery of human

---

<sup>7</sup>James P. Shaver, "A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession," Social Education, 41 (April, 1977), 301-302.

relations techniques. Advocates of this approach believe that good teaching depends primarily upon good human relationships.<sup>8</sup>

The above mentioned references, plus ten years of personal and professional experience, has led this researcher to examine the question of what is being done within the current trend toward performance-based teacher education (PBTE) programs to possibly meet the need for an examination or re-examination of a philosophical or rationale basis for what is being done in social studies education.

The Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program (NUSTEP) is an integrated PBTE program that has been in operation since the fall of 1969. It should seem that data concerning the acquisition of more positive teacher traits by NUSTEP social studies students due to the establishment of a more firm philosophical basis for their professional actions may be gathered to assist in the assessment of the NUSTEP social studies program. Is there a relationship between a more indepth analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements and more positively developed teacher traits at the preservice education level? What materials might be examined to enhance this positive development if it does exist? How much time should be spent in examining such materials in an already crowded social studies methods program? This information could provide the NUSTEP instructors and directors with some additional direction

---

<sup>8</sup>John J. Patrick, "Reforming the Social Studies Methods Course," Social Science Education Consortium, Publication No. 155 (Boulder, Colorado: The Consortium, 1973).

as to the future emphasis and content of the NUSTEP social studies program.

### STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there was a difference in educational values, dogmatic beliefs, social studies self assessment characteristics and classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between pre-service social studies teachers who were exposed to instruction in the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements and pre-service social studies teachers who were not exposed to this instruction. This was to determine if pre-service teachers can be assisted in developing a coherent belief system.

### RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The researcher tested the following null hypotheses:

1. There are no significant differences in the educational value scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
2. There are no significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
3. There are no significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy



and curriculum rationale statements.

4. There are no significant differences in the interaction analysis scores on taped observations of their classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

#### DEFINITION OF TERMS

NUSTEP. Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program. A performance based, nine credit hour program preceding student teaching and integrating courses in educational psychology, subject matter methodology and principles of secondary education. (Hereafter referred to as NUSTEP.)

Significant differences. Differences that have a t value and F value which are significant at the .05 level.

NUSTEP students. Enrollees in NUSTEP. In this research, specifically refers to those in the social studies portion of the program, during first semester, 1977-1978.

Micro-teaching session. Ten to twenty minute teaching episodes in which NUSTEP students exhibit behaviors to promote the learning of pupils.

Teacher assisting. Experiences of NUSTEP students in field/school setting.

Teaching style. A consistent pattern of classroom verbal behavior of a teacher.

Direct style. Teacher behavior which restricts the freedom of activity of a student by setting restraints or focusing his attention on an idea. Direct teacher talk includes categories 5, 6, and 7 of the Interaction Analysis System (see Appendix G).

Indirect style. Teacher behavior which tends to increase the freedom of action of a student by reducing constraints and encouraging participation. Indirect teacher talk includes categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Interaction Analysis System.

I/D ratio. When scoring an Interaction Analysis observation the number of tallies in categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 is divided by the total number of tallies in categories 5, 6, and 7 to find the I/D ratio or the ratio of indirect to direct teacher statements. An I/D ratio of 1.0 means that for every indirect statement there was one direct statement; an I/D ratio of 2.0 means that for every two indirect statements there was only one direct statement, etc.<sup>9</sup> If over half the teacher talk is in the direct categories (a score below 1.0), a teacher is more direct than indirect. If over half the teacher talk is in the indirect categories (a score above 1.0), a teacher is more indirect than direct.<sup>10</sup>

Educational values. Principles or ideas concerning teaching and learning held by individuals as revealed by the Educational Values Inventory (see Appendix D).

---

<sup>9</sup>Edmund J. Amidon and Ned A. Flanders, The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom (Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963), p. 30.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

Dogmatism. A relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority, which, in turn, provides a framework for patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others.<sup>11</sup>

Belief system. Conceived to represent all the beliefs, sets, expectancies, or hypotheses, conscious and unconscious, that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in.<sup>12</sup>

A. Closed belief system (person high in dogmatism): Tends to form opinions on the basis of limited information and to accept or reject information largely on the basis of its source and independent of its validity. The person high in dogmatism is regarded as prone toward opinionation, rigidity, resistance to new ideas and traditionalism.<sup>13</sup>

B. Open belief system (person low in dogmatism): Tend to be willing to weigh new ideas, is considered to be more flexible and is less prone toward prejudgment and prejudice.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Milton Rokeach, "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, 61 (1954), 195.

<sup>12</sup>Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960), p. 33.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 3-27.

<sup>14</sup>Milton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychology Monograph, 70 (1956), 1.

## ASSUMPTIONS

The basic assumptions underlying this study are outlined as follows:

1. Verbal behavior is a representative sample of teacher direct or indirect style.<sup>15</sup>
2. Indirect/Direct (I/D) ratio computed by use of the Interaction Analysis system is an indicator of indirect or direct teaching style.<sup>16</sup>
3. Micro-teaching sessions are representative of teaching style.<sup>17</sup>
4. Instruments used for data collection are valid or appropriate for measuring the selected factors; educational values, dogmatism, social studies education characteristics, and perception of teaching style. (Discussion on validation or appropriateness of data collection instruments is contained in Chapter III.)
5. The methods of statistical analysis were appropriate to the data.

---

<sup>15</sup>Ned A. Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application, eds. E. J. Amidon and J. B. Hough (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967), p. 224.

<sup>16</sup>Amidon and Flanders, op. cit., p. 44.

<sup>17</sup>L. Rex Wells, "A Study of Time Sampling Techniques of Classroom Behavior Using Interaction Analysis and Interaction Sequence Analysis" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1970), p. 151.

## LIMITATIONS

The specific limitations in the study include the following:

1. Eight disciplines are included within the NUSTEP program and this study was limited to the social studies portion of the program. Data were collected on the thirty-two students receiving social studies instruction and in teacher assisting during the first semester, 1977-78. Broad generalizations or conclusions from the findings of the study are limited due to sample size.

2. Due to the prerequisites of the NUSTEP program all students had previously taken a course in the history and philosophy of education. Yet, limitations existed as to the quality and quantity of their retention of the specific content covered in that course. No attempt was made to pre-test for such knowledge.

3. Additional variables such as pupils in the classroom, university proctor or instructors and cooperating teacher may have had relationships with teaching style. However, these factors were not examined in this study.

4. Consideration in this study is given only to the selected information collected by the Educational Values Inventory, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, A Personal Self-Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers, and the Interactional Analysis System.

## ORGANIZATION

This study has been organized into five chapters. In the first chapter the author has provided the background and rationale for the

study, stated the problem and hypotheses to be tested, and outlined the significance of the study. Definitions of terms for the study were given, assumptions were listed, and limitations were described.

Chapter II includes a review of related research and literature, while Chapter III fully describes the procedures that were followed in conducting this study. Chapter IV contains the report on the collected data and its analysis. Chapter V is devoted to the summary, conclusions, implications of the study, and recommendations for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

#### INTRODUCTION

The review of related research and literature presented in this chapter has been divided into six topics: (1) educational philosophy in general; (2) a definition of social studies; (3) programs in social studies teacher education; (4) related social studies documents; (5) instruments valuable in social studies education research: (a) Educational Values Inventory, (b) Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, (c) Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory, and (d) Interaction Analysis System; and (6) summary.

#### EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY IN GENERAL

It would be a very rare experience to find an undergraduate professional education program in the United States that does not require its students to take, as part of its stated requirements, a course that includes the history and philosophy of education. One can no doubt safely state that courses of this nature cover the full range of the quality spectrum. The work by Jansen<sup>1</sup> and others cited in his study attest to this statement. Questions may also be raised about the effectiveness of such a course in aiding the undergraduate to formulate

---

<sup>1</sup>Udo H. Jansen, "A Critical Analysis of Certain Aspects of the Introductory Course in Education in Selected Texas Colleges and Universities" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1961).

his own general philosophy of education, let alone a more specific philosophy for the subject matter area he or she might have chosen to specialize in for a professional career. The question can also be asked as to how important it is to begin to formulate such philosophical inquiries at such a point in one's preservice educational experience.

Perhaps some of the answer lies in the previously mentioned accusations by Charles Silberman on the "mindlessness" of so many of the American educational practices he observed. Silberman elaborated with the following:

But by and large, teachers, principals, and superintendents are decent, intelligent and caring people who try to do their best by their lights. If they make a botch of it, as an uncomfortably large number do, it is because it simply never occurs to more than a handful to ask why they are doing what they are doing--to think seriously or deeply about the purposes or consequences of education.<sup>1a</sup>

Educational philosophers have long sought to help both layman and professional alike to think about education and a philosophy of education in the terms mentioned by Silberman. Harry Broudy defined education as follows:

In its broadest and most general usage, therefore, education is the process or product of a deliberate attempt to fashion experience by the direction and control of learning. Formal education refers to the process as it is carried on in schools.<sup>2</sup>

Broudy goes on to define philosophy of education:

---

<sup>1a</sup>Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom (New York: Random House, 1970), p. 11.

<sup>2</sup>Harry S. Broudy, Building a Philosophy of Education (2nd ed.; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961), p. 8.



In this book the philosophy of education is regarded as the systematic discussion of educational problems on a philosophical level. . . .<sup>3</sup>

Broudy further elaborated on this position:

. . . philosophy of education can have its greatest value if it explores educational problems so that the controversies about them are pushed back to metaphysical, epistemological, aesthetic, and ethical issues. To do this, we have to see how each educational problem shapes up on the emotional, factual, and scientific level of discussion. It is only when these levels yield no clear-cut solution that we have to take up the problem at the philosophical level.<sup>4</sup>

Years before Broudy gave his definitions, John Dewey made this statement:

The need for a philosophy of education is thus fundamentally the need for finding out what education really is.<sup>5</sup>

Dewey goes on to partially define education as follows: ". . . it is a process of development, of growth. And it is the process and not merely the result that is important."<sup>6</sup>

The tremendous regard that was felt by Dewey toward the field of education can be seen in the following statement:

If we are willing to conceive education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional, toward nature and fellow men, philosophy may even be defined as the general theory of education.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>5</sup>John Dewey, "The Need for a Philosophy of Education," John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings, ed. R. D. Archambault (New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1964), p. 4.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 4.

<sup>7</sup>John Dewey, Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (New York: Macmillan, 1961; first published by Macmillan, 1961), p. 328.

Dewey continued as follows:

Perhaps the greatest need of and for a philosophy of education at the present time is the urgent need that exists for making clear in idea and effective in practice that its end is social, and that the criterion to be applied in estimating the value of the practices that exist in schools is also social. It is true that the aim of education is development of individuals to the utmost of their potentialities. But this statement in isolation leaves unanswered the question as to what is the measure of the development. A society of free individuals in which all, through their own work, contribute to the liberation and enrichment of the lives of others, is the only environment in which any individual can really grow normally to his full stature. An environment in which some are practically enslaved, degraded, limited, will always react to create conditions that prevent the full development even of those who fancy they enjoy complete freedom for unhindered growth.<sup>8</sup>

Dewey explained that the shrinking, interdependent-industrialized world along with a rising tide of nationalistic sentiment, racial and national prejudice, and readiness to resort to the force of arms to settle questions are some of the pressing reasons why in the conditions of the world at present a philosophy of education must make the social aim of education the center of its creed.

Although Dewey wrote that statement in the pre-war year of 1934, his insights apply as much to the world today as they did at that time. This leads back to one of the questions of this section--what is the quality of effect of the pre-service course work that has as one of its goals the tentative formulation of a philosophy of education for the prospective teacher candidate? It also leads directly to the

---

<sup>8</sup>Dewey, "The Need for a Philosophy of Education," op. cit., p. 12.

central question of this section--can the beginning of a philosophy of education, and therefore a rationale for teaching behaviors in the classroom, be developed at the undergraduate level? At present there seems to be very little evidence of research on this question or its implications upon the teaching profession.

### A DEFINITION OF SOCIAL STUDIES

In the previous section a position was presented for making the social aim of education the center point of any discussion of philosophy of education. This investigator will now attempt to relate this position to a general definition of social studies.

Tucker,<sup>9</sup> in his review of research on social studies teaching and teacher education, says that there is an increasing amount of evidence that teacher beliefs are an important variable in social studies teacher behavior, particularly within a social-issues definition of social studies. He also stated that further studies are needed on how the professional beliefs of social studies teachers are acquired and modified.

Tucker concurred with the earlier work of Shaver and Larkins<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Jan L. Tucker, "Research on Social Studies Teaching and Teacher Education," Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975, eds. Francis P. Hunkins and others (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), p. 116.

<sup>10</sup> James P. Shaver and A. Guy Larkins, "Research on Teaching Social Studies," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. Robert M. W. Travers (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973), pp. 1243-1262.

that the greatest barrier to building a solid research base is confusion and disagreement about the nature and purpose of the social studies.

The lack of clear meaning for the term social studies has deep historical roots. A long list of National Committee Reports, Commissions, Inquiries and other influential publications has led us down through the decades to the Project Social Studies materials of the late 1960's and early 1970's.

Glasheen<sup>11</sup> has documented the importance of one of these reports in her study of the 1916 Social Studies Committee of the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. An analysis of the 1916 report revealed the social studies as that subject which drew content from the various disciplines of the social sciences and used the information in such a manner that the pupil acquired facility in dealing with social problems confronting him. The outcome of instruction would now be a youngster thoroughly trained in participatory democracy, and skilled in using the training.

This proposal represented a radical departure from any national proposals that had been made prior to that time. Earlier national committee recommendations had all supported education for mental discipline and the use of social content to strengthen the mental powers.

However, the 1916 committee, as well as later committees, was not at all clear with regard to what constituted the social studies. The ambiguity and confusion within the social studies profession on this particular point persists to this day.

---

<sup>11</sup>Patricia Glasheen, "The Advent of Social Studies, 1916: An Historical Study" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1973).

Barr, Barth and Shermis have elaborated upon this historical background in their attempt to formulate a definition for the social studies. They stated their findings as follows:

We have attempted to demonstrate that the social studies is a "seamless web" of confusion. It is a field alive with conflict and confrontation; a field of ambiguity and chaos, choked with competing claims by theoreticians and curriculum designers. There are fundamental differences regarding the nature of the social studies, the goals of the field, the appropriate content, and even the instructional methods. This situation provides difficult problems for the scholars in the field and for the classroom teachers, and leads some educators to think about the social studies in one way and behave in another.<sup>12</sup>

A concern over this confusion within the social studies field led a number of writers<sup>13</sup> to ask questions about and make statements on the definition and direction they saw social studies taking in the late 1960's. Perhaps Engle<sup>14</sup> said it best when he asked whether social education is to be restricted to the teaching of the social sciences, or whether the comprehensive social education of citizens is to be the goal.

Shaver described his definition of social studies education as follows:

---

<sup>12</sup>Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977), p. 10.

<sup>13</sup>James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis, "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 743-751; Dale L. Brubaker, Alternative Directions for the Social Studies (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1967); Shirley H. Engle, "The Future of Social Studies Education and NCSS," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 778-781, 795; James P. Shaver, "Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition," Social Education, 31 (November, 1967), 588-592, 596.

<sup>14</sup>Engle, op. cit., p. 778.

Such a definition should begin with the clear recognition that social studies education is general education. In discussing social studies, we are talking about a set of required courses, a program intended for all students. This program should, therefore, be based on a rationale that takes into account the society's goals of all youth, not just those going on to college or those who come to school with an interest in abstract descriptions of the society and its past. A reasonable focus for such a rationale in a democratic society is the preparation of students for more reflective and effective political participation in their society--a society whose central commitment to human dignity assumes that all citizens have contributions to make to the determination of public policies, and that the schools should foster the ability to participate readily and rationally.

Explicit attention to those societal assumptions leads to a more viable definition of social studies as that part of the school's general education program which is concerned with the preparation of citizens for participation in a democratic society. Social studies is not, then, simply an off-shoot of the social sciences, with content to be dictated by the interests and desires of academicians in the social sciences and history.<sup>15</sup>

Shaver goes on to criticize both the teachers of social studies and their professors of social studies education for their shallowness in thinking about rationale-building with the following:

It is not surprising that questions about the rationale for social studies instruction are rarely raised in the heat of teaching. By default, a curriculum is perpetuated that is too often seen by students as not only lacking in challenge, but as irrelevant to the realities of life.<sup>16</sup>

Engle<sup>17</sup> added support to the writings of Shaver with his own definition of social education for citizenship as the utilization of

---

<sup>15</sup>Shaver, op. cit., p. 589.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 592.

<sup>17</sup>Engle, op. cit., p. 780.

knowledge from whatever source to meet the practical problems which confront a citizen.

He elaborates further by stating:

Conceived thus, the social education of citizens, called social studies or not, is an applied field--not a scientific one per se. It involves applying information to social problems and using responsible, intellectual processes to the resolution of these problems. It involves skillful teaching methodologies necessary to the student's effective utilization of knowledge including that derived from the realm of feeling as well as science. Intelligent, skillful teaching in the social sciences would mean giving due respect to the characteristics of science rather than crucifying these subjects as is true at present, asking of them more than they have to give, distorting the facts which they afford, and using these unthinkingly out of any context in which they could be useful.<sup>18</sup>

Barth and Shermis add their definition from their 1970 article and also describe what they see as three competing traditions which have developed in social studies teaching:

We define the social studies as a set of goals which describe how the content of citizenship education is to be selected, organized and taught. Implicit in this definition is a conception of citizenship. As diverse as are the philosophical assumptions of social studies educators, it seems clear that all of them do think of the social studies as a means of achieving citizenship.

The problem seems to have been that within the social studies there have developed three competing traditions which appear to be conceptually distinct and which prescribe three different modes of selecting and organizing content and teaching. We call these three

---

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., p. 780.

positions, "social studies as citizenship transmission," "social studies as social science," and "social studies as reflective inquiry."<sup>19</sup>

Barth and Shermis continued by describing each of these three different competing traditions and defining each of them as to their purpose, content and method.

Barr, Barth and Shermis added to the above mentioned work of Barth and Shermis with their introductory statement as follows:

The authors of this book believe that the field of social studies has reached a point in its evolution where it is possible to develop a definition of the social studies comprehensive enough to include all factions in the field, and yet flexible enough to permit differentiation of various points of view. The authors are prepared to argue that, far from a seamless web of illogical inconsistencies, there is logic and order to the field and that there are sufficient areas of agreement at least to attempt a generic definition. This definition differs from most other efforts in that it is not an attempt to say what the social studies should be; but it is a careful, systematic effort to develop a definition that is sufficient to describe the social studies in all of its complexities as it exists today.<sup>20</sup>

Barr, Barth and Shermis concluded their in-depth examination of the historical development of the social studies and its current customs, traditions and usage with the following statements:

At this particular time in the social studies evolution, the field can be defined in the following way:

Definition: The social studies is an integration of experience and knowledge concerning human relations for the purpose of citizenship education.

---

<sup>19</sup>Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 744.

<sup>20</sup>Barr, Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 10.



The Goal: Citizenship Education

Objectives Required to Achieve Effective Citizenship:

1. Knowledge
2. Skills necessary to process information
3. Values and beliefs
4. Social participation<sup>21</sup>

The authors warn that there are still many philosophical conflicts inherent in the three traditions they have outlined and that a great deal of further analysis will be necessary before social studies can be viewed in an orderly, meaningful process.<sup>22</sup>

The author of this current research project agrees with the general social studies definition, goal and objectives put forth by Barr, Barth and Shermis. The author feels this current definition is very representative of the historical development of the social studies and is also harmonious with the documents (see Appendix B--Charts B, C, D and E for summary) chosen by this author for use in the treatment of the experimental group of this study.

