This bulletin explores the effectiveness of law related education (LRE) programs by surveying the relevant research. The document begins with the article "Research and Law Related Education: Perceptions, Perspectives, and Possibilities" (David T. Naylor). The article identifies five categories of questions important to LRE research: (1) What is the nature and status of LRE? (2) What impact does LRE have on the lives of students? (3) What is needed to teach LRE effectively? (4) How should teachers be prepared to teach LRE? and (5) What is required to get and keep LRE in school programs? Five functions of research are identified: (1) to provide scientific underpinnings to the ideas and practices regarded as common sense; (2) to uncover new perspectives and provide fresh ideas; (3) to uncover ways of proceeding requiring different beliefs or complex actions; (4) to produce findings that simplify practice; and (5) to yield ideas and findings that are counter-intuitive. Ten references are included. The remainder of the bulletin consists of summary reports of seven research studies in progress: (1) "Exploring the Dimensions of Political Tolerance among Adolescents"; (2) "Current Status of LRE in Elementary Classrooms"; (3) "Teachers' Conceptions of Justice as Implemented in Social Studies Curriculum"; (4) "Judicious Discipline: Teachers and Students Practicing the Language of Citizenship"; (5) "Impact of Mediation Experience on Mediators"; (6) "Cognitive Development in Young Children: Issues of Literacy Expression and Law"; and (7) "An Analysis of Initial Law Related Education: Case Studies of Elementary School Teacher-Pupil Interactions Related to the Concepts of Law and Order." Eight research proposals are summarized. Contains 26 references. (OK)
LRE Research: A Status Report
During the 1970s and 1980s, law-related education (LRE) established itself as an important influence in the social studies curriculum. Reporting in 1985 on her four-state survey of Council of State School Studies Specialists, Carole Hahn observed that, "The biggest change since 1977 is that law programs are now in wider use than any of the new social studies' projects" (p. 221). Slightly more than one half of her respondents identified LRE as the most frequently added "theme" in their state's social studies curriculum. They ranked it fourth among a list of social studies priorities in their states, trailing only citizenship education, economic education, and critical thinking/problem solving. Charlotte Anderson (1987) echoed Hahn's findings in an article published two years later by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. She wrote, "All the evidence indicates that LRE is indeed 'for real'; that it is very much alive and prospering as a contributor to the secondary curriculum in 1987" (p. 1).

Despite LRE's growth and impact, information about it has been remarkably absent from the professional literature. To date, LRE has apparently been able to generate only limited scholarly interest, especially among researchers. After conducting an extensive literature search, Dorothy Skeel (1991) found only 13 research studies related to LRE published between 1977 and 1987. Of them, nine were dissertations, two of which were completed at her own university. Skeel observed: "Even though LRE programs are widely used, little research is being conducted to verify that use" (p. 63). The results of a Social Science Education Consortium study published in November 1990 supported Skeel's observation. That study, which examined the contents of commonly read professional education journals published between 1985 and 1989, reported that few articles and "informal studies of LRE as a subject or a pedagogy were found in the research literature" (p. 12).

Other sources of information about LRE exist, but much of it is unpublished and difficult to access. Much of it consists of reports to public funding agencies by LRE projects. These reports include descriptions of the programs and activities of individual projects, statistical data about the number of states, teachers, students, lawyers, judges, and others involved in those projects, and data, largely self-report in type, detailing the perceived impact a project has had on those involved with it. Such data sources are notoriously suspect. Also suspect are assessments of LRE national projects, even when they have been conducted by reputable outside agencies.

Between 1979 and 1984, the Department of Justice Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention funded a collaborative of five national LRE organizations "to develop and demonstrate effective methods of implementing LRE" (Hunter, 1991, p. 49). Assessment studies conducted jointly by the Center for Action Research of the University of Colorado and the Social Science Education Consortium (Johnson and Hunter, 1986) yielded controversial results, including the finding that LRE, when properly taught, reduces delinquent and school rule-breaking behavior. Concerns about research design, methodology, and conclusions, especially the reliance on student responses to attitudinal and self-reported delinquency measures, have been raised both within the field and within the research community. Similar concerns have also been voiced about the evaluations of the effects of the Center for Civic Education's National Bicentennial Competition on the Constitution and Bill of Rights, which were conducted by the Educational Testing Service (1988, 1991).

