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INTRODUCTION

What is novel on the horizon is not the notion of moral education but rather an adequate conception of what it entails. The currently popular rubric "moral education" has roots extending to the emergence of large scale public secondary education in the United States. The now famous NEA report on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Cardinal Principles, 1918) elaborated seven "cardinal principles" to serve as major aims of the secondary curriculum. The seventh cardinal principle, Ethical Character, was considered paramount by the commissioners who drafted the NEA report.

Following this report the 1920's and 1930's witnessed a great deal of practical and research interest in moral or character education. During these two decades moral education was conceived of as an explanation of the conventional code, exhortation to follow the code, and the planning of student activities which would manifest virtue or good works as defined by the code (Jones, 1936). Research evaluation of moral education during this period indicated that classes led to no significant changes in moral behavior (Hartshorne and May, 1928-30). These disappointing results along with reservations about both verbal indoctrination and the blending of church and state in schools led to a marked decline in moral education programs.

Since the decline of the character education movement educators have been confused about how to promote ethical character or to provide instruction in morality. Recently, cognitive-developmental theory has begun to clarify this persisting ambiguity. This theory offers a goal for moral education, and it suggests methods for attaining that goal.

The cognitive-developmentalist goal for moral education has received more attention than methods for attaining it. Inspired by Piaget's (1932) pioneering discovery that there are universal trends of age development in moral judgment Kohlberg has elaborated a six stage developmental framework for moral education (Kohlberg, 1970, 1971, 1976). The goal of moral education within this framework is to promote advance of students' stage of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969, Kohlberg and Turiel, 1971). Moral education, from this point of view, strives to prevent arrest of students' moral reasoning at lower stages and to stimulate movement to the next higher stage.
What is considered morally right by students' reasoning at lower stages is that which avoids punishment, serves one's personal desires, or meets expectations of those close to one. At higher stages right making considerations include rules for societal maintenance, the general welfare, individual rights, and universal principles of justice. The teacher's task is to provide a curriculum which induces students to reason at the higher stages. Why the higher stages are better is a philosophical argument made elsewhere (Kohlberg, 1975).

Methods for moving students toward the principled stages of moral reasoning are not yet refined. We have learned that the so-called "bag of virtues" approach is inadequate. It grew out of attempts of the character education movement to have teachers indoctrinate their students by inculcating them with adult moral clichés. Aside from the ethics of such methods, there is no evidence they promote moral development.

More recently two types of curriculum intervention have been successfully employed to promote development of moral reasoning. The more widely discussed of the two is called moral discussion while the other is termed deliberate psychological education.

Moral Discussion

The moral discussion approach, outlined recently in a straightforward handbook for teachers (Galbraith and Jones, 1976), is characterized by several features. Most important, it arouses genuine moral conflict within and among students by presenting them with carefully prepared open-ended moral dilemmas. (An open-ended moral dilemma is a moral conflict situation for which there is no clear agreed upon morally correct course of action.) Students are required to deliberate about the dilemmas and decide the right way to resolve them. They then are urged to present reasons in support of their moral judgments. Emphasis is placed upon students' reasoning to the extent that students are challenged to justify their choices and not merely assert them. Classes are arranged so that students encounter modes of moral thought one stage above their own. Inter-student dialogue is encouraged.

The moral discussion curriculum avoids the major pitfalls of the character education movement. During moral discussions students are not exhorted to follow a particular code, religious or otherwise. Also, moral discussion as described here is constitutional in that it violates neither the First Amendment's separation between church and state (Kohlberg, 1967) nor the Fourth Amendment guarantee of privacy (Lockwood, 1976). Furthermore, moral discussion does not patronize students, because it does not stress adult right answers, and it does not begin with appeals to abstractions so far over students' heads as to be beyond their reach.
There are several reports of successful attempts to induce stage advance through classroom moral discussion. At the elementary level Selman and Lieberman (1975) report significant moral development of second graders following a type of moral discussion curriculum. Blatt and Kohlberg (1973) report significant increases in moral judgment maturity among middle school age students. One year following a moral discussion type course Beck, Sullivan, and Taylor (1972) report significant increase in use of Stage 5 moral reasoning by Canadian eleventh graders. Attempts by regular classroom teachers to promote moral maturity of high school students in Boston and Pittsburgh by means of this curriculum have also been successful (Colby, Kohlberg, et al., 1977).

**Deliberate Psychological Education**

The second curriculum intervention which has been successfully employed to induce stage advance of students' moral reasoning is called deliberate psychological education. This approach was originally conceived by Mosher and Sprinthall (1971). Moral development is only one of the psychological growth aims of deliberate psychological education.

Unlike moral discussion, the emphasis of deliberate psychological education is not on cognitive conflict triggered by discussion of moral dilemmas. Students are not expressly urged to engage in moral deliberation or to render ethical judgments. Rather, this approach involves instruction in and practice of interpersonal communication skills in a therapeutic setting. The most common form of deliberate psychological education entails training students to use the listening and responding skills of a professional counselor (genuineness, empathy, immediacy) followed by a practicum in which students try out these skills, often by counseling each other.

There is evidence of significant moral maturity among high school students resulting from a course in the deliberate psychological education mode. Dowell (1971) reports that his one semester counseling course for high school students produced an average of one-third of a stage gain on Kohlberg's Moral Judgment Scale. This advance was greater than that of a control group. Results of a similar course are reported by Moser, Sprinthall, et al. (1972). The suburban Boston students in this latter course increased an average of one-third stage of moral reasoning, significantly greater development than control students. Comparable results are reported by Rustad and Rogers (1975) for Minnesota high school seniors taking a course called Psychology of Counseling. A one-third stage advance is also reported by Erickson (1974) as a result of a deliberate psychological education course for girls in a Minnesota high school.

No attempt to combine moral discussion with deliberate psychological
education has been reported. The study summarized below, a dissertation experiment (Harris, 1976), represents an effort to combine features of these two intervention strategies in a one semester high school course. The purpose of the study was to explore the effect on moral development of a combination of moral discussion with deliberate psychological education. The major hypothesis of the study was that a sequence of deliberate psychological education followed by moral discussion would have a synergetic effect on students’ moral development.

PROCEDURES

The course investigated in this study involved a sequence of two components, the first in the mode of deliberate psychological education and the second in the mode of moral discussion. The deliberate psychological education component was called Psychological Awareness (PA), and the moral discussion component was called Moral Discourse (MD). Students enrolled in this two part social studies course experienced nine weeks (one-half semester) of PA followed by nine weeks of MD. Simply stated, the central hypothesis was that nine weeks of PA would establish preconditions which foster subsequent moral discourse.

Curriculum Design

The study was conducted at one of four comprehensive high schools in Madison, Wisconsin during the fall semester, 1975-6. The course being studied was entitled Values and was taught as an eleventh grade social studies elective. Classes met one hour daily five days weekly for 18 weeks and were taught by the author.

The PA component of the course was a psychological hybrid uniquely designed to establish preconditions each of which was assumed to promote moral development. There were four preconditions comprising the PA component of the course: (1) the building of trust in the group, (2) the and express one’s feelings accurately, and (4) the use of five specific communication skills. Each precondition was included because each was theoretically expected to contribute to moral discussion in a different way. Because the PA component of the course is not as well known as the MD component, a brief rationale for each precondition is sketched here.

Trust in the group was expected to reduce defensive rigidity in the classroom. By use of self-disclosure exercises adapted from Values Clarification and Human Relations Training specific efforts were made to create a trusting group environment. Trust here is considered an emotional state characterized by mutual acceptance and lack of fear. When one trusts
another, he believes the other would no sooner do malice to him or others than he himself would. The theoretical assumption here was that once members of the values class came to trust each other, they would freely express genuine opinions without fear of censure or ridicule. Furthermore, once they trusted each other it was expected that class members would comfortably probe each other with pointed questions. Without trust the kind of rigorous dialogue typical of moral discussion is unlikely to occur. Kohlberg (1970) has said, “Movement to a higher stage of development presupposes some openness to experience, trust, interpersonal awareness, and self awareness.”

The second of the four PA preconditions was role-taking/empathy. Role-taking skill refers to the ability to recognize that others have feelings, thoughts, intentions, and viewpoints, that are different from one’s own. Empathy goes beyond role-taking. It requires not only knowledge of another’s feelings, but also a vicarious emotional response to them. When empathic, we not only know what another is feeling, we actually feel it.

According to Selman (1976) attainment of role-taking stages is a necessary but not sufficient condition for attaining parallel moral stages. It is for this reason that role-taking was included as one of the PA preconditions. Role-taking is a form of social cognition intermediate between logical and moral thought. While moral judgment assesses how people should think and act toward each other, role-taking assesses how and why people do in fact think about and act toward each other. Moral judgment, therefore, implies role-taking. Empathy may follow role-taking. It may also precede it by supplying the affective energetic necessary to decenter from the self enough to take another person’s viewpoint into account.

Specific lessons, inspired by counselor training strategies, were planned for the PA component of the course in order to foster role-taking and empathy. One of these lessons, for example, had student volunteers describe a personal problem to classmates. The listeners were then asked to paraphrase the nature of the problem using the stem: You feel __________, because __________. The student presenting the problem then used an empathy scale to rate the accuracy and insight of each classmate’s perceptions.

Expression of feelings, the third PA precondition, was expected to facilitate moral discussion in two ways. First, it was assumed that knowledge of one’s own feelings is necessary to discern accurately the emotions of others. Wilson, Williams, and Sugarman (1967) argue: “Because we keep some of our feelings out of our consciousness we limit the range of feelings we are aware of, and hence are unable to recognize them in other people.” Secondly, it was assumed that students must first be able to acknowledge and identify emotion in themselves and others before
they can distinguish between a feeling and a reason. This latter distinction is central to moral justification. Dyadic Encounter (Jones and Pfeiffer, 1973) and other lessons were designed to enhance students’ ability accurately to discern and express their own emotions.

The final PA precondition was a set of five interpersonal communication skills adapted from Schmuck and Schmuck (1971). The skills taught were paraphrasing, behavior description, feedback, description of feelings, and perception checking. Rest (1971) has suggested that group process skills are a necessary component of moral education programs overlooked by cognitive-developmental theory. Exercises involving practice of the five communication skills were selected to help fill this void. Several lessons were derived from exercises in Johnson’s (1972) book entitled Reaching Out.

The nine week MD component of the course is probably more familiar to readers of recent social studies literature. This component of the course combined rational discussion of moral conflict situations with analysis of concepts drawn from ethical philosophy and the law (e.g., equal protection, fairness, due process, universality). The typical format for classroom moral discussions involved four steps:

1. Presenting an authentic or hypothetical moral dilemma;
2. Delineating the moral issue(s) involved;
3. Taking and justifying a position on the moral issue(s); and
4. Responding to the reasoning of classmates confronting the same dilemma.

Published moral dilemmas were selected such as those in Lockwood’s (1972) collection of cases involving conflict over the moral value of human and non-human life. Students also prepared their own dilemmas for classroom discussion involving such moral values as property, punishment, truth, and promise keeping.

In addition to the regular discussion of moral dilemmas students practiced the skills of jurisprudential debate (Newmann and Oliver, 1970). They also read and discussed selections on ethics, meta-ethics, criminal procedure, and civil procedure.

Both the PA/MD and MD groups were taught by the author.

Study Design

An experimental design was used to assess the impact on students’ moral maturity of the values course involving a sequence of nine weeks of PA followed by nine weeks of MD. In addition to students in the sequence group two other groups were studied for comparison. One of these groups
was a control group taking no values course. The other comparison group took a values course consisting of 18 weeks (entire semester) of MD with no PA preconditions.

Each of the three groups was administered the Moral Judgment Interview (Kohlberg, Colby, et al., 1975) as a pretest, a nine week midtest, and a posttest immediately following the semester. Form A of the instrument was used for the pretest and the posttest; Form B was used for the midtest. A Moral Maturity Score was calculated for each interview. This score designates an individual’s stage of moral reasoning on a scale from 100 (Stage 1) to 600 (Stage 6). Interviews were taped in the classroom and scheduled so that interviewer and student were alone. The three dilemmas of the interview were read to the student one at a time, each followed by prepared questions and appropriate follow-up probes.

In summary there were three groups of students studied:

1. Psychological Awareness/Moral Discourse Group (PA/MD)
   Nine weeks of PA followed by nine weeks of MD
2. Moral Discourse Group (MD) eighteen weeks of MD
3. Control Group (C) no values course

The independent variable of this study is the curriculum treatment. The dependent variable is moral maturity as represented by change in moral maturity score between pretest and subsequent tests. Analysis of covariance (p = .05) was performed to determine whether there were any significant differences in moral maturity change scores among the two treatment groups and the control group. Where the analysis of covariance produced significant F ratios, planned post-hoc pairwise comparisons (Scheffe) were conducted to locate the differences.

Analysis of covariance was performed for the following two comparisons:

1. Mean moral maturity score for PA/MD, MD, and C from pretest to posttest.
2. Mean change of moral maturity score for MD from pretest to midtest and MD and C for midtest to posttest.

Sample Selection

The sample consisted of 45 eleventh grade students randomly selected from a pool of 200 volunteers. Informed parental consent was obtained for each student. Each of the 45 subjects was assigned at random to one of the three groups so that each group (PA/MD, MD, and C) contained 15 students. Subjects were assigned so that sex and IQ were comparably distributed in each group. There were eight girls and seven boys in each
group to provide a normal classroom mix of the sexes. Each group had five students from each a low, middle, and high IQ category. The IQ mix was designed to provide stage variation within each group. Since IQ is moderately correlated (r = .50 at age 12) with stage of moral reasoning (Kohlberg, 1969), it was accurately assumed that a variance of IQ scores would offer students exposure to moral reasoning one stage above their own which is necessary for stage advance.

Data Collection

The 135 Moral Judgment Interviews (three per student) were tape recorded, transcribed by a typist, and scored by the author who had been trained in what is called Standard Issue Scoring. To validate the experimenter’s use of the Moral Judgment Interview a random sample of 27 interview protocols was sent to the Harvard Center for Moral Education where they were scored by another trained scorer. An inter-judge reliability coefficient between the two scorers was computed (r = .889).

Each interview transcript was given a seven digit code number, and all transcripts were scored after the posttest. These steps were taken to insure that during scoring the scorer was essentially blind to the identity of the subject, the group, and the test time.

To determine the extent to which the two curriculum treatments differed according to the stated criteria perceptions of impartial judges were obtained. Three judges viewed or listened to eight randomly recorded audio and video tape excerpts of actual lessons, some PA others MD. Tapes averaged 20 minutes in length. Using a content analysis form designed by the experimenter, judges indicated which teacher and student behaviors were evident in each tape recording. Fourteen behaviors were listed as items on the form, some characterizing PA and some characterizing MD. Ninety-five point three percent of the behaviors marked by judges on the forms corresponded to the characteristics of the curriculum treatment being observed. This proportion is statistically significant (Z = 9.44, p < .05), and it indicates that there were observable differences between PA and MD lessons. A copy of the Judge’s Analysis Form is included here to highlight key differences between the PA and MD curriculum treatments.
Judge Analysis Form

Instructions: While viewing and/or listening to the following excerpt from a classroom lesson, check those teacher and student behaviors on the lists below which seem to be occurring. If a behavior is not evident to you, do not check it.

Teacher Behaviors

MD 1. T engages Ss in socratic dialogue urging them to state and justify reasons for their positions.

PA 2. T elicits disclosures of Ss' feelings and perceptions of themselves and others present.

MD 3. T distinguishes between and urges Ss to distinguish between factual "is" type questions and moral "ought" type questions.

MD 4. T challenges and urges Ss to challenges Ss' reasoning.

PA 5. T suspends judgments and responds emphatically to Ss' comments modeling "unconditional positive regard" and "congruence."

MD 6. T models or instructs Ss in the use of analytical discussion skills such as clear statement of issues, analogy, stipulation, and recognition of value-conflicts.

PA 7. T models or instructs Ss in the use of interpersonal communication skills such as paraphrasing, perception checking, description of feeling, behavior description, and feedback.

PA 8. T identifies and discloses his own feelings as they occur or have occurred in the past.

Student Behaviors

MD 1. Ss debate moral issues employing analytical discussion skills (6 above).

PA 2. Ss identify and disclose feelings they have about themselves and classmates who are present.

PA 3. Ss employ interpersonal communication skills in responding to another (7 above).

PA 4. Ss describe personal problems of their own.

MD 5. Ss examine the logical consistency of classmates' arguments.

MD 6. Ss discourage comments not relevant to the moral dilemma at hand.
To examine further whether the curriculum treatments were what the experimenter claims they were, perceptions of students were elicited. Both groups (PA/MD and MD) were provided a list of 18 randomly ordered behaviors, nine characterizing teacher role and student interaction of PA (as conceived by the experimenter) and nine characterizing teacher role and student interaction of MD (as conceived by experimenter). A copy of the list of behaviors is presented below.

Students from the PA/MD group were asked to indicate whether each item better described the first half of the course or the second half. There was 87 percent agreement between student perceptions and those of the experimenter. This proportion is statistically significant ($Z = 7.71, p < .05$).

Using the same form, MD students were asked to indicate whether or not each behavior listed characterized the course they had just completed. If students perceived the course similarly to the experimenter, then they would be expected to reject those nine behaviors which describe PA and affirm the nine describing MD. This occurred 67 percent of the time which is statistically significant ($Z = 3.46, p < .05$).

The foregoing data provide evidence that PA and MD were discrete not only in the eyes of the experimenter, but in the eyes of impartial observers and students as well. The impact of these interventions on students' normal development is reported next.
Behaviors Characterizing PA and MD

**MD** Teacher engaged in Socratic dialogue with students in which students were urged to support their claims and justify their reasons.

**MD** Students challenged classmates to correct logical inconsistencies in their positions.

**PA** Teacher presented information and assigned readings about psychology.

**PA** Students helped each other to recognize their emotions.

**MD** Teacher urged students' reasoning at adjacent stages to respond to each other's arguments and offered reasons one stage higher than the highest stage evident in the class.

**PA** Teacher did not challenge students to justify their value claims or engage students in logical argumentation. He elicited disclosure of thoughts and feelings which students were experiencing at the moment.

**MD** Teacher distinguished between factual "is" type questions and moral "ought" type questions. He also instructed students to draw this distinction.

**PA** Students were supportive and nurturing when feelings were being expressed. Judgments were suspended.

**PA** Teacher modeled and instructed students in the use of the five communication skills: paraphrasing, behavior description, description of feelings, feedback, and perception checking.

**MD** Teacher modeled and instructed students in the use of issue discussion skills such as the use of analogy, stipulation, and recognition of value conflict.

**PA** Students congruently disclosed their own feelings and thoughts about problems in their own lives.

**MD** Students presented the reasons for particular choices they made, and they challenged classmates to offer reasons underlying their choices for resolving moral dilemmas.

**PA** Teacher modeled empathic listening, unconditional positive regard, and congruent expression.

**MD** Students discouraged comments of classmates which were not relevant to the issue at hand.

**MD** Students rationally debated moral issues with their classmates and the teacher.

**PA** Teacher elicited student awareness of what they and others were experiencing during the "here and now."

**MD** Teacher presented information and assigned readings about ethical theories and legal procedures.

**PA** Students practiced listening and response skills with each other.
RESULTS

Tests of two hypotheses of the study will be presented here. The first hypothesis treats differences in stage advance of moral reasoning among the three groups for the entire semester. The second hypothesis, and the one essential to the study treats the *locus* of change in moral maturity, i.e., differences between the two treatment groups as when any stage advance occurred.