This brief background on the development of social studies definitions was given to show a portion of the direction that social studies philosophy and rationale development has been heading over the years. No matter how simple or complex they may be, such definitions and conceptualizations are important either as input for teacher education programs, stimulation for the thinking of social studies professionals, or as a foundation for curriculum development. But, these definitions and conceptualizations should not be substituted for the

---

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., p. 71.

needed rationale-building by professionals in the schools.

Shaver defined this process of rationale-building as follows:

. . . the explication of assumptions, the examination of them for validity and consistency, and the careful consideration of the implications for classroom practice, accompanied with testing by experience--is the process of rationale-building.<sup>23</sup>

Shaver stated that he feels a rationale, like an education, ought never be considered finished.<sup>24</sup> This ties in very heavily with his own ideas on personal growth. Shaver feels that rationale-building is not just a process like education: it is education.<sup>25</sup>

The previous section of this chapter concluded with the question of whether or not students in undergraduate teacher education programs could begin to develop the foundation for a philosophy of education and therefore take part in rationale-building at that level. The study by Rose<sup>26</sup> found evidence which tended to support the literature which indicated that pre-service teachers have not developed a well-defined philosophy of education. Shaver sheds some light and additional thought on the subject by relating to his own experiences as follows:

---

<sup>23</sup>James P. Shaver, "Needed: A Deweyan Rationale for Social Studies," The High School Journal, 60 (May, 1977), 345.

<sup>24</sup>James P. Shaver, "The Task of Rationale-building for Citizenship Education," Building Rationales for Citizenship Education, ed. James P. Shaver (Washington, D.C.: National Council for Social Studies, 1977), p. 101.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>26</sup>Shirley E. Corley Rose, "A Study of the Relationship Between General Education Beliefs and Social Studies Curriculum Choices of Preservice Social Studies Teachers" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1973).

My experience is that after a year or two teaching, teachers are ready, if given the opportunity, to move from the discussion of "how to do it" to rationale-building because they are frustrated from trying to build instructional programs that have the desired effects on students.<sup>26a</sup>

At present there seems to be a great deal of need for added examination of definitions of social studies education and total rationale-building on the part of the profession. At this moment the professional literature shows a good deal of introspection taking place. It is hoped that this search will continue to add new insights to the ongoing development of the social studies field.

#### PROGRAMS IN SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHER EDUCATION

As was mentioned in Chapter I of this study a great deal of the criticism for the poor state of the quality of social studies instruction in the United States is laid at the doorstep of the social studies methods class. A wide variety of authors<sup>27</sup> stated their criticisms of the social studies methods course during the time period in the middle to late 1960's to the early 1970's.

---

<sup>26a</sup>Shaver, op. cit., p. 98.

<sup>27</sup>James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw Hill, 1964); James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964); William T. Lowe and Warren Corbin, "Learning to Teach the Social Studies: What Do Teachers Recommend?" Social Education, 34 (March, 1970), 286-290, 352; Lawrence E. Metcalf, "Some Guidelines for Changing Social Studies Education," Social Education, 27 (April, 1963), 197-201; James W. Popham, "Teaching Under Scrutiny," Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (June, 1971), 599-601; Silberman, op. cit., 1970.

Weintraub, in his review of research on social studies methods courses from 1962-1970 stated the following conclusions:

1. Methods courses must concentrate on classroom dynamics and be less preoccupied with teacher knowledge, authority, and conformity.
2. It is not the amount of knowledge but new behavior (alternative roles and attitudes) that is important.
3. Teacher education should develop inquiry, discovery, and critical thinking capacities.
4. Training should include different teaching techniques and attention to selection and testing of new materials.
5. Schools must offer an educational environment that is a microcosm of modern changing society.
6. The educational program will have an appreciable influence on students' outlook, including political attitudes, values, and beliefs when controversy is allowed and critical thinking encouraged.<sup>28</sup>

Another set of authors<sup>29</sup> was much more specific in their

---

<sup>28</sup>Richard Weintraub, "A Review of the Research on Pre-Service Social Studies Secondary Teacher Education" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 051 006, June, 1970).

<sup>29</sup>(Listed by date) Barry K. Beyer, "Mandate for Change-Curriculum Innovation and Teacher Preparation in Social Studies," The Social Studies, 58 (October, 1967), 199-203; Derwyn F. McElroy and Ronald K. Templeton, "The Social Studies Revolution: Implications for Teacher Education," The Social Studies, 60 (March, 1969), 105-109; Lowe and Corbin, op. cit., 1970; Kenneth Carlson, "Preparation of Social Studies Teachers," Education Digest, 37 (March, 1972), 52-53; Richard Wisniewski, "A New Breed of Social Studies Teacher? Or New School System?" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 109 043, November, 1974); Robert G. Payne, "Let's Talk Turkey without Being Chicken," Social Studies Review (Spring, 1975), 45-48; Charles Keihl, "Methods: A Pre-Student Teaching Experience," Social Science Record (Winter, 1976), 26-27; John B. Kick and Joel S. Poetker, "Getting the Methods Class into the Schools," Social Science Record (Winter, 1976), 28-29.

criticisms of the social studies methods course and they offered additional recommendations as possible cures for the ills of the area as they saw them. Their recommendations ranged from lengthening the educational program to five years, with a sixth year as an internship and retraining all teachers in the inquiry process to early identification and counseling of social studies majors and more field based preparation programs including putting the methods course itself in the schools. The common denominator among all these authors is their agreement that the real problem area in effecting change in the social studies is in teacher education.

The research findings and opinions of Lowe and Corbin stand out in relationship to the significance of this present study. Their research centered around the question, What topics do social studies professionals in the field deem essential for a methods course? They surveyed 350 members of the New York State Council for the Social Studies and found the vast majority of the responses, with some exceptions, falling into the how-to-do-it categories of topics such as: "organizing and planning lessons (85%), motivating students (80%), development of process-oriented lessons (80%). . . ." <sup>30</sup> Significant areas of disagreement exist between Lowe and Corbin and their respondents. They stated their case as follows:

---

<sup>30</sup> Lowe and Corbin, op. cit., p. 289.

We think these educators tend to minimize the importance of theoretical considerations. This is a mistake. Particularly significant in this connection is our belief that a serious study of the purposes of goals for teaching the social studies is an absolutely essential element of methods instruction. The writers believe that successful teaching involves knowing precisely what you are trying to accomplish and why. A good teacher must be able to explain clearly and concisely what he is trying to do in a given lesson and why. A methods course should afford students the opportunity to explore, analyze and debate various philosophical models for teaching. Every student should be forced to attempt to find a personally satisfying sense of priorities.<sup>31</sup>

Marker provided some interesting comments on the social studies methods course and the "New Social Studies" curriculum development projects of the 1960's. He stated his concern as follows:

Most social studies methods course textbooks concentrate on planning, assuming the teacher will operate as his own curriculum developer and packager. Curriculum development projects prepackage materials and often include specific instructions on how to use them. Only a few textbooks and projects incorporate selecting/adapting skill development the teacher can apply to choosing or adapting project materials. If this misalignment continues both methods courses and projects will be disfunctional in their common concern, improving the teaching of the social studies in the schools.<sup>32</sup>

Patrick<sup>33</sup> had earlier been mentioned for his work in outlining

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 352.

<sup>32</sup> Gerald Marker, "Social Studies Methods and the Curriculum Projects: A Potentially Disfunctional Misalignment" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 044 337, November, 1970).

<sup>33</sup> John J. Patrick, "Reforming the Social Studies Methods Course," Social Science Consortium, Publication No. 155 (Boulder, Colorado, 1973).

the major reform efforts underway directed toward the social studies methods course. Briefly stated, they included the competency-based teacher education approach, the value analysis approach, and the human relations approach. This review will concentrate on the competency-based teacher education approach, and the basic characteristics, assumptions and limitations of the movement as it applies to social studies education.

West<sup>34</sup> stressed the following key characteristics of competency-based teacher education (CBTE):

1. CBTE programs have clearly identified the goals for teacher competencies.
2. There is a clear relationship between these competencies and the elements in a student's program.
3. Teacher certification is contingent upon the demonstration of required competencies.
4. CBTE evaluation focuses primarily upon classroom performance.

Saylor, in his in-depth research on the antecedent developments of the performance-based movement adds the following statements concerning competencies:

Hence, teaching is now seen as an interactive process that depends on three agents--the teacher, the student, treated individually, and the environmental situation,

---

<sup>34</sup>ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education, "Looking at: Competency-Based Teacher Education, Public Double-speak, Oral History, Death and Dying" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 128 262, February, 1975), p. 1.

or conditions in which the interaction proceeds. Any effort to study teacher effectiveness or factors conditional to success in the schooling process must take account of these three basic elements. Teacher education programs, therefore, must provide the training that will enable a teacher to select the most valid and proper teaching procedures to enable each student to attain the goals envisioned. Any program of teacher education based on competency-in-performance must include such competencies among those being developed by its students.<sup>35</sup>

Patrick<sup>36</sup> identified four basic assumptions that undergird the application of the competency-based teaching model to the methods course:

1. Advocates of the competency-based teaching model assume that teaching competencies which directly influence student learning can be identified.
2. One can describe teaching competencies in performance terms, which facilitates precise empirical performance assessments.
3. Teaching competencies can be developed additively through systematic, criterion referenced instruction.
4. Criterion references tests can be developed to assess validly the extent to which instructional objectives are attained and thereby to indicate the success or failure of the methods course.

Perhaps the greatest argument for competency-based teacher education programs comes from the demand for accountability--the

---

<sup>35</sup>J. Galen Saylor, "Antecedent Developments in the Movement to Performance-Based Programs of Teacher Education" (Prepared as a Working Document for the Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, University of Nebraska, 1976).

<sup>36</sup>Patrick, op. cit., p. 5.



demonstration on empirical grounds that instruction in teaching methods is related significantly and strongly to the successful classroom performance of the teacher. It would then be hoped that the competency-based methods courses would overcome the fundamental weaknesses of teacher education programs in the social studies that critics have denounced for years.

A number of authors<sup>37</sup> have also been critical of the competency-based teacher education movement and are very concerned over what they see as the limitations of the programs. Among the more common limitations mentioned by the critics is their fear that the focus of CBTE will result in behavior that is non-adaptive. They feel that CBTE will develop teachers who only follow recipes and who, consequently, lack the philosophical and theoretical base for change and flexible response.<sup>38</sup>

Saylor concluded his study with the following summation of what he sees as the future directions of the competency-based movement:

---

<sup>37</sup> Thomas A. Barlow, "CB/PBTE--The Wrong Road" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 102 128, June, 1975); Lorraine R. Gay and Fred K. Daniel, "Accreditation and Performance-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12 (1972), 45-50; Richard Hersh, John Mallan and David Welton, "CBTE: A Dagger in the Minde. . .?" Social Education, 40 (February, 1976), 98-101; Leonard Kaplan, "Survival Talk for Educators," The Journal of Teacher Education, 4 (1973), 319-321; Donald McCarty, "Competency-Based Teacher Education," School Management (October, 1973), 30-38; Jack L. Nelson, "A Criticism of Competency-Based Teacher Education and Behavioral Objectives," Social Education, 40 (November/December, 1976), 561-563.

<sup>38</sup> ERIC Clearing House, op. cit., p. 2.

. . . competency-in-performance programs of teacher education must devise programs of training and the means and procedures for demonstrating competency for all four aspects of teacher development (The Teacher as a Person, Teacher, Member of a Profession and as a Citizen). The critics contend that this condition has not been met in existing programs and many feel that measures of competency-in-performance will be extremely difficult if not impossible to devise for any phases of teacher education except the technology of teaching and knowledge of subject fields--the two aspects of teacher development with over a century of tradition. Yet in recent years, an increasing body of research supports the deductive reasoning that dominated the writings of philosophers from Socrates to Dewey in postulating the tremendous significance of the personal factors--character, morality, traits, exemplary behavior, and interpersonal relationships--in the total impact of schooling on the child and the youth.<sup>39</sup>

Saylor additionally stated that a three to five year internship or residency type of requirement should be a part of the basis for final judgment and certification as a professional. He concluded with the following:

A paper-and-pencil showing of competency, a series of micro-teaching demonstrations, or a brief period--six to eighteen weeks--of "practice" teaching (often with little real "practice") are obviously insufficient and inadequate measures of the kinds of competencies noted philosophers, educators, and teachers of teachers have written about for generations on end.<sup>40</sup>

One of the additionally desired outcomes of the review of research of this section was to search for teacher education programs that have, as one of their written statements, the specific development

---

<sup>39</sup>Saylor, op. cit., p. 165.

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 165.

of a philosophy of education and a rationale for teaching by their students. Four examples<sup>41</sup> of such programs were found to exist and each requires a variety of written and verbal examinations in search of development of such a philosophy and rationale. The question remains as to how extensive and to what degree of depth such programs pursue such a requirement.

#### RELATED SOCIAL STUDIES DOCUMENTS

The documents mentioned in this section come from a wide variety of sources--professional and governmental agencies, position papers, academic papers and books--to mention a few. Their commonality is that they all assist in casting additional light on this present study.

The first set of materials to be examined is three out of the four documents used by this researcher as part of his treatment upon

---

<sup>41</sup>Clement Hasenfus, "Education 321. Social Studies--Student Teaching. An Individualized Performance-Based Model. Pilot Program" (Volume III) Rhode Island College, Providence (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 084 206, 1973); Wayne Mahood, "Experiences in Developing a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program for Social Studies," State University College, Geneseo, N.Y. (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 088 774, November, 1973); James R. Miller and Harry McNally, "The UMO (University of Maine, Orono) Teacher Training Program: A Case Study and a Model" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 080 429, 1973); Clarice Ramsey (ed.), "Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program Social Studies Education Modules" (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 1977).

the experimental group of this study.

The Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines from the National Council for the Social Studies is divided into three major sections-- a Basic Rationale for Social Studies Education, Guidelines for Social Studies Education, and a Social Studies Program Evaluation Checklist. The rationale and guidelines sections are of main concern in this present examination. The following definition is given:

Social studies education has a twofold purpose: enhancement of human dignity through learning and commitment to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end.

The rationale assumes that knowledge, thinking, valuing, and social participation are all essential components of the social studies program and that commitment to human dignity is a major purpose of social studies education.<sup>42</sup>

Table 2.1 is a complete listing of the Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines which are recommended as a framework for evaluating the quality of a social studies program.

A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies is also from the National Council for Social Studies. It is an easy to read, non-technical, layman's level work that has won solid acclaim as a vehicle for communication with the public. It defines the social studies in the following manner:

In brief, the social studies are those instructional courses, programs, and projects that are designed to assist your child to understand, analyze, react to,

---

<sup>42</sup>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971), p. 7.

Table 2.1

Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines  
(Position Statement)  
National Council for the Social Studies

---

These Guidelines represent a set of standards for social studies programs. They are not intended to prescribe a uniform program or even to propose an ideal program. In a pluralistic and changing society no one such program could be prescribed even if more were known about the process of education than is presently available. Schools--their students, teachers, and communities--have basic responsibility for their own social studies programs. It is hoped that many will develop insights which go beyond the framework of standards set forth here.

1. The Social Studies Program Should Be Directly Related to the Concerns of Students.
  2. The Social Studies Program Should Deal with the Real Social World.
  3. The Social Studies Program Should Draw from Currently Valid Knowledge Representative of Man's Experience, Culture, and Beliefs.
  4. Objectives Should Be Thoughtfully Selected and Clearly Stated in Such Form as to Furnish Direction to the Program.
  5. Learning Activities Should Engage the Student Directly and Actively in the Learning Process.
  6. Strategies of Instruction and Learning Activities Should Rely on a Broad Range of Learning Resources.
  7. The Social Studies Program Must Facilitate the Organization of Experience.
  8. Evaluation Should Be Useful, Systematic, Comprehensive, and Valid for the Objectives of the Program.
  9. Social Studies Education Should Receive Vigorous Support as a Vital and Responsible Part of the School Program.
-

and act upon:

1. The relationships of human beings to the world in which they live.
2. The relationships of human beings to other human beings.
3. The relationships of human beings to themselves.<sup>43</sup>

A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies was issued by the Nebraska State Department of Education. It is a well written professional document that defines social studies in the following way:

We believe that the major purpose of the social studies is to prepare individuals to function effectively in a democratic society. The goal then, simply stated, is that of education for citizenship.

Accordingly, we have delineated five major areas of citizenship education in which the social studies should assume responsibility. These include:

1. Skill in the use of rational decision-making as a means of approaching the solution of personal as well as societal conflicts.
2. Understanding of and commitment to the values of a democratic society.
3. Development of the potential of each individual in order that he can develop a favorable self-concept which will enable him to become a constructive member of society.
4. Development of the ability to work effectively with others as a means of solving personal and societal problems.
5. Knowledge and ability to participate effectively in the governing process.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup>Daniel Roselle, A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1974).

<sup>44</sup>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies (Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska State Department of Education, 1971).

These three above mentioned definitions add tremendous reinforcement to the previously mentioned definitions in a prior section of this chapter.

Anna Ochoa, the current President of the National Council for the Social Studies, adds to the reinforcement with the following summation:

Guided by the values of character and intellectual development, conceptual development, learner consciousness, the democratic ethic, and human dignity, the purpose of schooling for the social studies teacher is to develop educated and ethical citizens who possess the knowledge, values and skills to be effective participants in a democratic society.<sup>45</sup>

In addition to the social studies teacher education programs that require a written statement of social studies philosophy (listed in the previous section of this chapter), two states<sup>46</sup> have also established position papers which strongly recommend the same practice.

The work of Dynneson<sup>47</sup> on the development of a competency-based workbook in social studies education is based on a strong

---

<sup>45</sup>Anna S. Ochoa, "The Social Studies Teacher: An Exploration of Ethical Behavior" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 132 082, November, 1976).

<sup>46</sup>"A Competency-Based Program for Certification of Social Studies Teachers. Position Paper," Minnesota State Department of Education (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Paper, ERIC Document ED 081 667, 1973); "Suggested Criteria for Certification of Social Studies Teachers, NYSCSS Occasional Paper No. 1," New York State Council for the Social Studies (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100 730, 1974).

<sup>47</sup>Thomas L. Dynneson, "Social Studies: Issues and Methods" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 130 963, September, 1976).

relationship of social studies to citizenship education. It stands as unique in its attempts to ask the student to individually identify and define social studies, social science, and citizenship education.

In the same direction, Tucker did some additional research on the identification of major characteristics of the "new" social studies (NSS) as perceived by methods teachers. Some of his general findings were that methods teachers:

1. tend to equate the NSS with major curriculum projects.
2. were dissatisfied with the strong developmental role played by the projects.
3. saw the NSS as overly academic, cerebral, and teacher centered.
4. wanted more emphasis on student interests, community activities, social action, and the affective domain.
5. also, methods teachers who held appointments in the schools of education tended to be more dissatisfied with the NSS than those in academic departments.<sup>48</sup>

Overall, Tucker's work summed up the large differences between the project developers and the teacher educators.

The purpose of the last four sections of this chapter has been to examine the general direction and issues of social studies education over the past few decades. An attempt has been made to state the importance of having an educational philosophy and also a social studies rationale. Current trends among social studies teacher education programs were examined for their relevancy to this study and

---

<sup>48</sup>Jan L. Tucker, "Pre-Service, Secondary School Teacher Educators and the 'New' Social Studies" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 049 145, February, 1971).



related documents were also examined for the same purpose. The final major section of this chapter will examine the research and literature related to data collection instruments that are valuable in social studies education research.

