

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Plan B and other Reports

Graduate Studies

5-1973

Difficulties Encountered in Implementing the New Social Studies: A Survey of Four Utah School Districts and a Review of the Literature

Larry R. Wilson
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wilson, Larry R., "Difficulties Encountered in Implementing the New Social Studies: A Survey of Four Utah School Districts and a Review of the Literature" (1973). *All Graduate Plan B and other Reports*. 690.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/gradreports/690>

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Plan B and other Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



DIFFICULTIES ENCOUNTERED IN IMPLEMENTING THE "NEW" SOCIAL STUDIES:

A SURVEY OF FOUR UTAH SCHOOL DISTRICTS

AND A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

by

Larry R. Wilson

A report submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF EDUCATION

in

Secondary Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1973

378.2
W 695 di
C 2

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks and appreciation is extended to my committee; Richard S. Knight, Chairman; Ross R. Allen and Douglas D. Alder, members; for the help and support they provided in completing this report.

Larry R. Wilson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE PROBLEM	1
An Introduction	1
PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH	4
Procedure	5
A Survey of Four Utah School Districts	6
Possible Factors that May Have Impeded Implementation ...	6
SUMMARY	26
IMPLICATIONS	30
RECOMMENDATIONS	33
LITERATURE CITED	34
APPENDIX A	36

LIST OF TABLES

1	Results of a Survey of Six of the Larger Utah School Districts Regarding the Extent of Use of the "New" Social Studies	7
---	--	---

THE PROBLEM

An Introduction

During the early 1960's, a number of education surveys were made in which the social studies ranked as least interesting and least useful of all school subjects (Fenton, 1967).

Writing in Nation's Schools in 1969, Dr. Dorothy Fraser, a past president of the National Council for the Social Studies and Coordinator of social science education for the Teacher Education Profession, Hunter College, City College of New York says:

Since the end of World War II, weaknesses of conventional social studies programs have been discussed by social studies specialists but it was not until "Sputnik fever" resulted in widespread public concern about the effectiveness of public education that demands for basic revisions in the social studies curriculum gained momentum.

While the critics often agreed about what was wrong with social studies and what should be done, one fundamental criticism was widely accepted: social studies had lost touch with social reality. U.S. society had been transformed while social studies programs, especially at the secondary level, were dealing with a world of the past.

Of additional concern to critics were various surveys of student reaction to social studies which indicated that it is one of the least-liked areas of the school program. (p. 31)

While most social studies educators recognize the decade of the 1960's as an era of attempted innovation in the social studies there is still considerable question regarding the extent to which effective change has been accomplished (Goetz, 1970).

Attempts to make the social studies more interesting and useful have included such innovations as team-teaching, revisions of department, district, and state guides, increased emphasis on behavioral objectives, and an approach oriented toward structure, process, and student-centered "inquiry" which became known as the "new" social studies (Lundstrom, 1970).

Of all the social studies innovations during the last ten years, the most promising appeared to many social studies educators to be the "new" social studies. The new approach seemed to hold great possibilities for needed answers in the quest for making the social studies more relevant and useful (Switzer, 1971).

The anticipated promise of the "new" social studies has apparently not been realized, however. The literature nationally and a survey of four of the largest school districts in Utah both indicate that the "new" social studies has not been as successful or as widely accepted for classroom use as a number of social studies educators had expected. Writing in Clearing House in March, 1970, William W. Goetz, Social Studies Coordinator for the New Providence (New Jersey) Public Schools, summarizes reaction to the "new" social studies in a way that is generally consistent with the tone and attitude of a considerable number of articles that have appeared in the professional journals during the late 1960's and early 1970's. According to Goetz:

It is ten years since Charles Keller boldly announced the need to "revolutionize" social studies; it is almost ten years since the appearance of Bruner's The Process of Education, a modest book destined to provide the theoretical basis for much of the "new" social studies. Perhaps it is time to ask, "How is the revolution going?"

The rhetoric of revolution has been most impressive. The past decade has witnessed an unprecedented appraisal and criticism of social studies education. The social studies we have been told, has been "social stew", "irrelevant", "textbook-dominated", and "curriculum's foggy bottom". After the bastion of traditional social studies--textbooks, facts, and lectures--has been destroyed, a new generation of prophets appeared confident that they could guide the profession into a new day for the social studies.

. . . [T]here are significant signs that the revolution has not lived up to the expectations of its zealous prophets. One senses this from many sources--from the repetitive haggling over theoretical questions, from the failure of many social studies projects to produce materials and programs on schedule, from expressions of concern over possible confusion in the field, from disclosures that many of the changes occurring are quite superficial, from the frowns that appear when the term "new" social studies is introduced, from reports such as the recent one conducted by the Educational Testing Service that social studies instruction has not changed in a decade, and from the fact that in many, many classrooms fact, lectures, and textbooks seem to hold sway. (Goetz, 1970, p. 404)

Thus, another innovation with seemingly great potential appears to be experiencing the same difficulties and lack of acceptance as previous efforts to bring about meaningful change in the social studies have experienced. And the social studies apparently continue to rate low in terms of student perception of interest and usefulness (New York Times, 1969).

The difficulties that have been experienced in attempts to implement the "new" social studies raise some significant questions regarding the prospects for future innovation in the social studies. Will significant needed change in the social studies curricula ever be possible? If so, under what conditions? Can our experience with the "new" social studies be used to advantage to help assure more extensive success and acceptance of future innovations in the social studies?

PURPOSE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Previous innovations in the social studies have not generally received a high level of teacher acceptance and use. Yet, in terms of interest and perceived usefulness the social studies are still rated low by students and school patrons. New social studies innovations are in the making, some of which appear to hold considerable potential for helping to solve the problem of achieving a higher level of interest and usefulness for social studies courses.

One example of new social studies innovations is the recently completed Utah State School Office Social Studies Guide, Focus on Man, which has been developed under the direction of Mr. Allen Bauer, State Social Studies Specialist. The new guide offers opportunity for social studies educators to accomplish a number of objectives which have, to a considerable extent, defied attainment over the years (Bauer, 1971). The new guide presents a workable process for converting abstract social goals into concrete, identifiable behavioral objectives that are useable in the classroom situation. Proposals and methods for accomplishing meaningful articulation for the social studies in the grades K through 12 as well as within individual social studies departments are also presented (Bauer, 1971).

But again the question that has faced the previous attempts at social studies innovation must be confronted: What are the prospects for success of this new and potentially valuable social studies innovation?

The purpose of this research is to use the current education literature to identify those factors which have worked against the optimum acceptance and use of the "new" social studies. Hopefully, the insights gained from this experience can be used to help assure greater acceptance and use of future social studies innovations, including the new state guide.

Procedure

The present research consists of three major phases. The first part is a survey of six of the larger Utah school districts to determine the extent to which social studies curricula based on the "new" social studies is being used at the secondary level. This survey included the Salt Lake City, Granite, Jordan, Davis, Ogden, and Weber School Districts.

In Davis District, the survey form shown in Appendix A was sent to 80 high school and junior high school social studies teachers. Approximately 50% of the forms were returned. Additional information was supplied by Dr. John S. White, Secondary Social Studies Supervisor.

In the other 5 districts the survey information was supplied by the social studies supervisory personnel as follows: Salt Lake City, Dr. Spencer Bennion; Granite, Dr. Barbara Beal; Jordan, Mr. Boone Colgrove; Ogden, Dr. Jerry Raat; Weber, Mr. Paul Selander. Second, this research will consist of a review of the current education literature, using the following questions as guides: (1) What does the current education literature indicate regarding the difficulties that have been experienced

in attempts to implement the "new" social studies? (2) To what extent does the current education literature provide suggestions for assisting social studies teachers to accept and use the "new" social studies? And third, the findings will be synthesized in a form that can be useful to social studies teachers and curriculum development personnel for implementing future social studies innovations.

A Survey of Four Utah School Districts

One of the basic assumptions of this paper is that considerable difficulty has been encountered in attempts to implement the "new" social studies and that the new approach has not been widely accepted for classroom use. Such assumptions can be tested in two ways:

- (1) Through a search of the current literature, and
- (2) through actual survey of school districts regarding the social studies curriculum used.

It is evident from a number of the sources already cited and from many of those which follow that the above assumption is basically valid. The validity is further supported by the results of a survey of six of the larger Utah school districts as indicated in Table 1, page 7.

Possible Factors That May Have Impeded Implementation

Personal experience and preliminary research indicated the possibility of at least four factors which may have tended to impede implementation of the "new" social studies:

Table 1

Results of a Survey of Six of the Larger Utah School Districts
Regarding the Extent of Use of the "New" Social Studies

District	Total Number Of Sections ¹		*Total Number Of "Primary" Sections ²		*Total Number Of "Secondary" Sections ³	
	High School	Junior High	High School	Junior High	High School	Junior High
Salt Lake City	150	170	20	15	60	40
Granite	265	290	40	60	120	150
Jordan	171	174	0	2	56	67
Davis	184	193	25	24	90	70
Ogden	100	150	0	0	20	0
Weber	109	108	15	0	45	48

¹Total number of social studies sections. All figures are approximate.

²Total number of social studies sections using materials defined as "new" social studies materials as the primary materials for the class.

³Total number of social studies sections using materials defined as "new" social studies materials as supplemental materials for the class.

*Note: The Survey defined the "new" social studies materials as (1) The Fenton (Holt-Rinehart) social studies curriculum materials; or (2) materials produced by any of the social studies projects.

1. Teacher involvement (or lack of it) in preparation of the materials,
2. district and teacher preparation and follow-through in connection with attempted implementation,
3. teacher personality, and
4. the materials themselves, i.e., level, adaptability and usability.

Suggestions resulting from Committee conferences and subsequent research have identified several additional factors. Among these are:

5. changes in social studies education personnel,
6. shifts in national priorities,
7. student involvement (or lack of it) in planning and preparation of materials,
8. changes in how students tend to view the school and learning, and
9. the slow pace of slow change in general.

Each of these nine possible factors will now be considered in terms of the current literature.

Teacher Involvement

In order to more clearly understand the relationship of teacher involvement to the ultimate success of the "new" social studies or to any innovation in the social studies it may be helpful to consider a taxonomy used by the Ahmehrs.

According to the Ahmehrs, a sign of Zing (true intellection) is recognition by the people. In their view, educational leaders are those who speak for the people. Of course, the

wisdom of the people must be brought out sometimes by a painful communal process called Zang (childbirth travail), as in popular suffering. However if there is no recognition freely offered by the people, there is no Zing. "No Zang, no Zing" is, in fact, a fundamental Ahmehr maxim. Further, if Zang is felt only among the educational leaders, it becomes Zong, or false Zang. (Hantula, 1971, p. 40)

After evaluating the "new" social studies in terms of the above analogy, Hantula concludes that "it appears to be an agent for false Zang". In other words, the leaders (curriculum development personnel) may have experienced the travail of developing the new approach, and may, therefore, understand and feel its importance, but the people (the teachers) (and the students?) do not recognize or understand because they have not experienced the travail. No Zang, hence no Zing.

This view is supported by Goetz when he states:

The social studies revolution started at the top. Much of the criticism and proposals came from the university couched in academic jargon and dressed in the refinery of scholarly articles and doctoral dissertations. It failed to turn many teachers on. (Goetz, 1970, p. 405)

And, in a review of Charles Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom, Silberman is quoted as follows in commenting on NDEA Institutes:

. . . The failure to involve ordinary classroom teachers in the creation and modification of the new curricula, moreover, tended to destroy, or at least inhibit, the very spirit of inquiry the new courses were designed to create. (Myers, 1970, p. 135)

Preparation and Follow-Through

It appears possible that at least some of the difficulties associated with the lack of teacher involvement in programs and materials

preparation could have been avoided with more experience, insight, and effort in the area of teacher orientation and follow-through. And apparently the need for continued effort in this area is greater than ever.

There seems to be a tacit assumption among the projects that the design of curriculum and instructional strategies is the task of the curriculum expert or a team. In the procedure the teacher assumes the role of implementor at the classroom level, placing into operation the prepared package according to pre-designed lessons.

The implication here for the administrator is that less use will be made of local curriculum committees, more use will be made of curriculum experts and teachers will be seen as implementors of pre-designed and well-thought-out teaching packages. In short, teachers will spend more time selecting than creating. (Switzer, 1971, p. 27)

Another broader view of preparation and follow-through is mentioned by Fenton (1967) as he outlines implications of the "new" social studies for administrators. After discussing the supportive role of NDEA Institutes and Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs, he indicates:

Two other sorts of in-service work seem desirable. More schools should pay the expenses of teachers who wish to attend national and state meetings of professional organizations such as NCSS. Many such meetings are devoted to the curriculum projects and to the principles behind them. Schools should also pay teachers to visit curriculum libraries which many of the projects maintain. (pp. 72-73)

An entirely new concept that relates to the problem of preparation and follow-through is proposed by Wronski in the 1969 NCSS Yearbook. In looking at the multiple variables that must be considered in order to effect social studies curriculum change he writes:

. . . Correspondingly, the new role suggested for the curriculum director is to call him a "mixer" or orchestra conductor. Nor is this so far-fetched. Senesh has already proposed a new art . . . which I call the orchestration of the curriculum. (p. 296)

Such a concept must surely be an exciting and tantalizing one for many social studies curriculum directors. However, such an analogy, on closer examination, proves to be at least partially invalid for a number of reasons. It is assumed that the various individuals and sections of an orchestra are professionally and personally committed to the group task, that they want to be "orchestrated", and are, therefore, willing to work within a framework of authority (or sometimes, even authoritarianism) with relation to the conductor or "orchestrator". Unfortunately such a willingness obviously does not exist at the present time along large numbers of social studies teachers, curriculum development staff, and administrators, let alone among students.

The unwillingness or inability to be a part of such curricular "orchestration" may be at least partially explained by our traditional tendency to confuse legitimate authority with authoritarianism. This problem is closely related to the larger question of theory of social change which is considered at a later point in this paper.

Teacher Personality and Professional Preparation

Possibly more has been written about this topic than about any of the other factors relating to attempts to implement the "new" social studies. Discussions of teacher attitude, personality, and role as these relate to curriculum change appear frequently in the literature. Such discussions are generally rather pessimistic. A typical example is the following, which appeared in Clearing House in March, 1971:

Teachers have been regarded as unimportant in the change process. . . . Commenting on the role of teachers, Henry Brickwell (1961) observed, "New types of instructional programs are introduced by administrators. Contrary to general opinion, teachers are not change agents for instructional innovations of major scope". Nearly all literature discussing change in the public schools assumes a vertical, authoritarian organization with both the intent and the execution of change coming from the administration. Teachers are cast, not only in a passive role, but frequently in the role of active obstructionists.

Teachers, who are among the most highly educated individuals in any community, have gained the reputation of opposing change. Many writers feel that teachers have carefully cultivated their state of relative powerlessness.

Teachers have invited suppression. Cunningham (1961) noted that teachers have sought well-defined roles which do not leave them accountable for their actions. The administrator who is authoritarian and directive has been the most popular with teachers. "Authoritarianism in the schools", according to Lantner and Howe (1969) "is imposed more by the teacher himself than by anything else". Teachers have debilitated themselves by seeking security at all cost. They have historically been mute about their needs and desires (Wirtz, 1965). Some teachers have made an uproar about making changes, but according to Cunningham and others they allow themselves to be easily suppressed. (Hill, 1971, pp. 424-425)

Some of the traits exhibited by social studies teachers are difficult to interpret. According to Goetz (1970):

Many social studies teachers simply do not feel a need for "reform" and "revolution" in the social studies. Many outstanding social studies teachers have created their own structures and materials and are skeptical of "canned" and "packaged" materials.

Many social studies teachers are unaware of the struggle for a "new" social studies. Only a small percentage of social studies teachers belong to their leading professional organization which has attempted to provide leadership for curriculum reform. (p. 405)

Can such attitudes and behavior patterns be attributed to strong tendencies toward individuality, independence, and self-reliance? Or to lack of interest and absence of professional commitment? The literature pertaining to social studies research does not seem to offer answers to these questions at the present time.

In attempting to identify those personal characteristics most closely associated with teaching excellence, Johnson and Radebaugh (1969) also experienced difficulty in drawing meaningful conclusions:

Finally, one might attempt to explain some of the inconsistencies found in the responses of excellent teachers (sic) to certain items, e.g., their tendency to rely on a supernatural source of authority when acting in their capacity as a public school teacher. (p. 156)

The relationship between teacher personality, teaching style, and preparation for teaching (training) is another complex factor which bears on the problem of social studies curriculum change. It is obvious from much of the literature already cited that some social studies curriculum developers had hoped that teaching style would be positively affected by the "new" social studies. This kind of change has apparently not occurred to a significant degree, however.

It is clear from the experiences with in-service education in the 1960's that traditional practices of offering more content to the teacher in NDEA Institutes, conventions, workshops, etc., does not produce much change in teaching style in the classroom. (Thompson, 1966, p. 53)

And, in fact, attempts to implement the "new" social studies have tended to compound some problems relating to teacher personality and preparation. In addition to the possible threat that the new approach posed for some teachers the "new" social studies also demanded expertise in social studies disciplines with which some social studies teachers were almost totally unfamiliar.

Some social studies educators anticipated the problem of inadequate teacher preparation in the social sciences and attempted to help their

colleagues to become more aware of it, and, hence, to be able to deal with it more effectively.

The most serious implication of the "new" social studies for school administrators, however, will be in the area of teacher preparation. Teaching the new social studies involves knowledge of anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, and geography, as well as a sound background in the history of the U.S., Europe, and the non-western world.

The social studies have for too long been the dumping ground for poorly prepared faculty members whose major interest was in some other school activity such as chaching. Poorly prepared teachers have never been able to teach social studies, which demands knowledge of a sophisticated conceptual scheme from the social sciences as well as the ability to use and teach cognitive processes involved in the validating of generalizations. (Fenton, 1967, p. 71)

Perhaps the most positive, if not optimistic, of the literature dealing with teacher personality and preparation is found in the 1968 NCSS Yearbook. In a chapter entitled "The Social Studies Teacher and Curriculum Change", John S. Gibson (1969) points to some possible approaches for enabling teachers to more effectively perform the role of change agent in the social studies. Gibson's ideas are considered in more detail in this paper in the sections on materials, national priorities, student involvement, and general theory of change.

The Materials

As the so-called "new" social studies materials became apparent, possibly the most obvious was that relating to the level, adaptability, and useability of the new materials. Many teachers who viewed the early "Fenton" films on how to use the "new" social studies felt that the teaching strategies and materials were more appropriate for use with students of relatively high ability and were probably less useful for

average and below-average students (personal experience as Chairman, Secondary Social Studies Curriculum Committee, Davis County School District, 1967 to 1970). This impression is supported by the experience of other social studies educators as reported in the literature.

. . . [T]he major thrust by social studies educators is towards establishing a conceptual structure and using it as a basis for organizing the social studies program. A recent review of twenty-six national social studies projects, for example, indicated a greater emphasis on ideas and methodology from the social sciences, concern for the structure of knowledge, and an interdisciplinary, integrated approach to curriculum development as the distinguishing features of the "new" social studies.

Under this program, he must integrate knowledge from the separate disciplines by himself. Moreover, he must forego study of life problems in favor of problems solvable by the application of separate fields of knowledge. Most important, he must solve problems rationally and thus not emulate adults. (Hantula, 1971, pp. 42-43)

Hantula (1971) adds emphasis to the concern expressed in the above paragraph by referring to a discussion by Arthur Foshay (1970) on the intellectual quality of the "disciplines proposal" for general social studies curriculum development.

A second problem area relates to the speed and/or process by which social studies change is attempted.

One decision that must be faced in curriculum development is the choice between gradual vs. drastic change or revision. It is the author's [Gibson's] conviction that curriculum change is essentially a matter of grafting the new upon the old. He believes that it would be rash and presumptuous for any educator, project staff member, or institution engaged in curriculum improvement in the social studies to recommend a total "wall-to-wall" change in the social studies program in any school. . . . Irrespective of the surface appeal of any innovative curriculum for the social studies, an entirely new and total program should not be adopted by a school system in exchange for its present program. Rather, the "new" must be woven in slowly and carefully. (Gibson, 1969, p. 306)

Still a third problem area involved the rapid proliferation of "new" social studies materials by the various social studies projects and by commercial sources.

The new programs and materials are too disjointed from one another. Social studies projects have been independently based. While this has served the cause of intellectual and creative freedom, it has produced a bewildering mixture of philosophies and materials--enough to tax the energy and time of even the most zealous teachers.

If needed, as Fenton has pointed out, materials are the heart of the "new" social studies, someone, some agency, some group should assume the responsibility for filtering and evaluating the materials being produced by the projects and by the publishers. (Goetz, 1970, pp. 405-406)

One agency that is apparently attempting to act as a clearing house for projects in the "new" social studies is the Social Science Education Consortium, Boulder, Colorado, which is under the direction of Irving Morrissett.

Changes in Personnel

An interesting dichotomy develops when an attempt is made to consider the relationship between changes in personnel and the implementation of social studies curriculum innovations such as the "new" social studies. On the one hand a problem appears to exist because of the occurrence of teacher changes.

Kastrinos (1967) surveyed fifty participants of an NSF Institute for Biology Teachers. He found that within a year, most of the participants had moved. Some responded that they moved in frustration, unable to implement their new ideas. Others had apparently used their new training for personal advancement. (Hill, 1971, p. 425)

On the other hand, a problem appears to exist because teachers tend to be security-bound and unwilling to risk the possible need to move or

change positions in the event that social studies or other innovations should require such moves.

If a teacher desires to make a change, he must be willing to accept the consequences of that action (Cunningham, 1961). The sociologists Brookover and Gottlieb (1964) noted that teachers have traditionally used their administrators as buffers against criticism. A teacher who is asking for authority to make an important change must also be accountable for the effects of the change. It seems reasonable to assume that some teachers are not in a social financial position to ask for the right to create change. The teacher who has property or family ties which cannot be sacrificed in the event a move becomes necessary, the teacher who is fighting for tenure, the teacher who is fighting against formal evaluation; all of these have disenfranchised themselves from the decision-making process. These teachers do not have the freedom to be held accountable for their actions. (Hill, 1971, p. 426)

On the basis of information in the literature that is presently available it would be extremely difficult to draw a meaningful conclusion regarding the net effect of personnel changes on social studies innovation such as the "new" social studies.

It is obvious, however, to most social studies educators who have worked with attempts to implement the "new" social studies and other innovations that changes in personnel, or at least certain "key" personnel, tend to have a devastating effect on the attempted innovation (Allen, 1971).

Shifts in National Priorities

Comparatively little information is available which deals directly with the relationship of shifts in national priorities to attempts to implement the "new" social studies. And again, no firm conclusion can be reached as to the net impact of this factor.

It is possible, however, to interpolate sufficiently to identify another seeming paradox. It may be argued that had NDEA Institutes

and Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs been continued on the same scale as they were funded during the middle 1960's, the "new" social studies would have had more of a chance of success in terms of teacher acceptance and use. This would seem to follow because these programs were designed to familiarize classroom teachers with both the theory and the operation of the "new" social studies.

And, yet, there also appears to be considerable evidence, some of which has already been cited in this paper, that the NDEA Institutes and Experienced Teacher Fellowship Programs were not really effective in bringing about substantial change in the teaching of social studies courses. Gibson (1969) discusses some factors which may be relevant to this problem:

Although a number of universities have hosted social studies research and development projects, there is not much evidence that demonstrates organized links between those projects and the in-service or graduate programs at these universities. The same absence of significant linkage was noted in universities having NDEA Institutes.

In other words, research and development projects and special institutes apparently have had little impact upon the traditional pattern of in-service education offered at universities. This, of course, is a ridiculous situation. One reason for it is that the project directors at the universities do not tend to talk to one another very often. There is a reason to conclude that a lack of communication, and perhaps jealousy on the part of administrators, department chairmen, and faculty members who have not been fortunate in receiving grants or other forms of federal support, are obvious obstacles to enhancing the role of the university as an agent of change through its basic educational program. (p. 313)

Student Involvement

Once again Hantula's (1971) model may be useful. When this model was discussed earlier in the section on teacher involvement social studies curriculum developers were cast in the role of the "educational leaders"

and the teachers were designated as the "people". By moving the model down one step we can view the teachers as the "educational leaders" and the students as the "people".

The basic point of the model remains the same: Involvement and even "suffering to make something work tends to result in commitment and recognition of its importance to those who are involved.

Gibson (1969) approaches the problem from a little different angle, but agrees on the importance of student involvement.

Research clearly points to the fact that students learn more effectively if they are genuine participants in the teaching-learning procedures. This has important implications for the teacher. For one who feels that his principal activity should be to spend most of the classroom hours talking (and frequently talking down) to students in order to "give" them information, this emphasis on active participation by learners demands a totally new conception of the teacher's role as an implementor of change. He must become a guide and a consultant, instead of an oracle. Induction approaches, role-playing, discovery, gaming, and other means for engaging students in active learning have been discussed in earlier chapters. The challenge to the teacher is how to employ such procedures in an effective manner; indeed, meeting this challenge is one of the principal obligations of the teacher in introducing change. At the same time, the teacher who considers his function in the classroom to be that of a guide for learners must handle the decision-making dimension of his role in curriculum planning quite differently than the teacher whose conception of teaching is "giving" information. (p. 308)

Regardless of the extensive rhetoric pointing up the importance of student involvement there are indications that the "new" social studies has not effectively involved students to a significantly greater extent than the more traditional approaches to the social studies. One such indication is a discussion by Roy A. Price (1969) which is presented in the 1968 NCSS Yearbook. Speaking with regard to the need for clarification of goals in the social studies Price states:

Evidence continues to mount that the social studies may be among the least effectively taught of the basic subjects in American schools. Data from standardized inventory tests, interest inventories, and other tests indicate a low pupil motivation level. Results of high school alumni questionnaires generally suggest a low rating by high school graduates of social studies courses taken. Studies by Bellack and others indicate a lack of purposeful and meaningful student-teacher interaction. (p. 35)

Changes in Student Attitude

It is almost certain to be obvious to anyone connected with the secondary public schools have occurred during recent years. Such attitude changes can be conveniently grouped into two categories for purposes of discussion: (1) Changes in attitude toward authority figures, including teachers; and (2) changes in attitude toward the perceived purpose of school.

Implications of attitude changes in the first category are probably easier to deal with because they are more direct and obvious. The fact is that high school "kids" simply are not going to "do what they are told" just because an authority figure tells them to. Such a fact requires major adjustments in teacher attitude, role and teaching strategy. Possibly it is time to "get with" the student to a greater extent than in the past. Such a proposal is outlined by Ralph C. Dobbs (1971) of the University of Missouri at Columbia:

The perceptive youths are in a very real sense pleading for curricular accommodations which are highly similar to what many adults are seeking. In my opinion, the youth of our generation are asking that the curriculum include opportunities to meet the expectations of the modern learner. (p. 43)

In outlining the major features of such a curriculum for teachers and students of the '70's Dobbs includes the necessity for providing opportunity for each learner to perceive of himself as a functional resource and the opportunity for each learner to experience the feeling that someone cares for him as a person.

Student attitude changes of the second kind tend to be more subtle and are, therefore, more difficult to deal with. They are reflected in the writings of Bruner and others in discussions about the increased tendency to use schools, or to see the schools as a tool for use, for gaining greater upward social and economic mobility. Perhaps this shift in student attitude accounts for the present emphasis on career-oriented courses and on vocational education courses and programs.

The implication of attitude changes of this second kind for the new social studies is that such changes will likely tend to cause additional problems in attempts at implementation. Practically and economically speaking (and recognizing the strong need for the "pay-off" to be available "now" or in the immediate future), what kind of job will it get the student who is interested in asking questions about his society? Possibly there is a need for research to determine if or how the social studies can be adapted toward meeting the student attitude of using school primarily for pre-career or vocational education purposes. Certainly this would be possible in sociology with potential career areas in social work, police science, or even business.

But the social sciences in general are obviously more abstract. The 1967 NCSS Yearbook was devoted to the general topic of "effective thinking". In the discussions presented, the domain of the social studies is

described as "not so much determined by the data of social phenomena as by the questions which are asked about the data". And while social scientists and social studies educators recognize the important (even essential) potential role that their field could play in encouraging a more positive trend of development in our society, this does not answer the problem of how to "turn students" on in social studies classrooms.

Just how important it is that social studies educators not lose by default to the influences of technology, business, career emphasis and vocational education, is vividly illustrated by a statement of former United Nations Secretary General U Thant as quoted in Alvin Toffler's (1970) Future Shock:

The central stupendous truth about developed economies today is that they can have---in anything but the shortest run--the kind and scale of resources they decide to have It is no longer resources that limit decisions. It is the decisions that make the resources. This is the fundamental revolutionary change--perhaps the most revolutionary man has ever known. (p. 15)

General Theories of Change

That the "new" social studies have encountered difficulties in attempted implementation appears obvious from the literature cited. Nor is this the first social studies innovation to experience such difficulty. The literature contains extensive analyses relating to the possible reasons for such difficulties, a number of which have been referred to in the previous pages. Much of the self-criticism and soul-searching that is taking place in the social studies may be justified. However, if the process of social studies change is placed in the larger context

of general social change then some of the criticism may be used more constructively. Some of it may also be unwarranted. Such a view of social studies and educational change as a part of general social change is suggested by Stanley Wronski (1969);

Schools do not exist in a social vacuum. They are a part of the total society, and the forces acting upon and within the society inevitably impinge upon the schools. It is a truism that all the major social institutions in any given society interact with each other. It should not be surprising that the educational system conforms to this general rule. Nor is it surprising that the dual and ostensibly incompatible elements of stability and change permeate all society. What is surprising is that the dynamics, process, and theory of social change in general have received such scant attention by those concerned with changing one institution within the total system. One cannot understand the structure or function of a complex machine by observing only one of its cogs. (p. 277)

This point is also underscored by the fact that almost all of the recommendations made by Gibson for accomplishing social studies curriculum change are directly related to or dependent on changes elsewhere in the educational system and/or society. For example:

School systems should allocate an appropriate proportion of their annual operating budgets--not less than one percent--for the support of research, experimentation, and innovation. (Gibson, 1969, p. 317)

Thus, even though Gibson's discussion is entitled, "The Social Studies Teacher and Curriculum Change," it becomes apparent on closer examination that most of the changes referred to go well beyond the control of the individual social studies teacher.

Maybe, when we begin to ask about teachers as "change agents", we need also to ask about government workers, school board members, and

parents as "change agents". Possibly the historical difficulty experienced in attempts to accomplish congressional reform should have a message for us. And could it also be that even education editors, with their frequent urging of educators and schools to change, may in reality, be holding on more than they realize to the ideas and ways of a previous era--ideas and ways which actually tend to obstruct the very change which they so glibly appear to advocate. For example, compare the quotation from U Thant (page 22) about the relationship of decisions to resources to the standard editorial fare regarding tax rates and structures and the public schools.

Or, possibly the teacher is where the focus really should be with regard to social studies change, change in education, and changes in society.

Miller (1966) has pointed to a source of teacher power--professional negotiation. As teacher organizations mature, concern over salary increases will be shared with teacher-instituted changes of organization, curriculum, and facilities. (Hill, 1971, p. 426)

Wronski (1969) also supports the view that teacher power can be a significant potential for change:

A far more complex and potentially revolutionary use of power is involved in the growing militancy of teachers, individually and collectively. The whole negotiating process between teachers' organizations and school boards goes to the heart of the power structure within a school system. The contractual agreements that emerge from these negotiations frequently contain explicit restrictions on certain types of action that were previously deemed to be within the prerogatives of the school building principal, the superintendent to include teacher representation in the decision-making process involving curriculum change. (p. 288)

The Wronski article continues with a discussion of change theory that could possibly serve as a beginning point for additional badly-needed research relative to the nature of change in our society. And, in fact, it appears that until such research is done and until more comprehensive strategies for change are developed that go beyond considerations of social studies educators and beyond considerations of public education itself, much of the present discussion will be less meaningful than it needs to be.

SUMMARY

Both the literature and the survey of four Utah school districts support the hypothesis that difficulties have been encountered with regard to attempts to implement the "new" social studies.

Nine major areas of potential difficulty were identified and considered. With regard to these nine factors the following conclusions appear to be supported by the current literature:

Teacher Involvement: It is evidence from the literature that the "new" social studies originated at the university level. Failure to involve social studies teachers in the preparation and implementation of the new approach has tended to impair its acceptance and use in the classroom. Such lack of teacher involvement appears to have persisted in spite of NDEA and other programs which have attempted to encourage teacher involvement.

Preparation and Follow-Through: The literature indicates a need for a much greater degree of preparation and follow-through by school districts if social studies innovations are to be affected. The Senesh term "orchestration of the curriculum" best describes this concept. However, there is also evidence that social studies teachers, administrators, and others involved in curriculum change may not be willing to be "orchestrated".

Teacher Personality: The relative effects of teacher personality and preparation upon social studies innovation is difficult to assess.

It is evident from the literature that social studies teachers are not innovators. It is difficult to distinguish strong tendencies toward individuality from lack of professional commitment. It is also evident that the demands placed upon social studies teachers by the "new" social studies in terms of requiring multi-disciplinary expertise have tended to discourage many teachers from using the new approach.

The Materials: This problem relates closely to those of teacher involvement and student involvement. It appears obvious from the literature that both teachers and students function most effectively when operating with materials and programs with which they have been involved from the ground up. Many of the "new" social studies materials have come the other direction: from the universities down to the public schools. Also, the general approach and level of many of the materials appears to be above the level of the average and below-average student.

Changes in Personnel: It is difficult to assess the net effect of this factor on implementation of the "new" social studies. There are seemingly valid arguments both ways: that personnel changes definitely hamper social studies innovation, and that teacher unwillingness to move and/or change also tends to hamper social studies innovation. It does appear obvious, however, that transfers of key people in innovative programs tends to destroy the thrust of such programs.

Shifts in National Priorities: Here again it is difficult to determine the overall effect of a possible problem area. Funding levels have been drastically cut for NDEA and other programs designed to aid

in the implementation of the "new" social studies. But there are compelling indications that these programs did not actually make significant changes in teaching style or in the level of effectiveness in social studies classes in the public schools.

Student Involvement: The need to involve students in teaching-learning situations is expressed frequently in the literature. Social studies educators appear to be committed, probably without exception, to the idea that such involvement is of basic importance to the success of any social studies curriculum approach. However, it also appears that the "new" social studies has not been significantly more effective in encouraging student involvement successfully than many of the more traditional approaches to social studies instruction.

Changes in Student Attitude: This factor appears to be one which has been significant in affecting attempts to implement the "new" social studies. And the net influence has probably been basically negative. Indications are that more work needs to be done in terms of relating social studies course content and activities to more immediate or short-term student interests relative to career or vocational possibilities.

General Theory of Change: This factor appears to be the most significant of the nine problem areas considered. And it may be that until such time as additional research is completed and models for

change are developed that go beyond consideration of only the social studies or just "education", much of the effort to understand many of the difficulties that have been encountered in the other eight areas will be somewhat fruitless.

IMPLICATIONS

The initial intent of this study was to attempt to use the experience with the "new" social studies as a source of insight regarding how best to plan for future social studies innovations, including use of the recently published State Social Studies Guide, Focus on Man (Bauer, 1971).

The kinds of implications anticipated from such a study related to the nine problem areas discussed. It was hoped that some rather specific answers could be found and documented and that these could serve as a guide for future attempts at social studies innovation. A number of possible answers of this specific type were found in the literature and are discussed and summarized in the preceding pages.

In addition to the specific implications referred to above, however, several possible further implications of a more general nature appear evident. These can be grouped for discussion purposes into four categories:

1. Implications relating to the apparent fact that there still exists a problem with regard to the relative effectiveness of social studies education. The message here would seem to be that social studies curriculum developers and social studies teachers must continue to try to find new means by which social studies classes can be made more relevant and interesting. Ways must be found to encourage social studies teachers to accept and use innovations such as the new State Guide.

2. Implications relating to the apparent fact that it is extremely difficult to place responsibility for lack of responsiveness to change with any one individual or group. It is apparent that most school districts tend to assume that teachers are professionals and therefore, function on more of a "staff" or colleague basis with regard to relationships between teachers and principals or supervisors. This is as opposed to a more authoritarian (and possibly more efficient) "line concept where orders are given and orders are carried out. Our society is not as well-known for its efficiency as it is for its commitment to the protection of individuality and diversity.
3. Implications relating to the fact that social studies change and education change are merely aspects of larger social change. Change comes slowly and is part of a series of extremely complex social process. "Educators (in common with many other classes of people) have too long looked for simple answers to complex problems. They are never found because they simply don't exist" (Ellsberg, 1969, p. 180). Realistic approaches to social studies innovations in the future will have to be viewed in this broader context.
4. Implications relating to proposals for alternative methods of providing for "public education" outside the existing school system. The difficulties encountered in attempting to implement the "new" social studies are not unique. "Most education innovations suffer from setbacks, particularly if they were

introduced with too much haste and too little forethought"
(Meyer, 1969, p. 203).

The thing that may be unique about the experience with the "new" social studies in the point in time at which the attempted innovation occurred. It appears that increasing numbers of people are becoming convinced that public education is incapable of needed and significant change.

. . . Now, in the early seventies, there are those who believe that school systems cannot and will not be able to change sufficiently to meet the changing needs of American society and, consequently, that new educational alternatives will have to be provided. (Georgiades & Trump, 1971, p. 55)

Thus, one compelling message that emerges from the literature is one of apparent enigma. For while social studies change may seem to occur slowly and with great difficulty, there is another kind of change that is occurring with increasing swiftness:

Change is avalanching upon our heads and most people are grotesquely unprepared to cope with it. The disturbing fact is that the vast majority of people, including educated and otherwise sophisticated people, find the idea of change so threatening that they attempt to deny its existence. Even many people who understand intellectually that change is accelerating have not internalized that knowledge, do not take this critical social fact into account in planning their own personal lives. (Toffler, 1970, p. 12)

Toffler's analysis, like much of the preceding discussion in this paper, may not offer specific answers to the enigma we face with regard to social studies change. But it may help us to better understand the problem so that we can begin to deal with it.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In view of the findings of the present research, this author would make the following recommendations:

1. That further research be encouraged relative to the dynamics of social change. Information, models, and strategies are obviously needed before significant change in the social studies can be accomplished.
2. That research be encouraged regarding the extent to which the social studies might be more closely related to the career and/or vocational interests of students.
3. That perhaps the most realistic approach for the social studies educator (even the would-be innovator) for the next few years will be to concentrate on implementing new social studies on an individual classroom basis and by encouraging colleagues to innovate where possible. One classroom that really "works" and finds success with the "new" social studies may be worth more than much of the evangelism of recent years.

LITERATURE CITED

- Allen, R.R. Professor of Secondary Education, Utah State University, Logan, Utah, Personal Interview, November 1971.
- Bauer, A. Focus on Man: Social Studies for Utah Schools. Salt Lake City, Utah: Utah State Board of Education, 1971.
- Dobbs, R.C. The perceptive youth and sound curricula. Clearing House, 1971, 45(1), 43.
- Ellsberg, A.W. A relevant high school curriculum. Journal of Secondary Education, 1969, 46(4), 180.
- Fenton, E. The new social studies: Implications for school administrators. Bulletin: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1967, 51(317), 71-73.
- Foshay, A. How fare the disciplines. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 51(7), 349-352.
- Fraser, Dorothy. Curriculum for the '70's: Social studies. Nation's Schools, 1969, 84(1), 31.
- Gibson, J.S. The social studies teacher and curriculum change. Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.
- Goetz, W.W. The new social studies: Boon or bust? Clearing House, 1970, 44(7), 404-406.
- Georgiades, W., & Trump, J.L. Which elements of school programs are easier to change and which are most difficult, and Why?. Bulletin: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971, 55(355), 55.
- Hantula, J. Social education: Is it zing, zang, or zong? Clearing House, 1971, 46(1), 40-43.
- Hill, C.H. Teacher as change agents. Clearing House, 1971, 45(7), 424-427.
- Johnson, J.A., & Radebaugh, B.F. Excellent teachers: What makes them outstanding? Clearing House, 1969, 43(3), 156.
- Lunstrom, J.P. Tradition and change in the social studies: Some observations on a decade of reform. Educational Resources Information Center, June 10, 1970, No. Ed 040 096.

Meyer, J.A. Salvaging team teaching. Clearing House, 1969, 43(4), 203.

Myers, M. A teacher reviews Crisis in the Classroom. Bulletin: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970, 54(350), 135.

New York Times. Report from ETS indicates that social studies instruction has not changed in a decade. Section I, July 20, 1969, 31.

Price, R.A. Goals for the social studies. Social Studies Curriculum: Prospects and Problems. Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1969.

Report from Educational Testing Service Indicates that Social Studies Instruction Has Not Changed in a Decade. The New York Times, July 20, 1969, Sec. I, 31.

Switzer, T.J. The new social studies: Promise and problems for the administrator. Bulletin: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971, 55(353), 25-34.

Thompson, J.M. Teachers, history, and NDEA Institutes, 1965. American Council of Learned Societies, 1966.

Toffler, A. Future Shock. New York: Random House, 1970.

Wronski, S.P. Implementing change in social studies programs: Basic considerations. Social Studies Curriculum: Prospects and Problems. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1969.

APPENDIX A

Davis District
Secondary Social Studies Survey

Please check one:

High School
 Junior High School

To what extent are materials from the "New Social Studies* Used in the courses you teach? Please check one:

Not used.
 Used as supplemental text or materials.
 Used as the primary text or materials.

Any comments you would care to make:

For 10th Grade American History the materials are too difficult. The average 10th grader has enough difficulty reading without analysis of contemporary material. Really would like to see American History a one-year course at a higher level of student maturity.

Signed,

Mr. Schoening LHS

*The "New Social Studies" materials would include the Fenton-Holt, Rinehart social studies curriculum and/or materials prepared by the various social studies projects such as the World History or Geography Projects.