**Hypothesis One**

In null form the first hypothesis states: There are no significant differences in change of mean moral maturity score over one semester among the three groups. This hypothesis was rejected because there were significant differences among the three groups. As indicated in Table 1, both treatment groups advanced nearly one-half stage on the average, whereas the control group advanced less than one-seventh stage of moral reasoning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Midtest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>$\bar{x}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 (PA/MD)</td>
<td>274.1</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>280.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 (MD)</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>301.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 (Control)</td>
<td>271.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>277.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Three Related Measures on Moral Judgment Interview

An increase of 100 moral maturity points on the Moral Judgment Interview represents an advance of one whole stage of moral reasoning; a 50 point increase represents advance of a half stage, etc. As Table 1 indicates, the mean moral maturity score for the PA/MD group changed pretest to posttest from 274.1 to 320.8. This is a semester gain of 46.7 moral maturity points. Comparably, the mean moral maturity score for the MD group
changed pretest to posttest from 277.1 to 323.6, a semester gain of 46.5 moral maturity points. Mean moral maturity scores for the control group pretest to posttest, however, changed from 271.3 to 284.6, a net increase of 13.3 moral maturity points.

As presented in Table 2 analysis of covariance ($F = 4.23, p < .025$) indicates that these differences among the three groups are statistically significant. Post-hoc comparison based on ANCOVA ($p < .025$) indicates that both the PA/MD group and the MD group advanced significantly more in moral maturity during the semester of the course than the control group.

Table 2: Analysis of Covariance for Moral Maturity Scores Among Three Groups for Entire Semester

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70897.1</td>
<td>70897.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10299.9</td>
<td>10299.9</td>
<td>4.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49842.1</td>
<td>49842.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>131039.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .025  
$F_{2, 40}(.025) = 4.05$

Table 3 further reflects changes which occurred over the entire semester of the course. It indicates that while only one of 15 control students showed appreciable advance in moral maturity (one-third stage gain or more), 10 of 15 PA students advanced this much, and eight of 15 MD students did. Both curriculum treatments seem to have had substantial impact, although it should be noted that 40 percent of students in the treatment groups did not mature morally.
Hypothesis Two

The question underlying this hypothesis and the paramount question of the study is whether the sequence of Psychological Awareness (PA) followed by Moral Discourse (MD) has a special impact on the moral development of students. In null form the hypothesis states: There are no significant differences in change of mean moral maturity score when comparing change during the first nine weeks for the MD group to change during the second nine weeks for the PA/MD and control groups. This hypothesis was rejected, because there were significant differences among groups regarding when moral maturity took place. In other words, the lion’s share of the advance for PA/MD students occurred during the second half of the sequence. This was not the case for MD students, however. For them moral maturity took place more evenly during both halves of the semester.

As indicated in Table 1 and reiterated in Figure 1 there are differences among the three groups regarding the locus of moral maturity change. For the first half of the semester mean moral maturity score, pretest to midtest, for the PA/MD group changed from 274.1 to 280.1 an increase of six points. During the same period mean moral maturity score for the control group increased comparably, 6.3 points from pretest 271.3 to midtest 277.6. Change in mean moral maturity score for the MD group during the first half of the semester, however, is greater. For this group mean scores advanced, pretest to midtest, from 277.7 to 301.9 an increase of 24.2 moral maturity points. These scores imply the MD group developed morally during the first nine weeks of the course while the PA/MD group remained essentially unchanged.

If semester long moral development for the two treatment groups is equivalent, and if one group did not develop during the first half of the semester, then that group must have developed during the second half of the semester. Results show that this is indeed the case. The PA/MD group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>0-½ Stage</th>
<th>½-1 Stage</th>
<th>1 Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA/MD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Frequencies of Fractional Stage Advances Pretest to Posttest for PA/MD, MD, and C Groups
advanced 40.7 moral maturity points from midtest (280.1) to posttest (320.8). Advance for the MD group was less pronounced. Mean moral maturity score, midtest to posttest, changed from 301.9 to 323.6, an increase of 21.7 points. Control students barely changed during this second nine week period. Their midtest to posttest mean moral maturity score advanced seven points from 277.6 to 284.6.

Figure 1 illustrates the lack of advance in the control group, the even advance of the MD group during both halves of the semester, and the dramatic advance of the PA/MD during the second nine weeks of the semester.

Figure 1: Mean Moral Maturity Scores for PA/MD, MD, and C Groups at Pretest, Midtest, and Posttest
These results comprise evidence that the curriculum sequence of PA followed by MD may have a special impact on the moral development of students. Immediately following nine weeks of the same curriculum, change which occurred for subjects who experienced prior preconditions is more dramatic than change which occurred for subjects not experiencing the preconditions. When considering these data it is important to note that the first nine weeks of the MD course consisted of the same instructional lessons as the second nine weeks of the PA/MD sequence. In sum, there is reason to believe that PA establishes preconditions which facilitate subsequent moral discourse.

To test statistically whether there were significant differences among the three groups regarding locus of moral maturity, analysis of covariance was performed comparing pretest to midtest mean moral maturity score for the MD group with midtest to posttest mean moral maturity score for both the PA/MD and control groups. Results as presented in Table 4 show that there is significant difference ($F = 4.68; p < .025$). Advance during the first half of the semester for the MD group was not as great as advance during the second half of the semester for the PA/MD group.

Table 4: Analysis of Covariance Among Three Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>ms</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55446.1</td>
<td>55466.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8447.6</td>
<td>4223.8</td>
<td>4.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36927.3</td>
<td>900.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100841.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .025 $ F 2,40 (.025) = 4.05
CONCLUSIONS

Effects of Moral Discourse

The average advance of nearly one-half stage of development for MD students in this study adds to the mounting evidence that systematic moral discussion in the classroom can have a significant impact on students' moral reasoning. The MD curriculum treatment described in this study represents high intensity of intervention. Students met five days a week for one-hour classes during an entire 18 week semester. Classes were half the normal size, comprised of volunteers whose parents consented, and the teacher was thoroughly trained. These optimal conditions suggest that one-half stage on the average is currently the upper limit of moral maturity to be expected in single semester high school courses. No other studies have reported greater advance. Moral development is a slow process which will require not only expertise among educators, but patience as well.

Other studies (Colby, Kohlberg, Fenton, et al., 1977) have suggested that students who have been at a particular moral judgment stage for a long time or who have just entered a stage may not be ready for transition to a higher stage. The fact that 40 percent of the students in both treatment groups of this study advanced less than one-third stage supports the notion that some students will not mature morally as an immediate result of being in a moral discussion class.

Effects of the PA/MD Sequence

The major discovery of this study is the apparent "dormant seed" effect of the PA/MD sequence. From the results reported here it seems that the curriculum treatment called Psychological Awareness (PA) sets the stage for moral discussion. Evidence has been presented supporting the hypothesis that PA meets preconditions which foster moral development during subsequent moral discourse. Following the same moral discussion curriculum students who experienced PA preconditions increased an average of 40.7 moral maturity points while those who experienced no advance preconditions increased an average 21.7 points.

One way to interpret this result is to conclude that the two treatments described here simply represent alternative ways to achieve the same end. On the face of it this interpretation seems valid. For the period of the entire semester both treatment groups (PA/MD and MD) averaged just under a one-half stage gain in moral maturity. To stop the analysis here would be myopic, however, because it offers no insight as to why maturity for PA/MD students predominantly occurred during the second nine weeks of the sequence. It is possible, and this may be an important difference of
effect between the two curriculum treatments, that the accelerated rate of development for PA/MD students may have continued during future moral discussions.

A more thorough explanation of the locus of the change for the PA/MD students requires some theoretical connections between the preconditions and the subsequent advance in moral reasoning ability. Why then did PA/MD students exhibit dramatic advance during the second half of the semester?

There are several possible ways by which the nine week PA preconditions may have paved the way for subsequent moral discourse. For one, the accepting and disclosing atmosphere in the classroom may have created a feeling of trust among members of the group. Students shy and intimidated at first became active discussants later on. Perhaps the trust in the group helped students to distinguish between a personal attack on them and a challenge to their arguments.

Another way that the preconditions may have promoted subsequent moral discourse is to have helped students distinguish between a feeling and a reason. This distinction is often blurred in discussions of what is right. Students in the PA/MD group spent time exploring their feelings. Perhaps they were consequently better prepared to elicit responses from classmates going beyond one's immediate feelings about a moral conflict situation. For example, one discussion involved a dilemma over whether it is right to slaughter baby seals for their fur. One student after reading the case and seeing a photo of the killing expressed her reaction. She said, 'I feel disgusted by these hunters and I feel so sorry for the babies and their mothers.' Another student responded to her by asking whether her feelings were a sufficient right making consideration. He said, 'I feel anger toward the hunters too, but does that make it wrong to kill the seals?' A dialogue ensued in which students tried to sort out the relationship between reason and emotion in the process of justifying moral judgments.

Furthermore, as a possible result of the empathy and communication skills training during the PA phase of the course, students may have learned to listen better to each other. While one student was talking others stopped rehearsing their own next comments in order to concentrate on what was being said. Student responses to each other frequently asked for clarification of meaning. Often students paraphrased prior comments to reduce ambiguity and increase the chance that the message being sent was the one received.

One flaw in this study was the lack of any careful measurement to assess the extent to which the four PA preconditions were actually met during the first nine weeks of the PA/MD course. No attempt was made to measure trust, empathy/role-taking, ability to discern and express emotions, or the five interpersonal communication skills. Without clear knowledge that
these preconditions were met, claims about their effects are tenuous. Future studies may attend to more rigorous measure of the correlation between any of these preconditions and subsequent moral maturity.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MORAL EDUCATION

Moral development seems to be an educational task which can be successfully performed in public school classrooms. There does, however, appear to be more than one way to skin the moral education cat. A steady routine of moral discussions is monotonous. MD students frequently commented about the boredom of the routine. A sequence of Psychological Awareness (PA) followed by Moral Discourse (MD) seems to be comparably effective, but did not produce complaints of monotony from students. There is reason to believe that approaches to values education other than moral discussion can be drawn upon to build a comprehensive moral education curriculum which promotes moral development, and perhaps has other educationally valuable outcomes as well. This study drew from some of the practices of Values Clarification, Human Relations Training, Deliberate Psychological Education, and Basic Encounter in its design of the Psychological Awareness (PA) curriculum treatment. The results reported here imply that there are appropriate ways to integrate these various values education approaches with the moral development approach.
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Harold Rugg, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, wrote a series of social studies textbooks during the 1920's. In these books, he attempted to select topics of "proved value," present them in ways that would make schools experience real, and prepare students to improve their changing society (Rugg, 1923). After being adopted widely, the textbooks became a target of attack by various "patriotic" and business groups. Shortly, the books were dropped from the schools.

Attacks on "innovative" curriculum are a reoccurring fact of American educational history, as exemplified by the current controversies over the "new" social studies and *Man: A Course of Study*. A question that can be raised to all those who attack textbooks is whether their negative views logically stem from the materials themselves. In this article, an analysis of two of Rugg's books is followed by a discussion of the controversy in order to assess the accuracy of the attacks.

While Rugg's social reconstruction rationale and books contain inconsistencies and other intellectual problems, the attack did not center on these issues, but on claims that he was teaching "un-Americanism." Some other curriculum developers, such as Henry Bragdon (1969, p. 264), have claimed that the Rugg textbook controversy retarded experiments in social studies curriculum development and caused publishers to hesitate to present controversial materials. If this is true, then the elements in the Rugg textbook controversy are important beyond the event itself.

**RUGG'S TEXTS AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTIONISM**

Social reconstructionism is a philosophy of education which holds that the role of the schools is to change, and not merely reflect American society. Mainly a response to what were seen as abuses of the business community during the Twenties and the Thirties, the movement's thrust was that schools which were ethically neutral and reflective of society were institutions worse than irrelevant—they were immoral. According to the social reconstructionists, during a period in which the "American system" of business and individualism had obviously broken down, both the "child-centered" and traditional approaches to education were avoiding the major issues of the day.
A speech by George Counts at the Progressive Education Association in 1932, and his pamphlet, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?*, summed up the reconstructionist approach. Counts claimed that the public schools as they existed served the interests of only the middle class and that the crisis of the Depression made it clear that schools needed to broaden the class interests served by actively fashioning a vision of social change that would include, particularly, an increased role for the working class within the context of a planned economy. (As the Depression continued and social reconstructionism developed, some who subscribed to the philosophy would have been happy to use the term the "proletariat.")

Teachers, according to the philosophy, should no longer view themselves as the guardians of an existing culture but should be in the forefront of social change. They should work for change on two levels: first as citizens with particular skills and knowledge, and secondly as leaders within their classrooms. In the first role, an alliance with "progressive" elements in society, which in the context of the 1930's meant the growing labor movement, was necessary. It is not surprising, therefore, to find a great overlap between social reconstruction thinkers and the early activists of the American Federation of Teachers. Later, the movement itself divided over the issue of support for the New Deal or a more radical endorsement of the "class struggle" in American life.

The second role for teachers created a number of practical difficulties. Teachers were to gear curriculum and instruction to creating in students the desire, knowledge, and skills to change American society. Further, the nature of the new society was to be a planned or "co-operative" one. A difficult issue was *how* to create curriculum that achieved the broadly stated objectives. In fact, Rugg was the only social reconstructionist who made a serious and sustained attempt to fashion a total curriculum to foster social change.

The idea of social reconstruction continued after the Depression—increasingly emphasizing the need for international order as well as the desirability of a planned economy, clearly a reaction to changing world problems. Theodore Brameld developed the philosophy into the post-World War II and Cold War era. His view of the goals of social reconstruction was that it is "...a radical attempt to build the widest possible consensus about the supreme aims that should govern mankind in the reconstruction of world culture" (1965).

The classroom was viewed as an arena in which to pursue clearly delineated social objectives. Obviously, then, there was inherent in social reconstruction a very real problem: How does one build a specified new social order through education with *forcing* children to accept a single view? How does one reconstruct society through schooling without indoctrination? Many of the social reconstructionists were aware of the problem
and simultaneously strong in their support of academic freedom for students. They attempted to fashion a defense of their position. However, most of the defenses seem to miss the subtleties of the problem.

On the crudest level, Rugg at times maintained that students were already being indoctrinated by the business culture through newspapers, radio, and family influence. The schools, in their reconstructionist role, would simply serve as a countervailing power (1936, p. 298). While frequently reiterating his stand against coercing students to think along certain lines, he also held that in academic circles a consensus was being built about the nature of American society and that “intelligent consent” to a new order could therefore be gained by free and prolonged discussion based on data and the emerging interpretations of society (1928, p. 298).

While the attempts to cope with the issue of indoctrinating students in order to build a new social order exhibit understanding of some of the difficulties, they fail to take account of the subtleties of the problem. Such failure is illustrated by Rugg’s rationale and social studies curriculum.

**RUGG’S BACKGROUND**

Harold Rugg left Dartmouth with a degree in engineering and became a student of Charles H. Judd’s. In his work with Judd at the University of Chicago, Rugg was very much involved in the “science of education” movement and carried his interest and knowledge into testing for the government during World War I. When he arrived at Teachers College in 1919, Rugg’s world was widened. According to his own account, both his colleagues and the artists and writers he met in Greenwich Village broadened his view of the scope of educational study to include the aesthetic dimension and more social, political, and economic concerns (1941, p. 45).

One of his early projects at Teachers College was a study of the *Child-Centered School* carried out with Ann Schumaker. He saw in these schools evidence that the creative urges of individuals were at last catching up with their exploitative aspects, the latter having been nurtured by industrialization. On the positive side of these schools, “... (the child-centered schools’) aversion to the doctrine of ‘subject-matter-set-out-to-be-learned’... (has led to) a whole-hearted commitment to the theory of self-expression” (1928, p. viii). Students, living in a “democracy of youth” and studying units of work from real life, were able to close the gap between the school and the world outside. Further, the ability of students to think for themselves and maintain their interest in “life” was developed, while “traditional” schools dulled these qualities through “rote and routine.”

Rugg was unable to commit himself totally to the concept of the child-centered school, however. His criticisms reveal the basis of his social
reconstructionist views. According to Rugg, the emphasis on self-expression led the child-centered school "to minimize the . . . equally important goal of education: tolerate understanding of themselves and of the outstanding characteristics of modern civilization" (1928, p. ix). These schools did not provide for continuity of development, particularly of skills, because they relied on occasional child interest and the extreme individualism of the teachers. They ignored the results of scientific study of civilization and the use of the scientific method. Finally, "child activity (was) regarded altogether too frequently as an end in itself, rather than as a means to growth" (1927, p. 436).

Since Rugg was simultaneously enthusiastic about and critical of child-centered schools, he developed his own rationale for public education, in which he emphasized the role of social studies in the enterprise. The emphasis on the social studies is a logical outcome of his views of society and of education. Rugg published his philosophy in a series of books and articles, written in a turgid style, which are frequently repetitive of one another.

THE RATIONALE FOR THE TEXTS

The task of the school was, to Rugg, to "guarantee the growth of understanding tolerant attitude, powers of general and reflective thought, critical judgment and appreciation, and meaningful backgrounds of experience for social interpretation and action" (1927, p. 445-446). This task was not being carried out, he said, because "the theory and practice of the American mass school conforms closely to the mass mind of America" (1931, p. 3). What was needed, then, was "social reconstruction through educational reconstruction" (1931, p. 3). Rugg's call for social reconstruction preceded the speech by Counts. However, the two men were colleagues who wrote together as early as 1927 and frequently exchanged ideas. The Counts speech can be viewed as the culmination of a series of discussions among like-minded academics.

The "Frontier Thinkers"

No educational or social reconstruction could occur without an intelligent description of the forces of American society, so Rugg developed one. He borrowed heavily from a group of scholars he classified as "frontier thinkers," those creating new hypotheses about social life on the edges of knowledge, particularly in history and the social sciences. Thus the influences of such people as Charles and Mary Beard, Frederick Jackson Turner, Charles Peirce, and (given Rugg's bias toward the creative artist) Alfred Stieglitz and Louis Sullivan are clear.
Modern American life developed, according to Rugg, from three revolutionary movements: the development of a power-driven machine technology; the rise of the corporation with its control over money, credit, and people; and the development of political democracy based on the concept of freedom. All of these revolutions involved and enhanced the power of the middle class (1936, p. 51). As Rugg saw the American climate of opinion of the 1920's, these movements added to the individualistic influence of the frontier and increased the emphasis on rights inherent in "rugged individualism" at the expense of concepts of social duties. The climate of urban America to Rugg, as to Dewey in *Individualism Old and New*, was composed of the following factors:

1. An attitude of "bigness and be-damnedness."
2. An increased time beat of life.
3. An increased demand for service and efficiency.
4. A demand for immediate profits.
5. A tendency toward disintegration.
6. A "false" hierarchy of classes, in which the businessman and not the scientist or artist was at the top (1936, p. 100).

The schools reflected the climate of opinion of the society. Thus one found in public education the exploitative mind rewarded far more than the creative mind (1936, p. 158). Also, skills (although Rugg saw them as inefficiently and improperly taught) dominated the curriculum, reflecting the general trend of divorcing techniques from social utility (1936, p. 144). Finally, education existed as preparation for, rather than part of, life (1936, p. 155). Even the "science of education" movement, of which Rugg had once been part, came in for criticism. He saw it as catering to what society, represented mainly by business interests, viewed as useful at a given time, without accounting for needed changes; as emphasizing competition since a student's progress was judged in comparison with other students; and as reinforcing the over-emphasis on skills and facts (1936, p. 170). In sum, then, both society and the schools needed to be rebuilt for the greater development of humans.

The vision of a new society that Rugg held was one in which:

... the ingrained idea of the 'free' individual, certainly as freedom was conceived of in the simple, frontier world of earlier days, must be given up. The social structure today impinges heavily and inescapably on each individual's life. Individual and society form a single integral organic structure from which no separate individual can escape to lead a 'free' uninfluenced life (1936, p. 296).

The schools, then, must strive to build a society in which "... exploitation for immediate private profits ... give(s) way to designed and controlled production for the total group" (p. 222).
The Educated Person

In order to accomplish this task, school people must ask two questions: What kind of person do we wish to create? And what curriculum helps create that person? Rugg's writings contained his answers to these questions.

The person the schools should produce would be a believer in the "Democratic Vista." He or she would understand the difficulties of democracy and be committed to a nation of socially co-operative individuals. He or she would be a person "fit to live in the modern world," possessing the skills demanded by the technology and freely using his or her creative powers. His or her loyalty would be the community (1936, p. 26). He or she would see group and individual life as a whole (1931, p. 209). In short, the schools would create the "new person" for the new, planned, co-operative society.

