

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 108 982

SO 008 324

AUTHOR Tucker, Jan L.; Mitchell, C. C.
 TITLE An Underlying Structure of Ought-to-Be Reactions to the "New" Social Studies.
 PUB DATE 75
 NOTE 24p.; A paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 1975);

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
 DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; *Curriculum Evaluation; Educational Philosophy; Educational Research; Personality Studies; Program Development; *Psychological Patterns; Resource Allocations; Social Science Research; *Social Studies; Sociocultural Patterns; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Two related objectives in this report are: (1) to discover psychometrically a structure underlying secondary school social studies teachers' responses to those items in an instrument which pertained to what the "new" social studies ought to be emphasizing, and (2) to contribute to the development of scales measuring the domain of such ought-to-be ideas. To conceptualize the domain of ought-to-be ideas, a social studies professional belief system is agreed upon as the major determinant of role behavior in social studies education. The responses of 82 social studies teachers to a questionnaire measuring what ought to be emphasized in social studies education provide the research data. From these data six tentative dimensions of a social studies professional belief system are named--curriculum focus, instructional focus, sociocultural focus, historical study, resource allocation, and program derivation. Also included are the manner in which scores in these six dimensions predict teacher personality and classroom teaching behaviors. The two areas of implications from this research are subsequent basic research and anticipated policy decision making and program practices in social studies education. (Author/DE).

 * Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal-unpublished *
 * materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
 * to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
 * reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
 * of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
 * via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
 * responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
 * supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED108982

AN UNDERLYING STRUCTURE OF OUGHT-TO-BE REACTIONS
TO THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES.

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

Paper presented at the SSSIG/AERA Session
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1975

Jan L. Tucker
Florida International University

C. C. Mitchell
University of Georgia

Jan L. Tucker is an Associate Professor, Secondary Education, School of Education, Florida International University, Tamiami Trail, Miami, FL 33144. C. C. Mitchell is an Ed.D. candidate in Social Science Education, University of Georgia, and resides currently at 420 Barrywood Dr., Nashville TN 37211.

This research had two related objectives. The first objective was to discover psychometrically a structure underlying secondary school social studies teachers' responses to those items in Tucker's instrument which pertained to what the "new" social studies ought to be emphasizing. In other words, the objective was the dimensioning of the domain of ought-to-be ideas as it was tapped by the instrument. The second objective was to contribute to the development of scales measuring the domain of such ought-to-be ideas.

Perspectives and Assumptions

The emphases on discovery and development, rather than the testing of hypotheses, made this research exploratory (see, Selltiz et al., 1959, p. 51; Wallace, 1971, p. 22). This research also involved secondary analysis, i.e., a reanalysis of data which had been collected previously and for other purposes. The instrument had been administered previously to stratified, random samples of social studies methods instructors and secondary school social studies teachers and supervisors, all of whom were members of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). The results for the methods instructors were reported in Social Education (Tucker, 1972). A comparison of methods instructors and secondary school personnel was reported at the American Educational Research Association (AERA) meeting in New Orleans (Tucker, 1973). In both reports the focus was single-item or item-by-item analysis, or bivariate analysis involving items. There was no scaling of items, empirical dimensioning, or multivariate analysis, and no explicit theoretical framework.

Mitchell, who has been doing empirico-theoretical research with his Social Studies Orientations Inventory, suggested the secondary analysis. Its development and execution included three main parts:

1. Principal components analysis (P.C.A.) was used as the tool in the dimensioning and the first-phase item analysis and scale development.¹ P.C.A.

See, e.g., Overall and Klett (1972, pp. 57-58) and Rummel (1970, pp. 3-4, 12, & 15-16) for dimensions and concept-mapping or dimensioning; Guertin

extracts subsets of correlated item. These subsets are referred to variously in the literature as dimensions, factors, clusters, and also scales. The configuration of the item content in each subset is the basis for the subset's name (i.e., a substantive concept). Thus each subset is a scale measuring some unidimensional concept.

There were three a priori guidelines involved in this use of P.C.A.: each extracted subset had to (a) contain at least five items; (b) have conceptual clarity; and (c) have statistical acceptability which in this case was an internal consistency of at least .60, preferably .70 and above. Any extracted subset which did not satisfy all three criteria was deleted.

