11-22-1974

Teacher Preparation for Social Studies on the Secondary Level as Recommended by Selected Colleges of Education and as Preferred by Selected School Districts

Clare Ignatia Sharp

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL STUDIES ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL

SHARP

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87106

POLICY ON USE OF THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

Unpublished theses and dissertations accepted for master's and doctor's degrees and deposited in the University of New Mexico Library are open to the public for inspection and reference work. *They are to be used only with due regard to the rights of the authors.* The work of other authors should always be given full credit. Avoid quoting in amounts, over and beyond scholarly needs, such as might impair or destroy the property rights and financial benefits of another author.

To afford reasonable safeguards to authors, and consistent with the above principles, anyone quoting from theses and dissertations must observe the following conditions:

1. Direct quotations during the first two years after completion may be made only with the written permission of the author.

2. After a lapse of two years, theses and dissertations may be quoted without specific prior permission in works of original scholarship provided appropriate credit is given in the case of each quotation.

3. Quotations that are complete units in themselves (e.g., complete chapters or sections) in whatever form they may be reproduced and quotations of whatever length presented as primary material for their own sake (as in anthologies or books of readings) ALWAYS require consent of the authors.

4. The quoting author is responsible for determining "fair use" of material he uses.

This thesis/dissertation by Clare Ignatia Sharp has been used by the following persons whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above conditions. (A library which borrows this thesis/dissertation for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.)

NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE

8/1/72—500

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

TITLE TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL STUDIES ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL AS RECOMMENDED BY SELECTED COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND AS PREFERRED BY SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Clare Ignatia Sharp

Candidate

Secondary Education

Department

Bernard Spolsky

Dean

November 22, 1974

Date

Committee

A. W. Howard

Chairman

[illegible]

[illegible]

George C Stoumbis

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL STUDIES ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL AS RECOMMENDED BY SELECTED COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND AS PREFERRED BY SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

BY
CLARE IGNATIA SHARP
A.B., College of New Rochelle, 1954
A.M., Columbia University, 1956

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Curriculum and Instruction—Secondary Education

in the Graduate School of

The University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, New Mexico

December, 1974

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Alvin W. Howard, Chairman of this Doctoral Committee, I wish to express my deepest gratitude and sincere respect for guiding my studies here at The University of New Mexico and helping me bring this program to a successful completion. It could not have been done without him.

I wish to thank Dr. George Stoumbis for his patience and kindness as a teacher and as a member of this committee, and Dr. William B. Runge for his consideration and interest in this dissertation.

To both my mother, Dr. Eleanor Weed Sharp, and my father, Dr. James Clayton Sharp, go my thanks for always encouraging me to try whatever occurred to me, and for always being proud of my attempts. I wish to thank my sisters, Sister Mary Elizabeth, S.S.N.D., and Helena, for their prayers and encouragement, and my brothers, George and John, who helped me in all ways possible and impossible. And to my beloved uncle, The Most Reverend Monsignor John Kean Sharp, go my most sincere thanks for his encouragement and prayers.

I wish to thank the nuns of St. Catherine's Indian School in Santa Fe for their prayers, their hospitality, and their companionship. Sister Ildefonse, S.B.S., and Sister Peter Claver, S.B.S., know I consider them indispensable.

I would like to thank Sister Colleen Hennessey, S.S.N.D., and Sister Philip Cotter, S.S.N.D., who led me by the hand to Dr. Howard in the first place, and who remembered me in their prayers thereafter.

To Mr. Charles A. Connell, Superintendent of South Huntington Schools, and to Mr. Orlando, Principal of Walt Whitman High School, go my thanks for recommending me for the sabbatical which financed a large part of this program. I wish to thank all the personnel at Walt Whitman, but especially Mrs. Gladys Mulford and Mrs. John DeFato. To those teachers who helped me correct final exams and complete my end-of-the-year procedures early, Mrs. Helen Rabidou, Mrs. Jane Bromstead, and Miss Joan Hohenrath, go my affection and my gratitude. I wish to thank my students for being proud of their teacher's efforts.

My affection, respect, and gratitude for all the

staff at La Posada, especially Mrs. Pauline Compton, are most sincere. Their kindnesses and encouragement made my stay here in New Mexico pleasant indeed.

Many thanks are in order to Miss Connie Jackson for typing the first draft of the dissertation from the rough manuscript, and to Mrs. Elaine Blair for typing the final copy and for attending to all the final details after I returned to New York.

May God bless all these people, and especially Dr. Howard.

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL STUDIES ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL AS RECOMMENDED BY SELECTED COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND AS PREFERRED BY SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

BY
Clare Ignatia Sharp

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Education
Curriculum and Instruction—Secondary Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
December, 1974

TEACHER PREPARATION FOR SOCIAL STUDIES ON THE SECONDARY LEVEL AS RECOMMENDED BY SELECTED COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND AS PREFERRED BY SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Clare Ignatia Sharp, Ed.D.
Curriculum and Instruction
Department of Secondary Education
The University of New Mexico, 1974

Problem

The curriculum changes in the social studies from the expostulatory method with history and economics content, to the inductive method with an interdisciplinary approach which included all the social studies, made it difficult for those prepared in the traditional teacher education patterns to adapt to the "new social studies." It was the purpose of this study to survey the programs recommended by selected colleges of education, and to survey the programs preferred by the school districts. This study also attempted to survey any changes that had taken place in teacher preparation on the one hand, and any changes in teaching problems in the schools.

Procedures or Methods

A preliminary letter of invitation to participate

in an assessment of teacher preparation was sent to no more than three selected colleges of education, having a student population of over 20,000, in each state. Three selected school districts, varied as to size, were contacted in each state where a college of education was invited to participate.

Results

The data indicated that a teacher education program, which was interdisciplinary in scope and which was coordinated by the academic disciplines in cooperation with the department of education, was the first choice of both the colleges of education and the school districts. This reflected an increase in preference for this program in the last fifteen years. Some changes were noted in the rank order of importance of several common educational problems over the last fifteen years.

Conclusions

These findings seemed to indicate that the education degree was least popular with both sets of respondents, while the cooperatively sponsored interdisciplinary program was preferred. This would seem to indicate a need for increased interdepartmental cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The doubling of the suicide rate,[1] now the second cause of death among our young people, in the last ten years is a shocking statistic, but it is only one symptom indicating the changes that have taken place in American life. The preoccupation of our students with the right to live, the right to die, the quality of human life here, the ecology, the possibility of war, and the seemingly impossibility of peace is part of a larger questioning process. A new age of humanism may come because of their search for identity, for self, for a truly human existence. In this age of transition, technology has undergone unbelievable changes, probed previously unreachable depths and spaces, and unlocked many secrets of the ancients. Time and space have been conquered by space "labs," undersea explorations, computer checks on the Druids, and aerial surveys of the ruins of ancient civilizations in the Mississippi basins. There seems no limit to the rapid

expansion of human knowledge, only limits to our ability to live with it. This "culture shock"[2] has become a major problem for those whose charge it is to prepare American youth for the future.

The New Student of the 1960's

Even in the 1960's, that era of crises, the problems of the schools were thought severe enough to merit national attention. The proclivities of university and high school students to riots have since caused a reappraisal of teaching aims and methods.[3] The portrait of The Student As Nigger,[4] drawn by Jerry Farber, was that of a "yes mam, no mam," foot-shuffling robot, able to parrot endlessly and mindlessly the words of others. The popularity of this document with students, and its unpopularity with those of the teaching profession, may lend some credence to its charges. Students were often still taught by being "lectured at" endlessly, their creative instincts stifled, their intellectual curiosity deadened by inadequately prepared teachers. In an era that demanded great personal flexibility and integrated moral standards, most students were encouraged to develop neither.

In the 1960's, this new generation of students, undeterred by the McCarthyism of the 1950's, took up once again the old liberal disputes of the thirties and forties, to which they added their own dimensions. Some had begun to assume, as they had been so carefully taught to do in another context in social studies classrooms across the nation, that the right of free speech included the right to question in class the politically expedient compromises of their parents, to form unsponsored clubs, to unite beyond school walls with others of similar interests and ages. At this same time, many educators were themselves questioning the chasm which existed between the middle class educational structure and values and the discrepancies between American ideals and American policies at home and abroad.

Throughout the decade after Sputnik, the explosive growth of the secondary school population became a major concern. The population group aged 14 to 24 increased nearly twice as fast as it had in the previous fifty years.[5] The consequences of this growth on the quality of education were devastating, forcing the adoption of mass production techniques. The impact of soaring

building costs, of the recruitment of thousands of new teachers, of the increase of class size and subsequent crowding of educational facilities, all led to a standardization of educational offerings at a time when sheer numbers seemed to leave no alternative. Students felt like boxes in a crate.[6]

Another source of pressure in this chaotic educational picture was the emerging power of the Supreme Court in its role as "National School Board." Never before 1954 had school board policy decisions been made at the national level. Prior to the Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas case, the Supreme Court found itself involved in several traditional school board functions, namely, curriculum,[7] building facilities,[8] and financing.[9] After 1954, the Supreme Court became, in effect, an appellate body over the nation's boards of education, much as it had assumed the power of judicial review in the days of John Marshall. The question, "Did segregation deprive minority children of equal educational opportunities?" was answered in the affirmative, and segregated schools were adjudged a violation of the equal protection guarantee of the Fourteenth Amendment. In 1955,

the time within which a district might comply with the desegregation ruling was further specified as "with all deliberate speed."[10] The Supreme Court went on to enumerate the factors which the school board should consider: "the physical condition of the school plant, the school transportation system, personnel, revision of school districts and attendance areas into compact units to achieve a system of determining admission to the public schools on a non-racial basis, and revision of local laws and regulations which may be necessary in solving the foregoing problems."

The primary burden for compliance with the desegregation ruling was placed on the school boards. It soon became obvious that the effectiveness of these directives to the nation's school boards would be vitiated by several factors: the white exodus to the suburbs or private schools; the closing of all public schools in certain counties; the failure of the Supreme Court to define a segregated school in a new "rule of reason"; the failure of anyone to provide a workable solution to the achievement of racial balance. In short, the Supreme Court had declared prejudice unconstitutional without

restructuring human nature.[11] That the students became pawns in the power struggle which ensued went unnoticed, as did the lessons they were learning at the barricades in practical politics of the relative effectiveness of riots versus votes as forces of change.

Student reaction was swift and vituperative. The analysis of middle-class values in the Port Huron statement of the Students for a Democratic Society was a scathing inditement of American society and American schools as purveyors of this culture.[12] This and other documents of the student revolt revealed why the students were protesting. The historical aspects of the situation indicated that the liberal movement developed during the depression years of the 1930's was no longer viable, as it could not meet the needs, especially in the areas of civil rights and the war in Vietnam, of the society which emerged in the 1960's.[13] That response to the 1960's, which is now identified as the New Left, seemed more nearly to do so, at least to the students. The attraction of pure Marxism for the young became evident, the trial of Angela Davis provided a rallying point. It was to these groups that the high school students looked for

leadership.[14] The fractionalization of the movement and extension of student activism downward into the high schools became a part of this phenomena which continued into the 1970's.[15]

The Role of the New Social Studies

In the period of public outcry following the discovery of Sputnik, the curriculum offerings of our nation's schools were subjected to severe criticism. Somehow the Russians were ahead and it was all the fault of the schools. The need for revision became apparent in the social studies. By 1963-1964, the Social Science Educational Consortium was set up, under the aegis of the National Council for the Social Studies, to evaluate the plethora of new materials available to the classroom teacher. Federal aid was allocated for curriculum research, and soon joint academic-commercial committees participated in numerous projects. In 1969, over 25 different curriculum packages had been analyzed. Many of these curriculum packages departed from the traditional textbook-lecture orientated presentations. The "new social studies," as it came to be known, stressed active student participation.[16]

These materials reflected an interest in three developments, characteristics of the "new social studies," (1) the inductive method, (2) generalizations, and (3) the interdisciplinary approach. Concern with dates and events had been replaced by a realization that understanding the "why's" of history was more important than chronology.[17] These broad, underlying ideas have been variously termed concepts, generalizations, principles, or laws of history.[18] In the past, preoccupation with the coverage of facts had led to an overuse of the expository method. Now that the focus of interest had shifted to the process of creative thought and the discovery of these generalizations by the student himself, a new approach was needed.[19] For this purpose, the "inductive approach" was derived from Jerome Bruner's "discovery method" for the teaching of mathematics[20] and applied to the social studies.[21] The course perspectives were broadened to include history, political science, sociology, economics, geography, and, where applicable, anthropology. Skills of research, map reading, chart and graph analysis, interpretation, generalization, all received new emphasis. The development of generalizations by the student proved

to be one of the most difficult aspects of the new curriculum.

How to realize the goals of the "new social studies" became a major problem in curriculum preparation. It required new techniques of teaching to implement the new methodology, and a thorough knowledge of content to select the material in which these aims could best be met, without doing violence to the structure of the knowledge itself:

> The student must be trained to think, to answer key questions and to make either analyses or decisions or both in value-laden situations. Daily lesson plans are no longer aimed at coverage by teacher and text but focus on activities, case studies and the tangible raw materials of living history—letters, documents, comparative statistics, artifacts.[22]

Further, the interdisciplinary approach required teacher competency in several social studies disciplines, but where was the teacher who could do all this?

THE PROBLEM

If, as has been generally conceded, new techniques of teaching were required to implement the new social studies curriculum, how could teachers be best prepared to meet these new demands? In this study it was hypothe-

sized that both colleges of education and superintendents of schools recognized the need for a new type of teacher preparation program, in which the expertise of the subject scholar was combined with that of the educational specialist, and that they would so indicate on a forced-choice questionnaire. It was further hypothesized that such a program would be given preference over degree programs offering social studies and education as major and minor fields of concentration. This study sought to determine the answer to this initial question and to other related questions as follows:

1. In hiring secondary school teachers for social studies, did superintendents prefer the traditional major-minor degree programs in social studies and education, or a cooperatively sponsored social studies-education program?

2. In advising prospective social studies teachers for secondary schools, did colleges of education recommend the traditional major-minor degree program in social studies and education, or a cooperatively sponsored social studies-education program?

3. What specific considerations should receive

major emphasis in teacher preparation as viewed by these two groups polled above?

4. Are the hiring practices of superintendents and the recommendations of the colleges of education confluent or divergent in view?

5. Has teacher preparation been responsive to the changing needs of the school situation in the last fifteen years?

These questions are of primary importance to those entering the profession in view of the unfavorable employment situation facing teachers today.

PROCEDURES USED

The study took place during the 1973-1974 school year. It was determined that the location of coordinated programs would not necessarily become evident from an examination of college catalogues, as had been initially thought. Furthermore, if any interdepartmental cooperation existed on a regular basis, the procedures set up in the descriptions of degree requirements might not so indicate. However, the availability of college catalogues proved limited, few college libraries maintain more than those of the current year. It was also found that many

Saturday, evening, and summer school courses were not listed in the regular catalogues. Special workshops often were listed in educational journals and circulars only, and this was more true of those sponsored jointly by the various learned societies. The details of practice teaching plans, one of the most important aspects of a teacher's preparation, are not described in most college catalogues. Thus, it was determined that a direct-mail questionnaire, to those colleges selected for the sample, would yield the relevant information on teacher preparation.