#### INSTRUMENTS VALUABLE IN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION RESEARCH

##### Educational Values Inventory (EVI)<sup>49</sup>

The primary purpose of the Educational Values Inventory (EVI) is to assess values and attitudes about education. It attempts to measure a person's beliefs in terms of what education is or what it should be. The test is constructed so that an individual responds to educational statements on a five-point Likert scale, according to the degree of agreement or disagreement the person has with the individual statements. An individual's score is determined by summing up the individual numerical values assigned to his or her responses. This score places a person on a values continuum ranging from closed to emerging values, or traditional to open concepts about education. Higher scores reflect a more congruent attitude toward innovative education while lower scores reflect a more dissonant attitude. The range of possible scores is from 33 to 165 on Form A and 40-200 on Form B.

The authors of the EVI are not saying that a certain score

---

<sup>49</sup>The majority of this section is based on a personal interview with Dr. Udo Jansen, one of the authors of the EVI, on January 27, 1978.

on the EVI means that a particular philosophy of education is better than another or that they can predict the success of that individual as a teacher. The basic premise of the EVI is that the effectiveness of teachers will increase if an individual is properly matched with a particular job and its expectations in a particular community.

Historical background. University of Nebraska-Lincoln professors Jansen, Joekel and Kelley are responsible for the development of the EVI. Their work was the culmination of the work begun by Dr. Jansen at the University of Arizona in the early 1960's. The individual items of the EVI were designed to assess educational values and these items centered around six factors which are as follows:

1. philosophy of education
2. role of teachers
3. role of students
4. attitudes toward evaluation of students
5. teacher methodologies, and
6. curricular content<sup>50</sup>

Through piloting and editing of the instrument, the EVI authors have been able to establish a constant level of validity and reliability.

In the early 1970's, the EVI was used in pilot studies conducted in the Lincoln Public Schools, Lincoln, Nebraska. Student teachers, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, additional teachers,

---

<sup>50</sup>Udo Jansen, Ronald Joekel, and Edgar A. Kelley, "Educational Values Perceptions and the Student Teaching Experience: Assessing Changes in Values Perceptions Which Occur for Student Teachers, University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and School Administrators" (Lincoln: University of Nebraska, September, 1971). (Unpublished.)

counselors, and administrators were involved. These studies helped to gather data to further refine the EVI and to increase the validity and reliability of the instrument. From that early work a 33-item, Form A of the EVI was eventually copyrighted (1971).

Recent developments. A second form (a 40-item, Form B) of the inventory, parallel to the first, was developed by Zimmer in 1973 and was validated correlationally against the original form.<sup>51</sup>

The EVI has been used in both the public and private school domain. It is extensively used at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in the methods classes and with student teachers. The use of the EVI in the area of student teachers has helped to match the personalities of the cooperating teachers and the student teachers to assist in providing an optimum environment for both parties.

Sheila N. Brown<sup>52</sup> checked the EVI as a possible indicator of creative potential. No significant correlation was found between EVI scores and creativity scores.

In late 1975, EVI's were administered by mail to a randomly selected group of public school teachers and administrators in Nebraska. This study resulted in the generation of 17 new items for the EVI

---

<sup>51</sup>J. W. Zimmer, "NUSTEP Program Evaluation--An Overview," A Report to the Departments of Secondary Education and Educational Psychology (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, May, 1973). (Mimeographed.)

<sup>52</sup>Sheila N. Brown, "Designing Environments for Creative-Affective Learning" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1975).

(50 items, Form 76:1).

In the future the authors additionally hope to design a general student form that might be used by the public school student.

This specific study will involve the use of Forms A and B of the EVI.<sup>53</sup>

#### Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

A Dogmatism Scale was constructed for the purpose of measuring individual differences in the extent to which belief systems are open or closed.<sup>54</sup> With the construction of this instrument the author sought to measure the belief system as a whole as compared to previous theory and research which generally focused on single beliefs and attitudes.

Rokeach credits his scale to the prior work by Adorno and colleagues in the measurement of authoritarianism.<sup>55</sup> Adorno's scale, known as the F Scale, focused on Fascist or right authoritarianism and intolerance. Succeeding research has substantiated the findings that those who score high on the F Scale also tend to score high on measures of ethnocentrism, anti-semitism, and anti-Negro feelings, and tend to be politically conservative. In addition, many personality differences are found to distinguish those who score high from those who score low

---

<sup>53</sup>Copies of Forms A and B of the EVI appear in Appendix D.

<sup>54</sup>Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960), p. 19.

<sup>55</sup>T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson and R. Levitt Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1950).

on the F Scale.<sup>56</sup> Rokeach describes the construction of his instrument as follows:

In other words, if our interest is in the scientific study of authoritarianism, we should proceed from right authoritarianism not to a re-focus on left authoritarianism but to the general properties held in common by all forms of authoritarianism. . . . What is needed is therefore a deliberate turning away from a concern with the one of two kinds of authoritarianism that may happen to be predominant at a given time. Instead, we should pursue a more theoretical ahistorical analysis of the properties held in common by all forms of authoritarianism regardless of specific ideological, theological, philosophic, or scientific content.<sup>57</sup>

In the scoring of the scale, persons scoring high on this scale are assumed to have relatively closed belief systems, while persons scoring low will be assumed to have relatively open belief systems. Rokeach defines the degree to which an individual's belief system is open as "the extent to which the person can receive, evaluate and act on relevant information received from the outside on its own intrinsic merits, unencumbered by irrelevant factors in the situation or arising from within the person or from the outside."<sup>58</sup>

The Dogmatism Scale-Form E (Appendix E) consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant

---

<sup>56</sup>Rokeach, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>57</sup>Ibid., p. 14.

<sup>58</sup>Ibid., p. 57.

of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a high degree of dogmatism.

The reliability and validity of the Dogmatism Scale is attested to by the five editions the scale has gone through, with a total of 89 items tried out in the initial scale and in four successive revisions. The final 40-item form had reliabilities ranging from .68 to .93.<sup>59</sup> Concerning validity, additional analyses were made between dogmatism (D) and authoritarianism (F) in relation to ethnocentrism (E). The original studies as well as additional studies have substantiated Rokeach's contention that the D Scale is a better measure of general authoritarianism than the F Scale.

Research findings. Over the past twenty years a variety of authors has contributed research on the topic and dogmatism and has related it to a broad range of subjects. Cronkhite and Goetz<sup>60</sup> have concluded that "dogmatism" and "attitude instability" are characteristics which tend to accompany the syndrome of "general persuasibility." Uhes and Shaver<sup>61</sup> found that high school students with

---

<sup>59</sup>Ibid., pp. 89-90.

<sup>60</sup>Gary Cronkhite and Emily Goetz, "Dogmatism Persuasibility and Attitude Instability," The Journal of Communication, 21 (December, 1971), 343-352.

<sup>61</sup>M. J. Uhes and James P. Shaver, "Dogmatism and Divergent-Convergent Abilities," Journal of Psychology, 75 (May, 1970), 3-11.

low dogmatism scores had higher intellectual abilities scores than high scorers. Gill<sup>62</sup> found that secure groups were less dogmatic than insecure groups and had a higher mean grade point average. Long<sup>63</sup> found a significant multiple relationship between dogmatism and conformity. The results of Costin's<sup>64</sup> work indicate that the relationship between "conservatism" and Rokeach's interpretation of "close-mindedness" may be stronger than first realized. Steigman<sup>65</sup> confirmed the considerable evidence of a significant relationship between dogmatism and mental health. Marker<sup>66</sup> found that a teacher's cognitive style can increase or reduce the effectiveness of inquiry-type civics materials. The findings by Barry<sup>67</sup> suggest that the Dogmatism

---

<sup>62</sup>Newell T. Gill, "The Effect of Security as an Independent Variable on Selected Variables . . . Etc." (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 011 796, September, 1966).

<sup>63</sup>Huey B. Long, "A Different Look at the Correlation Coefficient between Dogmatism and Conformity" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 061 486, April, 1972).

<sup>64</sup>Frank Costin, "Dogmatism and Conservatism: An Empirical Follow-up of Rokeach's Findings," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 31 (Winter, 1971), 1007-1010.

<sup>65</sup>Frank R. Steigman, "The Relationship between Dogmatism, Preference for Self-Actualizing Values and Indirect Discussion Leadership Style--As Influenced by Two Group Procedures" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1971).

<sup>66</sup>Gerald W. Marker, "Teacher Dogmatism and Its Impact upon the Political Attitudes of Students" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1970).

<sup>67</sup>G. C. Barry, "Teacher Open-Mindedness and Close-Mindedness as a Predictor of Student Creativity Progress" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1974).

Scale is an appropriate measure to assess aspects of a teacher's personality influencing children's creative development. Borgers and Ward<sup>68</sup> found that low dogmatic prospective teachers had greater need for autonomy, while the high dogmatic group had greater need for order, abasement, and aggression. Spivey<sup>69</sup> found that the assertion that the social science curricular perspective correlates positively with a more closed-minded perspective among teachers was not confirmed by his study. Chalker<sup>70</sup> concluded that teachers low in dogmatism are more reflective in their teaching behavior than those high in dogmatism.

A number of researchers<sup>71</sup> have all found that the Dogmatism Scale is not an effective tool for the evaluation of teachers at either

---

<sup>68</sup>Sherry B. Borgers and G. Robert Ward, "Differences in the Needs of Low Dogmatic and High Dogmatic Prospective Teachers," Educational Leadership, 31 (May, 1974), 697-699.

<sup>69</sup>J. R. Spivey, "A Comparative Study of the Curricular Perspectives and Scores of Dogmatism of Social Studies Teachers in Cook County, Illinois" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1973).

<sup>70</sup>Joan W. Chalker, "A Study, Using Interaction Analysis, of the Relationship between Teacher Dogmatism and the Reflective Method of Teaching Social Studies" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972).

<sup>71</sup>J. S. Johnson, "The Relationship of Open-Mindedness and Close-Mindedness to Success in Student Teaching" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966); Franklin G. Lewis, "The Relationship of Authoritarianism as Revealed by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Perceived Effectiveness of Teaching as Indicated by Teachers' Self-Ratings, Principals' Ratings and Supervisors' Ratings" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968); S. Davis Smith, "The Role of Dogmatism in Teacher Evaluation" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970); Gerald M. Hogan, "The Use of the Dogmatism Scale in the Prediction of Unsatisfactory Teacher Performance" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1971).



the pre-service or in-service level. Others<sup>72</sup> have found very little relationship between dogmatism and course achievement or overall learning. In a number of studies<sup>73</sup> concerning teacher education, all the authors came to the same conclusion that there is no evidence that students in teacher education programs are more authoritarian or dogmatic than other university students in general. Concerning the effects of dogmatism as related to student teachers, a number of sources<sup>74</sup> have concluded that student teachers do tend to be affected by the dogmatic level of their cooperating teacher but that those with a high self concept also had the lowest dogmatism. Additionally,

---

<sup>72</sup>C. M. Christiansen, "A Note on 'Dogmatism and Learning,'" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66 (1963), 73-75; Frank Costin, "Dogmatism and Learning: A Follow-up of Contradictory Findings," The Journal of Educational Research, 59 (1965), 186-188; Jim Shaver and Hyrum E. Richards, "Open-Closed Mindedness and an Inquiry Oriented Social Studies Methods Course," Journal of Educational Research, 65 (October, 1971), 85-93.

<sup>73</sup>Jim Shaver and Hyrum E. Richards, "Open-Closed Mindedness of College Students in Teacher Education, Final Report" (Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 026 303, October, 1968); Wendell B. Low, "Open-Closed Mindedness of Students in Teacher Education and in Other College Fields" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1971); David J. Hanson, "Dogmatism and College Major," Psychological Reports, 30 (1972), 190; James P. Shaver, W. Blair Low and Hyrum E. Richards, "The Authoritarianism and Dogmatism of Prospective Social Studies Teachers," Social Education, 38 (October, 1974), 561-565.

<sup>74</sup>J. S. Johnson, "Change in Student Teacher Dogmatism," Journal of Educational Research, 62 (1969), 224-226; M. M. Hart, "Dogmatism as Related to Accuracy of Student Teachers' Judgment of Students" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1966); Milton D. Marley, "The Relationship between Self-Concept of Teacher-Trainees and Dogmatism, Locus of Control and Teacher-Student Interaction Effectiveness" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1974); Sheila W. Morfield, "An Examination of the Relationship between Student Teachers' Dogmatism and Student Teacher Modeling Behavior" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1975).

those student teachers with lower dogmatism were less affected by authority and were better able to judge their own students.

A number of researchers<sup>75</sup> have also looked into the field in in-service teachers and have reached the conclusion that the tendency toward excessive dogmatism or close-mindedness is not a general characteristic of this group of present day educators. Work has also been done in the area of dogmatism and educational philosophy.<sup>76</sup> Liu, in an early study, found no clear-cut support for the hypothesis that a student teacher's authoritarianism, his philosophy of social education, and his instructional preferences were positively related to teaching behavior. On the other hand, Sears found that the relationship between philosophical orientation and certification rank was significant. Progressively oriented teachers tended to have a more advanced certification rank than traditionally oriented teachers. Anctil found results which indicated that both degree of dogmatism

---

<sup>75</sup>Leslie Y. Rabkin, "The Dogmatism of Teachers?" The Journal of Teacher Education, 17 (Spring, 1966), 47-49; Emma M. Cappelluzzo and James Brine, "Dogmatism and Prospective Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 20 (Summer, 1969), 148-152; T. M. Walsh, IV, "The Relationship between the Open-Closed Mindedness Systems within Teachers and the Degree of Their Implementation of an Innovative Curricular Program" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971).

<sup>76</sup>Shia-ling Liu, "Personal Characteristics in Secondary School Social Studies Teachers as Related to Certain Measures of Potential Teaching Behavior" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1963); Samuel Sears, Jr., "The Relationship between Teacher Dogmatism and Philosophical Orientation and Selected Teacher and District Characteristics" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1967); Donald E. Anctil, "Dogmatism and Philosophy: Their Relation to Teacher Acceptance and Understanding of the New Social Studies" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1973).

and educational philosophy were significantly related to teacher acceptance and understanding of the rationales of the New Social Studies.

Lastly, the area of dogmatism and classroom verbal behavior was examined.<sup>77</sup> Very little significance was found to exist between the topics, although some direction was shown for further investigation.

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the above review of literature in dogmatism is its relationship to the pre-service and in-service aspects of teacher education. Shaver stated it well when he said:

. . . the findings that education students (and teachers in the field) are not more authoritarian or dogmatic than other college students, provide some basis for speculating that the major impediment to the use of new social studies curricula may not be teacher personality. The pre-service and inservice education of teachers, the content and organization of curricular packages, and the instructional support systems provided by schools merit considerably more research effort than has been directed toward them in the past.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup>Azella L. Taylor, "Teacher Dogmatism as Related to Classroom Questions and Pupil-Teacher Verbal Interaction" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1969); Merlin Ager, "Dogmatism and the Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 21 (1970), 179-83.

<sup>78</sup>Shaver, Low and Richards, op. cit., p. 565.

Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory<sup>79</sup>

The author of this current research study became familiar with the Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers through a Departmental Leadership Handbook produced in 1975.<sup>80</sup> The editors of the Departmental Leadership Handbook had adapted the Inventory from a former document titled, "A Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies to Accompany the National Social Studies Guidelines" by Janet E. Alleman-Brooks, Ambrose A. Clegg, Jr. and Gary Huxford.

The original document was designed at the University of Washington in 1970-71. At that time Alleman-Brooks and Huxford were members of a project at the University of Washington and Clegg was a professor at the University of Washington. During that school year a similar document was developed to accompany the Washington State Social Studies Guidelines. The major intent by the authors of the document was to attempt to make the National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines<sup>81</sup> more usable.

---

<sup>79</sup>The majority of this section comes from two interview sources: A personal interview with Dr. Ambrose A. Clegg, Jr., Professor of Elementary Education, Kent State University, on November 25, 1977 in Cincinnati, Ohio; and two written interview responses from Dr. Janet E. Alleman-Brooks, Professor of Elementary Education, Michigan State University, dates November 30, 1977 and February 24, 1978. They are two of the three principal authors of the Inventory.

<sup>80</sup>"A Handbook for Departmental Leadership in the Social Studies," Social Studies Development Center, Prepared by the staff of the Social Studies Diffusion Project (Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1975), pp. 121-131.

<sup>81</sup>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, loc. cit.

Both of the authors interviewed were uncertain as to the reliability and validity of the Inventory. Also, both authors stated they had no knowledge of the Inventory being used in a research study (see Appendix F for a copy of the Inventory).

The Inventory has been used in numerous school districts throughout the country, but its use has not been carefully scrutinized. It has primarily been used by districts to assess their existing programs and to assist in planning for possible social studies curriculum revisions.

The author of this current research study made minor rewording revisions of the Inventory and developed the scoring sheet to accompany the Inventory. The Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a lack of agreement with current progressive social studies education.

The authors of the Inventory have also stated that the instrument will probably be revised to accommodate possible new social studies guidelines. The authors have been in contact with the National Social Studies Curriculum Committee in hopes of revising the instrument and

publishing it through that group.

### Interaction Analysis System

The Interaction Analysis System was developed as a result of the early work of Flanders<sup>82</sup> in which he focused on teacher influence patterns and their effect on student achievement. Flanders became concerned with verbal communication as the center of teacher-pupil contact and the Interaction Analysis System was designed and tested as a result of this concern. Flanders stated:

Classroom interaction analysis is particularly concerned with the influence pattern of the teacher. . . . Our purpose is to record a series of acts in terms of pre-determined concepts. The concepts in this case refer to the teacher's control of the students' freedom of action. Our interest is to distinguish those acts of the teacher that increase the students' freedom of action from those acts of the teacher that decrease the students' freedom of action, and to keep a record of both. . . .

Interaction Analysis is concerned primarily with verbal behavior because it can be observed with higher reliability than most nonverbal behavior.<sup>83</sup>

The assumption has been made that the verbal behavior of an individual is an adequate sample of his total behavior.

Amidon and Flanders further described the system as follows:

---

<sup>82</sup>Ned A. Flanders, Teacher Influence: Pupil Attitudes and Achievement, United States Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 397 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1960).

<sup>83</sup>Ned A. Flanders, Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare No. 12, OE 25040 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965).

In the Flanders system of interaction analysis observation all teacher statements are classified as either indirect or direct. This classification gives central attention to the amount of freedom the teacher grants to the student. In a given situation, therefore, a teacher has a choice. He can be direct, that is, minimizing the freedom of the student to respond, or he can be indirect, maximizing the freedom of the student to respond. His choice, conscious or unconscious, depends upon many factors, among which are his perceptions of the situation and the goals of the particular learning situation.<sup>84</sup>

The significant differences in achievement found in the earlier studies of interaction analysis support the generalizations that the teaching methods that are called indirect produce more achievement.<sup>85</sup>

Flanders added to the research findings on achievement with the following statement:

Perhaps the conclusion that needs to be emphasized the most in this summary is that the students who achieved the most and had significantly higher scores on our revised classroom attitude instrument were in classes which were exposed to flexible patterns of teacher influence. This flexible pattern included periods of predominantly direct influence as well as other periods of predominantly indirect influence. This characteristic flexibility was associated with a higher overall I/D average. Our data show that a sustained above average pattern of direct influence restricts learning and produces less desirable attitudes. It is obvious that as teacher influence deviates from this narrow pattern, the overall I/D must increase. These deviations are what we have called flexibility.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>84</sup>Edmund J. Amidon and Ned A. Flanders, The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom: A Manual for Understanding and Improving Teachers' Classroom Behavior (Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Inc., 1963), p. 5.