If the educational institutions were to produce the "new person," their view of themselves had to change. Rather than being captive reflectors of contemporary culture, the schools should "... visualize ... the changing community of the future and ... help ... direct its development ... come to regard (themselves) as conscious agencies for ... social regeneration" (1931, p. 212). A new curriculum was therefore needed, based on the educational concepts that growth is evolutionary and organic, that meaning grows through cumulative reaction to experience, and that the whole organism contributes to a response. These ideas, rooted in the thoughts of John Dewey, led to a curriculum based on the answer to the question: "What meanings and attitudes must be developed to enable juvenile minds ... to understand modes of living and social problems?" (1936, p. 333). A crucial part of the curriculum, then, should be problem-centered, and the problems should be those connected with the social and political environment in which the child lives. They should be "real life" problems. In order to cope with the issues, students must learn problem-solving techniques, especially the scientific (or pragmatic) method, including gathering data and choosing among options (1936, p. 305-307).

At this point, Rugg departed both from Dewey and from the other philosophers of social reconstructionism. While the solution to real problems would move the students on to rebuilding their society along more equitable lines, scientific method was not, to him, enough. There are, claimed Rugg, experiences which are not problems but "situations to be lived, seized, enjoyed, thrilled over." "... Scientific method has led to sound problem-solving. It has erected an adequate technology, produced an ordered, sane society. But has it produced happy individuals?" (1931, p. 215). Therefore, the modes of existence of the "democratic" artist, as exemplified by Emerson and Whitman, must also be a key part of the curriculum. The child's own creative expression must be unleashed.
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Criticisms of the Rationale

Boyd H. Bode pointed out that Rugg's stress on the freeing of the "inner light" was logical since Rugg saw pragmatism as essentially a rationalization of the process by which American society ended up in the predicament of the Depression. The same concern for creative inwardness that led Rugg to a vision of social reform could just as easily lead to a detachment from social issues in the call for "self-development." Finally, Bode criticized Rugg for his "hasty conclusion that creative art may be transformed into an oracle of the gods" (1931, p. 339-340).

Bode's criticisms are well-taken. Rugg's flirtation with the arts and his somewhat hazy definition of the "democratic" artist, while intriguing, seem to lead back to the very type of education that he criticized in The Child-Centered School. It is clear, at the same time, that Rugg either was unable or unwilling to integrate the "inner light" idea into his social studies curriculum.

The Shaping of the Texts

Rugg's rationale for his social studies curriculum flowed directly from his philosophy of education, except for the minimal role granted the creative mode of experiencing. The curriculum should be based around "the insistent and permanent problems and issues of contemporary economic, social, and political life" (1923, p. 262). Students need, then, to know what questions need to be answered so they could hold intelligent discussion of the issues. Finally, the curriculum should supply the data necessary for answering the questions and solving the problems. These data came from "episodes, narratives, descriptive, graphic, statistical, and pictorial matter which deal with current modes of living and their historical backgrounds" (1923, p. 262). As a final group of data for students to deal with in answering the basic problems, Rugg included "the fundamental generalizations which experts in various fields agree are useful guides for the consideration of current modes of living, and of contemporary problems and issues" (1923, p. 262).

With the last point, the issue of indoctrination is raised. Since even "expertly derived" generalizations are not raw data, it becomes crucial who Rugg includes as experts. Here, again, we find the "frontier" thinkers—the Beards, Thorstein Veblen, Turner, Oliver Wendell Holmes. If the basically Progressive views of these people are presented as data, how can a student logically arrive at any conclusion but that the society needs fundamental changes along certain lines? Free discussion becomes meaningless when the only information students have exists on one side. Taking as the basis for his own social studies curriculum the following statement, Rugg developed a total program for the schools:
Not the learning of *texts* but the solving of *problems* is what we need. Our material must be *organized around issues*, problems, unanswered questions which the student recognizes as important and which he really strives to unravel (emphasis his) (1923, p. 20).

In order to present a problem-oriented course, it was necessary to forego the traditional "disciplines" and organize a unified "social science" course. Only those aspects of each area (history, geography, civics, and economics) that were needed for an adequate understanding of the problems were to be presented to the students. Finally, the choice of problems to be dealt with was made by Rugg's own analysis of social needs and trends (the presumed purpose of his books on culture and education was to set forth this analysis) so that "each major topic of the course (was) of established social value to the rank and file of our people" (1923, p. 188).

Since involving students in unraveling the problems was crucial to Rugg and central to the curriculum, he puts emphasis on the layout of the books. He saw the use of pictures, charts, maps, and graphs as important—the last three having the double benefit of both involving the students and teaching them needed skills. He also developed what he called the "dramatic episode," a narrative designed to catch the students' interest and lay the groundwork for the problem to be discussed.

Rugg and a group of colleagues developed the first set of materials in 1921. They were used at the Lincoln School, an experimental school connected with Teachers College. After a year of failure, the materials were revised. Given Rugg's desire to reform all of American education (and society!), he was not satisfied with confining his efforts to one rather small school. He therefore decided to offer the curriculum, in mimeographed form and for a fee, to public schools. In part, this decision stemmed from a shortage of funds for continuing the project. Over one hundred schools tried the materials in the mimeographed form. Using the feedback from the schools and additional research supervised by Rugg, the program was further revised and then published commercially.

There was an immediate response on the part of teachers and schools. The popularity of the series was probably more a reflection of the liveliness of the books and the shift to a "social studies," rather than separate discipline, orientation than an acceptance of Rugg's total philosophy. One indication that the response was not to the total philosophy is the acceptance of the books during the more conservative Twenties and early Thirties prior to the social reconstructionist mood of the nation during the New Deal. The first books were published in August, 1929, and in that year 20,000 copies were sold. Sales averaged over this figure until 1938. From 1929 to 1939, 1,317,960 copies of the books were sold (Winters, 1967, pp. 493-514). The over four thousand districts in which they were used spread across the country (Beale, 1966, p. 270).
AN ANALYSIS OF TWO TEXTS

The books themselves are not startling as textbooks, at least in contemporary context. Narrative predominates despite the "problems" approach. A close look at two of them will serve as examples of the others.

Volume Two of the series is Changing Civilizations in the Modern World, in which students (who, in the first book, examined economic life in the United States) look closely at other nations. The nations are grouped into other industrial nations and changing agricultural nations. According to the text, a student who completes the study will be able to explain:

How it has come about that each part of the world depends upon other parts of the world, and that injury to one part affects the whole world (Rugg, 1930, p. 18).

With that objective stated to the students directly, the social reconstructionist premise of the book is clear.

The book itself makes great use of extended quotations from source material, such as one by Marco Polo (p. 42-43) and of graphs. The "dramatic episodes" come in the form of discussions among fictional characters, "trips" through a country, or facsimile newspapers. Throughout the book, judgmental words are used, e.g., "The working hours were cruelly long" (p. 67).

The questions posed in the text are generally answered in the text. For example, Rugg asks "what important factors helped Great Britain become a center of world trade?" and then lists four factors (p. 102). Such a technique would seem to mitigate against the development of critical thinking skills in students. At some points, however, students are asked questions without direct answers. For example, "What do you think are the things in favor of empire building? What do you dislike about it?" (p. 138). But, contrary to other problem-solving approaches, the materials are not organized to make answering the question central. It is possible, however, based on the evidence presented earlier, to make a strong case for the positive contributions of empire-builders to their colonies, and this is an important point when analyzing the textbook controversy.

Throughout the book, two ideas are emphasized: First, the commonalities among industrialized nations (summarized on p. 233); and secondly, the independency among nations. For example, a facsimile newspaper has the headline, "Cotton Shortage in US Hurts British Mills" (p. 67).

Since Rugg was later to be accused of "un-Americanism" and pro-Communism, the section on the Russian Revolution bears looking at. The causes and the course of the Revolution are presented in an extremely factual manner. It is in his discussion of the results that Rugg lays himself
open for criticism. These he sees as: the Russian people controlling their own land; the peasants restoring and improving agriculture; the availability of more goods; and the growth of cooperative organizations. Since cooperation has been developed as a necessary and positive value, his choice of that word is crucial. While he does point out that the standard of living and wages are low, he tempers the judgment by saying “but the people have many advantages—schools, medical help, and amusements are free” (p. 368-370). Although Rugg did create a point of vulnerability in his treatment of the Russian Revolution, most of his attackers ignored the issue and concentrated on those textbooks that concerned the United States.

The third volume of the series returns to a study of the United States, The Conquest of America: A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social. In format it is like the earlier book. Two general themes recur frequently in the text. The first is an emphasis on the importance of geographical factors in history that stops just short of geographical determinism. Secondly, Rugg emphasizes the class base of various groups. The importance of geography is clearly stated with regard to Puritan (p. 160-162) and Southern (p. 162) patterns of settlement. Perhaps the most direct statement of class basis for power occurs in a discussion of the Puritans as middle class. Co-operation among people is again an important focus, e.g., a section entitled “How the settlers worked and played together” (p. 249), but the development of individualism on the frontier is not slighted (p. 254), corresponding with Rugg’s view of the development of American civilization.

It is with the rise of industrialization that Rugg’s bias comes into clear focus. The Civil War is seen as a clash between the “Northern Industrial Zone” and the “Cotton Kingdom” (p. 260). The concentration of capital in the corporations and its effect on the lives of workers is emphasized. The rise of unions is virtually the only factor held responsible for improvement of workers’ conditions. Further, Rugg emphasizes that “trade and government go hand in hand” (p. 471), even to the extent that Rugg asserts that the United States allowed Philippine independence in order to end competition in the sugar trade. As a result of World War I (“A Lesson in Co-operation and Government Regulation”), Rugg states that the United States learned “...first...that in our kind of interdependent world the people have to co-operate with one another; second...that the government may have to step in and take charge of our lives” (p. 499). It is clear, then, that Rugg is preparing students for the extremely positive appraisal of the New Deal that occurs in a later chapter.

The interpretation throughout is more liberal than radical, but Rugg’s books share the problem of other, non-social reconstructionist, texts—presenting interpretation on the same level as data. That is, Rugg told students the conclusions reached by the “frontier thinkers.” Those
conclusions are presented as truth, without the historical data. For example, the view of the Civil War as an economic conflict is the only interpretation presented. While Rugg is not alone as a textbook writer in his lack of differentiation between fact and interpretation (indeed, his books share that problem with most junior high school texts), the problem does exist.

Since Rugg has the goal of reconstructing American life, the nature of his interpretation is important. Further, since he has a model in mind of what the new society should be like, his presentation can easily raise the problem of indoctrination. Perhaps this can be more clearly seen in the list of problems which Rugg sees as created by American industrial society. This list ends *The Conquest of America*. Some of the problems are:

1. Finding work for everyone
2. The fragility of an interdependent society
4. The unequal distribution of wealth
6. The growth of cities and the need for city planning
13. The commercialization of cultural activities
14. The reconstruction of education to keep pace with the changing American civilization
15. The need for training for the wide use of leisure (p. 545).

While the solutions to these problems are ostensibly open-ended, allowing each student to create his or her own answers, the way they are stated combined with the thrust of the previous materials leads almost inevitably to the acceptance of a planned, "co-operative" economy and society, probably along the lines of an extended New Deal.

**THE CONTROVERSY**

Although those who attacked the Rugg texts did focus, at least in part, on the goal of the rebuilt society, they seemed unaware of how carefully one has to read the books to follow that thrust. Further, the arguments themselves are extreme in that they cast any critical statement about American life as an attack on democracy. Thus, it is clear that the critics were less concerned about Rugg's rather mild (especially as compared to others in the movement) social reconstructionist views than they were about his departure from the traditional teaching of the discipline of history in order to inculcate simplistic patriotism.

**The Attacks**

In 1937-1938, the first major attack on the Rugg program occurred in Englewood, New Jersey. B. C. Forbes, the publisher of *Forbes Weekly*, a business magazine, and a columnist for the Hearst press, began, as a resident of Englewood, to put pressure on the local board of education to
remove the books from the schools. He accused the series of being "un-American, socialist, and subversive" (*Time*, March 3, 1941, p. 39-40). The campaign was conducted quietly and locally, but when Forbes and his supporters lost and the books were retained, he began to use his newspaper column to further his cause. As a result, others were alerted to the "danger," and the controversy spread.

The next round of the controversy centered on two articles, one by Augustin G. Rudd in the April, 1940, issue of *Nation's Business* and one by O. K. Armstrong in the September, 1940, issue of the American Legion magazine. Both accused Rugg of fostering "treason." Rudd charged that "textbooks and complete courses teaching that our economic and political institutions are decadent have been placed in more than 4,200 communities in the United States, according to the advertising claims of the publishers" (Rudd, 1940, p. 7).

One problem Rudd saw was that the books replaced history, geography, and government courses with the intellectually fuzzy and "un-American" approach of the social sciences. Further, teachers were supplied with guides ("which parents and children cannot examine") that reinforced the subversion of the books. Finally, they foisted onto students a revolutionary interpretation of American history which cast the Founding Fathers in an evil light. As support of his last contention, Rudd cited the following passage concerning the Constitution: "The manufacturers, landowners, shippers and bankers were given what they wanted...." He did not use the complete sentence, however, which concludes "... namely a government which would stabilize the money and trade, keep order within the country and defend the nation against foreign enemies" (Rugg, 1930, p. 73). Adding the last part makes the statement Beardian (and to that extent, biased) but hardly subversive.

Most of the problems Rudd saw were found in the dramatic episodes, in part because they would succeed in involving student interest in the questions they raised (Rudd, p. 43). The American Legion attack, entitled "Treason in the Textbooks," followed closely the lines of Rudd's analysis, with an additional emphasis on Rugg's position against the excesses of advertising.

A more rational criticism of Rugg's approach appeared in *Commonweal* magazine. Ruth Bryns, a member of the faculty of Fordham Graduate School of Education, viewed Rugg's idea of presenting historical and social realities as misguided:

The question is not one of "whitewashing" history but a matter of child psychology and common sense. There are many things about American life—rather about life—which children and adolescents cannot be taught because their experience is limited and their intellectual and emotional development is incomplete (Byrns, 1941, p. 43).
She saw the Rugg curriculum as diverting the schools from their major task, that of training the intellect through a classical education—a criticism that could be directed at all Progressive educators and not only social reconstructionists.

The final important written attack on Rugg's books was contained in the "Robey Report" for the National Association of Manufacturers. Ralph West Robey, an assistant professor of banking at Columbia and columnist for Newsweek, was hired by the NAM to prepare a series of abstracts of secondary school social studies textbooks to be distributed to school boards. Robey’s report also contained critical evaluations of many texts, but, probably because of the earlier criticisms, public interest and attack centered on the report’s comments on the Rugg books. Robey maintained that the texts were too critical of America: "New Dealish in tone, they are critical of big business, cry out against unequal distribution of wealth and unequal opportunity in the United States." Instead of presentations like the Rugg textbooks, we should, according to Robey, "...teach the pupils something about the principles of democracy or private enterprise before we start to tell them it is all run by a bunch of crooks and is not good" (Time, p. 39-40).

The published criticism led to controversies in a number of school districts that were using the Rugg texts. Some of the statements made in attack and defense of the curriculum were published. For example, in Philadelphia the Daughters of the Colonial Wars argued for the removal of the books from the schools because they "...tried to give the child an unbiased viewpoint instead of teaching him real Americanism" (New Republic, 1941, p. 327). The Daughters of the American Revolution were opposed to the presentation of the idea of a co-operative commonwealth in a favorable light, and the Advertising Federation of America protested Rugg's attempt to create skepticism about advertising (Publisher's Weekly, 1940, p. 2345).

The Defense

Rugg had his defenders as well. The School Book Publishers Association issued a statement on February 23, 1941, that "It is the consensus of the group that the charges made cannot be substantiated" (School and Society, March, 1941, p. 268). The National Council for the Social Studies prepared a package to aid teachers in defending their choice of the Rugg (or other) texts (School and Society, April, 1941, p. 406). Finally, academicians, clergymen, and liberal magazines defended the books both in terms of arguments for academic freedom and based on the lack of documentation in the attacks. For example, fifty-three educators and clergymen wrote to the superintendent of Los Angeles schools that his action in removing the
Rugg books from the schools was "... a grave threat to educational freedom not only in Los Angeles but, because of the precedent it sets, in our country as a whole" (School and Society, May, 1941, p. 688). Philosopher George Sabine stated:

Within this framework (of writing as a liberal and as a believer in democracy), he has treated his data fairly; he has recounted the facts, has distinguished fact from opinion, and has stated both sides of controversial issues, especially when the controversies are still living (Frontiers of Democracy, February 15, 1942, p. 132).

I. L. Kandell of Teachers College ridiculed the entire controversy, saying the attackers "... must really believe that because certain textbooks are used in schools, therefore the pupils are affected by them" (Kandell, School and Society, January, 1941, p. 82). Both the Saturday Review of Literature and the New Republic wrote editorials in defense of the use of the Rugg books. Thus the defense tended to come from the traditionally liberal community while the attack was from traditionally more conservative groups.

The battle over the continued use of the textbooks occurred in many communities. In some (e.g., El Paso, Los Angeles, Binghamton, New York) the books were removed immediately, and in Bradnor, Ohio, they were burned. In others (e.g., Englewood, Red Bank, and Camden, New Jersey) they were retained for a while and later quietly dropped. By the middle of the 1940's, almost no districts were using the Rugg curriculum. Thus while Rugg and his supporters won a number of immediate battles, in the end, the critics were the victors.

**SUMMARY**

Harold Rugg's interpretation of the need for American society to be reconstructed was part of the broader social reconstruction movement in education. The social reconstructionists saw in the chaos of the Depression the necessity of changing the individualistic and business orientation of American life to a planned, co-operative society. The job, they thought, could be done by placing teachers and students directly in the arena of social change. Rugg fashioned a social studies curriculum to foster these ends.

Students, through Rugg's curriculum, were to learn the method of thinking of the scientist and the mode of creation of the artist and put these to work to build the new society. His books were designed to involve the students in answering the major problems of a changing society so they would be able to create a better, co-operative life for America.

The books were widely adopted, in part because of the "social studies"
approach and their liveliness. Later, however, serious controversies developed over their use. The attacks came from business and "patriotic" groups, who accused the books of being subversive and un-American. Defenders were found in the academic and liberal communities where the battle was seen as essentially one for academic freedom. Neither side, it seems, gave serious attention to the series itself nor to the problems within both Rugg's rationale and the texts, particularly the problem of subtle indoctrination. Both sides reacted more emotionally than logically. By the end of the 1940's, the "anti-Rugg" forces had achieved victory and serious attempts to translate social reconstructionism into curriculum lay dormant.

It is important to ask: What can be learned from the Rugg controversy that is useful for those concerned about current controversies? First, we may learn that reason and careful citations of the materials themselves may answer the content of the charges, but not the emotions associated with them. Second, as in the case of the MACOS controversy, much of the anger was directed at the underlying rationale and a curriculum with a controversial rationale that succeeds in achieving it is probably more vulnerable to attack than one that fails! Finally, and perhaps most important, a curriculum may survive the immediate pressure and then be dropped when the spotlight leaves. Even after the school board vote, those concerned about maintaining a curriculum must be watchful.
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TEACHER BEHAVIOR
IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES*

Wayne L. Herman, Jr.
University of Maryland, College Park

What goes on when social studies is taught in the elementary school? More specifically, what activities are employed? Do pupil-centered or teacher-centered activities dominate instruction, and does either activity emphasis affect pupil achievement? Is the verbal behavior of teachers during instruction generally direct or indirect? Is teacher behavior the same or different with above average, average, and below average classes? What is the relationship among activities employed, type of teacher-talk, pupil achievement, and pupil interest in the social studies?

Although this report will attempt to answer these questions about the behavior of teachers, this topic is exceedingly complex. For an excellent and vigorous review of the research on teacher behavior, the reader is referred to Onstein (1971).