The questionnaire was validated in discussions with various committee members involved in educational research and by direct reference to the problem as stated. The hypotheses actually served to determine the basis for the questions and established the format of both versions of the questionnaire.

The preliminary contact inviting participation in the project employed a sampling method for the selection of the colleges and the superintendents. The selection of the colleges for the sample was based on two criteria: (1) size, only colleges as large as The University of New

Mexico in 1972, that is, those with at least 20,000 students were considered, and (2) response to a preliminary invitation to participate in the survey. If, as in the case of California, there were more than three qualifying institutions, then three were chosen at random. The purpose of this method of selection was to prevent any one state from dominating the responses.

Corresponding information about superintendents' hiring preferences relative to these programs was researched by means of a companion questionnaire, again solicited by a direct mailing, on degree preferences in hiring practices. The desirability of such a program for the preparation of secondary school teachers was to be indicated through forced-choices made on the questionnaire. The superintendents were selected from the states where qualifying colleges were located. One town was chosen at random to represent large districts having over 50,000 population; one to represent middle sized districts having from 5,000 to 49,000 population; and one to represent districts having fewer than 5,000 inhabitants. The statistics on population which were used were those cited in Rand McNally Road Atlas for 1973.[23]

The respondents were those individuals designated by the colleges of education and the offices of the superintendents as a result of the invitation to participate in the project. Twenty-four colleges of education indicated a willingness to participate from 21 different states. Of these, 22 replied, representing 20 states. Thirty-four superintendents, representing 22 states, agreed to participate. Thirty replies were received from superintendents in 20 different states.

Because of the practical applications of the findings in this survey to those of the profession seeking employment, the results of the questionnaire were analyzed in terms of percentages. The data were further analyzed using the chi square test, the preference for the coordinated degree program was significant at the .01 level.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

In the first section, an attempt was made to describe some of the critical features of the "new social studies" and of the "new student," which it was thought required some adaptation of teacher preparation procedures. The statement of the questions to be researched was phrased in terms of applicability to the demonstrated

need, that is, are there correlated or coordinated programs combining content area, methods, and practice teaching suited to the secondary level and the social studies area; are these recommended by the colleges of education to prospective teachers; and are these programs preferred by superintendents in actual hiring practices?

The presentation of data falls into two categories: data on available programs and data on hiring practices relevant to such programs. Comparisons between the two sets of data have implications for current programs of teacher education and provide direction for future innovation.

For the purposes of this study, a program was termed correlated if the student might combine two or more disciplines to satisfy degree requirements. If there were provision for jointly taught classes or jointly administered programs on an occasional basis, then the program was designated as coordinated. If there was a standing committee, composed of professors from the education department and the departments representing the social studies disciplines, set up on a permanent basis, to administer, teach, and supervise the preparation of

secondary school teachers, then it was termed an integrated program. These distinctions were incorporated into the structure of the questionnaire and the data analysis.

The final sections after the analysis of the data are devoted to the conclusions and recommendations. The seriousness of the problem, the education of our youth for a future, uncertain at best, gives some weight to any implications which can be drawn.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this study, the term "social studies" was designated as the broad category which included history, political science, sociology, economics, geography, and anthropology. Course offerings within these subject areas were expected to vary according to local conditions, such as teacher competencies, student interest, graduation requirements, and budgetary considerations.

The "new social studies" here refers to the application of Jerome Bruner's "discovery method"[24] to the teaching of social studies as applied by Edwin Fenton[25]

and others. In this approach, the student uses maps, documents, pictures, news reels, and other primary source materials, analyzes these historical materials, and draws conclusions in answer to basic key questions. The use of these materials as a basis for drawing conclusions is referred to as the inductive method, because the student is required to infer or formulate generalizations from research data, as opposed to the deductive method in which the generalization is given and must be supported by the student.

Degree requirements, as specified on the questionnaires, included choices related to majors and minors in education and social studies. The third choice, a cooperatively sponsored program, was further specified as: (1) individualized, (2) interdisciplinary, and (3) integrated. The distinctions made among these programs related to the degree of faculty coordination. An individualized program was described as one in which degree requirements were satisfied by two or more disciplines, but which did include education courses. An interdisciplinary program was one which included some jointly-taught classes, or programs which were interdisciplinary

in nature, but which did not reflect any permanent faculty coordination procedures. An integrated program, however, did imply procedural accommodations for faculty cooperation, coordination, and a pooling of resources and competencies. It was described on both questionnaires as a program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administered, taught, and supervised student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

In addition to the usual limitations of time and fiscal considerations, the study was designed to elicit replies wherever possible from sources not contacted necessarily by other research projects. No attempt was made to use those universities and districts already participating in research projects of the U. S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare. Participation in the project was further limited to those who responded to a letter inviting them to participate in a project to re-evaluate teacher education. It was felt that any degree of involuntary cooperation might reflect on the

validity of the answers.

The invitations to participate were extended to superintendents who were selected to include those from small, middle, and large sized districts. However, those who indicated a willingness to participate did not necessarily represent such a structured cross sample. The same can be said of those colleges which indicated a willingness to participate. Thus, the conclusions in this study are limited by these factors.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Audio-Digest Foundation, Internal Medicine, Vol. 19, November 10, 1972, tapes of the annual meeting of the American College of Physicians.

[2]Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (Paperback ed., New York: Bantam Books, 1971).

[3]Louise M. Berman, New Priorities in the Curriculum (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968).

[4]Jerry Farber, The Student As Nigger (Hollywood, California: Contact Books, 1969).

[5]The Columbia Forum, Summer, 1973, p. 11.

[6]Malvina Reynolds, "Little Boxes," No. 24 in The Genesis Songbook, ed. Carlton R. Young (Carol Stream, Illinois: Hope Publishing Co., 1973).

[7]"McCollum vs. Board of Education," The Role of the Federal Government in Education, Sidney W. Tiedt (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 115-116.

[8]"Cochran vs. the Louisiana State Board of Education," The Supreme Court and Education, David Fellman (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965), pp. 5-30.

[9]"Everson vs. the Board of Education," Ibid.

[10]Sidney H. Asch, Civil Rights and Responsibilities (New York: Arco Publishing Co., 1968), pp. 165-166.

[11]United States - National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), p. 226.

[12]Port Huron Statement, New York, Students for a Democratic Society, 1964, pp. 8-11, reprinted in Student Activism, ed. Irving Howe (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967), pp. 37-38.

[13]Marvin E. Gettleman and David Mermelstein (eds.), The Failure of American Liberalism, revised edition of The Great Society Reader (New York: Vintage Books, 1971).

[14]Charles A. Reich, The Greening of America (New York: Bantam Books, 1971), p. 290.

[15]William O'Neill, Coming Apart (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971), pp. 166-171.

[16]Bernice Goldmark, Social Studies: A Method of Inquiry (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968), p. 14.

[17]Hilda Taba, Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962), p. 43.

[18]National Council for the Social Studies, Social Studies in the Elementary Schools, 32nd Yearbook, 1962.

[19]Nancy F. Bauer (ed.), Revolution and Reaction (Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Cranbrook School, 1966), p. 10.

[20]Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York: Random House, 1963).

[21]Edwin Fenton, Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

[22]Bauer, op. cit., p. 9.

[23]Rand McNally Road Atlas: United States, Canada, Mexico, 1973 ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973).

[24]Bruner, loc. cit.

[25]Fenton, loc. cit.

CHAPTER II

THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of three historical developments on the teaching of social studies. The challenge to educational aims noted in the writings of Goodlad, Conant, Rickover, and other cited here in the review of literature was intensified with the discovery of Sputnik. The engineering expertise involved in propelling that enormous sized bulk that far off the earth was something the United States simply could not duplicate. Neither could any engineering feat, of which the United States was capable at that time, stop it, catch it, or even come anywhere near it. The failure of our defense establishment and of our education system was, in public opinion, responsible for this terrifying state of affairs.

Another event of grave importance to education in America was the growth of federal control over the classroom resulting from the Brown vs. Board of Education of

Topeka, Kansas decision in 1954 and the Supreme Court decision to end this segregation "with all deliberate speed," reversing attempts of some Southern school boards to delay implementation of the mandate. It had been planned to start integrated classes in kindergarten and first grade and have these integrated classes move up through the schools, integrating the entire system in twelve years or so. When the local authority of the school boards was overruled, students found themselves living in a new integrated society in the schools, while the old segregated order remained at home and on the streets. It was the primary responsibility, and the sole responsibility at first, of the schools to make desegregation work in the classrooms, and in the social studies classroom especially. It was also the responsibility of the school to de-fuse the potential for violence, with only occasional "aid" from the federal government, as when Eisenhower replaced the Arkansas National Guard, which following state orders kept the black students out; with U. S. paratroopers who forced the whites to allow the blacks into the schools. Under these difficulties, the teachers in the classroom were supposed to "continue

as usual."

The third historical development was the entrance of the "immense generation" into the schools. Sheer numbers of students overwhelmed the existing educational institutions, inundated faculties, and forced school cafeterias onto quadruple shifts. The introduction of instructional media, team teaching, the use of para-professionals and non-professionals in the classroom, computer scheduling, and computer report cards enabled school administrators to cope with the situation. Students caught in the impersonal mode of the new school became alienated, restless, and, finally, rebellious.

The results of these events in the development of the "new social studies" are discussed in the literature at greater length. Teachers' content knowledge now must encompass all the social studies: history, political science, sociology, economics, geography, and anthropology. The role of the student in the learning process became active, and new methods were devised for the student to discover the generalizations or "laws" of history, economics, and the other social studies disciplines, in primary source materials or in his own research. The

active student participations required new methods, approaches, and strategies of the teacher and placed added burdens on the colleges of education. The question arose, "To what extent had teacher preparation in secondary social studies responded to these new challenges?"

The Establishment of Education and Some Implications for Teacher Education in Pre-Revolutionary America

Free public education in America got off to an early start with the Massachusetts Public School Act of 1642, and the so-called "Old Deluder Act of 1647,"[1] because in the Puritan ethic, "the Devil finds work for idle hands," although it must be admitted that some towns preferred to pay the fines rather than go to the expense of establishing a school.[2] Thus, the "little hands" of the Massachusetts Bay Colony were kept busy learning the three "R's": "reading, 'riting, and 'rithmetic." Reading and writing were required by the responsibility of everyone to read and interpret the Bible in the early Congregational Churches and to participate in the government of the colony through the town-meeting system, a precedent institutionalized in American history in their Mayflower

Compact. The early settler, self-supporting of necessity, required arithmetic skills for the keeping of household and business accounts but had little time or interest for other subjects such as science or social studies. Other New England towns followed suit; some even provided high schools, as in Huntington Township, New York, where free public education was extended through secondary school in the late 1600's. Two magistrates were elected by these townspeople to see that children went to school every day and to the Congregational or Anglican Church on Sunday. Another kind of school developed in the colonies called Latin schools, to prepare young men, age eight to fifteen, in the classics as a background for a more intensive study of the Scriptures, perhaps at Harvard, founded 1636. By the mid-eighteenth century, however, even the Latin schools began to include a broader range of curriculum offerings,[3] and the study of ancient authors such as Virgil, Homer, and Cicero provided a kind of literary history, as many of the ancient authors wrote about historical developments in their own times and recounted tales about past events, a kind of "grandmother" history. However, probably one of the oldest classrooms

in the United States was built in Acoma Pueblo, next to the church, by the pioneering Spanish missionaries. Of course, the traditional instruction given in the kivas is far, far older than either of these. But, wherever it can be said to have started, education in early America had a religious as well as a practical aspect, and teacher recruitment and preparation was a question of the very survival of the group. Even though social studies, as such, may not have been developed as a separate field, children were taught of their past, of the events of importance in the lives of the group, through ceremonies, poems, tales, and even nursery rhymes.

Eighteenth Century Developments in Social Studies and Teacher Education

When free public schools became more common, and technical knowledge advanced with the growth of the Industrial Revolution, teaching and the dissemination of knowledge began to receive due consideration. Early labor organizations in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, patterned after the craft guilds of Europe, provided for the education of deceased members' sons in their father's crafts. These groups were politically active, however,

and took an interest in the affairs of government. Paul Revere, of Revolutionary fame, organized the silversmiths of Boston, and this group became the nucleus of organized opposition to the British in America. These groups also established an elaborate system of progression from apprentice, through journeyman, to master which is still reflected today in the licensing requirements of craft unions. This system provided a kind of on-the-job training in one of the social studies, economics, as this would be needed in managing a successful business. Benjamin Franklin described an ideal curriculum extending through the secondary level, which included history, as well as the classics, science, and the practical and manual arts. Each school, he thought, should have its own demonstration farm where students could learn by practical experience an early coordination of theory and practice.[4] The climate in Pennsylvania was conducive to educational innovation, as it was William Penn himself who, in the previous century, had deplored ignorance, believing as Franklin did that all children should, at least, learn to read.[5]

THE ROLE OF SOCIAL STUDIES AND TEACHER PREPARATION IN THE FOUNDATION OF THE NEW REPUBLIC

Dame schools, church schools, private tutors, and some free public schools, often supported by townships, completed the picture of education in early America. With the increase in immigration and the opening of new lands to the west after the Revolution came federal support for education. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 provided that lot number 16 be used for school purposes. In Vermont, certain lands known as "glebe land" were never sold, in that title was never transferred to private ownership, and the rent or "taxes" on this land were to be used forever for school purposes. To this day, if a farmer defaults in the payment of taxes on this land, he loses control and use to whoever steps in and pays off the back taxes.[6] Thus, public opinion in America, valuing education, gradually became institutionalized in state and federal laws, and teaching as a profession began to be developed on a more stable basis. In the wave of patriotic ferver which characterized the new nation, other social studies in addition to economics and the literary histories read in the classics came to be included in the curriculum,

mostly in the form of biographies of Revolutionary heroes such as George Washington.

In the United States, teacher preparation followed piecemeal on the development of the diverse schooling systems in the various sections of the new country. The Free School Society of New York, established to provide education for poor children including those of immigrants and freed slaves, soon realized the need for some system to prepare the many teachers needed in the new schools.[7] In the decision made on the kind of educational methods to be used, unfortunately, the expediency of the needs of the moment dictated the adoption of the Lancastrian system, which became a dominant trend from the end of the Revolution to about 1840, although it lingered on much longer in the less advanced schools of the country.

Distinguishing characteristics of the Lancastrian system were efficiency, speed, and large class size. Cubberley's book showed an illustration of one class with 365 pupils.[8] This system relied on monitors who were taught the lesson by the master teacher, then, in turn, taught it to their own groups. Students memorized pieces such as the Declaration of Independence or other

nationalistic items. Joseph Lancaster himself came to the United States to promote his movement in 1818. Schools became highly organized, and Manuals of Instruction gave complete directions for the organization and management of monitorial schools, the details of recitation work, use of the apparatus, order, and classification being minutely laid down.[9] Little was required of teacher education as an art, and, indeed, relatively few teachers were needed on a per pupil basis. The teachers relied on books for content, which made for dull, irrelevant lessons, especially in the social studies.