<sup>85</sup>Flanders, 1965, op. cit., pp. 107-108.

<sup>86</sup>Ibid., p. 109.

Description of categories (see Table 2.2 as well as Appendix G).

In order to make total behavior or total interaction in the classroom meaningful, the Flanders system also provides for the categorizing of student talk. A third major section, that of silence or confusion, is included in order to account for the time spent in behavior other than that which can be classified as either teacher or student talk. All statements that occur in the classroom, then, are categorized in one of three major sections: (1) teacher talk, (2) student talk, and a separate category, (3) silence or confusion, used to handle anything else that is not teacher or student talk.<sup>87</sup>

The major sections of teacher and student verbal behavior are further subdivided into nine categories in order to make the total pattern of teacher pupil interaction more meaningful (see Table 2.2).

The addition of the total tallies in categories 1, 2, 3, and 4 is divided by the sum of the total tallies in categories 5, 6, and 7 to produce the I/D ratio. As it was previously defined in Chapter I of this study, this ratio represents the ratio of indirect to direct teacher statements.

Research findings. Knight<sup>88</sup> researched the characteristics of teachers who dealt with social issues in their classrooms. He found the most marked differences between the high social issue and the low social issue teachers were in their priorities of educational objectives

---

<sup>87</sup> Amidon and Flanders, op. cit., pp. 5-6.

<sup>88</sup> Richard S. Knight, "Characteristics of Secondary Social Studies Teachers Who Deal with Social Issues in Their Classrooms" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1972).



Table 2.2

## Summary of Categories for Interaction Analysis

TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLU- ENCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. *ACCEPTS FEELING: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included.</li> <li>2. *PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "uhhuh?" or "go on" are included.</li> <li>3. *ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENT: clarifying, building, or developing ideas or suggestions by a student. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.</li> <li>4. *ASKS QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.</li> </ol>
	DIRECT INFLU- ENCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. *LECTURING: giving factors or opinions about content or procedure; expressing his own idea; asking rhetorical questions.</li> <li>6. *GIVING DIRECTIONS: directions, commands, or orders with which a student is expected to comply.</li> <li>7. *CRITICIZING OR JUSTIFYING AUTHORITY: statements intended to change student behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing, extreme self-reference.</li> </ol>

Table 2.2 (continued)

STUDENT TALK	<p>8. *STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE: talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contract or solicits student statement.</p> <p>9. *STUDENT TALK-INITIATION: talk by students, which they initiate. If "calling on" student is only to indicate who may talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category.</p>
	<p>10. *SILENCE OF CONFUSION: pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</p>

and in personality differences. High issue teachers were significantly more concerned about improving critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving skills of their students than were the low issue teachers. Low issue teachers were significantly more concerned about improving general academic achievement of their students. Perhaps most important of all, especially in relation to interaction analysis, was the finding that the high social issue teachers were distinctly more flexible.

Chalker,<sup>89</sup> who was previously mentioned for her study's findings on dogmatism, also found that the data from her study demonstrated a positive relationship between reflective and indirect teaching behavior. Teachers low in dogmatism not only excelled in behaviors characteristic of reflective teachers but were also identified by interaction analysis ratios as "indirect."

A number of other studies<sup>90</sup> have been concerned with the verbal behavior of student teachers who have been trained in the use of interaction analysis. These studies are for the most part inconclusive

---

<sup>89</sup>Chalker, op. cit.

<sup>90</sup>Anna S. Ochoa, "The Effects of Training in Interaction Analysis and Immediate Feedback on the Indirect Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers and the Verbal Behavior of Pupils" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1970); Edward L. Thomas, "The Effect of Training in Flanders' Interaction Analysis on the Teaching Patterns of Student Teachers in Social Studies at Mississippi State University" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1972); Charlotte J. Farris, "Effectiveness of Summarized Pupil Feedback for Self-Supervised Change in Student Teachers' Verbal Behavior" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1972); Ferne D. Garrett, "Feedback and Flanders Interaction Analysis Related to Change in the Indirect Teaching Behavior of Student Teachers" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973).

although they do reveal a trend that favors the use of training in interaction analysis. The one factor most of these studies have in common is the low number of hours of training in interaction analysis that their students received, which may be a factor in the present conclusions.

### SUMMARY

The purpose of the first four sections of this chapter has been to examine the general direction and major issues concerning social studies education over the past few decades. An attempt has been made to state the importance of having an educational philosophy and also a social studies rationale. Current trends among social studies teacher education programs were examined for their relevancy to this study and related documents were also examined for the same purpose.

The final major section of this chapter examined the research and literature related to data collection instruments that are valuable in social studies education research. The instruments described in these sections were: (a) the Educational Values Inventory, (b) the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, (c) the Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory, and (d) the Interaction Analysis System. The background development of each instrument was described and its usage in relation to this current study was explained. Whenever possible, crossover findings between various instruments concerning positive teacher characteristics were pointed out as they related to this study.

## CHAPTER III

### CONDUCT OF THE STUDY

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the study was to investigate whether there was a difference in educational values, dogmatic beliefs, social studies self assessment characteristics and classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between pre-service social studies teachers who were exposed to instruction in the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements and pre-service social studies teachers who were not exposed to this instruction. The background, hypotheses to be investigated and the need for the study were outlined in Chapter I. A review of related research and literature concerning such topics as educational philosophy, various social studies definitions, teacher education programs, and related social studies documents, as well as an explanation and review of the data collection instruments which were used in this study was presented in Chapter II.

This chapter is divided into the following sections: (1) Hypotheses, (2) Design of the Study, (3) Population and Sampling, (4) Treatment, (5) Data Collection Procedures, (6) Data Analysis, and (7) Summary.

#### HYPOTHESES

The primary purpose of this study was to determine if pre-service teachers can be assisted in developing a coherent belief

system. The following statistical hypotheses were tested:

1. There are no statistically significant differences in the educational values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
2. There are no statistically significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
3. There are no statistically significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
4. There are no statistically significant differences in the interaction analysis scores on taped observations of classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

#### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to use an Equivalent Group Design (experimental group and control group) whose groups were chosen on the basis of a random selection from the Nebraska University Student Teacher Education Program (NUSTEP) social studies class during the first semester of 1977-78. Both the experimental and control groups received the regular NUSTEP social studies program, including the normally scheduled teacher-assisting activities (see Appendix A for NUSTEP calendar). The experimental group received an additional exposure to an analysis of various social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements. This exposure was spread out over

seven days within a normal two week period of class meeting times (see Appendix B). The experimental group meeting times varied from thirty minutes to two and one-half hours. The experimental group did not miss any of the regularly scheduled NUSTEP class time due to their own group meeting times.

#### POPULATION AND SAMPLING

The participants in this study were all of the social studies students enrolled in the NUSTEP program during the first semester, 1977-78. Thirty-two students were involved as subjects in the study (see Appendix C). The fall NUSTEP population was generally made up of first semester seniors, who then student taught during the second semester of their senior year. The fall NUSTEP experience included teacher assisting in the secondary schools of the Lincoln, Nebraska area (see Appendix A for additional NUSTEP information).

Two groups of sixteen students each were randomly chosen, by use of a table of random numbers, from the social studies NUSTEP class. These groups were randomly assigned as the control and experimental groups. The fall social studies NUSTEP class was instructed by Dr. Clarice Ramsey, Assistant Professor of Secondary Education; Educational Psychology graduate assistant Mrs. Pat Mohr, and this investigator who served as a graduate assistant in Secondary Education.

## TREATMENT

The overall design of the study and a general outline of the treatment procedures were explained to the experimental group prior to the start of the treatment process. All members of the experimental group were asked to sign a consent form (see Appendix B) to indicate their willingness to participate in the study. All sixteen students in the experimental group consented to participate. The instruction of the experimental group was handled entirely by this researcher.

After a review of various literature, the researcher chose the following materials for the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements by the experimental group:

1. A Parent's Guide to Social Studies, by Daniel Roselle, National Council for the Social Studies, 1974.
2. A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies, Nebraska State Department of Education, 1971.
3. Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines, National Council for the Social Studies Position Statement, 1971.
4. Controversial Issues, Nebraska State Department of Education, 1976.

(See Appendix B for a summary of the main points of each document.)

The above mentioned documents were examined by the experimental group during a portion of the regularly scheduled NUSTEP social studies class meeting time. The treatment was administered over seven school days within a two-week time period and totaled seven hours of instruction time. The treatment coincided with the on-campus class time of the NUSTEP calendar schedule (see Appendices A and B). The experimental



group's meeting dates, amount of time involved and topic coverage are outlined in Table 3.1.

The analysis of materials by the experimental group consisted of the following general time and activity schedules:

1. Time. The time allotted to each of the previously mentioned philosophy or rationale statements varied due to the student interest, questions raised for discussion and time available in the NUSTEP calendar schedule.
2. Method. The primary method was one of reading, discussion and reaction, with this researcher acting as the moderator and, when needed, the questioner. All attempts were made to maintain a level of open-ended discussions by drawing upon the student's interpretations and opinions of the documents discussed. Emphasis was placed on the students' own secondary school social studies experiences and their reactions to their undergraduate History and Philosophy of Education course.
3. Documents Checklist. A brief summary documents checklist was developed by this researcher and it was filled out by each of the experimental group students upon the completion of the reading and discussion of each individual document (see Appendix B).
4. Philosophy Statement Rewrite. At the completion of the total treatment each student was asked to rewrite their personal social studies philosophy paper that they had written as an earlier class requirement during the first week of NUSTEP (see Appendix A).

The Documents Checklist and Philosophy Statement Rewrite were primarily used by this researcher as a reading check-off on the part of the students and also to observe any possible shift in philosophical stance. No formal evaluation techniques were used on these items.

#### COLLECTION OF DATA

Each instrument was selected in terms of its appropriateness in obtaining data for accepting or rejecting the hypotheses of the study. The data from each instrument were scored according to its

Table 3.1  
Experimental Group Meeting Dates, Times and Topics

Date	Time Involved	Topic
Monday, October 17, 1977	30 minutes	Began and covered over half of <u>A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies</u> .
Tuesday, October 18, 1977	1 hour	Completed the discussion on <u>A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies</u> , and began <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies--Major Area No. 1</u> (see Appendix B for description).
Wednesday, October 19, 1977	30 minutes	Completed the discussion on Major Area No. 1 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> and began Major Area No. 2 discussion.
Monday, October 24, 1977	30 minutes	Completed the discussion on Major Area No. 2 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> and began Major Area No. 3 discussion.
Tuesday, October 25, 1977	1 hour	Completed the discussion on Major Area No. 3, 4 and 5 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> . Reviewed whole document and discussed inquiry relationship to history, science and democracy.
Wednesday, October 26, 1977	1 hour	Began the <u>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines</u> up to page 15.
Friday, October 28, 1977	2 hours, 30 minutes	Completed the <u>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines</u> and began and completed a discussion on <u>Controversial Issues</u> . Reviewed all the documents for their possible inter-connectedness. Assigned the students <u>personal philosophy</u> of social studies education to be rewritten by Friday, November 18, 1977.

accompanying directions. All data collection was done by this researcher and all scoring and coding reliability for these instruments was established by this researcher.

The following instruments were used to collect data on the dependent variables:

1. Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B (see Appendix D). Each student, as a part of his or her pre-registration process for NUSTEP, was administered the EVI--Form A. Therefore, the pre-test scores on this instrument were available in the NUSTEP office. Form B of the EVI was administered, as the post-test, to all social studies NUSTEP students during the last week of their NUSTEP semester in December.

Scoring of the EVI. The test is so constructed that an individual responds to education statements on a five-point Likert scale, according to the degree of agreement or disagreement each person has with the individual statements. An individual's score is determined by summing up the individual numerical values assigned to his or her responses. This score places a person on a values continuum ranging from closed to emerging values, or traditional to open concepts about education. Higher scores reflect a more congruent attitude toward innovative education, while lower scores reflect a more dissonant attitude. The range of possible scores is from 33 to 165 on Form A and 40 to 200 on Form B.

2. Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E (see Appendix E). Each social studies NUSTEP student was pre-tested on this instrument during the last week of September of his or her NUSTEP semester, and post-tested during the last week of his or her semester in December.

Scoring of the Dogmatism Scale. In the scoring of the scale, persons scoring high on this scale are assumed to have relatively closed belief systems, while person scoring low will be assumed to have relatively open belief systems. The scale consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a high degree of dogmatism.

3. A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers (see Appendix F). This instrument was post-tested only, to the entire social studies NUSTEP class during the last week of their semester in December.

Scoring of the Self Assessment Inventory. The Inventory consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a lack of agreement with current progressive social studies education.

4. Interaction Analysis System (see Appendix G). All pre-test scores on IA came from the students' taped micro-teaching experiences in front of their peers which was done during the first two weeks of the NUSTEP semester. The post-test scores on IA came from the students' taped teacher assisting experience in front of secondary school students which was done during the last segment of their teacher assisting off-campus experience.

Scoring of IA. When scoring an interaction analysis observation, an I/D ratio will be found, which is the ratio of indirect to direct teacher statements. An I/D ratio of 1.0 means that for every indirect statement there was one direct statement; an I/D ratio of 2.0 means that for every two indirect statements there was only one direct statement. If over half the teacher talk is in the direct categories (a score below 1.0), a teacher is more direct than indirect. If over half the teacher talk is in the indirect categories (a score above 1.0), a teacher is more indirect than direct. A position was taken that more indirect teacher behaviors provide a more positive classroom environment.

#### DATA ANALYSIS

The level of significance as the standard of the statistical tests on the hypotheses was .05. The following forms of research design and types of statistical tests were used on each instrument:

1. Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B. Campbell and Stanley<sup>1</sup> research design 4 - Pretest/Posttest Control Group Design; Statistical test - F test, Analysis of Variance - Repeated Measures. The F test was used to determine whether there were significant changes in student attitudes toward innovative education as measured by scores on pre- and post-tests of both the control and experimental groups during the NUSTEP semester.

2. Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E. Campbell and Stanley research design 4 - Pretest/Posttest Control Group Design; Statistical test - F test, Analysis of Variance - Repeated Measures. The F test was used to determine whether there were significant changes in student attitudes of open-mindedness vs. close-mindedness as measured by scores on pre- and post-tests of both the control and experimental groups during the NUSTEP semester.

3. A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers. Campbell and Stanley research design 6 - Posttest only control group design; Statistical test - t-test. The t-test was used to determine whether there were significant changes in student attitudes toward innovative social studies education as measured by scores on post-tests of both the control and experimental groups during the NUSTEP semester.

4. Interaction Analysis System. Campbell and Stanley research design 4 - Pretest/Posttest Control Group Design; Statistical test -

---

<sup>1</sup>Donald T. Campbell and Julian C. Stanley, Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963).

F test, Analysis of Variance - Repeated Measures. The F test was used to determine whether there were significant changes in student verbal behaviors (as related to direct vs. indirect verbal teaching style) as measured by scores on pre- and post-tests of both the control and experimental groups during the NUSTEP semester.

Observational data on each individual's classroom verbal behavior were gathered from the video-taping of NUSTEP students in micro-teaching sessions during the semester and limited to those sessions. The tapings were made during the first two weeks in NUSTEP and during the last three weeks of teacher assisting.

The NUSTEP students did the micro-teaching with a peer group at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and with students in a junior or senior high school in the Lincoln, Nebraska area. No stipulation was made by this researcher concerning content to be taught or type and number of students in the teaching session. It was requested that the session be of a general class presentation/discussion format. All attempts were made to video-tape representative teacher behavior. If the NUSTEP student, proctor or cooperating teacher did not view the taped session as representative, at least one other session was then taped and included into the scoring on interaction analysis.

#### SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The procedures used to fulfill the design of the study were described in this chapter. The research hypotheses were stated and a general description of the design was outlined. The population of the

thirty-two NUSTEP students was described as well as the sampling method used. The overall treatment and data collection procedures were also described. The chapter concluded with an explanation of the data analysis procedures used in the study.



## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there was a difference in educational values, dogmatic beliefs, social studies self assessment characteristics and classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between pre-service social studies teachers who were exposed to instruction in the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements and pre-service social studies teachers who were not exposed to this instruction. This was to determine if pre-service teachers can be assisted in developing a coherent belief system. The following instruments were used to collect data on the above variables: the Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B; Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E; A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers; and the Interaction Analysis System.

The population in this study was the 32 University of Nebraska students enrolled in the Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program (NUSTEP) social studies class in the fall semester of 1977. These students were randomly divided into an experimental and control group of 16 students each.

The data presented in this chapter were gathered by the procedures described in Chapter III.

Briefly stated, the primary purpose of this study was to determine if pre-service teachers could be assisted in developing a

coherent belief system. Four statistical hypotheses were investigated in this study. They were stated as follows:

1. There are no statistically significant differences in the educational values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

2. There are no statistically significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

3. There are no statistically significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

4. There are no statistically significant differences in the interaction analysis scores on taped observations of classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

The level of significance as the standard of the statistical tests on the hypotheses was .05. The F test, Analysis of Variance - Repeated Measures was used on the data collected on hypotheses 1, 2 and 4 listed above. The t-test was used on hypotheses 3 (see Appendix H for all data collected on experimental and control groups).

Before moving into the statistical description of the data

for each of the above mentioned hypotheses, some of the symbols used in the "Source of Variation" column of the Analysis of Variance tables need to be defined.

The upper three items in the source of variation column are in the "Among Groups Category" and they are: Mean, G, and Error.

The lower three items in the source of variation column are in the "Within Groups Category" and they are: P, PG, and Error.

The letters G, P, and PG are further defined as follows:

G - Comparison Among Groups (Experimental vs. Control)

P - Comparison Within Subjects Across Time (Pre-test to Post-test)

PG - Interaction Between Groups and Time

The three above mentioned sets of letters can be further understood by further defining them in the form of questions they each ask toward the significance of F. These questions are as follows:

G - Is there a difference between the groups?

P - Is there a difference from pre-test to post-test  
ignoring the group they are in?

PG - Is there a difference between the groups from pre-test  
to post-test due to their being in specific groups?

The major significance of the F score to be examined in relationship to this current study will be the PG score.

### STATISTICAL TESTS OF THE HYPOTHESES

In Table 4.1 the analysis of variance scores for the Educational Values Inventory are presented. The individual statistical hypothesis tested by this set of data was as follows:

Hypothesis 1. There are no statistically significant differences in the education values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

Table 4.1

Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control  
Group Scores on the Educational Values Inventory

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Mean	973.09448	1	973.09448	10686.46875	0.000
G	0.00365	1	0.00365	0.04007	0.843
Error	2.73176	30	0.09106		
P	0.00185	1	0.00185	0.05715	0.813
PG	0.05157	1	0.05157	1.59445	0.216
Error	0.97023	30	0.03234		

Based on the results presented in Table 4.1, the statistical hypothesis is accepted. The figures in Table 4.1 indicate that there was no statistical significance between the scores of the groups tested.