2. It was imperative, for reasons made clearer in the third part, to conceptualize substantively the domain of ought-to-be ideas. The sensitizing concept finally agreed upon was social studies professional belief system.² This conceptualization is drawn from the ideas of Rokeach and others.

A belief system represents the total universe of a person's beliefs about the physical world, the social world, and the self.... A belief system can further be analyzed in terms of subsystems of varying breadth or narrowness [Rokeach, 1972, p. 123].

The social studies professional belief system is viewed as an analytical subsystem of Rokeach's general belief system. In addition to the shift from the total universe of beliefs to professional beliefs, there is a concomitant shift in focus from the total person to the "partial" person or occupant of professional roles in social studies education. These professional

and Bailey (1970, pp. 209-229), and the somewhat negative view of Nunnally (1967, pp. 255-258), for item analysis and scale development; and Lykken (1971) for exploratory factor analysis.

² This conceptualization is somewhat different from Mitchell's concept of social studies culture, which consists of two major components: the cognitive and the affective. The latter consists of professional value-orientation dimensions, which in addition to their explicit affective-evaluative aspect also contain a conative or action tendency aspect. This division is similar to the tripartite conceptualization of attitude (see, e.g., Triandis, 1971). Culture in this sense of social studies culture is restricted to ideational phenomena (see, e.g., Williams, 1970, pp. 25-27). Full explication of this conceptual scheme is contained in his dissertation (in progress).

roles include, e.g., classroom teacher, curriculum developer, and also the formal anticipatory role of teacher-trainee. It is stipulated that this subsystem of professional beliefs is possessed only by incumbents of professional roles in social studies education. Anyone can have attitudes toward the social studies, but only these role incumbents can be said to have a social studies professional belief system.

It is further stipulated that this professional belief system is the major determinant of role behavior in social studies education, although it is not the only determinant. Rokeach (1960, p. 401) notes that the understanding of behavior in general requires knowledge of the personality and the situational conditions. Cattell (1965, pp. 25-28 & 157-160) includes the additional element of role: behavior in general is a complex function of personality, the role, and the situation. Given the above analytical shifts, however, Cattell's equation must be reformulated. Since the interest is not behavior in general but role behavior, role is rewritten as role behavior, which is the phenomenon to be explained, and the professional belief system is inserted as a predictor. Hence the reformulation: role behavior in social studies education is a complex function of the social studies professional belief system, the personality, and the situation.

3. The construction of empirically-grounded, middle-range scientific theory (see, Merton, 1967) requires not only model-building,³ and the formalization and integration of the conceptual apparatus, but also instrumentation, measurement, data collection, etc. Looking toward the second phase of instrument development and subsequent basic research, the construction of valid scales which measure the multidimensional social studies professional belief system would provide tools for theory development. These theories would pertain to (a) the process by which the professional belief system is acquired and internalized; (b) the relationship between this subsystem and other subsystems within the general belief system, e.g., the relationships of the professional belief dimensions and dogmatism or other personality dimensions; and (c) the manner and extent to which the professional belief di-

³ The functions of models and model-building are contained in, e.g., DiRenzo (1966, p. 249), Inkeles (1964, pp. 28 & 44), Olsen (1968, p. 22), Sherif (1966, pp. 50-51), and Willer (1967, p. 15). See also Rapoport (1966, p. 132) for the notion of "theory in the weaker sense," which is comparable to the concept of model.

mensions, in interaction with personality and situational variables, explain and predict, e.g., classroom teaching behaviors.

Procedures

The stratified, random sample in the original study (Tucker, 1973) contained 215 secondary school social studies personnel, who were members of NCSS. One hundred and ten responded to the mail-questionnaire and the data of 101 (47%) were useable. In this secondary analysis those who were primarily supervisors and those whose official duties did not include at least 50% of their time in the social studies classroom ($N = 11$) were deleted. Eight Ss who had an excessive number of "No Opinion" or blanks also were deleted. The adjusted N was 101 minus 11 minus 8 = 82.