Thus, very early in American education two diverse trends were developing in social studies as in other areas: (1) a learning environment in which the student assumed an active role as in the apprenticeship system and in the recommendations of Benjamin Franklin, and (2) a rigidly authoritarian, punitive atmosphere in which students "learned by rote," were not encouraged to be creative, and were discouraged, sometimes brutally, from challenging or questioning the information to which they were subjected. This latter development was inimical to the teaching of social studies as it is construed today.

Teacher education began to be influenced by European developments in child psychology under Pestalozzi. In 1832, the New York Public School Society organized ten primary schools which served as model schools, with women teachers; and at this time a fortunate decision was made to abandon the old monitorial system.[10] By 1837, Horace Mann had left the practice of law to become Massachusetts' State Superintendent of Public Education. He embarked upon a life-long campaign to reawaken public interest in education, free the schools from sectarian control, secure public financing for the schools, stimulate the development of high schools, and improve the quality of education by the introduction of European educational developments to classroom teachers. To this end, he wrote 12 Reports on the condition of education in Massachusetts, with the successful aim of persuading the legislature to enact standardized state controls over schools in the interests of providing adequate education for its future citizens, who were to be self-supporting and self-governing. He edited the Massachusetts Common School Journal as an early instrument of teacher education,[11] and tried to improve instruction in light of the dual aims of the legislature.

Thus, the social studies came to be recognized as an important part of the secondary school curriculum and of teacher education.

A contemporary of Mann, Henry Barnard, who worked in Connecticut and Rhode Island, was equally concerned with the inferior condition of the schools in the 1840's and elected the route of teacher training as a remedy. He organized the first teachers institute in 1839 and established the Connecticut Common School Journal to introduce teachers, already in the profession, to new ideas in education. He edited the American Journal of Education as an encyclopedia of information on education into which he sank his entire fortune.[12] He, like others of the time, argued "that public schools were necessary to prevent crime and pauperism, to aid in the Americanization of immigrants, and to keep the country from becoming a caste-ridden society."[13] These tasks of promoting the American ideal, of inculcating a sense of patriotism and commitment to American society, devolved largely upon the teacher of social studies in the classroom.

This visionary dedication, part of the reform movements of the pre-Civil War era, had the solid backing

of the working men's organizations of the time. The expression of the American idea, "equal knowledge, the only security for equal liberty,"[14] was accompanied by a complaint of the "general ignorance" of teachers! This latter charge was incorporated into the political campaign literature of one Stephen Simpson, candidate for Congress in 1931 of the Workingmen's Party of Philadelphia.[15] The first normal school, established by Mann, to remedy these deficiencies and to provide "a clear sense of calling and dedication" to teaching as a respectable profession was set up at Lexington, Massachusetts in 1839, under Cyrus Pierce as principal. It was the concensus of Pierce, Mann, and Barnard that education should be a separate study, that the graduates of liberal arts colleges of the time, even such as Harvard and Yale, were not serious enough in their study of teaching methods. Pierce, in a letter to Barnard, described his methods of teacher preparation. These included: (1) teaching by "example, as well as by precepts, the best way of teaching the same things effectively to others";[16] (2) what could be described as the Socratic method of study through directed questions; and (3) a carefully supervised period of observation and

practice in a model school annexed to the normal school, all recognized now as essential to the education of all teachers, but especially to the education of social studies teachers. Pierce assumed a solid background would be acquired in the subject matter of the then-current high school curriculum, an assumption not borne out by later developments.[17]

The Development of United States Public School Systems after the Civil War and the Recognition of the Need for Adequate Teacher Preparation and Citizenship Education in the Social Studies

In the years which followed the Civil War, free universal education became an established part of the American system. The controversy over secondary education at public expense was determined affirmatively in the famous Kalamazoo Case of 1874, when the Michigan Court upheld this principle.[18] As with the common schools fifty years earlier, the arguments were advanced that "such training would prepare one for life, end inequalities, promote the welfare of mankind, train the masses to be useful and productive members of society, and encourage elementary education."[19] The challenge of educating

the newly freed Negroes for their role as citizens under the 14th and 15th Amendments led to the establishment of separate schools in the South. Federal aid, which had been advanced to states to establish agricultural and mechanical colleges in the Morrill Act of 1862, set precedent for further federal aid through the Freedman's Bureau in 1865 which was established to aid the former slaves and assist in their education through a separate school system. This establishment of a separate school system for colored students in the South helped institutionalize the "separate but equal doctrine," upheld on the federal level in Plessy vs. Ferguson in 1896. It led to the establishment of the separate preparation of many black teachers for these school systems through the foundation of such institutions of higher learnings as Tuskegee Institute. At this time also, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was established to improve the lot of the American Negro through education, as well as legal action.

In the post-Civil War era, too, the final subjugation of the American Indian took place, the federal government assumed the role of legal guardian of all

tribes and a separate system of schools was set up under The Bureau of Indian Affairs. But while black teachers staffed black schools, white government employees taught Indian children, until the recent reversals of this policy in the Southwest. In the biography of Maria Martinez, written by Alice Marriott from many discussions with the famous potter, the positive influence and encouragement of many of these white teachers is felt. But, there is always a sense of distance, of an impossible model, and of a culture on which the Indian could look from the outside, but never join.[20] The black student in the black schools taught by black teachers faced these problems of inequity too, not finally resolved until the Warren court decision in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas in 1954.[21]

During the post Civil War period, then, there developed three distinct types of public school systems in the United States: black, Indian, and "other," with implications for teacher education not explored fully in the literature until the middle of the next century, when the needs of the "culturally different" began to receive belated recognition. During the post Civil War period,

too, normal schools and colleges were developing into universities. Richard Edwards, who believed the normal school curriculum should include collegiate subject matter, became president of Illinois Normal University where he led in the transformation of normal schools from secondary-school level to true institutions of higher learning to upgrade the content preparation of teachers, as in the social studies, etc. In an address to the National Teachers' Association in 1865, he called on the states to support teacher education and made a plea for excellence in the academic areas of a teacher's preparation.[22] The question of teacher education for the secondary schools was discussed bluntly in an address of J. B. Sewall to the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in 1889. In this address, he argued that a liberal education awakens an interest in learning for its own sake, it trains a person in the principles of research, it disciplines one to concentration and perseverance in study, and it gives an interest in learning which lasts a lifetime.[23] He further declared that liberal education was the sine quo non of a secondary teacher's education. He advocated the elevation of instruction in education to

departmental status and urged that all universities offer graduate work in education. He pointed out that Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, and Clark Universities did, but not Harvard or Yale. He deplored the development of hostility between academically oriented professors and those of education, a development which has been most detrimental to the preparation of social studies teachers on the secondary level to this day.

Development of Reforms in Teacher Education and Curriculum Approaches at the Turn of the Century

It remained to James Earl Russell of Columbia University's Teachers College to assume leadership in the move to establish the influence and prestige of teacher preparation institutions.[24] Under his presidency, Teachers College became a center of advanced research; the printing presses turned out voluminous studies which formed the background of every teacher's professional reading for over thirty years. Here the ideas of John Dewey on project-centered learning were developed and disseminated widely, influencing all subject areas and leading eventually to the development of the "new social studies."

Unfortunately, in tailoring the length and content of education courses to the time limits of those already employed as teachers and administrators, Russell contributed to the contempt in which many of the academically oriented hold anything labeled "education." The rift in the Columbia faculties spread to other institutions and has been detrimental to any coordination between subject area scholars and those who teach teachers to teach to this very day.

Changes in the Role of the Schools and the Needs of Teacher Education in the Early Twentieth Century

By 1900, there had been dissatisfaction with the schools and teacher preparation for many years. A notable curricular study[25] concerned itself with the practices then existing in the schools before the influence of G. Stanley Hall and the findings of the child study movement were generally accepted. The methods described were little better than the Lancastrian system. The Committee of Fifteen, as it came to be known, described the separate subjects approach then current in the schools. "Rote learning" and "discipline of the mind" were terms that

occurred frequently, and the courses listed as valued were grammar, literature, arithmetic, geography, history, natural science, vocal music, manual training, and physical culture, i.e., calisthenics. The inclusion of two social studies, geography and history, was an improvement over most colonial curricula. But the report was severely criticized by Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University in his dissent as "an elaborate defense of the status quo."[26] Unfortunately, many of the reforms of the methods in education of the 1840's had succumbed to the pressures and corruption of the Guilded Age, as had honesty in government.

Parallel with the rise of progressive reform in the early 1900's were attempts to revise American education. The role of the school, and the social studies areas especially, was seen as a means of changing society and of counteracting the forces of evil by the reformers; but as a means of socializing students for psychological adjustment to a commercialized society by others.[27] The emphasis of the local business community who controlled the schools was on schooling merely as job training. But the preparation of more women as teachers, graduating

from institutions like Vassar, and the development of courses in the Constitution and American History broadened the public's outlook, contributing to the demand for more participation in government by those outside the ruling class.

The system by which American education is governed through locally elected school boards, usually composed of non-educators, almost guarantees that a business-oriented administration be appointed to run the schools on an efficiency basis.[28] The vested commercial interests of the district comprise the real power structure behind the board, however, not the voters.[29] Thus, any reform of education or teacher preparation had to overcome two obstacles: the inertia of the boards and the problem of cost.

The depression years developed in all the consciousness of the necessity of education for employment. Commercial or vocational courses proliferated and teachers were prepared to teach these courses. The so-called liberal arts courses suffered in both the public schools and in the teacher training institutions. In fact, so much did the demands of business dominate the high school

curriculum that leading educators such as George Counts and Jesse Newlon protested.

> In the 1930's, a remarkable group of educational theorists appeared who clearly understood the schools' basic function as a socialization agent. They tried to urge the profession of educational administration to concentrate its studies on history, philosophy, and sociology instead of business management.[30]

Little came of these efforts at the time.

Impetus for Reform after the Mid-Century

In the 1950's two events occurred, the results of which are still being discovered in education. One was the Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas decision which is still being implemented, and the other was the discovery of Sputnik which opened up the schools to criticism and reform. The end of school segregation brought to the fore the question of minority education in a mixed school setting, and questions on teacher preparation for the newly created integrated schools. A recent investigation of the needs of teachers of the disadvantaged summarized the preparation needed: (1) early exposure of the student teacher to schools with minority children; (2) student teaching in a school situation similar

to the one in which employment is sought; (3) course work in the psychology of the culturally different child and in minority cultures; (4) a cooperative laboratory program involving the college, the sponsor-teacher, and the community.[31]

Then, too, many of the growth changes which take place in the adolescent in the secondary school, a trend accelerated in this generation, undermine his self-confidence. The need for a feeling of success and the failure of many of our schools to provide opportunities for success has been the subject of John Holt's writings for some time. His How Children Fail showed that this fear of failure blocks learning. Many of his students constructed elaborate defenses against failure, some even predicting their own failure so that they would be "right" about their being wrong. Research studies by Davidson and Sarason substantiated the observations of Holt, that fear and anxiety impair gains in student achievement.[32] Louise M. Berman has noted:

The person who would be open to developing new

> patterns of ideas must also be open to handling the emotional states which accompany the emergency of a new system. If the person can tolerate discomfort as newness emerges, he is more apt to be creative rather than a conforming person.[33]

As it relates to social studies, it would seem then that the program of the school should engender an atmosphere of self-confidence, acceptance, and success for the "uneasy years," and a climate of openness in social studies discussions. These needs place additional demands on teacher preparation for these years.

The New York Times annual reviews of education for the last two years have discussed teacher preparation. In "Education '74: Sober Realism and Cautious Hope," the fiscal crisis in higher education is seen as lending impetus to education reform.[34] Institutions of higher education, faced with a mounting teacher surplus, are more likely to discontinue courses and programs not judged successful in terms of accountability and productivity. Courses in civics, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, the basic tenets of law and justice, and the other areas of the social studies, have all gained a new relevancy and form an important part of the social studies teachers' preparation. This renewed emphasis cannot help

but be reflected in the demand for higher standards in hiring practices in the social studies.

TRENDS IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES AND PREPARATION FOR TEACHERS FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

In reviewing the available literature on current teacher preparation in the social studies area, several general trends became apparent. Many sources indicated a preference for an active role of the prospective teacher in his own training period. The suggestion was made that the natural teaching style of the teacher be developed and that it be "conjoined" with the students' learning styles and teaching methods as the basis for classroom organization. Louis J. Rubin of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign observed that this will facilitate learning in the classroom.[35] A report on Project Change at the State University College at Cortland, New York, indicated success for a student-directed program which coordinated studies in two required areas: "behavioral competency" and "knowledge competency."[36] Student teachers selected various projects in these two areas and worked in local classrooms under the supervision

of classroom teachers. This active role of the prospective teacher was thought to encourage innovation, experimentation, and creative teaching. An active role was also stressed in the "experimental Program in the Preparation of Elementary School Teachers," called EXEL, at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. Although these two programs cited are for future elementary school teachers, both reflected a change in the traditional approach to teacher education. Self-realization is the stated goal of these teacher preparation courses to provide the new flexible teacher for the new hoped-for open society.

The creation of an open atmosphere, so necessary to the success of the inductive method, requires an atmosphere of mutual trust and affection. Encounter groups have been used in teacher preparation to foster the integration of personality and encouragement of creativity through mutual effort in group work. One of the pioneers in this movement, Dr. Carl R. Rogers, described this process in Freedom to Learn.[37] The "Open Classroom" approach cast the teacher in the role of facilitator and the student in the role of learner.

This "Open Classroom," where there is freedom to

learn, became a frequently discussed educational innovation in the 1960's. Herbert R. Kohl, one of its leading proponents, carrying a step further the ideas of John Dewey in utilizing student interest to motivate learning, called for a supportive atmosphere to facilitate learning. He did not believe in an orderly sequence in learning, but rather that children's learning is episodic and is developed, not on a linear nor vertical continuum but like a spider web.[38] Kohl and John Holt,[39] who had similar views on how children learn through discovery and curiosity, have been widely read in education courses, especially in those on social studies methods and strategies.

However, often specific course recommendations for secondary school teachers to implement the new ideas are lacking, as is basic research on available programs. Even though an active role was urged for student teachers in "The Reform of Teacher Education"[40] and the development of the person who is to be a teacher was considered of prime importance, the kind of program to accomplish this was not indicated. The same stress on the development of the teacher as an open person was evident in the 1974

yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. The title, Education for an Open Society, reflected current concern with the role of education and especially social studies in improving the quality of contemporary American life. Chapter 6, "Teachers for an Open Society,"[41] discussed the need to change the cultural consciousness of American teachers, locked into what was described as a Euro-American orientation, so that the school experience of Third World children would be improved. Specific information on course requirements or any suggested types of coordinated inter-disciplinary programs were not indicated. These were suggested by the aims as stated, however.

