

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 324

SO 006 767

AUTHOR Lantz, Mary Jean  
TITLE A Study of Teacher and Principal Ratings of  
Priorities in Social Studies Goals. Publication  
Number 3.  
INSTITUTION North Carolina Univ., Greensboro. Humanistic  
Education Project.  
PUB DATE Nov 73  
NOTE 9p.  
AVAILABLE FROM University of North Carolina at Greensboro,  
Humanistic Education Project, Dr. Dale L. Brubaker,  
Curry Hall 103, Greensboro, North Carolina 27412  
(Free)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS Classification; Educational History; \*Educational  
Objectives; \*Educational Philosophy; Educational  
Research; Educational Theories; Literature Reviews;  
Measurement Instruments; Models; Occupational  
Information; \*Principals; Rating Scales; \*Social  
Studies; \*Teachers

IDENTIFIERS Barth (James L); Joyce (Bruce R); Thomas (R  
Murray)

## ABSTRACT

Although the literature in the last decade contains many diverse opinions on the aims or goals of social studies, few empirical investigations have been reported. To meet this need, a consensual perspective on national social studies goals, a description of recent categorizations of goals within conceptual frameworks, and a summary of a present study are offered. The official statements on the goals for social studies published during the twentieth century are reviewed, reflecting an earlier emphasis on nationalistic loyalty and a common commitment to social responsibility, to intelligence, and to human dignity. Three prominent goal classification theories which have recently appeared - the Joyce framework, the Barth-Shermis view, and the Thomas-Brubaker dimensions - are sketched and summarized. An assessment device based on the dimensions of Joyce and Thomas-Brubaker, used to determine if social studies philosophical positions differ according to job category, reached three conclusions: the theoretical dimensions are not supported by empirical evidence; differences existing in philosophy do not appear to be significantly determined by job category; and the group tested placed high priority on social studies goals reflecting moral concerns. (Author/KSM)

ED 085324

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL  
RATINGS OF PRIORITIES IN SOCIAL  
STUDIES GOALS

by  
Mary Jean Lantz

Sφ 006 767

Publication #3 of the  
University of North  
Carolina-Greensboro  
Humanistic Education  
Project

Directed by Dale L. Brubaker  
and James B. MacDonald

*Nov. 1973*

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

## Foreword

The University of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project is one of two major centers that have given a good deal of attention to the historical, philosophical, and sociological dimensions of goal priorities in social studies education. Alternative Directions for the Social Studies (1967) stimulated a good deal of thought and controversy as indicated in a series of publications which reacted to it.

Professors James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis expanded the two camp model from the 1967 study into a three camp model which has received a good deal of attention. (See their "Defining the Social Studies--An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, November 1970, pp. 743-751.) Therefore, a second center for the study of social studies goals is located at Purdue University.

As might be expected, the doctoral students who have been a part of activities at both universities have done a good deal of research, and writing which has challenged and refined models built by their mentors.\* At the same time, other scholars outside the two centers have given attention to the matter of goal priorities in the social studies. The present study by Mary Jean Lantz was conducted at the University of Houston under the direction of Professor Jack Sheridan. We hope that it will be one of many statistical studies that follow earlier philosophical explorations.

---

\*Two dissertations at the University of North Carolina-Greensboro serve as examples: "A Conceptual Framework for Elementary Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," by Jo Watts Williams; and "Toward the Development of a Programmatic Language for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction," by Lawrence H. Simon.

# A STUDY OF TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL RATINGS OF PRIORITIES IN SOCIAL STUDIES GOALS\*

by Mary Jean Lantz

Almost a decade has elapsed since participants in the Needed Research in the Teaching of the Social Studies Conference chose as their top priority "major expectations" (Price, 1963:23). At that time, Dr. Melvin Tumin claimed that investigation into "the aims toward which social science education is being directed" was one of "our first research needs" (Ibid., 48). Although the literature since this conference contains a plethora of diverse personal opinion on the "aims" or goals of social studies, surprisingly few empirical investigations have been reported. This article will contain: (1) a consensual perspective through excerpts from "official statements" on national social studies goals; (2) a description of recent attempts to categorize goals within a conceptual framework; and (3) a summary of the present study.