In Table 4.2 the analysis of variance scores for the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale are presented. The individual statistical hypothesis tested by this set of data was as follows:

Hypothesis 2. There are no statistically significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

Table 4.2  
Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control  
Group Scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Mean	1102753.00000	1	1102753.00000	1259.69336	0.000
G	54.39453	1	54.39453	0.06214	0.805
Error	26262.41797	30	875.41382		
P	21.39038	1	21.39038	0.22292	0.640
PG	11.39038	1	11.39038	0.11870	0.733
Error	2878.71533	30	95.95717		

Based on the results presented in Table 4.2 the statistical hypothesis is accepted. The figures in Table 4.2 indicate that there was no statistical significance between the scores of the groups tested.

In Table 4.3, the t-test scores for the Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers are presented. The individual statistical hypothesis tested by this set of data was as follows:

Hypothesis 3. There are no statistically significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

Table 4.3

t-Test of Experimental and Control Group Scores on the Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers

Variable	No. of Cases	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error	F Value	Two-Tail Probability
Control Group	16	79.3750	24.709	5.177	3.88	0.013
Experimental Group	16	69.9375	12.546	3.136		
Separate Variance Estimate			t-Value	df	Two-Tail Probability	
			1.36	22.25	0.187	

Based on the results presented in Table 4.3 the statistical hypothesis is accepted. The figures in Table 4.3 indicate that there was no statistical significance between the scores of the groups tested.

In Table 4.4, the analysis of variance scores for the Interaction Analysis System are presented. The individual statistical hypothesis tested by this set of data was as follows:

Hypothesis 4. There are no statistically significant differences in the interaction analysis scores on taped observations of classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

Table 4.4  
Analysis of Variance of Experimental and Control  
Group Scores on the Interaction Analysis

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance of F
Mean	58.90503	1	58.90503	35.33008	0.000
G	0.76123	1	0.76123	0.45657	0.504
Error	50.01830	30	1.66728		
P	43.09883	1	43.09883	23.00603	0.000
PG	0.01379	1	0.01379	0.00736	0.932
Error	56.20114	30	1.87337		

Based on the results presented in Table 4.4 the statistical hypothesis is accepted. The figures in Table 4.4 indicate that there was no statistical significance between the scores of the groups tested.

In summary, Tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 each describe the statistical test which was run on the data collected from the four variables in this study. Those variables were: educational values, domestic beliefs, social studies self assessment characteristics and classroom verbal behavior teaching styles. Based on the results presented in each of the tables (Tables 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4), the statistical hypotheses in each case, which were stated in the null form, were accepted. Each table indicates that there was no statistical significance between the scores of the various groups tested.

The reason for accepting the null hypotheses in each of the above mentioned cases was generally the result of the large within group variation which was found in the study of the statistics listed in the tables. The large within group variation may be explained as a possible result of some or all of the reasons listed below:

1. All students in the experimental group did not respond in the same way to the treatment.
2. The measurement instruments which were used may not have been as sensitive as desired.
3. A larger sample size was needed in each of the cells (experimental and control groups).
4. The treatment may have been inadequate regarding length of time, the materials used, the methodology employed, and/or the needed instructional skills of the investigator.
5. Other unknown factors may have influenced the within group variation.



## POST HOC COMPARISONS OF MEANS

Although there was no statistical significance to be found between the groups on the variables mentioned in the preceding section, this researcher did some additional investigation by securing and analyzing the means of the groups on each of the time intervals of testing. Table 4.5 is a listing of all of the means, and the descriptions that follow will describe the directional changes of the means of each variable.

Table 4.5  
Post Hoc Comparisons of Means

Variable	Test	Group	Range of Scores	Mean Score
Educational Values Inventory	Pre-test	Control	1 to 5	3.9148
		Experimental		3.8731
	Post-test	Control		3.8687
		Experimental		3.9406
Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	Pre-test	Control	40 to 280	131.1875
		Experimental		130.1875
	Post-test	Control		133.1875
		Experimental		130.5000
Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory	Post-test only	Control	40 to 280	79.3750
		Experimental		69.9375
Interaction Analysis System	Pre-test	Control	0 to $\infty$	0.0444
		Experimental		0.2331
	Post-test	Control		1.6562
		Experimental		1.9037

### Educational Values Inventory

Two forms of the Educational Values Inventory (EVI) were used in this study, Form A (33 items) and Form B (40 items). The mean scores were adjusted for the item number difference. Higher scores reflected a more congruent attitude toward innovative education while lower scores reflected a more dissonant attitude. The range of scores was from 1 to 5.

The listing in Table 4.5 of the EVI pre-test mean score for the control group was 3.9148 and for the experimental group was 3.8731. The control group had a higher score than the experimental group by 0.0417. The EVI post-test mean score for the control group was 3.8687 and for the experimental group was 3.9406. The experimental group had a higher score than the control group by 0.0719. From pre-test to post-test the control group had declined in score by 0.0461, while the experimental group had increased in score by 0.0675.

### Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E

In the scoring of the scale, persons scoring high on this scale were assumed to have relatively closed belief systems, while persons scoring low were assumed to have relatively open belief systems. The range of possible scores was from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a high degree of dogmatism.

The listing in Table 4.5 of the dogmatism pre-test mean score for the control group was 131.1875 and for the experimental group was 130.1875. The experimental group had a lower score than the control group by 1.0000. The dogmatism post-test mean score for the control

group was 133.1875 and for the experimental group was 130.5000. The experimental group had a lower score than the control group by 2.6875, despite the fact that both post-test scores had risen from their pre-test mean scores. The major difference was in the amount of increase both groups received from pre-test to post-test. The control group had increased 2.0000 while the experimental group had increased by only 0.3125.

#### Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory

In the scoring of the inventory, persons scoring lower showed a more congruent attitude toward current progressive practices in social studies education while higher scores reflected a more dissonant attitude. The range of scores was from 40 to 280.

The listing in Table 4.5 of the inventory post-test mean score for the control group was 79.3750 and for the experimental group it was 69.9375. The experimental group had a lower mean score than the control group by 9.4375.

#### Interaction Analysis System

When scoring an interaction analysis observation an I/D ratio will be found, which is the ratio of indirect to direct teacher statements. An I/D ratio of 1.0 means that for every indirect statement there was one direct statement, and an I/D ratio of 2.0 means that for every two indirect statements there was only one direct statement. If over half of the teacher talk is in the direct categories (a score below 1.0), a teacher is more direct than indirect.

If over half of the teacher talk is in the indirect categories (a score above 1.0), a teacher is more indirect than direct. A position was taken that more indirect teacher behaviors provide a more positive classroom environment.

The listing in Table 4.5 of the interaction analysis (IA) pre-test mean score for the control group was 0.0444 and for the experimental group it was 0.2331. The experimental group had a higher mean score than the control group by 0.1887. The IA post-test mean score for the control group was 1.6562 and for the experimental group was 1.9037. The experimental group had a higher score than the control group by 0.2475. Both the control and experimental groups had increased their post-test scores over their pre-test scores, the control group by 1.6118 and the experimental group by 1.6706.

In summary, analysis of post hoc comparisons of means between the control and experimental groups showed that the experimental group that had received the additional exposure to the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements had a generally greater change in mean score in what was determined to be a more positive direction with each of the variables that were examined. The experimental group had a more positive attitude toward innovative education and current social studies education, less dogmatism and were more indirect in their teaching behaviors. This analysis revealed a trend or direction that positively favored the use of such exposure to social studies pre-service students.

## SUMMARY

Data collected during the conduct of this study have been presented in this chapter. All final computations were based on the total of pre-test and post-test scores of 32 pre-service social studies students included in the sample. The null hypotheses posed in Chapter III can now be answered relevant to the social studies pre-service teachers who were the subjects of this study. In light of the purposes and limitations outlined previously, the following summary statements of the findings are given.

In each of the following hypotheses the null hypothesis is accepted:

1. There are no significant differences in the educational values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

2. There are no significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

3. There are no significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

4. There are no significant differences in the interaction analysis scores of taped observations of classroom verbal behavior

teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

#### Post Hoc Comparison of Means

An analysis of the post hoc comparison of means between the control and experimental groups revealed a trend or direction that positively favored the use of such exposure, as outlined in the above hypotheses, to social studies pre-service students.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The material in this chapter is presented in three sections. A summary of this study is presented in section one. The second section presents conclusions based upon the findings of the study. Implications of the study and recommendations comprise the final section.

### SUMMARY

Various critics of the American educational system have centered their criticism on the mindlessness of what they have seen taking place in the nation's schools. In general this mindlessness is defined as a failure or refusal to think seriously about educational purpose. More specifically, within the ranks of the social studies profession itself, this criticism is generally aimed at the profession's lack of an established rationale. A great deal of the criticism of the social studies profession concerning the lack of this philosophical, rational or purpose base is generally directed toward the social studies methods class. This study investigated the question of whether or not it is possible to assist pre-service teachers in the development of a coherent belief system. Various teacher characteristics were measured between a control and an experimental group scores on the Educational Values Inventory, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory and the Interaction Analysis System.

### The Problem

The purpose of this study was to investigate whether there was a difference in educational values, dogmatic beliefs, social studies self assessment characteristics and classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between pre-service social studies teachers who were exposed to instruction in the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements and pre-service social studies teachers who were not exposed to this instruction. This was to determine if pre-service teachers can be assisted in developing a coherent belief system.

### The Hypotheses

The hypotheses of the study were stated in the null form as follows:

1. There are no significant differences in the educational values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
2. There are no significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
3. There are no significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.
4. There are no significant differences in the interaction analysis scores on taped observations of classroom verbal behavior



teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

### The Review of Research and Literature

The review of research and literature focused on five major areas: (1) educational philosophy in general, (2) a definition of social studies, (3) programs in social studies teacher education, (4) related social studies documents and (5) instruments valuable in social studies education research.

Research clearly demonstrates the general agreement among educators of the importance of having a personal philosophy of education. A review of the social studies movement in the United States also clearly shows the confusion and conflicting trends that have attempted to dominate the field over the past fifty years. The current movement toward a consensus definition of social studies for the purpose of citizenship education is not without its problems and a great deal of future discussion will need to take place to further define and actualize such a definition. The research on one of the more non-traditional programs in social studies teacher education, that of the competency-based teacher education movement, is also not without its critics as well as its supporters. Also, in the past eight years various documents related to social studies philosophy and rationale have been produced which are valuable in lending discussion and direction to the question of rationale building.

Overall, generally speaking, there has not been a great deal of attention given to the questions of an analysis of social studies philosophy or curriculum rationale statements, or to the general question of rationale-building on either the pre-service or in-service level.

### The Procedures

The participants in this study were all of the social studies students enrolled in the Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program (NUSTEP) during the first semester, 1977-78. Thirty-two students were involved as subjects in the study. An experimental and control group of sixteen students each was randomly chosen, by use of a table of random numbers.

After a review of various literature, the researcher chose four documents for use by the experimental group in their analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements. The treatment was administered over seven school days within a two-week time period and totaled seven hours of instruction time.

The following instruments were used to collect data on the dependent variables:

1. Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B
2. Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E
3. A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers
4. Interaction Analysis System

The experimental and control group scores were statistically computed in the following manner:

1. F-test, Analysis of Variance - Repeated Measures. Used

on the student scores obtained from the Educational Values Inventory, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Interaction Analysis System.

2. t-test. Used on the student scores obtained from the Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers. The .05 level of significance was chosen as the criterion for statistical significance in all analyses of data.

### The Findings

An analysis of the data provided in Chapter IV of the study yielded findings on the research hypotheses that can be summarized as follows:

There were no statistically significant differences in the educational values scores, the dogmatism scores, the social studies self assessment inventory scores of the interaction analysis scores of taped observations of classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

An analysis of the post hoc comparison of means between the control and experimental groups revealed a trend or direction that positively favored the use of an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements with pre-service teachers.

### CONCLUSIONS

Based on the evidence collected during this investigation, the following conclusions were made.

In each of the following hypotheses the null hypothesis is accepted:

1. There are no significant differences in the educational values scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

2. There are no significant differences in the dogmatism scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

3. There are no significant differences in the social studies self assessment inventory scores between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

4. There are no significant differences in the interaction analysis scores of taped observations of classroom verbal behavior teaching styles between a control group and an experimental group due to an analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements.

Generally speaking, the acceptance of each of the null hypotheses as listed above is the result of the large within group variation which was found in the study of the statistics computed on the data of each of the variables. The large within group variation may be explained as a possible result of some or all of the reasons listed below:

1. All students in the experimental group did not respond in the same way to the treatment.
2. The measurement instruments which were used may not have been as sensitive as desired.
3. A larger sample size is needed in each of the cells (experimental and control groups).
4. The treatment may have been inadequate regarding length of time, materials used, the methodology employed, and/or the needed instructional skills of the investigator.
5. Other unknown factors may have influenced the within group variation.

This researcher feels that reason number one listed above may have been a major contributor to the large within group variation due to the various student levels of cognitive development and, therefore, their ability to move from the concrete to the abstract in their conceptualization of the materials read.

Statistically speaking, it is of interest to note that the t-score for the social studies self assessment inventory and the F score on the educational values inventory were the closest to the .05 level of significance. The experimental group treatment seems to have had a greater effect upon the educational values of the students than upon their levels of dogmatism or verbal characteristics. This result agrees with general research findings that the experimental group would, as a result of their treatment, show greater change in general beliefs rather than in specific beliefs and specific behaviors over

a short period of time. One would hope for the latter changes over a longer period of time of incorporation of beliefs into actions.

Although there was no statistical significance shown in the F or t-tests that were computed on the data collected on each of the variables this researcher also examined a post hoc comparison of the means between the control and experimental groups. An analysis of these means showed that the experimental group that had received the additional exposure to the analysis of social studies philosophy and curriculum rationale statements had a generally greater change in mean scores in what was determined to be a more positive direction with each of the variables that was examined. The experimental group had a more positive attitude toward innovative education and current social studies education, less dogmatism and were more indirect in their teaching behaviors. This analysis revealed a trend or direction that positively favored the use of such exposure to social studies pre-service students.

It should be noted that both the control and experimental groups had an increase in their mean scores on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, although the experimental group had a much smaller gain compared to the increase by the control group. This gain in mean score is seen to be the result of the student-assisting experiences by the NUSTEP students in the public schools. The sometimes cold and hard reality of the live teaching situation can have the effect of eroding away some of the lofty ideals of the inexperienced future teacher.

It should also be noted that both the control and experimental groups had very excellent gains, and as a result, very favorable mean

scores on the interaction analysis system, although the experimental group had a slightly larger gain, pre-test to post-test, than the control group. The positive mean score by both groups may be a result of the overall instructional goal and modeling examples the students were exposed to in the NUSTEP program. A great amount of emphasis was placed upon the indirect teaching style and student-centered approach by the NUSTEP social studies instructors.

Generally speaking, the findings of this study lead this researcher to the conclusions that were basically reported in the review of literature which indicated that pre-service teachers have not developed a well defined philosophy of education. Also, more study is needed to determine if pre-service teachers possess a coherent belief system or if they can be assisted in developing one through a rationale-building process.

#### IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the general review of research and literature and the findings of this study, a firm research base does not seem to exist for making suggestions to social studies educators which could guarantee improvement in the construction of a coherent belief system in pre-service social studies teachers.

The process of rationale building seems to be a slow and arduous task, if it happens at all. Some social studies professionals seem to feel that the process of rationale building can not take place until the individual has had classroom experience to reflect upon. Others feel that a firm philosophical foundation can be established in

the pre-service experience and that these ideas can be matched to the realities of a teacher's classroom behaviors. With more and more teacher education programs seemingly going to the process of giving their education majors early experiences in the schools (during their freshman and sophomore years) there may be a new middle ground developing that may prove to be very productive for further experimentation on this question of rationale building. These early experiences in the schools may give pre-service students the necessary experiences for reflection that some professionals see as necessary for rationale building and they may also serve as a foundation for those who feel a belief system can be developed in pre-service students.

If this trend toward early experiences in schools continues, the following recommendations are suggested to aid in the experimentation on the question of the development of a coherent belief system:

1. Pre-test as early as possible in the undergraduate years and use the findings for the possible grouping of students into divisions for the use of various types of treatment methods.
2. Have some of the pre-testing concern itself with the student level of cognitive development, using these data as a possible grouping tool.
3. Give earlier and longer treatment sessions with follow-up reinforcement throughout the pre-service years. Compare those results with later and shorter treatment sessions.
4. Vary the method of treatment as many ways as possible to seek the most effective form.



5. Use other types of materials in the treatment sessions.
6. Frequently re-test to follow-up on student progress over time.
7. Improve the coordination of the History and Philosophy of Education course with the desired rationale building in the academic area teaching field selected by the pre-service students.
8. Aim a major portion of the in-service graduate education at the rationale building process. It may be a first-time experience for some and a re-examination or reinforcement exercise for others.

The above recommendations for research and strategies are all intended to encourage a continuation of the examination of the rationale building process by all segments of the social studies profession. If the profession cannot state what it believes and how it is acting upon those beliefs in the classrooms, then how can it justify what it is presently doing and where it may be going? Research data on these questions could help parents, students, curriculum planners, social studies teachers and their administrators in implementing social studies programs which reflect a coherent belief system.

*--It is not enough to be busy . . .  
the question is:  
What are we busy about?*

*Thoreau*

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adorno, T. W., and others. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1950.
- Ager, Merlin. "Dogmatism and the Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 21 (1970), 179-183.
- Alleman, Brooks, Janet E. Personal correspondence interview with the author. Michigan State University, Department of Elementary Education, November 30, 1977 and February 24, 1978.
- Amidon, Edmund J., and John B. Hough (eds). Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.
- Amidon, Edmund J., and Ned A. Flanders. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, 1963.
- Amidon, E. J., and M. A. Flanders. The Role of the Teacher in the Classroom: A Manual for Understanding and Improving Teachers' Classroom Behavior. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Inc., 1963.
- Anctil, Donald E. "Dogmatism and Philosophy: Ther Relation to Teacher Acceptance and Understanding of the New Social Studies." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1973.
- Archambault, R. D. (ed.). John Dewey on Education: Selected Writings. New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1964.
- Baker, Roy E. "A Comparison of Four Information Sources Used in Teacher Selection." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1977.
- Barlow, Thomas A. "CB/PBTE--The Wrong Road." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 102 128, June, 1975.
- Barr, Robert D., James L. Barth, and S. Samuel Shermis. Defining the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Barry, G. C. "Teacher Open-Mindedness and Close-Mindedness as a Predictor of Student Creativity Progress." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1974.

- Barth, James L., and S. Samuel Shermis. "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 743-751.
- Beyer, Barry K. "Mandate for Change--Curriculum Innovation and Teacher Preparation in Social Studies," The Social Studies, 58 (October, 1967), 199-203.
- Borgers, Sherry B., and G. Robert Ward. "Differences in the Needs of Low Dogmatic and High Dogmatic Prospective Teachers," Educational Leadership, 31 (May, 1974), 697-699.
- Broudy, Harry S. Building a Philosophy of Education. 2d ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1961.
- Brown, Sheila N. "Designing Environments for Creative-Affective Learning." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1975.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Alternative Directions for the Social Studies. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1967.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Secondary Social Studies for the 70's. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1973.
- Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1963.
- Cappelluzzo, Emma M., and James Brine. "Dogmatism and Prospective Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 20 (Summer, 1969), 148-152.
- Carlson, Kenneth. "Preparation of Social Studies Teachers," Education Digest, 37 (March, 1972), 52-53.
- Chalker, Joan W. "A Study Using Interaction Analysis of the Relationship between Teacher Dogmatism and the Reflective Method of Teaching Social Studies." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1972.
- Christiansen, C. M. "A Note on 'Dogmatism and Learning'," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 66 (1963), 73-75.
- Clegg, Ambrose A., Jr. Personal Interview. Cincinnati, Ohio, November 25, 1977.
- "A Competency-Based Program for Certification of Social Studies Teachers. Position Paper." Minnesota State Department of Education. Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 081 667, 1973.
- Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1964.