Various authors such as Charles R. Keller, Fred M. Newmann, Evans Clinchy, and Edwin Fenton described what the "new" social studies classes must do as a revolution in the methods of learning and, they concluded, of teaching also.[42] The stress on discovery by the student of the "why's" of history mandates an active student role and different techniques.[43] The learning of the methods of the social scientist in the context of the material became the goal of this "new social studies." The

teacher must be able to integrate the development of skills, understandings, and generalizations within the context of each specific course, as, American History or World History. Models of this new approach were important to the development of new teachers. A sample resource unit on religious freedom, using the approaches of the new social studies, was adapted from the Public Issues Series of the Harvard Social Studies Project by Oliver and Newman.[44] Lembo[45] pointed out that most teachers cannot really tolerate the climate of free inquiry in the classroom without such assistance. The implications for teacher education are new strategies to interest students in inductive reasoning, new materials for classroom use, and extended preparation in all the social studies for the new interdisciplinary approach. Social studies teachers, prepared in the old lecture methods and narrow content areas, found themselves inadequate.

Another concurrent, if somewhat contradictory, influence shaping classroom aims and procedures in the late 1960's and early 1970's was Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education.[46] According to this author, every

subject has its own structure and this structure should, more or less, dictate the sequence of learning of that subject *per se*, which seems the antithesis of the open classroom concept. However, the stress was on the inductive method which required an active role of the student. The role of the teacher was described as that of a "communicator" or "model." It was the task of the teacher "to communicate knowledge and to provide a model of competence." Thus, the social studies teacher could not continue the old classroom behaviors, and teachers could not be adequately prepared in the same old ways.

Bruner attempted to reconcile the theories inherent in Piaget's three stages of intellectual competency with his beliefs in the internal structure of knowledge by his description of learning as a spiral process, with some concepts being introduced in simplified form in early grades to be expanded and developed later as the child's intellect matured. This continuous development of basic generalizations throughout the curriculum became an important aspect of newer social studies curricula.

Criticism of American Schools in Recent Years

In an extensive survey of classroom practice

conducted in 1970 by John I. Goodlad and M. Frances Klein,[47] many aspects of education were researched. Although findings were reported on methods, materials, teachers' attitude, which imply a need to change teacher education, the authors deplored most the teachers' failure to use new materials and methods which were so readily available. The use of audio-visual materials was almost a concomitant of the new social studies.

An earlier investigation into educational practice in American high schools was conducted from the critical viewpoint of what might now be termed "accountability." James B. Conant, former President of Harvard University, assisted by his staff, found American high schools lacking in the educational quality of their course offerings.[48] Unfortunately, he did not recognize the problems of the universality of an educational system designed to educate all students. Continuing in the critical vein, Conant directed his concern to the preparation of teachers for American schools. He stressed the need for "on-the-job" education of teachers and the cooperation of all the departments of the university in an interdisciplinary program. Secondary teachers, he thought, should have

certification in one content field only and of which they should have mastery. He believed in close supervision of the student teacher by experienced professors.[49] These suggestions had gained common acceptance among many other educators over the years, especially in terms of the preparation of social studies teachers, and the idea of cooperation between the various departments was one of the aims of James Earl Russell at the beginning of the century.

Yet, James Coleman, in his devastating criticism of the schools, Equality of Educational Opportunity, seemed to denigrate the role of the teacher and teacher preparation in assuring quality education:

> School-to-school variations in achievement, from whatever source (community differences, variations in the average home background of the student body, or variations in school factors), are much smaller than individual variations within the school, at all grade levels, for all racial and ethnic groups.[50]

However, others quoted seemed to feel good teachers do make a difference.

One of the most interesting non-suggestions for teacher education implied that whatever a teacher has learned is probably irrelevant to the point that all

teachers should be forced to teach a subject about which they know nothing. Then after getting rid of the un-real, the fraud, the un-true, and the unimportant, teachers should return to their former subjects, never to teach in quite the same way again. This novel approach appeared in Teaching as a Subversive Activity,[51] a title which indicates the dearth of good teaching, at least in the authors' opinions, in the American public school system.

The Influence of the Scientific Approach and Systems Analysis on Teacher Education

Partly due to such attacks, teacher preparation began to include the principles of scientific research. N. L. Gage, in Handbook of Research on Teaching, made an attempt to classify and summarize important educational research. This book became a source book and model for students in education courses.[52] A more recent taxonomy of research on college programs, Warren W. Willingham's The Source Book for Higher Education,[53] listing such categories as "Educational Process" and "Manpower Utilization," served a similar purpose for research on higher education. This book also helped teachers to locate information in ERIC (Educational Resource Information

Centers) established under grants from the U. S. Office of Education. Other research sources are listed here in this useful handbook.

Teacher education has been influenced in many ways, too, by a scientifically designed classification devised to help identify, categorize, and organize educational objectives. In the Taxonomy of Education Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain, a systematic approach was used to identify specific educational objectives, and samples were given to test questions in the social studies, as well as other subjects, to evaluate pupil achievement of each specific goal.[54]

The whole question of the affective development of our students, postponed briefly during the panic of the Sputnik era, has finally come into its own, giving Bloom's work a value not foreseen when the research was begun in 1948. The limitations of the behavioral-objectives approach in developing the affective domain are also apparent. Thus, Bloom has made a significant contribution to educational literature and teacher preparation, first, because of the obvious utility of the taxonomy, and second, because it is helping to correct the over-emphasis

placed on operative conditioning in the cognitive area in recent years. It is interesting to speculate on the effects of the "decade of non-violence" on the restructuring of our curricula in the affective domain. This volume was the first of a trilogy; a second volume,[55] now published, was to deal with the affective domain; while a third delineated objectives in the psychomotor area. Now for the first time, classroom teachers could use a rational scientific approach to planning and evaluating pupil achievement. The formulations of objectives was to be specific, attainable and measurable, and teachers became familiar with these ideas in college education courses when Robert F. Mager's Preparing Instructional Objectives[56] appeared on reading lists. The development of measurable objectives has had an impact on education and on teacher education as well. Evaluation in terms of content and approach became classroom procedures. The demands of the newly developed curricula, especially in the field of social studies, have meant changes in classroom procedures. Thus, teachers were trained to refine, direct, and evaluate, in specific terms, their classroom activities.

Using the scientific approach, several educators collaborated on a plan for more effective schools in Organizing Schools for Effective Education. Described were guidelines of organizational strategy, case study, job descriptions with charts on the roles of the superintendent, principals, and business administrators illustrating the new emphasis of this approach. There were no specific guidelines for teacher education, but the rationalization of school practices meant that teacher education had to implement studies in organizational theory.[57] Any teacher who sought advancement into the ranks of administration became familiar with these techniques.

National Education Association Studies of and Recommendations for Teacher Education

The National Education Association, through various commissions, has also examined the question of teacher preparation. Even before Sputnik brought about the public outcry against the schools, the NEA Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards found standards low. The consensus of the group was summed up by Ruth A. Stout, of the Kansas State Teachers Association, "the teacher who fails on the job hurts his profession,

[and] the children."[58]

This same committee, a decade later pointed out that teachers and educators, not state legislators, Boards of Education, or state licensing bureaus, must implement the needed changes in education and teacher preparation. During this period, education had gone from a teacher shortage to a teacher surplus, as the "baby boom" of the post-war years moved through the schools. The conference deplored "the persisting split between the teacher education staffs and the other members of college faculties," and between the professors of education in the universities and the administrators and teachers in the public schools.[59]

Recently, attempts have been made to profile the American teacher and to determine teacher needs. This increased communication between policy planning levels and the classroom has resulted in some interesting discoveries about teacher perceptions of the role of the university. One of these studies conducted by the National Education Association[60] attempted to profile the average American public school teacher by means of a carefully worded questionnaire on what were major problems

encountered in the classroom. "Time" emerged as a major factor in answers ranging from "too many students," to "not enough time and clerical help," to "change instructional procedures." It would seem that the assistance of university curriculum experts would be seen as valuable in this respect, but the answers did not indicate that the teachers thought so. Yet, more teachers were reported as having increased academic preparation since the 1960's. Non-degree teachers were recorded as 3 percent, down from 15 percent in 1961. Masters' degrees or six years of preparation was reported by 42 percent of the men and 19 percent of the women. Unfortunately, the teachers were not questioned as to what their fields were, what types of undergraduate preparation would have been more helpful, nor what courses would they select to help with the classroom problems they indicated as serious or critical. This question was answered to some extent by the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education sponsored by the Kettering Foundation. Number four of the 32 recommendations of this commission was that teacher training institutions "should revise their programs so that prospective teachers are exposed to the variety of

teaching and learning options in secondary education."[61] This prestigious group was composed of representatives from teacher training institutions, high school student bodies, as well as from organizations as the American Association of School Administrators, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Catholic Education Association, North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It was noted, further, that "not represented was anyone who might be regarded as a curriculum specialist." This is unfortunate, because a curriculum specialist might have indicated more specifically exactly which kind of teacher preparation program would implement resolution number four.

Other Recommendations for Teacher Education

An outspoken critic of American education in the post-Sputkik era, Hyman Rickover, reasoned that the causes of the failure of American education lie in the faulty selection, preparation, and certification of American teachers. He claimed that what we need is a first rate school system, concentrating on the liberal arts.[62]

He seemed to agree with James D. Koerner's The Miseducation of American Teachers[63] that the roots of "mediocre scholastic standards" in American colleges of education were the "low intellectual caliber" of the faculty and also of the students.[64] Rickover further charged that "bureaucratic mismanagement of accreditation" resulted in credits or courses being required for certification, which did not necessarily insure competence.[65]

That "teachers are best educated liberally as well as professionally" was the subject of a one-year research study under the Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education. In a series of projects named "Breakthrough Programs," an attempt was made to coordinate the three elements of teacher preparation: the academic departments, departments of education, and cooperating schools. There were six criteria for Breakthrough Programs:

1. They were designed for future classrooms.

2. They were to be planned jointly by university departments of education, representatives of academic departments in the university, and public school teachers and administrators.

3. They were expected to incorporate changes in

the elementary and secondary schools as well as in the colleges.

4. They placed much responsibility for teacher recruitment, teacher education, and "the introduction of the teacher to his profession" on the public school itself.

5. They were to represent an effort to place teacher education in the mainstream of higher education by bringing academic professors and professors of education together for joint planning and to create a better articulation of elementary, secondary, and higher education through the cooperative efforts of college faculty members and teachers and administrators from the public schools.

6. They were expected to extend teachers' liberal education well beyond the sophomore year, provide "scholarly academic instruction" for all secondary teachers, avoid duplication of content in education courses, and provide "extended supervised internship" in classrooms.[66]

Promising as these developments were and despite the stated conclusions that "both liberal and professional education are the sine quo non in the education of a teacher," not all of the participating universities

continued the program after the funding was discontinued, and records were not kept of those that did.

Some Recommendations for Different Teacher Preparations for the Upper and Lower Levels of Secondary Schools

Other recommendations for the preparation of secondary school teachers differentiate between the preparation of those who deal with the pre- and early adolescents. The controversy over the failure of junior high schools has led many to suggest a middle school, with its own program designed for the young adolescent and its own specific teacher preparation. Suggested programs included courses in the psychology of this specific age group,[67] and course work designed to provide background in the curriculum areas specifically recommended for the middle years.[68]

Recommended programs for the younger students in secondary schools take cognizance of their special needs. Many ten and eleven year-olds are found capable of abstract operations. Their intellectual needs can better be met with a program that can go beyond the confines of the elementary school self-contained classroom, without

becoming as rigidly and narrowly specialized as the fully departmentalized high school. There can be more classes of an exploratory nature, especially in the social studies, as well as the arts, foreign language, industrial arts, home economics, and consumer and business education. These areas involving knowledge and skills can keep the mind, the hands, and even the feet happily involved in self-development. There can be a further accommodation of the characteristics now known to exist among our early adolescents with activities which channel the idealism of these young people. There can be more group activities such as field trips, field research in social studies classes, which provide constructive ways to develop a healthy self-image. The activities of these students should not be merely a copy of "the programs and activities of older children without much regard, imagination or concern for [these] children."[69] After all,

> the ultimate criterion of the effectiveness of educational experiences is the kinds of attitudes and values that persist throughout life after the period of formal education ceases. The skillful teacher will seek to inculcate a sense of joy, excitement, and exhilaration in the search for knowledge that will endure throughout life.[70]

The task of teacher education in the social studies and

other areas would seem to differ, then, with the specific age level in the secondary schools. Yet, few colleges have programs for the training of junior high school teachers in any subject concentration. Most states permit an overlap in K-9 elementary, or 7-12 secondary licenses, and tenure law provisions, as determined by the Baird case in New York, do not recognize any distinction between the levels of secondary schools.

As many of our students do not go on to senior high school, the needs of the early years of secondary school teacher preparation are especially acute. Paul Woodring, in discussing the issue of the junior high school, stated, "it now appears that the 6-3-3 plan, with its junior high school, is on the way out."[71] In A Fourth of the Nation, he argued that for the low achiever, especially the culturally deprived, our schools are just not adequate.[72] For a fourth of this nation to fail to acquire even basic skills is in the nature of a national disgrace. "The answer," according to the noted educator and sociologist Kenneth B. Clark, "is that with the proper expectations and programs, our schools can teach every child what he needs to know."[73] That the crucial point in which

compensatory education program gains level out occurs during the difficult junior high school years, when the self-concept is most vulnerable, comes as a surprise to no one who is familiar with the problems of the "normal" emerging adolescent.[74]

The junior high school has often been the most important educational facility in the ghetto, and it is here that its failure has been most keenly felt. For many slum children, it is the terminal phase of their education in which social studies plays a vital role in the development of their powers of decision, and it comes at a turning point in their lives. The exploratory functions of these school years are vital, if the cycle of poverty, where not working and living on welfare have become family traditions, is ever to be broken. Michael Harrington has described the hopelessness of these "internal aliens," some of whom are poor because they were born into the wrong school system and could never overcome their educational deficiencies.[75] It does not reflect well on our schools that the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders profile on the typical rioter is a product of our junior high schools.[76] "Citizenship Education" has failed here.