To date, much of the research in LRE has been undertaken in relation to project initiatives, and it has been done primarily for funding sources. Fortunately, there are encouraging signs that this situation is beginning to change. Acting as a catalyst, the American Bar Association Special Committee on Youth Education for Citizenship (YEFC) sponsored a series of activities designed to increase awareness of the need for broad-based research in LRE and to encourage researchers to engage in it. The
subject of research and LRE occupied a prominent role at a three-day conference in 1988 held at the University of Cincinnati that focused on LRE and preservice teacher education, the results of which have been published (Anderson and Naylor, 1991). Research was also the focus of sessions at YEFC-sponsored national meetings in Chicago (May 1989), St. Louis (November 1989), Newport Beach, California (January 1991), and Chicago (October 1991). Furthermore, in September 1991, YEFC sponsored the National Law-Related Education Invitational Research Seminar. From among more than 30 proposals submitted, 15 were selected. The 18 researchers involved with those proposals, whose positions ranged from teacher and school administrator to full professor, gathered at Vanderbilt University to share and refine their ideas under the tutelage of noted researchers James Shaver and Judith Preissle-Goetz. These types of activities make clear that, increasingly, those involved with LRE are recognizing the importance and value of research and seeking ways to get involved in it.

Given the perceived growing interest in research, what is it that those involved with LRE appear interested in knowing? Based on personal involvement in the six YEFC-sponsored research sessions previously identified, as well as the Skeel literature review previously referenced, a proper response would include at least five basic categories of questions. They are included here, along with illustrative questions within each category, to show the range of research interests.

1. What is the nature and status of LRE?
   a. What constitutes LRE in practice (i.e., in the name of LRE, what does LRE consist of, what kind of instruction is delivered, etc.)?
   b. How widespread is LRE (e.g., how many students in how many elementary and secondary schools, to what extent at the college and university level, how many lawyers and judges are involved, etc.)?

2. What impact does LRE have on the lives of students?
   a. How do students think about law and the legal system?
   b. What do students know about the law and legal system before and after participating in LRE programs?
   c. What skills do LRE programs enhance (e.g., decision making, conflict resolution, critical thinking, etc.)?
   d. How are the attitudes, beliefs, and values of students involved in LRE programs affected?
   e. Do students involved in LRE programs behave differently (e.g., less delinquent acts, better school attendance, more likely to be involved in community affairs)?
   f. How intense an impact does LRE have on the lives of students (e.g., testimonials, career choices, re-orientation in school or personal life, etc.)?
   g. What are the long-term effects on students?

3. What is needed to teach LRE effectively?
   a. How effective LRE teachers teach?
   b. What teaching methods and other factors in LRE programs are most important in influencing students' knowledge, skills, beliefs, attitudes, or values?
   c. How critical are mock trials, moot courts, field trips, and other experiences for teaching LRE?
   d. What types of instructional materials are most effective?
   e. What adjustments need to be made when teaching LRE to different students in different settings?

4. How should teachers be prepared to teach LRE?
   a. Of what value are teacher training programs (e.g., what effect does LRE teacher training have on the teachers who attend, what do teachers do when they return to the classroom, etc.)?
   b. What are the essential elements of LRE teacher training programs (e.g., how much training is needed, what type, what models are available)?
   c. What are the characteristics of teachers who attend LRE teacher training programs (e.g., age, experience, areas of concentration)?

5. What is required to get—and keep—LRE in school programs?
   a. How does LRE get introduced and established in schools (e.g., state mandate, mandatory testing program, elective course, lawyers and bar associations, etc.)?
   b. How is the LRE experience similar to or different from the experience of other educational innovations?

'to what end, it might be asked, should those involved with or otherwise interested in LRE be concerned with research? What might be gained by engaging in broad-based research activity? Perhaps the most effective re-
sponse to those questions is provided by David Berliner (1987), whose perspectives on the functions of research provide a powerful rationale for it. Berliner identifies five beneficial outcomes of research activity. One function is that research permits verification of "ideas and practices known to be effective by most people." In other words, research provides scientific underpinnings to the ideas and practices frequently regarded as "common sense." He suggests that a second function is to uncover new perspectives and provide fresh ideas for understanding educational phenomena. A third function is to uncover desirable ways of proceeding that require different beliefs to be held or different, more complex or demanding, actions to be taken. In short, research can identify paths that complicate practice.