## OFFICIAL STATEMENTS ON NATIONAL SOCIAL STUDIES GOALS

During the twentieth century, three "official statements" on the goals for the social studies have been published. The following section highlights the aims of social studies as reflected in these statements.

The first official "Committee on Social Studies," part of the Reorganization of Secondary Education appointed by the National Education Association in 1913, declared that the "conscious and constant purpose of the Social Studies is the cultivation of good citizenship" as represented by "appreciation of the nature and laws of social life," "intelligent and genuine loyalty to high national ideals," "a sense of responsibility of the individual as a member of social groups," "loyalty and a sense of obligation to city, state, nation: and to the human race," and "intelligence and the will to participate effectively in the promotion of the social well-being" (Engle, 1971:280).

In 1932, the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association reiterated the goal of Social Studies as being that of citizenship education which was to include "not only the transmission of the requirements of scholarship but also the comprehension of the social realities of the times and the climate of American ideals." The desirable citizenship attributes in this statement included "looking at things with a democratic slant; believing in decency and fair play, forbearance and respect for others; acquiring the customs, traditions, and nationalistic ideals of his country; believing in the idea of progressive improvement of society." (Ibid., 281-82.)

In 1971, the Task Force on Curriculum Guidelines of the National Council for the Social Studies published a statement which contains a two-fold purpose for social studies education: "enhancement of human dignity through learning and commitment to rational processes as principal means of attaining that end" (N.C.S.S., 1971:855). The statement defines "human dignity" as "equal access to the rights and responsibilities associated in a culture" and "rational process" as "any systematic intellectual effort to generate, validate, or apply knowledge." The statement further explains that the means by which human dignity is enhanced consist of intelligent, social actions. Categories of objectives included in the statement are listed as: "knowledge" (defined as a reservoir of data, ideas, concepts, generalizations, and theories); "abilities" (intellectual, data processing, and human relations competencies); "valuing" (clarifying value pluralism, value dilemmas, and basic cultural values);

\*The present monograph is excerpted from a doctoral dissertation of the same title. For further information, write Dr. Jean Lantz, 4319 Bettis, Apt. 8 Houston, Texas 77027.

and "social participation" (individual behavior guided by the values of human dignity and rationality and directed toward the resolution of problems confronting society) *Ibid.*, 856-59).

In summary, while the earlier statements appear to place greater emphasis on nationalistic loyalty, all three statements contain some commitment: to "social responsibility/democratic citizenship"; to "intelligence/scholarship/rationality"; and to "respect for the individual/human dignity."

#### RECENT ATTEMPTS TO CATEGORIZE GOALS WITHIN A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

In the past decade, three prominent goal classification theories have appeared in social studies education literature. The phrases "Joyce framework" "Barth-Shermis view," and "Thomas-Brubaker dimensions" are frequently heard among social studies education professionals. Since two of these theories are utilized in this investigation, a brief description of the three theories follows:

##### The Joyce Framework

In 1965, Bruce R. Joyce, Teachers College, Columbia University, classified the goals of social studies into three dimensions: humanistic education, citizenship education, and intellectual education, defined respectively as "helping the child comprehend his experience and find meaning in life"; "preparing the child to participate effectively in the dynamic life of his society"; and "acquiring the analytic ideas and problem-solving tools developed by scholars in the social sciences." Joyce maintained that these three goals are compatible and that educational activities can be designed to strive for all three goals concurrently. "As we help the child to learn the tools of social, economic, and political analysis prevailing in the social sciences, we also help him to examine the social world about him, lead him to face social problems, and help him to comprehend his experience. As he grows in ability to apply the concepts of social science to his own experience and to contemporary society, his social world will become more comprehensible to him and he will be better able to participate rationally as a citizen" (Joyce, 1965:3).

In 1972, Joyce published a second statement which incorporated many ideas from his earlier work. The terms and order of placement were changed slightly. This more recent classification substitutes the term "social education" for "citizenship education" and replaces "humanistic education" with the term "personal education" (Joyce, 1972:1). The first dimension discussed is "Intellectual" followed by "Social" and then "Personal". He again maintains that these three dimensions are compatible with each other and with activities designed to teach social studies. In this second publication, Joyce includes a section which categorizes twenty-four published sources into one of the three dimensions. For instance, the Georgia Anthropology Project is placed within the Intellectual Dimension while the Harvard Social Studies project is placed within the Social Dimension (*Ibid.*, 23-4).