Recommendations for Teacher Preparation in the Social Studies

A strong recommendation for interdisciplinary cooperation among the colleges of a university to insure adequate preparation of social studies teachers was made by the Committee for Economic Development:

> The task of providing competent, effective teachers for the schools rests upon the colleges and universities—not simply upon the schools or departments of education. For no school of education can successfully meet this obligation unless it has the full cooperation of, and cooperates fully with, the entire university.[77]

The Committee for Economic Development further specified a continuing program of teacher education:

> We urge the institutions engaged in the preparation of teachers to design their curricula to include adequate instruction in the values of research and the uses of advanced educational media. Institute programs to upgrade and update teacher competence have already proved their value. These programs, made available at leading universities to practicing elementary and secondary teachers, should be designed to improve both subject matter competence and capability in utilizing advanced teaching technology.[78]

In reference to the federal funding available under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Committee suggested that a federal "commission on Research, Innovation, and Evaluation in Education" be set up

> to coordinate research both basic and applied to encourage innovative and experimental activities, communication among agencies, publishers, manufacturers, state school offices, teachers, administrators to evaluate innovation in terms of skills, knowledge, other educational goals, and cost.[79]

The National Education Association concurred in these two points made by the Committee for Economic Development: (1) the need for on-going teacher education after graduation, and (2) the necessity for teacher involvement in in-service programs.[80] Undergraduate education of prospective teachers must be interdisciplinary if these teachers are to accomplish the aims of the new social studies as described by Howard D. Mehlinger, of Indiana University at Bloomington, "the main result of the new social studies has been to de-emphasize traditional textbooks and teaching methods and to encourage the development of alternatives."[81] Again he stated, "in recent years, the pendulum has swung to a greater emphasis upon affective education, to multidisciplinary approaches, and to an emphasis on taking action within or outside of the school."[82] Despite the problems faced by those in the social studies field, a note of optimism concludes this discussion. At least the debates among educators, as to

the purposes of social studies education, have opened up the field to innovation.

CONCLUSION

The needs of teacher education vary with the needs of the students in the classroom and the courses to be taught. Specific levels of secondary school seem to need different academic and professional preparation according to some authors. The needs of the culturally different, the poor, again differ from those of the WASP student. There has been a call for cooperation between those of the academic departments and those in the colleges of education, and always the recommendation is made for coordination with the practice teaching experience. These recommendations are particularly applicable to the education of social studies teachers.

The added burden on teacher preparation of desegregation rulings[83] has not been adequately met by additional federal funds. In recent administrations, funds appropriated for education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been "frozen," further hampering the needs of education. The threat of legal

action by groups of teachers and other concerned citizens finally saw the release of these funds. The needs of social studies departments for current, relevant materials was especially pressing.

It is also somehat disappointing to students of education that, in all of the material discussing the new era in the classroom, no definitive model for social studies teacher education exists. A search of the Education Index from July, 1972 to August, 1974, to locate other relevant material on social studies teacher preparation as recommended, or as selected in hiring practices, yielded nothing,[84] nor was any current information available on universities continuing with the programs started under the Breakthrough projects. No alternatives to the traditional curriculum designs, in which methods and techniques are taught separately from content courses, perhaps even by separate departments, are presented which might bring those involved on all levels closer to resolving the problems. For it has been said, "Change cannot come about until the people who want change list the particular conditions which need to be improved and spell out in detail constructive and workable alternatives to the

present system."[85] Thus, the question of how to prepare the new teacher for the new student in the new social studies class remains largely unspecified.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Ellwood Cubberley, Public Education in the United States (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919), pp. 17-19.

[2]Carroll Atkinson and Eugene Maleska, The Story of Education (Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1962), pp. 94-95.

[3]Ibid., p. 99.

[4]Benjamin Franklin, Benjamin Franklin on Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College. Columbia University, 1962).

[5]William Penn, "Some Fruits of Solitude (1693)," quoted in Rena L. Vassar (ed.), Social History of American Education, Vol. I, Colonial Times to 1860 (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), pp. 33-35.

[6]For a general discussion of education in early Vermont, see Ellwood Cubberley, loc. cit.

[7]Gordon Klopf and Garda Bowman, Education in a Social Context (New York: Mental Health Materials Center, 1966), p. 12.

[8]Cubberley, op. cit., p. 91.

[9]Ibid., p. 93.

[10]Ibid., p. 99.

[11]Ibid., pp. 166-167.

[12]Ibid., pp. 168-170.

[13]Atkinson and Maleska, op. cit., p. 157.

[14]Rena L. Vassar (ed.), Social History of American Education, Vol. I, Colonial Times to 1860 (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), p. 164.

[15]Ibid., p. 187.

[16]Cyrus Pierce, letter to Henry Barnard (1841), quoted in Merle L. Borrowman, Teacher Education in America (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965), p. 60.

[17]Ibid., p. 73.

[18]Rena L. Vassar (ed.), Social History of American Education, Vol. II, 1860 to the Present (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965), p. 4.

[19]Ibid.

[20]Alice Marriott, Maria: The Potter of San Ildefonso (Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1948).

[21]William B. Levenson, The Urban School in Transition (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1968), p. 119.

[22]Merle Borrowman, Teacher Education in America (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965), pp. 74-92.

[23]Ibid., pp. 93-94.

[24]Ibid., pp. 208-217.

[25]William T. Harris, Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education (reprint ed.; New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1969).

[26]Ibid., p. 145.

[27]Sidney Spiegel, "The Hidden History of Educational Administration in the U. S.," Changing Education, Fall, 1973, p. 11.

[28]Alan Rosenthal, Governing Education (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1969), p. 92.

[29]William P. McLure and Van Miller (eds.), Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making (Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960), p. 8

[30]Spiegel, op. cit., p. 8.

[31]Sister Colleen Hennessey, "Teacher Preparation Needed for Those Planning to Teach the 'Culturally Different' in Grades 5 Through 9 as Perceived by Teachers Presently Teaching the 'Culturally Different'" (Ed.D. dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1970), pp. 85-86.

[32]K. S. Davidson and S. B. Sarason, "Test Anxiety and Classroom Observation," Child Development, 32:199-210, 1961.

[33]Louise M. Berman, New Priorities in the Curriculum (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968), p. 128.

[34]Fred M. Hechinger, "Education '74: Sober Realism and Cautious Hope," New York Times, January 16, 1974.

[35]Louis J. Rubin, "Matching Teacher, Student, and Method," Today's Education, 62:31-35, September-October, 1973.

[36]"Excellence in Teacher Education," Today's Education, 62:89-94, September-October, 1973.

[37]Carl R. Rogers, Freedom to Learn (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969).

[38]Herbert R. Kohl, The Open Classroom (New York: New York Review, 1969), p. 54.

[39]John Holt, How Children Fail (paperback ed.; New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964); John Holt, How Children Learn (paperback ed.; New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1970).

[40]"The Reform of Teacher Education," Today's Education, 62:20-52, April, 1973.

[41] R. Bruce Ivons, "Teachers for an Open Society," Education for an Open Society, 1974 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), pp. 77-95.

[42] Nancy W. Bauer (ed.), Revolution and Reaction (Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Cranbrook School, 1966).

[43] Edwin Fenton, Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966).

[44] Donald W. Oliver and Fred M. Newmann, Religious Freedom (Columbus, Ohio: American Education Publications, 1967). Selecting and organizing units are discussed in Donald W. Oliver and James P. Shaver, Teaching Public Issues in the High Schools (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966).

[45] John M. Lembo, Why Teachers Fail (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971), pp. 59-60.

[46] Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (New York: Random House, 1963).

[47] John I. Goodlad and M. Frances Klein, Behind the Classroom Door (Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970).

[48] James B. Conant, The American High School Today (paperback ed.; New York: Signet Books, 1964).

[49] James B. Conant, The Education of American Teachers (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963), pp. 205-215.

[50] James Coleman and others, Equality of Educational Opportunity, Office of Education, OE-38001 (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 296.

[51] Neil Postman and Charles Weingartner, Teaching as a Subversive Activity (New York: Delacorte Press, 1969).

[52]N. L. Gage (ed.), Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963).

[53]Warren W. Willingham, The Source Book for Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973).

[54]Benjamin S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956).

[55]Benjamin S. Bloom (ed.), Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain (New York: David McKay Co., 1969).

[56]Robert F. Mager, Preparing Instructional Objectives (Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962).

[57]Daniel E. Griffiths et al., Organizing Schools for Effective Education (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1962).

[58]National Education Association, Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead (Washington: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1955), p. 242.

[59]National Education Association, Changes in Teacher Education (Washington: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1964), p. 30.

[60]"Finding Out What Teachers Need and Want," Today's Education, 61:31-35, October, 1972.

[61]"Reform of the High Schools Urged by I/D/E/A," News Exchange, 15:6, December, 1973.

[62]Hyman G. Rickover, American Education—A National Failure (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1963), p. 7.

[63]James D. Koerner, The Miseducation of American Teachers (Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1965).

[64]Rickover, op. cit., p. 21.

[65]Ibid., p. 283.

[66]James C. Stone, Breakthrough in Teacher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968), p. 16.

[67]Hennessey, op. cit., p. 85.

[68]Lela Joan G. Brown, A Survey of Opinions of Selected Principals Concerning Preparation and Characteristics of Teachers for Junior High and Middle Schools (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico, 1971), pp. 65, 184-185.

[69]Alvin W. Howard and George C. Stoumbis, The Junior High and Middle Schools: Issues and Practices (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1970), p. 208.

[70]Clarence H. Nelson, Measurement and Evaluation in the Classroom (New York: Macmillan Co., 1970), p. 22.

[71]William M. Alexander, "The New School in the Middle," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:355, February, 1969.

[72]Paul Woodring, A Fourth of a Nation (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1957).

[73]Leon Lessinger, Every Kid a Winner (Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates, 1970), pp. 27-28.

[74]Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), p. 46.

[75]Michael Harrington, The Other America (Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963), pp. 24, 42.

[76]United States—National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (New York: Bantam Books, 1968), pp. 128-129.

[77]Committee for Economic Development, Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School (New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1968), p. 50.

[78]Ibid., p. 51.

[79]Ibid., p. 70.

[80]William J. O'Keefe, "Some Teacher-Centered In-Service Programs," Today's Education, 63:39, March-April, 1974.

[81]Howard D. Mehlinger, "Social Studies—Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," Today's Education, 63:70, March-April, 1974.

[82]Ibid.

[83]William B. Levenson, The Urban School in Transition (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1968), p. 119.

[84]Education Index (New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., July, 1972—August, 1974).

[85]Lembo, op. cit., p. 97.

CHAPTER III

THE METHOD OF CONDUCTING THE STUDY

THE COLLECTION OF DATA

One purpose of this study was to determine what type of teacher education program was most frequently recommended by colleges of education to prospective social studies teachers to prepare them for teaching on the secondary level. The types of programs of teacher education to be studied were those indicated as either suggested or prevalent by the findings of the review of literature. For purposes of convenience, these were classified into three categories according to the degree of faculty supervision exercised in relation to the student and the program and the degree of cooperation which existed among the faculty members of the different departments. Another purpose of the study, closely related to the first, was to ascertain which type of program was preferred by superintendents of schools in their actual hiring practices. It was a point of pragmatic interest whether the two points of view were similar or dissimilar.

THE SELECTION OF RESPONDENTS

Once the hypotheses for this study were determined, the problem of locating respondents was approached with two criteria being applied. It was decided that the colleges of education to be contacted should be at least as large as The University of New Mexico in 1972, that is, roughly 20,000 students, because only teacher preparation institutions of this size were assumed to have sufficient financing for adequate faculty and library services, and because only institutions of this size would graduate enough students to substantially influence school systems in the surrounding areas. Furthermore, the colleges of education, since they were, it was hoped, to represent the viewpoints of different geographic areas and, where possible, were to represent the viewpoints of both state and private institutions, were arbitrarily selected, with this in mind, from among qualifying institutions as listed in The World Almanac—1972. If, as happened in the cases of California where there were nine qualifying institutions, Massachusetts where there were four, Michigan where there were five, New York where there were seven, Ohio where there were five, and Pennsylvania where

there were four, only three institutions were arbitrarily selected, but not from the same city and with the above criteria in mind.[1]

The second criteria which operated in the selection of the colleges of education, which would compose the sample, was response to a preliminary letter inviting participation in the project to re-evaluate teacher preparation of social studies teachers for the secondary level. The text of this letter is found in Appendix A. The letter was addressed to the College of Education of each university contacted and a self-addressed, stamped card was enclosed.[2] The last paragraph was included to insure that the person who replied to the questionnaire was authorized by the institution to represent its views. In this way, the colleges and universitites which comprised the sample would have some interest in the project.[3] Table 1 shows the states that were to be included in the preliminary invitation to participate in the study.

The superintendents whose views on hiring practices were to be surveyed were selected only from those states having qualifying institutions subject to selection for the sample of colleges of education. Here

TABLE 1

LIST OF STATES TO BE INCLUDED IN THE PRELIMINARY INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

State	Number	State	Number
1. Arizona	2	16. Minnesota	1
2. California	9	17. Missouri	1
3. Colorado	1	18. Nebraska	1
4. Connecticut	1	19. New Jersey	2
5. Florida	1	20. New York	7
6. Georgia	1	21. North Carolina	1
7. Illinois	3	22. Ohio	5
8. Indiana	3	23. Oklahoma	2
9. Iowa	2	24. Pennsylvania	4
10. Kansas	1	25. South Carolina	1
11. Louisiana	1	26. Tennessee	2
12. Maine	1	27. Texas	3
13. Maryland	1	28. Utah	2
14. Massachusetts	4	29. Washington	1
15. Michigan	5	30. Wisconsin	2

again, a sample was contacted in an effort to locate schools in both urban, suburban, and rural locations with varying enrollments. Based on population estimates of forty-five to fifty million children of school age from a population of about two hundred and twenty million, an estimate was made of about one in four or five of the general population in grades K through 12 in the United States. Thus, to secure a school-age population of a small district having less than five thousand students, a town with a population listed as twenty-five thousand or less was selected. To represent a large sized district, a town or small city having a population of over one hundred thousand was selected on the assumption of a student body of about twenty thousand or more. Towns with populations of twenty-five to ninety-nine thousand were selected to represent districts with an estimated five to twenty thousand student registrations. However, large cities such as New York, Boston, Chicago, and San Francisco were excluded, because these cities' problems were considered atypical of most other districts in the United States.

Other considerations affected the selection of

school districts in addition to size. For arbitrary reasons, no two districts were chosen from the same part of the state. No state capitals were chosen, if other cities in the size range could be located, because the large transient population attached to the legislature and other branches of the state government might have the effect of distorting the views of the indigenous population as reflected in most offices of the superintendents elsewhere. If possible too, a school superintendent was not contacted in a town where the university was already participating in the survey, lest the questionnaires reflect only one set of views. In these ways, it was hoped to get a variety of backgrounds in the educational scene. In order to avoid the pitfall of always researching the same areas, the districts were those serving the towns which were chosen. In one state, Arizona, two towns chosen—Scottsdale and Phoenix—returned the same card and so these two chosen to represent intermediate and large sized districts were sent only one questionnaire. The preliminary letter was addressed, in all cases, to the Superintendent of Schools with the town, state, and zip code as the address. Again, this was part of an

attempt to research new territory, to find out the views of the superintendents of the pupils of these specific towns, whether part of a larger school district or not. Thus, many letters of participation may never have been delivered, or many superintendents may not have felt an interest in participating in a project unless specifically named, or the post office might not have located the superintendent, if the district offices were in another town. These drawbacks to the method of selection were believed to be of secondary importance when compared with reasons for the method stated above.

The letter which was mailed to the superintendents was exactly the same as the one sent to the universities. The same self-addressed, stamped cards were enclosed for instructions as to who would be authorized to respond to the questionnaire for the district. Thus, those who did respond can be assumed to reflect the official policy of the district.