Along these lines, Berliner identifies a fourth function of research—producing findings that simplify practice. Research findings can identify key, salient elements to concentrate on—the things that really matter—as opposed to doing a multiplicity of things. The fifth function is to yield ideas and findings that are counter-intuitive. Research, he points out, can fly in the face of current thinking by contradicting prevailing beliefs and practices and by refuting erroneous assumptions that have a common sense flavor. A research program in LRE that realizes each of these five functions would do much to enhance LRE specifically, and education generally.
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LRE Research in Progress
Below are summary reports of seven research studies in progress. Each was first presented at the National Law-Related Education Invitational Research Seminar: Exploring the Dimensions of Political Tolerance Among Adolescents
Researcher: Patricia Avery, Assistant Professor, Social Studies Education, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
In 1987, Professor Avery conducted a survey of 480 ninth and eleventh grade students' willingness to extend basic human rights to disliked social and political groups. Students were asked to identify groups which they personally disliked. They were then asked to indicate their willingness to extend specific rights to the disliked group. Results generally supported previous research: gender (females), political experiences (high), cognitive moral reasoning (high), and perceived threat (low) were associated with higher levels of tolerance.
In 1989, she gave another survey to 546 tenth and eleventh grade students and conducted semi-structured interviews with 20 of the least tolerant and 20 of the most tolerant students concerning the rights of dissenters to hold demonstrations. The patterns of responses suggested that tolerant and intolerant students have different conceptualizations of dissent and dissenters. The tolerant students tended to display a broader knowledge and understanding of their least-liked group while at the same time readily acknowledging their dislike for the group's beliefs. The intolerant students, like the tolerant students, considered the potential negative consequences of dissent; unlike their counterparts, the intolerant students were more certain of the effects.
In 1990 Professor Avery, along with John Sullivan, Professor of Political Science at the University of Minnesota, and a team of public school teachers, wrote a four-week curriculum, Tolerance for Diversity of Belief. Throughout the curriculum, students systematically ex-
amine the ways in which the legal and constitutional framework of our society directly embodies the norms of freedom of speech and minority rights. Case studies, role play, simulations and mock interviews encourage students to consider the short- and long-term consequences of intolerance for the victim, the perpetrator, and society.

The curriculum was piloted in two school districts in the spring of 1990 and the results of pre- and post-tests indicated a statistically significant increase in students' level of tolerance. In spring 1991, four civics teachers taught the curriculum and, in addition to pre- and post-tests, the students kept journals and some of the students (selected to represent the extremely intolerant, moderately intolerant/tolerant, and extremely tolerant) were interviewed.

Professor Avery is currently analyzing the raw data gathered in 243 surveys and 23 interviews. She has completed the quantitative analysis and continues to analyze the qualitative data. She has considered extending this research through classroom observations of the ways in which teachers implement the curriculum, textbook analyses of the ways in which dissent and dissenters are portrayed, and comparisons of expert and novice approaches to First Amendment dilemmas.

* * *

Current Status of LRE in Elementary Classrooms
Researcher: Sherry L. Field, Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction, University of Colorado-Denver

Professor Field views the elementary social studies classroom as a viable, important opportunity to promote citizenship education. Throughout the school day, teachers draw both informal and overt attention to law-related educational themes creating "teachable moments" to further the ideas of democratic principles.

The aim of her research is to establish the state of current practice of LRE in the elementary curriculum. She began by distributing self-report surveys (reproduced in the box opposite) to 31 elementary social studies teachers in a major Denver-area school district. Her next step will be to interview in depth at least 5-10 of these teachers.

* * *

Teachers' Conceptions of Justice as Implemented in Social Studies Curriculum (tentative title)
Researcher: Andra Makler, Assistant Professor, Lewis and Clark College, Portland, OR

Law-related education seems a logical and practical place to assist adolescents in exploring issues of justice, ethics, and morality. Studies by Gilligan, Lyons and others on adolescent conceptions of morality, however, suggest that males and females may develop different conceptions of justice and morality.

Law-Related Education Goals Self Report Form

Name________________________School________________________

Grade Level________________________

Jarolimek (1990) and Anderson (1980) have established basic goals for law-related education in the elementary grades. The purpose of this self-report is to determine how you specifically address these goals in your classroom, if at all. For each goal identified, please note whether you plan or lead specific activities which would satisfy the goal. If you do not address a specific goal, please justify briefly.