##### The Barth-Shermis View

In 1970, James L. Barth and S. Samaul Shermis of Purdue University published an article in *Social Education* which offered a new conceptual scheme for categorizing views on "just what social studies is and ought to be" (Barth, 1970:743). The three categories used by these authors were:

(1) citizenship transmission; (2) social science; and (3) reflective inquiry. This team of authors maintains that although the overriding goal of social studies is to provide a means of achieving citizenship, "three competing traditions have developed which appear to be conceptually distinct and which provide three different modes of selecting and organizing content and teaching" (Ibid., 744).

Each category or "tradition" was discussed in terms of purpose, method, and content. The purpose of "citizenship transmission" is to "inculcate in youth a constellation of culturally approved traits"; the method is a "mixture of description and persuasion"; and content is composed of "facts, principles, beliefs, and theories of a consensus of authorities" (Ibid., 744-45). The purpose of the "social science" tradition is to "acquire knowledge"; the method is to "transmit certain selected concepts from one or more of the social science disciplines"; the content is composed of social science concepts and modes of inquiry (Ibid., 747-48). The purpose of the third tradition, "reflective inquiry," is to help students "acquire practice in making decisions which reflect significant social problems and which presently affect them or are likely to affect them"; the method is inquiry, defined as "sensing significant problems and seriously searching for satisfactory answers"; and the content is "whatever is needed to solve a problem" (Ibid., 750). In concluding, the authors maintained that although teachers may incorporate elements of all three traditions, this "indiscriminate mixing" is not necessarily in the best interests of students (Ibid.).

#### The Thomas-Brubaker Dimensions

Dale L. Brubaker first categorized goals of social studies into "majority" and "minority" positions (Brubaker, 1967). While granting that the "majority" advocated "good citizenship" as the primary goal of social studies, he suggested a "minority" promoted skill in "social science inquiry" as their primary goal. Brubaker introduced this "minority" concept with a claim by Arno Bellack that "the objective of teaching the social sciences in all the grades is to expose the folk wisdom and common sense that students absorb, through participation in the culture, to the light of analysis and empirical inquiry . . ." (Ibid., 23). In discussing positions, the author points out that although the two goals are "inextricably related," they may not be compatible in practice as "the kind of content most likely to stimulate reflection in students is also the content likely to arouse the opposition of authoritarian groups" (Ibid., 14). He warns of risks involved in operating under a theory of pluralistic objectives: "Although our society may theoretically support both good citizenship and critical thinking, there are some closed areas where critical thinking is considered less important than is agreement on a particular view" (Ibid., 13).

In 1971, Brubaker with R. Murray Thomas posed four dimensions involved in clarifying positions on desirable social studies goals (Thomas, 1971: 85-107). The first dimension discussed was termed "reconstructionist versus conservationist." A "reconstructionist" is "bent on building a new social order based on new educational policies and new programs of social, political and/or economic action." The focus is "primarily on the shortcomings of existing conditions" and the commitment is to "changing these conditions." Someone in this position would view the role of the social studies as "serving as an instrument of such change." In contrast, a "conservationist" is a person whose main aim is to "keep the major part, if not all, of the status quo intact." The conservationist's emphasis

is on the "desirable aspects of the present social order" and preventing "major changes that would destroy what is essential in the present system of economic, political, or social arrangements." In describing this first dimension, the authors frequently refer to the writings of Theodore Brameld (Ibid., 87-88).

A second dimension described by Thomas and Brubaker is the "Inquiry versus Authority" issue which refers to the "process an individual goes through in attempting to determine 'the truth' about social phenomena." A person strongly committed to "inquiry" would "refuse to accept at face value what anyone tells them is the truth about a social phenomenon," is a "skeptic," feels that he must "personally investigate each facet of the issue in order to arrive at a proper answer," and takes "great pains to define terminology, to formulate questions, to check the validity of data-gathering techniques, to evaluate statistical methods, to phrase conclusions in cautious terms," etc. Whereas, a person at the other extreme "accepts as true what is told them by an 'authority'" (Ibid., 95).