BACKGROUND FOR THIS REPORT

This report brings together the findings of observational studies conducted by the author in elementary school social studies during the past fifteen years. The studies concern the behavior of teachers, e.g., the activities they employ, their verbal behavior, children's interest in the social studies, the effect of teacher behavior on pupil achievement, and training programs in interaction analysis. Four investigations involved over 150 hours of coding classroom activities and 35 hours of coding teacher talk in thirty-two 5th grade classrooms; an additional study involving nine classrooms in the 4th, 5th, and 6th grades concerned children's interest in the social studies. Two training programs in interaction analysis involved 102 teachers. For all studies, 143 teachers, 1334 pupils, and fifty classrooms participated.

An important question in observational studies is the reliability of the observational data, i.e., the stability of the observed data over time in the same classroom (Shavelson and Dempsey-Atwood, 1976, p. 555). By inspection of the recording sheets, classrooms in the studies tended to deviate little from their regular activities. Another significant question is the

*The author acknowledges with much gratitude the review of this manuscript by Barak Rosenshine, University of Illinois, Urbana.
interrater reliability coefficients of the coded activities and verbal behavior. The reported studies include 178 different classroom visits for coding classroom activities and 106 discrete codings of teachers' verbal behavior. Table 1 indicates that interrater reliability coefficients were nearly always highly respectable: for coding classroom activities they were usually .80 or higher, and for coding verbal behavior the coefficients were .84 or higher.

All of the author's observational studies used a modified form of the Traditional Activities section of OScAR (Observation Schedule and Record, Medley and Mitzel, 1958) for coding activities, and Interaction Analysis (Amidon and Flanders, 1963) for coding teachers' verbal behavior. Similar methods were employed in the studies. One reviewer described one investigation (Herman, et al., 1969) as "an extremely well-designed study... The matching of teachers, the assigning of teachers to teach the two units, and the use of OScAR to code teacher adherence to method provided an excellent test of the hypothesis (Rosenshine, 1972, p. 299)."

Since an investigation often studied more than one variable, in the interest of clarity this report will separately and in this order examine the findings on classroom activities, teachers' verbal behavior and training programs in interaction analysis, children's interest in the social studies, and finally identify relationships among these three variables.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Activities

Although research studies dealing with classroom activities are sparse, classroom activities have long been recognized as important vehicles in learning. Ausubel (1968, p. 450) put it succinctly: "...it is nevertheless undeniable that the teacher's most important and distinctual role in the modern classroom is still that of director of learning activities." Dewey (1933) wrote that "... if one recalls his contacts with teachers who left a permanent intellectual impress, one will find... that they were persons who introduced novelty and variety to keep attention alert and taut..." This attention to activities that have appeal to children is underscored by Peters (1966) who recognized that activities are not solely a matter dealing with the intellect but also with the affective domain. Peters (1967) added that "... the educator must think not just of what is worthwhile but also of the interests of the children with whom he is dealing."

The studies by Bellack (1963, 1965) and Sie, Baker, and Voelkner (1973) indicated that speaking/listening activities dominated the classroom regardless of the grade level or the type of social studies program; a common activity was "teacher questions-pupils answer." Jackson (1968, pp. 8, 102) suggested that the identifiable forms of classroom activity are
Table 1: Summary of Studies Reported in this Article

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours of Observation</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Teacher Verbal Behavior</th>
<th>Pupil Interest</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>No. of Classes</th>
<th>Different Ability Classes</th>
<th>Random Selection</th>
<th>Interrater Reliability Coefficient</th>
<th>Common Unit(s)</th>
<th>Test of Significance</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Herman, “How Intermediate Children Rank the Subjects,” <em>Journal of Educational Research</em> 56 (April 1963), 435-436.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>4,5,6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman, “The Relationship Between Teacher’s Verbal Behavior and Children’s Interests in the Social Studies,” <em>Peabody Journal of Education</em> 43 (November 1965), 157-160.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.91; .84</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>p. &lt; .0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman, “The Use of Language Arts in Social Studies Lessons,” <em>American Educational Research Journal</em> (March 1967), 117-124.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>.93; .86; .98</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Activities, p. &lt; .001; Kind of class and activities, p. &lt; .05; Activities and phases of the unit p. &lt; .001.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman, “An Analysis of the Activities and Verbal Behavior of Selected Fifth-Grade Social Studies Classes,” <em>Journal of Educational Research</em> (April 1967), 339-349.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Activities: 78.6; 100.0; 64.2. Tests: 91.7; 92.7.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ANOVA</td>
<td>Interest: NS Achievement: NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- X indicates the activity was observed.
- NS indicates not significant.
few in number; and that boredom is a chief complaint of pupils having difficulty with school. In teaching skills commonly associated with the social studies, the reader is advised to consult the findings of studies done in reading and mathematics and reviewed by Rosenshine (1976; Spring, 1976; in press). He reported that direct and structured teacher instruction in small (N = 3-7) and large groups is positively related to pupil achievement.

In summary, the teaching-learning process depends on viable activities that are of interest to children, but it is doubtful that classroom activities are generally characterized by either animation or variability.

**Verbal Behavior of Teachers**

Flanders' (1962) introduction of Interaction Analysis and the popular training manual by Amidon and Flanders (1963) triggered a spate of studies examining teacher verbal behavior. Taken as a whole, the early studies of teacher behavior by Lewin (1935, pp. 114-170), Anderson (1939), Lippitt and White (1943, p. 458-508), Anderson and Brewer (1946) as well as Flanders (1959, 1962), Aspy and Roebuck (1972) and Aspy and Hutson (1972) revealed that students who have indirect teachers have higher achievement, more positive attitudes toward their teachers and other aspects of school life, and display more initiative and problem-solving behavior than do students who have direct teachers.

Ryans (1964, pp. 67-101) confirmed the finding by Anderson (1939) that pupil behavior appeared to be closely related to teacher behavior. Although the purpose of the lesson, e.g., discussion versus the teacher imparting new information, should determine the composition of direct or indirect teacher talk, recent evidence by Soar (1977) indicated that the greatest pupil achievement occurs when teacher talk is neither extremely direct nor extremely indirect, but somewhere in an intermediate position between the two kinds of talk.

Differences in verbal patterns have been reported among teachers of various ability classes. Amidon and Giammatteo (1965) reported that teachers of higher achievement level classes were less direct and critical of student behavior than were teachers of low achieving classes. But Stuck and Wyne (1971) found that no significant differences existed between the verbal interaction of teachers of special classes and those of regular classes. One of the best current reviews on teacher behaviors with different types of students is by Brophy and Good (1974). They reported that certain types of teachers have high expectations for some children and low expectations for other children which are communicated both directly and indirectly, thus affecting pupil achievement (p. 117).

Bondi (1971) indicated that a classroom teacher's verbal patterns remained stable, that students could predict what a teacher would say, and
that teachers of above average classes used five to six times as much praise and acceptance of pupils' ideas and less direction and criticism than did teachers of below average classes. The stability of a teacher's verbal behavior was disputed by Furst and Amidon (1971, pp. 167-175) who reported that contextual variables, such as grade-level and subject matter, contribute to differences in verbal patterns. Roebuck and Aspy (1974) found that grade-level effects on the variance of verbal behavior were significant only in the categories directly related to subject matter ("asks questions," "lectures," and "gives directions").

A recent article by Van Horn (1976) has created a stir because it appears to run counter to the general findings cited above. He found the model in which teachers gave information was positively associated with higher student self-concept of academic ability. In this author's opinion, this finding is not a threat to the larger reservoir of findings cited above because a large amount of overlap existed among the four models tested (Van Horn, p. 286); student concepts about their academic ability could have been high before the study commenced, (no pretests were given), and if this was the case, it can be argued that it usually takes a lot more than three months (Van Horn, p. 287) to change one's self-concept; a teacher's ability to impart information is a demand made by secondary school students (Spady, 1973), and the students in Van Horn's study might have considered that their teachers did a satisfactory job of giving information which in their case gave them a positive feeling about the material being learned, and consequently affected their self-concept. At any rate, at the present time "teacher giving information" appears to have a low positive correlation with achievement gain.

In sum, indirect teacher talk, if not extreme, results in higher pupil achievement than does direct teacher talk. It might be that indirect teachers gravitate to high ability classes. But the stronger evidence is that the purpose of the lesson, the subject matter, and the personality make-up of teachers determine whether teachers will be indirect or direct in their verbal behavior.

Children's Interest in Social Studies

The research literature is very consistent in reporting children's low interest in the social studies (Holmes, 1937, pp. 336-344; Jersild and Tasch, 1949; Chase, December 1949; Chase and Wilson, 1958; Rice, 1963; Curry, 1963; and Rowland and Inskeep, 1963). A disturbing finding of the Jersild and Tasch (1949, pp. 28, 146) study was that when children were asked to list topics they would like to learn more about in school, they mentioned topics germane to the social studies more than those of any other subject area.
An important finding reported by Egan (1973) was that children tend to like the subjects their teachers like. But some years earlier, Chase (October, 1949) studied twenty classrooms of teachers who stated they preferred to teach the social studies over all subjects; however, only children in ten of these classrooms gave social studies a high rating. In these classrooms Chase found that objectives were carefully planned, a wide range of activities were used, study and research skills were emphasized, and provisions were made for individual differences in reading ability.

These findings raise questions about what goes on when social studies is taught in the elementary school. Specifically, the following synthesis of findings will relate to (1) What activities are used? (2) Does a teacher-centered or pupil-centered activity emphasis affect pupil achievement? (3) What patterns of verbal behavior occur during instruction? (4) Are training programs effective in changing teachers’ verbal behavior? and (5) Do activities and a teacher’s verbal behavior affect children’s interest in the social studies?

THE FINDINGS: CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

One investigation of fourteen randomly selected fifth grade teachers in their teaching of the unit Early Explorers provided an analysis of classroom activities (Herman, April, 1967) as well as the amount of time spent in listening, speaking, reading, and writing activities (Herman, March, 1967). In this study, activities were coded on the 1st, 7th, 14th, 21st, and last day of the six week Unit. For analysis, the fourteen classes were sub-divided into three ability groups with the following mean intelligence quotients: Above Average Group = 108 I.Q.; Average Group = 100 I.Q.; Below Average Group = 95 I.Q.

Teachers clearly dominated instruction. In these fourteen classrooms teachers dominated instruction for 54 percent of the time (Table 2). Pupil-centered active activities, such as giving reports, demonstrations, reading orally, or painting and drawing accounted for 26 percent of the lessons. During the remaining 20 percent of the time children were engaged in seatwork.

Below average classes were led by the teacher more than average or above average classes were. Table 2 indicates that teacher illustrations occurred more for the below average classes than for the average and above average classes. When total teacher activities are considered, Table 2 reveals that teachers dominated instruction for 70 percent of the time for the below average classes, 62 percent of the time for average classes, and 41 percent of the time for above average classes.
Table 2: Percent of Social Studies Time Allocated for Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Teacher-Centered</th>
<th>Teacher-Illustrated</th>
<th>Pupil-Centered</th>
<th>Pupil-Seatwork</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Average Group (Indirect verbal pattern)</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>99.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Group (Neutral verbal pattern)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average Group (Direct verbal pattern)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Groups (Neutral verbal pattern)</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A few specific activities dominated the social studies teaching (Table 3). The major activities include "Teacher lectures with questions" (18%), "Teacher questions-pupils answer" (12%), "Pupils recite" (13.3%), and "Pupils read and write" (15%). Except for 6.4% of the time spent in skits, art, and committee work, children were sitting at their desks reciting, reading and writing, or listening to the teacher or another child in a few activities repeated over and over again. Provisions for additional differences were poor. Only one teacher used instructional grouping to help children with their work and that occurred in an above average ability class.

When activities were combined into the categories of Teacher-Centered Activities, Pupil-Centered Active Activities, Teacher-Illustrations-Demonstrations, and Pupil-Seatwork for an analysis of variance, a highly significant difference among the categories was found; that is, these categories of activities were differentially used by teachers. The interaction between activities used by below average, average, and above average classes was also significant (p. < .05); that is, teachers of different ability classes used the categories of activities differently. And a significant interaction was found between Activities and Periods of the Unit, i.e., Introduction, Work Period, and Culmination (p. < .001); that is, use of the categories of activities by teachers differed according to the phase of the unit.
Table 3: Percent of Total Observation Time Spent in Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher-Centered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. T. lectures w/questions</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T. questions—P. answer</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. T. lectures</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. T. non-subject talks</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. T. reads</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. T. illustrates at blackboard—P. silent</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Illustrated and Demonstrated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. T. illustrates at blackboard—P. verbalize</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. T. illustrates w/map, pictures—P. silent</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. T. illustrates w/map, pictures—P. verbalize</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. T. demonstrates—3D—P. silent</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. T. demonstrates—3D—P. verbalize</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Audio-visuals—P. silent</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Audio-visuals—P. verbalize</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil-Centered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. P. recites</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. P. give skit</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. P. works at blackboard</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. P. illustrates w/map, pictures</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. P. demonstrates 3D</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. P. reads aloud</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. P. paint, draw, paste</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Committees—verbalize</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. P. sing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. P. clean room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pupil Seatwork</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. P. read silently</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. P. write</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. P. write and read</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. P. get ready for activity</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Interruption—P.A. system, visitor</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T = Teacher, P = Pupil(s). AA = Above Average Group; A = Average Group; BA = Below Average Group; C = All Groups Combined.

An arrangement of the data for an analysis of language arts activities (Herman, March 1967) revealed that listening activities dominated the social studies for 76.5 percent of the lessons (Table 4). Most of this time (42.9%) was spent in teacher-pupil interaction, 22 percent of the time pupils were speaking in an extended manner, and 11.6 percent of the time the teacher was speaking in an extended way. Reading was assigned for 13 percent of the time and writing consumed about 2 percent of the lessons.
Table 4. Percent of Social Studies Lessons Spent in Language Arts
Activities for All Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Listening*</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Pupil</th>
<th>Teacher-Pupil</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Misc.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1st day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Period</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7th, 14th,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st days)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>———</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28th day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Study</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Listening and Speaking categories are related: Listening time represents total Speaking time.

Activities differed according to the mean intelligence of the class. Children in below average classes listened to their teachers talk nearly twice as much as children listened in above average classes; pupils in average and above average classes engaged in extended speaking activities about four times as much as did members of below average classes (6.4%). Listening to the teacher interact verbally with children in brief encounters consumed the largest block of time for all classes. And above average classes spent 18 percent of the time in the activity "Writing and reading," compared to about six percent for average classes and 3.7 percent for below average classes.

For each of the fourteen classes, the amount of time spent in listening activities was ranked according to the Introduction (1st day), the Work Period (7th, 14th, 21st days), and the Conclusion (last day) of the unit. The Friedman test indicated that the rank totals were not statistically significant.

In summary, usually only a few types of teacher-led activities were employed during the social studies period. These activities were usually of a speaking/listening nature with brief teacher-pupil encounters, and occurred more for below average achieving classes than for average or above average achieving classes. Since these data were collected, the author’s informal observations of about 200 student teachers and their classroom teachers reveal little change in the employment of activities.
Treatment Effects on Pupil Achievement Are Non-Significant

Since it is possible that teacher treatment of activities might affect pupil learning, the next step in the research was to test the influence of the two treatments of teacher-centered activities (in which teachers give information without pupil input) and pupil-centered activities (in which pupils participate in setting goals, in discussion, and in evaluation) on pupil achievement of factual information (Herman, et al., 1969). In this study 18 teachers were randomly selected from a pool of exemplary teachers and matched in nine pairs on their coded verbal behavior according to Interaction Analysis (Amidon and Flanders, 1963), and with attention to the class mean obtained on the Lorge Thorndike Verbal Intelligence Test. These teachers were randomly assigned to teacher-centered and pupil-centered treatments for the first social studies unit (Early Explorers). To cancel teacher effect and to make comparisons between the treatments regarding pupil achievement, the teachers reversed their treatment during the second social studies unit (Colonization). Each of the two units was about six weeks long. All teachers had taught the units previously and used a common curricular guide.

The methods employed to control treatments included giving teachers a suggested guide of activities, requiring teachers to submit weekly reports of the dominant activities used daily, and three unannounced visits per unit by observers who coded classroom activities.

In analyzing the data on pupil achievement of unit information, three dimensions included sex of student, level of intelligence of the class (above average group, $\bar{X} = 106$ I.Q.; average group, $\bar{X} = 100$ I.Q.; below average group, $\bar{X} = 94$ I.Q.) and treatment (teacher-centered or pupil-centered instruction). Due to variations among teachers, they were nested within treatment and levels. Most computations employed the program MANOVA, University of Miami Biostatistics Laboratory, 1966. For the first unit, Early Explorers, none of the main effects or interactions was significant regarding pupil achievement, although the nested teacher effect was highly significant (p. < .01). For the Colonization Unit none of the effects concerned with achievement, including the nested teacher effect, was significant.

THE FINDINGS: TEACHER VERBAL BEHAVIOR DURING LESSONS

When activities were being coded by an observer, a tape recorder simultaneously recorded classroom conversations (Herman, April, 1967). Afterward the Flanders system of Interaction Analysis was used to code the verbal behavior of fourteen teachers during social studies lessons. In using this coding system, the ratio of indirect statements to direct statements, the
ID Ratio, is obtained by dividing the total tallies for indirect statements by the total tallies for direct statements.

\[
\text{ID Ratio} = \frac{\text{Tallies for indirect statements (Categories 1-4, that include teacher accepts pupil feelings and ideas, praises, asks questions).}}{\text{Tallies for direct statements (Categories 5-7, that include teacher lecture, directions, criticism).}}
\]

A ratio of .50 indicates that a teacher uses two direct statements for each indirect statement; a ratio of 2.00 means that two indirect statements are used for each direct statement; and a ratio of 1.00 means that the teacher is neutral in verbal behavior and uses one direct statement for every indirect statement.

During this investigation, a tape recorder coded about twenty minutes of teacher talk on each of the 1st, 7th, 14th, and last days during the teaching of a common unit, or a total of eighty minutes for each teacher in the study.²

_Taken as a whole for total codings, the fourteen teachers were neutral in their verbal behavior (ID Ratio = 1.00), i.e., they spent as much time using direct statements as they spent using indirect statements. Teachers of above average classes were slightly indirect (ID Ratio = 1.17); teachers of average classes were about neutral (ID Ratio = .93); and the below average classes had teachers with direct patterns (ID Ratio = .75)._

The two recordings made during the work period of the unit, however, gave clear and significant evidence of differences among the teachers. _Teachers of below average classes were even more direct teachers (ID Ratio = .59) whereas teachers of average and above average classes deviated slightly from being neutral teachers (ID Ratios = .89 and 1.25 respectively)._²

With just a few exceptions as noted below, teachers of average, below average, and above average ability classes used all categories with about the same frequency for the total study. Of all talk in the classroom, teacher talk was used about two-thirds of the time, and sixty percent of this talk was direct talk.

The following analysis is mostly based on data contained in Table 5. Explanation of how tallies are entered into the matrix is given in Amidon and Flanders (1963). For interpretation, the row of praise (Row 2) for example indicates the percent of talk following the use of praise in each of the categories; the column of praise (Col. 2) indicates the percent of talk preceding the use of praise in each of the categories. Thus, an analysis of verbal categories is imperative since cause (preceding talk) and effect
(succeeding talk) of teacher talk is revealed, which can clarify classroom climate and aid improvement if needed.

Table 5: Percent of Total Tallies in Each Cell for Total Groups
Master Matrix for the Total Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>1.540</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>.945</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.424</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.724</td>
<td>2.052</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>4.443</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>7.207</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>2.660</td>
<td>16.137</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>1.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.3151</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>1.944</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>10.294</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>1.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>1.064</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.436</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>8.007</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

%GT* .10 5.79 7.09 15.01 22.42 3.99 1.69 21.18 11.47 11.25
%TT** .19 10.32 12.64 26.76 39.96 7.11 3.02

Teacher Tallies = 14,026
Student Tallies = 8,165

*CATEGORIES: Indirect Teacher Talk
1. Accepts feelings
2. Praises
3. Accepts ideas
4. Asks questions

Direct Teacher Talk
5. Lectures
6. Directs
7. Criticizes

Student Talk
8. Teacher-initiated
9. Pupil-initiated
10. Silence or confusion
Accepts pupil feelings: This category is shown in the first column and row. This category is rarely used by all teachers.