1) Develop an understanding of concepts that are basic to the legal system, such as liberty, justice, fairness, toleration, power, honesty, property, equality, and responsibility.

2) Develop an understanding and appreciation of the constitutional basis of the American legal system.

3) Develop a functional knowledge of how the institutions of the legal and justice systems operate.

4) Develop an understanding of and respect for the need for a system of law and justice as prerequisite for orderly and harmonious living.

5) Perceive law as promotive, facilitative, comprehensible, and alterable.

6) Perceive people as having the potential to contribute to the social order.

7) Perceive right and wrong as issues all citizens can and should address.

8) Being reflective decision makers and problem solvers who make grounded commitments.

9) Being able to give reasoned explanations about commitments made and positions taken.

10) Being socially responsible conflict managers.

11) Being critically responsible to legitimate authority.

12) Being knowledgeable about law, the legal system, and related issues.

13) Being empathic, socially responsible, and considerate of others.

14) Being able to make mature judgements in dealing with ethical and moral problems.

Previous research by Professor Makler has indicated that "fairness" is a high priority for social studies teachers in terms of student perception of their practices (grading, etc.) and that few seem to teach explicitly about justice. Her current research will employ interviews exploring the following questions:

Of the law-related education curriculum actually used in classrooms—

- what (if anything) is taught about principles of justice?
- what proportion of instructional time focuses on principles of justice as compared with information
about law and procedures of the court/legal system?
• which principles of justice are most often addressed,
in what context, and towards what intended outcomes?
• what is the rationale for the practices chosen?
• do male and female teachers' approaches differ
  significantly?

In addition, Professor Makler is considering including
a series of questions about fairness/justice in the "in-
formal" (implicit) curriculum rather than just focusing on
the explicit curriculum of what is actually taught as "subject
matter."

Judicious Discipline: Teachers and Students Practicing
the Language of Citizenship

Researcher: Barbara McEwan, Assistant Professor,
Elementary Education, Oregon State University,
Corvallis, in cooperation with Forrest
Gathercoal, Professor of Education, Oregon
State University, College of Education

Judicious Discipline, by Forrest Gathercoal, is a model
of classroom management designed to instruct children,
grades K to 12, about their citizenship rights and respon-
sibilities. The key to this model lies in experiencing the
balance between individual rights as guaranteed by the
Constitution, and "compelling state interests" that serve
our society's need for a safe, healthy, and undisturbed
environment.

Teachers using Judicious Discipline in their class-
rooms begin by introducing students to the rights they
are guaranteed by the First, Fourth, and Fourteenth
Amendments. This is followed with an explanation of
when those rights will be denied. If a teacher, adminis-
trator, or staff member is able to demonstrate that the ac-
tions of students threaten the health, safety, property,
and/or educational purpose of the school, then students
should lose their rights. Judicious Discipline advocates
approaching discipline problems as teachable moments.

Interviews conducted by Professor McEwan with stu-
dents, parents, teachers, and school administrators indicate
that use of Judicious Discipline expands conceptual
education across the curriculum, permitting all members of
a school community to appreciate and directly ex-
perience the nuances of the balance between citizenship
rights and responsibilities in a participatory democracy.
Through a series of further interviews, she plans to docu-
ment students' use and understanding of the language of
citizenship acquired through instruction using Judicious
Discipline.

Impact of Mediation Experience on Mediators

Researchers: Anthony R. Moriarty, Assistant Principal,
Rich Township High School, District 227,
Olympia Fields, Ill. and Shirley P. McDonald,
Clinical Assistant Professor, Jane Addams
College of Social Work, University of
Illinois-Chicago

In its effort to keep students in school, Rich East High
School began a pilot project applying mediation tech-
niques to problems which normally result in school sus-
pensions. In selecting students for mediation training the
project recruited those who were a positive influence on
their peers. The training followed the model of the Har-
vard Mediation Project (Fisher & Ury, 1981). During its
first school year (1988-89), the mediation project pro-
cessed 47 referrals with a recidivism rate of zero. The sec-
ond year of the project produced similar results, including
fewer suspensions, increased student acceptance of the
concept of proactive intervention, and the recognition
that students identified as mediators have enormous
potential to exercise leadership skill to improve operation
of the school system.