- Cook, David R. A Guide to Educational Research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1965.
- Costin, Frank. "Dogmatism and Conservation: An Empirical Follow-up of Rokeach's Findings," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 31 (Winter, 1971), 1007-1010.
- Costin, Frank. "Dogmatism and Learning: A Follow-up of Contradictory Findings," The Journal of Educational Research, 59 (1965), 186-188.
- Cronkhite, Gary, and Emily Goetz. "Dogmatism, Persuasibility and Attitude Instability," The Journal of Communication, 21 (December, 1971), 343-352.
- Dewey, John. Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education. New York: Macmillan, 1961. (First published by Macmillan, 1916.)
- Dewey, John. The Need for a Philosophy of Education, ed. R. D. Archambault. New York: Random House (The Modern Library), 1964.
- Dynneson, Thomas L. "Social Studies: Issues and Methods." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 130 963, September, 1976.
- Engle, Shirley H. "The Future of Social Studies Education and N.C.S.S.," Social Education, 34 (November, 1970), 778-781, 795.
- ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. "Looking at: Competency-Based Teacher Education, Public Doublespeak, Oral History, Death and Dying." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 128 262, February, 1975.
- Farris, Charlotte J. "Effectiveness of Summarized Pupil Feedback for Self-Supervised Change in Student Teachers' Verbal Behavior." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1972.
- Fenton, Edwin. Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Flanders, Ned A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1970.
- Flanders, Ned. A. "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes and Achievement," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research, and Application, ed. E. J. Amidon and J. B. Hough. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.

- Flanders, Ned A. Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitude and Achievement. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, No. 12 OE 25040. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.
- Flanders, N. A. Teacher Influence: Pupil Attitudes and Achievement. United States Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. 397. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.
- Garrett, Ferne D. "Feedback and Flanders Interaction Analysis Related to Change in the Indirect Teaching Behavior of Student Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1973.
- Gay, Lorraine R., and Fred K. Daniel. "Accreditation and Performance-Based Teacher Education," Educational Technology, 12 (1972), 45-50.
- Gill, Newell T. "The Effect of Security as an Independent Variable on Selected Variables . . . etc." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 011 796, September, 1966.
- Glasheen, Patricia. "The Advent of Social Studies 1916: An Historical Study." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1973.
- Gross, Richard E. "The Social Studies in Their Golden Years: An In-house Medical Assay," Social Studies Supervisors Association Newsletter, 5 (Winter, 1976).
- Gross, Richard E. "The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey," Social Education, 41 (March, 1977), 200.
- "A Handbook for Departmental Leadership in the Social Studies," Social Studies Development Center. Prepared by Staff of the Social Studies Diffusion Project. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University, 1975.
- Hanson, David J. "Dogmatism and College Major," Psychological Reports, 30 (1972), 190.
- Hart, M. M. "Dogmatism as Related to Accuracy of Student Teachers' Judgment of Students." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1966.
- Hasenfus, Clement. "Education 321. Social Studies-Student Teaching. An Individualized Performance-Based Model. Pilot Program (Vol. III). Rhode Island College, Providence. Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 084 206, 1973.

- Hersh, Richard, John Mallan, and David Welton. "CBTE: A Dagger in the Minde. . .?" Social Education, 40 (February, 1976), 98-101.
- Hogan, Gerald M. "The Use of the Dogmatism Scale in the Prediction of Unsatisfactory Teacher Performance." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1971.
- Hunkins, Francis P., and others (eds.). Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1970-1975. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Hunt, Maurice P., and Lawrence E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies. 2d ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.
- Jansen, Udo, Ronald Joekel, and Edgar A. Kelley. "Educational Values Perceptions and the Student Teaching Experience: Assessing Changes in Values Perceptions Which Occur for Student Teachers, University Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers and School Administrators." Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, September, 1971. (Unpublished.)
- Jansen, Udo H. "A Critical Analysis of Certain Aspects of the Introductory Course in Education in Selected Texas Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, 1961.
- Jansen, Udo. Personal Interview. Lincoln, Nebraska, January 27, 1978.
- Johnson, J. S. "Change in Student Teacher Dogmatism," Journal of Educational Research, 62 (1969), 224-226.
- Johnson, J. S. "The Relationship of Open-Mindedness and Close-Mindedness to Success in Student Teaching." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966.
- Kaplan, Leonard. "Survival Talk for Educators," The Journal of Teacher Education, 4 (1973), 319-321.
- Keihl, Charles. "Methods: A Pre-Student Teaching Experience," Social Science Record (Winter, 1976), 26-27.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research, 2d ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kick, John B., and Joel S. Poetker. "Getting the Methods Class into the Schools," Social Science Record (Winter, 1976), 28-29.
- Knight, Richard S. "Characteristics of Secondary Social Studies Teachers Who Deal with Social Issues in Their Classrooms." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1972.
- Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1964.

- Kopper, Elanor Joan Webster. "Personality Factors, Dogmatism and Pupil Evaluation of Teacher and Student Teacher Effectiveness." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1973.
- Krug, Mark M., John B. Poster, and William B. Gillies III. The New Social Studies. Itasca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1970.
- Lewis, Franklin G. "The Relationship of Authoritarianism as Revealed by the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and Perceived Effectiveness of Teaching as Indicated by Teachers' Self-Ratings, Principals' Ratings and Supervisors' Ratings." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1968.
- Liu, Shia-ling. "Personal Characteristics in Secondary School Social Studies Teachers as Related to Certain Measures of Potential Teaching Behavior." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, 1963.
- Long, Huey B. "A Different Look at the Correlation Coefficient between Dogmatism and Conformity." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 061 486, April, 1972.
- Low, Wendell B. "Open-Closed Mindedness of Students in Teacher Education and in Other College Fields." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1971.
- Lowe, William T., and Warren Corbine. "Learning to Teach the Social Studies: What Do Teachers Recommend?" Social Education, 34 (March, 1970, 286-290, 352.
- McCarty, Donald. "Competency-Based Teacher Education," School Management (October, 1973), 30-38.
- McElroy, Derwyn F., and Ronald K. Templeton. "The Social Studies Revolution: Implications for Teacher Education," The Social Studies, 60 (March, 1969), 105-109.
- Mahood, Wayne. "Experiences in Developing a Competency-Based Teacher Education Program for Social Studies." State University College, Geneseo, New York. Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 088 774, November, 1973.
- Marker, Gerald. "Social Studies Methods and the Curriculum Projects: A Potentially Disfunctional Misalignment." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 044 337, November, 1970.



- Marker, Gerald W. "Teacher Dogmatism and Its Impact Upon the Political Attitudes of Students." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1970.
- Marley, Milton D. "The Relationship between Self-Concept of Teacher-Trainees and Dogmatism, Locus of Control and Teacher-Student Interaction Effectiveness." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1974.
- Metcalf, Lawrence E. "Some Guidelines for Changing Social Studies Education," Social Education, 27 (April, 1963), 197-201.
- Miller, James R., and Harry McNally. "The UMO (University of Maine, Orono) Teacher Training Program: A Case Study and a Model." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 080 429, 1973.
- Moreland, Willis D. "An Analysis of the Preparation of Secondary School Social Studies Teachers in Certain Selected Institutions." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1956.
- Morfield, Sheila W. "An Examination of the Relationship between Student Teachers' Dogmatism and Student Teacher Modeling Behavior." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1975.
- Nelson, Jack L. "A Criticism of Competency-Based Teacher Education and Behavioral Objectives," Social Education, 40 (November/December, 1976), 561-563.
- "NUSTEP Student Handbook." Lincoln: University of Nebraska, Department of Secondary Education, August, 1977. (Mimeographed.)
- Ochoa, Anna S. "The Effects of Training in Interaction Analysis and Immediate Feedback on the Indirect Verbal Behavior of Student Teachers and the Verbal Behavior of Pupils." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1970.
- Ochoa, Anna S. "The Social Studies Teacher: An Exploration of Ethical Behavior." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 132 082, November, 1976.
- Oliver, Donald W., and James P. Shaver. Teaching Public Issues in High School. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1966.
- Patrick, John J. "Reforming the Social Studies Methods Course," Social Science Education Consortium. Publication No. 155. Boulder, Colorado, 1973.
- Payne, Robert G. "Let's Talk Turkey without Being Chicken," Social Studies Review (Spring, 1975), 45-48.

- A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies. Lincoln, Nebraska: Nebraska State Department of Education, 1971.
- Popham, W. James, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. Educational Statistics. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Popham, W. James. "Teaching Skill Under Scrutiny," Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (June, 1971), 599-601.
- Rabkin, Leslie Y. "The Dogmatism of Teachers?" The Journal of Teacher Education, 17 (Spring, 1966), 47-49.
- Ramsey, Clarice M. (ed.). "Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program Social Studies Education Modules." Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska, Dept. of Secondary Education, 1977. (Mimeographed.)
- Ramsey, Clarice M. "Relationships of Selected Factors of Social Studies Students in the Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program and Their Developed Teaching Style in the Program." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1975.
- Roberg, Roy R. "A Study of the Relationships Among Higher Education, Open-Closed Belief Systems and Job Performance of Nonsupervisory Patrol Personnel." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1977.
- Rokeach, Milton. "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychology Monograph, 70 (1956), 1.
- Rokeach, Milton. "The Nature and Meaning of Dogmatism," Psychological Review, 61 (1954), 194-204.
- Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.
- Rose, Shirely E. Corley. "A Study of the Relationship Between General Education Beliefs and Social Studies Curriculum Choices of Preservice Social Studies Teachers." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1973.
- Roselle, Daniel. A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1974.
- Saylor, J. Galen. "Antecedent Developments in the Movement to Performance-Based Programs of Teacher Education." Prepared as a working document for the Committee on Performance-Based Teacher Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, University of Nebraska, 1976.
- Saylor J. Galen, and William M. Alexander. Planning Curriculum for Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1974.

- Sears, Samuel, Jr. "The Relationship between Teacher Dogmatism and Philosophical Orientation and Selected Teacher and District Characteristics." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Kentency, 1967.
- Shaver, James P. "A Critical View of the Social Studies Profession," Social Education, 41 (April, 1977), 301-302.
- Shaver, James P. (ed.). Building Rationales for Citizenship Education. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Shaver, James P., and Harold Berlak. Democracy, Pluralism and the Social Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- Shaver, James P. "Needed: A Deweyan Rationale for Social Studies," The High School Journal, 60 (May, 1977), 345.
- Shaver, James, and Hyrum E. Richards. "Open-Closed Mindedness and an Inquiry Oriented Social Studies Methods Course," Journal of Educational Research, 65 (October, 1971), 85-93.
- Shaver, James, and Hyrum E. Richards. "Open-Closed Mindedness of College Students in Teacher Education. Final Report." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 026 303, October, 1968.
- Shaver, James P., and A. Guy Larkins. Research on Teaching Social Studies, ed. Robert M. W. Travers. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1973.
- Shaver, James P. "Social Studies: The Need for Redefinition," Social Education, 31 (November, 1967), 588-592, 596.
- Shaver, James P., W. Blair Low, and Hyrum E. Richards. "The Authoritarianism and Dogmatism of Prospective Social Studies Teachers," Social Education, 38 (October, 1974), 561-565.
- Shaver, James P. "The Task of Rationale-building for Citizenship Education," Building Rationales for Citizenship Education, ed. James P. Shaver. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.
- Smith, S. Davis. "The Role of Dogmatism in Teacher Evaluation." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.
- Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1971.
- Spivey, J. R. "A Comparative Study of the Curricular Perspectives and Scores of Dogmatism of Social Studies Teachers in Cook County, Illinois." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Ball State University, 1973.

- Steigman, Frank R. "The Relationship between Dogmatism, Preference for Self-Actualizing Values and Indirect Discussion Leadership Style--As Influenced by Two Group Procedures." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1971.
- "Suggested Criteria for Certification of Social Studies Teachers. NYSCSS Occasional Paper, No. 1." New York State Council for the Social Studies. Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 100 730, 1974.
- Taylor, Azella L. "Teacher Dogmatism as Related to Classroom Questions and Pupil-Teacher Verbal Interaction." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, 1969.
- Thomas, Edward L. "The Effect of Training in Flanders' Interaction Analysis on the Teaching Patterns of Student Teachers in Social Studies at Mississippi State University." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Mississippi State University, 1972.
- Travers, Robert M. E. (ed.). Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Ran McNally and Company, 1973.
- Tucker, Jan L. "Pre-Service, Secondary School Teacher Educators and the 'New' Social Studies." Arlington, Virginia: U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 049 145, February, 1971.
- Tucker, Jan L. Research on Social Studies Teaching and Teacher Education, eds. Francis P. Hunkins and others. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Uhes, M. J., and James P. Shaver. "Dogmatism and Divergent-Convergent Abilities," Journal of Psychology, 75 (May, 1970), 3-11.
- Walsh, T. M., IV. "The Relationship between the Open-Closed Mindedness Systems within Teachers and the Degree of Their Implementation of an Innovative Curricular Program." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1971.
- Walter, L. James. "An Assessment of the Teacher-Assisting Component of the Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1973.
- Weintraub, Richard. "A Review of the Research on Pre-Service Social Studies Secondary Teacher Education." Arlington, Virginia: U. S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 051 006, June, 1970.

- Wells, L. Rex. "A Study of Time Sampling Techniques of Classroom Behavior Using Interaction Analysis and Interaction Sequence Analysis." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1970.
- Wesley, Edgar B., and Stanley P. Wronski. Teaching Social Studies in High School. 5th ed. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1964.
- Wisniewski, Richard. "A New Breed of Social Studies Teachers? or New School System?" Arlington, Virginia: U. S. Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document Ed 109 043, November, 1974.
- Zimmer, J. W. "NUSTEP Program Evaluation--An Overivew." A report to Departments of Secondary Education and Educational Psychology. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, May, 1973. (Mimeo-graped.)

APPENDIX A

NUSTEP Information

## CHART A

## NUSTEP

NUSTEP (Nebraska University Secondary Teacher Education Program) is an integrated performance-based teacher education (PBTE) program. The initial planning for the NUSTEP program began in the 1968-69 academic year and involved staff members from the Department of Educational Psychology and Measurements and the Department of Secondary Education, Teachers College, University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Instruction of prospective teachers in the NUSTEP format began in the fall of 1969. The program has been gradually expanded from an initial enrollment of one hundred students per semester to a present enrollment, in 1977, of more than two hundred students per semester. Eight subjects areas are involved in the program: art education, math, English, modern foreign languages, music, science, social studies, and speech. The NUSTEP program has been designed and implemented within the existing resources of the two cooperating departments.

## GOALS OF THE PROGRAM

NUSTEP has as its goal the production of a teacher who is: (1) a humanizing agent; (2) an active and productive citizen; (3) a director of learning; (4) a guide for the development of students; (5) a mediator of the culture; (6) a member of the education profession; (7) a participant in cooperative staff activities; and (8) a skilled representative of his subject matter discipline. In working toward these goals, the NUSTEP program emphasizes: (1) collective planning, instruction, and decision making on the part of educators involved in the preparation of teachers; (2) systematic planning of instructional objectives which are consistent with the goals; (3) articulation of relationships between theory and practice in teacher education; (4) integration of teacher preparation courses into a unified program; (5) development and utilization of competency-based criterion-referenced assessment and evaluation of teaching skills; (6) promotion of flexible, individualized and multiple criteria for evaluation of competence in the development of teaching skills; (7) modeling by the NUSTEP instructional staff of teaching behaviors recommended to students; (8) use of self-monitoring skills by students and staff so that the skill of self-assessment is both developed and reinforced; and (9) a commitment to skill development in planning, conducting, and evaluating as an evolutionary part of educational competence.

## OPERATION OF THE PROGRAM

Students spend approximately 16-20 hours per week in NUSTEP self-instruction, lecture, laboratory, and practice-based activities. One-half of the student's time is spent as a teacher assistant working with a cooperating teacher in the public school settings of the Lincoln and Omaha area. Students enroll in NUSTEP during the semester prior to student teaching and are usually second-semester juniors or first-semester seniors. The NUSTEP program provides nine hours of academic credit and provides an integration of three separate courses: an educational psychology course, a subject methods course, and a general course in the principles of secondary education.

Materials provided in NUSTEP are arranged into criterion-referenced learning modules and are organized into three sequential stages, referred to as "spirals." The first spiral consists of general learning activities which incorporate basic instructional and psychological principles necessary--in the judgment of the NUSTEP staff--for successful teaching, regardless of subject area. Spiral II activities focus upon the application of skills and principles learned in Spiral I and applied to the specific area of subject matter preparation in which the student is to be certified for teaching. One or two paperback references are used but, at this state of its development, most of NUSTEP's materials are produced by the staff and are printed locally.

Instruction is provided on campus via lectures, small group discussions and task work, the extensive use of mediate materials, programmed learning activities with the NUSTEP materials, the utilization of individualized learning contracts, micro/peer teaching, and a variety of other approaches. Most large group instruction is provided on a team teaching basis; all instruction is planned by instructional teams. Each student also works closely with a single staff member who serves as a proctor for his activities. Reliability of proctor assessment of student competence is being validated by the use of the students' performance during student teaching. As the program has developed, there has been a growing emphasis upon the monitoring of student performance in practice settings through the use of performance contracts. The student, his proctor, and the cooperating teacher from the public school have been involved as equal partners in this process. Throughout the planning and operation of the NUSTEP program, there has been a high degree of involvement and cooperation by public school teachers, supervisors, and administrators. School personnel have been involved in the development of the program and in the planned periodic feedback data which are collected by the NUSTEP staff for the modification and revision of the program and its component parts.



## CHART B

ACTIVITY LOG/  
OBSERVATION GUIDE  
University of Nebraska

Name

Date

Pre-NUSTEP

NUSTEP

Student

☐☐☐

Teaching

School

Cooperating Teacher

Subject

Supervisor

Competency cluster, specific competencies and/or indicators to be demonstrated:

## A C T I V I T Y L O G

Desired Learner Outcomes (specific objectives)

Specific plans for conducting activity (sequence, materials, set, closure, classroom organization, content/concepts)

Specific plans for collecting assessment data

## O B S E R V A T I O N G U I D E

Specific teacher competencies to be observed (as stated in Teacher Competency Profile)

Observer Comments

**B - Assessment of Activity**

Please complete immediately after the activity. Fill out the self-assessment part, then hand to cooperating teacher and/or supervisor for comments and signature.