Praise: This category, shown in the second column and row, makes up about 10 percent of all teacher talk. Two-thirds of all praise is used after children talk. Praise is often followed by acceptance of pupil idea, questions or teacher lecture. Insignificant differences exist among teachers with different ability classes.

Acceptance of pupil idea: This category, shown in the third column and row, makes up about 13 percent of all teacher talk. Teacher initiated pupil talk and praise usually precede acceptance of pupil idea. Extended use of acceptance of pupil idea accounts for about seventeen percent of the use of this category. After accepting pupils' ideas, teachers usually ask a question or give additional information. As the ability level of the class decreases, this category is used decreasingly by teachers.

Asks questions: This category, shown in the fourth column and row, makes up about 27 percent of all teacher talk. Asking questions that continue for more than three seconds and asking questions after teacher lecture are used with the most frequency. Teachers of below ability classes also ask questions after silence or confusion. Since there is about as much silence or confusion after asking questions for these teachers as there is questions following silence, questions are probably being repeated. As would be expected, teacher-initiated pupil talk often follows the use of teacher questions.

Lectures: This category, shown in the fifth column and row, makes up 40 percent of all teacher talk. Extended use of lecture occurs for teachers of all ability groups for about forty percent of all lecture but less for the teachers of above average ability classes than for the other teachers. Following the use of lecture, all teachers ask questions for about the same amount of time.

Directs: This category, shown in the sixth column and row, makes up 4 percent of all teacher talk. Extended use of direction is common for all teachers, usually preceded and succeeded by silence or confusion.

Criticizes: This category, shown in the seventh column and row, makes up about three percent of all teacher talk. Teachers of below average ability classes used the category about three to five times as much as the other teachers in all phases of the unit; fourteen percent of this criticism occurred after pupils talked, and twenty-three percent of the total criticism of these teachers was given in an extended fashion, that is, for more than three seconds.

Teacher-initiated pupil talk: This category, shown in the eighth column and row, makes up about 20 percent of all talk in the classroom. When not used in an extended way, it usually follows teacher questions. After pupils talk, teachers use praise, acceptance of idea, and lecture for about the same amount of time.
Pupil-initiated talk: This category, shown in the ninth column and row, makes up about 11 percent of all classroom talk. As the ability level of the class decreases, pupils initiate less talk: of all talk in the classroom, pupil-initiated talk accounted for 15.74 percent in above average ability classes, 8.41 percent in average ability classes, and 6.55 percent in below average ability classes. In other words, children in average and below average classes initiated talk about half as much as did children in above average ability classes. For all classes, teacher lecture triggers pupil-initiated talk more than other categories, and praise usually follows this category.

Silence or confusion: This category, shown in the tenth column and row, makes up 11 percent of all classroom talk. Silence in below average ability classes is twice as much as for average and above average ability classes. For all teachers silence follows the use of questions; for below average ability classes, silence also follows teacher lecture and teacher-initiated pupil talk.

The verbal behavior tallies were converted to percentages for Group (above average, average, below average classes), Period of Unit (Introduction, Work Period, Culmination), and verbal behavior categories (Indirect, Direct, Student Talk) separately. An arcsine transformation was then applied to these percentages in order to normalize the data so an analysis of variance could be performed. No practical differences were found.

Indirect Teachers Are Effective With All Ability Levels

The next investigation (Herman et al., 1969) involved the matching of teachers on the basis of their verbal behavior for a study of the effects of the two treatments of teacher-centered activities and pupil-centered activities on pupil achievement and interest. Before the research commenced, six exemplary teachers of each of average classes, below average classes, and above average classes, or a total of eighteen randomly selected teachers had their verbal behavior coded for 45 minutes. Although the matching of teachers on their ID Ratio was an important part of the study's design, no analysis of the verbal behavior was made. Nevertheless, the fact that all teachers had indirect ID ratios—unlike the first study in this section—gave compelling evidence that teachers can be successful when they interact verbally in a generally indirect way with classes or varying ability, and dispelled the notion often expressed that children of a below average ability level need teachers who generally use direct talk.

Training in Interaction Analysis Is Effective

Two investigations that employed social studies content in a training program in interaction analysis were effective with teachers. In one study,
ninety-three elementary and secondary pre-service and in-service teachers showed a twenty percent increase in mean scores between pre and post multiple choice tests (Herman and Duffey, 1970). The effects of the training program were about the same for pre-service teachers as they were for in-service teachers of both the elementary and secondary schools. Training was effective in the use of acceptance of student feeling, praise and encouragement, acceptance of student ideas, and directions and less effective in instructing teachers when to question, lecture, or criticize.

The second training program involved nine day-care teachers of children between the ages of two and five (Herman, 1974). The verbal behavior of each teacher was coded for about thirty minutes before the training and about thirty minutes after the training. Post-test results showed that teachers moved from being neutral teachers to being slightly indirect (from ID ratio of 1.09 to 1.20). The training was effective in increasing acceptance of pupil ideas four-fold, in decreasing the giving of directions by two-thirds, and in asking open questions that nearly doubled the time that children spoke. By inspection, differences between pre and post codings were not statistically significant.

In sum, in both studies, training was effective in increasing teacher acceptance of pupil ideas.

THE FINDINGS: CHILDREN’S INTEREST IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Interest is an important attribute in learning because the amount of interest a child has in a subject area often determines the degree of effort he/she is willing to expend. As such, interest provides the motivation for effort.

The purpose of the first attempt (Herman, 1963) to measure children’s interest was to investigate whether or not different activities accounted for the perennial low ranking of social studies. A Kuder type Interest Inventory was developed using the five subject areas of arithmetic, English, science, social studies, and spelling. Forty multiple-choice groupings consisting of three activities comprised the Inventory and were administered to 107 boys and 107 girls in three classrooms on each of the 4th, 5th, and 6th grade levels, or a total of nine classrooms in a middle-middle class school.

Social studies is not a popular subject. Social studies ranked last or next to last for all girls and boys in the study. Using chi-square to test differences between boys’ choices, girls’ choices, and total boys’ and girls’ choices, no statistically significant differences were found. As a check, the children were asked which subjects they liked the least: social studies and English were mentioned most frequently (number of responses are in parentheses): English (82), social studies (71), science (62), arithmetic (31), and spelling (19).
To probe further, children were asked to name topics that they would like to learn more about in school. *When these topics were tabulated, topics in the social studies outnumbered the other subject areas,* which strongly suggests that instruction rather than the subject matter accounts for the low ranking of the social studies!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arithmetic</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwriting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Verbal Behavior of Teachers Affects Children’s Interest in Social Studies

Since activities—at least the activities listed in the Interest Inventory—did not alter children’s low ranking of the social studies, the author then studied the influence of teachers’ verbal behavior on children’s ranking of the social studies (Herman, November 1965). As a post-study of the April 1967 investigation in which balanced visits were made to the classrooms of fourteen teachers during their teaching of a common unit and four twenty minute segments of verbal behavior were collected for each teacher, or a total of eighty minutes per teacher, children were asked to rank the five subjects in the order in which they liked them (arithmetic, English, science, social studies, spelling). Although other variables probably contributed to children’s interest in the social studies, such as the confounding variable of intelligence, Table 6 indicates that as the intelligence level of the group increased and simultaneously as the verbal pattern of the group teachers became less direct, there were more children who liked the social studies. A chi-square of 23.2005 with 4 degrees of freedom indicated a statistically significant difference at p. < .0001 between the patterns of choice of children in the below average, average, and above average ability groups.

The Effects of Activities on Children’s Interest in Social Studies

Next, a study was designed to measure the effects of teacher-centered activities and pupil-centered activities on pupil interest in two fifth-grade social studies units (Herman, et al., 1969). This investigation is described in an early part of this article. To measure pupil interest, a paired comparison technique was used as the interest test; in this test one school subject, e.g., social studies, is paired with every other major school subject and the pupil chooses the subject he prefers.
An ANOVA revealed that none of the three major effects of sex, levels (above average, average, and below average classes), or treatment (teacher-centered or pupil-centered), was significant for either interest inventory. Nevertheless, in both cases, highly significant nested effects were found for teachers. Thus, different teachers within the same level and treatment group tended to obtain highly divergent results from their students.

On the first interest inventory (Early Explorers Unit), none of the interactions of the main effects was significant. On the second interest inventory (Colonization Unit), significant interactions were obtained for sex with levels and for levels with treatment. Males responded higher than females for the average and below average levels, but females were above males at the above average level. When treatments were considered, the interaction with levels is more complex. Pupil-centered instruction was associated with much higher mean ratings for above average students, but with lower mean ratings for average students and with virtually the same mean ratings for below average students. This finding, however, should be regarded as suspect because it was the only one statistically significant F-test
involving treatment in the whole package of F-tests used in the study; moreover, the finding did not generalize to the other unit.

RELATIONSHIPS AMONG ACTIVITIES, TEACHER-TALK, AND CHILDREN'S INTERESTS IN SOCIAL STUDIES

There was a relationship among activities employed to teach the social studies, teachers' verbal behavior, and children's interest in the social studies. These relationships were related to the ability level of the class. As the ability level of the class decreased, teachers were more direct in their verbal behavior, they dominated instruction with more teacher-centered activities, and children generally gave social studies a low rating. The teachers of high ability classes were indirect, employed more pupil-centered activities than did the teachers of the average and below average ability groups, and nearly half of their children gave social studies a high rating. The teachers of below average classes used illustrations and demonstrations more than the teachers of average and above average ability classes did.

Taken as a whole, teachers enjoyed a high profile during instruction in which a few specific kinds of desk activities were carried on; their verbal behavior was neutral, i.e., neither generally indirect nor direct; and the children generally gave social studies a low rating. In one study all of the teachers were indirect in verbal pattern but neither pupil-centered nor teacher-centered treatments significantly affected pupil achievement and interest.

DISCUSSION

The data in this report indicate that teachers dominated instruction with a few specific activities, such as "Teacher lectures with questions," and "Teacher questions-pupils answer." A few pupil-centered activities such as "Pupils recite" and "Pupils read and write" were employed frequently. In other words, these four activities were used over and over again. To meet individual differences and to provide a variety of learning experiences, a greater range of pupil-centered activities are needed, including creative activities in art, role-playing, construction, etc., which are a reaction to learned information and which have the advantage of fixing or reinforcing acquired learning. The research literature supporting the benefits of various kinds of creativity is incontrovertible.

The distribution of time spent in activities of the language arts revealed an imbalance favoring speaking/listening activities (77% of recorded time) and disfavoring reading (13% of recorded time) and writing (2% of recorded time). Listening and reading are input activities which give
children a reservoir of information upon which to draw for output activities concerned with speaking and writing. When reading activities are sparse, discussions probably deal with information the children already know or the little that they have read about. With an improvement in the time spent in reading (input), the quality of discussions would probably be increased.

Moreover, national and regional assessments of the low level of children's writing skill directs that more writing activities for all children regardless of ability level be employed; the functional nature of the social studies seems to be an ideal subject area to stress writing skills.

Although the teachers of below average ability classes used illustrations and demonstrations to a greater degree than did teachers of average and above average ability classes, few opportunities existed for pupils in below average ability classes to speak at length. In addition to the benefits of encouraging below average achieving children to share their ideas, the difficulties usually encountered by these children in the teaching/learning process suggest that increased opportunities to verbalize would be advantageous in order to alert the teacher to areas of information in which misunderstanding or misconceptions occurred that need reteaching, or for the purpose of having children reinforce learned concepts.

In one study the teachers of below average, average, and above average ability classes were indirect in their verbal behavior and regardless of the teacher-centered or pupil-centered activity program emphasis, differences in pupil achievement and interest were not statistically significant. But in another study the teachers of below average ability classes generally used direct talk that included three to five times more criticism of pupils than the teachers of higher ability classes used. Since fourteen percent of this criticism occurred immediately following pupil-talk, and twenty-three percent of all criticism was extended or continued for more than three seconds, it is understandable that children in below average ability classes initiated less talk than did children in higher ability classes. It is simply too much a risk to take for these children to talk. In essence, the need for more speaking activities in the conceptual area of social studies for children in below average ability classes is related to the need for their teachers to be more indirect in their verbal behavior.

Social studies is not a popular subject. The question can be raised whether teacher behavior causes children's attitudes, did children's attitudes influence teacher behavior, or does a mutual interaction exist? Evidence exists for all three points of view, but the research studies during the past four decades reviewed in this article under the topic of verbal behavior give credence to the view that teacher behavior has more of an effect on pupil attitudes than does pupil behavior have on teacher behavior.
RECOMMENDATIONS

This article has reviewed disturbing findings about what goes on during elementary school social studies. Although the generalizability of the findings of these studies carries with it a fair amount of risk, other observers using informal observations have reported similar findings.

What recommendations can be made? First, inasmuch as children vary in ability and background, they possess different modalities of learning, and a variety of learning experiences seems to have a salutary effect on the teaching-learning process, a wider range of activities appears justified (Herman, 1976). Especially needed is a balance between activities in which children acquire information (which are numerous) and creative activities in which they react to acquired information (which are sparse), the latter having the effect of reinforcing and cementing learning.

Second, more time ought to be spent in reading and writing activities.

Third, with the current emphasis on individual and group decision-making skills and with the attendant stress on the development of the attribute of independence, more activities are needed that take the teacher out of the spotlight and place children in it. In no way does this recommendation imply that teachers should decrease the amount they organize and structure for the teaching-learning process. If this recommendation were carried out, in all likelihood more organization, structure, and supervision would be required by the teacher.

Fourth, since social studies is largely a conceptual and idea-oriented field of study appropriate for speaking/listening activities, teachers need to be aware of the effect of their verbal behavior on children during discussions and strive to accept pupil feelings and ideas, to use praise and encouragement, and to ask open questions that stimulate critical thinking. This recommendation is appropriate for all teachers and especially those of low-achieving classes.

Fifth, several implications obtain from this synthesis of research findings. For the college professor, it is imperative that activities and teachers' verbal behavior be given adequate attention in the training of teachers since these two components occupy continuous and significant influences in classroom instruction. As with many variables in the teaching-learning process, a rationale is needed that includes the relationship of input activities to creative activities, the relationship of activities to individual differences, the relationship of activities to objectives and the phases of a unit, and the relationship of a teacher's verbal behavior, including specific verbal categories, to classroom climate and children's attitudes toward the social studies.

For elementary school teachers and supervisors, the implication of these studies is that a keener focus is needed on the assessment of classroom
activities and a teacher's verbal behavior and their relationship to citizenship education of children. In-service programs ought to be established in schools where teacher behavior hinders or blocks the development of traits needed in a democratic society. Improvement in the way that social studies is taught ought to have a salutary effect on children's interest in the social studies. The little attention generally given to writing and reading activities in the social studies requires immediate correction.

These studies suggest that researchers ought to continue observational studies of social studies classrooms—similar to the investigations reviewed by Rosenshine in reading and mathematics—and ascertain what occurs in classrooms, and which variables are related to achievement in terms of acquisition of knowledge, skills, and appreciations, or whatever it is that instruction in social studies is supposed to accomplish with children.

This article has addressed only a few of the many complex variables of teacher behavior that need to be investigated if improvement is to occur in social studies instruction.

**FOOTNOTES**

1It would be helpful if researchers used the same terms in describing teacher behavior. Anderson and Brewer employed the terms *dominative* and *integrative*; Lewin, Lippitt and White wrote of *autocratic* and *democratic* teachers; and Flanders introduced *direct* and *indirect* teachers. All of these terms are roughly equivalent.

In this article the terms *direct* and *indirect* will be used. A *direct* teacher talks and directs a lot, and is generally disrespectful and critical of children's ideas and feelings; an *indirect* teacher shares the spotlight with children, and conducts a supportive classroom climate by valuing and respecting children's ideas and feelings and by giving praise and encouragement.

2Twenty to thirty minutes of recorded verbal behavior is considered by Flanders to be an adequate time sample to ascertain a pattern of talk.

3The post-study was published before the main study of April 1967 was published.
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Today, social studies curriculum series are developed for national usage. This was not always the case however. In this paper the development of the first national curriculum series, that of Harold Rugg, will be presented and discussed. The impact of that curriculum on social studies curriculum development will also be examined.

One of the first educators to use consistently the term social studies was Harold O. Rugg, a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, from 1920 to 1951. “Others used the term social studies before Rugg, but they didn’t really understand it. Rugg was the first to really grasp the meaning of social studies” (Wesley, 1974). Before Rugg created his Social Science Pamphlets, there were no social studies texts nor were there any social studies courses.

Out of this emptiness, Harold Rugg created, wrote, mass produced, marketed and revised the first curriculum series on a nationwide basis in the social studies. This grandiose scheme was viewed with surprise, even incredulity, by many educators because of Rugg’s innovative ideas on curriculum making in general, but particularly social studies curricula. Harold Rugg was the first great curriculum developer. His models of curriculum development were built upon by others, and distinct parallels can be made between Rugg’s social studies curriculum and the “new” Social Studies Curricula of the 1960’s. Rugg’s contributions to social studies curriculum development, then, cannot be overemphasized.

The intent of this paper will be (1) to present Rugg and his materials in a descriptive overview, (2) to discuss Rugg’s designs for a newly created social studies field, (3) to examine the process of curriculum development practiced by Rugg and his team of educators and authors, and (4) to draw parallels between the Rugg product and those “newly” developed projects of the 1960’s.

THE “EDUCATION” OF HAROLD RUGG

Rugg came from a very unusual background for a curriculum developer. His major in college was civil engineering and upon graduation he taught civil engineering for two years at Millikin University. During that time Rugg grew interested in how students learned and this led to his return to school (University of Illinois) where he received a Ph.D. in education under
William C. Bagley. Rugg's focus was on educational psychology and sociology, particularly the transfer of knowledge.

Rugg's first teaching position was at the University of Chicago where Charles Judd was assembling his "team" of scientific educators. At Chicago Rugg began his first extensive work in curriculum work in the field of mathematics education. John Roscoe Clark, another young professor, and Rugg developed and "marketed" locally, at no profit, algebra materials for the secondary school. This local model would be the inspiration for Rugg's social studies curriculum distribution six years later.

During World War I Rugg was part of the army's Committee on Classification of Personnel headed by Edward L. Thorndike and other psychologists which was composed of psychologists, educators, statisticians and business leaders. In a year's time they compiled reams of quantitative data analyzing human and material needs (Rugg 1941, p. 183). It was in this group that Rugg found aesthetic intellectuals, and was impressed by their depth and breadth of knowledge. Of particular interest to Rugg was their concern with culture, the arts and the reinterpretations of certain social concepts. Those concerns would become focal points in the Rugg social studies materials three years later.

Rugg moved to Teachers College, Columbia during the school year 1919-20 to become associate professor of education and educational psychologist of the Lincoln School. There he compiled data on the capabilities and performances of each child in the exceptional Lincoln School student body. It was during this time that Rugg began to formulate a plan to pursue both his own intellectual growth and to provide America's youth with vital knowledge for citizenship.

In order to better formulate this plan Rugg was given six months off to read and cogitate. He spent that time reading the works of scholars and social critics such as Charles Beard, Thorstein Veblen, John Maynard Keynes, Bertrand Russell, Bernard Shaw, R. H. Tawney, James Harvey Robinson, et al. Robinson's New History (1912) particularly excited him, and he attempted to apply its premises to his anticipated social studies series.

Rugg's reading of these "Frontier Thinkers" both annoyed and exhilarated him. At daily luncheons Rugg bombarded John Roscoe Clark (now also at Teachers College) and Hughes Mearns, a professor of education, with the new ideas he was discovering. Rugg felt that he had been deprived of such knowledge and it was his duty to inform the children of the United States of this knowledge. As he recalls saying, "Something must be done about this! Our youngsters must know these ideas! The high school should build an understanding of the rise and spread of industrialism around the world!" (Rugg, 1941, p. 203).
During 1920, Rugg along with his brother Earle, J. Montgomery Gambrill, Daniel Knowlton and Roy Hatch founded the National Council for the Social Studies. Harold soon lost interest in the group but maintained some contact with it throughout the years. Earle felt "frozen out" by the eastern establishment and was somewhat bitter over that state of affairs (E. Rugg, 1969). Earle, a history teacher in Oak Park Illinois, had been Harold’s constant contact with the field of social studies and it was partly at Earle’s urging that Harold had considered pursuing the social studies. While in Chicago in 1920 they had discussed the ideas of the Frontier Thinkers and of shaping them into a social studies curriculum. With Harold’s increased reading the framework began to form in his mind.