P.C.A. of the 61 items obtained the subsets of correlated items. The 61 items had the same general stem: "I believe that the professional discourse about secondary school social studies education ought to be emphasizing the importance of:". There were, however, two different sub-stems and response formats. Forty-nine were paired-characteristic or bi-polar items with six choices (the value given to each choice is in parentheses), e.g.:

	Much Stronger *	Stronger	Equal	Stronger	Much Stronger	No Opinion	
Student Interests	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(3)	Academic Disciplines

"No Opinion," which had an original value of 6, was recoded as 3. As noted above, Ss with an excessive number of "No Opinion" responses were deleted. Twelve items (variables 50-61) were the more typical Likert-type (values again in parentheses), e.g.:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
historical content	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

The former is shown in the tables (e.g., Table 1, variable no. 3) as:

3 STUDENT INTERESTS -- academic disciplines

and the latter is shown as (e.g., Table 1, variable no. 50):

50 agree historical content

DISAGREE.

The underlined, upper case letters indicate the substance of the high polarity of the dimension.

The use of P.C.A. involved three general steps.⁴ The first step obtained the eigenvalues for as many eigenvectors as there were items. Cattell's Scree Test (see, Rummel, 1970, pp. 361 & 366) was used to determine the number of factors or subsets to work with in further analysis. The eigenvalues were plotted and the Scree Test was applied. This test, in which one can expect some indeterminacy, indicated a maximum of eight factors and a minimum of four factors.

In the second step three solutions were obtained: 4-, 5-, and 8-factor solutions, each with varimax or orthogonal rotation. Comparison of these solutions showed the 8-factor solution to be the most satisfactory.

The third step involved closer inspection of the 8-factor solution. Inspection of those items which loaded .30 and above⁵ on each factor and the correlation matrix of each factor indicated that only the first six factors were conceptually and statistically acceptable. On these six factors, items with a low average inter-item r , generally $p > .10$, were deleted. The screened six factors contained 54 of the 61 items; five of these 54 items loaded on more than one factor or dimension.

⁴ The measure of association used was the Pearson- r . Keown and Hakstian (1972) indicate that use of Kendall's Tau-B (rank order) is best given various conditions, but that the Pearson- r is a close-enough second to warrant its use without undue concern.

⁵ While a cut-off point of .30 was the criterion for inclusion, the items actually loaded either below .30 or above .34. A cut-off of .40 would have made very little practical difference in the substantive configuration of the item content in the dimensions. Very few items would have been omitted; this is shown by the factor loadings (F.L.) in Tables 1 - 6.

These six subsets or tentative dimensions of the social studies professional belief system were named. Cronbach's (1967) reliability coefficient alpha (internal consistency/accuracy form of reliability) was obtained for each subset. The item scores in each subset were summed to obtain the dimension scores. Finally, the relationships among the dimensions were obtained by the Pearson correlation technique.

Results and Discussion

Figure 1 contains the tentative names of the six extracted dimensions and what the high and low scores tend to indicate.

Figure 1 about here

The item content for each dimension is shown in Tables 1 - 6. Included in each are the alpha for the dimension and the mean, standard deviation and the factor loading (F.L.) for each item. The items which were reverse-scored are noted.

Tables 1 - 6 about here

The interrelations among the six dimensions--a tentative model of the social studies professional belief system--are shown in Table 7.

Table 7 about here

The Pearson rs in Table 7, the lack of orthogonality, suggest strongly only one second-order factor with polarities of, say, traditional and progressive social studies or innovative and non-innovative social studies professional beliefs. It was speculated that the explicit mention of "new" social studies in the instrument might have generated a response set, which tended to produce responses for or against the concept of "new" social studies rather than

responses strictly in terms of the items themselves. The expectation was a multivariate distribution with at least two more or less orthogonal dimensions. Such a response set would explain in part the tendency toward one broad second-order factor/dimension. But the lack of orthogonality among the dimensions was not considered to be a fatal flaw, especially at this stage of exploratory research. Actually, complexity rather than simplicity or parsimony with respect to the number of independent dimensions, even when the dimensions are not completely independent, was considered to be more desirable at this stage.