The current focus of the project is research to deter-
mine the impact of the mediation experience on the stu-
dent mediators. For a pre-mediation assessment, the
teachers of the 28 student mediator-trainees, completed
the "Behavior Evaluation Scale" (McCarney, Leigh & Cormblet, 1983) on each student. A post test will be ad-
ministered at the end of the school year. These data along
with evaluations by staff members and an assessment of
recidivism rates, will constitute the material for an out-
come study on the effect of mediation on the mediators
and the school.

This project has two unique elements. First, the as-
istance of a research grant from the University of Illinois-
Chicago was obtained and these services will be available
throughout the year. Second, the training included a group
of students from the special education programs at Rich
Central and their progress in mediating disputes within
the special education programs will be monitored
throughout the year.

Cognitive Development in Young Children—Issues of
Literacy Expression and Law

Researcher: Richard L. Roe, Professor of Law, Program
Director, D.C. Street Law Project, Geo-
getown University Law Center, Washington,
DC

Professor Roe has investigated the topic, "Valuing Student
Speech: The Work of the Schools as Conceptual Develop-
ment," (Cal. L. Rev. 79: 1269 (1991)). He found that the
prevailing judicial understanding of the work of the schools as inculcation of knowledge and values is inac-
curate and leads to legal rules which, by deferring to the
judgment of school authorities without a showing of ma-
terial and substantial disruption of the school's work, dis-
tort the function of student and teacher expression in the
schools. With the work of the schools understood as con-
ceptual development, however, students and teachers can
establish significantly more tolerance for their speech un-
der First Amendment protection, and, in turn, further de-
velop their cognitive and civic abilities.

In his present research, Professor Roe is inquiring into
recent advances in the understanding of cognitive de-
development as they relate to legal socialization. He believes that one's cognitive development and related knowledge are significant factors in one's feelings, beliefs and capacity to act with respect to expression, civic participation, and the law generally. Moreover, the lessons a child learns in how he or she learns are as important as, and contribute to, the shaping of what he or she learns. The practical application of this research would help law-related and other educators to engage in learning practices with their students that are more conducive to values supporting justice, fairness, and due process. The ideas would also be applicable to high school students and prison inmates, constituencies of Professor Roe's two clinical programs, in the education of their present and future children.

To establish a forum for ongoing research, Professor Roe started a pilot family literacy program for prison inmates, which trains prisoners and their wives/girlfriends in child development and literacy skills and brings families with children under seven years of age together at the prison for reading, crafts, storytelling and other literacy activities. An initial 8-week cycle was followed by a 9-week cycle. The sessions have been observed and videotaped and the participants have completed questionnaires and been interviewed. Preliminary findings indicate substantial knowledge and skill gains among adult participants. Further research is necessary to establish links between expression, literacy and legal socialization. There will also be exit interviews and 3-month follow-up interviews.

An Analysis of Initial Law-Related Education: Case Studies of Elementary School Teacher-Pupil Interactions Related to the Concepts of Law and Order
Researcher: Ron Wilhelm, Assistant Professor, University of North Texas, Department of Elementary, Early Childhood and Reading Education, Denton, TX

Professor Wilhelm proposes that a basic role of formal schooling is instilling in the nation's young children a knowledge of what is appropriate and inappropriate behavior in the classroom and, by extension, in social relations outside school. The school experience is the scene of most children's initial, systematic learning about societal boundaries and behavioral expectations.

In addition to specific academic content related to citizenship education, teachers communicate to elementary pupils information, rules, and expectations about proper work habits, hygiene habits, and social habits including respect for authority and for the property of others. Teachers routinely transmit their expectations through class rules, through their daily interactions with their pupils, and through "rituals of good manners," such as salutations and conflict resolution. An analysis of daily teacher practice and teacher-pupil interaction can reveal the manner in which school children are taught the concepts of "law," represented in class rules, and of "order," represented in "rituals of good manners."

An understanding of law-related education appropriately must attend to the hidden, as well as to the "officially" stated curriculum. Professor Wilhelm's research seeks to identify in the daily teacher practice (instructional methodology) of 5-10 elementary school teachers the manner by which young children are initially taught about restrictions to and protection of an individual's behaviors.