**Self-Assessment:****Comments:**  
**Cooperating Teacher/Supervisor**

- 
1. What was your general reaction to the activity?
  2. What did student learn that related to the intended outcomes?
  3. What did student learn that was unanticipated?
  4. If you were to repeat this activity, what would you do differently?
  5. Other comments or reactions:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Cooperating Teacher

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Supervisor

## CHART C

Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Profile of (Name) \_\_\_\_\_ Progress Report \_\_\_\_\_  
 End of Semester Report \_\_\_\_\_  
 Supervisor \_\_\_\_\_ Cooperating Teacher \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name of Person Filling Out Profile \_\_\_\_\_

Competencies * = Required in NUSTEP Leave Blank if No Opportunity to Demonstrate	Exemplary	Strong	Successful	Needs Improvement	Comments
<b>Cluster I - Diagnosis and Planning</b> 1.1 Identifies and diagnoses learner needs *1.2 Specifies desired learner outcomes to meet diagnosed needs 1.3 Determines assessment indicators for each outcome *1.4 Plans learning activities to achieve desired outcomes					
<b>Cluster II - Learning Director</b> 2.1 Provides effective environment for learning *2.2 Uses basic instructional skills effectively 2.3 Develops concepts, skills and attitudes of learners *2.4 Uses media, resources and strategies effectively					
<b>Cluster III - Assessment</b> *3.1 Gathers desired learner outcome data 3.2 Analyzes and uses learner outcome data 3.3 Uses assessment data to improve educational program					
<b>Cluster IV - Humanizing Agent</b> *4.1 Exhibits and develops positive self-concepts *4.2 Demonstrates general human relations skills 4.3 Relates with learners with exceptional learner needs					

	Exemplary	Strong	Successful	Needs Improvement	Comments
Cluster IV (continued)					
4.4 Relates with learners in a multicultural society					
4.5 Relates with appropriate age level learners					
Cluster V - Professionalism					
*5.1 Relates positively with team, peers, and other professionals					
5.2 Relates professionally with community					
5.3 Establishes and implements self-development program					
5.4 Demonstrates and promotes professional understanding and action					
Cluster VI - Subject Area Leadership					
*6.1 Demonstrates a sound understanding of subject matter in endorsement area					
*6.2 Organizes and applies subject matter skills and processes					
6.3 Develops curriculum for achieving subject area goals and activities					
As of this date, the overall rating is:					

CHART D  
RESPONSIBILITIES AND EXPECTATIONS

A. TEACHER/TRAINEE

1. Is aware of university and public school expectations, the procedures to follow, and the materials used in the program.
2. Maintains the Teacher Competency Profile and makes it available for cooperating teacher and supervisor input.
3. Serves as a liaison between the university and the public schools.
4. Uses activity log/observation guides appropriately.
5. Requests conferences to gain feedback from observers.
6. Participates in continuous self-appraisal.
7. Provides feedback concerning NUSTEP and/or Student Teaching program to the University staff.

B. COOPERATING TEACHER

1. Provides opportunities for the teacher trainee to complete competency indicators.
2. Helps the teacher trainee develop skills necessary to complete competency indicators.
3. Observes and comments on indicators of competence using the activity log/observation guides.
4. Provides time for cooperative planning and conferencing with teacher trainee regarding progress and problems.
5. Provides input regarding assessment of the teacher trainee to the university supervisor.
6. Completes the summary Teacher Competency Profile.
7. Provides feedback concerning NUSTEP and/or Student Teaching program to the University staff.

C. UNIVERSITY SUPERVISOR

1. Participates in planning/assessing conferences with the teacher trainee and cooperating teacher.
2. Remains in constant contact with the cooperating teacher and teacher trainee.
3. Is a resource for teacher trainee skill development.
4. Periodically reviews the teacher competency profile and provides input.
5. Observes and comments on indicators of competence.
6. Completes the final evaluation using input from the teacher trainee and the cooperating teacher.
7. Is responsible for taking appropriate action to handle problem situations.
8. Gathers information concerning program evaluation.

GUIDELINES FOR THE USE OF: A. Competency Clusters and Indicators  
B. Activity Log and Observation Guide  
C. Teacher Competency Profile

A. COMPETENCY CLUSTERS AND INDICATORS

1. The indicators listed for each competency are intended as examples to further specify and define the competencies. Other indicators of competence may be observed and noted in the space provided below the appropriate competency.
2. The competency clusters and indicators may be used by the teacher or teacher trainee for assessment purposes, by a school professional responsible for assessment of teachers or teacher trainees, and by university professionals responsible for supervising teacher trainees.
3. Each time an indicator is demonstrated successfully, the observation date should be noted in the space provided before each indicator. This information can serve as a basis for completing Teacher Competency Profile.
4. Indicators of learner results are sometimes more long range and difficult to measure. It is not expected that every indicator in both the teacher performance and learner results columns be demonstrated in order for the student to be considered competent.
5. Legitimate documentation includes activity logs, student test results, observer comments, performance class-room-videotaped, lesson plans, materials used, cooperating teacher and supervisor feedback.

B. ACTIVITY LOG AND OBSERVATION GUIDE

1. The activity log should be completed and approved by the cooperating teacher prior to conducting classroom activities. Clusters and/or competencies to be emphasized in the instructional activity should be pinpointed and noted on the activity log.
2. The observer should focus attention on the pinpointed clusters/competencies but may comment on other indicators as well.
3. The teacher trainee should complete the self-assessment section of the activity log after each activity.
4. Feedback should be provided by the observer after each observation and noted in the appropriate space on the activity log.
5. Completed activity logs should be kept by the teacher trainee as evidence of demonstration of competencies.
6. Spontaneous activities should be later recorded on activity logs and used for documentary evidence.

C. TEACHER COMPETENCY PROFILE

1. The Profile is used as a summary sheet or composite record of indicators demonstrated throughout a specified instructional period.
2. The Profile may be used as a progress report or as a final evaluation. The teacher trainee, cooperating teacher, and supervisor should all provide input and include descriptive comments.
3. For teacher trainees, the Profile data should be available to document entering competencies into the next phase of the teacher education program and to support job applications. For experienced teachers, these data should assist in identifying job targets and to build staff development activities.
4. The completed Teacher Competency Profile should be filed with the proper authorities as a record of competencies demonstrated.

CHART E  
SECONDARY TEACHER COMPETENCIES

Requirements for NUSTEP

Group I - Competencies to be Demonstrated during NUSTEP  
The following competencies will be emphasized in NUSTEP.  
For these ten the NUSTEP student is to demonstrate a  
majority of the indicators as evidence of the successful  
demonstration of the competency:

Cluster I - Competencies 1.2 and 1.4  
Cluster II - Competencies 2.2 and 2.4  
Cluster III - Competency 3.1  
Cluster IV - Competencies 4.1 and 4.2  
Cluster V - Competency 5.1  
Cluster VI - Competencies 6.1 and 6.2

Group II - Competencies Related to NUSTEP Activities  
The following competencies may be demonstrated as a part  
of NUSTEP and are related to NUSTEP activities, but they  
are not required by the end of NUSTEP:

Cluster I - Competencies 1.1 and 1.3  
Cluster II - Competencies 2.1 and 2.3  
Cluster III - Competency 3.2  
Cluster IV - Competency 4.5  
Cluster V - Competency 5.3

Group III - Competencies Related to Sec. Educ. 341/Student Teaching  
These competencies may be demonstrated in NUSTEP but are  
not required nor emphasized in NUSTEP:

Cluster III - Competency 3.3  
Cluster IV - Competencies 4.3 and 4.4  
Cluster V - Competencies 5.2 and 5.4  
Cluster VI - Competency 6.3

ALL TWENTY-THREE COMPETENCIES MUST  
BE DEMONSTRATED BY THE END OF  
STUDENT TEACHING FOR A PERSON TO BE RECOMMENDED  
FOR A TEACHING CERTIFICATE.



## CHART F

TYPICAL PROCEDURE FOR NUSTEP COOPERATING TEACHER AND  
STUDENT TO FOLLOW

1. NUSTEP student arrives with:
  - a) competency clusters and indicators
  - b) competency profile
  - c) copies activity logs
2. Cooperating teacher keeps clusters and indicators and competency profile for monitoring progress
3. Spiral I work samples - NUSTEP shows cooperating teacher. Together they plan implementation.
4. Activity log/observation form - filled out by NUSTEP prior to an activity. Approved by cooperating teacher.
5. Teacher competency clusters and indicators - checked for stated competencies at the completion of an activity.
6. Teacher Competency Profile - used as an overview of what has been accomplished. To be filled out several times during a semester.
7. Three-way conferences throughout the semester between university supervisor, cooperating teacher and student to monitor progress, provide feedback and evaluate.

CHART G  
SOCIAL STUDIES PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT PAPER

Write a one-page thought paper which briefly pinpoints your outlook on social studies education. Include each of the following: (1) your definition and philosophy of the social studies, (2) your idea of the most important goal(s) of social studies education, and (3) analyze yourself as a potential social studies teacher in terms of your areas of strengths and of those areas needing development. (Note: At the end of the semester you will repeat this work sample, identifying changes.)

## CHART H

Social Studies NUSTEP  
Fall, 1977

August 29 - September 2	On Campus
September 6 - September 9	On Campus
September 12 - September 16	On Campus/Off Campus Observation
September 19 - September 23	On Campus/Off Campus Tutoring
September 26 - September 30	On Campus
October 3 - October 7	Teacher Assisting
October 10 - October 14	Teacher Assisting
October 17 - October 21	On Campus
October 24 - October 28	On Campus
October 31 - November 4	Teacher Assisting
November 7 - November 11	Teacher Assisting
November 14 - November 18	Teaching Assisting
November 21 - November 22	Teacher Assisting
November 23, 24, 25	VACATION****
November 28 - December 2	On Campus
December 5 - December 9	Complete Individual Contracts
December 12 - December 16	Complete Individual Contracts
December 19 and 20	On Campus

## APPENDIX B

### Experimental Group Information

## CHART A

## EXPERIMENTAL GROUP MEETING DATES, TIMES AND TOPICS

Date	Time Involved	Topic
Monday, October 17, 1977	30 minutes	Began and covered half of <u>A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies</u> .
Tuesday, October 18, 1977	1 hour	Completed the discussion of <u>A Parent's Guide to the Social Studies</u> , and began <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies--Major Area No. 1</u> (see Appendix B for description).
Wednesday, October 19, 1977	30 minutes	Completed the discussion on Major Area No. 1 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> and began Major Area No. 2 discussion.
Monday October 24, 1977	30 minutes	Completed the discussion on Major Area No. 2 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> and began Major Area No. 3 discussion.
Tuesday, October 25, 1977	1 hour	Completed the discussion on Major Areas No. 3, 4 and 5 of <u>A Philosophy for the Teaching of the Social Studies</u> . Reviewed whole document and discussed inquiry relationship to history, science and democracy.
Wednesday, October 26, 1977	1 hour	Began the <u>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines--up to page 15</u> .
Friday, October 28, 1977	2 hours 30 minutes	Completed the <u>Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines</u> and began and completed a discussion on <u>Controversial Issues</u> . Reviewed all the documents for their possible interconnectedness. Assigned their <u>personal philosophy</u> of social studies education to be rewritten by Friday, November 18, 1977.

## CHART B

A PARENT'S GUIDE TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES  
National Council for the Social Studies - 1974

The Guide defines the social studies in the following manner:

In brief, the social studies are those instructional courses, programs, and projects that are designed to assist your child to understand, analyze, react to, and act upon:

1. The relationships of human beings to the world  
in which they live.
2. The relationships of human beings to other human  
beings.
3. The relationships of human beings to themselves.

## CHART C

A PHILOSOPHY FOR THE TEACHING OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES  
Nebraska State Department of Education - 1971Definition of Social Studies

We believe that the major purpose of the social studies is to prepare individuals to function effectively in a democratic society. The goal then, simply stated, is that of education for citizenship.

Accordingly, we have delineated five major areas of citizenship education in which the social studies should assume responsibility.

These include:

1. Skill in the use of rationale decision-making as a means of approaching the solution of personal as well as societal conflicts.
2. Understanding of and commitment to the values of a democratic society.
3. Development of the potential of each individual in order that he can develop a favorable self-concept which will enable him to become a constructive member of society.
4. Development of the ability to work effectively with others as a means of solving personal and societal problems.
5. Knowledge and ability to participate effectively in the governing process.

## CHART D

SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM GUIDELINES  
Position Statement  
National Council for the Social Studies - 1971

Rationale

Social studies education has a twofold purpose: enhancement of human dignity through learning and commitment to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end.

The rationale assumes that knowledge, thinking, valuing, and social participation are all essential components of the social studies program and that commitment to human dignity is a major purpose of social studies education.

Guidelines

These Guidelines represent a set of standards for social studies programs. They are not intended to prescribe a uniform program or even to propose an ideal program. In a pluralistic and changing society no one such program could be prescribed even if more were known about the process of education than is presently available. Schools--their students, teachers, and communities--have basic responsibility for their own social studies programs. It is hoped that many will develop insights which go beyond the framework of standards set forth here.

1. The Social Studies Program Should Be Directly Related to the Concerns of Students.
2. The Social Studies Program Should Deal with the Real Social World.



3. The Social Studies Program Should Draw from Currently Valid Knowledge Representative of Man's Experience, Culture, and Beliefs.
4. Objectives Should Be Thoughtfully Selected and Clearly Stated in Such Form as to Furnish Direction to the Program.
5. Learning Activities Should Engage the Student Directly and Actively in the Learning Process.
6. Strategies of Instruction and Learning Activities Should Rely on a Broad Range of Learning Resources.
7. The Social Studies Program Must Facilitate the Organization of Experience.
8. Evaluation Should Be Useful, Systematic, Comprehensive, and Valid for the Objectives of the Program.
9. Social Studies Education Should Receive Vigorous Support as a Vital and Responsible Part of the School Program.

## CHART E

CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Nebraska State Department of Education - 1976

The Nebraska State Board of Education takes the position that Nebraska schools are charged with the responsibility of promoting and protecting free and open inquiry. It is the recommendation of this body that local boards of education draft policy statements that reflect such a commitment. It is further recommended that said policy statements contain provisions to protect a climate of free inquiry while at the same time providing procedures for ascertaining whether that climate has been irresponsibly violated.

## CHART F

NUSTEP - Social Studies - Fall 1977

INFORMED CONSENT

I understand that the purpose of this study is to learn more about ways of improving the philosophical base of the NUSTEP Social Studies program.

I confirm that my participation as a subject is entirely voluntary. No coercion of any kind has been used to obtain my cooperation.

I understand that I may withdraw my consent and terminate my participation at any time during the investigation.

I have been informed of the procedures that will be used in the study and understand what will be required of me as a subject.

I understand that all of my responses, written or oral, will remain completely anonymous.

I wish to give my cooperation as a subject.

SIGNED \_\_\_\_\_

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## CHART G

NUSTEP - Experimental Group Checklist

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

1. Title of document \_\_\_\_\_
2. How would you rate the general quality of this document? Circle your choice:  

1	2	3	4	5	6
Terrible	Very bad	Bad	Good	Very good	Excellent
3. The main points of this document were:  
  - 1.
  - 2.
  - 3.
  - 4.
  - 5.
  - 6.

(List more if needed)
4. The main topic of interest to me was:  
  - 1.
5. This document ties in with our previous learning in the following ways:  
  - 1.
  - 2.

## CHART H

December 5, 1977

TO: NUSTEP Social Studies Students - Experimental Group  
FROM: Rick Kolowski - Grad. Ass't NUSTEP - Froom 102 Henzlik (472-1998)  
RE: Completion requirements of the experimental group before the end of first semester.

1. If you have not handed in any of your checklist sheets on the various documents were read or your rewrite of your Social Studies Philosophy, please do so as soon as possible!
2. I will need an individual 10-minute meeting with each of you to conclude some data gathering and to check your progress as a member of the experimental group. Please come in and see me on one of the following days:

Wednesday, December 7  
Friday, December 9  
Monday, December 12  
Tuesday, December 13

It is mandatory that I meet with each of you individually in this manner before our next major class session on Wednesday, December 14.

3. Before coming to this meeting, please reflect back upon the following:
  - A. Your own rewritten philosophy statement and how it was similar to or different from your first statement.
  - B. Your cooperating teacher's philosophy statement.
  - C. Your own observation memories of viewing the various classes you have seen this semester and comparing the teacher's philosophy (or ideals) with the practices (or realities) of what was actually done in the classroom.
  - D. How did what you have actually done in the classroom match up with the theory of the various documents we have read in class, and what would you like to have done differently if you had a chance to do it over?

## APPENDIX C

NUSTEP Students: Group, Age, Sex, and Setting

Table C-1  
Control Group  
Age, Sex, and Setting of NUSTEP Students

Student	Age	Sex	Setting*
C-01	21	F	J
C-02	21	F	J
C-03	21	F	J
C-04	22	F	S
C-05	22	M	J
C-06	21	F	J
C-07	23	F	J
C-08	23	F	J
C-09	21	M	S
C-10	21	F	J
C-11	22	M	J
C-12	21	M	S
C-13	22	M	J
C-14	23	M	J
C-15	23	M	S
C-16	21	F	J

\* Setting is Junior (J) or Senior (S) high school

Table C-2  
Experimental Group  
Age, Sex, and Setting of NUSTEP Students

Student	Age	Sex	Setting*
E-01	22	M	S
E-02	23	F	J
E-03	21	F	S
E-04	22	M	J
E-05	21	F	J
E-06	22	M	J
E-07	23	M	J
E-08	21	F	J
E-09	20	F	S
E-10	22	M	J
E-11	26	M	S
E-12	21	M	S
E-13	21	F	S
E-14	22	F	J
E-15	21	M	S
E-16	22	M	S

\* Setting if Junior (J) or Senior (S) high school



## APPENDIX D

### Educational Values Inventory--Forms A and B

The items contained on this inventory are designed to provide information on the attitudes of incoming NUSTEP students toward current educational thought. The information obtained from this and other questionnaires will aid the instructional staff of NUSTEP in the development of improved patterns of instruction. Complete the questionnaire as quickly as possible, giving your honest appraisal of each item. All reporting of the information will be anonymous.

1. Complete each item as rapidly as possible.
2. There are no right or wrong answers. Make your judgment of an item solely on the basis of what the statement means to you. Record your judgments on the blank preceding each item using the following scale.

5 = strongly agree with the statement

4 = agree with the statement

3 = neither agree nor disagree with the statement

2 = disagree with the statement

1 - strongly disagree with the statement

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION!

Educational Values Inventory - A

- \_\_\_1. Students should adopt, as early as possible, the behavior patterns which society considers appropriate for adults.
- \_\_\_2. Students are incapable of assuming major responsibility for the analysis, design and implementation of their own learning experiences.
- \_\_\_3. How a student feels about his learning experiences is as important as what he learns.
- \_\_\_4. Each educator should plan for growth in all types of growth patterns for the students he works with, i.e., he must be concerned with the social, emotional, etc.
- \_\_\_5. Schools should help students to critically examine the cultural heritage and should, in addition, promote an attitude of change from within the existing structures and institutions of society.
- \_\_\_6. Pupils should be encouraged to offer their suggestions for the improvement of the curriculum.
- \_\_\_7. Instructional programs within each class should consider differences in pupil ability and should be so organized as to permit each student to succeed.
- \_\_\_8. Pupils should be encouraged to set their own goals for learning and should participate in any evaluation of their progress toward the goals selected.
- \_\_\_9. Homogeneous grouping is the most effective pattern of class grouping if one's goal is to enhance learning.
- \_\_\_10. A teacher's primary function is to select information which is important and to then help the child acquire as much knowledge as possible.
- \_\_\_11. Problem solving skills can be learned in school settings.
- \_\_\_12. If the student is given instruction in factual knowledge, he will be able to make applications of that knowledge without further help.
- \_\_\_13. Planning for many instructional procedures should be cooperatively completed through the joint action of teacher and students.

- \_\_\_14. The planning of learning activities should take into account the student's concern about the opinion of his peers.
- \_\_\_15. The teacher should be familiar with, and involved in, school-sponsored student activities.
- \_\_\_16. The teacher's concern for effective instruction must focus upon providing a classroom atmosphere in which a student has the opportunity to engage in learning activities which the student considers important.
- \_\_\_17. The teacher's enthusiasm for the materials, objectives, and learning process being used will be reflected in the attitudes which students form about the class and the subject.
- \_\_\_18. Only cognitive knowledge gained by the student should be considered in any evaluation of the student's progress.
- \_\_\_19. Standard achievement tests provide the best comprehensive measurement of a student's knowledge and abilities.
- \_\_\_20. Evaluation of subject matter knowledge is the best indication of the potential abilities and successes which the student will be able to show in later life.
- \_\_\_21. Diagnosis of a student's present skills, followed by planning for his future learning activities, is the best use of classroom testing devices.
- \_\_\_22. Students should participate in the evaluation of their progress.
- \_\_\_23. Evaluation of a student's progress should be competitive and should reflect a judgment of the quality of his work as compared to that of other students.
- \_\_\_24. It is important that the same activities be used to judge the progress of all pupils who are in the same classroom setting.
- \_\_\_25. The appraisal of student performance, and the subsequent decision as to grades or marks, is the sole responsibility of the teacher.
- \_\_\_26. Grading systems (93-100, 85-92, or A, B. . .) are the best means of reporting student performance and student learning.
- \_\_\_27. The teacher must continue to be an active learner and his efforts at learning should be aimed both at this own self-growth and at improving his knowledge in areas which will be of direct use in the improvement of his teaching abilities.

- \_\_\_28. The most effective method of instruction is the lecture method.
- \_\_\_29. Individualized instruction is an effective method of classroom instruction.
- \_\_\_30. Small group methods of instruction are effective in aiding student learning.
- \_\_\_31. The basic goal of an educational system is the production of trained manpower to contribute to the goals of the society.
- \_\_\_32. Objectives selected for courses of instruction should agree with the overall objectives and goals of the school.
- \_\_\_33. The nature and needs of the community served by the school should determine the type of curriculum the school implements.

Educational Values Inventory - B

- 5 = strongly agree  
4 = agree  
3 = neither agree nor disagree  
2 = disagree  
1 = strongly disagree

- \_\_\_1. A major role of the school/institution is to train students for every day living.
- \_\_\_2. Students should learn, in the schools, to model the behaviors considered appropriate for adults.
- \_\_\_3. Students, generally, should not be concerned with managing their own learning experiences.
- \_\_\_4. Student attitudes toward learning are as important as what is learned.
- \_\_\_5. Educators should be concerned with the social growth of the student.
- \_\_\_6. Educators should be concerned with the emotional growth of the student.
- \_\_\_7. Educators should be concerned with the attitudinal development of the student.
- \_\_\_8. A major task of educational institutions is the development of student skills in rational or critical thinking.
- \_\_\_9. Teachers should critically examine social institutions, and promote this attitude in their students.
- \_\_\_10. Student input regarding curricular decisions should be actively sought by school personnel.
- \_\_\_11. Educational programs should emphasize individual student interests in their planning.
- \_\_\_12. Students should be encouraged to establish their own instructional goals.
- \_\_\_13. Grouping students on the basis of achievement or aptitude test scores is an efficient method of facilitating learning in the classroom.

- 5 = strongly agree
- 4 = agree
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 1 = strongly disagree

- \_\_\_14. Grouping students on the basis of age is an efficient method of facilitating learning in the classroom.
- \_\_\_15. A major role of instructors is to select important information and aid the student in acquiring as much of this information as possible.
- \_\_\_16. Students should acquire problem solving skills during their academic training.
- \_\_\_17. If students are provided the necessary content information, problem solving and application skills will occur naturally.
- \_\_\_18. Students and teachers should cooperatively plan the instructional procedures to be used in the classroom setting.
- \_\_\_19. In designing learning experiences or materials, emphasis should be placed on student-student interactions.
- \_\_\_20. School staff, generally, should be involved in, and familiar with, school-sponsored activities.
- \_\_\_21. Relevance of learning activities to the students should be part of the instructor's concern for effective instruction.
- \_\_\_22. Teacher attitudes toward learning or subject matter areas will be reflected in the attitudes of students.
- \_\_\_23. The teaching skills exhibited by teachers/faculty will be reflected in student attitudes toward the particular subject area.
- \_\_\_24. Only observable or subject matter skills acquired by the student should enter into the evaluation of the student's progress.
- \_\_\_25. Standard achievement tests provide a comprehensive measurement of a student's knowledge and abilities.
- \_\_\_26. Scholastic abilities are an effective indicator of students' later successes in life.

- 5 = strongly agree
- 4 = agree
- 3 = neither agree nor disagree
- 2 = disagree
- 1 = strongly disagree

- \_\_\_27. "Diagnosis" of a student's present skills, followed by planning (with parents, the student and the instructor) for future learning activities is the best use of classroom testing instruments.
- \_\_\_28. Students should actively participate in their own evaluation.
- \_\_\_29. Evaluation of a student's progress should be competitive, reflecting a teacher's judgment of the quality of his work compared with other students.
- \_\_\_30. To adequately evaluate student progress the same activities should be used to assess all students.
- \_\_\_31. Instructors should be free to choose the procedure used in evaluating students.
- \_\_\_32. Standardized grading systems are the best methods of reporting student performance.
- \_\_\_33. The education of a staff member should be a continuing, ongoing program throughout his professional career.
- \_\_\_34. There currently exist no best methods of instruction.
- \_\_\_35. Individualized instruction is an effective method of classroom instruction.
- \_\_\_36. Lectures are an effective method of teaching students.
- \_\_\_37. Small group methods of instruction are effective in aiding student learning.
- \_\_\_38. The basic goal of an educational system is the production of trained manpower to contribute to the goals of the society.
- \_\_\_39. Objectives selected for courses of instruction should agree with the overall objectives and goals of the school or institution.
- \_\_\_40. The nature and needs of the community served by the school/ institution should determine the type of curriculum the school implements.



Response Key for the Educational Values Inventory

<u>Form A</u>		<u>Form B</u>	
1. Disagree	21. Agree	1. Agree	21. Agree
2. Disagree	22. Agree	2. Disagree	22. Agree
3. Agree	23. Disagree	3. Disagree	23. Agree
4. Agree	24. Disagree	4. Agree	24. Disagree
5. Agree	25. Disagree	5. Agree	25. Disagree
6. Agree	26. Disagree	6. Agree	26. Disagree
7. Agree	27. Agree	7. Agree	27. Agree
8. Agree	28. Disagree	8. Agree	28. Agree
9. Disagree	29. Agree	9. Agree	29. Disagree
10. Disagree	30. Agree	10. Agree	30. Disagree
11. Agree	31. Disagree	11. Agree	31. Disagree
12. Disagree	32. Agree	12. Agree	32. Disagree
13. Agree	33. Agree.	13. Disagree	33. Agree
14. Agree		14. Disagree	34. Agree
15. Agree		15. Disagree	35. Agree
16. Agree		16. Agree	36. Agree
17. Agree		17. Disagree	37. Agree
18. Disagree		18. Agree	38. Disagree
19. Disagree		19. Agree	39. Agree
20. Disagree		20. Agree	40. Agree

All items on both Form A and Form B are coded on a rating scale defined as: 5 = Strongly Agree; 4 = Agree; 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 1 = Strongly Disagree. When keyed responses are considered, the Agree response scores, as given by the respondent, are coded at that value. All keyed responses coded as "Disagree" must have the five-point scale reversed. Thus, a respondent's answer is converted:

Response of 5 is converted to 1  
 Response of 4 is converted to 2  
 Response of 3 remains a 3  
 Response of 2 is converted to 4  
 Response of 1 is converted to 5

APPENDIX E

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E

## PERSONAL OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

Mark each statement with a check (✓) corresponding to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

	I agree very much	I agree the whole	I agree a little	I disagree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much
1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. A person on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	I agree very much	I agree on the whole	I agree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much
6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.	—	—	—	—	—
7. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.	—	—	—	—	—
8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.	—	—	—	—	—
9. It is only natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.	—	—	—	—	—
10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.	—	—	—	—	—
11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion I just can't stop.	—	—	—	—	—
12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.	—	—	—	—	—
13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am saying that I forget to listen to what others are saying.	—	—	—	—	—
14. It is better to be a dead hero than a live coward.	—	—	—	—	—
15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great person, like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.	—	—	—	—	—

	I agree very much	I agree on the whole	I agree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much
16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.	—	—	—	—	—
17. If given the chance, I would do something of great benefit to the world.	—	—	—	—	—
18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.	—	—	—	—	—
19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.	—	—	—	—	—
20. A person who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.	—	—	—	—	—
21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.	—	—	—	—	—
22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.	—	—	—	—	—
23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.	—	—	—	—	—
24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.	—	—	—	—	—

I	I	I	I	I	I
agree	agree on	agree a	disagree	disagree	disagree
very	much the	little a	on the	on the	very
	whole	little	whole	whole	much

- |     |  |       |       |       |       |       |
|-----|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 25. | When it comes to differences of opinion in religion we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.                | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 26. | In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.  | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 27. | The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.  | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 28. | In times like these it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camps. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 29. | A group which tolerates too much difference of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.  | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 30. | There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for truth and those who are against truth.  | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 31. | My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.   | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 32. | A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.  | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 33. | Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.   | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

	I agree very much	I agree on the whole	I agree a little	I disagree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much
34. In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.	—	—	—	—	—	—
35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.	—	—	—	—	—	—
36. In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.	—	—	—	—	—	—
37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.	—	—	—	—	—	—
38. If a person is to accomplish a mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."	—	—	—	—	—	—
39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.	—	—	—	—	—	—
40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.	—	—	—	—	—	—

### Scoring the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--Form E, consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with the 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a high degree of dogmatism.



## APPENDIX F

### A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers

### A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers

The following is a study of what the general social studies instructor thinks and feels about a number of important issues and areas relating to his or her field of social studies education. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover a broad range of educational issues that relate to the area of the social studies.

Mark all answers on the scoring sheet that is provided. Mark each statement with a check (✓) corresponding to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one.

1. In my classroom/school/district, students should be involved in the formulation of goals and in the selection of activities and instructional strategies.
2. I should be able to provide evidence that students in my classroom/school/district are involved in the assessment of curriculum outcomes.
3. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that the faculty, administration, and community at large are committed to student involvement.
4. The central focus of the curriculum of my classroom/school/district should revolve principally around enduring social issues.
5. In my classroom/school/district a wide variety of materials should be prepared at a multiplicity of reading and interest levels in an effort to expose every child to all sides of an issue.
6. In my classroom/school/district the curriculum being studied should focus upon problem solving and the decision making process related to social issues.
7. Controversial issues such as racism, poverty, war, and pollution should be dealt with in increasing complexity throughout the grades in my classroom/school/district.
8. In my classroom/school/district opportunities should be provided for students to meet, discuss, and work with ethnic groups other than their own.
9. I should be able to provide evidence that students in my classroom/school/district gather data from sources within the community as well as in the classroom.

10. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that current knowledge, theories, and interpretations are used and consistent with modern thinking.
11. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that textbooks and other instructional resources are carefully evaluated for up-to-date scholarship.
12. In my classroom/school/district extensive up-to-date references should be readily available for use in the social studies curriculum.
13. I should be able to provide evidence that up-to-date social science methods of inquiry and processing data are utilized in my classroom/school/district.
14. In my classroom/school/district objectives should be clearly defined for students in social studies to enable them to clearly understand what is expected of them.
15. I should be able to provide evidence that needs of students in social studies classes in my classroom/school/district are considered in the selection and formulation of objectives.
16. In my classroom/school/district community resource people should be consulted in the planning of long and short range objectives in social studies.
17. I should be able to provide evidence that a multiplicity of devices are employed in my classroom/school/district to assess needs and accomplishments of the students in social studies.
18. In my classroom/school/district social studies objectives should be related to each of the following areas: knowledge, skills and abilities, valuing.
19. In my classroom/school/district students should have access to a multiplicity of learning resources appropriate to the objectives of their social studies program.
20. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that students in social studies are active in the planning process.
21. I should be able to provide evidence to indicate that in my classroom/school/district a multiplicity of learning material is available for use in the social studies program.

22. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that students are involved in the selection of goals and play a vital role in assessment and evaluation of the curriculum.
23. In my classroom/school/district materials for various academic ability levels and interest levels should be available.
24. In my classroom/school/district I should have evidence to support the fact that a wide range of reading abilities exist and that data should be readily available to teachers to assist them in providing students with appropriate social studies materials.
25. I should have evidence to indicate that team planning in my classroom/school/district occurs in a concerted effort to provide students in social studies with appropriate materials.
26. I should be able to provide evidence to indicate that in my classroom/school/district the social studies program has a clearly defined structure.
27. In my classroom/school/district there should be evidence to indicate that the social studies learning experiences are designed in such a manner that students will be enthusiastic and have a zest for further learning.
28. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that learning experiences in the social studies program are drawn from the social sciences, humanities, and physical and natural sciences.
29. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that social studies objectives for every generalization considered are available and provide focus for planning, development, and evaluation of the program.
30. In my classroom/school/district I should have evidence that data is gathered in an attempt to evaluate each student's progress, both cognitively and affectively.
31. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that a variety of evaluation techniques are used to evaluate learnings (cognitive and affective) in the social studies curriculum.
32. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that evaluation procedures and progress of students are reported frequently to both the pupil and the parent.

33. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that adequate money is allocated and spent for up-to-date social studies materials.
34. In my classroom/school/district teachers of social studies should have a substantial background in the field (both in method and in content).
35. In my classroom/school/district I should have evidence that teachers are trying out and utilizing new innovations in social studies.
36. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that the team approach is utilized in order to draw upon the special competencies of individual faculty members.
37. In my classroom/school/district I should be able to provide evidence that social studies education considers the needs of the child in his or her immediate environment (school), in the community, and in society at large.
38. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district that teachers are actively involved in the formulation, development, and assessment of social studies curriculum in either a decision-making role or as advisors.
39. I should be able to provide evidence in my classroom/school/district to support the fact that social studies consultants are easily accessible.
40. In my classroom/school/district I should have evidence to support the fact that a social studies philosophy does exist and is considered in the planning, development, and evaluation of the program.

NAME \_\_\_\_\_

## Scoring Sheet

A Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers

Mark each statement with a check (✓) corresponding to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark everyone.

	I agree very much	I agree on the whole	I agree a little	I disagree a little	I disagree on the whole	I disagree very much
1.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
13.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
19.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
20.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
21.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
22.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
23.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
24.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
25.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
26.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
27.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
28.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
29.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
30.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
31.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
32.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
33.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
34.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
35.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
36.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
37.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
38.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
39.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
40.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

### Scoring the Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory

The Personal Self Assessment Inventory for Social Studies Teachers consists of 40 items from which the subjects indicate disagreement or agreement on a scale ranging from -3 to +3, with a 0 point excluded in order to force responses toward disagreement or agreement. This scale is then converted, for scoring purposes, to a 1-to-7 scale by adding a constant of 4 to each item score. The total score is the sum of scores obtained on all items in the test. The range of possible scores is from 40 to 280, with a high score indicating a lack of agreement with current progressive social studies education.

## APPENDIX G

### Interaction Analysis System



Table G-1  
Categories of Interaction Analysis

TEACHER TALK	INDIRECT INFLU- ENCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. *ACCEPTS FEELINGS: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included.</li> <li>2. *PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "uhhuh?" or "go on" are included.</li> <li>3. *ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENT: clarifying, building, or developing ideas or suggestions by a student. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.</li> <li>4. *ASKS QUESTIONS: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.</li> </ol>
	DIRECT INFLU- ENCE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. *LECTURING: giving facts or opinions about content or procedure; expressing his own idea; asking rhetorical questions.</li> <li>6. *GIVING DIRECTIONS: directions, commands, or orders with which a student is expected to comply.</li> <li>7. *CRITICIZING OR JUSTIFYING AUTHORITY: statements intended to change student behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing, extreme self-reference.</li> </ol>

Table G-1 (continued)

STUDENT TALK	<p>8. *STUDENT TALK-RESPONSE: talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement.</p> <p>9. *STUDENT TALK-INITIATION: talk by students, which they initiate. If "calling on" student is only to indicate who may talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category</p>
	<p>10. *SILENCE OR CONFUSION: pauses, short periods of silence, and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</p>

Table G-2

Scoring Sheet

ID \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Observer \_\_\_\_\_ type \_\_\_\_\_  
CC \_\_\_\_\_ Period \_\_\_\_\_ page \_\_\_\_\_

UN/McREL Observation Form 1

Anecdotal Notes

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0
0	15	30	45	60						

## APPENDIX H

### Data Collected on Control and Experimental Groups

Table H-1

Data Collected on Control Group

Student	Educational Values Inventory		Rokeach Dogmatism Scale		Social Studies Self Assessment Inventory		Interaction Analysis System		
	Pre-test		Post-test		Post-test Only		Pre-test		
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test Only	Pre-test	Post-test		
C-01	130	3.94*	161	4.03*	141	129	069	0.01	1.82
C-02	135	4.09	139	3.48	144	164	136	0.07	0.96
C-03	132	4.00	148	3.70	141	155	082	0.02	0.87
C-04	143	4.33	171	4.28	133	156	049	0.07	0.68
C-05	113	3.42	143	3.58	139	145	080	0.00	2.03
C-06	128	3.88	165	4.13	141	160	071	0.03	0.50
C-07	141	4.27	155	3.88	128	116	048	0.17	1.70
C-08	133	4.03	159	3.98	075	086	067	0.01	1.90
C-09	116	3.52	144	3.60	161	134	099	0.11	5.10
C-10	142	4.30	172	4.30	130	131	044	0.00	1.85
C-11	129	3.91	154	3.85	137	132	094	0.12	0.33
C-12	121	3.66	138	3.45	140	153	119	0.00	2.38
C-13	124	3.76	149	3.73	140	140	080	0.01	3.57
C-14	121	3.66	156	3.90	132	120	067	0.07	0.17
C-15	129	3.91	164	4.10	142	148	090	0.00	1.59
C-16	130	3.94	158	3.95	075	062	075	0.02	1.05

\* Lists converted scores from the 33-item EVI Pre-test (Form A) and the 40-item EVI Post-test (Form B).

Table H-2

Data Collected on Experimental Group

Student	Education <sup>1</sup>		Rokeach		Social Studies Self		Interaction	
	Values	Inventory	Dogmatism Scale	Assessment Inventory	Post-test Only	Pre-test	Post-test	Post-test
	Pre-test	Post-test	Pre-test	Post-test				
E-01	137	4.15*	169	4.23*	101	103	073	0.02
E-02	132	4.00	151	3.78	146	128	078	0.07
E-03	136	4.12	159	3.98	153	132	078	0.21
E-04	123	3.73	160	4.00	133	137	064	0.01
E-05	120	3.64	155	3.88	132	130	083	0.17
E-06	124	3.76	151	3.78	139	148	053	0.00
E-07	127	3.85	152	3.80	142	150	094	0.20
E-08	121	3.66	153	3.83	130	141	086	1.23
E-09	144	4.36	170	4.25	104	114	067	0.00
E-10	134	4.06	145	3.63	131	114	057	0.01
E-11	131	3.97	168	4.20	150	150	049	0.14
E-12	121	3.66	158	3.95	122	128	074	0.02
E-13	137	4.15	157	3.93	112	129	073	1.58
E-14	120	3.64	173	4.33	119	094	057	0.06
E-15	114	3.45	149	3.73	158	167	061	0.00
E-16	124	3.76	152	3.80	111	123	072	0.01

\* Lists converted scores from the 33-item EVI Pre-test (Form A) and the 40-item Post-test (Form B).