The letters contacting both the colleges of education and the superintendents were mailed, air-mail if outside the state, during April of 1973. A total of 93 superintendents were contacted and a total of 55

colleges were invited to participate. As the cards, indicating a wish to participate, were received, the questionnaires were sent out to the name and address given on the returned card.

THE FORMULATION AND VALIDATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaires asked the same basic questions, but were varied slightly as to the position of the respondent. The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the perceptions of the two sets of respondents on degree requirements and approaches used during the period of teacher preparation. The questions on programs were based on the findings and recommendations noted in the review of literature. According to the review of literature, there seemed to be a definite consensus that new methods and strategies were needed for the new social studies and the various other problems, some old, some new, faced by the schools in the 1970's. Other questions were suggested by the various categories of federal aid available under the different titles of the Elementary and Secondary School Act.

The questionnaire was tried out on some experienced teachers and future teachers in classes at The University of New Mexico. It was discussed by the doctoral committee and colleagues. It was also discussed with administration and faculty in Walt Whitman High School in Huntington Station, New York. As a result of these discussions, the questionnaires were revised, certain specifications were added, and other modifications which helped structure the answers were made.[4]

After the questionnaires were revised, shortened, and refined, they were printed with self-stamped, self-addressed reverse sides and mailed to all those who volunteered after the initial contact. Of the 34 superintendents who volunteered, 31 replies were received, representing 20 different states. This gave a 93 percent participation. Of the 24 colleges of education indicating a willingness to participate, 22 replied, representing 20 different states. The rate of participation here was 91 percent. As the questionnaires were returned, the results were tabulated. Where returns were slow, second contacts were made. The convenience of reply and the personal interest of many respondents may have been factors in the high rate of return.

THE TREATMENT OF THE DATA

As the questionnaires were returned, the responses were tabulated by hand for each question on the questionnaire and separately for each set of questionnaires. The data were organized into the tables used in the following chapter.

The level of significance of the preference for the cooperative program described in item "c" of question number one was determined, using the chi square formula resulting in a .01 level of significance. The returns on each question from each of the two sets of respondents were tabulated separately. The data were then interpreted by means of percentages, ratios, or by internal comparison of the raw scores, as the nature of the data seemed to suggest. Where the question required responses on a Likert-type scale giving rank order of preferences, if any, data were discussed by means of ratios and comparisons. The figures were revised as the returns came in over a period of a year.

SUMMARY

The manner of selection of subjects for the

inquiry and the techniques for designing and handling the questionnaire yielded the data to be cited and discussed in the next chapter. The results were hand tabulated, tables were prepared for the presentation of results, and the various approaches—chi square formula, percentages, or ratios—were worked out and computed. Comparisons were made and became the basis for the final conclusions and recommendations. The actual collection of the data took place from June, 1973, through a cut-off date of June 1, 1974.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Actually, only 55 were contacted due to the decision to effect a better balance of the geographic distribution of the respondents.

[2]See Appendix A.

[3]When contacted for information on the project, the National Education Association, Division of Instruction and Professional Development requested the results of the assessment.

[4]See Appendix B for the questionnaire used with superintendents and Appencix C for the one sent to the colleges of education.

CHAPTER IV

THE PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data to be presented here were collected to affirm or negate answers to several related questions. These were:

1. In hiring secondary school teachers for social studies, did superintendents prefer the traditional major-minor degree programs in social studies and education or a cooperatively sponsored social studies-education program?

2. In advising prospective social studies teachers for secondary schools, did colleges of education recommend the traditional major-minor degree program in social studies and education or a cooperatively sponsored social studies-education program?

3. What specific considerations should receive major emphasis in teacher preparation as viewed by these two groups polled above?

4. Are the hiring practices of the superintendents

and the recommendations of the colleges of education confluent or divergent in view?

5. Has teacher preparation been responsive to the changing needs of the school situation in the last fifteen years?

These questions seemed of importance in light of the public's demand for accountability in education, the students' demands for interesting courses and an active role in their own education. These questions were designed to assess the impact of the events of over a decade upon education in general and teacher education in particular.

Tables of findings 2 through 17 are classified according to the following headings:

Degree Preferences as Indicated by Colleges of Education in Rank Order;
Degree Preferences as Indicated by School Districts in Rank Order;
Type of Cooperative Program Selected by Colleges of Education Indicated in Rank Order;
Number of Colleges Indicating that They Do Have the Kind of Program Rated as First Choice;
Types of Cooperative Program Selected by School Districts Indicated in Rank Order;
Perceptions of Educational Problems as Ranked in Importance by Colleges of Education;
Perceptions of Education Problems as Ranked in Importance by School Districts;
Similarities and Differences in Responses of Colleges of Education to Questions One Through Three as They Would Have Been Answered Fifteen Years Ago;

Number of Colleges of Education Reporting a Difference in Selection Fifteen Years Ago on Question One Indicating Degree Preferences;
Number of Colleges of Education Reporting a Difference in Selection Fifteen Years Ago on Question Two—Type of Cooperative Program Preferred;
Number of Colleges Indicating that They Did Have the Kind of Program Rated as First Choice Fifteen Years Ago;
Number of Colleges of Education Reporting a Difference in Emphasis Fifteen Years Ago on Question Three—Perceptions of Educational Problems;
Similarities and Differences in Responses of School Districts to Questions One Through Three as They Would Have Been Answered Fifteen Years Ago;
Number of School Districts Reporting a Difference in Selection Fifteen Years Ago on Question One Indicating Degree Preferences;
Number of School Districts Reporting a Difference in Selection Fifteen Years Ago on Question Two—Type of Cooperative Program Preferred;
Number of School Districts Reporting a Difference in Emphasis Fifteen Years Ago on Question Three—Perceptions of Educational Problems.

These tables are further explained and analyzed in the accompanying text.

RESPONDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE SURVEY

The data which were collected in response to the questionnaires mailed to selected colleges of education and school districts from June, 1973, through June, 1974, falls into two distinct categories: (1) responses from

the colleges of education, and (2) responses from the superintendents of schools. These responses are tabulated on separate tables for each question. Of the 34 school districts which volunteered, 30 returned questionnaires. Of the 24 colleges of education which volunteered, 22 returned questionnaires.

Degree Preferences as Expressed by Selected Colleges of Education and by Selected School Districts in Response to Question Number One on the Questionnaires

For the colleges of education[1] question number one read: "In advising prospective secondary school teachers for social studies, which of the following degree programs do you prefer (1) most, (2) second choice, (3) third choice, all other factors being equal?

(a) a major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education

(b) a major in education—minor in social studies disciplines

(c) a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program."

The responses of the colleges of education were tabulated and yielded the results shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

DEGREE PREFERENCES AS INDICATED BY COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN RANK ORDER

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
(a) A major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education	7	4	4
(b) A major in education—minor in social studies disciplines	1	5	6
(c) A cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program	14	3	2
No response	0	10	10
Total	22	22	22

Ten of the respondents had no second or third choices. Of these, seven recommended only the cooperative program, while three preferred the social studies major—education minor program.

Tabulated in Table 3 are the responses from the superintendents, for whom question number one was worded: "In hiring secondary school teachers for social studies, which of the following degree programs do you prefer (1) most, (2) second choice, (3) third choice, all other factors being equal?

(a) a major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education

(b) a major in education—minor in social studies disciplines

(c) a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program."

The responses, as follows, parallel those of the college advisors.

TABLE 3

DEGREE PREFERENCES AS INDICATED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN RANK ORDER

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
(a) A major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education	11	8	4
(b) A major in education—minor in social studies disciplines	0	5	15
(c) A cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program	19	8	1
No response	0	9	10
Total	30	30	30

Here again, second and third choices sometimes were not indicated. Of those indicating no other preference,

seven respondents ranked a cooperative program as their first choice, and two of these superintendents ranked the social studies major—education minor program as their first choice. The lone respondent, who failed to indicate a third choice, found the cooperative program as his first choice. This would indicate that the school superintendents are well informed of the variations in degree programs and have definite views on the value of each kind of teacher education.

Thus, in reply to the first question, a majority of both college of education advisors and school superintendents' offices indicated a preference for the cooperatively sponsored program as described on the questionnaire. The percentages of preference were 64 percent for the colleges of education and 63 percent for the superintendents. It must be borne in mind that this was a three-way choice and that this percentage contrasts with the 4.5 percent of the colleges of education which elected the education major as first choice, and the 0 percent of the school districts which did. The percentage of election for the remaining choice, the social studies major—education minor were 37 percent for the districts

and 31.5 percent for the colleges of education. This finding was computed as significant at the .01 level.

Type of Cooperatively-Sponsored Degree Program Chosen by Those Colleges of Education and by Those School Districts Indicating a Preference for an Interdisciplinary Preparation in Response to Question Number One

Only those indicating the cooperatively-sponsored program as a first choice were asked in the second question what type of cooperative program they preferred. As addressed to the colleges of education, the question was stated: "If a cooperatively-sponsored social studies—education program was your first choice, please indicate what type of program would be of most value to a prospective teacher. Second choice? Third choice?

(a) an individualized program in which degree requirements are satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses.

(b) a program which includes some jointly-taught classes, or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis.

(c) an integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis.

Do you currently have the type of program you have indicated as your first choice? Yes ____ No ____?"

The responses to this question were less conclusive, due perhaps to confusion over the wording of the question. The results as tabulated in Table 4 indicate this confusion by the varying numbers of "no response" and the three extra respondents. The total should have been 14 in each column.

According to Table 2, 14 respondents from the colleges of education selected answer "c" for question number one and thus were entitled to answer question two. However, 16 replies were tallied; three came from respondents who should not have made any selection, while one, who should have replied, did not. Either confusion existed, the format of the forced choice questionnaire was not considered as reflecting adequately the thoughts of the respondents, or three more respondents showed a preference for the cooperative program than was reflected in the responses to question number one. An interpretation of Table 4, Column 1, alone might indicate that the professors seemed to prefer equally, on an eight to eight basis, a program initiated and supervised either by the individual student or a permanent faculty committee,

TABLE 4

TYPE OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAM SELECTED BY COLLEGES OF EDUCATION INDICATED IN RANK ORDER

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
(a) An individualized program in which degree requirements are satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses	8	5	1
(b) A program which includes some jointly-taught classes, or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis	0	5	8
(c) An integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis	8	3	2
No response	1	4	6
Extra responses not authorized by choice indicated in question number one	-3	-3	-3
Total	14	14	14

but distrusted any program of a temporary nature, created, perhaps, for the expediency of the moment. In rating the choices from Column 3 on the scale of least liked, the interdisciplinary program of a temporary nature was most unpopular, being the last choice of eight respondents. The integrated program with two selections and the individualized program with one selection seemed far more popular and were close. This would seem to bear out the interpretation given on the basis of the first choices here.

The responses to the last part of the question, indicating the existence of the preferred program, came as a disappointment after the successful experiences described in the "Breakthrough Projects" of the Ford Fund for the Advancement of Education in the review of literature. Table 5 shows these responses.

It is sad to note the number of professors, eight, who did not have the program of their choice as opposed to nine who did. Roughly half of the respondents work under conditions, in the important area of academic freedome, of which they do not approve. It is hoped that the results of this survey may lend some backing to their position.

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF COLLEGES INDICATING THAT THEY DO HAVE THE KIND OF PROGRAM RATED AS FIRST CHOICE

Response Alternatives	Program of Choice
Yes	9
No	8
No Response	5
Total	22

Oddly enough, the responses of the superintendents of schools showed an even greater preference for organized university supervision than did the colleges of education, as Table 6 shows.

As indicated by Table 3, 19 respondents were to answer this question. Here the superintendents favored the integrated program on a 5 to 14 ratio as seen in Column 1. Again, two superintendents who had not selected the coordinated program as first choice chose to indicate what type of coordinated program they preferred. Here, too, a reverse ranking of Column 3 shows the most popular was the third item listed, the integrated program; the second choice was the individualized program, but not a

TABLE 6

TYPE OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAM SELECTED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS INDICATED IN RANK ORDER

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
(a) An individualized program in which degree requirements are satisified by two or more disciplines, but including education courses	5	4	7
(b) A program which includes some jointly-taught classes, or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis	2	8	7
(c) An integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis	14	4	2
No response	0	5	5
Extra responses not authorized by choice indicated in question number one	-2	-2	-2
Total	19	19	19

close choice; and the least favored was the interdisciplinary program, as indicated also by an interpretation of Column 1.

Special Educational Considerations Perceived as Requiring a Special Teacher Preparation by Selected Colleges of Education and by Selected School Districts

Responses to question number three were somewhat inconclusive. This question listed some educational problems thought to be common in various areas around the country, as suggested by the review of literature, and by available graduate course listings. The choices were to be ranked in order, on a Likert-type scale, starting with "1" as of major importance through "7" of least importance. The question read: "Please indicate any of the following factors which you believe should receive major consideration in the preparation of teachers, in rank order, with (1) indicating your first choice, (2) second choice, and continuing up to (7).

(a) Reading levels

(b) Drop-out rate

(c) Special needs of American Indian, Mexican American, and Black students

(d) Expenditure per pupil and problems of school finance

(e) Advanced placement and honors classes, and college-bound students

(f) Opportunities for teachers' professional growth and advancement, problems of job dissatisfaction

(g) Other (please specify)."

Returns from the colleges of education were scattered, as were those of the superintendents tabulated in Table 8 on these choices. See Table 7 for those responses which were indicated on the questionnaires.

The free choices expressed as first or second in (g) listed such items as: "content" with three selections; "individualization," "field experience," "continuous screening of teachers," "writing competency," "curriculum change," and "subject matter methodology." Many of these choices seem to reflect the demands of the new social studies, because authors as Fenton, Goodlad, Woodring, and others suggested we need to update our methods and content and utilize the skills of research, including expository writing skills. The recommendations of the coordinated programs, as described in the literature on the Breakthrough Programs, would seem to support the concern for "field experience" and "subject matter methodology."

TABLE 7

PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS AS RANKED IN IMPORTANCE BY COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice	6th Choice	7th Choice
(a) Reading levels	6	8	1	2	1	0	0
(b) Drop-out rate	0	3	3	2	3	4	3
(c) Special needs of American Indian, Mexican American, and Black students	1	2	4	10	1	0	0
(d) Expenditure per pupil and problems of school finance	0	0	4	0	6	5	3
(e) Advanced placement and honors classes, and college-bound students	1	1	1	4	3	6	2
(f) Opportunities for teachers' professional growth and advancement, problems of job dissatisfaction	3	2	5	0	4	3	1
(g) Other (please specify)	7	2	0	0	0	0	1
No Response	4	4	4	4	4	4	12
Total	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

"Continuous screening" would seem to indicate a request for continuing teacher education, also favored by various sources in the Review of Literature, Chapter III.

In order to assess the perceptions of the school districts as to specialized course recommendations, indicated as necessary in the review of literature by the National Education Association reports and other individual authors, a list of possible educational considerations were given and were to be ranked in order of importance by the respondents. The question as stated on the questionnaire mailed to the school districts was phrased as follows: "Please indicate any of the following factors which you consider in hiring teachers for your district, in rank order, with (1) indicating your first choice, (2) second choice, and continuing up to (7).