These results, which are tentative, provide a partial basis for further instrument development. Immediate consideration of the validity of these six dimensions, in light of no other replicating or validating studies, involves two points. First, the basic point: a scale which has a "good" internal consistency coefficient usually has an acceptable test-retest coefficient (dependability form of reliability), and a scale that has both has validity for some purpose (see, Shaw and Wright, 1967, p. 564). Thus the three dimensions or scales with alphas in the .80s would appear to be fairly sound; the three with alphas near .70 need substantial work. Second, four of these six dimensions have their counterparts in the results obtained by Mitchell with his instrument. The comparison is logically based, but the similarity in the substantive configuration of the item content suggest strongly that the same things are being measured. The alphas for Mitchell's scales range from .65 to .92, with three-fourths of the alphas in the .80s; estimates of test-retest reliability range from .69 to .84. He also has done some construct validation, e.g.: his Citizenship Scale, which is the counterpart to the SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS dimension and which is purportedly a measure of citizenship indoctrination, was found to be correlated positively ($p < .02$, one-tailed) with Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale (40-item Form E) in two studies involving secondary school social studies teachers.

Thus the six dimensions in this present study appear to be more than artifacts of statistical analysis or of the imagination. They appear to be tapping some reality with respect to the underlying sources of variation in teachers' ideas about what ought to be the nature of social studies.

Consideration of validity, however, is premature. The appropriate context in which these six dimensions should be viewed is the context of discovery for the second-phase instrument development. In other words, item

construction and scale development involve not only measurement and statistics, but also various elements of conceptual imagery which "spearhead" the tasks of instrument development and theory construction.

Each of the six dimensions presents an idea for the secondphase instrument development. Different combinations of dimensions are also heuristic. For example, high scores for the combined SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS and HISTORICAL STUDY dimensions ($r = .29$) are suggestive of the "citizenship transmission tradition" posited by Barth and Shermis (1970). The following interaction illustrates in detail the sort of heuristic conceptual imagery which will play a part in the refinement and expansion of the instrumentation.

* Figure 2 shows the interaction of the SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS and RESOURCE ALLOCATION dimensions ($r = -.53$).

Figure 2 about here

A high SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS (High SOCICULT) score in combination with a low RESOURCE ALLOCATION (Low RESOURCA) score indicates a hypothetical preference for social studies which instills a concern with the maintenance of institutional stability--when it and individual freedom seem in conflict--in those who will be leaders, not followers. Figure 2 shows this hypothetical orientation labelled as: IDEOLOGICALLY-CONSERVATIVE (leader) ELITES. The interaction of Low SOCICULT-High RESOURCA scores indicates a hypothetical preference for social studies which instills an active-oriented, deliberative support for innovation and social reform in those who will be followers, not leaders. This hypothetical orientation is labelled: "PARTICIPANT-CITIZEN" (follower) MASSES. The High SOCICULT-High RESOURCA scores indicate a preference for social studies which instills a passive-oriented, unquestioning support for tradition and the status quo--"My President right or wrong"--in those who will be followers, not leaders. And the Low SOCICULT-Low RESOURCA scores indicate a preference for social studies which instills a concern with the maintenance of individual freedom--when it and institutional stability seem in conflict--in those who will be leaders, not followers.

The principal polarities, based on the negative correlation, are the high-low interactions. Further hypothetical inference suggests that High SOCICULT-Low RESOURCA teachers identify with the notion of a republic, author-

ity and power, and that their general belief system contains an element of close-minded conservatism; while Low SOCICULT-High RESOURCA teachers identify with the notion of a democracy, legitimacy and compromise, and that their general belief system contains an element of open-minded liberalism. The "proof of the pudding" of such heuristic conceptualization would rest in part on whether the High SOCICULT-Low RESOURCA teachers scored significantly higher on the F Scale than the Low SOCICULT-High RESOURCA teachers.

In summary, these findings⁶ along with Mitchell's work provide a basis for the second phase of instrument development and insights for subsequent basic research.

Implications and Importance

Two areas of implications are delineated: 1) subsequent basic research and 2) anticipated policy decision-making and program practices in social studies education.

Several points for basic research are noted briefly. First, there is a basis for further item construction and refinement and expansion of the scales measuring the social studies/professional belief system.