THE INTENT OF THE RUGG MATERIALS

Through his curriculum Rugg hoped to perfect the total integration of the social sciences into social studies and was the first to emphasize the distinction between the two concepts. "Rugg has abolished the artificial divisions existing between history, geography, civics, economics and sociology, and grouped the material under one natural heading—social studies—designed to help the student to understand and deal intelligently with the problems of contemporary life" (de Lima, 1925, p. 135). By abolishing these divisions, Rugg sought to portray the strands of the curriculum in various conceptual schemes, e.g. property, power, immigration. These would be viewed historically at times, but the other social sciences were fully integrated into any historical discussion. At other times the discussion or topic was more economically oriented but always with sociological, anthropological, geographical, political, psychological and historical ramifications included as an integrated part of the topic in question.

Rugg hoped to create a social studies curriculum for the elementary grades through senior high school. Thus his first efforts were part of a larger design rather than an attempt to create an isolated curriculum for each division of the school.

Rugg had originally aimed his books at the fifth and sixth grade level. With that in mind Rugg assembled a team from Lincoln School consisting of the high school history teacher, a geography teacher, an elementary history teacher and an elementary "room" teacher. Immediately difficulties arose. Rugg recalled,

My plan wasn’t too clear, even to me, and to the teachers it was utterly nebulous. We were certainly not equipped to do the difficult task of assembling new reading and study and work materials in a vast field where there was almost nothing. It meant mimeographing
and graphing, making bibliographies, planning excursions for the children to various parts of the city, keying in the work of the "arts" teachers, the "science" and "industrial arts" teachers and others to see our new program, holding round-table discussion, providing for sufficient practice on the "skills" and what not. I had never taught in the elementary school—and yet I had to teach, to illustrate to the other teachers what I was talking about, improvising a good deal of it as I went along. The elementary teachers had never worked at research problems; neither had they acquired a clear conception of the "new history" or of my theories of integration of the "social studies." And the high school history man was downright opposed to the whole idea. (Rugg, 1941, p. 205)

After a year of trial and error the team agreed to disband except for Emma Schweppe, the "room" teacher, who remained with Rugg for several years aiding in writing and teaching the new material.

Although this effort resulted in the disbanding of the original team in the summer of 1921, a new revitalized team was formed soon after that with Earle Rugg as a new key member. Earle had come to Teachers College to pursue his own doctorate and to work with Harold in developing the social studies materials. With Earle's arrival in 1921, the plan of action was recast.

The decision was made to refocus the materials on the junior high school for two major reasons. The most obvious reason was the difficulty the fifth and sixth grade students had had using the materials. Rugg knew from his testing that the Lincoln School student body was generally more intelligent than most other schools. Thus, if those students found the materials difficult, average students would be overwhelmed by them. Redirecting the materials towards a slightly higher grade level seemed quite sensible. The second reason for refocusing the materials was the confused state of the junior high school and, particularly, "social studies" in the junior high school.

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES

The junior high school, originally conceived in the early 1900's in America, had grown in a crazy-quilt pattern of disorganization: poor administration, poor materials and a staff wholly unprepared for the singular psychological qualities of adolescents (Nelson, 1974).

The curriculum of the junior high was more often than not, merely the high school curriculum "shoved" down to the junior high level. This might seem absurd, but there was some method in this madness. The lack of textbooks at the junior high level necessitated such a move. The high school texts were simply used at a slower rate or at a shallower level (Benet, 1926, p. 59).
Thus the acute shortage of texts and the relative youth of the junior high as an institution made an experimental series seem quite timely. In addition the Committee on Social Studies of the National Education Association (NEA, 1916) had broken with American Historical Association traditions and recommended geography (with some European History) in grade seven, American history in grade eight and political, economic and vocational civics in grade nine. By 1919 these recommendations had become the most popular offering for the junior high school (Douglass, 1956 and Briggs, 1919), yet no national series and few local materials truly met these recommendations.

Rugg realized then that if he could provide a well-written, all-encompassing series of social studies materials, it had an excellent chance of being adopted almost immediately by schools across the country.

Rugg had examined the contemporary curriculum in history, geography and civics with the following questions in mind: (Rugg, 1923)

(1) Does the present curriculum treat adequately the pressing industrial, social and political problems of the day?
(2) Are problems of government adequately treated by histories and civics books which pay chief attention to political affairs?
(3) Do the new school histories pay more attention to industrial and social matters than the older ones did?
(4) Do social science textbooks furnish backgrounds rich enough for constructive interpretation?
(5) Are social science materials so organized as to give thorough practice in deliberation?
(6) Does the present division of social science materials into separate subjects aid or hamper the teacher and the pupil?
(7) What dominates our social science instruction: reading about life or participation in life activities?

Rugg answered an emphatic “no” to questions one, two, four and five, and an equally emphatic “yes” to question three. The answers to questions six and seven were equally obvious before Rugg “answered” them. He then set out to expedite these important matters. Rugg certainly saw personal gain as a possibility in this venture but more than that, he saw his materials as a vehicle for thinking, creative world citizens.

DEVELOPING THE SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS 1921-22

Rugg and his new team put together nearly a thousand pages dealing with contemporary problems such as immigration and population, industry and business, municipal, state and national governments (Rugg, 1941, p. 206). These materials were used at the Lincoln School in the junior high grades
during the school year 1921-22. By the middle of that year it became obvious that implementing their plan in public schools would be impossible as long as they continued to use mimeographed materials. Rugg summed up the shortcomings by saying that "They were hard to read and generally uninteresting. With them clear pictures, photographs and other illustrations were out of the question. Public school experimental work required large editions, also impossible with mimeographing" (Rugg, 1941, p. 207).

Rugg then proposed the printing of experimental editions for selected public schools. A budget was prepared and presented to Otis Caldwell, the Director of Lincoln School, and funds were then solicited from two large foundations. The requests for funding were denied. Rugg then suggested duplicating a technique that he and John Roscoe Clark had used in Chicago with their algebra materials. Rugg would contact school personnel (superintendents and teachers) that he knew from Illinois, Chicago and Teachers College and try to get them to finance the project. These persons would be asked if they would subscribe for enough copies to supply one experimental class at each school. In Chicago, Rugg and Clark had had sixty school people cooperating with them. Now Rugg solicited support from five times that number—three hundred superintendents, principals and teachers in public and private schools.

In the spring of 1922, Rugg sent out a short mimeographed announcement of a proposed general social science course for the junior high school. Since nothing had yet been written or printed, Rugg asked for cooperation, sight unseen. He simply described his ideas of truly combining all the social sciences, said he would write and publish the materials and that they would be in the form of pamphlets, probably eight per year per class.

Most of the school personnel solicited were former students of Rugg and they were terribly excited by his proposal, if one can judge by the response that he received. The orders poured in, many with the caveat that the pamphlets would be taken only if all would be shipped, pamphlet by pamphlet, on time. By June, Rugg had actual orders for four thousand copies of each of the pamphlets (Rugg, 1941, p. 208).

Rugg and his team, which now consisted of Earle Rugg, Emma Schweppe and Marie Gulbransen (a former student and assistant at Chicago) had just three months to produce the promised material. The labor was divided with Harold writing and Earle doing research, documenting material and preparing suggestions for teachers. Marie Gulbransen revised and read proof. As Earle recalled,

We wrote 2200 pages and printed it in Yonkers, New York during the year 1922-23. Harold and I wrote rough drafts, then a trained editorial worker, Marie Gulbransen, rewrote it for printing. She averaged fifteen pages per day (including Saturday and Sunday) to
the printer and sometimes we were barely a day ahead of her. I wrote exercises, tests and the like in the print shop. We lived there at the time. We also handled the shipping, but the volume was so great that Harold finally hired a man to ship the pamphlets (E. Rugg, 1969).

Harold also recalled this chaotic scramble in much calmer, retrospective tones, “The first pamphlets were sent by the end of the summer (on time) to the cooperating schools. Thereafter every two months they received another” (Rugg, 1941, p. 209). Because of school requests for fewer items, the number of pamphlets was changed from eight per class to four per class per year. In the spring of 1923, Rugg began planning for the next year utilizing, to a certain extent, the feedback from the cooperating schools.

Rugg’s Social Science Pamphlets (Rugg 1922) had ostensibly been built around the thoughts and writings of “the frontier thinkers” on what he referred as the five frontiers:

- the educational frontier—studying and building the story of man and his changing society
- the social frontier—the study of man and his culture
- the personal frontier—the study of the organic life of the living creature
- the psychological frontier—the psychology of man and his changing society and the study of his methods of inquiry and work, especially the creative act
- the esthetic frontier—the study of man’s statement of his view of life

By basing his curriculum on these frontiers, Rugg felt that his curriculum would succeed where others had failed in adequately dealing with the pressing problems of the day (Rugg, 1923, p. 1-24).

Rugg sought to explore the first frontier, but found it impossible without knowing tools from the other four, although he acknowledged that he was not adept with them when writing the pamphlets. In order to borrow meaningfully, with design (Rugg’s legacy from engineering), from these other frontiers, Rugg realized that he needed an increase in two things, time and work force. Harold and Earle saw the project as being improved and shaped over a three year experimental period. This longer amount of time would, it was hoped, improve on what Rugg noted as shortcomings.

Each pamphlet had to be longer, and a vast amount of research had to be done on a score of phases of the local culture which we had not touched before. The materials had to be much better organized and written better, or perhaps I should merely say in good form. That they were not in the first edition is a certainty (Rugg, 1941, p. 217).
In order to do the additional research that Rugg deemed essential he needed a greatly expanded staff. From the sale of the Social Science Pamphlets, Rugg had set aside a research fund of approximately $100,000 (Rugg, 1941, p. 218). He borrowed from this fund in order to pay his new workers. Most of them used their work with Rugg as the basis for doctoral dissertations, but none of them chose Rugg as their major adviser, although he received profuse acknowledgement in their dissertations. Rugg was difficult to work for and, although a conscientious teacher, does not seem to have gained fame as an extremely interested adviser (Hockett, 1974, and Redefer, 1974). Money was very scarce at Teachers College at that time and Rugg managed to hire an incredibly well-versed but impecunious staff. The Research associates and their years with Rugg were:

Table 1: Rugg's Research Associates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earle Rug</td>
<td>1921-23</td>
<td>Chester O. Mathews</td>
<td>1925-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Galloway*</td>
<td>1923-26</td>
<td>Helen M. Lynd</td>
<td>1926-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John N. Washburne</td>
<td>1923-26</td>
<td>James E. Mendenhall</td>
<td>1926-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyman Meltzer</td>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>Louise Krueger*</td>
<td>1926-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Jockett</td>
<td>1924-27</td>
<td>Lawrence F. Shaffer</td>
<td>1926-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal Billings</td>
<td>1924-27</td>
<td>Bertha M. Rugg*</td>
<td>1926-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These did not write dissertations. Mendenhall wrote his on spelling errors. Lynd wrote hers with her husband—the famous study of “Middletown.”

The staff's assignments were divided up. Rugg contended that the research tasks were amalgamated into the second edition of the pamphlets. This was unlikely since some of the dissertations upon which results were based, were not begun until the second edition was being issued. What is more probable is the assertion of John Hockett.

The second edition, written largely by Mrs. Woods (Elizabeth Galloway Woods), was prepared more or less simultaneously with the studies. Dr. Rugg, of course, went over Mrs. Woods' material and rewrote when he deemed it advisable. It is my opinion that the influence of the studies on the content and organization of the
second edition was informal. It was Rugg's hope that the influence on the published edition [by Ginn] would be much more direct (Hockett, 1974).

Thus, many of Rugg's assertions of a totally scientific determination of curricular content were just not so, although he did later concede this. "'Scientific' (Rugg's quote) validation of concepts and generalizations were made, as far as possible'" (Rugg, 1941, p. 220). Instead what the team sought to do was maintain a critical attitude towards the reliability of their sources, using only factually documented materials. They tried to portray with fidelity, "...current and earlier modes of living by utilizing the statistics of social life and the judgement of frontier thinkers. Whatever numbers of similar identities could be found, these were tabulated and classified in frequency distributions and rank orders" (Rugg, 1941, p. 220).

The design of the course was to provide at least one-half the time for individual work while combining that with a group method of using the new materials. The general direction of the work was to be in the teacher's hand, but the responsibility for the class hour would be shared (Rugg, 1923, p. 191).

GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF ORGANIZATION

The content concerns of the Rugg materials were centered around certain guiding principles that Rugg had distilled from the frontier thinkers (Rugg, 1934). The first was a focus on modern cultures. Rugg discussed the nature of culture, three types of culture (based largely on armchair anthropologists like Lewis Henry Morgan), historical concepts of cultural change, the role of industrialism and central revolutionary concepts. All of this culminated in his thesis concerning the transformation of culture of every people that adopted industrialism.

Another guiding principle was concern with loyalties and attitudes from a philosophical point of view. He called this historical ethics. Rugg sought to have students clarify their own rationale for loyalties and decision making.

The final guiding principle was the synthesis of knowledge—social studies.

Rugg's methodology for introducing this content was again loosely based on the studies of his team. The dramatic episode, a planned recurrence of key concepts, practice in the skills of generalizing and tolerance building were the chief vehicles by which Rugg hoped a new public mind would be created (Rugg, 1934, p. 32).

With these thoughts in mind the Rugg team members set about collecting data and from this collection the dissertations emerged. Earle Rugg's *Curriculum Studies in the Social Sciences and Citizenship* was an
investigation into citizenship values. Using the data collected for the pamphlets, Earle "...endeavored to discover every impersonal or objective study of the value of the social science citizenship curriculum" (E. Rugg, 1928, p. 111). Hyman Meltzer did a study of the nature and development of children's social concepts. By understanding this development, Meltzer hoped to make important situations of contemporary life more intelligible to students (Meltzer, 1925).

Undoubtedly, Rugg was a spellbinder to these younger workers who were happy to toil with such a prominent educator. John Hockett wrote "He was ten years older than I and more experienced, and I greatly admired his almost unlimited energy, his enthusiasm and his many abilities. Working with him was a pleasure, but at times, it would be difficult because of his several enthusiasms and distractions" (Hockett, 1974).

C. O. Mathews and Laurence F. Shaffer followed Meltzer's technique of comparing the results of tests to students who had used the Rugg materials to those students who had not done so. Shaffer focused on the student's abilities to interpret political cartoons (Shaffer, 1930), while Mathews examined other "non-conceptual" materials: (1) episodes, (2) descriptions, (3) newspaper articles, (4) bar graphs, (5) line graphs, (6) circular graphs, (7) time lines, (8) pictograms, (9) maps (Mathews, 1926). Since the Rugg materials were the source for all of the cartoons and other non-conceptual materials, it seemed a foregone conclusion that those who had used the Rugg materials would test higher than those who had not. The most important findings of these studies was the determination of how an average student would handle the Rugg materials. The studies of Mathews and Shafer would be useful in Rugg's next revision of his materials.

John Hockett's dissertation, *A Determination of the Major Social Problems of American Life* (Hockett, 1927), was a vital key in Rugg's structure of determining materials. The Rugg team used selected critical books of social analysis and news columns to determine these major social problems (Hockett, 1927, p. 3).

A list of "frontier thinkers" and their books was built up by sending a letter to 150 selected persons, requesting a short list of books with "the most penetrating insight and critical analyses of contemporary life and problems," (Rugg to Butler, 1924) in particular fields, e.g. economics, law, sociology, the press, international affairs, immigration, geography, anthropology and the field of artistic expression. Rugg explained in the letter that his team would study the books cited for "the purpose of analyzing contemporary life" (Rugg to Butler, 1924). The books were categorized and ranked by the team after receiving the various lists. Hockett then read the selected books and compiled a list of the issues and problems contained therein.
For current events, the Rugg team used Literary Digest and the editorials of *Outlook, The Independent, New Republic* and *Nation*. These magazines were quite liberal in political and social stance. By using only them Rugg's team produced a highly skewed interpretation of American society.

Neal Billings' research (Billings, 1929) as part of the Rugg team resulted in 888 social studies generalizations that were broken up into 69 groups. Billings' work aided the field of social studies by determining an organizational structure of the social studies and is one of the first 'competency oriented' studies.'

The results of the Rugg team's studies were not immediately incorporated into the development of the second edition of the *Social Science Pamphlets*. Nevertheless the team members were integrally involved with the production of that edition as they worked on writing, collating, printing and shipping. Although the team was larger and more organized, the pace was still frenetic. Sometimes the researches wrote all day, printed and packed at night and then literally passed out in their beds. Rather than be satisfied with any of the old writing, they rewrote everything. Rugg recalled,

> We scrapped the nearly nineteen hundred old pamphlet plates which I owned out at the Gazette Press in Yonkers and replaced them with some thirty-three hundred plates of the new description of society (Rugg, 1941, p. 220).

The second edition was written and four times a year for three years, a new and enlarged pamphlet was "sent to the cooperating schools; in all about one-hundred thousand copies a year—the seventh grade ones in 1923-24, the eighth grade ones in 1925-26, the ninth-grade ones in 1925-26" (Rugg, 1941, p. 221).

Rugg somehow managed to find time to edit Part II of the 22nd NSSE Yearbook which appeared in 1923 (Rugg, 1923). One chapter in that yearbook was on the *Social Science Pamphlets* and this certainly aided in their promotion. Rugg noted that "the nationwide reading and discussion of these yearbooks stimulated interest in the social sciences and brought many school men to cooperate financially and otherwise in the pamphlet enterprise" (Rugg, 1941, p. 217).

**A BRIEF LOOK AT CONTENT**

Through two editions of the *Social Science Pamphlets* and two of the hardcover series based on the pamphlets, the general format and topics of the Rugg materials remained relatively constant. A list of titles of the book titles appears in Table 2. Reading through the list one is immediately struck by the topical emphasis of the series and the concern with industrialism in the modern world. These initial reactions are borne out in detailed
Table 2: The Rugg Social Studies Materials

Social Science Pamphlets

Grade 7
Town and City Life
Resources, Industries and Cities
Industries and Trade Which Bind Nations Together (Parts I and II)

Grade 8
Explorers and Settlers Westward Bound
The Mechanical Conquest of America
America’s March Toward Democracy (Part I 1607-1865)
America’s March Toward Democracy (Part II Since the Civil War)

Grade 9
Americanizing Our Foreign Born
Resources and Industries in a Machine World
Waste and Conservation of America’s Resource
How Nations Live Together

Man and His Changing Society

Grade 7
An Introduction to American Civilization
Changing Civilizations in the Modern World

Revised Edition
Our Country and Our People
Changing Countries and Changing Peoples

Grade 8
A History of American Civilization
A History of American Government and Culture

The Conquest of America
America’s March Toward Democracy

Grade 9
An Introduction to the Problems of American Culture
Changing Governments and Changing Cultures

Citizenship and Civic Affairs
America Rebuilds
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examination of the materials. At the end of each chapter was an extensive bibliography for use by teachers and pupil alike. Rugg felt that the more views on a topic that were presented, the more critical a student could be. Thus, the exhaustive bibliographies.

The first pamphlet, "Town and City Life," was concerned with the quality of life in our country and in each student's community. This was essentially an active community civics book which forced the students out into the community to gather their own data from community resources. Rugg's biases, at times, are blatant. Rugg contrasts the costs of war with educational costs. This type of social action inquiry is indicative of the tone and focus of the Rugg materials. The pamphlets had many photographs, a rare commodity in textbooks at that time. Certain themes predominate—the process of providing for an industrial nation, the need for interdependence in the modern world, the development of the culture of humans, a constant concern with skill development—maps, globes, decisionmaking, generalizations. Rugg also had certain blatant omissions—in none of his books does he recount battles in a war. He did sketch the underlying causes that led to war as well as describe the devastation that war brought to an area, but he eschewed totally descriptive accounts of battles. Rugg was not a pacifist, however. He simply abhored the glory given to such holocaustic activities. The gruesome accounts of each foray served no social or personal need for the citizen Rugg envisioned. Thus, the omission of war descriptions.