A third dimension offered by Thomas and Brubaker is termed "Social Analysis and/or Socialization." The term "social analysis" refers to the "analytic and integrative aspects of inquiry represented by skill in identifying significant social phenomena, observing accurately, defining and classifying characteristics, contrasting and comparing classifications, and drawing generalizations and inferences." The term "socialization" refers to the adoption of "attitudes and actions approved and encouraged by society" (Ibid., 99-100).

The fourth dimension offered by the authors is "knowledge and/or Action." The "knowledge proponent believes that "education is properly an intellectual activity and that the school is not a training center for either present or future activism; while the "social action" proponent considers "immediate social behavior as an essential part of the social studies program" (Ibid., 105-6).

The authors suggest that while attitudes within the first two dimensions probably fall along a continuum, the last two dimensions do not lend themselves as easily to such a scaling procedure.

In a more recent article, Brubaker offers a third conceptual framework by differentiating between the social studies goals of the "humanities" and those of the "social sciences" (Brubaker, 1972). He classes those goals concerned with "accurate description" as "social science" and those "subjective goals" concerned with "prescription within the domain of the "humanities". He concludes that students and teachers of the social studies are working in both domains and should be aware of the relationship between the two.

In summary, this section has sketched the conceptual theories of Bruce R. Joyce; James L. Barth and S. Samuel Shermis; and Dale L. Brubaker and R. Murray Thomas. The more recent Joyce theory consists of intellectual, social, and personal dimensions. The Barth-Shermis theory categorizes goals as "citizenship transmission," "social science" and "reflective inquiry." The theories of Dale Brubaker differentiate (1) between "citizenship" and "social science inquiry"; (2) between the four dimensions of "reconstructionist versus conservationist," "inquiry versus authority," "social analysis and/or socialization," and "knowledge and/or action"; and (3) between the descriptive goals of social science and the prescriptive goals of the humanities. Joyce concluded that his dimensions were compatible while both Barth-Shermis and Brubaker warned of indiscriminate mixing.

## THE PRESENT STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine if social studies philosophical positions, as characterized by priorities in selected goals, differ according to job category. Job categories included elementary teachers, secondary teachers, elementary principals, and secondary principals.

An instrument consisting of twenty-nine Likert-type items based on five theoretical dimensions suggested by Bruce R. Joyce, R. Murray Thomas and Dale L. Brubaker was constructed as the assessment device. The five theoretical dimensions employed were Joyce's Personal, Social, and Intellectual Dimensions and Thomas-Brubaker's Conservationist and Authority Dimensions.

The instrument was administered to 124 subjects who had been selected through a random sampling procedure. Elementary and secondary teachers and principals from six public school districts in Harris County, Texas, participated. Responses were anonymous except for job category.

In analysis of data, the Principle component method using a Varimax rotation procedure was used to determine empirical dimensions through factor analysis. Seven dimensions were found. Since these empirical dimensions did not conform to the theoretical dimensions, new labels were assigned to the empirical dimensions. Sub-scale scores for each dimension were computed by summing Likert scores for all items assigned to each dimensional category. Finally, dimensional Likert scores for each subject were used as variables in discriminate analysis. Neither individual nor combined variables were found to discriminate significantly between job categories.

In incidental findings, the Thomas-Brubaker theoretical continuums termed Conservationist-Reconstructionist and Authority-Inquiry were found to be lacking in bipolarity. According to total group means, the most valued empirical dimension was found to be the Moral Dimension while the most valued theoretical dimension was found to be the Personal Dimension of Bruce Joyce.

Based on the results of this study, several conclusions were reached. First, the dimensions as theoretically presented by Bruce Joyce and Thomas-Brubaker are not supported by empirical evidence. For instance, one item from the Joyce Social Dimension and two items from the Thomas-Brubaker Conservationist Dimension merged to form a Moral Dimension. Two items from the Thomas-Brubaker Reconstructionist scale merged with two items from their Inquiry scale to form another dimension. While Joyce's Personal and Intellectual Dimensions appear to be viable dimensions, the existence of a separate Social Dimension seems unlikely. While many of the Thomas-Brubaker items did lend themselves to clustering, many items did not fall in the predicted categories. A continuum pattern did not exist.