Second, the second-phase scales could be used to increase our understanding of the professional socialization of social studies teachers. For example, why are some teachers high on SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS and others low? What changes occur during the preservice, undergraduate period? What are the effects of graduate courses and inservice training? What happens to the professional beliefs as a teacher acquires experience in the classroom?

Third, these scales could be used in basic research which seeks to increase our understanding of classroom teaching behavior. The reformulation of Cattell's equation mentioned earlier is applicable here: classroom teaching behavior is a complex function of professional belief dimensions, personality dimensions, and situational variables.

⁶ The relationships between the several background variables in the original study and these six dimensions are not reported in this paper. The variances accounted for are relatively low. For example, two dichotomous variables, chairman/non-chairman and cooperating/non-cooperating teacher, account for .17 ($p < .05$) of the variance of CURRICULUM FOCUS.

The aim of these basic researches would be explanation and prediction, that is, the generation and validation of middle-range theory which consists of interrelated propositions based on empirical research. A hypothetical example of one proposition is: if teachers are high on the SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS dimension, then probably their instruction emphasizes citizenship indoctrination.

We can look beyond this basic research and anticipate several implications which the instrumentation and theory would have for policy decision-making and practices in social studies education. First, the items could be used in methods courses as devices for the teacher-trainees' analysis and clarification of their own professional beliefs.

Second, the methods instructors could use the items and scales for diagnosis-evaluation. Response patterns which suggest logical inconsistencies in the underlying cognitive beliefs might serve to prompt special attention by the instructor.

Third, the instrument might provide a means for systematic placement of student teachers with cooperating teachers who would be of most benefit to the student teachers.

Fourth, we might consider the use of valid scales, along with personality measures, as screening devices in the teacher education program. We probably can agree that there are teachers whose presence in the classroom has an undesirable effect on students, even though we might disagree on exactly what constitutes an undesirable effect. Suggestive of this line of thought are some "early-stage" researches which indicate that persons high in dogmatism are unwilling and/or unable to teach the "new" social studies (Anctil, 1972; Chalker, 1972; Manning, 1972). This is not to claim that avoidance of the "new" social studies is necessarily undesirable. But a closed personality, and by inference closed professional beliefs, tend toward undesirable effects in the classroom (Massialas and Cox, 1966, p. 42; Ro-keach, 1960, p. 16). At some point the extent of closed personality and professional beliefs constitute legitimate cause for withholding recommendation for teacher certification.

On the other hand, one might argue that colleges/universities should not be the sole judge of entry into the profession. There is a middle position between unilateral screening and no screening. Some school systems

might want teachers who are, for example, "new" social studies teacher-types, but other school systems might want other types. Based on a teacher's professional belief profile and personality profile--in conjunction with characteristics of the school and community, and in consultation with the school system--we might match teachers and schools in a mutually congenial relationship.

In conclusion, the importance of this exploratory research rests on its generation of ideas for subsequent basic research and the foreshadowing of uses to which such research can be put.

REFERENCES

- Anctil, D.E. Dogmatism and philosophy: their relation to teacher acceptance and understanding of the new social studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Utah State University, 1972.
- Barth, J.L., & Shermis, S.S. Defining the social studies: an exploration of three traditions. Social Education, 1970, 34, 743-751.
- Cattell, F.B. The scientific analysis of personality. Baltimore: Penguin Books (Pelican Original), 1965.
- Chalker, J.W. A study, using interaction analysis, of the relationship between teacher dogmatism and the reflective method of teaching social studies. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Pennsylvania, 1972.
- Cronbach, L.J. Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. In W.A. Mehrens and R.L. Ebel (Eds.), Principles of educational and psychological measurement. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967.
- DiRenzo, G.J. Toward explanation in the behavioral sciences. In G.J. DiRenzo (Ed.), Concepts, theory, and explanation in the behavioral sciences. New York: Random House, 1966. Pp. 239-291.
- Guertin, W.H., & Bailey, J.P., Jr. Introduction to modern factor analysis. Ann Arbor: Edwards Bros., 1970.
- Inkeles, A. What is sociology? Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Keown, L.L., & Hakstian, A.R. Some notes on the choice of measure of association for the component analysis of Likert scale data. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: Division of Educational Research, Univ. of Alberta, 1972.
- Lykken, D.T. Multiple factor analysis and personality research. Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 1971, 5, 161-170.

