

AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES SKILLS
IN STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES

by

Glenda Casey Petrini

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

Curriculum and Instruction

APPROVED:

Dan B. Fleming, Chairman

Patricia Kelly

Mary Ann Lewis

James Sellers

Thomas Teates

February, 1988

Blacksburg, Virginia

AN ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL STUDIES SKILLS
IN STATE CURRICULUM GUIDES

by

Glenda Casey Petrini

Committee Chairman: Dan B. Fleming
Education

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this study was to answer an overall question: What is being recommended or required by states regarding social studies skills in actual curricula? The researcher examined curriculum guides to see how the states defined, classified, and organized the skills - determining whether patterns of agreement existed. Materials for the analysis were received from 39 states via letters sent to states' social studies supervisors. The states' materials were content-analyzed using the researcher's "Basic Analysis Process" which included a coding instrument based on the Essentials Of The Social Studies (1980) - a statement by NCSS to enumerate basic learning expectations for exemplary social studies programs.

The method of research, the findings of the study, the literature search, and generalizations regarding curriculum guides should interest education professionals, curriculum designers, and researchers in general. The researcher's "Comparative Content Analysis System," which is based on ideas gained from research theory on qualitative study, includes a pretesting component, a "Basic Analysis Process" for the

actual content analysis of the states' documents, and a system for collecting and summarizing the findings. Three special appendices illustrate the study's findings: a state by state summary of content analysis information and tables of quantitative data revealing, for example, the most dominant skills cited at specific grade levels. The literature search, which evolved into a history of the social studies skills spanning some 100 years, documented a continued situation of confusion and chaos relative to the skills. The content analysis indicated, in varying degrees, confusion extends into states' curriculum materials as well. An open-ended aspect of the study's design allowed for the emergence of the unexpected --- such as the researcher's findings regarding desirable characteristics of "ideal" curriculum guides.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation and gratitude to Dr. Dan B. Fleming, Chairperson of my graduate committee, whose constant encouragement, knowledge, guidance, enthusiasm, and faith helped make it possible for me to complete this research project.

I also extend my sincere appreciation to the other members of my committee who gave their support, technical assistance, encouragement, and guidance.

DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my husband, Bill, and my parents, Scottie and Glen Casey. Their magnificent support, encouragement, faith, and love made it possible for me to complete this research project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
DEDICATION	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER I - DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Need for the Study	1
Overall Question of the Study	2
Significance of the Study	3
Research Questions	4
CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Preface	6
Introduction	7
The Progressive Era	8
The Social Studies	8
The "Skills" of Citizenship	10
The Skill Called Inquiry	12
Thinking Skills	15
The 1920's	17
Evolution of Testing Relative to the Skills	20
The 1930's	24
Testing, Skills, and Propaganda	26
The 1940's	28
The 1950's	30
Skills in the 1950's	32
The 1960's	34
Skills in the 1960's	39
The 1970's	42
Skills in the 1970's	44
The 1980's	47
Current Literature on the Social Studies	48
Current NCSS Scope and Sequence	51
ASCD Efforts Regarding Thinking Skills	52
Selected Current Writings of Barry Beyer	53
Other Points of View	55

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER III - RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	58
Overview of Study	58
Research Plan for Chapters III, IV, and V	59
Qualitative Theory	60
Qualitative Research Problems and Content Analysis	62
Analysis Procedures	63
Collection of Data	65
The Coding Instrument	66
Pre-testing of Instrument	68
Procedural Directions for Coders	69
Pre-test Summary: Phase Two	71
Pre-test Summary: Phase Three	73
Summary to the Pre-testing Section	73
The Basic Analysis Process: An Example	74
Recording Form	75
Analysis and Summary of Results	76
CHAPTER IV - FINDINGS	79
Introduction	79
Findings - (Appendix A)	81
Definition and/or Identification of Social Studies Skills	81
Definition of "Skill" Relative to the Social Studies	84
Classification of the Social Studies Skills	89
Organization of the Skills by Grade Levels	93
Analysis of Appendix F	99
Analysis of Appendix G	101
Generalizations and Patterns of Agreement Regarding the Social Studies Skills	103
CHAPTER V - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS	110
Introduction	111
Summary and Conclusions of Results	112
Question 1	112

	<u>Page</u>
Question 2	114
Question 3	117
Question 4	120
Recommendations Regarding the Questions . . .	124
General Conclusions	128
General Recommendations	130
Future Studies	134
REFERENCES	138
APPENDICES	144
First Letter Requesting States' Materials .	145
A 2 - Second Letter Requesting States' Materials	146
B - NCSS Essentials	147
C 1 - Measurement Instrument	148
C 2 - Recording Form	150
C 3 - Data Summary Sheet	151
D 1 - Seventh Grade Curriculum Sheet . . .	153
D 2 - Example of Analysis	155
E - STATE BY STATE SUMMARY OF FINDINGS . .	166
F - TALLY RESULTS FOR ALL CODED GUIDES . . .	189
G - TABLE OF INFORMATION FROM EACH STATE'S GUIDE	193
H - BIBLIOGRAPHY OF STATES CURRICULUM GUIDES	199
VITA	206

CHAPTER I - DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

INTRODUCTION

Professionals in the field of social studies deal with a confused situation in the area of skills. There seems to be little agreement on priorities for the instruction, organization, and definition of social studies skills. Even in the research related to the social studies skills, discrepancies are seen with regard to the scope of areas discussed. In one study (Cousins, 1976), broad general categories of data gathering and thinking skills were cited as the most important social studies skills. In another study (Guenther, 1973), the following somewhat narrower skills were described as the most important:

(1) distinguishing between fact and opinion, (2) discriminately reading newspapers, magazines, and pamphlets, and (3) applying problem solving and critical thinking skills. While these studies indicate lack of agreement over which skills have priority for instruction, they also illustrate lack of uniformity in skill categorization. In the former case, skills are designated in broad general terms while, in the latter case, they are delineated in more specific organizational terms.

These areas of confusion reflect a general lack of semantical agreement by professionals as to social studies skill terminology. Cousins (1976) remarked that one problem of surveying professionals in the social studies is that "the terminology used to ask questions about skills meant different things to different persons" (p. 1). Herber

(1976) also expressed concerns regarding a general lack of agreement among professionals relative to the semantics of the social studies. Further, he expressed doubt that certain skills are really unique to one subject area or another or even whether any subject area possesses a significant number of skills unique to itself. Uniqueness, he contends, lies in the semantics or terminology used by the subject area rather than in the nature of the skills because various authorities use different names for the exact same mental process. Beyer (1983) addressed the problem of semantics while advocating research that would bring order to the skills aspect of the social studies. The term "thinking skills", for example, is confusing since, according to Beyer, different teachers tend to use different terms to describe what he believes are essentially identical thinking skills. He stated that reading teachers designate thinking skills as "critical reading skills," while language arts teachers refer to thinking skills as "analysis." Beyer called for a detailed, readily available description of specific thinking skills to provide a common basis for continuity of instruction across grade levels, and more objective evaluation of skill learning. Given the state of semantical confusion alone, the profession will benefit from an analysis of what is being required or recommended regarding the social studies skills.

Before professionals in the social studies can attempt to resolve the confusion over such problems as lack of semantical agreement, an important and basic question must be addressed: what is being required or recommended regarding social studies skills in actual curricula? The

answer can supply a base of knowledge, or an inventory, exhibiting current patterns of usage that imply areas of agreement as to skill priorities, organization, and social studies skill classification terminology.

An inventory of requirements or recommendations regarding the social studies skills, primary to any professional study and discourse toward possible acceptance of a skills standard, should include an analysis of what already exists within state curriculum guides. These guides are the result of curriculum organizing efforts of state departments of education. According to Jarolimek (1977), state departments of education are powerful forces in providing direction for the social studies; and, therefore it is important to know what they are requiring or recommending.

Judging from a review of related literature, little seems to be known about what is being required or recommended by states that affects the social studies curriculum in the area of social studies skills. This study of existing state curriculum guides will portray what exists ---areas of diversity as well as commonality of goals. However, even if a de facto standard for the social studies skills is perceived via this comparative analysis, it may not necessarily be one that the community of social studies professionals wishes to maintain. Part of the purpose of this study is to inform the "debate" as to what the social studies skills are, whether there should be a national standard of skill objectives for the social studies, and, if so, what kind of standards are most acceptable to the profession.

There are numerous advantages for acceptance of a standard for the social studies skills. Such a standard would facilitate a common instructional language and promote cross-curricular continuity of instruction in skills. National, state, and local education systems have a variety of interests that would benefit from standardization regarding skill terminology and expectations, such as: curriculum efforts relative to the development of special needs programs such as minority achievement, avoidance of haphazard adoption of textbooks, focused evaluation of instruction and study progress, improvement of standardized test scores, and establishment of minimal competencies. Therefore, the social studies profession at all levels, national, state, and local, can be affected in a variety of ways from this analysis of how the various states deal with the social studies skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The purpose of this study is to determine what is being recommended or required by states in their centralized curriculum guides regarding social studies skills. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. Do the states define and/or identify specific social studies skills?
2. Do the states classify the social studies skills? If so:
 - a. What are the various classification designations?
 - b. Do the states classify the skills within general objectives or listings of skills for all content areas?

3. Do the states organize skills by grade level designations? If so:

a. What are the various grade level organizational designations? (i.e.: K - 3, 1 - 3, K - 6)

b. Can generalizations be made as to typical grade level skill designations?

4. What generalizations and patterns of agreement are suggested in this base of information regarding social studies skill requirements, classifications, or organization?

Data gathered from the above research questions provides fundamental information for future projects and study for professionals who seek to order and define social studies skill areas, evaluate professional objectives, and design improvements for the social studies curriculum. Gross (1977) referred to a social studies research concern that is still relevant to this current (1987) study: "There is a vital need to know where the social studies stands today so we can direct more satisfactorily where we wish to proceed" (p. 194).

CHAPTER II - REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Preface

There are several problems for the researcher engaged in a review of literature on social studies skills. First of all, comprehensive literature on the history of the social studies skills (according to results of both computer and hand searches of the ERIC data bank, University of Michigan data bank on theses and dissertations, NCSS Library, Virginia Tech Library, and the Library of Congress) appears to be non-existent. General literature of the social studies, covering the past 100 years, can be found in great abundance, and incidental references to the skills can be found even in older sources. References to the skills increases through the decades to an overwhelming abundance of sources on the social studies skills. Therefore, the researcher, lacking any comprehensive histories of the skills, must engage in a broad, diverse, and time-consuming reading of considerable amounts of materials.

The researcher, while primarily concerned with a chronological documentation of the confusion of the skills terminology from the aforementioned abundance of sources, faces still another major problem. Because of natural historical interrelationships, a chronicle of the skills should include some background information on the evolution of the social studies. Topics such as the growth of the professional organizations, publications, curriculum, the various reform movements,

plus all relative aspects of the political, social, and economic history of the United States of America tempt the unwary researcher.

The purpose of this chapter is to show chronologically the evolution of the social studies skills and to document examples of the confusion over terminology. Brief and summary references to the overall social studies history, organizations, publications, curriculum development, and reform efforts are used to provide appropriate background for the sake of expositive clarity. Finally, selected contemporary literature regarding skill designations and terminology confusion explains the continuing communication problems for the social studies.

Introduction

Since the inception of the field of social studies, educators in the social studies have been in disagreement over terminology, interpretation of meanings of that terminology, as well as the primary purpose of the field. Arguments began early on and have continued over guiding philosophy, curriculum, instructional methods, and need for reform efforts, as well as the effect on the profession of various past reform movements. Educational history relative to the social studies, approximately from the end of the 19th century to present time, illuminates the philosophical disagreement and resulting confusion that has plagued the field, inhibiting improvement and progress. However,

the most critical problem has been, and remains, communication hindrances. The language needed to allow social studies educators to talk to each other remains the vehicle for better human relations that prerequisites resolution of all other problems in the field.

The Progressive Era

The "Social Studies"

Confusion over the terminology of the social studies is as old as the origins of this field of study, as well as its identifying term--- "social studies." Jarolimek (1981) noted the term "social studies" was officially adopted in 1916 by the National Education Association (NEA) sponsored Committee on the Social Studies Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. Dunn (1916) reported that this committee recommended a scope and sequence of social studies courses; and Hertzberg (1981) indicated that particular report has influenced the structure of social studies curriculum up to the present. According to Hertzberg, who wrote a history of the field as part of Project Span, the term "social studies" remained ambiguous.

During the Progressive Era, roughly 1900 to 1917, the idea of "social betterment" was in vogue. At the time, (Hertzberg, 1981) the term social studies meant "a well-established curriculum encompassing history, civics or government, and...economics and sociology" (p. 1).

However, the term also was used as a simplified reference to the social sciences. It was even used as a synonym for the social sciences, as well as a designation for any school subject encompassing social purposes (p. 2). Wesley (1950), one of the leaders of the social studies movement, called it a term that met a semantic need ... designating the school subjects that deal with human relationships (p. 29). The flexibility of the term, however, contributed to general confusion over its true meaning.

Part of the problem in arriving at definition consensus was confusion over what the term "social" actually meant. During the Progressive Era, (Hertzberg, 1981) the word "social" was a popular adjective in the lexicon of reform---attached to such terms as "social betterment, social gospel, social efficiency" (p. 1). The term "social efficiency" applied to the education of citizens which was identified early on as an important education goal for the social studies. However, judging from the positions of educational leaders of the era, "social efficiency" remained an ambiguous term open to various interpretations (p.17).

John Dewey and David Snedden, influential philosophers and educators of the Progressive Era, interpreted "social efficiency" in polarized visions representing a dichotomy of positions. Their quarrel over the interpretation of the purpose of the social studies typified early confusion over the language meant to serve the social studies. Dewey, according to Hertzberg (1981), looked upon "social efficiency" as "the socialization of mind (in order to effect the) breaking down of the

barriers of social stratification" (p. 18). Snedden, on the other hand, interpreted "social efficiency" as education designed to meet the needs of different classes of pupils via predetermined (by students' socio-economic status) work destinies for those pupils. His definition stemmed from a reform school philosophy shaped by his perception of the needs of society to achieve social control (p. 17).

The "Skills" of Citizenship

Beginning with the turn of the century, industrialization and increased immigration contracted a cause-effect relationship that produced tremendous concerns over protection of American values. Business leaders, university professors, and public school personnel encouraged development of centralized control of school districts via such innovations as non-political school boards (Molnar, 1985). There was concern that decentralized, unregulated school systems were not capable of producing citizenry dedicated or equipped with the skills to preserve the republic. Era reformers saw the need to Americanize millions of newly arrived immigrant children with the public school as the "social mechanism necessary to produce a loyal citizenry" (p. 8). Thus, concomitant to the creation of "social studies" as an academic field came one of the earliest identified social studies goals involving skills: (participatory) citizenship. However, confusion over the terms

of "social studies" and "social efficiency" was echoed in early debate surrounding the advocacy of teaching the skills of "citizenship."

Acceptance of the need to inculcate the knowledge and skills of citizenship by founders of the social studies was incorporated in reports disseminated by professional groups such as NEA, the American Historical Society (AHA), and National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS) that were organized during the earliest attempts to define and set goals for the social studies. Most educators during the Progressive Era accepted good citizenship as a teaching goal, but debate raged as to the definition of what was an appropriate education of citizens (Hertzberg, undtd.). To John Dewey, achievement of citizenship goals meant dealing with an open, changing society where education would allow all to make their own place in society (p. 6). The opposition to Dewey, typified by Snedden, looked upon citizenship education as a means of static social control of people who held pre-ordained places in society (p. 7). Snedden's views remained popular with administrators and members of governing bodies of bureaucrats that developed as the whole field of public schools burgeoned after the turn of the century (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 36). However, it was Dewey's ideas that became more pervasively a part of the entire educational scene. All in all, much confusion existed in the earliest days for even the most basic identifying term, "social studies," its most basic rationale---"social efficiency," and its most primary of goals---citizenship.

The Skill Called "Inquiry"

While problems were more broadly addressed throughout the earlier decades---prior to the emphasis upon skills during the 1960's---the confusing terminology regarding social studies "inquiry" skills surfaced early on. One of the most recognizable, albeit confusing, terms used for social studies skill designations is "inquiry." Currently, this skill has numerous names and identities as well as an array of interpretations of its meaning and application. Inquiry (Hertzberg, undtd.) has been advocated in some form in every major social studies reform movement. The skill was advocated as early as 1883 in the very first methods textbook which was edited by psychologist G. Stanley Hall: Methods of Teaching and Studying History (Hertzberg, 1981). Previously, the skill had been a tool of a generation of American historians trained in the German Seminar Method; such scholars made use of the "scientific" attitude in using primary or original sources. These historians believed that the testing and weighing of historical evidence allowed the writing of the best historical narration. Using University-based seminars, they promoted the idea of scientific research training beyond the natural sciences (p. 6).

As the recommended "borrowing" from the methodology of the sciences for historical research took hold, the skill of inquiry began being referred to as the "laboratory method" (NEA, 1916, p. 169). This was promoted by the National Education Association (1916) whose Committee of Ten produced the famous Report of the Committee on Secondary Social

Studies, which recommended teaching the sciences by the laboratory method. By that time, inquiry as a method of teaching had several appellations---the objective or inductive method, the scientific method, and the laboratory method (NEA, 1893, pp. 105, 119, 169).

Use in the sciences of the laboratory method led to the desire of social studies educators to apply the principles to the teaching of history (Hillman, 1935). NEA (1893) made a mild suggestion of this sort by saying: "The value of history is increased if it is looked upon in part as a laboratory science, in which pupils learn to assemble material and from it to make generalizations" (p. 169).

In the decades of 1880 and 1890, the sciences' laboratory method was used as a method of teaching history. The "source method," as it was called, meant that students selected and evaluated historical evidence and practiced the writing of history (Hillman, 1935, p. 65). According to Wesley (1950), this first procedure meant, in practice, the following:

Parallel passages containing inconsistencies, contradictions, and errors were prepared; the problem for the student was to reconcile these differences and to construct clear outlines and reliable accounts. Thus conceived and practiced, the source method was a method of learning a process that involved discrimination and judgment as well as the acquiring of historical facts. The student was supposed to secure some of the advantages that a historian derives from the practice of his art (p. 464).

By 1900, enthusiasm for the source method had faded. When interest revived again, around 1910, the teaching procedure and philosophical emphasis changed. By that time, more than a dozen volumes of readings and sources were available for classroom use by teachers and students (Wesley, 1950, pp. 470-471). Interpretation of the source method meant that published collections of readings and selected sources were used as enrichment rather than application of the historian's technique (p. 465). According to Wesley, "sources were used to enrich and vivify the condensed accounts given in textbooks" (p. 464). Hillman (1935) indicated that in the early phase of the source method, both historians and teachers were motivated to use the inquiry method to stimulate thinking and the formation of judgment (p. 65). While this early goal did not fade, the point of emphasis changed. After 1909, teaching procedures involved teaching "some history from the sources rather than teaching history by the source method, as was the case in the original source method" (p. 71). This meant that students would be exposed to original sources; but such materials were supplemented by textbooks written by historians, and were not the only source of information as in the latter case. The switch in emphasis promoted much disagreement among social studies leaders.

In 1897, the American Historical Society met in Cleveland, Ohio, mainly to address the issues regarding the source method. Basically, one side wanted to leave practice of the source method to university scholars and historians; the other side wanted students to learn history by learning to use the actual process of the source method. As reported

by Keohane (1949), leaders opposed to general practice of the source method in public schools won out and "the last chance that the source method would be one of the more common approaches to the study of history in American Secondary schools was lost for at least half a century" (p. 216).

Thinking Skills

The inquiry, objective or inductive, scientific, laboratory, source, or historian's method became part of the confusion regarding "thinking skills." As noted above, early proponents of inquiry were concerned with stimulation of thinking via the source method. Many of the earliest leaders in the social studies advocated efforts to improve students' ability to think. One of the earliest proponents of thinking skills, and one of the first to experience difficulty in explaining what he meant by that term, was John Dewey. To Dewey (1933), it was important to develop an individual capable of "reflective thinking"--- which he termed "a better way of thinking" (p. 4). Today, some educators' would refer to "reflective thinking" as "critical thinking." John Dewey defined reflective thinking as "(1) a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity, mental difficulty, in which thinking originates, and (2) an act of searching, hunting, inquiring, to find material that will resolve the doubt, settle and dispose of the perplexity (p. 12). Isidore Starr (1963) called Dewey's two part definition "the classic

definition of critical thinking" (p. 35). In the preface of his book How We Think, Dewey acknowledged his own problems with terminology confusion explaining that the revisions made to his earlier edition arose because he wished to increase "definiteness" and restate his ideas "found by teachers to give undue trouble in understanding" (p. iii). In any case, Dewey's theories regarding reflective thinking, as well as his "steps" in the thought processes, merged with later educators' ideas on the thinking skills.

Dewey (1933) advanced a theory that the complete act of thought occurred in five steps between prereflective and postreflective states: (1) suggested possible solutions, (2) intellectualization of the problem, (3) the use of hypothesis, (4) reasoning, and (5) testing the hypothesis by overt or imaginative action. Since Dewey's time, numerous other studies (Starr, 1963) involving the sequence theory of critical thinking argued against his "five" steps presenting instead anywhere from three to nine steps (p. 36). Other researchers, reported Cornbleth (1985), argued that "critical thinking" is not linear, nor sequential, at all (p. 18). Further discussions herein of the state of confusion on thinking skills in the 1980's is presented in that section entitled: Current Literature on the Social Studies Skills.

The 1920's

During the 20's (and 30's), the influence of the 1893 and 1916 reports by the National Education Association (NEA) and the 1899 report by the American Historical Association (AHA) executed by professionals in the social studies field during the Progressive Era spread throughout American education. Hertzberg (1981) wrote that "social studies was clearly in transition" with many influential factors contributing to the rapid growth of public education, curriculum development, and standardized, diagnostic testing (p. 40).

While organizations such as NEA and AHA began reform efforts during the Progressive Era, their impact became most evident during the 1920's. Such national organizations began the reform practice of examining existing curricula, deciding upon desirable modifications, and recommending a more or less specific program for schools (Wesley, 1950, p. 79). The reports by NEA and AHA issued in 1893, 1899, and 1916, were broadly based in concerns with incidental references to the "laboratory method" for the sciences, and use of "sources" in history---as explained in the section on inquiry above. Too, the 1893 NEA report included admonitions relative to the desirability of teaching students the "drawing of historical maps" (p. 199). Generally speaking, these reports' suggestions on subject-oriented curriculum, knowledge objectives for learning, teaching methods, use of textbooks, and scope and sequence characterized public schools in the 1920's.

That concern for skills existed during the twenties was largely illustrated in the studies on testing during the era. Elston (1923), for example, reported on evidence that map skills were being tested. The Vannest Diagnostic Test in Modern European History contained knowledge items and test items on "time sense, place sense, and power to evaluate facts, and power to reason" (p. 300). Elston referred to the desirability for diagnostic testing during the first few weeks of school to determine whether students can use a map, dictionary, reference book, and can read with comprehension (p. 303).

Besides the influences by the NEA and AHA reports, the 1920's experienced enormous growth in the entire field of public education largely precipitated by immigration. After the turn of the century, there were several years when more than one million people arrived each year on the shores of the United States. Public education increased in importance as society at large perceived the desirability of educating the new immigrant children in the English language, the duties of citizenship, and American values. Immigrant children entered public school at various ages and all children began to remain in school longer. The "client" demands on public high schools increased. Hertzberg (1981) wrote that "by 1940, some 2/3rds of the youth from 14 to 16 were in school..." (p. 33). Much of the concerns expressed for more emphasis on citizenship education for newly arrived immigrant children resulted in increased efforts toward ending fragmentation of educational efforts and localized control.

There was, according to Saylor (1986), a push toward centralizing and unifying efforts stemming from discipline-based reform or "social efficiency" ideas with the result that work in social studies curriculum began in earnest. By the latter part of the 1920's, there was much activity at the state and local levels in intensive programs in what was called "curriculum construction" (Saylor, 1986, p. 6). That meant that teachers and other staff created elaborate, formal written courses of study. Such courses, at the same time, admonished teachers to engage students in projects "to capitalize on children's interests to make them active learners" (Kliebard, 1985, p. 38).

In addition to the centralizing and curriculum efforts, specialization began as new knowledge developed in all fields. New general education courses were created at colleges and universities. The emerging field of curriculum-making, renewed allegiance to the "scientific" method, and having teacher-identified learning objectives further characterized the era.

Part of the unifying efforts resulted in organization of The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) in 1921 to organize the various disciplines in the field so that information could be exchanged. The vehicle for diffusion of knowledge was, for a time, the American Historical Association (AHA) publication The Historical Outlook; but the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), in 1937, began its own journal Social Education, publishing yearbooks and bulletins as well. Hertzberg (1981) wrote that NCSS tried facing the problem of defining the "social studies" by viewing it as a federation rather than a fusion

of the various subject areas (p.37). Too, NCSS conducted studies on the contributions of the various social science disciplines to the social studies (p. 41). Today, this organization has one of the best repositories of sources on this field.

While there were some references to skills in the 1920's social studies literature, writers in the 1920's were mainly concerned with broader problems: defining and deciding the purpose of the social studies, review and analysis of the current state of the social studies; improvement of content and its organization, objectives, scope and sequence, instructional methods, testing, and teacher preparation (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 43).

Evolution of Testing Relative to the Skills

During the 1920's, fields other than the social studies were engaged in pioneer work in testing. Theories began to develop regarding testing procedures relative to psychology and intelligence measurement. Subsequent developments in the social studies would involve another instance of "borrowing" from other fields of theory, techniques, and terminology relative to the social studies skills.

A 1928 article in The Historical Outlook referred to the pioneer testing work done in psychology. Krey (1928) discussed a survey taken at the University of Minnesota on the "new-type or so-called objective type of examination" in use by the Department of Psychology. He

discussed the "recent achievement" of a "highly developed form of test which psychologists urge...as the corrective of many academic ills" that had resulted from their work in test construction (p. 159).

Psychologists, at that time, had been experimenting with such tests for intelligence measurement procedures for the United States Army as well as for their own professional purposes. Krey raised various issues involving the kinds of questions used in objective tests, weighing whether teachers of history would benefit from similar test structuring.

That the social studies field was, early on, receptive to the new tests is indicated in a series of articles in a 1923 edition of The Historical Outlook. Elston (1923, November) referred to the new scientific testing, revealing evidence of personal enthusiasm for a possible answer for "solving the problems of instruction" in history (p. 300). This article provided evidence that the field of social studies was still in disarray as indicated by Elston:

That attempts are being made at all to apply scales to history is, in itself, a notable thing. The pioneers in the field have shown courage in trying to establish norms and standards in a subject where content and teaching objectives are so little agreed upon, and where the complex mental processes necessary to succeed in learning it have been so little analyzed (p. 300).

Elston presented an analysis of tests she deemed useful to the social studies. In terms of "skills" evolution, note is taken below of

what some of these tests were supposed to measure since these references are forerunners of social studies skills. What current educators would decry as examples of the "sin" of testing that which had not (necessarily) been taught, these tests attempted to measure far more than retention of the facts of history. Indeed, another new idea of the era was that of "directed study"---or study procedures in which the pupil's learning efforts were guided toward the desired objectives rather than being left to chance (Good, 1973, p. 564). The problem of "directed study" had, according to Boyington (1932), precipitated some of the activity in diagnostic testing (p. 132).

Elston (1923, November) presented analysis of several tests and indicated what they were designed to measure: The Vannest Diagnostic test measured "time sense, place sense, power to evaluate facts, and power to reason;" the Spokane Test measured "causes with results;" eight tests on United States History measured "ability to judge character, to comprehend historical terms, to see cause/effect relations, to draw inferences and to solve simple problems in criticism" (pp. 300-301). Elston's terminology then found in tests are today found in social studies listings of skills. Two other tests evaluated by Elston indicate early interest in diagnostic use and inclusion of reading skills as part of the concerns of social studies. A test by C. E. Finch measured ability in locating information in textbook aids such as the table of contents, index, and appendix. A Burgess and Monroe test recommended that teachers administer some sort of "reading test" at

least three times a school year to measure initial reading problems and "result of growth" (p. 303).

Other articles in the 1923 issue of The Historical Outlook gave examples of the new objective-style tests, as well as examples of traditional "omnibus" essay tests described by Krey (1928, April), that were designed to make a dragnet sampling of as wide a range of factual information as possible. Monroe (1923, November) devoted much attention to teacher "skills" in constructing and grading either kind of test. Shryock (1923, November) acknowledged the benefits from "the last year or two" of psychologists attempts to "carry over their methods of testing, developed in connection with intelligence tests, into the field of examinations in history" (p. 319). He referred to a "newer aim" of history to develop a "critical attitude of mind" and explored whether the new tests actually measured that aim (p. 319).

More evidence of the growing attention to what would later be termed "the social studies skills" was shown in other articles written at that time. Rugg (1923, November) referred to an analysis of some 59 books, articles, courses of study, and teacher-made tests done in 1917. Rugg took this material and classified this data into "aims and outcomes" of the study of history using terminology that contemporary social studies educators would use in reference to skills: "methods of studying, use of books; training certain "powers," such as memory, judgment, and imagination; broadening the pupil's point of view; training in seeing causal relationships" (p. 325). In spite of having addressed what would later be termed "skills," Rugg discussed the "fact"

that the subject area of history must be thought of as a content area rather than a skill subject, and that educators should concentrate on methods to help pupils remember facts, which was (in his view) the primary goal of the field (p. 325). Hardy (1923, November) pressed for development of tests that would measure several types of "achievement," in addition to factual retention. Her comments suggested further that skill evolution for the social studies was underway. Hardy wrote that "the ability to read with understanding, the ability to classify, and the power to detect an incorrect statement and at best to tell in what respects it is wrong" must be measurement goals in testing (p. 327-8).

In summary, if the researcher were to deal only with literature of the social studies field of the 1920's, one might conclude that little occurred in the development of the social studies skills---that leaders, reformers, and educators were far too engrossed in building curriculum according to Progressive Era reform innovations and unifying public school education to meet the needs of a rapidly growing school population. However, examination of developments in the field of psychology and testing, reveals important history relative to skill designations, measurement, and goals of the social studies.

The 1930's

Historians and other educational leaders continued to form commissions under the auspices of NEA, AHA, and NCSS to study curriculum

and reform possibilities for the social studies in the 1930's. Their efforts, often elaborate and comprehensive, failed to relate to what Hertzberg (1981) called the "conditioning realities of the school or the classroom" and thus their work did not have the lasting impact of the "Big Three" reports of the Progressive Era (p. 47). As Michener (1939) reported, there were no clear answers for educators who question what to teach and when to teach it (p. 4).

In the 1930's, Saylor (1986) found that curriculum efforts focused more on actual classroom methodology as influenced by John Dewey's experience concept, or learning by doing (p. 9). The origin of the "in-service" and the "teacher workshop" can be traced to this period as curriculum planning revolved around direct involvement of the teachers themselves. This was school-based reform and was more successful in "longevity" than other attempts at reform of this period --- probably because teachers were directly responsible for planning, creating, and implementing the processes (p. 9). Curriculum, in the 1930's, was further characterized by "units" of study and "core" organization - or English, social studies, mathematics, and science taught together. Curricular materials were grouped in units of related topics and experimental combinations across subject fields, such as social studies and English (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 57).

Testing, Skills, and Propaganda

Work continued during the 1930's on testing of the "study skills." Morse and McCune (1940) prefaced their work in the NCSS Selected Items for the Testing of Study Skills with a commentary on the history of study skills as well as the evolution of testing (pp. 9-17). Morse and McCune substantiated the view that the social studies, at that time, accepted the historical method as a social studies skill and recognized work done in testing, originally for other fields, as applicable to the social studies. Morse and McCune indicated that researchers of the period referred to "work habits and study skills" but not to "the social studies skills" (p. 9). By 1940, NCSS had published its first comprehensive skills bulletin listing some 23 unclassified items referred to as "study skills" (p. 9). Finally, in 1953, NCSS published an expanded version of the 1940 bulletin and referred to the social studies skills in the title: Skills in the Social Studies (Carpenter, 1953). The designation "social studies skills" had arrived.