Professor Wilhelm will use the videotape, "Looking at Young Children: Observing in Early Childhood Settings" by the Teacher's College Press, to train his observers. He will engage student teachers to act as participant observers of daily classroom routines. The student teachers will also interview the teachers regarding their rationale for classroom rules and traditions and they will interview the students regarding their understanding of the concepts of law and order. Regular discussions will be held with the student teachers/researchers to probe their understanding of the instructional methodology employed in teaching about social boundaries and expectations.

Summary of Research Proposals
National LRE Invitational Research Seminar
Below are summaries of the other eight research proposals included in the National Law-Related Education Invitational Research Seminar:

1. Case Based Reasoning: A Novel Paradigm for Instructional Research on Law-Related Education
Researcher: Allan R. Brandhorst, Associate Professor of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Professor Brandhorst planned to outline the Riesbeck and Schank model of case-based reasoning, identify some research questions pertinent to the operation of the model in law-related education settings, and distill those research questions into hypotheses amenable to testing in public school settings.

2. Teacher and Student Perspectives of K-12 Law-Related Teaching and Learning: A Qualitative Investigation of the Explicit and Implicit LRE Curriculum
Researchers: Jeffrey W. Cornett, Assistant Professor, University of Central Florida College of Education, Orlando and James J. Elliott, Coordinator of Social Studies, The School Board of Seminole County, Sanford, FL

The researchers proposed to investigate the relationships between teacher thinking and teacher actions as evidenced in the law-related curricular and instructional behavior of K-12 teachers in a local school district and the impact of those actions on student perceptions of the curriculum.
3. **Attention to Law-Related Education in Elementary Social Studies Methods Courses: A Survey of Practices and an Agenda for the Practical**

**Researcher:** O. I. Davis, Jr., Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Texas at Austin

Professor Davis proposed an investigation of the current status of law-related education in the elementary social studies methods courses offered in the 45 state approved programs for the preparation of elementary school teachers in Texas colleges and universities. Based on interviews of Texas' elementary social studies methods course instructors, he planned to recommend practical course suggestions for the inclusion of law-related education in methods courses.

4. **Investigation of Beginning Teachers' Implementation of LRE**

**Researcher:** G. Dale Greenawald, Director, Center for Teaching Social Sciences, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley

Professor Greenawald planned to do an ethnographic study of beginning teachers who, as a result of a secondary social studies methods class, were interested in implementing LRE in their classrooms. The study was planned to focus on the variables that facilitated or inhibited the teachers in their implementation of LRE.

5. **Juveniles in Trouble with the Law**

**Researcher:** Ellen Marrus, Clinical Fellow, D.C. Street Law Project, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, DC

Ms. Marrus planned to examine the similarities and differences of two different programs which use weekly law-related education classes to help rehabilitate juveniles who have been arrested. She planned to gather statistical information on the juveniles to determine if they returned to the criminal justice system and if the classes had an impact on keeping them out of trouble.

6. **The Impact of an International Law-Focus on Secondary Students Participating in a Global Studies Course (tentative title)**

**Researcher:** Thomas J. O'Donnell, Director, Project P.A.T.C.H., Northport-East Northport USFD, Northport, NY

Mr. O'Donnell planned a three-year study to explore whether the infusion of a strong international law focus (content) would enhance a newly emerging secondary global studies curriculum in New York State. He proposed to assess the impact of information acquisition in the content area of international law on secondary school students. The research design would initially involve the monitoring and measuring of ten pilot school districts' staff and student participation in this project.

7. **Linking the Judiciary to the Use of LRE**

**Researcher:** Pat Stein, Assistant Professor, Eastern Illinois University, College of Applied Sciences, Charleston, IL

Professor Stein proposed research linking the judiciary to law-related education by 1) surveying members of the judiciary to discover their understanding, attitudes, and probable support for LRE; 2) surveying teachers and students to assess their attitudes and experiences of the judiciary; 3) designing an effective judicial orientation and training program; 4) disseminating the program through the states; and 5) evaluating the effectiveness of the program both in training and implementation.

8. **Where and How Do Teachers "Learn" Their Values?: Implications for the Preparation of Teachers**

**Researcher:** William H. Vanderhoof, Acting Chair, Department of Educational Foundations and Administration, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, TX

Professor Vanderhoof planned to survey selected Anglo, African American, and Hispanic elementary level teachers (with follow-up interviews) to determine where and how they learned the values which are related to their understanding and respect for the law, and what activities and methods seemed to them to be most effective in their learning and understanding those values.

---
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