- Manning, D.L. Inquiry in the social studies: a study of the relationship between selected personal characteristics of secondary-school social studies teachers and their reaction to the inquiry embodied in the Carnegie/Holt social studies curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston Univ., 1972.
- Massialas, B.G., & Cox, C.B. Inquiry in social studies. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Merton, R.K. On theoretical sociology. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- Mitchell, C.C. Empirical dimensions underlying high school social studies teachers' ideas about what should be the nature of their subject field: an exploratory study related to the concepts of social studies culture and role socialization. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Georgia, in progress.
- Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Olsen, M.E. The process of social organization. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.
- Overall, J.E., & Klett, C.J. Applied multivariate analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Rapoport, A. Some system approaches to political theory. In D. Easton (Ed.), Varieties of political theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966. Pp. 129-141.
- Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Rummel, R.J. Applied factor analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern Univ. Press, 1970.
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M. & Cook, S.W. Research methods in social relations. (rev. ed.) New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1959.
- Shaw, M.E., & Wright, J.M. Scales for the measurement of attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Sherif, M. Theoretical analysis of the individual-group relationship in a social situation. In G.J. DiRenzo (Ed.), Concepts, theory, and explanation in the behavioral sciences. New York: Random House, 1966. Pp. 47-71.
- Triandis, H.C. Attitude and attitude change. New York: John Wiley, 1971.
- Tucker, J.L. Teacher education and the "new" social studies. Social Education, 1972, 36, 548-554 & 560.
- Tucker, J.L. Training teachers: curriculum inventors or adopters? Paper

presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1973.

Wallace, W.L. The logic of science in sociology. Chicago: Aldine, 1971.

Willer, D. Scientific sociology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

Williams, R.M., Jr. American society. (3rd ed.) New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1970.

FIGURE 1
SIX TENTATIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES PROFESSIONAL BELIEF SYSTEM

Low scores tend to indicate a preference for:	Dimensions	High scores tend to indicate a preference for:
academic-oriented, discipline centered curriculum with separate-discipline organization	CURRICULUM FOCUS (Factor I)	student-oriented, problem-centered curriculum with inter-disciplinary organization
expository, descriptive strategy for academic achievement with conservation of values	INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS (Factor II)	heuristic, interpretive strategy for self-concept development with reconstruction of values
reflective, relativistic (cosmopolitan) social membership and cultural pluralism	SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS (Factor III)	patriotic, nationalistic (ethnocentric) social membership and cultural consensus
process-oriented, thematic historical study with emphasis on generalizations	HISTORICAL STUDY (Factor IV)	content-oriented, chronological historical study with emphasis on facts
emphasis on programs for the more-able students and their intellectual development	RESOURCE ALLOCATION (Factor V)	emphasis on programs for the less-able students and their sociocivic preparation
separate-discipline, nationally-developed curricula with the teacher as "adopter"	PROGRAM DERIVATION (Factor VI)	inter-disciplinary, locally-developed curricula with the teacher as "inventor"



High SOCIOULT

patriotic, nationalistic (ethnocentric)
social membership and cultural consensus

IDEOLOGICALLY-CONSERVATIVE
(leader) ELITES

"SUBJECT-CITIZEN"
(follower) MASSES

Low RESOURCA

emphasis on programs for the
more-able students and their
intellectual development

High RESOURCA

emphasis on programs for the
less-able students and their
sociocivic preparation

IDEOLOGICALLY-LIBERAL
(leader) ELITES

"PARTICIPANT-CITIZEN"
(follower) MASSES

Low SOCIOULT

reflective, relativistic (cosmopolitan)
social membership and cultural pluralism

HYPOTHETICAL PREFERENCES BASED ON THE INTERACTION
OF THE SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS AND RESOURCE ALLOCATION DIMENSIONS