During the 1930's some of the work on testing was motivated by statistical reports concerning freshman failures at the college level. Boyington (1932) explored experimentation with tests developed for use as diagnostic instruments in North Carolina and in New York (p. 132). North Carolina developed a test to administer to high school seniors to try to predict future college success probabilities. Items were classified in the North Carolina test under such titles as: "(1) part of books (such as appendix, bibliography, and index); (2) reference books

(i.e. atlas, encyclopedia, and Readers Guide to Periodical Literature); (3) activities (such as long papers and note taking); (4) terms in questions (such as classify, compare, contrast, define); (5) critical evaluation (meaning opinion, reliability, sources)" (p. 133). Morse and McCune (1940) reported that New York teachers developed a work skills diagnostic test which contained such items as "use of general references; newspaper reading; interpreting a chart, pictures, graph, and table of statistics; summarizing and outlining" (p. 13). Much of this terminology then applied to test items would become part of the terminology of the social studies skills.

Probably more significant than testing was to the evolution of the skills, was the interest in propaganda. Ellis (1937) found that World War I, the rise in the 1930's of Hitlerism, and the New Deal focused public attention on the potentials of opinion management (p. 2-3). With the spread of democracy, the extension of suffrage, and increase in literacy, public opinion became more and more a matter of government concern (p. 3-4). The burden of providing a "realistic civic education" regarding propaganda with teachers giving the "necessary guidance for their students" became part of social studies responsibility (p. 170). The 1937 NCSS yearbook issue, Education Against Propaganda, was devoted to the subject of propaganda, highlighting the seven most commonly used devices: cardstacking, transfer, bandwagon, glittering generalities, name-calling, testimonial, and plain folks. Later on, the ideas explored in this yearbook would be tied to the ideas for teaching critical thinking.

The 1940's

Wesley (1950) summarized the concerns of the 1940's in general education, referring to increased study of children, greater use of community resources, evaluation and measurement, increased study of contemporary problems, continuation of core and unit organization, and increased use of instructional aids (p. 109-110). During the decade some echoes of the need for reform were heard, and curricular work continued in diagnostic testing. Too, the period's literature generally exhorted educators to be concerned over propaganda, work and study skills, and critical thinking.

Hertzberg (1981) found there were few calls for curricular reform in the 1940's. A position taken during the 1930's by the AHA Commission on the Social Studies that things like scope and sequence was the business of the local school system remained a popular viewpoint during the 1940's (p. 81). Usual references to problems of "coherence or confusion" in the social studies generally were not accompanied by calls for national curricular review (p. 81).

References to skills during this period was exemplified by works published by NCSS in the early years of the decade. In the NCSS yearbook, Wrightstone (1941) identified objectives relative to "social studies information" and "work and study skills" (p. 232). These skills included "reading maps, graphs, charts, tables; using index and library; drawing conclusions in critical thinking" (p. 232). Wrightstone, who had written a test for critical thinking, advocated efforts to evaluate

critical thinking as a "prominent objective of the natural and social sciences" (p. 238). His own test measured the following: first, "abilities to obtain facts from graphs, maps, references, newspapers and magazines; second, abilities to draw conclusions from given facts and data; and third, abilities to apply generalizations to social studies situations" (p. 238). According to Beyer (1984, April), educators continue to try to define, agree on components of, and figure out how to measure critical thinking during the 1980's.

Increased interest in critical thinking was evident when NCSS devoted the entire 1942 yearbook to this subject. The issue, entitled Teaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies, contained very general articles that avoided defining the term, or specifying sub-skills, or recommended methods of evaluation. The preface referred to an unspecified "hierarchy of skills" included under the umbrella of "critical thinking," and charged teachers with the ultimate responsibility to "determine the specific skills which are part of this general skill" (Anderson, 1942, p. vii). The yearbook suggested certain steps involved in this thinking process: "(1) defining the problem; (2) locating, selecting, and organizing information; (3) evaluating the information; (4) drawing conclusions; (5) presenting conclusions in an acceptable form; (6) reconsidering conclusions" (pp. 7-41). During the 1980's, educators dispute these steps, and some argue that critical thinking and problem-solving are different processes (Beyer, 1984, April). Wesley (1950), referred to these steps to critical thinking, cited in the NCSS 13th Yearbook, as being closely allied to the methods

used in building up a defense against propaganda. Further, he reported that the crux of the 1940's critical thinking movement was an effort (again) to popularize and teach the principles of the historical method. Wesley defined critical thinking as a "new synthesis of elements from language, logic, grammar, and philosophy" (p. 106).

The 1950's

Jarolimek (1981) referred to the time since World War II as three "approximate" segments: (1) pre-curriculum-reform: 1946-1960; (2) period of curriculum reform: 1960-1974; (3) postreform period: 1974 to present (p. 6). He characterized the first time period, 1946-1960, as reflective of a continuation of the progressive education philosophy with, by the close of the war, new interest in culture studies and an international perspective in the social studies. In spite of a "status quo" in general educational changes, characteristics of the era included reform-generating criticism, increased interest in curriculum development, and continued exposition on skills.

The beginning of the reform movement that would focus so much attention on social studies skills occurred during the 1950's. Hertzberg (1981) found that critics of education, largely of the fields of mathematics and science, tended to be from outside the public school systems---mainly journalists and university intellectuals. They complained that American education was inadequate for "citizens of a

great power with world responsibilities" (p. 85). Typical allegations that "curriculum was soft, many students couldn't read, able students were neglected, and teachers were ill-prepared were echoes of criticisms that would be heard in the 1980's (Hertzberg, undtd., p. 13). Critics wanted more attention paid to the "basics," academically talented students, and more courses offered in mathematics, science, and foreign language (p. 13). By 1957, there were six major national projects established in the fields of mathematics and science that focused on creation of better materials in the individual disciplines (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 87). More importantly, that same year saw the launching of the Soviet's Sputnik and massive funding for these curricular projects appeared as well in true cause/effect fashion (p. 87).

In curriculum, Alexander (1986) found that the 1950's saw a change in curriculum attitude from discipline-based or school-based curriculum to research-based reform. The ASCD 1957 yearbook, Research in Curriculum Development, indicated that contemporary curriculum leaders wanted to develop and use research-based approaches to curricular reform. With the launching of the Soviet space rocket, "Sputnik," in 1957, criticism of the public schools reached its zenith and massive efforts in curriculum reform began. ASCD published a "warning" in a publication called, Balance in the Curriculum, in 1961 that dealt with what it termed "curricular balance" (Alexander, 1986, p. 36). This publication warned that the pressures on schools to train more scientists and engineers as well as other technicians who could

challenge the Russians in space would cause problems. Ways to keep a balance in curriculum, content, organization of schools, and academic requirements in general were urged to avoid too much emphasis on any one area. If followed, perhaps the curriculum dilemmas of the "past 25 years as cited in the U.S. Department of Education report A Nation At Risk might have been avoided" (Alexander, 1986, p. 36).

Skills in the 1950's

A textbook used at the college level during the 1950's entitled Teaching Social Studies in the High School contains some illuminating comments regarding skills. Wesley (1950) discussed the changes in this third edition of his textbook. He remarked in the preface that he had to give his textbook a new title as the previous editions had dealt with both elementary and secondary social studies. Further, this new edition included new features and discussions on such things as: developing concepts, generalizations, and the teaching of map skills (p. v). Wesley included two chapters on skills: one on reading and study skills, and one on the source method. His reading and study skills chapter specifically named some 36 items that he classified as "reading" skills including such things as: to recognize the denotation of a word; to evaluate the reliability of a statement, to relate effect to cause, and to read graphs, tables, and diagrams, (p. 250-1). His chapter on the source method was largely exposition relative to past history of the

method and included a listing of published collections of sources. There was no attempt at a "how-to-teach using sources" explanation and Wesley avoided any advocacy of teaching social studies via the inquiry method.

The 1953 NCSS yearbook edited by Helen M. Carpenter entitled Skills in the Social Studies, a landmark publication, was so well received that NCSS has reissued the original document, made several revisions, and published new editions. This first yearbook effort on skills classified them in two main divisions: Part I - Skill Development In Relation to Society, The School, and The Learner; Part II - Skill Development Through The Total Social Studies Program. Part I was subdivided into two chapters: Skills Needed For Democratic Citizenship, and Skill Development in Reference to Human Development. Part II was subdivided into several chapters on such topics as: critical thinking and problem-solving, locating and gathering information, reading and listening, writing and speaking, interpreting maps and globes, interpreting graphics, developing a sense of time and chronology, and participating in group undertakings.

It was notable that the 1953 NCSS publication recognized that the term "skills" had come to have a broader meaning. Editor Carpenter reported that at one time, this term referred to "facility in physical activity" (p. 9). Later, the term meant learning acquired through "drill;" but in 1953, had come to mean "a way of doing well a variety of things" (p. 9). Carpenter stated that "a discrete classification of

skills is impossible...(and) a grouping which would elicit general agreement among educators would also be unlikely" (p. 9).

The 1960's

Jarolimek (1981) reported that curriculum in the 1960's was physically characterized by such innovations as "open-space" school construction, related to well-funded projects referred to as "the new social studies," and later on in the decade to a determination that courses of study should have "relevance" (p. 8). Reform was dominated philosophically by a concern over perceived deficiencies in public education. The curriculum work was, at first, directed toward strengthening the subject areas of mathematics, science, and foreign language (p. 7). Concurrently, there was much critical rhetoric directed at the neglect of the skills, especially at the "failure to make use of appropriate modes of inquiry and little attention to "thinking" as an important outcome of social studies activities (p. 8).

Curricular work during the 1960's came in two phases identified by Jarolimek (1981) according to the afore-mentioned key terms: the new social studies and relevance. Up through 1965, academic scholars, taking advantage of public and private funding, wrote prescriptive articles and curriculum aimed at correcting the problems in American public school classrooms. Basically, they developed academically oriented curriculum based on the structure of the disciplines (p. 8).

Hertzberg (1981) found that by 1963, new curricular projects in the social studies were patterned after those in mathematics and science that had been influenced by Jerome Bruner's ideas expressed in The Process of Education (p. 97). Bruner's book was actually a report of a conference held at Woods Hole, Massachusetts, in 1959, that had been attended by university-based scientists. Funding for the proposed enterprises was coming from universities, private foundations, and government. Participation, however, was not extended to ordinary classroom teachers and "educationists" (p. 97). Too, Bruner's synthesis of the conference ideas had applied to mathematics and science---not to the social studies. Later, critics would look upon the personal characteristics of the reform contributors and the mathematics and science orientation of Bruner's principles as part of the causes of the failure of the "new social studies" (p. 97).

Hertzberg (1981) found that certain basic principles set forth in Bruner's book were borrowed for use in reference to social studies skills. These include:

---Mastery of the fundamental ideas of a field involves not only general principles but the development of an attitude towards learning; that is, learning by "inquiry" or "discovery."

---Since intellectual inquiry is everywhere the same, the "school-boy" can learn more easily by behaving as a social scientist.

---Any subject can be effectively taught in some honest form to any child at any level (p. 97).

Philosophical linkage of the new reform movement underway in mathematics and science was provided by such authorities as Charles R. Keller, head of John Hays Fellows Program, who called for elimination of the "murky term `social studies'" and a methods stress on "conceptual rather than fact-by-fact approach ... learning and discovery ...(and) analysis, critical thinking, and interpretation" (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 99). His ideas indicated a clear influence by and linkage to Brunerian principles.

Various projects for social studies got underway including the Harvard Project featuring analysis of public issues; the Amherst College Project, and the Carnegie-Mellon Project focused on use of primary sources. By 1965, several nationwide social studies centers were set up, funded, and designed to fuel the reform projects (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 108). In the same year, Edwin Fenton and John M. Good in an article in Social Education gave it all a new name---the "new social studies" (p. 108).

Hertzberg's (1981) study indicates that debate over the new reform began during the mid 60's and that not everyone was on the "bandwagon." Discussions among professionals often encompassed confusion over the terminology involved; for example, the meaning of Brunerian terms such as "structure, inquiry, and concepts" were variously interpreted and

was sometimes contradictory. Hertzberg cited the April, 1963, Social Education:

There was simply no agreement among historians that history had a "structure." Civics, the only social studies subject specifically invented by school instruction, had no discernable structure. "Inquiry" looked like a combination of "problem-solving" and "critical thinking," which was probably not quite what many "new social studies" proponents had in mind... The meaning of "concept" was fuzzy in spite of efforts to differentiate "concepts," "subconcepts," "generalizations," and so forth. Since the curriculum was supposed to be organized around "concepts," this lack of clarity was a serious matter, not to mention the fact that nothing inherent in "concepts" prevented them from simply being memorized, which no one favored (p. 112).

Furthermore, leaders of social studies reform though united "at a high level of generalization on 'inquiry'... interpreted the term differently" (p. 107). Hertzberg referred to a 1967 survey of 42 curricular guides which reflected discernable "attempts to identify a conceptual structure and to implement 'concepts' and 'generalizations' (as) the distinctions were often unclear, and they were often poorly integrated with content" (p. 110). Too, these guides indicated "emphasis on 'inquiry' and 'discovery' (more often recommended than spelled out)" (p. 110).

Hertzberg (1981) found that advocacy of the social studies skills reached its zenith during the 1960's reform period amidst warning about the weaknesses inherent in the "new social studies" package. She reviewed several articles in Social Education (1965) by Fred M. Newman, Byron Massialis, Richard Gross, William Cartwright, and Carl O. Olson, Jr. that relayed perceived problems in the new approach. Hertzberg found that there was evidence that in actual practice the implementors, or ordinary classroom teachers, were "modifying" but not replacing the old curriculum, and that most classroom teachers "had no more than passing acquaintance with national reform" (page 115). Reformers had not looked at what schools were already doing well, closely examined what it was like to be a classroom teacher, or felt the heavy demands on teacher time made by the newer "inquiry" methods (p. 117). Too, reform had focused on the above average student ignoring the rest and some criticized the assumption that "what was good for the social scientist as researcher was also good for the child or adolescent" (p. 113).

Just as publication of the new curricular materials was reaching the classroom, social forces were creating issues and problems not covered in the "new social studies." The civil rights movement for example, pointed to the lack of "relevance" in the new materials. Jarolimek (1981) found that "relevance" meant that courses should be designed to meet the needs of current societal problems (p. 8). The general message by the end of the 1960's was that social studies should devote more attention to existing social realities on such topics as racism, poverty, hunger, the environment, and civil rights (p. 8).

Skills In The 1960's

The 1963 NCSS yearbook, while yet another revision of the popular 1953 yearbook, contained some noteworthy changes. Possessed of the same editor, general subject area, and basic organization, the new edition had 13 new chapters and a suggested guide to grade placement of skills as an appendix. Authors Johns and Fraser (1963) cautioned that "almost no research evidence exists to guide the proper grade placement of skill instruction;" and that "it is impossible to set a particular place in the school program where it is always best to introduce a specific skill, and one cannot assume a child has learned a particular skill after being exposed to it" (p. 312). In the foreword, Editor Carpenter discussed "education in the 1960's" and "increased emphasis given to skills for listening, writing and reading," and development of critical thinking (p. vii). The yearbook was divided into three parts: Part I - Skill Development in Relation to Society, the School, and the Learner; Part II - Skill Development Through the Total Social Studies Program; Part III - Measurement and Synthesis of Skills in Social Studies. The appendix of skills with recommended grade placements was divided into two parts: Part I - Skills which are a Definite but Shared Responsibility of the Social Studies; and Part II - Skills which are a Major Responsibility of the Social Studies.

In Part I of the appendix, there were eight main skill designations, each having several sub-skills. The main skills named were: locating information (40 sub-skills); organizing information (11

sub-skills); evaluating information (9 sub-skills); acquiring information through reading (6 sub-skills); acquiring information through listening and observing (8 sub-skills); communicating orally and in writing (19 sub-skills); interpreting pictures, charts, graphs, tables (23 sub-skills); working with others (7 sub-skills). Based solely upon the number of sub-skill designations, it would appear that "locating information" with 40 specific sub-skill items was to be considered the most important.

In Part II there were four main skill designations: reading social studies materials (two sub-skills); applying problem solving and critical thinking skills to social issues (10 sub-skills); interpreting maps and globes (69 sub-skills); and understanding time and chronology (25 sub-skills). Again, based upon the number of sub-skill designations, it would appear that "interpreting maps and globes" was to be considered a primary learning objective. All in all, there were 229 specific skill designations.

Two other NCSS publications of the 1960's are noteworthy. The 37th yearbook published in 1967, was devoted to clarifying what is meant by "thinking," and the 39th yearbook published in 1969 was devoted to clarification of problems regarding social studies objectives.

The 37th yearbook entitled Effective Thinking in the Social Studies contained exposition on the problems educators encounter in trying to develop effective programs on thinking. Focused largely on "haziness about what is meant by thinking," editors Fair and Shaftel (1967) deplored the "vagueness" and "confusion" generated from educational as

well as research literature regarding thinking skills (p. 26). Further, they wrote:

"Even the most serious educational thinkers have failed to distinguish between (a) the elements of thinking or the basic skills of which thinking is composed, and (b) the strategies of thought, such as problem solving. Styles of thinking, such as convergent and divergent thinking, productive thinking, and critical thinking are mentioned in the same breath with fundamental processes such as concept formation, inferring, and generalizing" (p. 26).

The 39th yearbook, entitled Social Studies Curriculum Development: Prospects and Problems addressed the problem of lack of consensus in the social studies in order to clearly define and cite specific goals. A review of the history of social studies goals for instruction cited "persisting general concerns ... of ethical values, effective citizenship, and 'thinking abilities'" (p. 41). Editor Fraser (1969), while basically advocating "inquiry" as a mode of instruction, nevertheless deplored the fact that "inquiry has long been sacrificed to coverage of data" (p. 46). However, while extending much exposition to the why's and how's of this methodology, Fraser admitted that "while substantial agreement may exist concerning those objectives related to inquiry, there is not similar agreement concerning the meaning of the term" (p. 47). Generally speaking, the literature of that time

indicated educators were in disagreement over what was meant by thinking and inquiry and the organization or classification of the skills.

Jarolimiek (1963), who authored a chapter entitled "The Psychology of Skill Development" in the 1963 NCSS yearbook, divided the social studies skills into three classifications: work study skills (reading, outlining, map-reading, etc.); thinking skills (critical thinking and problem solving); social skills (cooperating with others, group work, etc.)" (p. 18). Other educators of the period used different divisions. Rubin (1969), for example, referred to primary and secondary skills--- primary meaning life skills vital for emotional and physical well being; and secondary meaning less significant, modifiable and replaceable skills (such as note-taking)" (p. 20). In the next two decades more disagreement would emerge on skill designations, definitions, and classifications.

The 1970's

Besides lack of acceptance within the "real world" of the average classroom as reported by Hertzberg (1981), other forces caused the "new social studies" movement to lose steam in the 1970's due to such things as social upheaval typified by the civil rights movement and the divisiveness over the Vietnam conflict. Many educators focused on the "relevance" issues of current social concerns, on black history, and the meanings of cultural pluralism (p. 147). Grassroots support arose for a

"back to basics" curriculum, for citizenship education, law related education, and attention shifted to the inculcation of American values...concerns largely ignored by the reformers of the "new social studies" (pp. 158-9).

Curriculum in the 1970's was marked by features such as mini-courses, less dependence on single textbooks, and pluralistic social concerns. Jarolimek (1981) found that problems abounded as, early in the decade, the social studies was perceived as "adrift," lacking the public's confidence and understanding ... devoid of a consensus on what should be its legitimate concerns (p. 9). Problems were validated by data from national achievement tests showing depressed scores of students especially in basic skills (p. 9). "Both parents and teachers had had enough of educational innovations and of the innovators that promised more than they could deliver" (p. 9). Inquiry teaching and values clarification strategies, features of the new social studies, were under fire. Parents were critical because they feared such instructional methodology undermined traditional values and religious training (p. 11). By the mid 1970's, most programs developed under the name of "the new social studies" were having little effect on the curriculum of the nation's schools (p. 9). Hertzberg's (1981) studies indicated that many teachers did not use the new materials because they often felt insecure with inquiry procedures, did not fully understand it, and lacked the skills to implement it. Jarolimek (1981) reported that teachers found the "inquiry" process time-consuming and unproductive in terms of knowledge transmissions; plus, they wanted to

avoid confrontations with parents over open-ended inquiry strategies, valuing processes, and controversial topics (p. 11).

According to Jarolimek (1981), the bicentennial celebration of 1976 reawakened interest in more traditional social studies concerns as such things as American values, personal histories, America's pluralistic heritage, and state and local historical celebrations. By the late 1970's, such new topics as pluralism, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural concepts were incorporated into textbooks and other curricular documents.

Skills in the 1970's

Literature of the 1970's on the skills reflected ambivalence toward the "new social studies" as some writers continued to echo its philosophy but, at the same time, complained about the state of confusion and lack of consensus over the skills. Chapin and Gross (1973) authored a book entitled Teaching Social Studies Skills which included chapters on reading, listening, speaking, viewing, language, and time-space orientation skills. They devoted three separate chapters to "inquiry," a basic teaching goal as advocated by leaders of the "new social studies." However, authors Chapin and Gross caution that "we in the social studies are not clear in which direction we are moving" (1973, Preface). Beyer (1979) referred to the "scores of articles and books (on inquiry and inquiry teaching) that had been published; and to

the numerous curriculum projects and instructional materials and programs based on inquiry" (p. iii). He too cited the "confusion and misunderstanding about inquiry teaching" and indicated this is what provoked his own writing efforts to produce a practical book for teacher use (p. iii). Fraenkel (1973) referred to the "lack of clarity and confusion over the nature of thinking" (p. 189). He tried to categorize the skills and to indicate which were the most important. He classified learning skills as thinking skills, academic skills, and social skills; and he identified the most important ones as: reading, viewing, speaking and listening, note-taking, reading and interpreting maps, construction of time lines, and writing.

Research literature published during the 1970's documents the confusion over the skills. In 1977, NCSS in collaboration with ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Sciences Foundation, and Social Science Education Consortium issued a review of empirical, or scientific, research materials on social studies education. This review by Hunkins, Ehman, Hahn, Martorella, and Tucker (1977), entitled Review of Research in Social Studies Education, 1970-1975, presented a concise overview of research executed during this period on "cognitive learning and instruction, values education, teacher education, and diffusion of innovations in the social studies" (p. 1). Illustrative of the concerns of the 1970's, the work documented the problems regarding the language of the social studies.

The first chapter of the review focused on explanations of research language and procedures. Author Hunkins (1977) wrote that, in order to

comprehend social studies research, "we need to focus on and interpret the language and approaches that researchers in the field are using" (p. 1). In essence, this chapter pointed out the fact that researchers and educators did not use the same language thus diffusion of information back and forth was stifled.

In the second chapter, author Martorella referred to research by Feely (1976) on "the semantic untidiness of our research language concerning thinking" (p. 16). Martorella explored the confusing variety of ways researchers have treated learning and thinking regarding the problem of semantics citing the work of several researchers: Guilford (1959, 1966) dealt with mental abilities by creating a "structure of intellect model" that was made up of 24 cognitive abilities; Bloom and associates (1956) approached thinking in terms of "curriculum outcomes;" while the works of Bruner et al (1962, 1973); Walach and Kogan (1965); and Gagne (1970) referred to specific thinking "products" such as perceptions, facts, concepts, generalizations, and principles (p. 16). Martorella stated that usage of the term "skills" as if in reference to cognitive products, such as map skills or reading skills, "appears inconsistent and fuzzy" (p. 16). Further, he wrote:

In a comprehensive review of research on skill learning, the term was defined broadly as "processes producing expert, rapid and accurate performance" (Posner and Keele 1973). If this definition is applied, it would appear that there are few "skills" that are prominent in social studies instruction and, to the extent that

they can be identified, they might more properly be classified as psychomotor rather than cognitive objectives. It has been suggested elsewhere that the term, as it is used frequently in social studies, might more properly be regarded as a special class of facts, concepts, and generalizations (Martorella, 1976, p. 16).

Martorella (1977) commented on his own frustration in reviewing research on the nature of "concepts" applicable to the social studies remarking that this term as used in the social studies lacks consensus and precision as to definition (p. 22). "Typically, in social studies discussions, the term "concept" appears to have been used in at least five different ways" whereas in research there is only one agreed-upon definition (p. 22). In social studies, "concept" may mean an idea, a theme, a general condition, a fundamental element or structure of disciplines, or categories for grouping knowledge and experiences (p.22).

The 1980's

As to the 1980's, Hertzberg (1981) wrote that "if there is any definite, identifiable trend in the social studies ... it is a search for coherence ... for understandable explanations" (p. 183). In addition to continued confusion over identification and definition of the social studies skills, much of the current literature alludes to

disagreement specifically over the "thinking skills." Arguments abound over whether direct teaching of thinking skills is possible, whether they can be taught independent of content, even whether they should be taught at all.

And so, this literature search now turns to current writing relative to the continuing confusion over the terms used to identify social studies skills. As stated in the beginning, the real problem herein is not the sources themselves ... it is their multiplicity. There is an overwhelming abundance of materials just in the area of "thinking skills." Materials abound relative to social studies and general education, testing, and related subject matter in the fields of philosophy, neurobiology, and psychology. Resources include not only books, journals, and magazines, but also media sources (such as audio cassettes), newsletters, networks for information-sharing, and professional associations devoted to the study of thinking skills. Limitation of literature review for the 1980's is not a convenience but a necessity. It is hoped that the selection herein will be perceived as representative of the ideas of the 1980's.

Current Literature on the Social Studies

An important recent contribution (Stanley, 1985) to an understanding of the skills is the NCSS publication Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976 - 1983 which was an effort to "make

some sense out of a field divided by conflicts regarding rationales, content, values, and approaches to research" (p. iii). Chapter three was devoted to review of research in critical thinking and cognitive process research relative to social education. Author Cornbleth (1985) argued that current ideas are based on erroneous and untested concepts, assumptions, and beliefs. Further, she asserted that "at times such beliefs become myths guiding research and practice" resulting in more "misunderstanding and misinterpretation of research" (p. 5). Her review summarized several points regarding critical thinking in that: (1) the meaning of the term is confused, (2) it is more than a list of skills, (3) it is unlikely that critical thinking can be directly taught, (4) it is not linear, but recursive in nature, (5) no agreement exists on what constitutes critical thinking skills, or even what constitutes a skill, and (6) there is no reason to expect that further efforts to specify and sequence skills will be any more productive of critical thinking than past efforts. Cornbleth's findings based on her review of the research literature that document contemporary confusion over the term "critical thinking" are summarized below.

Cornbleth's first concern was that educators have historically accepted critical thinking as a goal in principle "without bothering to define the term precisely" (p. 11). Furthermore, "while much has been written in the name of critical thinking, the intended meaning of the concept is rarely made explicit" (p. 12). Cornbleth expressed concern that "educators seem to assume that critical thinking is inherently knowable and, further, that all of us would recognize it when it

appeared. Taking critical thinking for granted and assuming a doubtful consensus has served to obscure rather than clarify its meaning and implications" (p. 12). Cornbleth referred to several studies to support her conclusions regarding critical thinking: Feely (1976), Wiggins (1978), McPeck (1981), and Shulman (1984).

Cornbleth cited a study by Feely (1976) which distinguishes two models of critical thinking in the social studies and general education literature: the mental and the logical (p. 12). Feely found the "mental conception essentially undefined ... and therefore unsatisfactory" (p. 12). Feely concluded that the logical approach as exemplified by Ennis' (1962) analysis of the 'aspects' of critical thinking ... was found to be sufficiently precise to be helpful to instructional practice and research" (p. 13). However, Feely pointed out that while seemingly precise, the logical paradigm "fragments rather than defines critical thinking by reducing it to a list of skills" (p. 13).

Cornbleth attempted to define critical thinking and documents her analysis with studies that reflect her own conceptions of the meaning of that term. She connected her ideas on critical thinking to John Dewey's notion that the essence of reflective thought is informed skepticism or active inquiry. Further, she asserted that critical thinking is a "dynamic process of questioning and reasoning ... (reflecting) a particular disposition or quality of mind, a critical spirit (Passmore, 1967) or reflective skepticism" (McPeck, 1981, p. 13). She concluded that critical thinking was best described in terms of features which

reflect an informed skepticism, a seeking of information, a process of reasoning, an evaluating of options, a reflecting on one's thinking and then the raising and pursuing of further questions (p. 15). Finally, she made the point that if critical thinking were indeed a number of skills or a series of steps, there would be agreement or consensus among educators as to what constitutes a skill or such steps and no such agreement exists (p. 19). The real problem, Cornbleth maintained, was that educators cannot tell whether skills or steps lead to critical thinking; and that lists of skills or steps imply that critical thinking is linear in nature which, she asserts, it is not (p. 18).

Current NCSS Scope and Sequence

As seen throughout this chapter, NCSS publications have been important in the evolution of the social studies skills. Recently, NCSS published the results of a study by a special Task Force relative to a new Scope and Sequence in Social Education (1984, April). The proposed changes reflect differences from the 1963 version published in the NCSS Yearbook, Skill Development in Social Studies in skill terminology, classification, and emphasis. In the 1963 version, there were some 229 skills and subskills listed. The 1984 matrix of skills contained just over 100 items. In 1963, skills were classified in two parts: skills which are a definite but shared responsibility of the social studies and skills which are a major responsibility of the social studies. The 1984

skills and subskills were simply categorized under identifying headings. Based on numerousness of included items, the most important skills in the 1963 version were those relating to locating information and to interpretation of maps and globes. There were 53 map and globe skills specified in 1963; the newest matrix of skills listed only 13. There were six reading skills specified in 1963; the 1984 matrix lists 18 reading skills.

ASCD Efforts Regarding Thinking Skills

In May of 1984, ASCD appointed a committee on teaching thinking which conducted an invitational conference for researchers and practicing educators. One of the results of this conference was publication of a teachers' resource book entitled Developing Minds. Costa (1985) collected and edited the writings by more than 50 experts who covered numerous aspects of the thinking skills. The book included a glossary of cognitive terminology, a listing of multi-media resources, an annotated bibliography, and a section on recommended critical thinking tests. Contributors wrote on such topics as classroom strategies, curriculum planning, fostering thinking, assessment suggestions, and existing curriculum programs on thinking skills.

That the book is meant to be "suggestive," was made clear in the preface, as well as in other sections. Editor Costa reminded readers that "thinking is most often idiosyncratic and covert [and] definitions

of thought processes, strategies for their development, and assessment of the stamina required for their increased mastery are therefore illusive" (p. xi). Costa explained that the book was designed to be "symbolic of this field of educational inquiry today---controversial, tentative, incomplete, and fascinating" (p. xi). Implementors were cautioned that there are differing points of view, different definitions expressed and the individual educator is urged to "adapt, modify, and decide what is most appropriate for your situation" (p. 41). The glossary of definitions for cognitive terminology was prefaced by the statement that "while some may take issue with these definitions, the following terms may be helpful to practitioners" (Costa, 1985, Appendix A).

Selected Current Writings of Barry Beyer

An advocate of direct teaching of the thinking skills via a multi-grade, sequential skills program, Beyer (1983, November) cites the problems in trying to deal with research on the subject: "Research is inconclusive about the best way to teach thinking skills; [that] for every set of studies showing that questioning patterns improve student thinking, there is another set that suggests they have no significant effect" (p. 44). Further, he commented that "thinking skills are currently so ill-defined that what passes for these skills is quite idiosyncratic and rather inconsistent from one district to another"

(p. 45). Beyer stated that school districts need a coherent, unified program and a crucial feature should be a "common instructional language" with teachers using the "same terms [for] the same intellectual skills" (p. 48).