THE RUGG HARDCOVER SERIES

The pamphlet work ended in June of 1926. Rugg reassessed the time and money that he had spent on his project over the previous five years. Rugg saw an opportunity to reap greater financial rewards and to take much of the responsibility off his own shoulders by publishing his materials through a commercial publisher (Rugg, 1941, p. 222). Rugg went to a fellow Dartmouth alumnus who "had long been my friend and a kind of elder brother adviser to me," (Rugg, 1941, p. 223) Henry H. Hilton. Hilton was a Ginn and Company partner and he, along with Charles H. Thurber, another partner, approved a comprehensive publishing plan. This plan was to include social studies from grade three to grade twelve, although a specific date was not set for the elementary school or senior high school series to be completed. The other partners approved the plan and, in the fall of 1926, an agreement was drawn. Rugg was satisfied with this arrangement since it assured publication of his entire proposed social studies series and took the publishing responsibilities out of his hands. Ginn was pleased since it was able to step into a series that was already immensely popular in selected schools across the country. The expectation of huge profits on the part of both parties was great, to say the least, and certainly not unfounded.
During the next three years Rugg rewrote the Social Science Pamphlets with the aid of his team. Hockett said that Rugg did almost all of the rewriting. The changes, though, appear to be more in organization than in substantive content.

At about this time Rugg’s infatuation with the creative arts began to “impose” on his social studies interests. As John Hockett recalled,

While the social studies project was underway, he discovered the world of creative arts and read and experienced extensively in this field...some of us working for him feared that enthusiasm for these latter areas might result in abandonment of the social studies project but fortunately, this did not happen (Hockett, 1974).

Rugg was not spending all of his time on the social studies revision, but he was putting in quite an effort. The books were all being rewritten. In addition, he wrote a separate teacher's guide to be used with each volume (now two in each grade), and a pupil’s workbook for each volume. Both supplements were written with the assistance of James E. Mendenhall.7 These two components were, to Rugg, the most important part of the materials. The larger volumes he referred to as reading books, not textbooks, and were not to be used in a lock step manner.

The revised edition of the pamphlets, now in hard cover form, was published and distributed to the schools in August of 1929. Every six months the next book in the series came off the presses. The last one, Changing Governments and Changing Cultures (Rugg, 1932), was published on January 1, 1932 as the second volume for the ninth grade. This entire series was also revised, partly to allay some of the criticism that arose charging the books with un-American views. However, this charge was not the only reason for the revision. The crux of Rugg's material was their contemporary nature. Revision then was constantly necessary and planned to maintain the topical quality of much of the material. This Rugg has done from the start of the social studies enterprise. Rugg claimed that the junior high series was “systematically reconstructed to fit the drastic world changes of the 1930’s” (Rugg, 1941, p. 43). Undoubtedly more revision was done in an attempt to ameliorate criticism that arose in the late 1930’s and exploded in the early 1940’s. (This is described in Bagenstos’ article in this issue.) Had the sales of the volumes not plummeted, Rugg would most likely have continued to revise them.

The revised editions of the textbooks appeared from 1936-40 with some title changes, in addition to their being brought up to date. In between the revisions, Rugg, in collaboration with Louise Krueger4 of the Walt Whitman School in New York, finally published the elementary school social studies series which consisted of eight volumes with workbooks. Rugg
and Krueger's approach to the series was described by their publishers as "correct and interesting storytelling" (Lawler, 1938, p. 273). This series never "got off the ground." The junior high textbook furor overshadowed the elementary school series and the name Rugg on the title was too controversial for many school districts. Also, many school people disliked Rugg's "reverse concentricity" in format. The preferred expanding communities approach of Paul Hanna began with the family and then built outward to the larger world. Rugg rejected this and reversed it, beginning with the universe, the solar system and the early earth. Read today, these books remain interesting.

The addition of Ginn and Company to the Rugg team had another asset for Rugg and his series. Now other house authors could write of the vitality of the Rugg series and promote it. Burdette R. Buckingham's *The Rugg Course in the Classroom* (1935) sketched the philosophy of the course, the psychology of the course, its proposed outcomes and discussed experiments using it.

Rugg was not reluctant to push his own materials. He wrote numerous articles in various journals promoting the utilization of his techniques and products (Rugg, 1923; Rugg and Hockett, 1925; Rugg, 1926, 1927). He also published a monograph which was intended to explain and encourage the use of the Rugg materials (Rugg, 1934). The success of all these promotions can be partly seen in the revenues that Rugg received from the series, set out in Table 3.

**RUGG AND THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES**

It was stated in the beginning of this paper that distinct parallels could be made between Rugg and many new social studies ideas of the 1960's. It would be presumptuous, however, to credit Rugg with the inspiration for these same ideas. What would be more realistic is to note the similarities between Rugg and the new social studies concepts. Certain trends have often been used to characterize the new social studies. Two very common ones are a concern with values and the use of problem solving or inquiry. Rugg's materials were the most inquiry oriented social studies series produced until the new social studies. Rugg's use of values was limited to inquiry discussions but it was still superior to most social studies texts used until the 1960's.

Rugg spent more time on each of the social sciences than most texts developed before 1960. He was one of the rare proponents of anthropology as a social science and was extremely forceful in advocating an understanding of a cultural point of view. This may not seem earth shaking but if one examines texts prior to 1960 one will be hard pressed to find the word or the concepts of anthropology present.
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Table 3: Summary of Receipts and Expenditures in Connection with the Sale of Social Science Pamphlets, 1922-32

(Taken from Harold Rugg’s annual reports to the United States Collector of Internal Revenue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Prior to</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>$ 7,855.42</td>
<td>10,276.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>30,401.09</td>
<td>27,840.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>39,292.85</td>
<td>38,306.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>44,479.46</td>
<td>44,214.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>63,803.51</td>
<td>60,349.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>55,197.10</td>
<td>59,617.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>49,811.22</td>
<td>53,289.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>36,141.46</td>
<td>33,491.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>16,801.76</td>
<td>18,916.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1,970.35</td>
<td>14,631.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>1,088.14</td>
<td>12,763.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$346,942.36  $378,697.52

Deficit (January 1, 1933) $ 31,755.16

From *That Men May Understand*, page 223.

The use of case studies—Rugg had dramatic episodes—is another characteristic common to new social studies that virtually disappeared after Rugg. Rugg presented a great deal of raw social science data for student discussion, a technique eschewed by many in the 1930's, 40's and 50's. Most of the data were utilized as part of the practice of skills, a very important focus of social studies today. Map and inquiry skills were augmented by many activities, one of which is almost exactly like Portsville from the High School Geography Project.

Rugg was obviously limited by the lack of media at that time but his texts made the most of maps, charts and photographs. They were probably the most interesting texts of that time.
CONCLUSIONS

The Rugg social studies materials were unique in their formation, their promotion, their organization and their content. Rugg had managed to meet a series of continuous deadlines as the pamphlets were written and received by schools. At times the material showed the strain of those deadlines, but overall the series was a model for other curriculum developers to follow. And indeed they did just that. The content of the Rugg series, as mentioned above, broke new ground and that is reflected in many elementary and junior high school social studies materials, even today. Rugg’s concern with objective research as a basis for curriculum development has been almost universally adopted.

Despite all this, it must be noted that Rugg’s expertise in any one social science was not deep and when experts in various fields examined or reviewed his books, they were usually found lacking in the reviewer’s own discipline. Edith Parker, a geographer, said Rugg did not know anything about geography (Parker, 1930). Bessie Pierce, a historian, said Rugg’s ideas of history were almost non-existent in his textbooks (Pierce, 1930). A. C. Krey, another historian, did not want Rugg’s books in the library at the University of Minnesota (Wesley, 1974). Not that Rugg’s organization or choice of issues was poor. A major weakness however was the failure to use a panel of experts to create a new and better curriculum. Rugg was a strong enough person not to be cowed by the social scientists and with him as chief architect, incomparable materials might have been produced. Nevertheless, the conceptual structure of Rugg’s materials was excellent.

The process of curriculum development practiced by the Rugg team is one of the first detailed examples of how a curriculum is created. Theoretical “textbook” models pale when compared to the actual problems that had to be (and still have to be) overcome by curriculum developers in the social studies. Knowledge of the development of the Rugg series gives social studies educators a better sense of past and a better understanding of present problems. This will undoubtedly lead to a stronger social studies field in the future.

FOOTNOTES

1Harold Rugg was not a complete stranger to junior high school social studies. In 1916 he had co-authored with William C. Bagley, The Content of American History as Taught in the Seventh and Eighth Grades.
It isn’t clear which ones. Harold did not say and Earle did not elaborate on his tape. John Hockett did not know since he had joined the team in 1924.

Cited numerous places in Rugg’s writings from 1920-1950. See e.g., p. 214 of That Men May Understand.

This letter may be seen in the Columbia University Special Collections located in Butler Library. It is similar in form to the other letters sent. Rugg also sent out thank you notes after receiving the list.

Though not called that, competencies can be philosophically traced as far back as Franklin Bobbitt.


Mendenhall later edited with Paul Hanna, Building America, a monthly social studies supplement on major social issues.

At least one person who knew Louise Krueger found it impossible to believe that she could have written anything in the books. The late Fred Redefer, former president of the Progressive Education Association, claimed that her brother, Marvin, was the actual co-author. Rugg later made Louise Krueger his second wife.

See The Social Science Pamphlets, Resources, Industries and Cities, p. 312 for details on this.
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DECISION-MAKING IN SIMULATION GAMES

Ronald L. VanSickle
University of Georgia

The rapid diffusion of instructional simulation gaming throughout the nation’s schools has been motivated by many expectations. Teachers anticipate increased student motivation, greater interest in the subject matter, improved decision-making abilities, better interpersonal relationships, clearer understanding of complex processes, and greater subject matter acquisition through more intensive participation (Wentworth and Lewis, 1973). Research during the past decade has supported belief in some of these expectations and cast serious doubt on others. One of the most widely held expectations for instructional gaming is that students will become more effective decision-makers as a result of playing simulation games (Gordon, 1970). In a review of seventy-eight social studies simulation games, Van Sickle (1975) observed that seventy-seven percent focused on decision-making processes.

Teaching decision-making skillfulness has long been a major goal for social educators. Social educators with a disciplinary orientation are concerned with decision-making as it relates to scholarly thinking or “inquiry” (Morrisett, 1971). Others more concerned with a citizenship theme for social education emphasize the need to make decisions in public life (Hunt and Metcalf, 1968; Newmann and Oliver, 1970). If simulation games, already popular among social studies teachers can be shown to help participants learn to make more adequate decisions, then one of the principal justifications for their use will be soundly established.

Given that many instructional game developers and users are interested in improving decision-making through the use of games, we need to know how well games help participants reach that goal. Surprisingly, relatively little game research and evaluation has attended to this question. The available evidence does not clearly support or refute the hypothesis that instructional games lead to increased decision-making capacity (Wentworth and Lewis, 1973). Certainly, the data are limited enough that the hypothesis cannot be safely discounted (Greenblat, 1973). The primary purpose of this paper is to examine a variety of research and evaluation efforts to identify clues which might help answer the question: Under what conditions, if any, can decision-making skills be learned in a simulation game context?

In order to design any kind of instruction adequately, the variables which affect learning must be known. Due to a lack of this kind of knowledge, a major problem with much game research and development has been the inability of researchers and developers to specify precisely their
instructional treatments. Consequently, the interpretability and generalizability of the findings of research and development efforts are restricted; the inquiries are essentially case study evaluations of particular educational games. The product of this analysis will be the identification of variables likely to have an effect on participants' decision-making skills. A set of research hypotheses will be stated which, when tested, will clarify the conditions under which gaming can improve participants' decision-making skills.

DEFINITIONS

In order to clarify the scope of this analysis, the concept of "instructional simulation game" needs definition. "Game" means a setting in which participants make choices, implement those choices, and receive consequences for those choices in an effort to achieve given objectives. Explicit rules govern the choices and resources available to the participants, the actions and interactions of the participants, the relationships between participants' choices and consequences, the consequences of one participant's choices for other participants, and the conditions under which the given objectives are achieved. A game is "instructional" when some aspects of a game's substantive or procedural framework are regarded as worth teaching and learning. In this case, the aspect of interest is the decision-making process. The instructional game is a "simulation" if the rules refer to an empirical model of reality, such as a political process or an ecological system.

There is little consensus in the literature regarding what to call the intellectual skill of decision-making. Among the labels and their somewhat different conceptualizations are decision-making, case analysis, problem-solving, and critical thinking. They all appear to involve the analysis, synthesis, and evaluation levels of the cognitive taxonomy (Bloom, 1956). Some conceptualize the phenomenon as the invention or discovery of complex sets of rules which can be used to solve a class of problems (Edwards, 1976). Others break the phenomenon into a series of discrete steps which a decision-maker follows. Bobula and Page (1973) suggest the following: (1) clarify the relevance or irrelevance of issues; (2) identify the most important issues in the problem; (3) establish a sequence of steps to follow in solving the particular problem; (4) collect relevant data; (5) interpret the data; (6) identify and avoid unnecessary actions; (7) select a decision and implement it; (8) collect data on the effects of the action and make corrections if necessary; (9) continue to monitor the situation and apply available knowledge to improve the situation; and (10) review the process to identify the most effective decisions and ways of implementing them.
A key feature of the various conceptualizations and of most instructional games based on empirical models of the world is the requirement that participants make predictions about the future stages of the system. This is usually done by participants making judgments about the likely consequences of alternative actions and then selecting the alternative they believe will most effectively help them reach their objective. Jankowicz (1973) thinks of this in terms of model building. Participants at first have only vague ideas about the model which a given game simulates. Through the play of the game, the participants try to assess the nature of the simulation model, predict the probable effects of alternative actions, select action alternatives consistent with their goals, assess the effects of their actions, revise their conception of the simulation model, again predict the probable effects of alternative actions, and continue systematically to repeat the process. The end product, if the participants are successful, is a clear conception of the simulation’s model and an ability to make effective decisions in the context of the model and in the real world to which the model refers. This process of empirically testing hypotheses about the effectiveness of alternative actions and of conceptualizing a model of reality seems to be the essence of what people refer to when they speak of decision-making skill or problem solving ability in relation to instructional games. For our purposes, “decision-making skill” will refer to the ability to use a systematic process of predicting the probable consequences of alternative actions and selecting action alternatives consistent with given goals.

VARIABLES AND HYPOTHESES

Several variables which might facilitate or impede the development of decision-making skill will now be examined. Among these are the differential effects of making decisions in groups or as individuals, the effects of discussion during and after game play, the involvement of the teacher or the lack of it, and the use of decision records. Pacing, the similarity between the presentation of problems and data in games and real life, the acquisition of essential concepts, and problems related to content specificity will also be considered. Finally, the specificity of the decision-making procedure and the use of feedback regarding decision consequences will be discussed.

Group and Individual Decision-Making

The quality of decisions in an instructional game are likely to vary considerably if participants make their decisions as individuals or as groups. Piper (1974) observed that decisions arrived at by group consensus or
arrived at by a group supplying information to a single decision-maker prior to a decision were more correct than individuals making the same decisions alone. It was also observed that groups frequently made more correct decisions than any of the same participants had been able to make alone prior to the group decisions. It can be hypothesized that more accurate decision-making will take place in groups. An important question is: Does group decision-making in a game, rather than individual decision-making, help participants learn to make decisions as individuals more effectively regarding a class of problems? In other words, will the decision-making contexts during and after the game be similar enough to result in an effective transfer of learning?

The following hypotheses about group and individual decision-making need testing. Simulation game participants who make decisions as a group rather than as individuals are more likely:

1. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context when they decide as individuals; and
2. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context when they decide as individuals.

Discussion

Some researchers suggest different effects depending on whether structured discussion is used during or after game play. Structured discussion simply refers to the requirement that participants analyze a situation by using a set of analytical questions posed either by the game materials or the game director. It is widely believed by game developers and users that post-game discussions or debriefings are important to consolidate learning and to transfer learning to related contexts. For learning intellectual skills, the post-game discussion of a single play of a game may not be particularly helpful. Chartier (1972) found no higher cognitive learning gains when comparing simulation games with and without post-game discussion. On the other hand, a number of studies have found significant improvements in intellectual skills in games involving structured discussions throughout the game play or between multiple plays of a game. Lindblad (1973) observed that sixth grade students involved in a career decision simulation game which included periodic structured discussions later used a more thorough, systematic process for making personal career decisions. Fletcher (1971) observed that an analytical discussion of previous game plays led to more effective decision-making in future games. Kidder and Guthrie (1972) found that structured discussion of game performance between plays of a behavior modification game resulted in better
performance on a skill test when compared to a treatment of post-game
discussion only. In business management games, McKenney (1962) and
Raia (1966) found improved decision-making ability after participants
played management games involving structured, analytical discussion of
strategy and tactics throughout the games. In a consumer education game
utilizing discussion in a similar way, Anderson (1970) also observed
improved evaluation of credit sources as a result of game play. In contrast
to this set of findings, Livingston (1971) did not find improved
decision-making even though structured discussion did take place
throughout the game. Most of the available evidence supports the
hypothesis that structured discussions throughout game play tend to lead to
more effective decision-making. However, some of the cited researchers did
not set out to test this hypothesis.

Related to the use of discussion, two other variables are potentially
important. In studies finding improved intellectual skill performance
associated with structured discussion throughout game play, Kidder and
Guthrie (1972), Fletcher (1971), McKenney (1962), and Anderson (1970)
noted the active involvement of the teacher in those analytical session. In
other studies, the nature of the teachers' involvement was not clearly
indicated. Fletcher (1971) compared decision-making effectiveness in
treatments involving the presence and absence of written decision records
made by the participants. Participants who analyzed their written records of
prior game performance performed in the game and learned the
problem-solving strategies more effectively than participants who had no
written records. Fletcher strongly recommended the inclusion of behavior
records and a sequence of game plays separated by analytical discussions of
the records.

The following hypotheses about discussion need testing. Simulation game
participants who engage in structured discussion intermittently throughout
game play rather than post-game discussion only are more likely:

3. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation
game and (b) the real-life context; and
4. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the
simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Simulation game participants who engage in intermittent structured
discussions with teacher involvement rather than no teacher involvement
throughout game play are more likely:

5. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation
game and (b) the real-life context; and
6. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Simulation game participants who analyze written rather than remembered records of their prior decisions and consequences in structured discussions intermittently throughout game play are more likely:

7. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
8. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Pacing and Group Size

A difficult variable to handle is the time schedule or pacing of an instructional game. Cohen and Rhenman (1961) hypothesized that there is an inverse relationship between the quality of game participants' decision-making and the intensity of time pressure they experience. McKenney (1962) observed in an evaluation of a business game that student decision-making was poorer when the need to make a quick decision was urgent. This finding is critical because a number of developers recommend that participants be pressured because that is realistic in the real-life analogue of the simulation game. A conflict arises at this point between maintaining the fidelity of the simulation model and effectively teaching the desired decision-making skills. Perhaps throughout the play of a game the time pressure can be increased as students become more proficient decision-makers. By the later stages of the game, this element would meaningfully represent the real-life analogue. The time needed to implement any given decision-making procedure will probably have to be determined empirically for different categories of participants.

The problem of pacing is further complicated by the number of players in a decision-making group. In a given period of time for making a decision, the data collection, data interpretation, and consequence analysis should be appropriate for the number of players. Too few players could result in sloppy decision-making; too many players could result in not enough decision-making to go around with a consequent lack of practice. Appropriate group size will vary depending on the complexity of the decision-making procedure and the simulation model.