(a) Reading levels

(b) Drop-out rate

(c) Percentage of American Indian, Mexican American, Black students

(d) Expenditure per pupil

(e) Percentage of college-bound students

(f) Teacher turn-over rate

(g) Other (please specify)."

TABLE 8

PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS AS RANKED IN IMPORTANCE BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice	6th Choice	7th Choice
(a) Reading levels	11	5	4	0	0	0	0
(b) Drop-out rate	2	5	5	5	0	0	0
(c) Percentage of American Indian, Mexican American, Black students	1	3	4	2	2	5	2
(d) Expenditure per pupil	3	3	0	6	4	4	0
(e) Percentage of college-bound students	2	2	6	3	3	3	0
(f) Teacher turn-over rate	3	3	1	3	6	3	1
(g) Other (please specify)	4	1	0	0	0	1	1
No response	4	8	10	11	15	14	26
Total	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

The special concern of the superintendents for reading levels (a) reflects that of the colleges. Slightly more concern is shown by the superintendents for the drop-out (b). The spread of answers in (c) for these selected minorities probably reflects local conditions. Some superintendents were concerned about school finances (d), others ranked this choice low on the list of priorities, again reflecting local conditions. Generally the colleges of education were less concerned about the support of public education. The importance assigned to the education of the gifted (e) received a wide spread in ranking by both colleges of education and superintendents. The colleges of education seemed slightly more concerned about minority groups in (c), while superintendents showed an equal concern for the two types of students. Quality education for an intellectual elite has never seemed popular with most Americans. In many school budgets, more is spent per pupil for the less gifted and handicapped than for the students who do best in the educational system.[2]

Changes in Election of Questionnaire Items as Perceived by Selected Colleges of Education and by Selected School Districts Over a Fifteen Year Period

It was one of the stated purposes of the study to attempt an analysis of any change made in the preparation of teachers, especially any changes which reflect the needs of the new social studies, emphasizing as it does the inductive method, interdisciplinary content, and an active role of the student in the learning process. This it proved was more difficult to do, as the following Tables 9 through 16 indicate.

As addressed to the colleges of education, the statement of question number four was as follows: "What would your answers to these questions have been fifteen years ago (pre-Sputnik)?

1.(a)_____	2.(a)_____	3.(a)_____	(d)_____
(b)_____	(b)_____	(b)_____	(e)_____
(c)_____	(c)_____	(c)_____	(f)_____
	Yes_____	No_____	(g)_____"

A total of 16 colleges of education responded from a possible 22. The returns were thought to be too low to be conclusive here and, therefore, only comparisons

will be drawn and the directions in which the changes were made will be noted.

TABLE 9

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION TO QUESTIONS ONE THROUGH THREE AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN ANSWERED FIFTEEN YEARS AGO

Colleges of Education Reporting:	Number
Changes in election	15
No change in election	1
No responses	6
Total	22

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN SELECTION FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION ONE INDICATING DEGREE PREFERENCES

Response Alternatives to Question One	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
1. (a) A major in the social studies—minor in education	10	3	1
(b) A major in education—minor in social studies disciplines	2	3	3
(c) A cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program	3	2	3
No response here	0	7	8
Same or non-responding	7	7	7
Total	22	22	22

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN SELECTIONS FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION TWO—DEGREE PREFERENCES

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
2. (a) An individualized program in which degree requirements were satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses	2	3	3
(b) A program which included some jointly-taught classes or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis	1	3	3
(c) An integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis	6	1	1
No response here	6	8	8
Same or non-responding	7	7	7
Total	22	22	22

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF COLLEGES INDICATING THAT THEY DID HAVE THE KIND OF PROGRAM RATED AS FIRST CHOICE FIFTEEN YEARS AGO

Response Alternatives	Program of Choice
Yes	1
No	7
No response here	7
Same or no response at all	7
Total	22

As previously noted, returns from the colleges of education on question number four were fewer in number than on other parts of the questionnaire. Two stated they were not in education ten years ago and so could not respond. However, eight replies indicated stable choices, two indicated slight changes, giving more emphasis to (a), (b), and (c). As with the superintendents, six respondents upgraded their ratings of the cooperative program. Four moved it from last to first place, one moved it from third to second choice, and one moved it from second to first place.

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION THREE— PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice	6th Choice	7th Choice
3. (a) Reading levels	5	3	2	1	0	1	0
(b) Drop-out rate	0	4	2	2	3	0	1
(c) Special needs of American Indian, Mexican American, and Black students	0	0	0	4	3	5	0
(d) Expenditure per pupil and problems of school finance	1	0	1	2	2	4	2
(e) Advanced placement and honors classes, and college-bound students	3	2	2	2	1	1	1
(f) Opportunities for teachers' professional growth and advancement, problems of job dissatisfaction	1	3	4	0	2	0	2
(g) Other	3	1	2	1	0	0	3
No response here	2	2	2	3	4	4	6
Same or non-responding	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Total	22	22	22	22	22	22	22

As addressed to the school districts, question number four was as follows: "What would your answers to these questions have been 15 years ago (pre-Sputnik)?

1.(a)_____	2.(a)_____	3.(a)_____	(d)_____
(b)_____	(b)_____	(b)_____	(e)_____
(c)_____	(c)_____	(c)_____	(f)_____
			(g)_____"

A total of 13 school districts responded to question number four out of a possible 30. Again, the returns were thought to be too low in terms of the sample to lend themselves to any kind of a conclusive analyses. Therefore, only comparisons will be made here, as shown in Table 14.

TABLE 14

SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN RESPONSES OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO QUESTIONS ONE THROUGH THREE AS THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN ANSWERED FIFTEEN YEARS AGO

School Districts Reporting:	Number
Changes in election	15
No changes in election	8
No response	7
Total	30

TABLE 15

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN SELECTION FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION ONE INDICATING DEGREE PREFERENCES

Response Alternatives to Question One	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
1. (a) A major in the social studies—minor in education	12	0	1
(b) A major in education—minor in social studies disciplines	1	6	2
(c) A cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program	2	3	6
No response here	0	6	6
Same or non-responding	15	15	15
Total	30	30	30

TABLE 16

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN SELECTION FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION TWO— TYPE OF COOPERATIVE PROGRAM PREFERRED

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice
2. (a) An individualized program in which degree requirements were satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses	6	2	1
(b) A program which included some jointly-taught classes or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis	1	5	2
(c) An integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis	3	1	5
No response	5	7	7
Same or non-responding	15	15	15
Total	30	30	30

Table 17 shows that the returns on this last question, an attempt to assess any change in the patterns explored in questions one through three, were somewhat surprising. Of the superintendents responding, eight indicated no change in hiring preferences or educational priorities. Two indicated an increase in emphasis on per pupil cost. Three indicated slight change except for a shift in emphasis from (e) the gifted student and (f) teacher growth, both characteristics of quality education, to (a) reading levels, (b) drop-outs, and (c) problems of minority education. These three districts were Roswell, New Mexico; Richmond, Indiana; and Pensacola, Florida. Proximity to university projects and an increased awareness and appreciation of cultural differences may account for the shift in emphasis in these areas rather than a change in the composition of the study body as sometimes happens in northern cities. The most startling change came in the complete reversal in ranking the cooperatively sponsored program from choice 3 to choice 1 in question number one. Eight superintendents did so; another moved this program from second to first choice; and still another superintendent who specified only the cooperative

TABLE 17

NUMBER OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS REPORTING A DIFFERENCE IN EMPHASIS FIFTEEN YEARS AGO ON QUESTION THREE— PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

Response Alternatives	1st Choice	2nd Choice	3rd Choice	4th Choice	5th Choice	6th Choice	7th Choice
3. (a) Reading levels	1	3	2	1	0	3	0
(b) Drop-out rate	0	0	4	5	0	1	0
(c) Special needs of American Indian, Mexican American, and Black students	0	0	0	0	4	2	2
(d) Expenditure per pupil and problems of school finance	2	3	2	1	1	1	0
(e) Advanced placement and honors classes, and college-bound students	3	2	3	2	1	0	0
(f) Opportunities for teachers' professional growth and advancement, problems of job dissatisfaction	3	4	1	1	2	1	0
(g) Other	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
No response	3	3	3	5	7	7	13
Same or non-responding	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
Total	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

program would have chosen only the social studies major fifteen years ago. Another response, while holding most choices stable over the fifteen year period, would give now more emphasis to teacher availability (Salina, Kansas).

SUMMARY TO QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

From the Colleges of Education and the School Districts Participating in the Surveys

The data for the questionnaires sent to the colleges of education and to the superintendents of schools have been tabulated, and interpretations have been given. Wherever possible, differences and similarities between the two sets of respondents have been noted. Slight differences were observed in the election of the cooperative program and in the type of cooperative program preferred. Some slight difference was noted in emphasis on the needs of the slow learner and the culturally different between the two sets of responses. If any changes have occurred over the last 15 years, as observed by the respondents, this has been noted also. The major difference noted was the increased preference of the two sets of respondents for the cooperative program. On the basis of this data some implications can be drawn.

FOOTNOTES

[1]See Appendix E for the list of participating colleges.

[2]The per pupil cost of students receiving a technical education in Walt Whitman High School, Huntington Station, New York, for the 1973-1974 school year was $1,700 per year. The academic student cost $1,500. Figures are not available on special education students nor for the homebound.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

The impact of the new social studies and of the active learning styles of many of today's students can be seen throughout the responses discussed here. The purpose of this study was to determine the degree preferences of selected school districts in hiring social studies teachers and to compare this preference with the programs advised by the colleges of education to prospective teachers of social studies. It was also projected that these selections would show a move away from the more traditional major-minor degree requirements to the type of teacher education recommended in the literature, an approach attuned to the needs of the students, involving a broad, interdisciplinary, content preparation, and supervised experience in the classroom.

The two sets of questionnaires and the tabulation of the results of each set separately give the perceptions

of the two different groups involved in the education of our youth today. The data suggest that changes are being made, if slowly, in the preparation of the teachers for the next decade.

FINDINGS

The findings, as discussed in Chapter IV, indicate only minor differences between the two sets of respondents on most questions.

1. The findings seem to indicate that in actual hiring practices superintendents of schools do prefer teachers who have participated in a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program by a majority of 61 percent. This finding was significant on the .01 level. The colleges of education also preferred the cooperative program by 64 percent, and this too was significant at the .01 level. (See Appendix G, pp. 148-149.)

2. In further specifying the type of cooperative program desired, the superintendents chose the one involving the most faculty supervision by a 14 to 8 ratio, and rejected it by a 2 to 15 ratio. Thus, the superintendents seemed to favor more university-level interdisciplinary

coordination in teacher preparation as indicated by their preferences in hiring practices.

3. The findings on the questionnaire sent to the colleges on the availability of preferred programs indicates that nine respondents did not have the preferred type of coordinated program, while eight did. Of this small sample, 17, roughly half did not have their preferred teacher education program.

4. The recommendations of the colleges of education to prospective teachers on programs and courses to satisfy degree and certification requirements are not really divergent from the hiring practices of school superintendents.

5. Specific school considerations ranked as important by both sets of respondents were again more confluent than divergent in viewpoints. However, as Tables 7 and 8 indicate, the superintendents were somewhat more concerned with finances and drop-outs than the professors were. College responses indicated a slightly greater concern with the problems of minorities over the needs of the gifted, while the concern of the superintendents seemed about equal.

6. Finally, in answer to the question, "Has teacher preparation been responsive to the changing needs of the school situation in the last fifteen years?" the answer is yes. Twelve out of 18 college responses indicated an increased preference for the cooperatively sponsored, interdisciplinary program in the social studies. Ten of the school superintendents indicated an increased preference for the cooperative program, while 10 reported no change in preferences or hiring practices. Three indicated an increased concern over reading levels, the drop-out rate, and the special needs of minority students. This indicates a slightly more conservative outlook than evidenced by the responses from the colleges of education.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, it may be said that, generally, the results of the study tended to affirm the original perceptions of traditional teacher education as tending to be outdated, irrelevant, and narrowly limited, either to the technical aspects of the learning process, or to an academic foundation in only one area of the social studies. It was inferred from the review of literature

that this was the result of rigid certification requirements and disharmony between the different faculties in most universitites.

1. The views of the superintendents on degree preferences in teacher education are consistent with the suggestions made in the literature and the preferences expressed by the colleges of education. Thus, there is evidence here to suggest to prospective teachers that, as the odds of finding a job upon graduation are 19 to 11 to 0 for students with degree programs classified as (1) cooperative, (2) social studies major—education minor, and (3) education major—social studies minor, they should take the cooperative program.

2. The preferences of the colleges of education for types of cooperative programs to satisfy the degree and certification requirements of prospective teachers are not really divergent from the hiring practices of school superintendents. This lends further support to the first conclusion.

3. In view of the findings on the availability of the preferred programs in the colleges, it must be concluded that teacher education in some areas does not

reflect the wishes of the colleges of education nor the preferences of the superintendents.

4. It can be further concluded that there is a definite consensus among both colleges of education and superintendents of schools relative to the preferred type of teacher education.

5. The specific needs of minority groups in overcoming learning disabilities have been recognized. These needs are reflected in the choices indicated on question number three, Tables 7 and 8.

6. There is reason to believe that, as the available pool of teachers prepared in the cooperative programs increases, the preferences of the superintendents will become a stronger factor. The increase in selection of this type of program over the last 15 years among those responding was high. The results also suggest the need for specific preparation for all teachers, but especially social studies teachers, in the reading and writing skills needed for the new social studies.

RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of these conclusions and on a review

of the literature, several recommendations seem in order.

1. The innovations in teacher education described and recommended in the review of literature, such as field experience, cooperation between the different faculties in the supervision of student teaching in the classroom, should be more fully implemented.

2. The cooperatively supervised program as described in question number two, choice (c), "an integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis," should receive priority in any reordering of teacher preparation.

3. It is suggested that, since some colleges of education do not have the program of teacher education preferred by both sets of respondents, a further survey of current hiring practices might prove of value in determining more accurately the needs of the profession.

4. In redesigning teacher education programs to meet the needs of the new social studies, further research to determine the actual needs of the school districts could suggest specific competencies to be included.

5. The specific classroom student composition largely determines the specialized training a teacher needs. If an early selection could be made of the kinds of students, i.e., age, ethnic background, etc., with which the teacher prefers to work, then this specialized training could be included in an undergraduate program.

6. In view of the findings, a narrow degree preparation in education would seem unsuitable to meet the current demands of the new social studies. It would appear, therefore, that, if colleges of education are to meet the needs of future teachers of social studies on the secondary level, the education major should be phased out, where it exists, and students advised to take the cooperative program.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PRELIMINARY LETTER ADDRESSED TO THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND THE SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS

Dr. Alvin W. Howard
College of Education
Dept. of Secondary Education
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico
Zip 87131

Dear Sir:

Your participation is invited in a pilot project at The University of New Mexico to re-evaluate teacher preparation. Included in the study will be fifty-nine leading colleges and universities across the nation.