A second conclusion is that differences which exist in social studies philosophical position do not appear to be significantly determined by job category. Elementary and secondary teachers and principals appear to share similar priorities in social studies goals in terms of mean rankings.

A third conclusion is that teachers and principals in Harris County, Texas, place high priority on social studies goals reflecting moral concerns. Subjects assigned highest value to the empirical dimension which included items of preserving democratic ideals, character building, and fostering principals of truth, justice and patriotism.

Based on the high in-group variance found, a fourth conclusion is that considerable disagreement exists among inservice educators as to priorities in social studies goals. Therefore, one must conclude that in any group of teachers and/or principals a wide variety of philosophical positions can be found. In other words, a principal could expect to find among any faculty group a wide variety of priorities in social studies goals. Accordingly, a superintendent could expect a wide variety of goals from a staff of principals.

Based on an analysis of standard deviation by job category, some job categories appear to stand out from others in terms of general in-group agreement or disagreement. Secondary teachers as a group seem more in agreement as to the worth of the Humanist Dimension while in less agreement as to the worth of the Moral Dimension. Elementary principals are in considerable disagreement as to the worth of the Social Science Dimension.

The following questions are offered as possibilities for further research:

1. What dimensions might exist which would stand up under widespread empirical testing?
2. Would some other framework discriminate between job categories?
3. Would the Barth-Shermis model prove to be more empirically sound? more discriminating between job categories?
4. What variables affect social studies philosophical position?
5. Would responses of other category groups such as preservice teachers, teacher educators, parents and students conform to the responses found in this study?
6. Does "moral education" involve "moral issues"? If so, would issues be examined through open inquiry or is indoctrination envisioned as the appropriate instructional mode? If indoctrination is envisioned as appropriate, who determines what morals are to be indoctrinated?

In terms of immediate application, one final recommendation is that data concerning goal priorities be used as a guide in administrative decisions. For instance, there may be no need to plan separate inservice sessions for different job categories, because persons in each category on the average hold the same priorities in goals. Also, personnel directors may wish to select teachers and administrators according to homogeneous or heterogeneous purposes. That is, the director may wish to select all faculty who hold the same priorities or select a faculty holding divergent points of view.

### SELECTED REFERENCES

- Barth, James L., and S. Samuel Shermis. "Defining the Social Studies-- An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education (November, 1970) pp. 743-751.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Alternative Directions for the Social Studies. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1967.
- Brubaker, Dale L. Social Studies in a Mass Society. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1969.
- Brubaker, Dale L. "The Humanities, the Social Sciences, and the Social Studies," The Social Studies (January, 1972), pp. 10-14.
- Engle, Shirley H. "Exploring the Meaning of the Social Studies," Social Education (March, 1971), pp. 280-88, 344.
- Joyce, Bruce R. Strategies for Elementary Social Science Education. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.
- Joyce, Bruce R. New Strategies for Social Education. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.
- Kane, Paul Wayne. "Contemporary Affairs Instruction in Selected High School Social Science Classes," Dissertation Abstracts International, 30:1751-A, November, 1969.
- National Council for the Social Studies. "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines," Social Education (December, 1971,) pp. 853-869.
- Price, Roy A. (Ed.). Needed Research in the Teaching of Social Studies. Research Bulletin No. 1. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1963.
- Raths, James, and John Fanning. A Study of the Attitudes of Nine Reference Groups Within the Lower Merion Schools Districts Toward Selected Secondary Social Studies Curriculum Activities. Bulletin of the Bureau of Education Research. College Park, Md.: University of Maryland, April, 1971.
- Schremser, Robert P. "The Teaching of Controversial Issues-- A Study of the Opinions of Selected Social Studies Teachers, Administrators, and School Board Members of New Jersey," Dissertation Abstracts, 27:3677-A, May, 1964.
- Thomas R. Murray, and Dale L. Brubaker. Decisions in Teaching Elementary Social Studies. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth, 1971.
- Tucker, Jan. "Teacher Educators and the 'New' Social Studies," Social Education (May, 1972), pp. 548-554, 560.