In the following year, Beyer (1984, March) again discussed the above-mentioned obstacles that prevent educators from effective teaching: disagreement over which skills to teach and precise definitions of the skills. He referred to the "haziness and great diversity" of what educators opted "to discuss or to teach as thinking skills" (p. 486). Teachers were confused, he maintained, because definitions were so vague that they misled, caused conflicts, and failed to explain (p. 487). Beyer cautioned that teachers' failure to find consensus inhibited professional communication, research, teaching, testing, and that resolution of this problem was primary to everything else (p. 487). In a followup article, Beyer (1984, April) attempted to clarify the situation by asserting that thinking skills are not all alike. He distinguished between three: (1) broader, more all-encompassing skills (such as problem solving); (2) discrete and basic operations (such as extrapolation); and combinations of these (such as critical thinking) (p. 557).

Other Points of View

Cornbleth (1985) had addressed the "myth" that skills and strategies are content independent reproaching de Bono's efforts to teach skills in isolation from subject matter (p. 21). Edward de Bono, director of the Cognitive Research Trust, Cambridge, England, is the creator of a "packaged" curriculum on thinking skills called CoRT---an acronym for Cognitive Research Trust. De Bono (1984, September) equates critical thinking with "reactive thinking" or vertical thinking as in debate or argument (p. 16). He has stated that adults, as well as children, need lateral thinking skills (planning, deciding, choosing, constructing, taking initiative, making things happen) which are not necessarily sequential nor predictable (p. 17). Regarding content, de Bono (1985) has asserted that the teaching of the skills through content "distracts from attending to the thinking tools being used" (p. 206). Further, he believes early introduction of his thinking skills program to nine, ten, and eleven year olds is important. His program (1984, September) consists of some 60 lessons, involving timed exercises on such things as perception (p. 16).

One who believes in teaching a specific, listing of skills via content is E. M. Ennis who is director of the Illinois Critical Thinking Project as well as a professor of philosophy at the University of Illinois. Ennis (1962, Winter) published an inventory of critical thinking skills based on his search of psychological, philosophical and teaching research. A contributor to the ASCD book, Developing Minds,

Ennis equated rational thinking to critical thinking or "reasonable, reflective thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe and do" (1985, p. 54). Further, he explained that the kinds of thinking that jurors (engaged in deciding the outcome of a murder trial) are asked to do is critical thinking; for example, if jurors believe the evidence presented in certain basic propositions as presented by the prosecutor beyond a reasonable doubt, then the defendant must be judged guilty (p. 55).

An advocate of the transfer of learning theory and in teaching thinking separate from content, is Walter Lipman, director of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children at Montclair State College, New Jersey. Lipman (1984, September) stated his belief that thinking is best taught directly, separate from content areas, via the required study of philosophy beginning at the elementary school level (p. 51-52). He asserted that philosophy, by definition, was "thinking that devotes itself to the improvement of thinking;" and that philosophy provided the "criteria---the principles of logic---for the improvement of students' reasoning" (p. 51).

Countering Lipman's views, Goldman (1984, September) cautioned that teaching children philosophy could be dangerous. Goldman cites Plato who warned that children taught to question law, customs, mores, standards, and values will come to neither honor nor obey these societal guidelines (p. 60). Furthermore, Lipman stated that the Socratic method is inappropriate for children because it teaches them to question adult authority before they have the necessary experience" (p. 57). He

contended that Plato's concerns were valid and that the Athenians "knew what they were doing when they brought Socrates to trial" (p. 57).

This literature search has documented the evolution of the social studies skills, the "borrowing" from other disciplines, the chronic terminology confusion, the continued lack of professional consensus, and the divisiveness of philosophical disagreements. Morse and McCune (1957) presented yet another concern: will instruction in the skills, especially the thinking skills, ensure that students will acquire ordinary "common sense"? An appropriate quote from their NCSS Bulletin, Study Skills and Critical Thinking, is an appropriate conclusion to this chapter:

The meticulous research (experiment-oriented) scholar in the physical sciences...may upon occasion make entirely unwarranted generalizations in regard to social relationships, generalizations based upon a limited number of experiences or observations. Doctors and professors, who are supposed to have developed critical acumen to an unusual degree, comprise a surprisingly large percent of the names on the "sucker lists" of promoters of get-rich-quick schemes. As profound a thinker as John Stuart Mill is supposed by popular account to have cut holes in his screen door so that his cat and her kittens could have easy entrance---a large hole for the cat and a small one for the kittens (p. 8-9).

CHAPTER III - RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Overview of Study

This dissertation is a descriptive study dealing with a "whole" or a "universe" in that all available state social studies curriculum guides were analyzed.¹ The purpose of the study is to answer an overall question: What is being recommended or required by states regarding social studies skills in actual curricula? More specifically, the researcher is interested in the answers to related questions such as: (1) Do the states define and indicate clear priorities regarding the skills? (2) Do the states classify the skills? (3) Do the states organize skills by grade levels? (4) What generalizations and patterns of agreement are suggested in this base of information regarding skill requirements, classification, or organization? While initial focus remained on these questions, the research was open to information other than what was anticipated from the questions as stated above. The design and plan of analysis for this study utilized content analysis procedures geared toward the generation of theory through qualitative methodology rather than the verification of theory via quantitative processes. The researcher's analysis system, termed a "Comparative Content Analysis System," includes a pretesting component, a "Basic Analysis Process" for actual content analysis of states' materials, plus a system for collecting and summarizing the findings.

¹ Not all states have centralized curriculum guides.

Research Plan for Chapters III, IV, and V

First of all, Chapter III focuses on applicable qualitative theory and the research process for discovery of grounded theory as outlined by Glaser and Strauss (1967). Then, content analysis as a qualitative process is explained as it relates to this study. Next, the rationale behind the creation of the coding instrument designed to collect skills data is explored. Finally, the planned content analysis procedures are demonstrated via application of this instrument targeting content of one part of the Virginia state social studies curriculum guide. This detailed, step by step demonstration (see Appendix D 2) illustrates the procedures that were followed, cites examples of limitations on coding, explains the kinds of problems likely to be encountered with such procedures and, finally, provides examples of the kind of summary data expected from this comparative study of states guides in terms of generalizations, concerns, and recommendations. Chapter IV of this paper is an expansion of this demonstrated process providing a comprehensive examination of all available guides. Chapter V includes a general summary and comparison of all the collected data, presentation of theory or generalizations emerging from the comparison, concerns and recommendations for further study and/or testing of the grounded theory data.

Qualitative Theory

The qualitative theory most relative to this study of states' curriculum guides is adapted largely from the ideas and suggested procedures advocated in The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research by Glaser and Strauss (1967). These researchers have argued for "grounding theory (generalizations) in social research (or) for generating it from data (p. viii)." The research process that Glaser and Strauss have recommended, a general method of comparative analysis, is different from more specific methodologies. While directed toward sociological research projects, the philosophy espoused by Glaser and Strauss is valid for research in other fields whenever study objectives demand collection of qualitative data (p. vii).

The main advantage in studying the Glaser and Strauss book lies in their clarification of fundamental qualitative theory that lends credence to the approach required to pursue a topic like the nature of this research paper. The goals for this paper require a defense of the pursuance of a partially open-ended analytical approach. This means, for example, that the questions stated in Chapter I cannot be viewed as research "limitations." Such questions are a beginning point. When a study is open-ended, the researcher does not know what constitutes the best or most complete questions. Unexpected information may give rise to new questions and initial questions may remain unanswered. Open-endedness, however, does not mean the researcher begins the study without initial questions, goals, or lacks rigorous procedural

guidelines. Glaser and Strauss advocate a general, comparative analysis method that addresses requirements for production of reliable research.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) defined "grounded theory" as that which has emerged unpredicted from data. While conceding there are "few theories of this nature," they have urged general, professional acceptance of their ideas as a "beginning venture in the development of improved methods for discovering grounded theory" (p. 1). Glaser and Strauss avoided clear cut procedural recommendations, taking the position that "slight knowledge makes any formulation (of recommended procedures) premature" (p. 1). Glaser and Strauss differentiated between grounded theory and logically deduced theory in terms of durability. They contended that theory arrived at from hard study of data is destined to last, whereas theory based on unfounded assumptions or "guesses" confused professionals and does not last (p. 4). They presented a strategy to facilitate the discovery of grounded theory involving the systematic choosing and studying of several comparison groups. The term "comparative analysis" encompasses different meanings for various purposes and so they have created their own interpretation of the term---meaning the generation of theory (p. 21). Glaser and Strauss applied the term broadly to "comparison on social units of all sizes and dimensions" for such things as organizations, nations, institutions, men or their roles, or small units of study such as hospitals and schools (p. 22).

Qualitative Research Problems and Content Analysis

Glaser and Strauss recognized the problems inherent in qualitative research. They addressed, for example, the difficulty in collecting data for valid qualitative study and the problems in being able to acquire only a "theoretical sampling" rather than a broad range of data. They also referred to the problem of "theoretical saturation" which means that data collection reaches a point where no additional data applicable to assignment of new categories are being found. They recommended collection of data from dissimilar sources, or "cross-site analysis," which lends validity to generated formal theory. They also referred to the need for "depth of sampling" which relates to the amount of data collected. Then, there is the question of reliability of data generated, or the question of whether other researchers can use the instrument and arrive at findings similar to the primary researcher's? For the purposes of this study, these problems or cautions are accounted for as (1) there is no sampling since all states' guides are to be inspected; (2) theoretical saturation will be welcomed since this will indicate commonality of goals within states guides; (3) the states themselves are dissimilar enough to provide adequate comparison data; and (4) depth of sampling is addressed since all available guides will be examined.

Analysis Procedures

Four sources were studied in relation to qualitative research and content analysis procedures: Krippendorf (1980), General Accounting Office (GAO), (1982, June), Patton (1980), and Naisbitt (1982). Krippendorf, in addressing the need for replicable data, recommended the researcher be explicit about the proposed procedures so that others may examine and replicate the process. A coding instrument, for example, should be pre-tested and other individuals should use the coding instrument and follow the researcher's analysis process (Krippendorf, 1980; GAO, 1982, June). Pre-testing and having others code using the researcher's procedures addresses the questions of validity and reliability. The "pre-testing" is an integral part of this chapter providing a vehicle for a preliminary trial run of the tentative instrument, an illustration of the proposed content analysis process, and a clarification of how the researcher intended to process and summarize the target data.

Patton viewed content analysis largely as an inductive procedure. He asserted that there is no "right" way to go about the organization, analysis, and interpretation of qualitative data. Patton encouraged each analyst to find his or her own process for analyzing content. He, like Krippendorf and the GAO, argued that it is important to have more than one person classify (or code) data using the researcher's procedures.

Naisbitt (1982) referred to the historical beginnings of the use of content analysis to illustrate the value and reliability of its use as a research method. World War II marked the beginning of content analysis methodology as intelligence experts searched for a way to learn about enemy positions through an examination of German newspapers. Researchers found that they could detect the strain on Germany's people, industry, and economy as they tracked local stories about factory closings, production goals, train delays, and counted the names of the missing and dead soldiers. Intelligence gatherers were so impressed by what they were learning that they began to analyze Japanese newspapers as well. This method of monitoring public behavior and events is still utilized by the intelligence community.

Glaser and Strauss contended that the comparative method via content analysis was just as useful in gathering and analyzing qualitative data from documentary sources as well as the more popular sociological procedures involving actual observations and interviews (p. 163). However, in a very real sense, each state's guide represents at least a small committee of people "equivalent to an anthropologist's informant or the sociologist's interviewee (p. 163)." In such publications, committees "talk" to peers, announce positions of policy, debate goals, and prescribe areas of emphasis in ways that compare to things seen and heard during ethnographic field work (p. 163). In contemplating actual field work, the researcher first must figure out the best locale for study, decide with whom to talk, determine who is involved and who is not, follow certain sequences of related events and

research the meaning of key words used by those s/he is observing (p. 166). The content analysis of documents involves deciding what materials are best to examine, inspection of the documents to see which states are involved with social studies skills, and observe the key words used in those documents (such as terms used to categorize the skills). Indeed, the researcher may look at the examination of states' curriculum guides as a set of "interviews" with people from all over the United States (p. 167).

Basically, the procedure for content analysis of the state guides involves simultaneous inspection and coding of data according to instrument categories, taking notes on the material, determining the need for new categories for the information noted, synthesis and summary of the data generated, and overall comparison to address the research questions. The process is not linear in nature; that is---the content analysis process fluctuates back and forth in a somewhat "trial and error" fashion. It does not proceed in a simple, sequential order.

Collection of Data

To collect data for analysis, a letter requesting a copy of each state's curriculum guide, listing of skill priorities, and related documents that show state priorities concerning social studies skills was sent to each of the fifty states' social studies specialists (see Appendix A 1). Participants' names and addresses were obtained from the

Council of State Social Studies Specialists Directory, 1985-86, as provided through the National Council for the Social Studies (see Appendix H). A follow up letter (see Appendix A 2) was sent to those states not responding to the first letter and, finally, phone calls were extended to those states not responding to the second letter. Within a span of six months in 1986, 39 states guides were received. Ten states indicated that they did not have centralized curriculum guides. One state, Mississippi, did not respond.

States' social studies specialists were chosen to receive the letter of request because it was assumed that they were best able to supply the necessary materials for analysis, are interested in the analysis outcomes, and would be willing to respond to any follow up study dealing with the terminology, organization, and priorities for social studies skills.

The Coding Instrument

The tentative coding instrument (see Appendix C 1) resulted from material taken from two sources: the Essentials of the Social Studies (1980) and the Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors (1982). The "Essentials" is a statement produced by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) to enumerate basic learning expectations for exemplary social studies programs. Since NCSS as an organization is the recognized

leader in the field of the social studies, these "essentials" were identified as basic items for the coding instrument.

It must be recognized, however, that the NCSS "Essentials" statement has inherent flaws (see Appendix B). Some of the items are misplaced and are overlapping in scope. NCSS, for example, listed Interpersonal Skills and Participation Skills as two separate headings. Examination of the respective sub-topics shows these two categories definitely overlap. Therefore, the tentative coding instrument was adjusted by combining these two areas into one heading called "Participation Skills---Interpersonal and Civic Skills." Too, it must be anticipated that the NCSS items are inadequate as category headings ---that some will not be used and new categories might have to be added. These problems are explored below as part of the demonstration of the proposed analysis process.

In addition to incorporation of the NCSS "essentials," terminology from the ERIC system relative to social studies skills was added to the initial coding instrument. The ERIC system utilizes a controlled vocabulary for computer data bases. Such vocabulary results from years of monitoring educational literature and represents a de facto standard of uniform, social studies skills terms. The system defines terms, and indicates broad, narrow, and related terminology. Since recognition of a commonality of language is a prerequisite to resolution of the state of confusion regarding the skills terminology, the ERIC terms relative to the social studies skills were added to the coding instrument (see Appendix C 1).

Pre-testing of Instrument

Pretesting, as advocated by content analysis authorities (Patton, 1980; Krippendorff, 1980; GAO, 1982, June), establishes reliability and validity and can indicate whether there are problems with the coding system, the instrument itself, and whether coders can categorize the same material with the same responses. The researcher has to establish an arbitrary percentage of what is allowable as to percentage differences. Regarding acceptable variance, GAO (1982, June) indicated that no less than 80% agreement or above is appropriate. The researcher should indicate major sources of discrepancies in coding and learn the reasons for them.

Pretesting occurred in three phases. In the first phase, a social studies curriculum specialist for a large school system was asked to be the first outside coder to use the tentative instrument. The specialist was asked to code a copy of the seventh grade objectives from the Virginia Standards of Learning for the Social Studies (see Appendix D 1). The specialist received no specific limitations or guidelines--- just general, how-to-do-it instructions. The results were illuminating. This curriculum specialist over-coded, tried to deal with vague ambiguous items, and assumed the presence of unstated skill designations through personal interpretation of the requirements for teaching a particular objective. The specialist also coded objectives that were basically knowledge or content goals; for example, item 7.6 - "The students will analyze how rights and responsibilities of American

citizenship have been applied from 1860 to the present" ("Standards of Learning," 1983, January, p. 16) was coded as an Intellectual Skill objective. While the verb "analyze" indicates a skill activity; the objective is to learn content relative to applications of American citizenship. The specialist also used the ERIC terms on the instrument even though these were not specifically in the document used for pre-testing. The only reason for including ERIC terms was to determine whether they are used with any significant regularity by the states. Finally, the pretest coder placed some items under more than one category. This is against the rules relative to mutual exclusivity in research. It became evident that guidelines had to be created to help fellow coders.

In addition to pretesting results which indicated need for coding guidelines, it must be noted that accepted research procedures (Krippendorff, 1980; Patton, 1980; GAO, 1982, June) dictate that coding strategies for content analysis must have limitations so that reliability and validity can be established. The following guidelines, therefore, were created to direct those using the research instrument:

Procedural Directions for Coders

1. Do not code vague, general, unclear, ambiguous items.
2. Do not infer or assume a skill is indicated. Read and react only to the specific language utilized in the state's curriculum guide.

3. Do not code items with skill verbs but content targets. The following example clarifies what is meant by this: "The student will analyze how rights and responsibilities of American citizenship have been applied from 1860 to the present" ("Standards of Learning," 1983, January, p. 16). The verb "analyze" indicates a skill activity; however, the objective is to learn content relative to American citizenship. If the student were to analyze and then actively apply concepts relative to American citizenship, then a skill is indicated. In other words, if the main objective is the practice or exercise of the skill then it is a skill objective.
4. Do not code the ERIC terms on the instrument unless these terms are specifically used in the curriculum. Some of these items are overlapping with the NCSS terms. The objective in their inclusion was to determine whether this accepted, standardized computer language is being utilized.
5. Code an item only once.² If two or more coding designations could apply, choose the best one.
6. Code only skills designated as "social studies" in nature; do not code general lists of skills for all content areas.

In phase two, two other pretest coders --- a social studies specialist and a general curriculum specialist K - 12 for the same school district --- were asked to examine a copy of Appendix D 1, or the seventh grade objectives from the Virginia Standards of Learning for the Social Studies, and go through the coding process using the limitations as set forth above. The results of phase one of the pre-testing had indicated the necessity for the coding limitations, and during the process of phase two the wisdom of creating the coding directions became evident.

Each of the specialists worked on the coding process independently. Neither had as many problems as the first pretest coder and the process

²Changed after subsequent pretesting to read: "Code an item, or phrase within an item, only once."

moved much more quickly. The only problem that arose was that they both started to place items under more than one instrument category. They had to be reminded to code an item only once as prescribed by the Procedural Directions for Coders. The results of their work compared favorably with the coding done by the researcher. A summary of the data is presented below:

PRETEST SUMMARY: PHASE TWO

Target of Analysis: Seventh Grade Objectives from the Virginia Standards of Learning for the Social Studies - Social Studies; 10 broad objectives.³

1. All coders, researcher and specialists, identified the same objectives that should not be coded, or 100% agreement.
2. All coders identified the same five objectives that should be coded, or 100% agreement.
3. Of the 11 specific items coded within the objectives by the researcher:

Coders A and B agreed 100% of the time; however, coder A coded one more item.

Coders A, B, and C agreed on six of the same items, agreeing 60% of the time. Coder C both under- and over-coded; that is, C did not always specify items within the descriptive statements as well as the general objectives and he coded two additional items.

As a result of this exercise, the researcher determined coding limitation number 5 - "Code an item only once" should be changed to read

³Coder A was the researcher. Coders B and C were the Curriculum Specialist K - 12 and the second Social Studies Specialist respectively.

"Code an item, or phrase within an item, only once. This would encourage others using the limitations to look within complex objective statements for more data.

Accepted research procedures (Krippendorff, 1980; Patton, 1980; GAO, 1982, June) recommend that after data gathering has progressed, the researcher should train another person or retrain a fellow coder to check the continuing efficiency of the analysis process and further establish validity of data generated and reliability of the instrument. Therefore, phase three of the pretesting process was accomplished after the researcher had examined several states' guides.

For phase three, a different state's guide and a different grade level was chosen to establish that the instrument and coding process applied easily to different material. The curriculum specialist for K - 12 was asked to analyze the new material because he was somewhat familiar with the instrument and the process. As a precaution, however, the researcher followed recommended procedures and retrained the specialist on using the process, the coding instrument, and reviewed the limitations on coders once again. Material was chosen from the state of Oklahoma because the objectives were designed like Virginia's with lists of objectives for each grade. Each objective had an overall, broad statement plus a descriptive statement clarifying the intent. A brief summary of phase three comparison is below:

PRETEST SUMMARY: PHASE THREE

1. Both researcher and specialist identified the same four objectives that should not be coded. This represented 100% agreement.
2. Both researcher and specialist identified nine of the same objectives that should be coded. This represented 100% agreement.
3. Within the nine objectives, the researcher identified 11 separate items that should be coded; while the specialist identified 9. This represented an 82% agreement on specifics.

SUMMARY TO THE PRETESTING SECTION

Content analysis authorities (Krippendorff, 1980; Patton, 1980; GAO, 1982, June) suggest that reliability of the research process and the instrument utilized, and the validity of the data findings be established via a pretesting procedure wherein other coders use the researcher's methods and instrument. Pretesting was accomplished in three phases. The researcher and three curriculum specialists from a large public school system engaged in the procedures. During the first phase, the necessity for establishing coding procedures, recommended by content analysis experts, was clearly established by the results. Such limitations were identified by the phase one experience. The second phase of pretesting concerned the comparative analysis and summary of the results of three different coders: the researcher and two pretest coders, a social studies specialist and a general curriculum specialist. This phase showed that participants categorized material with the same

responses more than 80% of the time and helped to slightly refine the coding limitations. Finally, the third phase of pretesting occurred, as recommended by authorities (Krippendorf, 1980; Patton, 1980; GAO, 1982, June), after analysis of several states' guides had been accomplished. New material and a different grade level was provided to one of the specialists that participated in phase two and retraining in the coding process took place. This phase showed that researcher and fellow coder found 82% or better agreement in coding results. The actual analysis process, use of the recording form, analysis and summary of expected results is explained below:

The Basic Analysis Process: An Example

In order to clearly establish the basic internal content analysis process utilized for this study, a step by step example of the plan for examination and comparison of all the material to be studied was included as Appendix D 2. The target of the example of analysis was the Seventh Grade objectives from the Standards of Learning for the Social Studies for the state of Virginia (see Appendix D 1). This particular grade level was chosen because it is "in the middle" and represented a typical example from Virginia's curriculum objectives for the social studies.

The analysis procedure involved: (1) inspection of the various objectives for seventh grade; (2) actual coding, or labeling, of the

document objectives with the outline numbers and letters designating the items on the coding instrument (see Appendix C 1); (3) notation at each appropriate point of "limitations" deemed necessary relative to the coding; (4) notation of any problems with the procedure as they occur, and (5) summary of results. These five steps are not "linear" or sequential in nature.⁴

Recording Forms

After the information gathered for "The Basic Analysis Process: An Example" was coded, or written, on the seventh grade curriculum sheet, it was then transferred to a "Recording Form" where the data was more easily analyzed (see Appendix C 2). Specifics regarding the skills at particular grade level designations were then extracted and recorded on a separate sheet (see Appendix C 3) to facilitate comparison with other states' data. The collected information provided the foundation for a summary of the coding results relative to the 7th grade; thus making it easier to compare Virginia's grade seven skill requirements with other grade levels and with other states' grade seven requirements.

⁴See the Procedural Directions For Coders on page 69, and the Content Analysis Example in Appendix D 2 which details the analysis procedure referred to above.

Analysis and Summary of Results

Explanation of proposed Basic Analysis Process, explored above and detailed step by step in Appendix D 2, also requires clarification of the proposals for analysis and summary of the outcomes from this research that are reported in Chapter IV and synthesized in Chapter V. Naturally the researcher focused on the initial research questions but there are other, broader issues as well. For example, the coding instrument and analysis procedure revealed the priorities of the states regarding the skills. This raises questions such as: If the original NCSS category listings are the "essentials," does the research indicate that they are being taught in the public schools? Second, the analysis revealed how the states organize and deal with the social studies skills. This raises questions such as why do some states make separate, general listings of skills applicable to all subject areas while others designate the skills as "social studies" skills? These concerns generated via the open-ended aspects of the research procedures are addressed in the conclusions and recommendations sections of Chapter V.

In order to address the research questions as well as other study expectations as explained above, the data generated from the basic analysis process are summarized in a summary and two tables which are part of this study's appendices. First, there is an Appendix E entitled A State by State Summary of Findings which is aimed at the initial questions of this study. This summary of research findings promoted the formulation of those generalities, conclusions, and suggestions needed

for Chapter V. Then, there is a summary collection of the data relative to skills cited at particular grade levels. This information was collected from all the tally sheets and recorded on a form (Appendix F) entitled: Tally Results for all Coded Guides. This table allowed the researcher to see generally which skills are cited at particular grade levels. Finally, there is a table (Appendix G) entitled Table of Information from Each State's Guide which displays the specific data from each state: detailing the total number of tally marks made, the percentage of items found for the instrument's main categories of "thinking" and "participation" skills, the percentage of items found for the sub-headings such as "data gathering," the most dominant skill(s) cited, the dominant skill by grade level groupings (i.e. grades 1 - 3 "group work"), and the dominant grade for skill attention. The state by state summary, the general collection of data relative to tally marks, and the table of specifics such as percentages allowed the comparison, analysis, and synthesis necessary to address the study's original questions as well as the broader expectations as discussed above.

Overall, the basic research objective was to reveal the state of the art in curriculum guides relative to the social studies skills. Ultimately, after analysis and synthesis of the content analysis research results, the evidence gathered was addressed in Chapter V relative to the implications of the findings, recommendations for further study, and concerns for the future. The flaws, problems, conflicts, and confusion as revealed in the guides---as well as the strengths---are used to suggest what ought to be done relative to the

skills in curriculum guides.

CHAPTER IV - ANALYSIS OF DATA COLLECTED

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to determine whether the states' curriculum guides define and/or identify the social studies skills, classify the skills, and organize the skills by particular grade level designations. These concerns directly address the research questions posed in Chapter I. The data supporting the responses to these questions will be presented in this chapter. In Chapter V, the study will focus on drawing conclusions, making generalizations, and recommendations based upon the data collected and analyzed.

Materials for the study were received from 39 states. Ten states indicated that they did not yet have curriculum materials as requested, and one state did not reply. The curriculum documents ranged in size from a one-sheet document which was folded twice to page size (from Massachusetts) to an 11 pamphlet collection (Florida).

The states' guides were collected via the letters sent in late Spring, 1986, to the states' supervisors of the social studies (Appendices A 1 and A 2) and follow-up phone calls were made in January, 1987. Most of the guides arrived between the end of June, 1986, and January, 1987.

The content analysis data was collected using formats shown as appendices to this study. The coding instrument, Appendix C 1, was used

to analyze each state's guide and information gathered was placed on the Recording Form, Appendix C 2. Next, the results for each state were tallied on the Data Summary Sheets, Appendix C 3. To achieve an overall picture of the data, A State by State Summary of Findings (Appendix E); Tally Results for all Coded States (Appendix F); and Table of Information from Each 's Guide (Appendix G) were created to facilitate analysis and synthesis. Appendix E provides a state by state exposition of general information and summaries of the material that addresses the research questions for this study. Appendix F and G displays the specific data collected in the content analysis procedures. Appendix F shows the number of states that named a skill at a specific grade level or within grade clusters, i.e. K - 3, at least once. Appendix G is a table for such information as the number of tally marks per state guide, percentages relative to instrument categories such as "thinking skills," and the dominant skill cited at various grade levels. The information collected from examination of the individual states' guides via the researcher's "Comparative Content Analysis System" is set forth in Chapter IV organized by the research questions that were identified in Chapter I.

FINDINGS

Definition and/or Identification Of Social Studies Skills

The research question concerned with the above topic is as follows:

Research Question 1 - Do the states define and/or identify specific social studies skills?

The content analysis process of the states' curriculum guides indicated that confusion regarding the skills, as documented in Chapters I and II, extended into the states' curriculum publications. Determining the appropriate response to the above question was difficult as the guides, in general, were not very clear relative to some concerns of this research. Problems in the research materials will be explored in greater detail in Chapter V; however, some explanation as to the complex nature of the data collection should be included here.

A few examples of the diverse treatment of the skills provide evidence of the individual nature of the states' approach to curriculum construction. Eleven states defined a "skill" as relative to the social studies, meaning that the definition applied to the social studies and not to other subjects or content areas. Ten states, while not specifically defining the social studies skills, provided clearly understandable skill statements of intent or purpose. However, there were guides that did not "define" anything but used social studies skill terminology; others used broad skill designations, sub-skills, or sample

skill activities that appeared designed to clarify the broader designations. Some states had an entire pamphlet devoted to the subject of "skills" in addition to the curriculum guide for different grade levels and courses of study. However, skill designations, definitions, and statements were different in the "skill" pamphlets in comparison with actual curriculum guides showing a lack of consistency within a state's own materials. A few states had separate and/or detached skill charts that appeared totally unrelated to the content and skill objectives within the main curriculum guide. Often, the introductory sections of curriculum guides which included statements on "skills" did not appear coordinated with the actual learning objectives for the social studies skills. The following conclusions, therefore, must begin with the caution that there is a great deal of confusion within states' curriculum materials. What is presented below is based on the least ambiguous materials. Regarding Question 1 as to whether states define and/or identify the skills:

1. Eleven states defined the term "skill" relative to the social studies: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Maine, Minnesota, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Dakota.

2. Ten states made skill statements: Alaska, California, Florida, Kansas, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Virginia, Wisconsin.¹

¹The statements generally were goal oriented, i.e. to develop a sound educational program, to foster good citizenship, or to develop those proficiencies needed to meet standards of learning.

3. Ten states did not identify or make a skills statement:

Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia.

4. Thirty-one states had skill objectives in their curriculum guides. These objectives were either separate skills objectives or were incorporated items within social studies content objectives. Skills were cited as goals and/or activities related to objectives and goals. The thirty-one states included: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, New Mexico, Oklahoma, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, Wisconsin. Most of these states were, therefore, the subject of the coding process as described in Chapter III. Two states identified single areas of skills: Montana and Massachusetts. California and Minnesota did not list skill objectives at specific grade levels and, since the coding process was tied to grade levels, their materials were not coded. The information collected from the coded material is presented as part of the response to this study's Question 3 in this chapter. The following information provides specific data relative to Question 1:

Definition of "Skill" Relative to the Social Studies:

There were eleven states that provided a definition of a social studies skill: Alaska in its "Elementary" curriculum guide referred to skill development as "the third component of a social studies program" in addition to the components of Knowledge and Beliefs/Values; further, this state defined skills as "processes which enable students to link knowledge with beliefs that lead to action" (1986, June, p. iv).

California in its "History - Social Studies Framework" guide defined skills relative to the social studies as "tools essential for learning and for effective participation" (1985, p. 5).

Hawaii referred to skills in its "Elementary Social Studies" guide as "processes" which provide the "means of achieving objectives" and defined each of three categories for the social studies skills: "(1) Intellectual Skills - usually called thinking skills, include lower level intellectual operations, such as memory, as well as more complex cognitive processes such as analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating; (2) Data Processing Skills - include competence to locate and compile information, to present and interpret data, and to organize and assess source material; (3) Human Relations Competencies - associated with social behavior. Effective interpersonal relations seem to depend on a sensitivity to the needs and interests of others, adequately developed communication skills, and the ability to cope with conflict and authority" (1981, July, pp. 6-7).

Kansas in its "Guidelines" stated that "to have a skill means that one is able to do something proficiently in repeated performances..." and that "reading, knowing how to find a book in the library, participating in a group discussion, and finding a place on a map are examples of a few skills important to the social studies" (1984, p. 10).

Louisiana stated in its "Louisiana Social Studies" that the skills refer to "competencies to acquire, organize, evaluate, and report information using various techniques, including computers and computer technologies, for the purpose of solving problems and clarifying issues" (undated, p. 1).

Maine in its "Scope and Sequence" book referred to a skill as "the ability to do something proficiently in repeated performances. Skills are processes that enable students to link knowledge with beliefs that lead to action" (undated, p. 4).