FIGURE 2

TABLE 1
 FACTOR I (CURICLUM): THE 14-ITEM CURRICULUM FOCUS DIMENSION ($\text{Alpha} = .85$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
3	<u>STUDENT INTERESTS</u> ^a -- academic disciplines	2.2	1.0	.69 ^b
8	<u>SOCIAL ACTION</u> -- social science	2.6	1.0	.65
59	<u>AGREE</u> increased civil rights for students	2.3	1.0	.64
54	<u>AGREE</u> student-planned goals and activities	2.0	1.0	.62
34	<u>MELIORATION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS</u> -- knowledge of acad. disciplines	2.5	1.0	.60
51	agree maintaining "integrity" of separate disciplines	3.5	1.2	-.59
55	<u>AGREE</u> flexible patterns of classroom management	1.7	1.0	.54
57	<u>AGREE</u> dealing with problems of disadvantaged minority groups	1.7	0.7	.52
50	agree historical content	2.9	1.2	-.48
21	<u>INTERDISCIPLINARY CURRICULA</u> -- separate discipline curricula	2.0	1.1	.45
47	<u>THE FUTURE</u> -- the past	2.6	0.9	.45
41	<u>CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS</u> -- non-controversial topics	2.1	0.8	.44
58	<u>AGREE</u> increased acad. freedom for social studies teachers	2.1	0.6	.42
44	hist. as scientific discipline -- <u>HIST. AS HUMANISTIC DISCIPLINE</u>	3.8	1.0	-.38

^a The polar characteristics and either the agrees or disagrees which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores.

^b Those items which load positively (+) were reverse-scored to obtain the dimension scores. The item means shown are for the initial coding. The reverse scoring "flip-flops" the means, e.g., in the first item (variable 3) from 2.2 to 3.8.

TABLE 2

FACTOR II (INSTRUCT): THE 13-ITEM INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS DIMENSION ($\text{Alpha} = .84$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
9	lecture	4.1	0.9	.65
4	description of social phenomena	3.9	1.1	.64
24	value-excluded inquiry	4.0	1.0	.62
-1	classroom activities	3.5	1.2	.59
12	academic achievement	3.9	1.0	.58
45	social systems	3.0	0.9	.57
48	the present	2.8	0.9	.51
17	teacher talk	4.1	0.8	.48
18	conservation of values	3.5	1.0	.46
5	"closed" convergent inquiry	4.1	1.0	.44
26	cultural ideals	3.4	0.9	.44
6	specific events	4.2	0.9	.44
10	homogeneous classes	3.2	1.3	.42

^a The polar characteristics which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores.

TABLE 3

FACTOR III (SOCICULT): THE 9-ITEM SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS DIMENSION ($\underline{\text{Alpha}} = .83$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
15	<u>PATRIOTIC VALUES</u> ^a -- values of scientific inquiry	3.1	1.3	.69
23	<u>NATIONAL HISTORY</u> -- comparative history	3.6	1.2	.66
30	<u>VALUE COMMITMENT</u> -- value clarification	3.4	1.1	.66
16	<u>SOCIAL STUDIES</u> -- social science	3.1	1.1	.65
29	<u>HISTORICAL PERSONALITIES</u> -- social science concepts	3.8	1.0	.58
31	<u>CULTURAL CONSENSUS</u> -- cultural pluralism	3.6	1.0	.53
33	<u>HISTORY</u> -- social science	3.5	1.1	.52
46	<u>ETHNOCENTRISM</u> -- cosmopolitanism	3.7	1.0	.52
25	<u>PROBLEM FINDING ABILITY</u> -- problem solving ability	3.5	1.0	.50

^a The polar characteristics which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores. All of these items were reverse-scored to obtain the dimension scores. The item means are for the initial coding. The reverse scoring "flip-flops" the means, e.g., in the first item (variable 15) from 3.1 to 2.9.

TABLE 4

FACTOR IV (HISTSTUD): THE 8-ITEM HISTORICAL STUDY DIMENSION ($\underline{\text{Alpha}} = .69$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
36	thematic history	2.3	1.0	.68
38	process	2.5	1.0	.56
13	political efficacy	3.0	1.1	.52
35	<u>SPECIFIC FACTS</u>	3.5	1.1	-.51 ^b
20	curriculum materials development	2.9	1.1	.46
41	controversial topics	2.1	0.8	.45
32	in-service teacher education	2.6	1.2	.43
50	<u>AGREE</u> historical content	2.9	1.2	-.39

^a The polar characteristics and either the agree or disagree which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores.

^b The two items which load negatively (-) were reverse-scored to obtain the dimension scores. The item means shown are for the initial coding. The reverse scoring "flip-flops" the means, e.g., in the fourth item (variable 35) from 3.5 to 2.5.

TABLE 5

FACTOR V (RESOURCE): THE 8-ITEM RESOURCE ALLOCATION DIMENSION ($\text{Alpha} = .71$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
7	academically above-average students -- <u>ACAD. BELOW-AVERAGE STUDENTS</u> ^a	3.2	0.8	.67
22	cognitive domain -- <u>AFFECTIVE DOMAIN</u>	3.1	1.0	.63
37	descriptive problems ("is") -- <u>NORMATIVE PROBLEMS ("OUGHT")</u>	2.9	0.8	.55
49	the past -- <u>THE PRESENT</u>	3.4	0.9	.53
42	human significance -- <u>HUMAN EFFICIENCY</u>	2.1	0.9	.45
25	problem finding ability -- <u>PROBLEM SOLVING ABILITY</u>	3.5	1.0	.40
28	<u>SOCIAL SCIENCE</u> -- philosophy	2.8	1.0	-.39 ^b
33	history -- <u>SOCIAL SCIENCE</u>	3.5	1.1	.38

^a The polar characteristics which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores.

^b This one item was reverse-scored. With reverse scoring, its mean "flip-flops" from 2.8 to 3.2.

TABLE 6

FACTOR VI (PROGRAMD): THE 7-ITEM PROGRAM DERIVATION DIMENSION ($\text{Alpha} = .67$)

Variable No.	Item	Mean	S.D.	F.L.
60	<u>AGREE</u> ^a curr. dvlpd. viewed as... "invention" by local schools	disagree 2.3	1.1	-.65 ^b
19	national curriculum development -- <u>LOCAL CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT</u>	3.4	1.1	.64
61	agree curr. dvlpd. viewed as... "adoption" of pre-packaged curr. <u>DISAGREE</u>	3.6	1.2	.61
53	<u>AGREE</u> social action as a planned-for-outcome of instruction	disagree 2.1	1.0	-.51
11	pre-packaged content -- <u>TEACHER-DEVELOPED CONTENT</u>	3.7	1.1	.44
58	<u>AGREE</u> increased academic freedom for social studies teachers	disagree 1.5	0.6	-.42
21	<u>INTERDISCIPLINARY CURRICULA</u> -- separate discipline curricula	2.0	1.1	-.35

^a The polar characteristics and either the agrees or disagrees which are in upper case letters and underlined are indicators of high dimension scores.

^b The four items which load negatively (-) were reverse-scored to obtain the dimension scores. The item means shown are for the initial coding. The reverse scoring "flip-flops" the means, e.g., in the first item (variable 60) from 2.3 to 3.7.

TABLE 7

CORRELATION MATRIX: A TENTATIVE MODEL OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES PROFESSIONAL BELIEF SYSTEM; INCLUDING THE NUMBER OF ITEMS, ALPHA COEFFICIENT, AND THE AVERAGE ITEM SCORE FOR EACH DIMENSION ($N = 82$)

Dimensions	No. of Items	Alpha	Ave. Item Score ^a	Pearson r_s					
				CURICLUM	INSTRUCT	SOCICULT	HISTSTUD	RESOURCA	PROGRAMD
CURRICULUM FOCUS	14	.85	3.79		.439	-.321	-.509	.244	.385
INSTRUCTIONAL FOCUS	13	.84	3.66	.439		-.477	-.256	.411	.294
SOCIOCULTURAL FOCUS	9	.83	2.51	-.321	-.477		.289	-.534	-.113
HISTORICAL STUDY	8	.69	2.63	-.509	-.256	.289		-.171	-.236
RESOURCE ALLOCATION	8	.71	3.11	.244	.411	-.534	-.171		.098
PROGRAM DERIVATION	7	.67	3.84	.385	.294	-.113	-.236	.098	

^a The average item score is the mean of the 82 dimension scores divided by the number of items in the dimension. This statistic should be read in relation to the mid-point of 3 in the 5-point item response scale.