The following hypotheses about pacing and group size need testing. Simulation game participants who have sufficient rather than insufficient time to implement all the steps of a decision-making procedure are more likely:
9. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
10. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Simulation game participants who make decisions in groups where there are decision-making tasks for each member rather than for only some members are more likely:

11. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
12. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

### Similarity of Problem and Data Presentation

Another way that decision-making skill learning might be facilitated or impeded is the way the problem to be solved and the relevant data are presented. Intellectual skills learned in a simulation game might not transfer to real-life settings or even artificial testing settings if the contexts are too dissimilar. Perhaps students must encounter the problem to be solved in the simulation game in much the same manner that it is encountered in real-life, not in a pre-game briefing session. Similarly, if data must be collected, then the data collection process probably must be analogous to the actual situation (McGuire, 1973; Jamieson, 1973). Thus, it can be hypothesized that intellectual skill learning will be maximized if the simulated decision-making context and procedure are closely parallel to the actual context and procedure. If this hypothesis is supported, there is an implicit threat to the usefulness of simulation games for some purposes. For example, suppose a student learns to evaluate foreign policy decisions as a simulated secretary of state but is confronted in real-life with evaluating such decisions based on television and newspaper accounts. Perhaps the learned foreign policy evaluation procedure will not be activated in the student even though he or she knows how to implement it.

The following hypotheses about the similarity of the simulation and real-life contexts need testing. Simulation game participants who encounter decision-making problems and data in ways closely analogous rather than nonanalogous to the real-life context are more likely:

13. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in the real-life context; and
14. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in the real-life context.
Content Specificity and Concept Learning

Another problem involves the degree to which decision-making processes are content specific. Fletcher (1971) questioned whether interpersonal and information-processing skills can be operationally defined independent of particular instructional games and particular decision-making contexts. In a series of medical diagnosis and treatment simulations, McGuire (1973) observed widely varying performance within individuals as they made decisions regarding a series of medical problems. An important research problem is whether decision-making processes can be taught which people can transfer to situations other than the specific one used as the training context.

Jamieson (1973) observed that transfer of learning takes place more readily when students transform and integrate their experiential learning into a conceptual structure. This necessary conceptualization probably does not occur in many cases. VanSickle (in press) found that requiring students to read about and repeatedly to use a set of evaluative concepts in a series of decision-making situations did not lead to adequate comprehension of the concepts. This suggests that if students are to use a given set of concepts in making decisions in a simulation game, then those concepts should be explicitly taught prior to the game play. Students should at least be able to differentiate between examples and nonexamples. This might seem obvious but very few game developers recommend such a procedure.

The following hypotheses about content specificity and concept learning need testing. Simulation game participants who learn before the game to differentiate between examples and nonexamples of key concepts utilized in a decision-making procedure are more likely than participants who do not adequately comprehend the concepts:

15. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
16. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Decision-Making Procedure Specificity and Feedback

The specificity of the decision-making procedure might also be an important variable determining whether participants can learn a decision-making procedure. In the previously cited survey of simulation game characteristics (VanSickle, 1975), it was observed that only twenty-seven percent of the games emphasizing decision-making required students to utilize explicit criteria in formulating their judgments. Without explicit guidelines to shape their behavior, it seems unlikely that
participants will make systematic judgments in the press of simulated events. A highly specified decision-making procedure can provide cues for the naive decision-maker so that he or she can be guided in the procedure's use until adequate learning has taken place (Jamieson, 1973). VanSickle's finding (in press) that a highly specific decision-making procedure did not lead to greater comprehension of the decision-making criteria, however, does not support the sufficiency of this condition. It may be that a highly specific decision-making procedure is a necessary but insufficient condition for teaching decision-making skills.

In addition to decision-making procedure specificity, the nature of the feedback which students receive after making decisions might determine the degree to which they learn to use a decision-making process. Fletcher's experience using behavioral records and intermittent structured discussion (1971) led him to conclude that game participants learn strategies better if they can analyze the consequences of their previous actions. A closely related factor is the nature of the feedback students receive after making decisions. When game participants receive explicit consequences from their decisions, it is usually in the form of game consequences (e.g., profits, influence points, troop casualties). Game performance may be improved by this information, but it is not clear that academic performance is necessarily improved. Participants may learn more from failing in the game context at particular points. Performance feedback alone could be misleading to participants in that case. Jankowicz (1973) recommends that participants predict what they believe the consequences of their actions will be. In addition to performance feedback, participants would receive data regarding the accuracy of their predictions. This could reward exploratory behavior and increase the efficiency with which students learn a game's model and the procedures with which they can make effective decisions.

The following hypotheses about decision-making procedure specificity and feedback need testing. Simulation game participants who are required to use a highly specified rather than a lowly specified or nonspecified decision-making procedure are more likely:

17. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
18. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.

Simulation game participants who receive predictive accuracy feedback regarding their game decisions in addition to game performance feedback are more likely:

19. To utilize a systematic decision-making procedure in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context; and
20. To predict accurately the consequences of alternative actions in (a) the simulation game and (b) the real-life context.
NECESSARY AND SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS

Whether simulation games can be used to teach decision-making skills effectively is an open question. A number of variables appear potentially important as determinants of such higher level learning. The key task of simulation game developers and researchers is to identify which of the variables, if any, have a significant impact on learning to make decisions more adequately. The hypotheses presented here are intended to suggest directions for that research. An important consideration for developers and researchers to keep in mind is the distinction between necessary and sufficient conditions for learning. A particular variable, such as highly specified decision-making procedure, may be necessary for decision-making skill learning to take place. However, it may be insufficient to bring about that effect without the addition of another factor, such as predictive accuracy feedback. In formulating a particular inquiry, the investigator should consider how to maximize the likelihood that a significant learning effect will be generated. This will involve several variables identified in this paper. Once some combination of factors is found which reliably produces the desired learning outcome, particular variables can be deleted or modified to see if they are critical. Research along these lines should clarify the value of simulation games in teaching decision-making skills and should enable educators to develop a more adequate operational definition of a well-designed instructional simulation game.
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RESPONSE TO JACK NELSON REVIEW OF

SKILLS IN CITIZEN ACTION*

Fred M. Newmann
University of Wisconsin, Madison

It is helpful to have Education for Citizen Action (1975) and Skills in Citizen Action (1977) reviewed together, for the latter was an effort to design a specific secondary program to teach the conception of citizenship developed in the former. I make no claim to have solved the important problems in this field, and I hope that reviews will help advance our thinking about the theory and practice of civic education. Unfortunately, the Nelson review (T.R.S.E., August, 1977) is no help.

Most important, Nelson failed to evaluate the 1977 book in terms of the authors' objectives. While he correctly described the "skills" book as "an attempt to provide practical assistance for implementing ideas expressed in the earlier volume," he did not focus on this challenge: that is, he did not offer a reasoned opinion on whether the proposed program would in fact help educators to increase students' ability to exert influence in public affairs.

Nelson's neglect of our objectives is illustrated in his repeated critique that the 1977 book is weak on rationale. I provided that rationale in the 1975 book which he evaluated rather favorably. Yet he faults the 1977 book: "Apparently, the view is that the school practitioners don't deserve, can't understand or shouldn't have a proper explanation of the bases on which the program rests." Quite the contrary. In the 1977 book, we acknowledged that

We give relatively slight attention to arguing why public secondary schools ought to place high priority on teaching citizen action skills. Such skills have not been accepted in academia or the schools at large as a central objective. However, the case has been made elsewhere from ethical, psychological and political perspectives, and has not been challenged in the literature (Preface, p. ii).

We not only referred readers to the 1975 book but offered in Chapter 1 a summary of its rationale. This approach in the 1977 book respects the ability and responsibility of practitioners to pursue scholarship independently.

*Skills in Citizen Action: An English-Social Studies Program for Secondary Schools is now available only from National Textbook Company, Niles Center Road, Skokie, Illinois, for $3.95 plus postage.
Nelson's review makes two criticisms of the abbreviated rationale in the 1977 book, but both points were discussed in the 1975 volume. He claims that we did not address the possible conflict among national interest, traditional representative democracy and ethical justification. In the 1975 book, however, I explained how the principle of consent of the governed can be justified ethically, based on the value of equality (p. 47) and also that "universal" ethical principles should take precedence in a conflict between them and other values, such as national interest (pp. 79-83).

In both books, we attempted to define the ability to exert influence in public affairs (1975, pp. 41-46; 1977, pp. 3-9) and cautioned readers that for both logical and ethical reasons one should not interpret this as the ability always to prevail with one's views. In our distinction between the ability to exert influence and the ability to win, Nelson finds a contradiction, but he does not explain this with reference to our words on the topic.

The ability to exert influence is the ability to produce effects in directions consistent with one's intentions, assuming that those intentions can be justified with reference to ethical principles. The ability to win is the ability to prevail over opponents, regardless of the ethical merit of one's intentions. In a controversy, it is logically impossible for everyone always to win, and ethically irresponsible to endorse this unconditionally as an educational goal. On the other hand, it is vital to teach citizens to pursue intentions which they can justify ethically and which they can act upon so as to exert influence consistent with those intentions. "Losers" in many controversies (e.g. third parties, special caucuses, public interest advocates) know they will "lose," but enter the fray for the purpose of exerting influence (raising issues, gaining organizational support). This conception of citizen participation is often obscured by the more publicized forms of superstar activism, but democracy and civic efficacy suffer through its neglect.

Nelson mentions quickly, in an isolated way, a number of specific criticisms, but takes comments out of context, does not develop his critique, and misrepresents our work. Here are five examples. He begins comments on the 1977 book with the inaccurate claim that "some of these ideas were conducted experimentally under a 1976 grant from the Rockefeller Family Fund." In the Preface we stated that "experimental programs like the one we propose do not (to our knowledge) exist" and that the 1976 grant provided only for the writing of the 1977 proposal. Nowhere did we claim that some of the ideas were conducted experimentally under the grant. Some of the ideas have been tried in various schools, but not under the auspices of this proposal.

He quotes our assumption that "if citizen participation is taken seriously it can enrich learning and life," and then dismisses it by noting that such a claim could be made for virtually any educational program. I would agree
that the claim can be broadly made, but he should not imply that we tried to justify our program on this claim. We did not. Far more complex justifications were presented in both the 1975 and 1977 books.

He quotes our statement, "the most desirable type of relationship between the citizen and the state is outlined in the structure of constitutional representative democracy" and asserts that this "seems to be a 'chosen people' conservative view that permits no inquiry." Our entire paragraph from which that was lifted follows:

We begin with a few assumptions. First, that the purpose of civic education as opposed, for example, to aesthetic, economic, or psychological education, is to teach students to function in a particular relationship with the state. Second, that the most desirable type of relationship between the citizen and the state is outlined in the structure of constitutional representative democracy. Third, that the major way in which this political arrangement differs from others is that the state "belongs" to the citizens, and the citizens have certain unalienable rights to influence what the state shall do. The primary educational mission, therefore, is to teach citizens to influence the state, the unalienable right to do so (that is, the key feature of representative democracy) cannot be exercised. (1977, pp. 3-4)

To suggest that our proposed program might stifle inquiry is perhaps the most serious misrepresentation a reviewer could make. While it would be inefffectual to remind teachers repeatedly that they should foster critical inquiry, we made the point forcefully in both books, and here is an example of it in the most recent one:

...As students observe political-legal processes they may be outraged at apparent injustice, hypocrisy, incompetence. They may be pleased to find justice, sincerity and competence where it was least expected, and at times they may be curious or confused about what is just, right or fair. Citizens inevitably make evaluative judgments about specific policies (e.g., laws against marijuana) and aspects of political-legal process (e.g., discretionary power of police to arrest). Instruction on the use of power in the political-legal system should help students arrive at evaluative judgments which they can justify rationally, preferably through a principled form of reasoning.

To deliberate on fairness and justice in public affairs, students need a knowledge of and facility with certain concepts from ethical, political and legal theory. The meaning of ideals such as equality, liberty, due process, consent of the governed, pluralism, etc., can be studied through historical events, Constitutional debates, and contemporary issues. The goal is not to indoctrinate students to cherish
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these values, nor is it to demonstrate that existing political-legal process embodies them. To the contrary, the most costly errors of civic education have been preaching blind faith in simplistic versions of such abstractions and teaching (implicitly if not explicitly) that America has achieved them. An intellectually responsible curriculum must help students examine complexities in the ideals themselves, openly discuss their desirability, and investigate the extent to which the operating political-legal system seems to uphold them. (1977, p. 18)

The passage shows that Nelson’s “chosen people” and “stifling inquiry” criticisms are ludicrous.

Nelson attacks the communication course for being simplistic and traditional and for teaching outdated jargon. It is not possible to respond to such vague and unsubstantiated charges. He ought to tell us why the communication model is not helpful, why the concepts we propose are improper.

He faults the course, Action in Literature, for failure to emphasize literary criticism, but here he requires that we offer something which we deliberately decided would not be critical in developing civic competence. He should explain the sense in which literary criticism would enhance the ability to exert influence in public affairs.

Nelson refers to the 1975 book as refreshingly consistent with some of the early reconstructionist writers (Counts, Childs, Rugg, Brameld), but he acknowledges his suspicion that it “carried the seeds of conformist and elitist traditions through its espousal of competencies handled in technical and how-to courses for volunteer students to sharpen their exploitative skills.” He concludes that, “the 1977 book strengthens my suspicions that the program is too easily subverted from laudable goals of social reconstruction and thoughtful social criticism to mechanical, behavioral manipulation consistent with traditional national beliefs.”

This criticism raises several points: First, what is the relationship of our theory (1975) and the proposed program (1977) to the writing of social reconstructionists? In the 1975 book (p. 166) I offered some observations on this, but because of my limited knowledge of educational history, I avoided specific historical comparisons. I would assert, however, that much “social reconstructionist” writing does not provide adequate guidance for conceptualizing a curriculum that would enhance civic competence. Educational prescriptions in this literature often place excessive emphasis on critical thinking or “understanding,” neglecting the knowledge, attitudes and skills required to affect social reality. At the other extreme, there is often a restrictive curriculum focus on particular social problems which places schools in the role of alleviating discrete social ills rather than enhancing civic competence in a general sense. The point of the 1975 and
1977 books is to move beyond these limitations in the curriculum conceptions of social reconstructionists. I would invite an expert in the history of curriculum thought to comment on this.

Does our conception of skills necessarily imply that students be taught to "sharpen exploitative skills" thereby nourishing conservatism and elitism? The 1977 book introduced the curriculum with the following seven competencies:

If people are to formulate goals, win support for them and thereby exert influence, we suggest they must have the more specific competencies to

1) communicate effectively in spoken and written language;
2) collect and logically interpret information on problems of public concern;
3) describe political-legal decision-making processes;
4) rationally justify personal decisions on controversial public issues and strategies for action with reference to principles of justice and constitutional democracy;
5) work cooperatively with others;
6) discuss concrete personal experiences of self and others in ways that contribute to resolution of personal dilemmas encountered in civic action and that relate these experiences to more general human issues;
7) use selected technical skills as they are required for exercise of influence on specific issues. (1977, p. 6)

Such statements could conceivably be interpreted in both "conservative" and "radical" ways, but it is difficult to see how such competencies must be necessarily conceived as conservative or exploitive. Moreover, we clearly advocated that such competencies be used to strive toward ultimate principles of justice, not an exploitative elitism; for example, "...citizens must know that proposed actions help to advance, or at least do not violate, unalienable rights...grounded in the principle of human dignity or equal respect for every human life" (1977, p. 7); "It (political-legal process course) combines instruction on realities of the use of power in politics and law, on research skills required to make intelligent factual claims about those realities, and on ethical, legal and political concepts that help us make principled personal choices on issues and strategies for action." (1977, p. 16) Finally,

School sponsorship of civic action for the purpose of education must not, however, violate the very principles of representative democracy that it seeks to promote. To uphold the equal rights of all to participate in the consent process, the school cannot restrict student projects to the
preferences of a few partisan interests; the civic action laboratory
must allow a diverse plurality of interests to be pursued. Some
students may work for increases in welfare payments, others for
decreases. Some may lobby for more parks, others for more parking
lots. Opposing political candidates might each have students working
on their campaigns. Whether one holds minority or majority points
of view, whether one belongs to a group with negligible or awesome
power, all should have a chance to enhance their ability to participate.
The school must make every attempt to remain "neutral" (in the
partisan sense of the word) while helping students to become politically
active.

The obligation to support a plurality of action efforts is not,
however, unconditional. Some proposed actions could conceivably
violate the principles of justice that the school is obligated to defend.
For this reason the school is justified in requiring students to
demonstrate that proposed actions do not violate the equal rights of
persons upon which democracy itself is ethically justified, and that they
do not deliberately violate local, state or federal laws.*

*Conceivably, in some situations violation of laws may be required
in order to uphold principles of justice. If a school board passed a
regulation that denied library privileges to a racial minority, and all
legal attempts to revise the regulation failed, teachers and administra-
tors might have to violate some regulations (e.g., deliberately refusing
to enforce the rule, or filing false reports on library use) in order to
consistently support the rights of students. Without discussing here
the ethics of civil disobedience or revolution, the example is given
only to illustrate that the commitment to abide by underlying principles
that law is intended to serve takes precedence over commitment to
obeying specific laws themselves. (1977, p. 133)

In short, Nelson has misrepresented critical aspects of the 1977 book by
neglecting the strong recommendations we made for critical empirical and
ethical inquiry, for students being actively involved in collective efforts at
institutional change in and beyond the school, and for students
participating in the governance of their own school program.

A final issue concerns the implementation, rather than the guiding
philosophy of the 1977 program. Will the proposed program be subverted
in the schools to "mechanical, behavioral manipulation consistent with
traditional national beliefs"? To respond, we should recognize alternative
definitions of "traditional national belief." If we interpret this to mean
belief in the right of people to participate in their own government, I would
fully endorse such a traditional national belief and be delighted if schools offered some help in operationalizing it. I would not define this as "subversion of the program's intent." If, on the other hand, a school were to use this program to perpetuate the "traditional national belief" that children should be seen and not heard, that assertiveness against dominant institutions should be suppressed in order to get ahead, that America and its governments have always made morally defensible decisions, this would truly subvert the program's mission.

Once the definitional point is clarified, there is the empirical question, "What are schools likely to do with the program?" Nelson is correct in his suspicion about schools, but this is more an indictment of schools than of the proposed program. We know from many institutional reform efforts in schools and elsewhere how common it is for those institutions to subvert the intentions of idealistic framers to serve conservative, maintenance functions of the institution. I believe this tendency is inherent in bureaucracy and social process. No new program proposal can be immunized against it. For this reason, many who call themselves "radicals" will refuse to try to improve any existing institution, fearful that their plans must inevitably be co-opted, or used by the corrupt institution to make it appear more legitimate.

The proposed program is clearly an attempt to "fit in" to existing schools, thereby inviting such risks. Regrettably, however, most schools at the moment are unlikely to consider adoption of a program that places such comprehensive emphasis on citizenship. In those few areas where it might be attempted, committed teachers, parents and students will have to work hard to protect it from emasculation. But if co-option is inherent in corporate bureaucracies, why try to improve them at all? Here we rely on the wisdom of Saul Alinsky whom we quoted in the Preface to the 1977 book. He once described the disillusionment of youthful citizens who came to him in despair after dedicated work on Eugene McCarthy's presidential campaign in 1968. He recalled their question, "You told us to work for power within the system. We tried, but the bosses wouldn't give us a chance, and the police bloodied our heads. Now what should we do?"

"You have three choices," Alinsky replied, "build yourself a wailing wall and start crying, build some bombs and blow us all to hell, or roll up your sleeves and go back to work on the next election."

The point of the Alinsky remark is to expose the naivete of Nelson's apparent approach to educational-social reform. While his own ultimate agenda is vague, by implication he calls for a fundamental restructuring of education or at least more forceful teaching of an anti-capitalist, anti-behaviorist ideology. He fails to see what successful community organizers from Ghandi, to Mao, to Alinsky, to King or Friere have taught: that an advocate must start from the peoples' frame of reference, in their
own existing institutional contexts, even while this may violate the advocate's high minded social ideals. Adolescents spend much time in schools, subject to many constraints that contradict the spirit of our program. But we must start somewhere, and if Nelson knows of a better place or more effective way to teach youth to assert themselves and take responsibility for community affairs in this society, let us hear of his scheme.
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