Maryland in its "Curricular Framework" included as one of its seven overall goals the "process skills to analyze and apply (a) knowledge base" (undated, p. 3).

Minnesota's tentative guide stated that "to have a skill means that one is able to do something proficiently in repeated performances" ("Some Essential," 1985, Spring, p. 83). This state referred to skill goals as process objectives and specified the need to develop competencies to "acquire, organize, evaluate, and report information for purposes of solving problems and clarifying issues" ("Some Essential," 1985, Spring, p. 42).

North Carolina in its state guide stated that a skill "implies the

proficiency to do something well" ("Standard Course", (1985, June, p. SS4).

Pennsylvania stated that skills are "the tools of learning" in its guide entitled The Use of Social Studies Concepts in Curriculum Development (1985, p. 1).

South Dakota in its "South Dakota" guide called skills the "processes which result in observable behavior" (1981, September, p. 109).

States That Make a Statement and/or Identify Specific Social Studies Skills:

Alaska in its "Elementary Guide" stated that the social studies should equip students to be decision makers and that "skills essential to citizen participation are critical thinking and problem solving" (1986, June, p. iv).

California's "History - Social Sciences Framework" referred to skills as a "major component of the history and social studies program in Kindergarten through grade 12 because they represent the critical bond among knowledge, values, and social participation" (1981, p. 5).

Connecticut's, A Guide to Curriculum Development in Social Studies, stated that "the student should be able to demonstrate skill in locating, compiling, and weighing the evidence and data necessary for clarifying issues and making decisions'" ("A Guide," 1981, p. 19).

In one of Florida's pamphlets, "Student Performance Standards," the State Commissioner of Education included a statement regarding the skills: "These Standards represent a broad spectrum of higher level competencies expected of those students who demonstrate progress toward academic excellence in specified fields of study in our public schools. The Skills will form the basis for a state assessment program..." (1984-85 through 1988-89, p. iv).

In Guidelines for Program Development--Social Studies, Kansas stated that students should "develop the ability to use data processing, intellectual, and interpersonal skills for the purpose of solving problems and clarifying issues" (1984, p. 3).

Kentucky's guide, Social Studies, had a separate section titled "Essential Skills - Social Studies," which stated that "the social studies skills developed for this list are those considered to be essential for a sound educational program" (1986, August, Preface). It should be noted here that most of the skills listed at each grade level were content-oriented.

Michigan in its "Essential Performance Objectives" stated that "in social studies education four elements are essential: knowledge; democratic and human values; skills in acquiring information and thinking about social affairs; and social participation. Programs must bring them together to foster a sense of efficacy, sound decision making, and responsible action" (1984, p.vii).

New Hampshire in its "Elementary School" guide stated that social studies should help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and

attitudes necessary for effective participation in the life of the community, the nation, and the world. New Hampshire also identified specific social studies skills including geography and the skills of decision making, data gathering, and critical thinking (1986, p. 15).

New York's pamphlet entitled, Incorporating Skills into Social Studies Programs K - 12, was intended to help schools implement the state's social studies program so that "skills will be important components of the curriculum..." and that certain skills should be viewed as "necessary if the student is to learn to function as a responsible person in society" (1984, Foreword). In the same source, New York identified several specific social studies skills stating that there are certain definite and interrelated skills such as "gathering adequate, available data and using such information (which) are baseline skills that a person needs to act in a way that would not be antithetical to a democratic society" (1984, Preface).

Rhode Island's Social Studies Curriculum specified certain skills that should be developed: "thinking skills, location skills-maps, social analysis skills, citizenship skills, reading skills, communication skills, study skills, value skills" (Undated, p. 72).

South Dakota combined a statement with identification of specific social studies skills in its "Curriculum Guide". Concerned with citizenship education (as were many states), South Dakota cited "problem solving and critical thinking skills ... as examples of generic educational outcomes needed in preparing students to meet the ever increasing challenge of the future" (1981, September, p. 86).

Virginia's "Standards of Learning" contained a message from the state Superintendent of Public Instruction which refers to learning "objectives which will help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes believed necessary for further education and employment" (1983, January, Foreword).

Wisconsin's A Guide to Curriculum Planning in Social Studies referred to "... the development of reflective thinking and reasoning" and stated the importance of students being able to "conceptualize and connect ideas and knowledge with beliefs and civic participation. To do that, thinking and reasoning skills are learned by means of systematic practice throughout the social studies program" (1986, p. 12)

Classification of the Social Studies Skills

The research question concerned with the above topic is as follows:

Research Question 2 - Do the states classify the Social Studies Skills?

Eighteen states provided classification systems for the social studies skills: Alaska, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, Virginia, and Wyoming. The various categories ranged from complete sentences to topics.

Research Question 2. a. - What are the various classification designations?

- Alaska:
- (1) Skills related to acquiring information (Reading, study skills, reference and information search skills, technical skills unique to electronic devices)
 - (2) Skills related to organizing, using, and presenting information (intellectual, decision-making, and communication skills)
 - (3) Skills related to interpersonal relationships and social participation (Personal, group interaction, social and political skills) ("Elementary," 1986, June, p. iv)
- California:
- (1) Study or Basic Skills
 - (2) Intellectual or Critical/Creative Thinking Skills
 - (3) Interpersonal or Social Participation Skills ("History - Social Science Framework," 1981, p. 6)
- Hawaii:
- (1) Intellectual Skills
 - (2) Data Processing Skills
 - (3) Human Relations Skills ("Elementary Social Studies," 1981, July, p. 6-7)
- Idaho:
- (1) Map and Globe Skills
 - (2) Interpersonal Skills
 - (3) Geography
 - (4) Report Skills
 - (5) Study Skills
 - (6) Values ("Pilot Program," 1984-85, pp. 3-39)
- Kansas:
- (1) Skills Related to Acquiring Information (Reading Skills, Study Skills, Reference and Information-Search Skills, Technical Skills Unique to Electronic Devices)
 - (2) Skills Related to Organizing and Using Information (Intellectual Skills, Decision-Making Skills)
 - (3) Skills Related to Interpersonal Relationships and Social Participation (Personal Skills, Group Interaction Skills, Social Participation Skills) ("Guidelines," 1984, pp. 10, 11, 12)
- Louisiana:
- (1) Skills Which Are A Major Responsibility Of Social Studies (i.e. reading, applying problem-solving and critical thinking, interpreting maps and globes, time and chronology, evaluating information, interpreting pictures, charts)
 - (2) Skills Which Are A Definite But Shared Responsibility Of Social Studies (i.e. locating information, organizing, and acquiring information, listening, observing, communicating orally and in writing,

working with others) ("Curricular Goals," undated, pp. 287-310)

- Maine: (1) Skills Related to Acquiring Information
 (2) Skills Related to Organizing and Using Information
 (3) Skills Related to Interpersonal Relationships and Social Participation ("Scope and Sequence," undated, p. 4)
- Massachusetts: (1) Citizenship Skills ("The Final Report," 1982, April 27, not numbered)²
- Michigan: (1) Students Need Communication Skills Focused on Social Affairs - i.e. reading and media comprehension, writing and discussion skills
 (2) Students Must Learn to Find Information
 (3) Young People Must Learn to Think for Themselves
 (4) Decision Making is Crucial ("Essential Performance Objectives," 1984, pp. xi, xii)
- Minnesota: (1) Problem Identification Skills
 (2) Information Gathering Skills
 (3) Information Processing Skills
 (4) Decision Making Skills
 (5) Interpersonal Skills ("Some Essential," 1985, Spring, pp. 42-43).
- Montana: (1) Geography Skills ("Montana Rural," 1984, not numbered)
- New York: (1) Getting Information
 (2) Using Information
 (3) Presenting Information
 (4) Participating in Interpersonal and Group Relations
 (5) Self Management Skills ("Incorporating Skills," undated, p. 12-18, 26)
- N. Carolina: (1) Academic (Intellectual) Skills
 (2) Self Management Skills
 (3) Skills of Social Participation ("Standard Course," 1985, June, p. SS4)
- Pennsylvania: (1) Information Acquiring Skills
 (2) Reading Skills

²This guide was a one sheet document which was folded twice to page size. No page numbers were used. Other states' curriculum materials also were not numbered, e.g. Montana and South Carolina.

- (3) Organization Skills
 - (4) Communication Skills
 - (5) Citizenship Education Skills
 - (6) Geography Skills
 - (7) Time Relationship Skills ("The Use of Social Studies Concepts," 1985, pp. 2,3,4)
- S. Carolina: (1) Social Skills
 (2) Academic Skills - locating skills, map skills
 (3) Thinking Skills ("Sequential List," undated, not numbered)
- Texas: (1) Geography Skills
 (2) Social Studies Skills ("Social Studies," undated, pp. 2-6)
- Virginia: (1) Map and Globe
 (2) Chart/Graph - Picture/Cartoon Skills
 (3) Time/Date Skills
 (4) Study Skills
 (5) Inquiry/Group Skills ("Standards of Learning," 1983, January, pp. 29-32)
- Wyoming: (1) Thinking Skills - data processing skills, intellectual skills, decision making skills, intrapersonal and interpersonal skills
 (2) Participation Skills
 (3) Civic Action ("Wyoming Standards," 1982, pp.6-8)

Research Question 2. b. - Do the states classify the skills within general objectives or listings of skills for all content areas?

Very few of the states classified the skills within general, or generic, objectives or listings of skills for content specific areas. Twenty-six states' guides were analyzed relative to this question and nearly half of them (Alaska, California, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) provided listings of the skills as social studies skills.

Eight states (Alaska, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Michigan, New Mexico, Texas, and Virginia) included skills objectives within the general learning objectives for the social studies. Five states (Arizona, Missouri, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin) cited skills that belonged to all content areas. Two states (Arkansas and Florida) listed all learning objectives under "skills" designations. One state (Montana) listed only Geography Skills. Another state, Massachusetts, listed only citizenship skills. Two states (New Hampshire and Wyoming) listed skill classifications within broad, general goal statements. A few states dealt with skills in more than one way; note for example that Virginia and Alaska are cited in more than one category above. A few states (Utah, Vermont, Rhode Island, and South Carolina) did not provide classifications as such but did list skills as social studies skills.

Organization of the Skills by Grade Levels

The research question concerned with the above topic is as follows:

Research Question 3 - Do the states organize skills by grade level designations?

In general, analysis of the states guides did not indicate agreement that the skills should be organized by grade levels; however, most of the guides had identifiable skill objectives as part of

knowledge or content objectives at grade levels. It was possible to "code" skill designations at the grade levels using the instrument and coding process described in chapter III. One of the confusing aspects of the guides concerned the fact that some states were not consistent between the general information sections of their curriculum guides and the learning objectives; that is, they would refer to grade clusters in the general information section and then proceed to provide objectives at every grade level within the clusters.

There were some 31 states' guides with skill objectives by grade level designations. The guides varied in format and organization of the grades: some used "grade clusters" or groups of grades i.e. K - 3, 4 - 6; most used "selected" grades i. e. 3 - 6 - 8 - 10; a few states designated "exit competencies"; and a few used designations of skills for every grade K through 12. As to sequential development of the skills, some made an attempt to have a model (based on NCSS standards) for local school districts to use for that purpose while others simply stated the desirability of having sequential development of the skills. These general background remarks provide the context for the following data:

Research Question 3. a. - What are the various grade level organizational designations?

States with knowledge and skill objectives in grade clusters:

(1) Alaska: 1 - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12

This state included separate listings of skills at each grade cluster. Grades 7 and 8 had separate objectives although they were referred to in the general information section as a "grouping."

(2) Delaware: 1 - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12

(3) Kansas: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9, 10 - 12.

This state used National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) suggested sequence of skills; however, all skill designations commenced at grade K. Therefore, all skills appeared at every grade level.

(4) Michigan: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9

(5) New York: K - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12

(6) South Dakota: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9, 10 - 12 - sequential skill development indicated; coded only at grade level where introduced.

(7) Vermont: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12

(8) West Virginia: K - 4, 5 - 8, 9 - 12

Two of the above states' guides (New York, West Virginia) were organized in grade clusters in the sections on philosophy, overview of purpose, or goals; however, they presented material in the form of objectives at specific grades. These objectives were measurable using the coding instrument for this study. The question for the researcher was whether to consider the guides as organized by clusters or by specific grade levels? New York referred to clusters of K - 6, 7 - 8, 9

- 12 but this researcher coded material for grades one, three, and six. West Virginia, too, referred to organizational groupings as K - 4, 5 - 8, 9 - 12 but material was presented in the curriculum guide that was possible to code for grades 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 - 12. Generally speaking, however, one can see that of those states that clearly use grade clusters, the K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12 system is the more dominant pattern.³

States with knowledge and skill objectives in selected grades:

(1) Arkansas: 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 - 12

(2) Georgia: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

Note: Georgia also had lists of skills applicable to all content areas titled: Media Skills.

(3) Idaho: organized by grades K - 6; 7 - 12 but used different skill headings at different grades; however, material was coded grades K - 9.

(4) Missouri: 3, 6, 8, 10

(5) Montana: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

(6) New Hampshire: 9 - 12

(7) New Mexico: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8

(8) North Carolina: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 - with the same eight skills at each level. Note: Nothing at Grade 12.

³For an overall, though "skewed," picture of content analysis data, see Appendix F. Skill designations were recorded at the upper end of grade clusters; for example, for grade cluster K - 3, a skill was tallied at grade 3. This posed a concern as it showed a deceptively heavier concentration of skills at the end of the clusters or groupings. The same thing was true for those guides that listed or stated the skills as exit competencies at designated grades.

- (9) Oklahoma: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 - 8, 9 - 12
- (10) Pennsylvania: 4, 5, 10
- (11) South Carolina: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 - 12 - only listed the social studies skills.
- (12) Texas: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12
- (13) Utah: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12
- (14) Wisconsin: K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 - coded skills at the indicated levels from "recommended" objectives.

Some of these states were difficult to classify and code. North Carolina, for example, listed the same eight skills at every single grade indicating the same skill expectations for level K as for level 11. Idaho used "skill" headings (Basic, Developmental, Extensions) for both knowledge and skill objectives at grades 4, 5, 6, and 7. Yet, it was possible to find skill designations for the coding at grades K through 9. Georgia had social studies skill designations within general objectives yet devoted an entire appendix to "Media Skills" for all content areas.

A few states organized material according to grade level expectations, or exit competencies, performance expectations, outcome statements, or mastery expectations:

- (1) Arizona: Grades 8 and 12 - exit competencies
- (2) Hawaii: Grades 3, 6, 8, 10 - performance expectations
- (3) Florida: Grades 3, 5, 8, 12 - exit competencies
- (4) Illinois: Grades 3, 6, 8, 10 - outcome statements
- (5) Kentucky: Grades K - 11 - mastery expectations

Just as for those states' guides that indicated the skill objectives within grade clusters, states' guides that had exit competencies tended to "skew" the data in the overall picture (see Appendix F). The data was recorded at certain grades; for example, most of the above states had expectations at grade 3 and grade 8; therefore, overall data tally showed more skill expectations at grades 3 and 8.

States with knowledge and skill objectives designated grades K through 12:

- (1) Louisiana: K - 12 - sequential skill development (1963 NCSS Model); skills coded only at the grade where they were introduced.
- (2) Maine: K - 12
- (3) Virginia: K - 12

Among the states, the generally favored organizational pattern appeared to be selected grades for skills designations, i.e. Pennsylvania's model guide for grades 4, 5, and 9 - 10. One reason for this was that in some cases the state had not finished all phases of the curriculum guide. In other cases, the guide served as a model for local districts to use to create their own local curriculum guide and therefore the state had provided only selected grades as the models. In still other cases, the state had mandated certain expectations for several selected grades. In these cases, the state had left the local districts the option of supplementing the objectives to meet their own local needs. In general, most guides made a statement that local

districts were to create their own local curriculum guides using the state version as a model or "point-of-departure."

Research Question 3. b. - Can generalizations be made as to typical grade level skills designations?

Analysis of Appendix F

Originally, this researcher supposed that the above question could be readily addressed when all of the information was collected on each state's guide and tallied on Appendix F; however, only the data collected in Appendix G proved useful regarding Question 3. part b. It proved to be impossible to answer the above question in a straightforward manner ---i.e. "Yes! And here are the skills usually designated at each of the grades K through 12." There are two basic reasons why. First, there are no typical grade level designations and second, as was previously explained in the information for Question 2, the tally marks shown on Appendix F are skewed or misleading.

As illustrated in the material for Question 2, there were no "typical grade level designations" among the states' guides. Twenty-six state guides were studied that cited skills at sequential grade levels, in groupings or clusters of grade levels, at specified grade levels, or within mixtures of these. Few of these guides were similar. Only two states cited skills at every grade K through 12. Five cited skills at sequential grades stopping short of grade 12. None of those five

stopped at the same grade. Six states used groupings or clusters of grades but each used a different pattern. The only common usage among them was the choice of grades 4 - 6. Six other states used selected grades usually citing "exit competency" goals; however, each one used different selected grades although they all included grades 3 and 8. Seven states mixed groupings and individual grade level designations, yet none of these were similar. One must conclude that a basic part of Question 3. b. was an assumption that proved false ... there were no typical grade level designations.

Many states used groupings or clusters of grades; therefore, grades at the end of such groupings received the tally marks since those grades were considered the targets for mastery of the skill. That meant, for a grouping of grades K - 3, the tally mark for a skill was placed at grade 3 --- which did not necessarily mean there was no skill work at grades K, 1, or 2. The result, however, was that grades at the ends of groupings or clusters showed a heavier emphasis on skill work and that is very misleading.

The main value of Appendix F is that (1) it illustrates an overall picture of the coding marks that were made, and (2) it shows areas of the instrument that received little or no attention. While the placement of marks does not represent data beneficial for generalizing for Question 3. b., the second point relative to the instrument, Appendix C 1, does merit examination.

Analysis of Appendix G

In reference to Question 3. b. --- Can generalizations be made as to typical grade level skill designations? --- the answer is a qualified "yes," based on Appendix G which is a table of data collected on each state's guide. Under the heading "Dominant Skill by Grades" in Appendix G are included the skills considered to be the most important by each of the states. Since there were no typical grade levels, this table was created via either states' designations or groupings established by the researcher, usually grades K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, and 9 - 12. Only those skills revealed as dominant skills by the content analysis process were included in the comparative analysis used to answer this question. The following generalizations relative to dominant social studies skill requirements resulted from this analysis:

1. Map and Globe Skills - This skill area under Data Gathering was the single most dominant skill area. Map and Globe skills were especially important for grades 4 - 6, slightly less so for K - 3 and 7 - 8. A few states ranked this skill area high for grades 9 - 12.

2. Data Gathering - This umbrella term was the second most significant skill in the state by state comparison. This skill area, development and use, was expected K through 12. Data Gathering was most important for grades 9 - 12; but, it was somewhat less important for grades 4 - 6 and 7 - 8. Data Gathering was least important at the K - 3 level.

3. Participation Skills (including Civic Skills), or Group Skills - This broad skill area was the third most dominant area in emphasis. Group work was the most important skill expectation for grades K - 3, less so for grades 4 - 9. Participation skills relative to civic responsibilities was the key expectation for grades 9 - 12, especially at grade 12.

4. Other skills emphasized by a few of the states:

- a. Research Skills - Research was an important expected skill for development work, especially at grades 8 - 10.
- b. Intellectual Skills - These skills were most important at grades 8 and 12, slightly less so for grades 5 and 10. The intellectual skills, as a group, were not emphasized for development and use at the primary or intermediate grades.
- c. Communication Skills - These skills were most emphasized at grades K - 3.
- d. Infer and Conclude - The most mentioned of the Intellectual Skills was the ability to "draw conclusions or inferences from evidence" especially for grades 7 - 8.
- e. Classify - The second most dominant Intellectual Skill was the ability to "classify or group items in categories" particularly at grade 3.
- f. Locate Information - The most important skill under Data Gathering was the ability to "locate information in a variety of sources especially for grade 6."

- g. Decision Making - This skill was a dominant expectation for the upper grades 9 - 12.

Generalizations and Patterns of Agreement Regarding the Social Studies

Skills:

The research question concerned with the above topic is as follows:

Research Question 4 - What generalizations and patterns of agreement are suggested in this base of information gathered by the researcher regarding social studies skills requirements, classifications, or organization?

The response to this final research question focuses first upon social studies skill requirements and then on skill classifications or organization. Basically, data analysis revealed no general agreement concerning skill requirements. Appendix E, a state by state summary of data, was analyzed as to whether each state presented an overall purpose or goal relative to skill requirements. In spite of the fact that some states' materials lacked clarity or were ambiguous as to intent, the following determinations emerged from the comparative analysis.

The statements of purpose and skill requirements of the 39 states' guides were categorized by this researcher into six different areas of information:

(1) Resource or Model Guides/No Skill Requirements: Ten states (Alaska, California, Connecticut, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma and Wisconsin) had statements within their guides that

indicated the material was to be used as a resource model for local school districts in developing their own curriculum. These states' guides did not state specific skill requirements.

(2) Mandated Use-Guides/Assessment or Testing Indicated: Eight states (Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, and Virginia) stated clearly or strongly implied that their guides were, or soon would be, mandated for use throughout the state.⁴ The content and skill objectives within these guides were, or soon would be, tied to state-wide and/or locally based assessment or testing.

(3) Resource or Model Guides/Performance Expectations: Six states (Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, Michigan, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania) had statements in their guides that indicated the materials were to be used as resource models for local districts to use in creating their own curriculum. These guides included "performance expectations" relative to content and skill objectives. While these guides did not refer to assessment or testing, the language used implied that the performance expectations, cited at various grades such as 3, 6, 8, and 10, were accepted standards for use in evaluating student progress.

(4) Unclear Purpose Guides/Social Studies Skills Mentioned: Seven states (Louisiana, New Mexico, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Texas, Utah, and West Virginia) had material that presented no clear purpose or

⁴See Appendix E for specifics on these states' requirements for use and assessment.

intent regarding skill requirements, but each of these guides contained references to skills for the social studies.

(5) Framework Guides/Content-oriented: Four states (Maine, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Vermont) presented minimum guidelines or frameworks for local school districts to use as point-of-departure material. The idea was for local districts to supplement the material to meet local needs. Some of the guides briefly referred to skills but were largely content-oriented.

(6) Philosophical Goals: Three states (Maryland, Massachusetts, and Wyoming) had brief documents aimed largely at presenting broad philosophical goals as guidelines. Skills, if referred to at all, were incidental to the overall goal messages.

Analysis of the classification systems recommended in the various guides did not reveal an overall agreement as to a skill classification system. Eighteen states classified the skills in one or more categories; however, only two states (Kansas and Maine) agreed on the same classification system (Acquiring Information Skills, Organizing and Using Information, and Interpersonal Skills). Many classification systems consisted of three broad categories. There were 24 categories used by the various states.⁵

Seventeen states used Group Skills, or a related term, as a category. Specifically, twelve states (California, Hawaii, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, New York, North Carolina, South

⁵Categorization was sometimes the researcher's interpretation; for example, Wyoming referred to interpersonal and participation skills. The researcher only cited "Interpersonal Skills."

Carolina, Virginia, and Wyoming) cited Interpersonal Skills, or something comparable such as Social Skills, Group Skills, or Human Relations as part of their classification system. Four states (Alaska, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming) cited Citizenship or Civic Skills. Wyoming cited both Interpersonal and Civic Skills. Two states (New York and North Carolina) used Self Management Skills as a category.

There was a tie for the second most used category involving Acquiring Information which including related terms such as Locating Information (eight states - Alaska, Kansas, North Carolina, Maine, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, and New York) and Thinking Skills, including the term Intellectual Skills (eight states - California, Hawaii, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Wyoming).

The third most frequent category was for Map Skills, including related terms. Seven states (Idaho, Louisiana, Montana, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia) used this category.

The fourth most frequent category was for Organizing and Using Information. Six states (Alaska, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, New York, and Pennsylvania) cited this category.

The rest of the categories and the states using them are as follows: (5) Data (or Information) Processing - Minnesota, Hawaii, Michigan, Wyoming; (6) Study Skills - California, Hawaii, Virginia; (7) Thinking Skills - Wyoming, Michigan, South Carolina; (8) Time/Chronology Skills - Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Virginia; (9) Decision Making Skills -Michigan, Minnesota, Wyoming;

(10) Citizenship (Civic) Education - Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Wyoming; (11) Critical/Creative Thinking - California, Louisiana; (12) Reading - Louisiana, Pennsylvania; (13) Problem Solving Skills - Louisiana, Minnesota; (14) Interpreting Pictures/Charts/Graphs/Cartoons, etc. - Louisiana, Virginia; (15) Communication Skills - Louisiana, Pennsylvania; (16) Presenting Information - Alaska, New York; (17) Self-Management Skills - New York, North Carolina; (18) Study and Basic Skills - California; (19) Report Skills - Idaho; (20) Values - Idaho; (21) Evaluating Information - Louisiana; (22) Listening, Observing - Louisiana; (23) Inquiry - Virginia. Basically, the foregoing information showed there were more differences among the states' classification systems than similarities.

It is important to compare the content analysis findings relative to dominant skill requirements to the foregoing summary on classification categories used by the various states. The results of content analysis of the states' curriculum guides showed conflicting information compared to the classification categories cited by the various states. First of all, the dominant skill requirement found in abundance in virtually every state's curriculum guide was that of Map and Globe Skills (see Appendices F and G). However, only seven states chose this as a category or classification for the skills. The broad, general term Data Gathering, a major category for the NCSS "essentials," was the second most dominant skill area found via the content analysis procedures; however, none of the states used that term as a category or classification. Eight states used the more specific classifications of

Acquiring Information. or a related term such as Locating Information. A few states used the term Data Processing with the implication that the term was a synonym for Data Gathering. The third most dominant area of emphasis found via content analysis of states' guides was that of Participation Skills (including Civic Skills), or Group Skills. This term, however, ranked first as to numbers of states including it as a major classification category. The classification designations, however, did not clearly include Civic Skills. This conflicting information implied a general lack of coordination within states' materials between classification of skills and skill objectives.

Overall, the analysis of data relative to research question number 4 (on generalizations and patterns of agreement suggested in this base of information regarding the social studies skills requirements, classification, or organization) revealed there was no general agreement over skill requirements or skill classifications. Some states did not state specific skill requirements, while others cited skills tied to assessment or testing. Some states stated performance expectations relative to evaluating progress. A few states' guides merely contained vague, token references to some of the skills for the social studies. Virtually all of the guides were content oriented; that is, most learning objectives were for subject matter goals. In addition, analysis of the classification systems recommended in the various states' guides did not reveal an overall consensus. Conflict was revealed in the comparison of states' preferred classification categories with the dominant, or most often cited, skills found via the

content analysis of the learning objectives within curriculum guides. Not only was there was a general lack of consensus between the states over the skills, there was evidence of lack of coordination within states' guides as well. The implications of the research findings will be explored in Chapter V. Answers to the research questions will be summarized, conclusions will be drawn, and recommendations will be presented for future studies by social studies professionals.

CHAPTER V - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to analyze states' curriculum guides focusing on an overall question: What is being recommended or required by states regarding social studies skills in actual curricula? The study specifically examined states' materials as to whether patterns of agreement emerged as to definition, classification, and organization of the skills by particular grade level designations. These concerns directly address the research questions posed in Chapter I. In Chapter V, this study focuses on the summary of data, conclusions and/or generalizations, and recommendations generated from the data collected, analyzed, and synthesized from the states' curriculum guides.

Materials for this study were received from 39 states. Ten states indicated that they did not yet have curriculum materials as requested, and one state did not reply. The states' guides were collected via letters (Appendices A 1 and A 2) sent in late spring, 1986, to the states' supervisors of the social studies (see Reference List of Sources - Appendix H). Follow-up phone calls were made in January, 1987, to those states that had not replied. Most of the guides arrived between late June, 1986, and January, 1987.

After collection, guides were examined using the researcher's "Comparative Content Analysis System" as described in Chapter III. Data were collected using an instrument and information collection formats:

Appendices C 1, C 2, and C 3 respectively. The data generated were then summarized, tabulated, and placed in summary and table format as Appendices E, F, and G to facilitate overall analysis and comparison. The information collected from examination of the individual states' guides was set forth in Chapter IV organized by the research questions as identified in Chapter I.

The researcher recognizes that each guide examined for this study reflected that state's particular preferences and needs. The content analysis comparison of the 39 states' guides relative to the instrument based on the NCSS "Essentials" (see Appendix C 1) should not be viewed as negative criticism of any individual state's guide.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS OF RESULTS

The purpose of this section is to present the answers to the four research questions stated in Chapter I. Each question is restated and the major findings are reported below in summary and conclusion statements:

Research Question 1 - Do the states define and/or identify specific social studies skills?

Research Summary Statements

1. Eleven states defined the term "skill" in relationship to the social studies; that is, they did not define the term as applicable to all content areas.

2. Only four of the states' definitions were similar. North Carolina's definition in "Standard Course," provided a good example of those four found to be alike: "... (a skill) implies the proficiency to do something well" (1985, June, p. SS 4).

3. Ten states provided skill statements relative to goals. The majority of them cited "citizenship participation" and/or "responsible social participation" as the major purpose of the social studies skills.

4. Ten states either did not define the skills or provide a statement regarding the social studies skills.

5. Thirty-one states had skill objectives either separate from or as part of social studies content objectives, goals, or activities related to objectives and goals; most of these states were the object of the content analysis process as described in Chapter III.

6. Content analysis of the states' curriculum guides revealed that the dominant, or more often cited, skills included: Map and Globe Skills, Data Gathering Skills, and Participation Skills (including Civic Skills) or Group Skills.

Research Conclusions

1. Analysis of research data revealed an overall lack of acceptance of standards for skill definitions. There is a need for the profession to adopt standards for social studies skill definitions to provide guidance to the classroom teacher, to insure a better education for the student, and especially in order to help resolve the overall state of confusion over skills.

2. Most states acknowledged (in definitions, statements of goals, and/or learning objectives) the existence of social studies skills.

3. States that indicated skill goals or objectives relative to mandated minimum standards and/or exit competencies tended to have better organized and more complete curriculum materials.

4. Most states provided "model" curriculum guides which implied that responsibility for skill definitions and requirements belonged to local school districts.

5. Most states recognized Map Skills, Data Gathering, and Participation, or Group Skills as essential for the social studies.

Research Question 2 - Do the states classify the social studies skills?

Research Summary Statements

Of the 39 states' guides examined, 18 classified the social studies skills in three or more categories using either complete sentences or topics; however, only two of the classification systems were similar.

Research Question 2. a. - What are the classification designations?

Eighteen states classified the skills using various classification categories. Those that were most frequently used included:

1. Participation, or Group Skills, or a related term, was cited as a category:

13 states - Interpersonal Relations or Social Participation

6 states - Citizenship or Civic Skills

2 states - Self Management Skills

2. Acquiring Information, or a related term, was cited as a category:

8 states - Acquiring, Getting, or Locating Information

3. Map Skills, or a related term, was cited as a category:

4 states - Map and Globe Skills

4 states - Geography Skills¹

4. Thinking Skills, or a related term, was cited as a category:

4 states - Intellectual Skills

3 states - Thinking Skills

5. Organizing Information, or a similar term, was cited as a category:

6 states - Organizing, Using, and/or Presenting Information

Other categories used for classification systems by one to four states included: Decision Making/Critical Thinking/Problem Solving Skills, Report Skills, Values Skills, Reading Skills, Time and Chronology Skills, Evaluation of Information, Interpretation of (non-print media) such as Pictures/Cartoons or Charts/Graphs, Listening and Observing Skills, Communication Skills, and Inquiry Skills.²

Research Question 2. b. - Do the states classify the skills with general objectives or listings of skills for all content areas?

1. Few states classified the skills within general, or generic, objectives or listings of skills for content specific areas.

¹Only seven states in all should be counted here as Idaho used both Map Skills and Geography as classification categories.

²Decision Making, Critical Thinking, and Problem Solving Skills were used in states' guides as separate entities and as synonymous terms.

2. Twenty-six of the states' guides provided material relative to the general question posed: Twelve states provided listings of the skills as social studies skills and not as skills relative to all content areas. Eight states included skill objectives within the general learning objectives for the social studies. Five states cited skills as part of all content areas. Two states cited all learning objectives as skills. Two states cited only one area or category of skills.

3. A few states dealt with skills in more than one way; for example, Alaska included skill objectives within the general learning objectives for the social studies as well as in separate listings of the social studies skills.

Research Conclusions

1. Half of the states classified the skills and those tended to have the better organized, more complete guides overall.

2. Analysis and comparison of research data revealed an overall lack of uniformity or agreement on skill classifications or organization.

3. The classification systems utilized by the states were characterized more by their differences in skill designations than by their similarities.

4. The most preferred categories for skill classification were: Participation or Group Skills, Acquiring Information, Map Skills, and Organizing and Using Information.

5. There was recognition that skills should be classified as social studies skills not as general content skills.

Research Question 3 - Do the states organize skills by grade level designations?

Research Summary Statements

1. The states' guides generally did not indicate a clear effort to organize skills by grade levels.

2. Most of the states' guides had identifiable skill objectives as part of knowledge or content objectives at various grade levels.

Research Question 3. a. What are the various grade level organizational designations?

1. Eight states cited knowledge and skill objectives in grade clusters; three of these cited skill objectives at specific grades as well.

2. Fourteen states cited knowledge and skill objectives in selected grades, however, few were similar:

3 states - used K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12.

2 states - used K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

2 states - used K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

3. Seven states used seven different selections of grades.

4. Five states organized material according to grade level exit competencies; each state had a different organizational system but grades 3 and 8 were cited by all five.

5. Only three states designated knowledge and skill objectives grades K through 12.

Research Question 3. b. - Can generalizations be made as to typical grade level skills designations?

1. There were no typical grade level designations.

2. Generalizations were made relative to dominant social studies skills requirements based on analysis of grade clusters K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12:³ The most often cited skills included the following:

a. Map Skills were the most dominant skill area, especially for grades 4 - 6.

b. Data Gathering Skills were the second most significant skill area, especially for grades 9 - 12; however, these skills were included in all grades.

³These groupings were established by the researcher.

c. Participation or Group Skills were the third most dominant skill area, especially for K - 3; and Civic Skills were especially important for grades 9 - 12.

d. Other dominant skills preferred by at least one state each were: Research Skills, grades 8 - 10; Intellectual Skills, grades 8 - 12; Communication Skills, grades K - 3; Drawing Inferences and Conclusions, grades 7 - 8; Classifying, grade 3; Locating Information, grade 6; and Decision Making, grades 9 - 12.

Research Conclusions

1. Generally, the states did not attempt to organize skills by grade level designations. The research for this study indicates that not enough is known yet as to when skills should be taught. This probably explains why establishing appropriate sequence of grade levels for skill development was not a commonly accepted priority or concern among the states. The curriculum designers also avoided commitment to grade level skill designations in order to allow such decisions to be made by the local school districts.

2. Identifying skill objectives was secondary to specification of knowledge or content objectives at designated grades.

3. States' guides did not have the same grade level designations. Some states used grade clusters, or groupings; while others used selected grade designations. Few cited objectives K through 12; thus,

comparison for typical skill requirements at particular grades was difficult.

4. Most states appeared to prefer to cite selected grades to illustrate learning and skill objectives; however, there was no consensus on which grade levels should be cited for model objectives.

5. Many states appeared more concerned with selecting grade level designations for goals relative to content oriented exit competencies rather than attempting to sequence skill development.

6. Grade clusters, or groupings, K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, and 9 - 12 were determined by the researcher to be appropriate categories to use for making generalizations based on data generated by content analysis. Relative to grade level designations, the most often cited skills in order of rank were: Map Skills, Data Gathering Skills, and Participation or Group Skills (including Civic Skills).

Research Question 4. - What generalizations and patterns of agreement are suggested in this base of information regarding social studies skills requirements, classifications, or organization?

Research Summary Statements

1. Basically, data analysis revealed no general agreement over skill requirements for the social studies.

2. Comparative analysis of data from 39 states' guides relative to statements of purpose and skill requirements revealed six different areas or categories of information relative to Question 4:

a. Resource or Model Guides/No Skill Requirements - Ten states had statements within their guides that indicated the material was to be used as a resource or model for local school districts in developing their own curriculum; however, they did not provide specific skill requirements.

b. Mandated Use-Guides/Assessment or Testing Indicated - Eight states stated or implied that their guides were, or soon would be, mandated for use throughout the state; content and skill objectives cited were tied to state-wide and/or locally based assessment or testing.

c. Resource or Model Guides/Performance Expectations - Six states indicated their guides were to be used as resource models for local districts; "performance expectations" were cited relative to content and skill objectives.

d. Unclear Purpose Guides/Social Studies Skills Mentioned - Seven states provided no clear purpose or intent regarding skill requirements, but these guides contained references to the social studies skills.

e. Framework Guides/Content-Oriented - Four states presented minimum content oriented guidelines or frameworks for local school districts encouraging local districts to supplement materials for local needs; skills were incidental in the guides.

f. Philosophical Goals - Three states provided brief documents of broad philosophical goals; skills were incidental to the overall goal messages.

3. The dominant skill requirements, revealed by the content analysis of the states' guides, were: Map Skills, Data Gathering, and Participation or Group Skills (including Civic Skills).

4. Analysis of the classification systems recommended in the various guides did not reveal an overall agreement of a skill classification or organizational system. Eighteen states stated classification systems for the skills; however only two were similar. There were 23 categories used by the various states; only five of which were cited with some frequency:

a. Interpersonal Skills - Thirteen states cited this category or something comparable.

b. Acquiring Information - Eight states cited this category.

c. Thinking Skills - Eight states cited this category.

d. Map and Globe/Geography Skills - Seven states used one or both of these designations.

e. Organizing and Using Information - Six states cited this category.

5. Since the type and rank order of dominant skills and categories or skill classifications preferred by the states were different, there was evidence of a general lack of coordination within states' guides.

6. Other categories cited by one to four states included: Decision Making Skills, Data (or Information) Processing, Study Skills,

Time/Chronology Skills, Interpreting Pictures/ Charts/Graphs/Cartoons, Communication Skills, Presenting Information Skills, Self-Management Skills, Study and Basic Skills, Report Skills, Values, Evaluating Information, Listening and Observing Skills, and Inquiry Skills.

7. Interpretation of the data relative to Question 4 as to skills requirements and classifications revealed that most of the states' guides were just that---guides.

Research Conclusions

1. Analysis of the data from the states' guides relative to skills requirements mirrored the same lack of agreement and state of confusion regarding the social studies skills found in the professional literature and documented in Chapters I and II.

2. Generally, states' guides lacked a united image: some were resource, or model guides, lacking skill requirements; some were mandated for use by local districts and tied to assessment; some were resource models but included student performance expectations; others lacked philosophical purpose but contained incidental references to social studies skills; some were framework or minimum curriculum guides but were largely content oriented; and a few were simply messages of philosophical goals.

3. Analysis of the classification systems recommended in some states' guides did not reveal an overall consensus among the various states.

4. Comparison of states' preferred classification categories with the dominant, or most often cited, skills found through the content analysis process revealed a general lack of coordination within states' materials.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of the findings and conclusions of the study recommendations are as follows:

Recommendations Based on Conclusions Relative to Question 1: Do the states define and/or identify specific social studies skills?

1. State Departments of Education have an inherent leadership role in curriculum design and establishment of learning standards. The majority of curriculum guides analyzed for this study indicated a general reluctance by states' education professionals to exercise that leadership role. Statewide standards for skills can help insure that every student within the state receives a quality education. The states need to examine students' needs and define and/or identify social studies skills to meet those needs. Curriculum designers should base standards on student developmental levels and research relative to skills instruction.

2. It is important to note that state educational leaders can best serve their constituency by including local district professionals, particularly classroom teachers, in the curriculum design process. Indeed, because of the diversity of local school districts, state leaders have an obligation to include all levels of classroom teachers in the decision-making process regarding statewide curriculum standards. This can help insure that local needs are addressed, that the realities of the classroom are recognized, and that state curriculum standards win local school districts' endorsement of statewide guidelines.

3. A good state guide should provide local districts with minimum, mandated standards and expectations as to social studies content and skill requirements. The "framework" guide, used by several states, sets minimum requirements while allowing for local supplementation to meet local needs. Minimum curriculum and skill standards and requirements set by the state insure that students who move from one school district to another will enjoy a consistency of standards that continues their educational progress.

4. Based on a comparison of the information gathered on each state's Data Summary Sheets, (see form Appendix C 3), it appeared that skill requirements should include Map Skills, Data Gathering Skills, and Participation (including Civic Skills), or Group Skills. In comparing these data collection sheets summarizing the tally marks for each state's guide, the most frequent placement for these skills were: Map Skills between grades 4 - 6; Data Gathering Skills K - 9; and Participation or Group Skills at K - 3.

Recommendations Based on Conclusions Relative to Question 2:
Do the states organize skills by grade level designations?

1. A good state guide should provide a way of organizing the skills via a classification system. The classifications system utilized by NCSS in its "Essentials," upon which Attachment C 1 was based, represents a viable standard for state curriculum guides. This system includes the categories most preferred by the states which classified the skills.

2. This study revealed that there is no common agreement as to a skills classification system. At state and national conferences attended by professionals in social studies and representatives from such groups as NCSS, skills classification should be a subject for study and consensus for the achievement of a nationwide recommended standard.

3. Based on comparison of content analysis data, a good state guide should have internal consistency; that is the skills designated in the state's classification system should also appear within the learning objectives stated within the body of the curriculum guide.

Recommendations Based on Conclusions Relative to Question 3:
Do the states organize skills by grade level designations?

1. Ideally, a state guide would provide the user with both content and skill objectives at appropriate grade levels. When objectives for grades K - 12 cannot be provided, a guide should at least cite learning

objectives within grade clusters or groupings, i.e. grades K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, and 9 - 12.

2. If a state prefers to deal with fewer grades levels, it is recommended that minimum objectives be created for grades at the end of the clusters cited above, i.e. grades 3, 6, 8, and 12---with social studies skill learning expectations or learning outcomes set at those grades.

3. The system of providing the user with objectives for grades K - 12 seems to be the preferred system as it provides a vehicle for addressing, where appropriate, a sequencing of the skills. The K - 12 system also facilitates interdisciplinary instruction and cross-curricular comparison of content and skill objectives.

Recommendations Based on Conclusions Relative to Question 4:
What generalizations and patterns of agreement are suggested in this
base of information regarding social studies skills requirements,
classifications, or organization?

1. States need to address the problem of skill definition, classification or organization, and set skill requirements to eliminate the state of confusion surrounding the subject of skills.

- a. Many states' guides need revision to differentiate between content and skills objectives. Analysis showed that the majority of the states recognize that skills are separate from content; few took the view that all competencies are skills.

- b. Many states need to re-examine their skills classification and compare their systems to the NCSS "Essentials."
- c. Many states should work with their local districts and establish a uniform scope and sequence for content standards. Content then should be examined to determine what skills are needed by the student to learn the content as stated. Content requirements determine what skill should be taught and when it should be taught.
- d. Skill essentials, both minimum and maximum, should be identified in state guides. NCSS research on the "Essentials" and on the whole range of social studies skills would provide states with sufficient guidelines for curriculum examination and reform to meet the needs of the various states.

2. While social studies content remains the focus around which curriculum development occurs, the skills should be recognized by the states as a vital partner to that aspect of learning.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The content of most states' curriculum materials lacked internal consistency and coordination; for example, skills may be classified in the introduction in one fashion, and within the body of

the guide in another way. Often such guides lacked clear statements of philosophy or purpose.

2. Overall, states' materials were distinctively individualistic and were frustrating to compare as a group.

3. States' guides were content oriented. Even the curriculum guides of states that handled all competencies as skills, contained mainly content or knowledge objectives.

4. Most of the curriculum guides reflected the states' decisions to defer curriculum decisions to local school districts. While local needs and desires must be considered, some state level commitment to uniform minimum standards regarding learning skills is desirable.

5. Generally, skill objectives were broad, ambiguous statements leaving the user in doubt as to the real intent of the objectives.

6. Many states' guides lacked the most elementary aids or features helpful to the user such as: a title page, publication date, numbered pages, foreword and/or preface page, table of contents, glossary, index, bibliography and suggested resources. Some did not even have a title or an states' name as an identification.

7. Generally, the clearest and best organized curriculum guides tended to be those that included methods of evaluating student progress.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the statements that were part of the general conclusions section of this chapter, the following general recommendations regarding states' curriculum materials on content and the skills are proposed:

1. Most of the states' curriculum guides incorporated social studies skills as part of the general guide rather than separating the skills objectives into a special section or in another curriculum pamphlet. Based on research information on the relationship between skills and content, this is the recommended procedure since subject matter content dictates what skills are needed for instruction (Herber, 1978; Robinson, 1975).

2. The ideal state curriculum guide should have internal focus and consistency; that is, there should be a clear, introductory statement of purpose coordinated with the body of the guide and any other separate pamphlets published by the state. A statement of purpose regarding social studies skills, for example, should coordinate with the state's classification system of the skills, and the learning objectives for the skills.

3. All curriculum guides should reflect some commonalities, some standards of learning that are generally accepted by professional groups as the essentials while retaining individual state and local characteristics. State curriculum leaders should analyze those commonalities as suggested herein, and search for others through their professional associations, literature, and research and incorporate them

into states' curriculum materials. Specifically, for example, it would be helpful to the average user of a state's curriculum guide if the term "skill" was defined as well as other terms relative to specific social studies skills in an introductory section or a glossary. Also, the NCSS essentials relative to the skills should be included in every state's guide as part of the minimum expectations so that the average user would have some direction as to curriculum and instruction. Then, the guide should include NCSS skill objectives at each grade level appropriate to the content objectives cited therein.

4. All competencies learned are not skills. They classify as other things as well; for example, simple memory objectives and affective goals. Revision efforts of state curriculum leaders should focus on differentiating learning objectives for the benefit of those who use the curriculum guides.

5. Recognition of local needs should not deter state departments of education from assuming their leadership role in adopting standards of learning. Minimum content and skill objectives should be established by state departments of education in consultation and cooperation with local school districts.

6. Ways to write objectives for curriculum guides should be sought that promote clarity of purpose. For example, a broad, all-encompassing skill objective can be followed by a descriptive statement that provides a specific, clear example of the learning objective's purpose or intent.

7. The ideal state curriculum guide should include features such as a title page, publication date, numbered pages, table of contents, glossary, index, bibliography, and recommended resources.

8. Some means of monitoring for student progress should be established by state departments of education in consultation and cooperation with local school districts. This should be designed to help the educator set goals to benefit the student. This study revealed that the better organized states' materials often cited standards, expectations, as well as some means of evaluation.

9. There is a need to coordinate skills instruction between subjects such as English and the social studies. The importance of cross-curricular planning becomes clear, for example, if a student is required to write a research paper for social studies at the seventh grade level and the writing skills needed are not taught in the student's English class until grade nine.

10. There is a need to address what is meant by "thinking skills" relative to the social studies. Current professional literature abounds with materials on the thinking skills (see Chapter III); yet, confusion and ambiguity exists as to definition, goals, and appropriate instructional procedures (Beyer, 1984, April; Cornbleth, 1985). Beyer (1984, April) differentiated between the steps involved in problem solving, and decision making. These terms were used interchangeably within states' curriculum guides. Adoption by the states of Beyer's definitions would clarify these processes and benefit classroom teachers and students. Also, Beyer cited skills that were inherent in critical

thinking while calling for further study to clarify the thinking skills in general. It is important to clarify the thinking skills since professionals accept them as the domain of the social studies. Critical thinking or evaluative skills relative to materials containing biased exposition or propaganda, specifically the biases inherent in mass media, are examples of this domain (Ellis, 1937). Students taking American Government, for instance, should be taught the skills relative to determining political biases expressed in campaign rhetoric.

11. Professional collaboration between social studies leaders and officials of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) of the National Institute of Education (NIE) would be invaluable in establishing a standard glossary of social studies terminology. ERIC is credited with more than 20 years of monitoring educational literature and attempting to determine a controlled vocabulary so that materials can be uniformly categorized, indexed, and entered into computer data bases for professional dissemination ("Thesaurus," 1982). "ERIC remains committed to maintaining a Thesaurus that represents the definitive vocabulary for education" ("Thesaurus," 1982, Introduction). The ERIC system, for example, has an accepted definition for such social studies terms as: Social Studies, Skills, Locational (Map) Skills, Evaluative Thinking (Critical Thinking), Library Skills, Research Methodology, and Primary Sources.

12. At future professional conferences, instigated by such groups as NCSS, states' social studies leaders need to meet, confer, and decide on what social studies skills are the essentials, establish definitions and

other guidelines, and establish minimum standards for the various states as well as local districts to use for curriculum development, review, and reform. While state and local individuality is desirable and often necessary, much can be gained by the setting of national recommended standards via professional organizations and state curriculum leaders.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES

To address the concerns raised in this study and eliminate the general confusion regarding the social studies skills, future studies are needed. The following areas of study are recommended:

1. Comprehensive studies into the history, research, and literature on the social studies skills.

2. A comprehensive study of the "essentials" of the social studies skills. Professionals need to find a basis for agreement as to what are the minimum standards. If results from use of this study's instrument, based on NCSS "Essentials," is any indication (see Appendix F), one must question whether the essentials are being taught.

3. A comprehensive survey concerning the views of the states' social studies leaders, administrators, teachers, and parents regarding the social studies skills and/or their opinions relative to the results of this study.

4. A study, similar to this one, of standardized tests to determine whether a de facto standard for the skills exists within those

tests. Professionals need to know what social studies skills are being tested, for example, by the Science Research Associates (SRA) at grades 4, 6, 8, and 11.

5. Comparative studies are needed focusing on the relationship between subject areas in skills such as between English/social studies, science/social studies, and math/social studies to determine whether skills research in other content areas may relate to social studies skills. It would be interesting to discover, for example, whether research in math skills has addressed the problem of when, or at what age level, skills can be best learned by students. Then, a comparative study might explore whether social studies skills are best learned at particular grade levels.

6. Recently, the National Geographic Society reported on the general lack of geography knowledge among high school students nationwide. Since Map and Globe Skills were cited predominantly throughout the states' curriculum materials and the content analysis revealed learning objectives in Map Skills were coded more than twice as much as any other skill area, studies should be conducted on why this seeming discrepancy exists. State leadership personnel, local districts, and classroom teachers also should be polled as to whether the Map and Globe Skills should be given priority over other skill areas as this research has suggested.

7. This study has focused on what is recommended in the states' curricula and has exposed the confusion and disarray therein. Clearly, a priority of the Social Studies is to find consensus on what Social

Studies professionals accept as appropriate definitions of the social studies skills. Then, research can go forward to examination of the "how" and the "when" of skills instruction; in other words, an examination of how skills can best be taught and at what age and/or grade levels they are best learned. Research is needed based on understanding how students best learn the skills and at what age levels they learn most productively.

* * * * *

The research findings herein provide substantial amounts of data on the social studies skills in response to the initial research questions. In addition, the study generated a history of the social studies skills, some unexpected generalizations on the nature of "ideal" curriculum guides, an exploration and practical application of the Glaser and Strauss grounded theory approach to qualitative research, and an analysis and synthesis of content analysis ideas into an original Comparative Content Analysis System useful to other researchers.

First of all, the purpose of this study was to answer an overall question: What is being recommended or required by states regarding social studies skills in actual curricula? Specifically, the researcher wanted to know whether states' curriculum guides defined, classified, or organized the skills by grade levels. Also, the researcher looked for patterns of agreement based on a content analysis and comparison of the states' curriculum materials. Basically, the findings of this study did not reveal the initially expected research information regarding de facto agreements among the states relative to the social studies skills.

The content analysis of the states' materials showed more differences than similarities: that skills were identified but few definitions were alike; that skills were classified but few classification systems used the same terms; that skills were cited at grade levels but the skills and grades were different in most guides. Generally, curriculum guides were perceived as content oriented, externally and often internally inconsistent. The confusion and chaos documented in the literature search extended into the states' materials and provoked the researcher's opinions regarding desirable characteristics of "ideal" curriculum guides. However, the idea initially was to discover the state of the art relative to curriculum materials and that was accomplished.

Secondly, because of a general lack of literature relative to the initial research questions, the researcher was led to a literature search that was of necessity historical in nature. The researcher wished to establish the background for definition, classification, and organization of the skills. Thanks largely to the NCSS library in Washington, D. C., Chapter II evolved into a historical narration spanning approximately 100 years. Finally, the researcher recognizes and appreciates that it was the study's open-ended aspects that allowed for emergence of unexpected and valuable ideas of interest to social studies professionals, designers of curriculum guides, and other researchers. The Comparative Content Analysis System, devised by the researcher to address this study's requirements, stemmed from ideas gained from the analysis of theories relative to methods of qualitative study and content analysis (see Chapter III).

References

- Alexander, W. M. (1986). ASCD and Curriculum Development: The Early Years. In W. Van Til ASCD in Retrospect (pp. 33-51). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Anderson, H. R. (Ed.). (1942). Teaching Critical Thinking in the Social Studies (13th Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Beyer, B. K. (1979). Teaching in Social Studies (2nd ed.). Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill.
- Beyer, B. K. (1983, November). Common Sense about Teaching Thinking Skills. Educational Leadership, 44-49.
- Beyer, B. K. (1984, March). Improving Thinking Skills. Phi Delta Kappan, 486-490.
- Beyer, B. K. (1984, April). Improving Thinking Skills - Practical Approaches. Phi Delta Kappan, 556-560.
- Bloom, B. S., ed. (1956). Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. NY: David McKay.
- Boyington, G. (1932). Experiments with Diagnostic Tests to Determine Knowledge of Study Tools and Techniques in the Social Studies. Classrooms and Administrative Problems in the Teaching of the Social Studies (2nd Yearbook), 132-152.
- Carpenter, H. M. (1953). Skills in the Social Studies (24th Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Carpenter, H. M. (1963). Skill Development in Social Studies (33rd Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Chapin, J. R. & Gross, R. E. (1973). Teaching Social Studies Skills (2nd ed.). Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Commonwealth of Virginia. (1983, January). Standards of Learning Objectives for Virginia Public Schools: Social Studies. Richmond, VA: Department of Education.
- Cornbleth, C. (1985). Critical Thinking and Cognitive Process. In W. B. Stanley Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976-1983 (pp. 11-63). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

- Costa, A. L. (Ed.). (1985). Developing Minds. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Council of State Social Studies Specialists Directory. (1985-86). Washington DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Cousins, J. (1976). Status and Effectiveness of Social Studies Skills Programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 137 208).
- de Bono, E. (1984, September). Critical Thinking is not Enough. Educational Leadership, 42, 16-17.
- de Bono, E. (1985). The CoRT Thinking Program. In A. L. Costa (Ed.) Developing Minds (pp. 203-209). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dunn, A. W. (Ed.) (1916). The Social Studies In Secondary Education (NEA Bulletin, No. 28). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Dewey, J. (1933). How We Think. Boston: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Ellis, E. (1937). Education Against Propaganda (7th Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Elston, E. (1923, November). Improving the Teaching of History in the High School Through the Use of Tests. The Historical Outlook, 14, 300-304.
- Ennis, E. M. (1962, Winter). A Concept of Critical Thinking. Harvard Educational Review, 32, 82-83.
- Ennis, R. H. (1985). Goals for a Critical Thinking Curriculum. In A. L. Costa (Ed.) Developing Minds (pp. 54-57). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Essential Skills for the Social Studies. (1984, June). Social Education. 260-261.
- Essentials of the Social Studies. (1980). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Fair, J. and Shaftel, F. R. (1967). Effective Thinking in the Social Studies (37th Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Feely, T., Jr. (1976). Critical Thinking: Toward a Definition, Paradigm, and Research Agenda. Theory and Research in Social Education. 4: 1-19.
- Fraenkel, J. R. (1973). Helping Students Think and Learn. NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Fraser, D. M. (Ed.).(1969). Social Studies Curriculum Development (39th Yearbook). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Glaser, B. C. and Strauss, A. L. (1967). The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. NY: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goldman, L. (1984, September). Warning: The Socratic Method Can Be Dangerous. Educational Leadership, 42, 57-62.
- Government Accounting Office. (1982, June). Content Analysis: A Methodology for Structuring and Analyzing Written Material. Methodology Transfer Paper 3. Institute for Program Evaluation. pp. 1-21.
- Good, C. V. (1973). Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gross, R. (1977). The Status of the Social Studies in the Public Schools of the United States: Facts and Impressions of a National Survey. Social Education, 41, 194.
- Guenther, J. (1973). The Importance of Specific Skills to High School Social Studies Teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 077 833).
- Hardy, R. E. (1923, November). New Types of Tests in Social Sciences. The Historical Outlook, 14, 326-328.
- Herber, H. L. (1970). Teaching Reading in Content Areas. NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Herber, H. L. (1978). Teaching Reading in Content Areas. NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (undated). Social Studies Reform: The Lessons of History. In I. Morrissett (Ed.) Social Studies in the 1980's (pp. 2-14). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). Social Studies Reform 1880-1980. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Hillman, R. U. (1935). The Source Method in the Teaching of History. In The Historical Approach to Methods of Teaching the Social Studies (5th Yearbook) (pp. 65-71). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

- Hunkins, F. P., Ehman, L. H., Hahn, C. L., Martorella, P. H., Tucker, J. L. (1977). Review of Research in Social Studies Education 1970-1975 (Bulletin No. 15). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Jarolimek, J. (1963). The Psychology of Skill Development. In H. M. Carpenter (Ed.) Skill Development in the Social Studies. (pp. 17-33). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Jarolimek, J. (1977). The Status of Social Studies Education: Six Case Studies. Social Education, 41, 574-579.
- Jarolimek, J. (1981). The Social Studies: An Overview. In H. D. Mehlinger and O. L. Davis, Jr. (Eds.) The Social Studies (pp. 3-18). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jarolimek, J., Austin, S., Carlson, F. D., Henderson, C. K., Johnston, A., Kaltsounis, T., Leonard, K. E., Pearson, E. O., Rogers, J., Strickland, L. (1984, April). In Search of a Scope and Sequence for the Social Studies. Social Education, 48, 249-262.
- Johns, E. and Fraser, D. M. (1963). Social Studies Skills: A Guide to Analysis and Grade Placement. In H. M. Carpenter (Ed.) Skill Development in the Social Studies. (pp. 310-327). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Keohane, R. E. (1949, May). The Great Debate over the Source Method. Social Education, 212-218.
- Kliebard, H. M. (1985). Three Currents of American Curriculum Thought. Current Thoughts on Curriculum. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Krey, A. C. (1928, April). What Does the New Type Examination Measure in History? The Historical Outlook, 19, 159-161.
- Krippendorff, K. (1980). Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lipman, M. (1984, September). The Cultivation of Reason Through Philosophy. Educational Leadership, 42, 51-56.
- McPeck, J. E. (1981). Critical Thinking and Education. NY: St. Martin's.
- Michener, J. A. (1939). (Ed.). The Future of the Social Studies: Proposals for an Experimental Social Studies Curriculum. Cambridge, MA: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Molnar, A. (1985). Schools and Their Curriculum: A Continuing Controversy. In A. Molnar (Ed.) Current Thought on Curriculum (pp. 1-29). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

- Monroe, W. S. (1923, November). Written Examinations and Their Improvement. The Historical Outlook, 14, 306-318.
- Morrissett, I., (Ed.). (undated). Social Studies in the 1980's. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision of Curriculum Development.
- Morse, H. T. & McCune, G. H. (1940). Selected Items for the Testing of Study Skills (Bulletin No. 15). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Morse, H. T. & McCune, G. H. (1957). Study Skills and Critical Thinking (Bulletin No. 15). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Morse, H. T. & McCune, G. H. (1971). Selected Items for the Testing of Study Skills and Critical Thinking (Bulletin No. 15). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Naisbitt, J. (1982). Megatrends. NY: Warner.
- National Education Association (NEA). (1893). Report of the Committee on the Secondary Social Studies. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- National Education Association (NEA). (1916). The Social Studies in Secondary Education. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative Evaluation Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Robinson, H. A. (1975). Teaching Reading and Study Strategies: The Content Areas. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Rubin, L. J. (1969). The Object of Schooling: An Evolutionary View. Life Skills in School and Society. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Rugg, E. (1923, November). Evaluating the Aims and Outcomes of History. The Historical Outlook, 14, 324-326.
- Sanders, N. M. (1966). Classroom Questions: What Kinds? NY: Harper & Row.
- Saylor, J. G. (1986). ASCD and Its Beginnings. In W. Van Til (Ed.) ASCD in Retrospect (pp. 5-14). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

- Shulman, L. S. (1984). A Psychological Perspective. In Acquisition of Reasoning Skills. Symposium conducted at the 1984 annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Shryock, R. H. (1923, November). New Tests for Old. The Historical Outlook, 14, 319-322.
- Stanley, W. B. (Ed.). (1985). Review of Research in Social Studies Education: 1976-1983. Boulder, CO: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education.
- Starr, I. (1963). The Nature of Critical Thinking and Its Application in the Social Studies. In H. M. Carpenter (Ed.) Skill Development in Social Studies (pp. 35-52). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Taba, H. (1967). Implementing Thinking as an Objective in Social Studies. In J. Fair & F. R. Shaftel (Eds.) Effective Thinking in the Social Studies. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors. (1982). Phoenix, Arizona: ORYX Press.
- Wesley, E. B. (1950). Teaching Social Studies in High Schools (3rd Ed.). Boston: D. C. Heath & Company.
- Wiggins, D. (1978). Deliberation and Practical Reason. In Practical Reasoning. Edited by J. Raz. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wrightstone, J. W. (1941). Measuring and Evaluating in a Specific Social Studies Situation. In W. E. Young (Ed.) The Social Studies in the Elementary School (pp. 230-243). Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A 1

June 12, 1986

John J. Doe
Social Studies Specialist
Every State Department of Education
Capital City, Every State

Dear John J.,

This is a request for a copy of your state curriculum guide, listing of skill priorities, and related documents that show state priorities concerning knowledge objectives and social studies skills.

Since state departments of education are powerful forces in providing direction for the social studies, it seems important to know what the various states are requiring or recommending for social studies curriculum. I propose to undertake an analysis of the fifty state "guides" and/or related documents, looking at the variety of skill designations that exist in actual curricula for the social studies. This analysis is the foundation for my dissertation and is thus an important part of my doctoral requirements as directed by Dr. Dan Fleming of Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University.

Such analysis will yield a base of knowledge, an inventory, and patterns of usage that imply areas of de facto agreement as to what can be considered "social studies skills," what terminology is most accepted, and what are the considered priorities for instruction. This will result in a valuable synthesis of information useful for all in the field of social studies. Naturally, this data will be shared with you.

If you have any advice, comments, suggestions regarding this endeavor, I would appreciate hearing from you. In any case, thank you for contributing your state's material for this doctoral research. Please respond as indicated on the inclosed postcard and return same.

Sincerely,

Glenda C. Petrini
10516 Samaga Drive
Oakton, VA 22124
(703) 938-1421

APPENDIX A 2

August 13, 1986

John J. Doe
Social Studies Specialist
Every State Department of Education
Capital City, Every State 12345

Dear John J.,

As I have not yet heard from you, this is a reminder of the initial request dated June 12, 1986, for a copy of your state's curriculum guide for the social studies or listing of priorities or recommendations regarding the social studies skills.

You will agree, I am sure, that it is important to include the state of _____ in an analysis of social studies skill terminology actually in use by state departments of education. The purpose of the study is to determine what variety of social studies terminology regarding skills is being used by the states. From this analysis, we hope to determine areas of agreement, patterns of commonality, or de facto standards regarding the skills. Analysis of the states guides has begun for the doctoral study underway via Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University as directed by Dr. Dan Fleming, Associate Professor for the Social Studies. Upon completion of the study, the data generated will be shared with you.

I am enclosing an addressed, stamped postcard for your convenience in a prompt reply. Please indicate on the card whether your state has such information and if it is shortly forthcoming.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Glenda C. Petrini
10516 Samaga Drive
Oakton, VA 22124

(703) 938-1421

APPENDIX B

Source: Essentials of the Social Studies. (1980). National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D. C.

I. Thinking Skills

A. Data Gathering Skills

1. Acquire information by observation
2. Locate information from a variety of sources
3. Compile, organize, and evaluate information
4. Extract and interpret information
5. Communicate orally and in writing

B. Intellectual Skills.

1. Compare things, ideas, events, and situations on the basis of similarities and differences
2. Classify or group items in categories
3. Ask appropriate and searching questions
4. Draw conclusions or inferences from evidence
5. Arrive at general ideas
6. Make sensible predictions from generalizations

C. Decision Making Skills.

1. Consider alternative solutions
2. Consider the consequences of each solution
3. Make decisions and justify them in relationship to democratic principles
4. Act, based on those decisions

D. Interpersonal Skills:

1. See things from the point of view of others
2. Understand one's own beliefs, feelings, abilities, and shortcomings and how they affect relations with others
3. Use group generalizations without stereotyping and arbitrarily classifying individuals
4. Recognize value in individuals different from one's self and groups different from one's own
5. Work effectively with others as a group member
6. Give and receive constructive criticism
7. Accept responsibility and respect the rights and property of others

II. Participation Skills

- A. Work effectively in groups---organizing, planning, making decisions, taking action
- B. Form coalitions of interest with other groups
- C. Persuade, compromise, bargain
- D. Practice patience and perseverance in working for one's goal
- E. Develop experience in cross-cultural situations

APPENDIX C 1

SKILLS CODING INSTRUMENT¹

I. Thinking Skills

A. Data Gathering Skills

1. Acquire information by observation
2. Locate information from a variety of sources
 - a. Library Skills
 - b. Research Tools ie Primary Sources
3. Compile, organize, and evaluate information
4. Extract and interpret information
 - a. Map (and Globe) Skills
 - (1) Locational Skills
 - (2) Map Reading Skills
 - (3) Cartography Skills
 - b. Non-Print Media, ie political cartoons, charts, graphs
 - c. (Time Order Skills)
5. Communicate orally and in writing

B. Intellectual Skills.

1. Compare things, ideas, events, and situations on the basis of similarities and differences
2. Classify or group items in categories
3. Ask appropriate and searching questions
4. Draw conclusions or inferences from evidence
5. Arrive at general ideas
6. Make sensible predictions from generalizations
7. Research Skills (Research or Scientific Methodology)

C. Decision Making Skills.

1. Consider alternative solutions
2. Consider the consequences of each solution
3. Make decisions and justify them in relationship to democratic principles
4. Act, based on those decisions
5. Critical or Evaluative Thinking
6. Problem Solving

¹Most of the items and terms in the outline are from the NCSS "Essentials" (1980); however, the underlined terms are from ERIC ("Thesaurus," 1982). Some, designated by the asterisk symbol (*), are both NCSS and ERIC designations.

Appendix C 1, Skills Coding Instrument - page 2

II. Participation Skills - * Interpersonal and Civic Skills

- A. See things from the point of view of others
 - 1. Understand one's own beliefs, feelings, abilities, and shortcomings and how they affect relations with others
 - 2. Use group generalizations without stereotyping and arbitrarily classifying individuals
 - 3. Recognize value in individuals different from one's self and groups different from one's own
- B. Work effectively with others as a group member
 - 1. Give and receive constructive criticism
 - 2. Accept responsibility and respect the rights and property of others
 - 3. Form coalitions of interest with other groups
 - 4. Persuade, compromise, bargain
 - 5. Practice patience and perseverance in working for one's goal
 - 6. Develop experience in cross-cultural situations

APPENDIX D 1

Social Studies
Standards of Learning Objectives**SEVENTH GRADE**
(United States and Contemporary Virginia)

Program Description:

Expanding on the content of grades four and five, this grade level focuses on life in Virginia and the United States from 1850 to the present. Civil War and Post-Civil War history is combined with geographic, economic, and government content. Students continue to examine values and build skills in the areas of symbol interpretation, reasoning, communication, and other skills. Virginia-related objectives dealt with in the fourth grade program should be reviewed briefly, but need not be repeated at this grade level. The general overview of American history should examine major trends and events in the historical setting in which they occurred. The study of contemporary problems and issues should be initiated with current events and information from different forms of mass media. The use of case studies for examining personalities, events, and institutions is recommended.

Objectives:

- 7.1 **The student will identify information about persons and events of the United States and Virginia history from pre-Civil War to the present.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis is placed on developing a sense of chronology and contributions of individuals. Major trends and events such as American Wars (Civil, World War I, and II), expansion (Westward and immigration of various ethnic and cultural groups) and economic trends (the Great Depression and the New Deal) should be examined.
- 7.2 **The student will recognize values and ideals in historical documents of Virginia and the United States and show how they influence contemporary life.**
Descriptive Statement: Documents such as the Declaration of Rights, Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, Declaration of Independence, Constitution of the United States, and the United States Bill of Rights will be examined and their ideas applied to contemporary life in Virginia and the United States.
- 7.3 **The student will demonstrate the ability to use reference sources.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will continue to be placed on using standard reference sources--atlas, encyclopedia, and almanac. The readers guide should be introduced. Attention will be given to processing and evaluating information for proper use.
- 7.4 **The student will interpret graphic information.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis is placed on acquiring skills in utilizing charts, diagrams, cartoons, graphs, timelines, and globes. Special focus should be placed on interpreting maps by identifying direction and location, measuring and estimating distances, and interpreting map symbols.

- 7.5 **The student will identify the three levels of government and the jurisdiction of each.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will be placed on national, state, and local government and the powers of each from the Civil War to present day.
- 7.6 **The students will analyze how rights and responsibilities of American citizenship have been applied from 1860 to the present.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will be placed on examining the growth of individual freedom including: freedom for slaves, segregation, civil rights and women's movements, integration, and immigration of various cultural groups into the United States and Virginia.
- 7.7 **The student will analyze mass media.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will be placed on current events with stress placed on interpreting facts, distinguishing relationships, cause and effect, differentiating between fact and opinion, and evaluating for accuracy. Sources should include television, radio, newspapers, magazines, and eyewitness accounts.
- 7.8 **The student will demonstrate an understanding of the increasing interdependence of Virginia and the United States and the world.**
Descriptive Statement: An awareness of the role of technology, natural resources, social, political, and economic factors relative to an increasingly interdependent world will be developed.
- 7.9 **The student will participate effectively in group activities.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will be on courteous behavior, respect for other opinions, polite listening, and participating in discussions.
- 7.10 **The student will research and chart stages of development that led to sectionalism.**
Descriptive Statement: Emphasis will be on territorial changes, westward expansion, economic growth, social and technological changes, slavery in the South, and industry in the North.

APPENDIX D 2

EXAMPLE OF ANALYSIS

Content Analysis of Seventh Grade Objectives
(United States and Contemporary Virginia)Virginia Standards of Learning for the Social Studies

Objective - 7.1

Step 1, or inspection of an item: The main statement for 7.1 is a knowledge or content objective rather than a skill objective. However, there is reference to "...a sense of chronology..." within the accompanying descriptive statement. Note is taken of the fact that sources identifying the social studies skills often list time order skills as part of the social studies domain ("Essential Skills," 1984, April; Herber, 1970; Chapin & Gross, 1973; Carpenter, 1963). However, the initial coding instrument (see Appendix C 1) did not include this category Heading. Here is an example of a situation calling for the addition of a new category to the instrument. This exemplifies, also, one of the "problems" relative to step 4 of the Basic Analysis Process, explained in Chapter III, that is of having to determine whether a new classification is needed. The new category of "Time Order" was added as I. A. 4. c. on the coding instrument (see Appendix C 1), and these numbers and letters should be written or coded (step 2 of Basic Analysis Process) on the Seventh Grade curriculum sheet (see Appendix D 1). Indeed, one of the hoped for results, step 5 of the Basic Analysis Process, is that this study can be used as a future standard for classification of the social studies skills. It must be noted, however, that once the instrument is reviewed by the dissertation committee, the basic coding instrument, or Appendix C 1, must

remain basically unchanged. No changes are supposed to be made to the coding instrument after the dissertation committee has approved its use. This would destroy the initial research agreement between researcher and members of the dissertation committee. The data collection sheets, however, are open-ended enough to allow for margin-type notes for the "unexpected." Any findings relative to the coding instrument beyond what is already indicated will be covered in chapter five as part of the overall analysis of the research results.

Objective 7.2 - a content objective.

Objective 7.3

Inspection of this item reveals a reference to "...ability to use reference sources." Clearly, this objective statement belongs under the umbrella of I. A. 2., or "Locate information from a variety of sources" and should be coded as such on the seventh grade curriculum sheet. Then, in the descriptive statement there is reference to "processing and evaluating information for proper use." This statement can be coded as I. A. 3 related to "compile, organize, and evaluate information."

Objective 7.4

This item includes a main statement calling for the student to be able to "...interpret graphic information." Here is an example of step 3, Basic Analysis Process, or "limitations" relative to the coding process. This statement is a very broad, unclear, and vague objective which can mean anything and everything. The coding process should not be applied to such items, and this qualification or exception becomes one of the limitations on the coding process.

The descriptive statement of this objective is more helpful than the main statement. It refers to "...charts, diagrams, cartoons, graphs..." which should be coded under Non-print Media or I. A. 4. b. Then, the term "...time lines..." should be coded I. A. 4. C. and classified under Time Order. Further, there is reference to "...globes..." which is another example of a category not listed on the tentative coding instrument and which is often referred to in sources which identify the social studies skills ("Essential Skills," 1984, April; Herber, 1970; Chapin, 1973; Carpenter, 1963). As in the example before, this category was added to the instrument. Item I. A. 4. a. was changed to read "Map and globe skills, and the seventh grade sheet was coded with those numbers and letters. The reference to "...interpreting maps by identifying direction and location, measuring and estimating distances, and interpreting map symbols" clearly belongs under the same umbrella of Map and globe skills or I. A. 4. a.

Objective 7.5, 7.6 - content objectives

Objective 7.7

This objective statement referring to a student learning to "...analyze mass media" is far too ambiguous to be coded. Mass media includes so many targets of comprehension and analysis can mean anything from interpreting for basic study or reading to a scientific process comparing various sources.

The descriptive statement, however, can be coded under Data Gathering and interpreting or I. A. 4. as it includes "...interpreting facts, distinguishing relationships;" while the reference to "cause and effect" can be coded as I. B. 4. or "drawing conclusions or inferences from evidence." Then the reference to "...differentiating between fact and opinion..." fits under Intellectual Skills and comparing for differences or I. B. 1. Finally, the reference to

"...evaluating for accuracy" belongs under the category of Data Gathering and Evaluating or I. A. 3.

This last reference, or "...evaluating for accuracy" provides another example of problems, step 4 Basic Analysis Process, since the skill of "evaluating" fits as a Data Gathering Skill as well as an Intellectual Skill. In order to gather information one must be able to evaluate sources to determine if they fit criteria relative to whether sources are selected for use in research or rejected. However, the skill of evaluation, as defined in various sources (Herber, 1970; Bloom, 1956; Sanders, 1956), is a "higher level" thinking classification thus qualifying as an Intellectual Skill as well as a Data Gathering Skill. This exemplifies one of the difficulties with the creation of an instrument of analysis. Most of the instrument's categories are from the "essentials" as determined by NCSS; yet some of the terms overlap within the NCSS statement ("Essentials," 1980). In addition, other subject areas claim dominion or ownership over some of these skills as well (Herber, 1970). One of the limitations, step 3 Basic Analysis Process, must include the rejection for content analysis of general, all-encompassing lists of skills, and other subject area skill designations. While no instrument can be perfect for qualitative content analysis, identification and recognition of its problems, step 4 Basic Analysis Process, enhances the validity of the analysis procedure.

Objective 7.8 - content objective

Objective 7.9

This item's main statement refers to having a student participate effectively in group activities. This is a clear example for coding under the category of Participation Skills and working with others, or II B.

The descriptive statement, however, referring to "listening" and "participating in discussions" does not fit under any of the sub-headings in that category on the coding instrument. A marginal note should be made on the seventh grade sheet questioning whether other states' guides use this terminology rather than the NCSS sub-headings. If the researcher finds upon further analysis that this is the case, the NCSS sub-headings will be discussed in that regard in chapter 5, with the researcher's suggestion that terms such as "listening" and "discussing" be added to the NCSS essentials. This problem, handled via a margin note, is another example of situations relative to step 4, or coping with problems, in the analysis process.

Objective 7.10

This item refers to having a student "...research and chart..." and relates to learning about stages of development that led to sectionalism prior to the Civil War. Here is another broad, vague, and ambiguous statement. The term "research" can mean use of the scientific method, library skills, study or reading skills. The reference to "chart" may mean the student is to create some kind of chart, a timeline, or a graph. Perhaps the student is merely to be able to discuss the causes of sectionalism in an organized fashion. In any case, this objective should be judged too general and not coded.

Inspection of coded material indicates that most items are data gathering, i.e. locate information from a variety of sources such as books, maps, globes, non print media. Some attention is given to intellectual skills, i.e. developing a sense of chronology and use of time lines. Students are to differentiate between fact and opinion, and to participate in group activities as well. Overall, of the 10 objectives cited at the seventh grade level, five of these contained one or more references to skills that were coded. One may

well conclude that Virginia's guide for instruction on U. S. History and Contemporary Virginia at the seventh grade level indicates a clear recognition of the social studies skills as an important part of curriculum objectives.

APPENDIX E

A State By State Summary Of Findings
General Information And Data Collected On Each Curriculum Guide

Note: In order to shorten Appendix E, the topics are complete as stated only for Alaska. Appropriate abbreviations of phrases and/or numbers and letters are used for the rest of the states. See Appendix H for detailed bibliography of states' curriculum materials.

Alaska

Statement of General Purpose: Alaska provided two pamphlets that were analyzed; one was for elementary and one was for secondary grade levels. The elementary guide's statement of purpose included this comment: "This first edition curriculum guide is one of a series intended to serve as a model to aid school districts as they develop and review their own curriculum documents" ("Elementary," 1986, June, p. i).

Format of Objectives: The format was the same for both the elementary and secondary curriculum guides. A three column format presented curriculum objectives: (1) Topics/Concepts, (2) Learning Outcomes/Objectives, (3) Sample Learning Activities. At the end of each organizational grouping of grade levels there was a listing of skills.

Content Analysis Notes: In general, objectives for grades 1 - 3 indicated an emphasis on participation skills; 4 - 6 emphasized geography skills; grade 7 showed only geography skills; grade 8 showed references to research skills ("Elementary," 1986, June). In "Secondary Social Studies," grade levels 9 - 12 had several references to data gathering and intellectual skills (1986, June). In both guides, the separate listings of skills did not seem coordinated with the skill objectives at grade levels and, therefore, the intent of the separate listings was unclear. Also, there was some inconsistency in the categorization of the skills for the guide objectives and for the separate listings.

INFORMATION RELATED TO THE RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. The States' Definitions and/or Identification of Social Studies Skills:
"Skill development is the third component of a social studies program. Skills are processes which enable students to link knowledge with beliefs that lead to action. The skills essential to citizen participation are critical thinking and problem solving" ("Elementary," 1986, June, p. iv).
2. The States' Classifications of the Social Studies Skills - Research question sub-topics: (a) Classifications Utilized; (b) General Objectives, Social Studies or General Listings. Sub-topic (a): Critical thinking and problem solving may be categorized as "1. Skills related to acquiring information (reading, study skills, reference and information search skills, technical skills unique to electronic devices). 2. Skills related to organizing, using, and presenting information (intellectual, decision-making, and communication skills). 3. Skills related to interpersonal relationships and social participation (personal, group

interaction and political skills)" ("Elementary", 1986, June, p. iv).
 Sub-topic (b): Skills were designated within general objectives as well as in separate listings at the end of grade clusters.¹

3. The States' Organizational Designations for the Skills by Grade Levels - Sub-topics: (a) The Various Grade Level Designations; (b) Generalizations Regarding Typical Grade Level Skill Designations. Sub-topic (a): Alaska grouped grade levels as: 1 - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12 and basically identified the skills only within the groupings not in separate grades. However, Alaska did provide learning and skill objectives separately for grade 7 and separately for grade 8. Sub-topic (b): See content note above.
4. Generalizations and Patterns of Agreement Regarding Skill Requirements, Classifications, Organization, and Coding Data - This question will not be answered for individual states as it refers to an overall comparison of the states' guides to the research instrument for the study, or Appendix E.

Arizona

Statement: Arizona's "Essential Skills" pamphlet provided no statement of purpose (1984, June).

Format: A one column format entitled "Social Studies Skills" which presented a numbered list of curriculum objectives.

Content: This material was confusing to handle because knowledge, affective, and skill objectives were organized together as "Social Studies Skills." In other words, this state judged all learning objectives as skills. Viewed narrowly, many items should not have been classified as social studies skills. For example, item number 41 in "Essential Skills" (the student) "describes how Arizona became a state" (1984, June, p. 18). This learning objective, according to the philosophical assumptions of this research, is a knowledge or memory objective---not a skill. In another example, item number 1 (the student) "attends school regularly and on time" seemed more like an affective expectation for all subject areas in general ("Essential Skills," 1984, June, p. 18). Arizona's "skills" were required for graduation from the 8th and 12th grades; therefore, those skills that were identified were coded at only two grade levels. In general, expectations at the 8th grade level were mainly in the area of group responsibility and Maps Skills; at the 12th grade level more was expected in the area of Intellectual Skills---specifically in drawing conclusions and hypothesizing.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No information appropriate for this study was supplied. This state's guide presented all cognitive (knowledge/memory) accomplishments, affective (attitude/feelings) objectives, and process competencies as skills.
2. Classification - (a) No classification of the "skills" was supplied.
 (b) Arizona's skills were listed as to subject areas.

¹If a state's guide had references to skills in more than one place, only the skill designations within the actual curriculum guides were coded.

3. Organization - (a) According to a cover letter accompanying the curriculum guide sent by the state's Deputy Associate Superintendent, dated July 2, 1986, Arizona had organized curriculum materials according to exit competencies required for graduation from grades 8 and 12. (b) (See content note above.)

Arkansas

Statement: Arkansas provided two guides, one for grades 4 - 6 and one for American History. According to Arkansas Public School Course Content - Grades 4 - 6, Arkansas's Standards for Accreditation of Public Schools required that essential skills be identified in course content guides at three instructional levels: basic, developmental and extensions. Such material was the focus for the state's Student Assessment/Minimum Performance Test, and promotion from 8th grade was tied to accomplishment in the areas of reading, mathematics, language arts, science, and social studies (undated, Introduction).

Format: Arkansas's format was essentially a listing of learning objectives classified under skill headings: basic, developmental, and extensions.

Content: Content analysis revealed that Arkansas placed knowledge, attitude, and skill objectives together. In other words, Arkansas appeared to view all memory accomplishments, attitudes/feelings, and process competencies as skills. For example, under Basic Skills, was the Grade 5 item 2.6: (the student will) "list the three branches of government (executive, legislative, and judicial)." ("Arkansas Public School", undated, p. 22). Under the constraints of this research, item 2.6 is a knowledge or content goal, not a skill. In general, the coding results for grades 4, 5, and 6 showed that Map and Time Order Skills were overwhelmingly dominant. For grades 9 - 12, the location Map Skills were dominant. There were very few other coded marks for the other categories relative to research instrument.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Arkansas did not define the skills relative to the social studies.
2. Classifications - (a): No information relative to this study. (b) Arizona listed all knowledge expectations under skill designations --- a general listing for the social studies.
3. Organization - (a) Selected grades were 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 - 12; (b) (See content note above). There was no clear preference at different grade levels for different skills. Generally, the same skills were repeated for all grades.

California

Statement: California provided two items that were analyzed for this research: History - Social Science Framework For California Public Schools Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve and Model Curriculum Standards - Grades 9 Through 12.

According to a cover letter from a state social studies consultant, dated June 24, 1986, California's materials were designed to be used as a resource for local districts' curriculum development processes. California referred to skills as a "major component of the history and social studies program ... because they represent the critical bond among knowledge, values, and social

participation" ("History - Social Science Framework," 1981, p. 5) The following notes relate to the "History - Social Science Framework" since the "Model Curriculum Standards" cited the same skill goals.

Format: The objectives for the skills were listed under an introductory section of "History - Social Science Framework" entitled "Goals." The coding for the research instrument was taken from that section. The difficulty in the analysis for this guide was that California provided no grade level designations. California did indicate grade level designations for suggested topics. Under the umbrella title of "Specific Grade Level Recommendations," each grade level was titled as to content; for example at the Kindergarten level the title was — "Myself and Others in My World" ("History - Social Science Framework," 1981, p. 14). At each grade, there was a paragraph introducing the subject followed by a listing of topics; however, the vast majority of those "topics" were knowledge goals.

Content: Nothing coded for California was used by this researcher to compare to other states since grade level designations for skill goals were not identified. However, content analysis for California alone showed that skills identified easily matched the terminology of research instrument and were well distributed among the major and minor skill topics. Much of the terminology used by California was similar to that of the NCSS Essentials from which the research instrument was taken. Participation skills, Intellectual and Decision Making Skills earned the highest number of tally marks in the coding process.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - California defined the skills as "tools essential for learning and for effective participation" ("History - Social Science Framework," 1981, p. 5).
2. Classification - (a) 1. Study or Basic Skills; 2. Intellectual or Critical and Creative Thinking Skills; 3. Interpersonal or Social Participation Skills" ("History - Social Science Framework, 1981, p. 6). (b) California used listings of social studies skills but not at the grade levels.
3. Organization - (a) No organization of the skills by grade levels; (b) No data.

Connecticut

Statement: Connecticut provided two pamphlets that were analyzed for this research: Design for Excellence and A Guide to Curriculum Development in Social Studies. The latter pamphlet was designed to help local school districts write their own curriculum guides in the belief that the "diversity of the state's public school system is one of its greatest strengths" ("A Guide," 1981, p. viii).

Format: No information in either guide was relative to this study as no objectives were stated for the various grades.

Content: No information was relative to this study. Connecticut's guide offered only a few "samples" of how to create objectives. Much attention was given to general guidance for local school districts who were expected to develop their own curriculum.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Connecticut made a brief skills statement indicating that "the student should be able to demonstrate skill in locating, compiling, and weighing the evidence and data necessary for clarifying issues and making decisions" ("A Guide," 1981, p. 19).
2. Classifications - (a) No information relative to this study; (b) No data.
3. Organization - No data for Connecticut relative to this study.

Delaware

Statement: None was provided either for the general purpose of the guide nor one applicable to the skills in Delaware's Social Studies Content Standards.

Format: A two column format was used with two category headings: Program Objectives and Standards of Student Expectations.

Content: In general, Delaware's guide indicated an emphasis on data gathering skills for grades 1 - 3 as well as for grades 4 - 6, 7 - 8. Data gathering was perceived to be less important for grades 9 - 12. There were analysis and coding problems relative to the Intellectual and Decision making Skills. For example, Delaware's document made references to items under Decision making Skills that, according to the research instrument, belonged under Intellectual Skills. Delaware's guide used references to problem solving/critical thinking and problem solving/decision which failed to adequately discriminate between these items. Lack of clarity as to intent caused the researcher not to code some items.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Delaware provided no information regarding this question.
2. Classification - (A) No information provided; (B) General lists of content objectives.
3. Organization - (a) Data was coded from grades 1 - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12; (b) See coding note above.

Florida

Statement: Florida provided eleven pamphlets containing curriculum materials, guidelines, and statements of policy. Two pamphlets were especially valuable for purposes of this research: Student Performance-Standards of Excellence for Florida Schools in Mathematics, Science, Social Studies and Writing and Florida School Laws and State Board of Education Rules Relative to Statewide Minimum Student Performance Standards, Standards of Excellence and Other Related Areas.

The Commissioner of Education for the State of Florida discussed the purpose for the state's curriculum guides relative to the state's goal to attain higher achievement in all academic areas. It should be noted that Florida has led the movement toward minimum competency testing and establishment of educational standards of achievement for all students. The state commissioner wrote, in reference to Florida's Student Performance Standards of Excellence, that "these Standards ... represent progress toward academic excellence in specified fields of study in our public schools. The skills will form the basis for a state assessment program..." ("Student Performance Standards," 1984-85 through 1988-89, p. iv).

Format: A two column format in "Student Performance Standards" presented curriculum objectives under these headings: (1) Standards, and (2) Skills - The student will:. At the right of each page was a matrix showing specified grade levels. The Standards were stated as broad, general goals, whereas the Skills statements provided teachers and curriculum specialists with specific information concerning performance expectations.

Content: In general, grade 3 showed an emphasis on Data Collection Skills; Grade 5 showed continued emphasis on Data Collection plus Intellectual Skills; grade 8 showed attention on Data Gathering, Intellectual, and Decision Making Skills; while grade 12 showed a focus mainly on the Intellectual and the Decision Making Skills. There was no clear preference for anything other than Map Skills (for grades 3 and 5) and very little was coded for any grades under Participation Skills. In one sense, Florida's material was confusing to handle because knowledge, affective, and skill objectives were organized together under the heading of "Skills." In other words, the impression was that Florida intended to treat all competencies as skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No data according to the constraints of this study. See content note above.
2. Classifications - No data according to the constraints of this study.
3. Organization - (a) Grade designations were 3, 5, 8, 12. Note: Learning objectives appeared to be "exit competencies" at these grades. (b) See content note above.

Georgia

Statement: Georgia's curriculum guide, Basic Curriculum Content for Georgia's Public Schools, was produced to guide teachers as to the minimum curriculum requirements for every grade level. The objectives for each subject area were keyed to Georgia's criterion-referenced testing program: "Our intent in publishing the curriculum is ultimately to establish uniformity and consistency in curriculum offerings in all Georgia Schools. We must ensure that students learn the same basic curriculum content in every grade and every subject through our education system" ("Basic Curriculum," 1985, p. 3).

Format: Learning objectives were presented under content area headings at each grade level. Most objectives were knowledge or content oriented. There was a Media Skills Appendix designating skills; however, these were intended for application in all subject areas.

Content: Generally, skills identifiable within the social studies sections were repeated at each grade level indicating similar expectations for a student whether at grades K or 8.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No data relative to this study.
2. Classification - No data relative to this study.
3. Organization - (a) Grade level designations were K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; (b) See Content notes above.

Hawaii

Statement: Hawaii provided two pamphlets: Elementary Social Studies Program Guide and Secondary Social Studies Program Guide. Hawaii's guides were designed to help educators develop school-level social studies programs. Hawaii identified "performance expectations" in both guides which referred to behavior expectations which required that students be able to apply specific knowledge, skills, or attitudes.

Format: A single column format presented curriculum objectives. The headings, i.e. Performance Expectations for Lower Elementary Level (Grade 3), were followed by brief introductory paragraphs explaining the objectives listed for the page. There was a code beside each objective indicating where each performance expectation could be addressed, i.e. K - 3: (the student) "identifies a problem facing the class or school" ("Elementary Social Studies," July, 1981, p. 22). This objective could begin to be addressed at the Kindergarten level, and the expectation was that it would be "mastered" by grade 3.

Content: Analysis of Hawaii's guides showed an overall emphasis on Data Gathering, particularly Map Skills, and Participation Skills such as: understanding of oneself and the value of pluralism in society. Skills were coded heaviest grades K through 6. A great sense of concern for furthering human relations was reflected in this material.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Hawaii referred to skills as "processes" that provide the "means of achieving objectives" ("Elementary Social Studies", 1981, July, p. 6-7).
2. Classification - (a) 1. "Intellectual Skills ... usually called thinking skills, include lower level intellectual operations, such as memory, as well as more complex cognitive processes such as analyzing, synthesizing and evaluating...; 2. Data Processing Skills ... include competence to locate and compile information, to present and interpret data, and to organize and assess source material...; 3. Human Relations Competencies ... associated with social behavior. Effective interpersonal relations seem to depend on a sensitivity to the needs and interests of others, adequately developed communication skills, and the ability to cope with conflict and authority" ("Elementary Social Studies," 1981, July, p. 6-7). (b) Skills for the social studies were coded from within the general objectives for Performance Expectations for the various grades.
3. Organization - (a) In the general information sections, Hawaii referred to performance objectives by grades 3, 6, 8, 10, and 12. However, for this research it was possible to identify skill objectives for grades K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. (b) See Content Note above.

Idaho

Statement: Idaho provided two pamphlets: Pilot Program - State Department of Education of Education - Blaine County School District #61 - Social Studies Curriculum and Secondary School Courses of Study. A Commission on Excellence in Education recommended in 1982 that "...all Idaho public school districts utilize the state curriculum guides as a basic resource for developing local

guides at both the elementary and secondary levels. It is the responsibility of the local board, administrators, and building supervisors to ensure use of the state guides" ("Secondary School," 1985, Foreword).

Format: In the booklet "Pilot Program" a three column format presented curriculum objectives: 1. Objectives; 2. Suggested Activities; 3. Resources. Learning objectives were listed under each heading.

Content: Overall, material was coded for grades K - 9 because there were no course objectives for grade 10; however, there were a few skill objectives identified for the required courses for grades 11 and 12. Generally speaking, grades K through 5 showed a focus on Map Skills. At grade six there was a broader interest throughout the data gathering items. Very few tally marks were recorded for grades 7 - 9. Idaho organized grades as K - 6, 7 - 12 but used different skill headings at different grades.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No information on this research concern.
2. Classification - (a) Idaho's skill classifications varied at each grade level. Overall, this state used these headings: 1. Map and Globe Skills; 2. Interpersonal Skills; 3. Geography; 4. Report Skills; 5. Study Skills; 6. Values ("Pilot Program," 1984-85, pp. 3 - 39). (b) The skill headings are part of the general objectives.
3. Organization - (a) Idaho organized the grades as K - 6, 7 - 12; however, there were skill headings or categories throughout the various grades not just within the two main grade level groupings. Also, the skill classifications were not the same at each grade level. The material was coded, grades K through 9. (b) See content note above.

Illinois

Statement: Illinois produced a curriculum guide for the social sciences in response to state legislation enacted in 1985 requiring the state school board to define the primary purpose of schooling, set up related goals, and help local school districts adopt learning objectives consistent with state standards. The state has adopted five broad "outcome statements" applicable to several subject areas and the curriculum guide focuses on "model" objectives applicable to those outcome statements. Relative to the area of the social sciences, the guide's purpose is to "provide students with an understanding of themselves and of society, prepare them for citizenship in a democracy, and give them the basics for understanding...the world community" ("Illinois Outcome Statements," 1986, March, p. v).

Format: This guide had a one column format with objectives listed numerically and was organized according to the "Model Learning Objectives" for each of the five outcome goals. Each list begins with an introductory phrase, i.e. "By the end of Grade 8, students should be able to":

Content: By grade 3, students were expected to have mastered Data Gathering Skills especially the Map and Location Skills; by grade 6 the emphasis was still on the Data Gathering skills, but there was some emphasis on the Intellectual and Decision Making Skills as well. The data collection and analysis results for grade 8 was very similar to grade 3, and grade 10 was similar to grade 6. In places this guide was challenging to code for several reasons. Most of the objectives were content-oriented; plus many of the verbs

used for learning objectives were repetitive as well as ambiguous as to intent for the objective. For example, the verb "Identify" was frequently used. This verb can mean a variety of things, such as provide the characteristics of something, describe someone, or pick out something from a list.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No information provided.
2. Classifications - No information provided.
3. Organization - (a) Grade level designations: 3, 6, 8, 10 - "outcomes." (b) See content note above.

Kansas

Statement: Material from Kansas, entitled Guidelines for Program Development—Social Studies, was designed to help educators develop their own local programs. The foreword referred to the different needs of communities in Kansas which should be addressed by those who have the primary responsibility for student learning outcomes ("Guidelines," 1984). The content of the Kansas guide was influenced by recently published (1983) NCSS materials on social studies skills and included a tentative Scope and Sequence as well as a proposed Matrix of Social Studies Skills.

Format: Kansas has produced an outline format borrowed almost word for word from the skills matrix portion of the tentative NCSS Scope and Sequence (1983). Skills are listed under headings relative to Acquiring, Organizing, and Using Information plus those related to Interpersonal Relationships and Social Participation.

Content: The content analysis for "Guidelines" showed that Kansas had a fairly complete, overall coverage of the essentials for social studies skills; although most of the data was coded under Data Gathering as well as Intellectual Skills. The only coding difficulty was that Kansas indicated that all skills were to be introduced at the K - 3 cluster and continued through the rest of the grades; therefore, there was no attempt at sequencing of skills nor clear evidence of specific skill emphasis for the various grade levels.

1. Definitions - Kansas stated that having a skill meant that one is able to do something proficiently in repeated performances ("Guidelines," 1984, p. 10). Kansas also stated that students should "develop the ability to use data processing, intellectual, and interpersonal skills for the purpose of solving problems and clarifying issues" ("Guidelines," 1984, p. 3)
2. Classification - (a) Classification of the skills related to: (1) Acquiring Information; (2) Organizing and Using Information, (3) Interpersonal Relationships and Social Participation ("Guidelines," 1984, pp. 10, 11, 12). (b) Kansas organized the social studies skills in outline lists.
3. Organization - (a) Grade level groupings: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9, 10 - 12. (b) No data since all skills were designated to commence at grade K and continue to 12.

Kentucky

Statement: The Kentucky curriculum guide entitled Social Studies included a section called "Essential Skills - Social Studies" and was designed to guide

local school districts who "shall follow the program of studies K - 8, while flexibility of course scheduling is allowed at grades nine through twelve..." (1986, August, Goals).

Format: A one column format presented learning objectives at each grade level. There were brief, introductory topics introducing the primary content for each grade. While this section was called "Essential Skills - Social Studies," most of the learning objectives were content-oriented.

Content: In general, material was coded under Data Gathering, specifically under the Map Skills. Primarily, skill references were noticed between grades K - 6, with grade 3 having the most; however, grade 11 had as many notations, or tallies, as grade 3. Kentucky indicated that there were mastery expectations for grades K - 11.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - In the Preface to the "Essential Skills" section of Social Studies, there was a statement relative to a definition: "The Social Studies Skills developed for (these lists) are those considered to be essential for a sound educational program" (1986, August, Preface). The problem for this research study was that most of the identified essentials were actually content goals.
2. Classification - (a) No information provided. (b) Material was listed generally as social studies skills.
3. Organization - (a) No classifications given. (b): See content note above.

Louisiana

Statement: Louisiana's general purpose for Louisiana Social Studies Curricular Goals was unclear as there was no statement regarding whether the material examined was a guide, a statement of minimum competencies, or mandated expectations. Basically, it presented goals, a scope and sequence, and a skills matrix borrowed from the 1963 NCSS Scope and Sequence.

Format: Learning objectives were related to social studies skills and were presented in an outlined matrix, grades K - 12.

Content: Skills were designated according to recommended grades for introduction, reinforcement, and maintenance; however, they were coded by this researcher only where they were "introduced" for manageability of the data. Most of the skills identified relative to the instrument matched Data Gathering items especially Map Skills. There were more skills coded at grade 5 than any other grade and included such things as comparing information, evaluating sources, and drawing inferences.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Louisiana stated that skills refer to "competencies to acquire, organize, evaluate, and report information using various techniques, including computers and computer technologies, for the purpose of solving problems and clarifying issues" ("Louisiana Social Studies," undated, p. 1).
2. Classification - (a) Louisiana classified the skills as: (1) Skills Which Are A Major Responsibility Of The Social Studies (reading social studies

- materials, problem-solving and critical thinking skills, maps and globes, time and chronology, evaluating information, pictures/charts/graphs/tables); (2) Skills Which Are A Definite But Shared Responsibility of Social Studies (locating information - books, encyclopedia, references; using dictionary, newspapers, magazines, pamphlets; library skills, card catalogue; field trips/interviews; organizing information, acquiring information through reading, listening and observing; communicating - orally and in writing; work with others ("Louisiana Social Studies," undated, pp. 287 - 310). (b) Louisiana had the social studies skills outlined in a matrix borrowed from 1963 NCSS material on skills as stated above.
3. Organization - (a) grades K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; (b) See content note above.

Maine

Statement: Maine's guide, A Social Studies Framework - The Social Studies Program, included objectives relative to knowledge, skills, and attitudes recommended for inclusion in locally developed social studies programs. Local school districts were advised to supplement this material to meet the needs of their students. A second pamphlet, Scope and Sequence for the Social Studies-Report of the National Council for the Social Studies, provided general information on skill development.

Format: A three column format, in Maine's "Framework," presented knowledge objectives, skill objectives, and attitude objectives. Each grade was accorded a general topic of content and a brief paragraph describing the program.

Content: Generally, Maine's "Framework" guide matched well with the research instrument and the researcher was able to find skill designations K through 12. Overall, there were more Data Gathering skills identified, especially Map Skills. At K - 6 there was an emphasis on the Participation Skills especially in showing respect for others. At grades 10 - 12, there was a greater emphasis on the Intellectual Skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - A skill is "the ability to do something proficiently in repeated performances. Skills are processes that enable students to link knowledge with beliefs that lead to action" ("Scope and Sequence," undated, p. 4)
2. Classification - (a) Maine classified the skills as: (1) Acquiring Information; (2) Organizing and Using Information, (3) Interpersonal Relationships and Social Participation ("Scope and Sequence", undated p. 4). (b) The skills are included in general objectives and are outlined in an added matrix of skills.
3. Organization - (a) Maine provided objectives for every grades K through 12; (b) See content note above.

Maryland

Statement: Maryland's curriculum guide presented several broad goals meant to provide "structure for designing and developing comprehensive social studies programs" at the local school districts ("Curricular Framework," undated, p. v).

Format: No information provided.

Content: No data was presented meeting the parameters of this study.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - One of the broad goals stated in Social Studies - A Maryland Curricular Framework, specified that programs should provide the "process skills to analyze and apply (a) knowledge base" (undated, p. 3).
2. and 3.: No data was available.

Massachusetts

Statement: Curriculum material entitled The Final Report of the Study Committee on American History and Citizenship Education was produced by the state of Massachusetts with a single focus—Citizenship Education. A special state committee on American History and citizenship education produced a series of recommendations relative to educating students for good citizenship. The committee defined citizenship, cited the elements of citizenship education, and provided curriculum recommendations for state-wide use.

Format: This state produced a large, one sheet page of information that folded twice down to normal page size. Some of the material was in outline form; however, most of the information was presented in paragraphs linked by special symbols to state legislative mandates on citizenship education.

Content: The information presented was one-dimensional in subject matter, largely tied to the upper grade levels, and to the subjects of American History, Civics, Massachusetts and local history, and government. Skills were incidental to the overall message and were largely those relative to civic participation in nature: i.e. (students) should learn skills such as how to vote, or how to access local, state, and county governments.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

Because of its focus on one topic, this guide did not define, identify, or classify the social studies skills, or identify them by grade levels as would benefit this study. Any attempt to content analyze and code references to skills relative to this document would have produced results too narrow in scope to be useful for the broader frame of reference of this study.

Michigan

Statement: Michigan's curriculum guide, Essential Performance Objectives for Social Studies, was built upon a statement of minimal performance objectives approved by the state and intended to help local districts revise and review their own programs.

Format: A one column, outline format presented curriculum objectives organized into three categories: attitude, knowledge, and skills. Each heading was titled: "Essential Objectives for Social Studies Education in Michigan" and the appropriate grade level was indicated.

Content: Generally, the Michigan guide matched topics of the research instrument and analysis showed a good coverage of the skills, grades K - 9. Overall, there were some unique results from the comparative content analysis. Unlike most guides, the coding for Michigan revealed an almost equal concern

for Participation Skills as well as Thinking Skills. Content analysis on most states' guides resulted in more tally marks under Thinking Skills, especially for Data Collection, than anywhere else on the instrument. Another unusual result of comparative analysis on the Michigan guide was that there was no particular emphasis on Map Skills. For grades K - 3, emphasis was generally on Participation Skills; for grades 4 - 6 and 7 - 9, there was a fairly equal amount of attention to Data Gathering, Intellectual Skills, Decision-Making Skills, and Participation Skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Definitions - Michigan did not define the term "skill" but did make a skills statement and cited specific skill goals. Michigan stated that, "in social studies education four elements are essential: knowledge; democratic and humane values; skills in acquiring information and thinking about social affairs; and social participation. Programs must bring these elements together to foster a sense of efficacy, sound decision making, and responsible action" ("Essential Performance," 1984, p. vii).
2. Classification - (a) Michigan classified four skill goals: (1) Students Need Communication Skills Focused On Social Affairs; (2) Students Must Learn To Find Information; (3) Young People Must Learn To Think For Themselves; (4) Decision Making Is Crucial ("Essential Performance Objectives," 1984, pp. xi, xii). (b) Michigan's material on skills was mixed with attitude and skill objectives.
3. Organization - (a) Objectives were organized in clusters or groupings: Grades K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9. (b) See content note above.

Minnesota

Statement: This curriculum guide, Some Essential Learner Outcomes in Social Studies, was produced to aid grades K - 12 teachers of the social studies. The guide identified student learning outcomes as to knowledge, skill, and attitude goals. The material overall was identified as an object of field testing. Educators were to respond to items such as the definition for a "skill" as to levels of agreement or disagreement, i.e.: SA - strongly agree, or SD - strongly disagree. Therefore, everything presented therein had to be viewed as tentative. A second pamphlet, Social Studies Student Goals, Objectives, and Student Outcomes, appeared to be a brief, revised version of the 1983 document; however, the latter revision was still tentative.

Format: Material was presented in lists of thinking and processing skills unrelated to content goals or to grade levels.

Content: Generally, there was good coverage of the items on the instrument. There were more Intellectual Skills than any other category. Some of the items proved confusing to the researcher; for example, the differences were unclear as to decision making and problem solving. The main stress under Data Gathering was on skills relative to compiling, organizing, and evaluating material; under Participation Skills, there was more emphasis on understanding one's self and how to relate to others.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Definitions - "To have a skill means that one is able to do something proficiently in repeated performances" ("Some Essential," 1985, Spring), p. 83) and, more specifically, students must develop competencies to "acquire, organize, evaluate, and report information for purposes of solving problems and clarifying issues" ("Some Essential," Spring, 1985, p. 42).
2. Classification - (a) Minnesota classified thinking and processing skills relative to the social studies: (1) Problem Identification Skills; (2) Information Gathering Skills; (3) Information Processing Skills; (4) Decision Making Skills; (5) Interpersonal Skills ("Some Essential", Spring, 1985, pp. 42 - 43). (b) Minnesota listed items as social studies skills in an outline form.
3. Organization - (a) No information as grade levels have not been designated as yet. (b) See Content note above.

Missouri

Statement: Missouri's curriculum guide, Social Studies/Civics, included a social studies objectives framework for local districts to incorporate into local programs. A cover letter from the state's Director of Curricular Dissemination, stated that this was a draft of Missouri's new core curriculum objectives. Items were coded by the state to indicate which objectives related to statewide assessment tests, or local assessment tests. An additional pamphlet, A Guide to Social Studies Curriculum Development for Missouri Educators, provided general information to educators for all grade levels for curriculum development.

Format: Michigan used a single column, outline format organized by subject area for grades 3, 6, 8, 10.

Content: Overall, content analysis tally marks were heaviest under Data Gathering, especially for Map Skills, for each selected grade. There were more skills identified for grade 6 than any other; fewest for grade 10. For Participation Skills, there was an emphasis on civic and group skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Definitions - There was no direct definition or identification of the social studies skills; however, skill references were identified within the learning objectives.
2. Classification - (a) No data provided; (b) Missouri's skill objectives were listed among other kinds of objectives under the subject areas.
3. Organization - (a) Missouri identified skills at grades 3, 6, 8, 10; (b) See content note above.

Montana

Statement: Montana's publication, Montana Rural Education Curriculum Guide, was presented as a guide designed to advise the classroom professional as to when to introduce and develop concepts.

Format: Overall, this guide was a brief, tabulation-style publication for all content areas. The format for each subject was a matrix with content and skills listed in outline form at the left side of each page. Grades K -8 were

headings across the top. Special symbols were used to indicate when a topic or skill should be introduced, developed, mastered, reviewed, or extended.

Content: The only skills mentioned for the social studies related to geography and citizenship; however, there were only six items coded for Map and Globe skills. There were a few items coded under participation relative to rights and responsibilities, making decisions, problem solving, and citizenship education. All coded items were for grades K - 3.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No information relative to this study.
2. Classification - (a) The only heading was "Geography - Skills."
(b) Geography skills was listed under the heading of Social Studies.
3. Organization - (a) Montana organized material according to grades K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8; (b) See content note above.

New Hampshire

Statement: New Hampshire provided two pamphlets, one for elementary and one for secondary grade levels. The elementary guide indicated that "these standards are minimum only. It is the intention of the board to hereby adopt standards below which no elementary school may fall" (1986, Preface). This goal statement of purpose was reinforced by a reference in the guide regarding state law wherein state schools must meet minimum standards to qualify for state financial aid ("Elementary," 1986, p. 23).

Format: There was only a brief paragraph on goals in the elementary guide. There was a paragraph setting forth a definition of the social studies, unit requirements, and a list of general program objectives in the secondary guide.

Content: Only about eight items were identified in the brief list of objectives in the secondary guide. Skills relative to critical thinking, decision making, comparing for cause-effect, geography, and participation both social and civic were coded by the researcher ("High Schools," 1984, December, p. 29).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - New Hampshire's "Elementary School" guide provided a statement that social studies should "help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for effective participation in the life of the community, the nation, and the world" (1986, p. 15).
2. Classification - (a) No classification of the skills was provided; (b) New Hampshire specified a few skills such as geography, decision making, data gathering, and critical thinking skills as part of a statement of purpose (see above) for the elementary school, and in a brief list of objectives under the topic of social studies for grades 9 - 12.
3. Organization - (a) Material was not specified as to individual grade levels although objectives were coded 9 - 12; (b) See content note above.

New Mexico

Statement: New Mexico's guide, Social Studies Education for New Mexico Schools, provided no information relative to this study.

Format: New Mexico's guide had a unique format. There were eight columns per page, four at the top and four at the bottom. Each column was headed by a grade designation for grades 1 through 8. The overall title was "Social Studies Competencies" with page one showing objectives for U.S. History; page two was World History; page three was Politics and Rights/Responsibilities; page four was Economics; page five was Geography, page six was Geography again; and page seven was New Mexico History. The implication was that all those content areas were to be taught from grade 1 through 8.

Content: Skills emphasized for grades 1 - 8 were Data Gathering especially the location skills and Map Skills; plus some attention was given to other non-print media and Time Order Skills. At grades 1 and 2, there was attention to the Participation Skills as well.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. and 2. There was no information provided.
3. Organization - (a) New Mexico organized grades as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Skills were designated as to various social studies content areas; (b) See content note above.

New York

Statement: New York provided several pamphlets. New York's publication on "Incorporating Skills" was intended as a guide for teacher use in building their own skills programs. Individual schools were supposed to use it to implement the state's social studies program so that "skills will be important components of the curriculum..." (1984, Preface). There were three pamphlets providing learning objectives for three grades: 1, 3, and 6.

Format: The format for the three guides examined for grades 1, 3, 6, was unusual because the program of studies was designed to be read on two pages at once. Columns on the left hand page were titled: Concepts, Content Understanding, Possible Activities; while Columns on the right hand page were titled: Possible Skills/Attitudes, Evaluation, Resources. Specific content was not prescribed. Concepts, knowledge goals, and skills were to be used as a framework only; teachers were expected to adapt the syllabus to their students' needs.

Content: Overall, there was good coverage relative to the research instrument in Data Gathering and in Participation Skills. Grade 1 showed an almost equal concern by the state for both areas of skill development. Special emphasis was placed on observing, evaluating, and communicating. The coding results for Grade 3 showed special emphasis on classifying or categorizing; grade 6 showed emphasis on locating, organizing and evaluating information. Grades 3 and 6 showed concern for the Intellectual Skills, especially for classifying information, drawing conclusions, and generalizing. Coding analysis for all three grades revealed concern for Participation Skills, especially for seeing things from other points of view and working in groups.

New York provided "tentative" materials for the secondary grade levels. That material was not coded since it was still being field-tested. It should be noted that New York has established "new examination requirements in social studies which were incorporated into the revision process" ("Social Studies," 1986, p. v). Also, this state has adopted new standards that included provisions for handicapped students who "are expected to receive the same

informational base that will be required for proficiency on statewide testing programs" ("Social Studies," 1986, p. 104).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Statements in the Preface to New York's pamphlet Incorporating Skills into Social Studies Programs K - 12 referred to skills as "important components of the curriculum" (1984, Foreword). Further, New York stated that there was a certain "definite and interrelated set of skills such as gathering adequate, available data and using such information" in ways necessary to function as a responsible member of society (1984, Preface).
2. Classification - (a) New York classified the skills as: (1) Getting Information; (2) Using Information; (3) Presenting Information; (4) Participating in Interpersonal and Group Relations; (5) Self Management Skills ("Incorporating Skills", 1984, pp. 12 - 18, 26). (b) New York's skills were listed as social studies skills separate from content.
3. Organization - (a) New York appeared to favor the grade level organizational pattern of K - 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12. In the "Incorporating Skills" pamphlet, the skills were organized as: I. Introducing and Using Skills---Primary, Intermediate; and II. Remediating and Applying --- 7 - 8 or 7 - 12 (1984, p. 12). (b) See content note above.

North Carolina

Statement: The North Carolina Standard Course of Study - Social Studies "provides an overview of the basic curriculum which should be made available to every child in the public schools" (1985, June, p. v). This statement was not meant to imply that some local school systems could not offer more, nor that each student had to take everything offered.

Format: A one column format included a general content topic for each grade, a brief introduction for the content, and then objectives were listed under "Knowledge" and "Skills."

Content: While several introductory pages were devoted to explanations regarding the skills, the objectives for each grade were repetitive. The same eight skill objectives were cited Grades K through grade 11. There was preliminary discussion regarding levels of skills and sequential development; yet, the same skill expectations were cited, for example, for both the K and 11th grade levels. The skills cited included Data Gathering items such as locating, gathering, evaluating, and organizing information. There were items on Map Skills and Time Order plus a couple of objectives relative to Participation Skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - A skill "implies the proficiency to do something well" ("Standard Course," 1985, June, p. SS4).
2. Classification - (a) North Carolina identified three types of social studies skills: (1) Academic (intellectual) Skills - those intellectual operations associated with a scientific approach to social inquiry; (2) Self Management Skills - those techniques and abilities that one uses in managing interpersonal and intergroup relations; and (3) Skills of Social Participation - includes the skills of effective listening, group discussion

and planning, group decision making, and accepting responsibility for decisions made ("Standard Course," 1985, June, p. SS4). (b) North Carolina's skills were listed separately at each grade level.

3. Organization - (a) Objectives were cited for each grade, K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. (b) See content note above.

Ohio

Statement: In the pamphlet Minimum Standards for Elementary and Secondary Schools, Ohio stated: "Minimum standards for elementary and secondary schools reflect recognition of the state's legitimate interest in educating young people for citizenship and ... opportunity for a general education of high quality" (1983, Foreword). While Ohio had established state guidelines for minimum learning standards, it appeared that this state had published several additional pamphlets designed to assist localities in developing their own curriculum guides to meet local needs. For example, clarification of the state's requirements for minimum standards regarding each course of study developed locally was set forth in Ohio's Process Model for Course of Study.

Format: There was no specific social studies curriculum in any of the pamphlets meeting the constraints of this research.

Content: There were no objectives provided to assess.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Ohio's "Process Model" provided a definition of a skill relative to all subject areas: "performance component of an objective" describes the behavior a student exhibits to achieve an objective. It is written precisely and is measurable. An action verb represents the statement of behavior/performance in a subject or pupil performance objective" (1983, p. 48).
2. Classification - (a) Ohio indicated a categorization of the skills in reference to a general classification scheme (for all subjects) regarding the above performance expectations: There are "six verbs under which nearly all learner behaviors can be categorized. These verbs are as follows:
 1. Identify (select, distinguish between, classify, discriminate between, match).
 2. Name (label, list, state, give).
 3. Describe (define, tell how, tell what happens when, explain).
 4. Construct (prepare, draw, make, build).
 5. Order (arrange in order, sequence, list in order).
 6. Demonstrate (show your work, show the procedure, perform an experiment, perform the steps" ("Process Model," 1983, p. 48). Use of such general, all-encompassing verbs regarding objectives, leaves the user unsure as to intent of objectives, and contributes to the general state of confusion regarding the skills. (b) The material, cited relative to question number 2., part (a), was intended for use in subject areas such as English composition, reading, and mathematics.
3. Organization - No organization of the grades was indicated.

Oklahoma

Statement: "Education for living in our contemporary society has become an increasingly complex process. There is a vast array of outcomes that we expect our young to achieve, but all too often we are not at all clear as to how we will help them arrive at those outcomes. We do not always set clear goals and

objectives; we do not present consistent guidelines" ("Suggested Learner Outcomes," 1984, Foreword). Because of the preceding rationale, Oklahoma published two pamphlets for elementary and secondary use to help teachers organize their own curriculum. Both pamphlets were analyzed for this research. Format: Oklahoma used a learning objectives format similar to Virginia and West Virginia's. The design format included grade level designation as the heading, a brief introductory paragraph regarding knowledge area of focus, and a numbered list of learner objectives. Each item provided the user with: (1) a broad statement identifying a goal; (2) a descriptive statement specifying example(s) of the broader goal statement. This basic format is short, simple, straightforward, and relatively uncomplicated for the user in comparison to other designs. However, verbs used for Oklahoma's objectives were misleading, repetitious, and confusing. Oklahoma, for example, frequently used the verb phrase "will identify" to begin a broad statement. That phrase can mean so many things. Is the student supposed to select an item from a list, distinguish between one or more items, classify an item, relate characteristics of something, or match an item to an identifying definition?

Content: Basically, the grades were organized as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 - 8, 9 - 12, though skills were identified at every level. Determining organization relative to the skills was difficult, however, since designations were so similar in language at every grade. Therefore, the content analysis results for both elementary and secondary guides tended to be misleading because skill designations were repetitious. In the elementary guide, for example, the designation "The student will be helped and encouraged to develop a positive self-image" appeared at every grade 1 through 8. In the secondary guide, a designation such as: "The student will develop problem-solving and critical-thinking skills" appeared word for word in every subject area. Overall, there was more attention to Data Gathering, Participation, and Intellectual Skills. More specifically, for grades 1 through 8, the data showed most attention focused on map skills, respect for self and individual differences, and comparing and drawing inferences. For grades 9 through 12, the data showed much attention focused on collecting, organizing and evaluating information; and drawing conclusions based on problem-solving and critical-thinking processes ("Suggested Learner Outcomes," 1984).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. and 2. No information was found regarding definitions or classification of the skills.
3. Organization - (a) Oklahoma organized the grades as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 - 8, 9 - 12. Oklahoma provided material according to suggested "learner outcomes."
(b) See content note above.

Pennsylvania

Statement: In The Planned Course, Pennsylvania stated requirements for local districts to revise and/or write coordinated and articulated K - 12 curriculum beginning no later than September, 1985 (p. 2). Localities were to develop planned courses plus curriculum guides and syllabuses. Planned courses should include four criteria - "learning objectives, content and instructional time, expected levels of achievement and procedures for evaluation" (1985, September, pp. 4-6).

Format: Curriculum objectives were analyzed in Pennsylvania's pamphlet entitled A Program in American and Pennsylvania Studies. A one column format for Elementary Program Objectives and Jr. - Sr. High Objectives which presented content focus and objectives for each grade level. The numbered learning objectives included skill, attitude, and content within the same list. The user was to understand that the skill and attitude-oriented items applied throughout Pennsylvania's model curriculum guide. The cognitive, or knowledge, objectives were indicated in the content outlines where appropriate for use (1983, pp. 3 - 21).

Content: Since only grades 4, 5, 9 - 10 were identified for model objectives, the content analysis produced a limited amount of data. Overall, 25 items were recorded according to the constraints and procedures of this study. At grade 4 and 5, most items fell into the general category of Data Gathering specifically for the maps skills. At the 9 - 10 level, most items identified were in the Intellectual Skills area specifically for research methodology such as checking reliability of sources.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - In another pamphlet entitled The Use of Social Studies Concepts in Curriculum Development, Pennsylvania referred to skills as "tools of learning" (1985, p. 1).
2. Classification - (a) Pennsylvania suggested certain categories of skills as "building blocks for the curriculum" including basic language arts skills needed for development of social studies understandings, plus skills specifically related to social studies: (1.) Information Acquiring Skills; (2) Reading Skills - reading for Comprehension and for exploring attitudes and feelings; (3) Organization Skills - acquire, classify, compare, analyze and synthesize; (4) Communication Skills - writing and oral; (5) Citizenship Education Skills - political, decision-making, and interpersonal skills; (6) Geography Skills; (7) Time Relationship Skills ("The Use of Social Studies Concepts," 1985, pp. 2, 3, 4). (b) Pennsylvania listed skills as social studies skills.
3. Organization - Material was organized (relative to learning objectives for American and Pennsylvania history and culture) for grades 4, 5, 9 - 10.

Rhode Island

Statement - In Social Studies Curriculum, Rhode Island stated: "The primary purpose of the social studies program is to provide learning experiences for all students that will lead to the acquisition and development of the knowledge, skills, attitudes, processes, and competencies essential for self-development, positive human relationships, and participation in a representative democracy, a market economy, and a work society" (undated, p. 70). A cover letter from the state's social studies specialist indicated that this material was from the mandated Basic Education Program for Rhode Island.

Format: A two column format was used by Rhode Island to show social studies objectives. The categories used were: Standards and Indicators. Items under Standards were broadly stated, i.e. There shall be a social studies program, K - 12, which shall include instruction in: principles of popular and representative government ("Social Studies," undated, p. 71). Items under

Indicators explained how the standards would be recognized, i.e. K - 12 curriculum, and appropriate course outlines, which include the principles of popular and representative government, R. I. and United States History and Government, and operation of a voting machine.

Content: Rhode Island's guide was a short, four page document; therefore, little data was generated from the content analysis procedures.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No information supplied.
2. Classification - (a) Rhode Island did not provide a classification system; however, this state's guide identified eight skills to be developed K - 12: thinking skills, location skills (map skills, spacial relations), social analysis skills, citizenship skills, reading skills, communication skills, study skills, and value skills. None of these were defined or clarified and some were difficult to relate to this study's instrument, i. e. reading, study, and value skills ("Social Studies," undated, p. 72). There were too few designations for research generalizations regarding skills. (b) Rhode Island listed the eight skills (cited above) as social studies skills.
3. Organization - No information supplied.

South Carolina

Statement: South Carolina provided two pamphlets. The first one entitled, Sequential List of Skills was undated and had no statement of purpose. The second pamphlet entitled Outline of High School Credit Courses was identified as a resource for principals to be used for planning curricular offerings and for planning master schedules; thus, this source was not applicable to the purposes of this study (1984, p. 1).

Format: South Carolina had skills listed under designated grades in the "Sequential List" material.

Content: Overall, the content analysis for the "Sequential List" source revealed a concentration on Data Gathering specifically the map skills for grades K - 6. Very little attention was devoted to skills at 9 - 12 grade levels.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No specific definition of the skills.
2. Classification - (a) South Carolina designated three social studies skill categories: (1) Social Skills, (2) Academic Skills - locating and map skills, and (3) Thinking Skills. (b) South Carolina listed this skills classification separate from content ("Sequential List," undated, not numbered).
3. Organization - (a) South Carolina organized material in lists according to grade levels K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 - 12.

South Dakota

Statement: The South Dakota Social Studies Curriculum Guide K - 12 was developed to provide local districts with a point-of-departure for their own curriculum development programs (1981, September, p. ii).

Format: Learning objectives were listed under instructional goals for such

content areas as history, anthropology, sociology, political science, economics, geography, American Indian education, and drug/alcohol education. A basic theme was stated at the top of a content section and then goals were listed. Some attempt was made to sequence instruction as there was a code showing introduction, reinforcement, and mastery of the objectives. The objectives whether skill, affective, or knowledge were all listed together. While there was a separate section devoted to problem-solving and critical-thinking skills, these skill designations and sub-categories were for the entire curriculum—not just the social studies.

Content: The recording of items found through the content analysis was completed for entry, or introduction, level only as all skills were to be reinforced and maintained through higher grades. One problem with content analysis for this guide was the repetitive use of broad, ambiguous terms - such as "describe" - to introduce objective statements. The verb "describe" can mean the student is expected to define an item, tell how something happened, tell what the characteristics of something, or explain a concept. Only the learning objectives were subjected to content analysis; that is, the separate section devoted to problem-solving and critical-thinking was not "coded" because this information did not specify learning objectives for the social studies. Overall, the content analysis revealed a nearly equal amount of attention in the guide to both Thinking Skills and Participation Skills. That was unusual as most states' guides that were analyzed tended to favor the Thinking Skills especially Data Gathering. At grades K - 3, South Dakota gave more attention to the Participation Skills especially the interpersonal skills; material for grades 4 - 6 showed more attention to Data Gathering especially in compiling, organizing, and evaluating; grades 7 - 9 showed an almost equal amount of attention to both Decision Making and Interpersonal Skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - South Dakota defined a skill as a process "which will result in observable behavior" ("South Dakota," 1984, May, p. 109). South Dakota also made a statement concerning citizenship education and cited "problem solving and critical thinking skills...as examples of generic educational outcomes needed to prepare students for the future ("South Dakota," 1984, May, p. 86).
2. Classification - (a) This state categorized skills, including the problem solving and critical thinking skills, for use in curriculum generally, not just for the social studies; (b) The skills were listed together with knowledge and affective instructional goals the for content areas.
3. Organization - (a) South Dakota organized material in grade clusters: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 9 and 10 - 12. (b) See content note above.

Tennessee

Statement: Tennessee's guide, Social Studies Curriculum Framework - 9 through 12, was designed as a basis for developing social studies curricular guides for teachers of secondary courses (1984, November, Preface).

Format: Skills were not included in this guide. The format began with content area designation, grade level recommendations, credits for graduation, and then items were listed under the headings of Concepts and Content.

Content: There were incidental references to skills; however, such references

were tied to content goals. The skill verbs were repetitive and ambiguous leaving doubt as to purpose of the objectives.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS: No information was found. See above comments.

Texas

Statement: The Texas guide, Social Studies, Texas and United States History, provided no statement of purpose; however, a cover letter from the state's Social Studies Director indicated that the material was from the statewide mandated core curriculum..

Format: The format was a very long outline (similar to Montana's format). The skills were specified as either Geography or Social Studies Skills. The guide appeared to be separated from a larger outline (not provided to the researcher), which probably encompassing other subject areas as well. The material was confusing to read as the rules of outlining were not followed; that is, rather than use roman numerals, capitalized letters, and then arabic numbers (I.- A.- 1.-), the form used was backward: (a)- (1)- (A)-. It was difficult to determine, therefor, which objectives were supposed to be emphasized for learning.

Content: Overall the content analysis revealed that Data Gathering especially map and location skills dominated K - 6, while grade 7 - 8 showed a fairly equal amount of attention to Data Gathering, Intellectual, and Interpersonal Skills and had the most items that were coded. For grades 9 - 12, map skills dominated the objectives.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - No separate skills definition was identified.
2. Classification - (a) Texas used two skills designations: Geography and Social Studies Skills ("Social Studies," undated, pp. 2 - 6). (b) Although these categories are specified, they were outlined together with content objectives.
3. Organization - (a) Texas organized material at K, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 - 8, 9 - 12; however, the skills were not organized separate from content goals. (b) See content note above.

Utah

Statement: Utah's guide, Section D - Social Studies, provided no statement of purpose.

Format: Utah used two formats. Curriculum was organized first as core curriculum for the social studies in grade clusters, i. e. K - 3 and included course description. Then, each grade was organized in a one column format sectioned by headings: Standards and Objectives. The Standards were broadly stated goals. The Objectives were numbered statements specifying content and skills to be learned.

Content: Overall, the Thinking Skills were given the most emphasis K - 12. Data Gathering, especially map and location skills, were identified as the most important skills K - 12. Overall, coding analysis for grades K - 8 revealed that grades 3 and 7 had the most attention to the skills. There were three required courses designated for grades 9 - 12 and all three were content-

analyzed. More skills were identified for grades 9 - 12 than for K - 8. Also, grades 9 - 12 had an overall even distribution of emphasis. In comparison, most states guides showed little attention to skills at grades 9 - 12.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - None provided.
2. Classification - (a) No classification of the "skills" was provided.
(b) Utah's skills were listed generally within the objectives which included knowledge objectives as well.
3. Organization - (a) Utah organized material within grade clusters: K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, and 9 - 12 as to course description; (b) Utah also organized material at each grade level within K - 6; and by specific courses 9 - 12.

Vermont

Statement: Vermont's elementary school material was introduced as a flexible framework to provide local educators with concepts, skills, and content so that localities can develop and revise individual course scope and sequence meeting state standards: "The purpose of this framework is to establish some general parameters for a social studies scope and sequence, with emphasis on the K-12 development of concepts, skills and content. It is intended to be used by local educators involved in social studies curriculum development and revision" ("Framework - K - 8," 1986, no page numbers)

Format: Overall, the two Vermont guides, elementary and secondary, were large, one page documents folded twice to page size with no page numbers. Learning objectives were designated under content categories i. e. Geography, History, and Economics. Grade designations appeared at the left of each large page.

Content: Overall, Data Gathering received the most emphasis in both guides. At grade cluster K - 3 there was special attention to map and interpersonal skills; at 4 - 6 few skills were coded (usually a heavy spot for skills); at 7 - 8 emphasis was on map and research skills; while at 9 - 12 there was the most emphasis for comparing and contrasting.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Vermont's guides did not have skill statements nor did they specify or list skills as such; however, the researcher noted skills within content designations.
2. Classification - (a) No classification of the "skills" was supplied.
(b) Vermont's skills were listed within content objectives under subject areas.
3. Organization - (a) Vermont organized grades as K - 3, 4 - 6, 7 - 8, and 9 - 12. Vermont organized material, not skills, under subject areas. (b) See content note above.

Virginia

Statement: Virginia's superintendent stated that the Standards of Learning Objectives for Virginia Public Schools - Social Studies guide provided an instruction framework which "includes objectives which will help students acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes believed necessary for further

education and employment. The basis for the Standards of Learning Program is an objective adopted by the Board of Education in June, 1981. The objective reads as follows: Basic skills and knowledge to be expected of students at each developmental level will be identified and published for K through grade 12... Assessment instruments for use in teaching and remediating will be made available to those school divisions which do not have such instruments of their own" (1983, January, p. i).

Format: A single column format headed by grade level designation, content, plus a program description introduces numbered objectives. Each numbered item included a broad learning objective followed by a descriptive statement that specified and/or clarified the meaning of the broader objective.

Content: Every grade level, K - 12, included at least one skills objective not tied to content. Overall, emphasis was on Data Gathering K - 12. Map skills received the most attention, K - 12, followed by non-print material such as charts, graphs, political cartoons. Grades K - 3 had equal attention given to Participation and Interpersonal Skills especially having respect for others. Grades 4 - 6 had the least attention overall to skills. Grade 12 had the most items coded regarding skills; while grades 7, 8, 9, and 10 had more skill designations than any single elementary grade level. Grades 9, 10, and 12 had the most equal distribution of skills.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. Definitions - There was no specific definition for the skills in the Virginia state guide; however, there was a statement relative to the skills. In the foreword message, the state superintendent referred to learning objectives designed to help students gain the knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for future education and employment ("Standards of Learning," 1983, January, Foreword).
2. Classification - (a) In a chart separate from the actual learning objectives, Virginia classified skills as: (1) Map and Globe Skills, (2) Chart/Graph—Picture/Cartoon Skills, (3) Time/Date Skills, (4) Study Skills, (5) Inquiry/Group Skills ("Standards of Learning," 1982, January, p. 29 - 31). (b) No classification designations appeared within the main body of the guide; skills were part of the learning objectives.
3. Organization - (a) The State of Virginia designated skills within the learning objectives at every grade level, K - 12. (b) See content note above.

West Virginia

Statement: West Virginia's Social Studies Program of Study provided no overall statement of intent.

Format: West Virginia's format was similar in style to Oklahoma and Virginia's. A single column format headed by the title of Learning Outcomes-The Learner Will: was followed by numbered objectives for each grade level K-12. There were brief paragraph course descriptions of content and concept goals. The skills were not separated but were part of the general content objectives.

Content: Overall, West Virginia's guide had more Data Gathering and Participation skills than anything else. Under Data Gathering, there were more

map and globe designations; and there were more items that fit the broad umbrella of Participation Skills. Analyzing this guide proved challenging because there was excessive repetition of broad and vague terminology; for example, at level 4, the phrase "demonstrate knowledge" began 12 out of 22 learning objectives (undated, p. E1/V5). Some broad skill objectives were repeated word for word at different grade levels; i.e. "apply reading skills in content area" (U.S. History 9 - 12). The reading skills in the content area are numerous and the researcher wondered which skill or skills were being touted for use.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - There was no definition or statement regarding the skills in the West Virginia materials.
2. Classification - No classification of the skills was provided
3. Organization - The grade levels were grouped as K - 4, 5 - 8, 9 - 12; but the skills were not organized as such. However, skills were identified as part of the learning objectives at every grade K through 8, and within the required courses 9 - 12.

Wisconsin

Statement: The Wisconsin publication, A Guide to Curriculum Planning in Social Studies, was designed to help educators develop curriculum programs and projects focused on citizenship education (1986, Foreword).

Format: First, there was a brief course description, short lists of illustrative objectives, and suggested methods and activities for each grade level. Then, a two column format entitled "Topics" and "Concepts/Key Ideas" was used to present model program descriptions for each grade level. Topics were sub-divided into broad questions a student might ask, i.e. What is expected of me at school? Then under Concepts/ Key Ideas, words such as Respect, Protection, Responsibility, followed the question ("A Guide," 1986, pp. 35 - 36).

Content: Overall, there were more skills identified under Data Gathering than any other area. Specifically, skills relative to map and globe and communicating orally and in writing received the most attention.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Wisconsin's guide included a statement relative to skills: "A central goal of the social studies program is the development of reflective thinking and reasoning. It is important that students learn to conceptualize and connect ideas and knowledge with beliefs and civic participation ("A Guide," 1986, p. 12).
2. Classification - (a) Wisconsin, in a separate section (Part 3) from the model learning objectives, classified skills under the umbrella of thinking and reasoning. As in several other guides with separate sections or charts on the skills, there was no clear connection to the actual recommended learning objectives in Part 2 of the guide. (b) This guide proceeded on the assumption that the skills focused upon applied to all subject areas not just the social studies ("A Guide," 1986, p. 106).

3. Organization - (a) The skills were not organized as such; however, skills were identified in learning objectives K through grade 11. (b) See content note above.

Wyoming

Statement: The Wyoming state guide, Wyoming Standards of Excellence for the Social Studies, "contains the essential elements for a well-planned, comprehensive social studies program. The document is designed to help school districts meet the social studies needs of their students and communities. Because conditions vary from school system to school system, each system should determine, on the basis of local conditions, needs, capabilities and desires, the best ways to use the standards to improve its current social studies program" (1982, p. 1).

Format: There was no section for learning objectives. Wyoming has published a small 15 page booklet that outlines the "essentials of education, fundamentals of an exemplary social studies program, essentials of the social studies curriculum programs, and program organization and management" (Footnote credit indicates that the material is based on The Essentials of the Social Studies, National Council for the Social Studies, 1981). There was a brief appendix of relevant state statutes and policies pertaining to courses of study, minimum competencies for high school graduation, accreditation regulations for social studies, and teacher certification requirements. The booklet included a note that local communities may send to the Wyoming State Department of Education for material on how to develop local curriculum.

Content: Basically, this booklet contained no learning or skill development objectives that could be content analyzed. The broad goals stated were a copy of the NCSS essentials upon which the instrument for this study was based. The researcher noted the obvious endorsement of the NCSS skill designations. While encouraging a great deal of local control in curriculum creative efforts, it should be noted that Wyoming statute 21-9-102 (cited in the Appendix) required the passage of a satisfactory examination on the principles of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Wyoming prior to graduation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

1. Definitions - Wyoming provided a skills statement: "Interdependence of skills and content is a central concept of a balanced education. People use a combination of skills, knowledge, and feelings to come to terms with the changing world. In all subjects, students develop skills in using languages and other symbol systems; they develop the ability to reason; they undergo experiences that lead to emotional, social and aesthetic maturity. Students master these skills and abilities through observing, reading, talking and writing about science, mathematics, social studies, the arts and other aspects of our intellectual, social, and cultural heritage" (Wyoming Standards," 1982, p. 3).
2. Classification - (a) Wyoming's classification of the skills was the same as the NCSS Essentials: (1) Thinking Skills - data processing skills, intellectual skills, decision making skills, intrapersonal and interpersonal skills; (2) Participation Skills; (3) Civic Action ("Wyoming Standards," 1982, pp. 6 - 8). (b) Wyoming's classification system was part of broad, general curriculum goals.

3. Organization - (a) Wyoming chose not to organize the skills by grade levels. (b) No information provided.

Appendix F

Tally Results for all Coded Guides

This information was taken from the Data Summary Sheets for Appendix C1. Each number represents the number of states that mentioned a skill at least one time. Results, as far as grade levels are concerned, are skewed in that many states placed skills at the ends of grade clusters, such as K - 3, or in specific grades as exit expectations, such as grades 8 and 12. The benefit of this chart is that it shows an overall picture of the coding marks that were made, and areas of the instrument that received little or no attention overall.

Apdx. C 1 Numbers & Letters: ¹	GRADE LEVELS												T O T A L S	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
I.					1									1
A.		1		2	1		2			2			3	11
1.	1	5	1	2	2	1	1							13
2.	1	3	3	12	4	10	9	2	3	1	3	1	2	54
a.				2	2	1	2	2	3	2	1			15
b.				1	3	2	2		5		1	3	5	22
3.		1		8	1	4	10	3	4	2	3	2	5	43
4.			1	3		3	3	3	5	1	2	1		22

¹See page 148 for Appendix C 1 - the measuring instrument for this study.

Apdx. C 1 Numbers & Letters:		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
a.	5	13	12	19	14	15	17	10	12	2	4	2	7	132	
(1)	1	6	4	13	7	6	8	1	9	1	2	1	3	62	
(2)			1	2			1							4	
(3)				1			2							3	
b.	1	5	3	9	6	12	9	3	11	1	4	1	4	69	
c.	3	5	4	11	5	7	8	5	8	1	2	3	2	64	
5.	1	4	1	7	3	4	7	3	7	2		2	4	45	

Total: 560

B.						1								1
1.		2	1	5	1	3	8	1	4	1	3	1	4	34
2.		4	1	8	3	3	5		9	2			2	37
3.		1		1	2	1	2		3	1	1	1	2	15
4.				5	5	6	7	1	9	2	4	4	6	49
5.				1			3	1		1			1	7
6.		1			1	1	2		3	1	2	1	2	14
7.				1	1	2	2	2	4		5	1	5	23

180

Apdx. C 1 Numbers & Letters:		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	C.	2	2	2	9		3	5	2	3	3	4	2	7	44
	1.		2		9		2	6	2	3	1	3	1	8	37
	2.		1		3			6		4	2	1		3	20
	3.	1	1	1	2			1		3	2			1	12
	4.				1			2			1				4
	5.					1	2			1	1	1		2	8
	6.	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	1	5	2	1		3	25
															150
	II.	7	9	5	13	3	5	9	2	7	3	1		6	70
	A.	1	1	1	4			7	1	2	1	1		1	
	1.	4	2	1	5	1	1	3		3	3	2	1	2	28
	2.		2		1			2		2		1		1	9
	3.	1	4	2	6	2	1	5	2	3	2	2		1	31

Apdx. C 1
Numbers &
Letters:

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
B.	7	5	6	9	1	1	7	2	3	3	1		2	47
1.				4	1		2		2	1			2	12
2.	5	7	4	9	2	4	5	1	1	3	2	1	3	47
3.														
4.		1		1			1		2				1	6
5.														

APPENDIX G

TABLE OF INFORMATION FROM EACH STATES' GUIDE

Summary Of Data Recorded Via Attachment C 1

STATE	Organization of Grades ¹	Total ²	Percents I & II ³	Percents Sub-Heads I.A., etc. ⁴	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
AK	1-3,4-6, 7,8,9-12	59	I. 76 II. 24	I.A. 73 B. 16 C. 11 II.A. 20 B. 80	I.A.4.a. Map and Globe; II.B. Group Work	1-3 Group Work;4-6 Map and Globe;7 Maps; 8 Research; 9-12 Data Gather	4-6
AZ	8/12	28	I. 64 II. 36	I.A. 67 B. 22 C. 11 II.A. 20 B.-80	I.A.4.a. Map Work II.B.Group Work	8 Map Work 12 Intel- lectual Skills	8
AR	4-6,9-11	115	I. 99 II. 01	I.A. 99 B. C. II.A. B. 01	I.A.4.a. & c. Map and Time Order	4 - 11 Map and Globe	4

¹This column shows how each state organized the grade levels.

²This column shows the total number of tally, or code, marks recorded in the content analysis process for the state's guide.

³This column relates to the headings on the measuring instrument or Appendix C 1. Roman numerals I and II identify the percentage for each states' guide of tally, or code, marks recorded for "Thinking Skills" and "Participation Skills" respectively.

⁴This column shows the percentages for the sub-headings on the measuring instrument, Appendix C 1. Both of the main sections, parts I and II, represent 100% respectively; for example, Alaska had 73% of the tally marks recorded in part I for Data Gathering Skills, while 80% of the tally marks in part II were for "Work effectively with others..."

STATE	Organization of Grades	Total	Percents I & II	Percents Sub-Heads I.A. etc.	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
CA	No Grade Designations	28	I. 64 II. 36	I.A. 44 B. 39 C. 17 II.A. 70 B. 30	Equally Distributed on instrument	No Data	No Data
CT	No Data						
DE	1-3,4-6, 7-8,9-12	63	I. 78 II. 22	I.A. 86 B. 08 C. 06 II.A. 64 B. 36	I.A.2 Data Gather; I.A.4.a. Map and Globe	1-3,7-8, 9-12 Data Gather; 4-6 Maps	1-3
FL	3/5/8/12 Exit Competencies	57	I. 96 II. 04	I.A. 53 B. 27 C. 20 II.A. 04 B.	I.A.4.a. Maps;B.4 Infer & Conclude C.2. Consequences of Choice	3, 5 Data Gather & Maps; 8 Intellectual Skills	5
GA	No Data						
HI	3/6/8/10/12 Exit Competencies	48	I. 52 II. 48	I.A. 36 B. 24 C. 40 II.A. 78 B. 22	II.A.1 & 3;Understanding Self;Value of Pluralistic Society	K Communicate; 1-7 Maps & Participation Skills	3
ID	K-9	53	I. 91 II. 09	I.A. 100 B. C. II.A. 60 B. 40	I.A.4.a. & 1; Maps Location	K-6 Map Skills	4,5,6
IL	3/6/8 & 10 Outcome Goals	88	I. 98 II. 02	I.A. 76 B. 15 C. 8 II.A. 100 B.	I.A.4.a. & 1 Maps Location	Same as "5"	3

STATE	Organization of Grades	Total	Percents I & II	Percents Sub-Heads I.A., etc.	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
KS	K-12 Same Skills; Emphasis Differs	36	I. 86 II. 14	I.A. 46 B. 35 C. 20 II.A. 40 B. 60	I.B.1 Compare & Determine Bias	No Data	No Data
KY	K-8,11 Mastery Expectations	69	I. 99 II. 01	I.A. 54 B. 13 C. 01 II.A. B.	I.A.4.a. Maps	K-7 Maps 8 Infer & Conclude	3,11
LA	K-5: Skills Coded Where Introduced	26	I. 85 II. 15	I.A. 55 B. 41 C. 05 II.A. 25 B. 75	I.B.1 & 4 Compare & Deter- mine Bias; Infer & Conclude	K-4 Data Gather 5 Intel- lectual Skills	5
ME	K-12	193	I. 79 II. 21	I.A. 65 B. 19 C. 16 II.A. 32 B. 68	I.A.4.a. & c. Maps and Time Order I.B.4 Infer & Conclude II.A. Civic Skills; B. Respect for Group	K Group Skills;1- 3,9 Maps; 4-7 Data Gather; 8,12 Intel- lectual Skills	5
MD	No Data						
MA	No Data						
MI	K-3,4-6, 7-9	86	I. 53 II. 47	I.A. 37 B. 22 C. 41 II.A. 63 B. 37	I.A. Data Gather; I.C. Decision Process; II.Group Process	K-3 Group Skills; 4-6 Same; 7-9 Same	7-9

STATE	Organization of Grades	Total	Percents I & II	Percents Sub-Heads I.A. etc.	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
MN	No Data	50	I. 62 II. 38	I.A. 42 B. 45 C. 13 II.A. 58 B. 42	I.A.3 Gather & Evaluate I.B Intel- lectual Skills II. Self & Others	No Data	No Data
MO	3,6,8,10 Minimum Comp. & State Test Related	66	I. 86 II. 14	I.A. 67 B. 19 C. 14 II.A. 78 B. 22	I.A.4.a. & 1 Map & Locate II. Civic Rules	3,6,8,10 Map & Locate	6
MT	Insignificant Data						
NH	Insignificant Data						
NM	1,2,3,4, 5,6,7,8	90	I. 88 II. 12	I.A. 100 B. C. II.A. 50 B. 50	I.A.4.a. & 1 Map & Locate	1-8 Map & Locate	2
NY	1,3,6	236	I. 60 II. 40	I.A. 66 B. 30 C. 04 II.A. 68 B. 32	I.A.2. Locate Informa- tion; I.B.2 Classify- ing;II.A Others' Point of View; B. Group Work	1 Group Work; 3 Classify- ing; 6 Locating Informa- tion	6
NC	Insignificant Data						
OH	Insignificant Data						

STATE	Organization of Grades	Total	Percents I & II	Percents Sub-Heads I.A. etc.	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
OK	1,2,3,4,5 6-8,9-12	66	I. 74 II. 26	I.A. 55 B. 33 C. 12 II.A. 94 B. 06	I.A.4.a Maps; I.B.1 & 4 Point of View & Infer; I.C. Decision Process	5 Maps; 6-8 Maps & Locate; 9-12 Decision Process	6-8, 9-12
PA	4,5,9-10	25	I. 72 II. 28	I.A. 61 B. 28 C. 11 II.A. 58 B. 42	I.A. Data Gathering II.Group Work	4 Data Gathering 9-10 Research	9-10
RI	Insignificant Data						
SC	K,1,2,3, 4,5,6,7, 8,9-12	70	I. 84 II. 16	I.A. 68 B. 25 C. 07 II.A. 45 B. 55	I.A.4.a. Maps;B.7 Research II. Civic Skills	K-6 Data Gather;9 -12 Civic Skills	4,5
SD	K-3,4-6, 7-9 Coded Skills at Grade In- troduced	89	I. 53 II. 47	I.A. 45 B. 21 C. 34 II.A. 40 B. 60	I.A.3 Gather & Evaluate Info; 4.a. Maps;I.C. Decision Process; II.B. View Point of Others	K-3 Inter- Personal Skills;4- 6 Group Skills & Gather Data; 7-9 Group Work	4,6
TN	Insignificant Data						
TX	K,1,2,3, 4,5,6,7- 8,9-12	51	I. 71 II. 29	I.A. 81 B. 14 C. 02 II.A. 33 B. 67	I.A.4.a. Maps & Locate; II.Group Work	K-3 Maps & Group Work;4-6 Data Gather;7- 8 Infer & Conclude	7-8

STATE	Organization of Grades	Total	Percents I & II	Percents Sub-Heads I.A. etc.	Dominant Skill(s) Cited	Dominant Skill by Grades	Dominant Grade for Work in Skills
UT	K,1,2,3 4,5,6,7- 8,9-12	108	I. 81 II. 19	I.A. 74 B. 17 C. 09 II.A. 55 B. 45	I.A.4.a & 1 Map & Locate; I.B. In- tellect- Skills;	K-6 Map & Locate; 7-8 Data Gather; 9-12 Data Gather	9-12
VT	K-3,4-6, 7-8,9-12	51	I. 80 II. 20	I.A. 76 B. 17 C. 07 II.A. 40 B. 60	I.A.4.a. Maps	K-3 Maps & Group Work; 7-8 Data Gather	K-3
VA	K-12	103	I. 80 II. 20	I.A. 65 B. 18 C. 17 II.A. 40 B. 60	I.A.4.a Maps;b. Non-print Media;B. Infer & Conclude	K-2 Group Work; 3-6 Maps;7,8, 9,12 Data Gather;10 Intel- lectual Skills	12
WV	K,1,2,3, 4,5,6,7, 8,9-12	55	I. 63 II. 37	I.A. 78 B. 10 C. 12 II.A. 52 B. 48	I.A.4.a. Maps;II. Partici- pation Skills	K-7 Maps & Parti- cipation Skills;9- 12 Data Gather	5,12
WS	K,1,2,3, 4,5,6,7, 8,9,10, 11	85	I. 80 II. 20	I.A. 78 B. 10 C. 12 II.A. 67 B. 33	I.A.4.a. Maps;I.A. 5. Commu- nication; II. Group Work	K-3 Maps 4-6 Data Gather; 10 Data Gather	4
WY	No Data						

APPENDIX H

Bibliography of States' Curriculum Guides

Alaska

Elementary Social Studies - Alaska Curriculum Guide. (June, 1986). (Available from Phyllis E. Marchese, Correspondence Study Curriculum Coordinator, Office of Curriculum Services, Alaska State Department of Education, Pouch GA, Juneau, AK 99811).

Secondary Social Studies - Alaska Curriculum Guide. (June, 1986). (Available from: see above).

Arizona

Essential Skills List. (June, 1984). (Available from Gary Emanuel, Deputy Associate Superintendent, Arizona Department of Education, 1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, AZ 85007).

Arkansas

Arkansas Public School Course Content - Grades 4 - 6. (undated). (Available from Cheryl Pagan, Social Studies Specialist, Arkansas Department of Education, 4 Capitol Mall, Room 405-B, Little Rock, AR 72201).

American History. (undated). (Available from: see above).

California

History - Social Science Framework For California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve. (1981). (Available from Harvey Miller, History - Social Sciences Unit, California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, CA 95814).

Model Curriculum Standards - Grades 9 Through 12. (1985). (Available from: see above).

Connecticut

Design For Excellence. (December 4, 1985). (Available from Daniel W. Gregg, Social Studies Consultant, State Department of Education, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106).

A Guide To Curriculum Development In Social Studies. (1981). (Available from: see above).

Delaware

Social Studies Content Standards. (undated). (Available from Lewis E. Huffman, Supervisor of Social Studies, State Department of Public Instruction, Townsend Building, Federal Street at Loockermann Street, Dover, DE 19901).

Florida

Student Performance-Standards Of Excellence For Florida Schools In Mathematics, Science, Social Studies And Writing. (1984-85 through 1988-89). (Available from Sidney Henry, Performance Standards Consultant, Florida Department of Education, Knott Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301).

Florida School Laws And State Board Of Education Rules Relative To Statewide Minimum Student Performance Standards, Standards Of Excellence And Other Related Areas. (undated). (Available from: see above).

Georgia

Basic Curriculum Content For Georgia's Public Schools. (1985). (Available from Nannette McGee, Social Studies Consultant, Georgia Department of Education, 1952 Twin Towers East, Atlanta, GA 30334).

Hawaii

Elementary Social Studies Program Guide. (July, 1981). (Available from Elaine M. Takenaka, Social Studies Educational Specialist, Department of Education, 189 Lunalilo Home Road, 2nd Floor, Honolulu, HI 96825).

Secondary Social Studies Program Guide. (September, 1986). (Available from: see above).

Idaho

Pilot Program - State Department Of Education Of Education - Blaine County School District #61 - Social Studies Curriculum. (1984-85). (Available from Orville Reddington, State Department of Education, 650 W. State Street, Boise, ID 83720).

Secondary School Courses of Study. (1985). (Available from: see above).

Illinois

Illinois Outcome Statements And Model Learning Objectives For Social Studies. (March, 1986). (Available from Ann M. Pictor, Educational Consultant, Illinois Street, Board of Education, 100 North First Street, Springfield, IL 62777).

Kansas

Guidelines For Program Development—Social Studies. (1984). (Available from Richard D. Leighty, Social Studies Specialist, Kansas State Department of Education, 120 East 10th Street, Topeka, KS 66612).

Student Learning Outcomes For The Social Studies - A Procedure For Developing A Kindergarten-Through-Grade-Twelve Social Studies Program. (1981). (Available from: see above).

Kentucky

Social Studies. (August, 1986). (Available from Glenda Donoho, Social Studies Director, State Department of Education, 1832 Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, KY 40601).

Louisiana

Louisiana Social Studies Curricular Goals. (undated). (Available from Louis J. Nicolosi, Social Studies Section Chief, State Department of Education, P.O. Box 94064, Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064).

Maine

A Social Studies Framework - The Social Studies Program, K - 12. (July, 1985). (Available from Joseph Pecoraro, Department of Educational Cultural Services, State House Station 23, Augusta, ME 04333).

Scope And Sequence For The Social Studies - Report Of The National Council For The Social Studies. (undated). (Available from: see above).

Maryland

Social Studies - A Maryland Curricular Framework. (undated). (Available from Margaret Holiday-Crews, Specialist in Social Studies, Maryland State Department of Education, 200 West Baltimore Street, Baltimore, MD 21201).

Massachusetts

The Final Report Of The Study Committee On American History And Citizenship Education. (27 April 1982). (Available from George S. Perry, Jr., Director of Student Services, Massachusetts Department of Education, 1385 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169).

Michigan

Essential Performance Objectives For Social Studies. (1984). (Available from John M. Chapman, Social Studies Specialist, Michigan Department of Education, P.O. Box 30008, Lansing, MI 48909).

Minnesota

Some Essential Learner Outcomes In Social Studies. (Spring, 1985). (Available from Roger K. Wangen, Social Studies Specialist, Minnesota Department of Education, 640 Capitol Square Building, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, MN 55101).

Social Studies Student Goals, Objectives, And Student Outcomes. (1986).
(A revision available from: see above).

Missouri

A Guide To Social Studies Curriculum Development For Missouri Educators. (1980). (Available from Warren Solomon, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, P.O. Box 480, Jefferson City, MO 65102).

Social Studies/Civics - Revised. (undated). (Available from: see above).

Montana

Montana Rural Education Curriculum Guide. (1984). (Available from Edward Eschler, Social Studies Specialist, Office of Public Instruction, State Capitol, Helena, MT 59620).

New Hampshire

Standards & Procedures For New Hampshire Public Elementary School Approval - Kindergarten - Grade 8. (1986). (Available from Carter B. Hart, Jr., Division of Instructional Services, State Office Park South, 101 Pleasant Street, Concord, NH 03301).

Standards For Approval Of New Hampshire Public High Schools - Grades 9 - 12. (December, 1984). (Available from: see above).

New Mexico

Social Studies Education For New Mexico Schools. (undated). (Available from Joseph D. Baca, Department of Education, Education Building, DeVargas and Don Gaspar Streets, Santa Fe, NM 87501-2786).

New York

Incorporating Skills Into Social Studies Programs K - 12. (1984). (Available from Donald H. Bragaw, Bureau of Social Studies Education Chief, N.Y. State Education Department, Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12234).

Social Studies Program - Grade 1. (1984). (Available from: see above).

Social Studies Program - Grade 3. (1984). (Available from: see above).

Social Studies Program - Grade 6. (1984). (Available from: see above).

Social Studies - United States History and Government. (1986) (Available from: see above).

North Carolina

Standard Course Of Study - Social Studies. (June, 1985). (Available from John D. Ellington, Division of Social Studies Director, Department of Public Instruction, Education Building, Raleigh, NC 27611).

Process Model For Course Of Study. (1983). (Available from: see above).

Ohio

Minimum Standards For Elementary And Secondary Schools. (1983). (Available from Kent J. Minor, Social Studies Consultant, Ohio Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, 65 S. Front Street, Columbus, OH 43215).

Oklahoma

Suggested Learner Outcomes - Language Arts, Math, Reading, Science, Social Studies - Grades 1 - 8. (1984). (Available from Rita Geiger, Social Studies Specialist, State Department of Education, Oliver Hodge Building, 2500 N. Lincoln, Room 382, Oklahoma City, OK 73105).

Suggested Learner Outcomes - Grades 9 - 12. (July, 1985). (Available from: see above).

Pennsylvania

A Program In American And Pennsylvania Studies. (1983) (Available from Robert A. Wingert, Bureau of Curriculum & Instruction, State Department of Education, 333 Market Street, Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333).

The Use Of Social Studies Concepts In Curriculum Development. (1985). (Available from: see above).

Rhode Island

Social Studies Curriculum. (undated). (Available from H. Wells "Red" French, Adult Programs Coordinator, Rhode Island Department of Education, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908).

South Carolina

Outline Of High School Credit Courses. (May, 1984). (Available from Margaret B. Walden, Social Studies Consultant, State Department of Education, 801 Rutledge Building, Columbia, SC 29201).

Sequential List Of Skills. (undated) (Available from: see above).

South Dakota

South Dakota Social Studies Curriculum Guide K - 12. (September, 1981).
(Available from Eugene E. Fracek, Social Studies Consultant, Division of
Elementary and Secondary Education, Kneip Building, Pierre, SD 57501).

Tennessee

Social Studies Curriculum Framework - 9 Through 12. (November, 1984).
(Available from Bruce Opie, Social Studies, Tennessee Department of
Education, 214 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, TN 37219).

Texas

Social Studies, Texas And United States History - K Through 12. (undated).
(Available from Louis Grigar, Social Studies Director, Texas Education
Agency, 1701 N. Congress, Austin, Texas 78701).

Utah

Section D - Social Studies. (undated). (Available from Boone C. Colegrove,
Social Studies Specialist, Utah State Office of Education, 250 East 500
South, Salt Lake City, UT 84111).

Vermont

Framework For The Development Of A Social Studies Scope And Sequence - K
Through 8. (1986). (Available from Bill Dunkelberger, Social Studies
Consultant, Vermont State Department of Education, Montpelier, VT 05602).

Framework For The Development Of A Social Studies Scope And Sequence - 9
Through 12. (1986). (Available from: see above).

Virginia

Standards Of Learning Objectives For Virginia Public Schools - Social Studies.
(January, 1983). (Available from the Associate Director for Social Studies,
Department of Education, Richmond, VA 23216).

West Virginia

Social Studies Program Of Study. (undated). (Available from Social Studies
Coordinator, West Virginia Department of Education, Capitol Complex, Rm B
-337, 1900 Washington Street East, Charleston, WV 25305).

Wisconsin

A Guide To Curriculum Planning In Social Studies. (1986). (Available from
H. Michael Hartoonian, Social Studies Supervisor, Department of Public
Instruction, 125 S. Webster Street, P.O. Box 7841, Madison, WI 53707).

Wyoming

Wyoming Standards Of Excellence For The Social Studies. (1982). (Available from Roger O. Hammer, Social Studies Consultant, Wyoming State Department of Education, Hathaway Building, Cheyenne, WY 82002).

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 1 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 2 of 3**

**The three page vita has been
removed from the scanned
document. Page 3 of 3**