We would be most grateful for your help in completing a brief questionnaire indicating your preferences among available programs. This information will remain confidential, if you so indicate.

To participate in this survey, please mail the enclosed card and indicate the name and title of the person to whom the questionnaire should be sent.

Sincerely yours,

Alvin W. Howard

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Dr. Alvin W. Howard
College of Education
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In advising prospective social studies teachers for secondary schools, which of the following degree programs do you recommend most (1); second choice (2); third choice (3)?

____(a) a major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education
____(b) a major in education—minor in social studies disciplines
____(c) a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program.

2. If a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program was your first choice, please indicate what type of program would be of most value to a prospective teacher. Second choice? Third choice?

____(a) an individualized program in which degree requirements are satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses
____(b) a program which includes some jointly-taught classes, or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis
____(c) an integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis.

Do you currently have the type of program you have indicated as your first choice? _____ Yes _____ No

3. Please indicate any of the following factors which you believe should receive major consideration in the preparation of teachers, in rank order, with (1) indicating your first choice, (2) second choice and continuing up to (7).

____(a) Reading levels
____(b) Drop-out rate
____(c) Special needs of American Indian, Mexican American, and Black students
____(d) Expenditure per pupil and problems of school finance
____(e) Advanced placement and honors classes, and college-bound students
____(f) Opportunities for teachers' professional growth and advancement, problems of job dissatisfaction
____(g) Other (please specify)

4. What would your answers to these questions have been 15 years ago (pre-Sputnik)?

1. (a)____	2. (a)____	3. (a)____	(e)____
(b)____	(b)____	(b)____	(f)____
(c)____	(c)____	(c)____	(g)____
		(d)____	

Yes____ No _____

5. What is the student enrollment in your college?_____

APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE SENT TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Dr. Alvin W. Howard
College of Education
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. In hiring secondary school teachers for social studies, which of the following degree programs do you prefer (1) most; (2) second choice; (3) third choice; all other factors being equal?

____(a) a major in the social studies disciplines—minor in education

____(b) a major in education—minor in social studies disciplines

____(c) a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program

2. If a cooperatively sponsored social studies—education program was your first choice, please indicate which type of program would be of most value to a prospective teacher in your district (1); (2) second choice; (3) third choice.

____(a) an individualized program in which degree requirements were satisfied by two or more disciplines, but including education courses

____(b) a program which included some jointly-taught classes, or programs interdisciplinary in nature, but not offered on a permanent basis

____(c) an integrated program in which a standing committee composed of professors from the education department and the social studies disciplines administer, teach, and supervise student teachers cooperatively on a permanent basis.

3. Please indicate any of the following factors which you consider in hiring teachers for your district, in rank order, with (1) indicating your first choice, (2) second choice, and continuing up to (7)

____(a) Reading levels
____(b) Drop-out rate
____(c) Percentage of American Indian, Mexican American, Black students
____(d) Expenditure per pupil
____(e) Percentage of college-bound students
____(f) Teacher turn-over rate
____(g) Other (please specify)

4. What would your answers to these questions have been 15 years ago (pre-Sputnik)?

1. (a)____	2. (a)____	3. (a)____	(e)____
(b)____	(b)____	(b)____	(f)____
(c)____	(c)____	(c)____	(g)____
		(d)____	

APPENDIX D

LIST OF STATES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

LIST OF STATES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY*

1. Arizona
2. California[1]
3. Colorado
4. Connecticut
5. Florida
6. Georgia
7. Illinois[1]
8. Indiana
9. Iowa
10. Kansas
11. Louisiana[2]
12. Massachusetts
13. Michigan
14. Minnesota[2]
15. Missouri[1]
16. New Jersey[2]
17. New Mexico[2]
18. New York[2]
19. North Carolina
20. Ohio
21. Oklahoma[1]
22. Pennsylvania[1]
23. Tennessee
24. Texas[1]
25. Utah[2]
26. Washington
27. Wisconsin[1]

*Unless otherwise noted, Colleges of Education and School Districts from these states participated in the surveys.

[1]Participated in Colleges of Education Survey only.

[2]Participated in School Districts Survey only.

APPENDIX E

LIST OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

LIST OF COLLEGES OF EDUCATION PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

1. Arizona State University
   Tempe, Arizona

2. San Jose State College
   San Jose, California

3. University of Colorado
   Boulder, Colorado

4. University of Florida
   Gainesville, Florida

5. University of Georgia
   Athens, Georgia

6. Southern Illinois University
   Carbondale, Illinois

7. Purdue University
   Lafayette, Indiana

8. Iowa State University
   Ames, Iowa

9. University of Kansas
   Lawrence, Kansas

10. Harvard Graduate School of Education
    Cambridge, Massachusetts

11. Michigan State University
    East Lansing, Michigan

12. University of Missouri
    Columbia, Missouri

13. University of North Carolina
    Chapel Hill, North Carolina

14. Kent State University
    Kent, Ohio

15. University of Akron
    Akron, Ohio

16. University of Oklahoma
    Norman, Oklahoma

17. Temple University
    Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

18. Pennsylvania State University
    University Park, Pennsylvania

19. The University of Tennessee
    Knoxville, Tennessee

20. Texas Tech University
    Lubbock, Texas

21. University of Washington
    Seattle, Washington

22. University of Wisconsin
    Milwaukee, Wisconsin

APPENDIX F

LIST OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

LIST OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

1. Scottsdale School District
   Phoenix, Arizona

2. Denver Public Schools
   Denver, Colorado

3. Board of Education
   Norwalk, Connecticut

4. Dade County Public Schools
   Miami, Florida

5. Escambia County Schools
   Pensacola, Florida

6. Bibb County Public Schools
   Macon, Georgia

7. Richmond Community Schools
   Richmond, Indiana

8. Cedar Rapids Public Schools
   Cedar Rapids, Iowa

9. Salina Public Schools
   Salina, Kansas

10. Wichita Public Schools
    Wichita, Kansas

11. East Baton Rouge Parish School Board
    Baton Rouge, Louisiana

12. Lafayette Parish School Board
    Lafayette, Louisiana

13. Worcester Public Schools
    Worcester, Massachusetts

14. Grand Rapids Public Schools
    Grand Rapids, Michigan

15. Manistique Area Schools
    Manistique, Michigan

16. Lake of the Woods School District
    Baudette, Minnesota

17. Minneapolis Public Schools
    Minneapolis, Minnesota

18. Belleville Public Schools
    Belleville, New Jersey

19. Albuquerque Public Schools
    Albuquerque, New Mexico

20. Roswell Independent School District
    Roswell, New Mexico

21. Pine Plains Central School District
    Pine Plains, New York

22. South Huntington Schools
    Huntington Station, LI, New York

23. Central High School District #1
    Valley Stream, New York

24. Durham City Schools
    Durham, North Carolina

25. Dayton Public Schools
    Dayton, Ohio

26. City of Jackson Schools
    Jackson, Tennessee

27. Knoxville City Schools
    Knoxville, Tennessee

28. Provo School District
    Provo, Utah

29. Bellingham Public Schools
    Bellingham, Washington

30. Dayton Public Schools
    Dayton, Washington

APPENDIX G

CHI SQUARE COMPUTATIONS

SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Chi Square (X^2)

		A	B	C	Totals
Expected choices	fe	10.333	10.333	10.333	31
Observed choices	fo	12	0	19	31

DF = (Rows - 1) x (Cols. - 1) = 2DF

$$X^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe} \right]$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(10.333 - 12)^2}{10.333} + \frac{(10.333 - 0)^2}{10.333} + \frac{(10.333 - 19)^2}{10.333}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(-1.667)^2}{10.333} + \frac{(10.333)^2}{10.333} + \frac{(-8.667)^2}{10.333}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{2.779}{10.333} + \frac{106.771}{10.333} + \frac{75.117}{10.333}$$

$$X^2 = .269 + 10.333 + 7.270$$

$$X^2 = 17.872$$

X^2 Table of Values @ 2DF = .01

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION

Chi Square (X^2)

		A	B	C	Totals
Expected choices	fe	7.333	7.333	7.333	22
Observed choices	fo	7	1	14	22

DF = (Rows - 1) x (Cols. - 1) = 2DF

$$X^2 = \sum\left[\frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}\right]$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(7.333 - 7)^2}{7.333} + \frac{(7.333 - 1)^2}{7.333} + \frac{(7.333 - 14)^2}{7.333}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{(.333)^2}{7.333} + \frac{(6.333)^2}{7.333} + \frac{(-6.667)^2}{7.333}$$

$$X^2 = \frac{.111}{7.333} + \frac{40.107}{7.333} + \frac{44.449}{7.333}$$

$$X^2 = .015 + 5.470 + 6.061$$

$$X^2 = 11.546$$

X^2 = Table of Values @ 2DF = .01

See John W. Best, Research in Education (2d ed.; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970), pp. 278-281, for explanation of method.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Atkinson, Carroll, and Eugene Maleska. The Story of Education. Philadelphia: Chilton Co., 1962.

Asch, Sidney H. Civil Rights and Responsibilities. New York: Arco Publishing Co., 1968.

Bauer, Nancy W. (ed.). Revolution and Reaction. Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Cranbrook School, 1966.

Berman, Louise M. New Priorities in the Curriculum. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1968.

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1956.

_____. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain. New York: David McKay Co., 1969.

Borrowman, Merle. Teacher Education in America. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. New York: Random House, 1963.

Coleman, James, et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Office of Education, OE-38001. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Committee for Economic Development. Innovation in Education: New Directions for the American School. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1968.

Conant, James B. The American High School Today. Paperback ed. New York: Signet Books, 1964.

Conant, James B. The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Cubberley, Ellwood. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919.

Farber, Jerry. The Student as Nigger. Hollywood, California: Contact Books, 1969.

Fellman, David. The Supreme Court and Education. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Fenton, Edwin. Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Franklin, Benjamin. Benjamin Franklin on Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.

Gage, N. L. (ed.). Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963.

Gettleman, Marvin E., and David Mermelstein (eds.). The Failure of American Liberalism. Revised edition of The Great Society Reader. New York: Vintage Books, 1971.

Goldmark, Bernice. Social Studies: A Method of Inquiry. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968.

Goodlad, John I., and M. Frances Klein. Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Co., 1970.

Griffiths, Daniel E., et al. Organizing Schools for Effective Education. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1962.

Harris, William T. Report of the Committee of Fifteen on Elementary Education. Reprint ed. New York: Arno Press and New York Times, 1969.

Harrington, Michael. The Other America. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1963.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. Paperback ed. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964.

_____. How Children Learn. Paperback ed. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1970.

Howard, Alvin W., and George C. Stoumbis. The Junior High and Middle Schools: Issues and Practices. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Co., 1970.

Ivons, R. Bruce. "Teachers for an Open Society." Education for an Open Society, 1974 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Washington: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974.

Klopf, Gordon, and Garda Bowman. Education in a Social Context. New York: Mental Health Materials Center, 1966.

Koerner, James D. The Miseducation of American Teachers. Baltimore: Pelican Books, 1965.

Kohl, Herbert R. The Open Classroom. New York: New York Review, 1969.

Lembo, John M. Why Teachers Fail. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1971.

Lessinger, Leon. Every Kid a Winner. Palo Alto, California: Science Research Associates, 1970.

Levenson, William B. The Urban School in Transition. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1968.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.

Marriott, Alice. Maria: The Potter of San Ildefonso. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1948.

McLure, William P., and Van Miller (eds.). Government of Public Education for Adequate Policy Making. Urbana, Illinois: Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1960.

National Council for the Social Studies. Social Studies in the Elementary Schools. 32nd Yearbook, 1962.

National Education Association. Changes in Teacher Education. Washington: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1964.

_____. Teacher Education: The Decade Ahead. Washington: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1955.

Nelson, Clarence H. Measurement and Evaluation in the Classroom. New York: Macmillan Co., 1970.

Oliver, Donald W., and James P. Shaver. Teaching Public Issues in the High Schools. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.

_____, and Fred M. Newmann. Religious Freedom. Columbus, Ohio: American Education Publications, 1967.

O'Neill, William. Coming Apart. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Penn, William. "Some Fruits of Solitude (1693)." Quoted in Social History of American Education, Vol. I, Colonial Times to 1860, ed. Rena L. Vassar. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

Postman, Neil, and Charles Weingartner. Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press, 1969.

Rand McNally Road Atlas: United States, Canada, Mexico. 1973 ed. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1973.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Rickover, Hyman G. American Education—A National Failure. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1963.

Riessman, Frank. The Culturally Deprived Child. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

Rogers, Carl R. Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1969.

Rosenthal, Alan. Governing Education. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1969.

Stone, James C. Breakthrough in Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Students for a Democratic Society. Port Huron Statement (New York, 1964). Reprinted in Student Activism, ed. Irvin Howe. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1967.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Tiedt, Sidney W. The Role of the Federal Government in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. Paperback ed. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

United States—National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

Vassar, Rena L. (ed.). Social History of American Education, Vol. I, Colonial Times to 1860. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

_____. Social History of American Education, Vol. II, 1860 to the Present. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1965.

Willingham, Warren W. The Source Book for Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973.

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

PERIODICALS

Alexander, William B. "The New School in the Middle," Phi Delta Kappan, 50:355, February, 1969.

The Columbia Forum, Summer, 1973, p. 11.

Davidson, K. S., and S. B. Sarason. "Test Anxiety and Classroom Observation," Child Development, 32:199-210, 1961.

Education Index. New York: The H. W. Wilson Co., July 72-August 74.

"Excellence in Teacher Education," Today's Education, 62:89-94, September-October, 1973.

"Finding Out What Teachers Need and Want," Today's Education, 61:31-35, October, 1972.

Hechinger, Fred M. "Education '74: Sober Realism and Cautious Hope," New York Times, January 16, 1974.

Mehlinger, Howard D. "Social Studies—Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," Today's Education, 63:70, March-April, 1974.

O'Keefe, William J. "Some Teacher-Centered In-Service Programs," Today's Education, 63:39, March-April, 1974.

"Reform of the High Schools Urged by I/D/E/A," News Exchange, 15:6, December, 1973.

Rubin, Louis J. "Matching Teacher, Student, and Method," Today's Education, 62:31-35, September-October, 1973.

Spiegel, Sidney. "The Hidden History of Educational Administration in the U.S.," Changing Education, Fall, 1973, p. 11.

CURRICULUM VITAE

for

Clare Ignatia Sharp

Date of Birth:	March 21, 1932
Place of Birth:	New York City, New York
Educational Institutions Attended:	A.B., History, 1954 College of New Rochelle New Rochelle, New York
	A.M., History, 1956 Columbia University New York, New York
	Ed.D., Curriculum and Instruction, 1974 The University of New Mexico Albuquerque, New Mexico
Professional Experience:	Production Editor Porto Rican Study—New York City Board of Education New York, New York 1956-1958
	Special Studies Teacher Walt Whitman High School Huntington Station, LI, New York 1958 to the Present

This Dissertation

was typed by

ELAINE W. BLAIR
6917 Bellrose, N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico