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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Economic, social, and political events in recent years have had a profound affect on American education in general and on business education in particular. Many challenges that have confronted the nation have spotlighted the need for greater economic literacy of the American people. Education has long included among its objectives the development of economic efficiency and responsible citizenship (Daughtrey, 1965).

Business education is concerned with two major aspects of the education of youth:

A. The knowledge, attitudes, and nonvocational skills needed by all persons to be effective in their personal economics and in their understanding of our economic system.

B. The vocational knowledge and skills needed for initial employment and for advancement in a business career. (Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education, n.d., p. 1)

Economic activities are an indispensable part of the daily lives of every person. Ample provision should be made through the curriculum for every student to:

A. Develop economic literacy
B. Gain an understanding and appreciation of our economic system
C. Become an intelligent consumer of goods and services. (Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education, n.d., p. 1)
Statement of the problem

The reason for this study was to determine the level of economic understanding among 244 seniors of Washington County, Utah, School District as compared to the national norms developed for the "Test of Economic Understanding" and to Sky View High School students.

Objectives of the study

The specific objectives of this study were as follows:

1. Compare the results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the national norms set by those who have had no course in economics.

2. Compare the results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the results of the seniors of Sky View High School, Smithfield, Utah, who have had no course in economics.

Procedures of the study

On April 2, 1968, 244 seniors from Washington County were called to meetings in the auditoriums of their respective schools. These schools included: (1) Dixie High School (157 senior students), (2) Hurricane High School (64 senior students), and (3) Enterprise High School (23 senior students). Counselors and business education teachers distributed test booklets and answer sheets to each of the students. Data resulting from this activity were compiled and compared to national norms and achievement by Sky View High School students.
Importance of the study

For too long knowledge of economics has been neglected in too many of our secondary schools; and, in the twentieth century, to neglect this area of study is to deny the student an opportunity to acquaint himself with forces which will be of vital concern to him all of his adult life (Dodd et al., 1961).

Relatively few of man's activities are not related in some manner to economics. As future adult citizens, high school students will make decisions concerning employment, consumption, saving, investment, legislation on economic issues, and political candidates and their economic platforms. Too frequently their decisions must be made from a base of economic illiteracy rather than a respectable understanding of the alternatives or the implications of their actions (Dodd et al., 1961).

At the present, no formal economics course exists in any of the Washington County schools. With this in mind, there appears to be need for information by which one can evaluate the level of economic understanding of Washington County high school seniors.

Delimitations and limitations

The following delimitations and limitations were considered in this study:

1. There was only one test given to the Washington County seniors; and, therefore, the results were interpreted
on the basis of just one measuring device.

2. The study of the Washington County seniors could not be considered any better than the measuring device used.

3. The attitudes and emotions of the students, as well as the time of day and environment of the testing area, could have affected the students when taking the test.

4. The background (home, friends, social status, and interests) could have affected the students economic understanding in a manner different from that of the students included in the norm group.

**Definition of terms**

For the purpose of this study, the following terms were used in the manner described below:

**Economic Literacy.** Economic literacy is the possession of that basic equipment in economic understanding and skills needed by every citizen for intelligent and responsible participation in the everyday activities of a modern economy (Daughtrey, 1965).

**Economic Understanding.** Economic understanding is the understanding of how society organizes itself to solve the universal problem of unlimited human wants and scarcity of resources in relation to these wants (Daughtrey, 1965).

**Summary of chapter**

Many people and organizations seem to believe that more and better economic education is essential in the American
economy. For example, a person needs to understand economics in order to make decisions based on economic considerations. The future of the American economy depends on the level of economic understanding of its citizens.

Organization of remainder of paper

Chapter II includes a review of literature related to the problem. Chapter III discusses the procedures that were used to achieve the objectives of the study. The results are presented in Chapter IV. And conclusions that could be drawn and recommendations that seem logical are found in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Current periodicals, dissertations, reports, theses, yearbooks, and pertinent literature on the subject of economic competency were reviewed for their pertinence to this study.

Examples of economic illiteracy

Lemuel R. Boulware (1960), Vice President of General Electric Company, has the following to say:

I believe the elimination or sharp reduction of economic ignorance is the most pressing problem of our country and the world. It seems so obvious that—if economic ignorance had not been, and were not now so widespread in Europe, Asia, Africa, South America, and North America, including the United States—we would not have such recurring problems, of such anxiety and long-continuing expense in lives and treasure, as those presented by Hitler, Stalin, and the lesser dictator-destroyers closer to home. If it were not for this ignorance, the newly free peoples in Asia and Africa would not be expecting magic simply from having their own government. I am for people being free, of course, but what I am afraid is too surely going to happen is that too many of them are going to lose their freedom almost before they have it—simply by embracing ideas they are wrongly assured will protect and enhance their freedom and well-being. (Boulware, 1960, p. 56)

To summarize Boulware's comments, everyone needs a basic understanding of the economic system under which he lives.

A Business Week editorial (Economic Commentary, 1965) reported results of a test given to 12,000 high school
seniors, high school social studies teachers, college sophomores, and industrial employees and managers. Results of this test revealed that high school seniors without formal economics instruction averaged 24.2 correct responses out of fifty questions. High school seniors who had taken an economics class averaged 29.7. Social studies teachers who had taken no economics classes scored 32 correct out of 50. Those social studies teachers with one or two economics courses scored 32.8, and those with five or more formal economics courses scored 37.2. Industrial foreman and first-line supervisors averaged 34.2 on the test, and middle managers achieved 36.3.

Madsen (1961) tested economic "concepts" with twenty-five questions and five controversial questions. The high school senior students' achievement was 48 percent. In his study, there was no significant difference in achievement between the students who had taken classes with economic content and those students who had not taken the classes with economic content. There was no significant difference between boys and girls who participated in taking the test.

In April, 1966, J. Karl Worthington, teacher at Sky View High School, Smithfield, Utah, performed a study similar to the one now reported. He gave the "Test of Economic Understanding" to 328 senior high school students who had not taken a course in economics. He found as a group, the Sky View students who had not taken a class in economics
achieved a mean score of 21.26. The Sky View students who had completed an eighteen-week semester or who were fourteen weeks through a semester of the formal economics class achieved an average score of 28.71 for the group. The group who completed a course in economics consisted of 30 senior high school students.

The mode of the Sky View students who had not taken an economics class fell at a score of 24. Those who had taken an economics course achieved a modal score of 23.

The median scores of the Sky View groups examined were as follows: The seniors who had not taken a course in economics achieved a median score of 22; and, the seniors who had taken a course in economics achieved a median score of 25 (Worthington, 1967).

What economics to teach

Every person needs to be educated to deal effectively with his personal economic problems so that he will manage his personal business affairs in a manner that will produce the greatest good to him. This means education in better buymanship of all goods and services as well as financial planning for his present and future needs. All students in all secondary schools should study business problems and issues. The courses in business economics must include more than the theory of economics and should be coordinated with other teaching materials (Policies Commission for Business and Economic Education, 1961).
A properly organized and conducted study of economics should provide information and learning experiences which will enable the pupil to deal intelligently with materials involving the following:

1. Personal and family finances and the economical use of money. This would include how to spend money effectively and economically and how to invest savings wisely.
2. The choice of an occupation.
3. The organization of business and industry.
4. The exercise of the right and responsibilities of suffrage.
5. Understanding of contemporary culture. (Dodd, 1956, p. 210)

There is no simple answer in the teaching of economics; it is a complex subject. Even the best scholars fail to know everything about economics. "Nobody knows because we would not have sufficient control of human relations of human processes to be able to control them in a multi-dimensional human society." (Tonne, 1965, p. 248)

Who should teach economics

Dodd, Kennedy, and Olsen (1961) say the following as to who should teach economics:

Practices in secondary schools differ widely as to the selection of teachers for courses in economics. In the small high schools, economics is taught by the social studies staff or generalists. The medium and larger high school systems usually assign the economics courses to the staff in business education. The largest city systems, which maintain college preparatory high schools, consider economics as a separate discipline and they generally assign economics courses to personnel who have majored in economics at the master of arts or at the doctorate level. Consequently, there is no common pattern of pre-service training for secondary school teachers of economics.
The current secondary school trends toward stressing intellectualism and toward making economics a required course have had an impact upon the teaching of economics as a profession. The National Association of Secondary School Principals, as an example of one pace setter, is strongly advocating that teachers of any of the social sciences should:

1. Affiliate with and actively participate in both professional organizations and learned societies.
2. Follow a pre-service program with a minimum of five years in college.
3. Divide their in-service education in the approximate proportions of 40 per cent liberal education, 20 per cent professional education, and 40 per cent in the social science disciplines. A major social science concentration of 25 semester hours would be in one discipline field, such as economics. (Dodd et al., 1961, p. 2)

**Summary of chapter**

Most of the literature in this chapter pointed towards the need for more and better economic education. The chapter pointed out the problem of reducing economic illiteracy in schools. And, the success of economic education in the future depends, in part, on how well the various instructional programs related to economics will be organized.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES

The following were related to the activities necessary to conduct this study: (1) Permission to conduct the study, (2) Selection of the measuring device, (3) Administration of the test, (4) Collection of data, and (5) Tabulation of data.

Permission to conduct the study

The superintendent, counselors, and business education teachers of Washington County Public School District, Utah, were contacted to discuss the possibility of conducting this study. In April, 1968, permission was given by the superintendent, counselors, and teachers to administer the test.

Selection of the measuring device

Since one goal of the study was to compare the results of the Washington County seniors to the achievement of students across the nation, it was important to find a test with established national norms. Of course, this test needed to be reliable, valid, and capable of being administered within one class period.

The test selected to be used was the "Test of Economic Understanding," published by Science Research Associates, Inc. The test was copyrighted by the Joint Council on Economic Education. And the "Test of Economic Understanding"
Authors of the test. In July, 1960, the Joint Council on Economic Education appointed a special committee to develop the "Test of Economic Understanding." The chairman of the committee was John M. Stalnaker, President of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. The other members on the committee are as follows:

Albert Alexander, Executive Secretary, New York Council on Economic Education;
George Leland Bach, Maurice Falk Professor Economics and Social Science, Graduate School of Industrial Administration, Carnegie Institute of Technology;
Arno A. Bellack, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University;
Bernard Berelson, Vice-President, the Population Council, New York City;
Edgar O. Edwards, Chairman, Department of Economics, Rice University;
Joseph A. Kershaw, Provost, Williams College;
Ben W. Lewis, Chairman, Department of Economics, Oberlin College;
Lewis E. Wagner, Director, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Iowa. (Stalnaker, 1964, p. 3)

Serving as consultants to the committee were:

Laurence E. Leamer, Professor of Economics, Harper College, and Ralph W. Tyler, Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Science. (Stalnaker, 1964, p. 3)

Test data. The norms established for this test were bases on the scaled scores of 6,435 twelfth-grade students. The students came from all geographic regions in the United States. Of the 6,435 students who took the test, 1,834 students had completed a course that included a minimum of twelve weeks of instruction in economics; the remaining students (4601) had no formal instruction in economics.

Reliability and validity criteria were applied to the
"Test of Economic Understanding." Reliability coefficients were all greater than .80, a level high enough to justify use of the scores in individual evaluation. Ninety-five percent of the time a true scaled score would be within two standard errors of the obtained scaled score.

The concurrent validity criteria application determined that in all but one case the observed mean differences were significant beyond the .01 level of confidence. Content validity is left to the judgment of the user.

The "Test of Economic Understanding" is considered a power test, since only 1.9 percent of the standardization sample failed to complete it in forty minutes. The test includes fifty multiple-choice questions (Stalnaker, 1964).

Administration of the test

On the morning of April 2, 1968, 244 seniors from Washington County were called together in meetings in the auditorium of their respective schools. These schools included: (1) Dixie High School (157 senior students), (2) Hurricane High School (64 senior students), and (3) Enterprise High School (23 senior students).

Counselors and teachers distributed the test booklets and answer sheets. The students were informed that this test would have no bearing on any of their grades, but that it would benefit future students.
Collection of data

At the end of the forty minutes allowed for the test, the materials were collected as the students left the auditorium. All students turned in an answer sheet.

Each of the answer sheets was scored by hand. Each answer sheet was checked for more than one selection of the multiple-choice items. The raw scores were then determined. Using the table provided with the test for converting raw scores to scaled scores, the scaled scores were determined and assigned. Finally, from the scaled scores a percentile rank was given using the conversion tables provided with the test.

The study was intended to compare the results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the national norms set by those who have had no course in economics. The study was also intended to compare the results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the results of the seniors of Sky View High School who have had no course in economics.

Tabulation of data

After the collection of all data and the conversion of the raw scores to their respective percentile rank, all scores were then tabulated as shown in the following tables: Table 1, Inventory and comparison of Washington County, Utah, seniors' achievement and measuring device norm group, and Table 2, Comparison of Washington County High School 1968.
seniors' achievement and Sky View High School 1966 seniors' achievement on measuring device. These tables are presented in Chapter IV.

**Summary of chapter**

This chapter has reviewed explanatory material concerning the test to be used, details concerning the administration of the test, and method of tabulating and presenting the data in usable form. Chapter IV presents the findings of this study.
Chapter IV
FINDINGS

Chapter IV compares the following: (1) The results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the national norms set by those who have had no course in economics; (2) The results of the seniors of Washington County who have had no course in economics to the national norms set by those who have had a course in economics; and (3) The results of the seniors of Washington County who had no course in economics to the results of the seniors of Sky View High School who had no course in economics.

Inventory of economic understanding

Table 1 is an analysis of each of the test questions. Along with each question are the results of the national sample tested. The results are indicated for students having no formal economics class, designated "no economics group," and for those in the national sample who had participated in an economics class, designated "economics group." The results are stated as the percent of correct responses given. The inventory is summarized as follows:
Table 1. Inventory and comparison of Washington County, Utah, seniors’ achievement and measuring device norm group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>No Economics Group</th>
<th>Economics Group</th>
<th>No Economics Group</th>
<th>Economics Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Right</td>
<td>% Right</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>% Right</td>
<td>% Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>WCG</td>
<td>+ or -</td>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>WCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>+10</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+7</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-14</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>No Economics Group</th>
<th>Economics Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>No Economics Group</th>
<th>Economics Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Right Norm</td>
<td>% Right WCG</td>
<td>+ or -</td>
<td>% Right Norm</td>
<td>% Right WCG</td>
<td>+ or -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>- 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>- 8</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>- 7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>- 4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aWashington County seniors have not had a course in economics.

bThe percent right for Washington County High School seniors has been rounded up or down. The difference is computed from the rounded off figures and designated + (plus) if the Washington County students achieved a higher percent of correct responses than the national sample.

Table 1, pages 17 and 18, shows that the Washington County group achieved a higher percentage of correct responses than the norm of the "no economics group" on twelve of the fifty questions. The percentage of correct responses comparing the Washington County group to the "no economics group" was the same on three test items.

Also, Table 1 shows the Washington County group only twice achieved more correct responses than the norm of the "economics group." There were no questions in which the scores of the Washington County group had no difference.
in percent of correct responses in reference to the "economics group."

General achievement on complete test

As a group, the Washington County students who had not taken a class in economics achieved a mean score of 22.4 (Table 2, p. 20). When the mean score of 22.4 was assigned a scaled score and converted by the table established by the norm to a percentile, the "no economics" group, the Washington County students would rank in the 31st percentile.

The mode of the Washington County students fell at a raw score of 26. This score, as interpreted on the conversion charts, would be in the 50th percentile of the norm sample who had not taken an economics class.

The median of the Washington County group fell at a raw score of 23. This score, as interpreted on the conversion charts, would be in the 39th percentile of the norm sample. Table 2 on page 20 summarizes the preceding information.

Cited earlier in this study, J. Karl Worthington, teacher of Sky View High School, Smithfield, Utah, performed a similar study. He gave the same test to 328 seniors who had not taken a course in economics (Worthington, 1967). Table 2 on page 20 also presents a general comparison of the Washington group to the Sky View group who have had no course in economics.
Table 2. Comparison of Washington County High School 1968 seniors' achievement and Sky View High School 1966 seniors' achievement on measuring device

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Averages</th>
<th>Washington County Seniors (No Economics Group)</th>
<th>Sky View High School(^a) Seniors (No Economics Group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw Score Percentile Rank</td>
<td>Raw Score Percentile Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Sky View data taken from Worthington (1967, p. 43).

The raw scores of the Washington County students for the "no economics" group showed a range of 9 to 38 points out of a possible 50. On the other hand, at Sky View High School, the range of raw scores showed as few as 5 correct responses out of 50 choices and as many as 40 correct selections.

Summary of chapter

This study showed, on the average, the Washington County seniors and the Sky View High School seniors were below the national norms. Chapter V presents the conclusions and recommendations concerning this study.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The conclusions drawn from the results discussed in previous chapters are presented as follows:

1. The 1968 Washington County seniors, on the average, are below the scores of the national norm, which represents students with similar economic backgrounds. This is also true when comparing the students of Washington County with the norms of those who have taken an economics course.

2. Students in the national sample who have taken a course in economics, on the average, have improved their level of economic understanding as compared to those who have had no course in economics.

3. The seniors from Washington County scored nearer to the national sample achievement of the "no economics group" than to the "economics group."

4. The 1968 Washington County seniors, on the average, scored slightly higher than the 1966 Sky View seniors when comparing the "no economics group."

Recommendations

Washington County schools should strive to improve the level of economic understanding of their students before
they graduate from high school. For this reason, recommendations that follow are presented so they may be of help in determining how to provide better economic understanding for Washington County students in the future.

A well-developed course could be added to the present curriculum of Washington County School District in an effort to improve the economic understanding of the students. Along with a course, Washington County needs qualified teachers in the area of economics. The course itself should be one semester in length on the eleventh or twelfth grade level.

Another recommendation is to integrate the teaching of economic concepts, on a coordinated basis, in as many classes as possible.
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