DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 894 SO 000 071

AUTHOR Tom, Alan R.; Applegate, Jimmie R.
TITLE The Teaching Workshop: An Approach to Implementing New Social Studies Curricula.
INSTITUTION Washington Univ., St. Louis, Mo. Graduate Inst. of Education.
PUB DATE 69
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Observation Techniques, *Curriculum Development, Educational Objectives, Inservice Teacher Education, Lesson Plans, Microteaching, *Social Studies, Teacher Attitudes, *Teacher Education, Teacher Evaluation, *Teacher Workshops
IDENTIFIERS Saint Louis Teacher Workshops, Structure of Knowledge

ABSTRACT

The failure of teachers to comprehend basic curriculum objectives and their unwillingness or inability to act in accordance with these objectives are severe impediments to the successful use of new materials, according to the authors. They discuss these impediments and conventional solutions as an introduction to their suggested approach: teacher workshops incorporating actual practice with new materials. The three components of the workshops are: examination of assumptions and planning for teaching, practice teaching, and analysis of teaching. Also discussed are the role of the workshop director, equipment and facilities, recruitment of teachers, and evaluation of the St. Louis teacher workshops. A ten-item bibliography is included. (DJB)

THE TEACHING WORKSHOP: AN APPROACH TO IMPLEMENTING NEW SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULA

Alan R. Tom and Jimmie R. Applegate

Washington University

The Problem

Many of the developers of new social studies curricula are concerned that teachers are not prepared to teach the new curricula.[1] This concern may appear to be exaggerated because teachers, though often not trained in curriculum development, are experienced in adapting materials written by others. Few teachers follow a

---

[1]The concern of curriculum developers is expressed in a number of ways. Several of the projects--for example, the Anthropology Curriculum Study Project, the Harvard Social Studies Project, the Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Project--have created demonstration films that can be used for teacher training. The Greater Cleveland Social Science Program has developed an in-service teacher education package, and the creation of teacher education materials is the primary focus this year of the High School Geography Project. The Amherst History Project, that for several years has sponsored in-service training workshops, is currently cooperating with selected school districts to foster curriculum innovation and to provide in-service training for teachers. One project, the Education Development Center, does not permit a school to purchase its materials unless the district is willing to enroll participants in an approved teacher training institute.

textbook page by page; they select from and rearrange the content of a text. Teachers also add to the book's content through supplemental lectures, discussions, and readings.

Yet our experience has been that many, perhaps most, teachers do not feel at ease when they begin teaching materials from one of the curriculum development projects.[2] Some teachers do not know how to conduct lessons comparing and contrasting primary sources; others are disturbed with open-ended discussions, especially if moral issues are being considered. Another common reaction is for teachers to question whether the "community" really wants its youngsters to discuss controversial issues, or to examine carefully the folklore of American history.

Curriculum specialists and supervisors may identify a slightly different set of problems. The authors, for instance, believe that new materials often require an intellectual colleagueship between teacher and students that many teachers are unwilling to establish. That is, curricula based on discovery learning usually assume that teachers as well as students are inquirers, but many teachers are accustomed to being the origin of historical and moral truth. Even if teachers are willing to relinquish a portion of their intellectual authority, they may in practice be unable to carry out their intentions.[3] Another problem is that many

---

[2]The authors, however, are not aware of any formal research that would substantiate the claim.

[3]That some teachers have difficulty changing style has been demonstrated empirically. See John Withall "An Objective Measurement of a Teacher's Classroom Interactions," The Journal of Educational Psychology, 47 (April, 1956), 203-212.

teachers do not understand fully the basic objectives of a new curriculum, nor do they comprehend the rationale for these objectives.[4] In the absence of this knowledge, teachers often experience difficulty in achieving the objectives and in adapting new materials to an ongoing curriculum.

The failure to comprehend basic curriculum objectives and the unwillingness of inability of a teacher to behave consistent with these objectives are severe impediments to the successful use of new materials. These problems are different from rearranging and supplementing content from an established textbook because they involve understanding and accepting a new set of objectives. Accepting the new objectives is especially important if the materials are to be used in ways consistent with the objectives. Clearly a teacher, not sympathetic to the goals of a curriculum based on structure of the discipline, can use "structure" materials to teach for mastery of factual content. Such a potential outcome indicates that teaching new materials may require the teacher to rethink attitudes he holds about the pruposes of social studies instruction.

---

[4] Teachers are not solely to blame; more than one curriculum developer has not made clear either the basic objectives of his curriculum or the rationale for these objectives.

The Conventional Solution

Once a district has adopted new social studies materials,[5] it may organize training sessions to help teachers learn to use the materials. If the district has already scheduled teacher work days prior to the opening of school, one or more of those days may be devoted to discussions of the new materials led by the curriculum director, the social studies supervisor, or a department chairman. Another approach is to devote several of the fall departmental meetings to practical to practical problems associated with teaching the new materials. The authors know one department head who has encouraged teachers to meet daily before school to discuss problems related to teaching social studies materials.

The conventional in-service approach is based on two assumptions: (1) discussion with a knowledgeable person can help teachers identify problems involved in the implementation of a new curriculum, and (2) once the implementation problems are identified, additional discussion can provide the teacher with specific class-

---

[5]Guidelines for selecting among curricula have been developed by the following people: Irving Morrissett and W. Williams Stevens, Jr., "Curriculum Analysis," Social Education, XXXI (October, 1967), 483-86, 489; Alan Tom, "An Approach to Selecting Among Social Studies Curricula," An Occasional Paper of the Metropolitan St. Louis Social Studies Center (St. Louis: The Center, 1969); Louise L. Tyler and M. Frances Klein, Recommendations for Curriculum and Instructional Materials (Los Angeles: University of California, 1967).

room techniques for resolving these problems. Certainly discussion between a department head and his teachers can help the latter understand the goals of a particular curriculum. However, if, as contended earlier, implementation issues involve teacher attitudes as well as understandings, then it is unlikely that these issues can be resolved by discussion.

Even if discussion should lead teachers to change their attitudes toward the purposes of instruction, they may lack the teaching skills to interact with students in ways consistent with their altered attitudes. A teacher, for example, may agree with a basic curriculum goal, the identification and clarification of public issues. Yet he may be unable to realize that goal because he cannot practice appropriate teaching techniques, such as helping students to distinguish between factual and moral issues and using analogies to clarify student positions on public issues. Describing these techniques to teachers does not ensure they will be able to implement them.

Rationale for an Alternate Solution: The Teaching Workshop

When one wants to master a new skill, it is natural to assume that practice is useful. Talking about how to do a new swimming stroke does not assure proficiency in the stroke; sooner or later you must jump into the pool. Moreover, reactions by someone experienced in the stroke can help the swimmer overcome difficulties he has mastering the stroke. Similarly we believe you cannot learn to teach a new curriculum merely by talking to someone experienced

in teaching it. You must teach it yourself. In addition, supervision of the teaching act by someone familiar with the new curriculum should help the teacher identify and overcome initial difficulties.

Practice in teaching, therefore, can be the focal point of an in-service program designed to prepare teachers to teach new curricula.[6] Practice is important because it helps answer the question: Can I teach the new materials? The answer comes in the form of immediate feedback from students as the teacher interacts with them. Feedback concerning the ability of the teacher also comes from reactions to his performance by teacher colleagues and by the leader of the in-service program. These reactions, based on observation, can be called analysis of teaching.

Analysis of teaching is not an end in itself. Analysis of a teacher's performance can provide a basis for either evaluating his competence or discovering areas in which his future performance could be improved. Since in-service programs are designed to improve instruction, the latter use of analysis should be emphasized. Weaknesses in performance discovered through analysis of teaching suggest focal points for planning. The planning for the next day or the next unit must, therefore, take into account the analysis of previous instruction. Preparation for teaching based on the analysis of teaching can be called planning for teaching.

---

[6]Judson Shaplin has made a similar argument for the importance of practice in teaching for pre-service teachers. See Judson T. Shaplin, "Practice in Teaching," Harvard Educational Review, 31 (Winter, 1961), 34-38.

The cycle of teaching-analysis-planning can serve as the core of an in-service program designed to train teachers to use a particular new curriculum. However, as noted earlier, it is also important teachers understand clearly the objectives of a new curriculum.

In addition, we believe that if teachers are to make intelligent use of a new curriculum, they must be aware of its objectives and the assumptions behind the objectives. The examination of assumptions is very difficult because assumptions are abstract and often implicit. In addition there are several types of assumptions. Many of the new curricula, especially those concerned with the structure of the discipline, make assumptions about the nature of knowledge. Other assumptions relate to the psychology of learning; most, if not all, curricula make assumptions concerning the vocabulary level and the conceptual ability of students. Most curricula also make assumptions about the nature of society; for example, an economics curriculum based on the free market model assumes certain relationships among economic factors.[7] The more the teacher is acquainted with the assumptions within a curriculum, the more likely he can teach it effectively.

---

[7]Harold Berlak and Alan Tom suggest several questions which can be asked of any curriculum to clarify some of the assumptions underlying the materials. See Harold Berlak and Alan Tom, "Toward Rational Curriculum Decisions in the Social Studies," The Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 20 (Autumn, 1967), 17-31.

In summary, an in-service program designed to teach teachers to use new curricula should stress teaching, the analysis of teaching, and planning for subsequent teaching. Examination of assumptions contained in a particular curriculum is also an important activity. Since these four activities require a major commitment of time, it is likely that the in-service program will need to occur in the summer. In the St. Louis area we have employed all day sessions for six weeks and have termed the experience a teaching workshop. The next section describes the procedures we have used in conducting teaching workshops.

The Components of a Teaching Workshop and Some Suggestions for Implementation

In order to obtain students for the teaching workshops, the workshops have been associated with summer schools conducted by school districts in the St. Louis area. Most summer schools have a class period from 8:00-10:00 A.M. so that a typical daily workshop schedule is as shown in Table I.

Insert Table I about here

The Examination of Assumptions Component. The component labeled examination of assumptions has been omitted by some workshop directors because of time limitations and because it is difficult to conduct. In most cases, however, the director decided the examination of assumptions was not essential to teaching a new curriculum. Moreover, workshop directors interpreted its meaning in

TABLE I
TIME ALLOCATION IN A TYPICAL WORKSHOP DAY

Activity	Teaching	Analysis of Teaching	Planning for Teaching and Examination of Assumptions
Time	8:00-10:00 A.M.	10:00-12:00 Noon	1:00-3:00 P.M.

different ways. A few followed the definition outlined in this paper: examining assumptions behind the objectives of a curriculum. Other directors have chosen to raise basic issues in social studies education and relate them to a variety of new social studies curricula.

The lack of consensus about the definition and importance of the assumptions component indicates there is no shared view of the relationship between theoretical issues and classroom practice. However, most social studies educators, including those of us who developed the idea of teaching workshops, assume that theory and practice are interrelated. But there are few models that describe how abstract issues are relevant to day-to-day instruction.[8] It is not surprising, therefore, that the workshop directors have had difficulty implementing the examination of assumptions component.

The Teaching Component. Our experience in St. Louis indicates that the workshop director should do most of the teaching for the first week. Most of the teacher-participants will be strangers, not only to each other but also to the director and to workshop procedures. Until a group spirit and a common set of expectations are developed, the workshop tends to run more smoothly if the director does the teaching. The director can also provide a model of

---

[8]James P. Shaver and Harold Berlak, Democracy, Pluralism, and the Social Studies (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968). Issues are defined in introductory essays and explored from a variety of perspectives in selected readings.

teaching behavior that is appropriate to the materials. Moreover, if he analyzes his own teaching first, he may be able to reduce the anxiety many teachers feel about having their teaching examined.

The Analysis of Teaching Component. If classroom teaching is completed by mid-morning, the analysis of teaching period can be scheduled before lunch. Questions that arise as the result of teaching have a sense of urgency for the person who raises them. Not only can this sense of urgency be lost if analysis is delayed, but in addition the concrete events out of which the questions arose become blurred with the passage of time. Delayed analysis tends to lack both passion and specificity.

The analysis of instruction periods should be organized around questions central to measuring successful performance:[9] were the day's objectives attained, were the teaching strategies used by the teacher appropriate to the objectives, what alternative strategies might be more effective in reaching the day's objectives? These questions probably should be preceded by an attempt to describe the teaching, since people tend to perceive social interaction differently. Developing consensus about "what happened" is facilitated by the use of such key questions as: what tasks did the teacher establish for the students, what strategies were employed to accomplish these tasks, how did students

---

[9]It may also be that the most profitable way of examining the assumptions behind a curriculum is to relate these assumptions to specific teaching events.

react to the strategies. These and similar questions should lead to a description of the teaching; the teaching workshop participants can use this description to judge the extent to which the teacher's performance was successful in reaching the objectives.

Judgments of teacher performance, especially if they are negative, should be used as guides for future action. Otherwise, the person whose performance is being examined may see analysis as an attempt to disparage his teaching. Giving analysis of teaching a future orientation also tends to erase the distinction between analysis and planning. Analysis, the review and evaluation of today's teaching, becomes the first step in planning for tomorrow's instruction.

The Planning for Teaching Component. Many of the new curricula do not suggest teaching strategies, and a few do not even provide sutdent materials. Planning, therefore, can be devoted to developing strategies and materials appropriate to the objectives of the curriculum. Even when a curriculum package includes objectives, materials, and strategies, teacher-participants may want to modify the objectives and write their own student materials and teaching strategies.

The end product of a normal planning session is a lesson plan and student materials for the next day's instruction. Planning of a long-term nature can also be done. The teacher-participant should learn to conceptualize the general objectives and daily lesson plans for a unit of instruction in the new curriculum.

Long-term planning can also focus on ways of integrating a new curriculum into a school's established curriculum; however, this is difficult to do if teacher-participants represent different school districts.

From the previous discussion it should be clear that a wide variety of activities can occur during the teach-analysis-plan cycle. In addition, the relative emphasis given to each component can vary, and a decision must be made whether to include the examination of assumptions. These decisions for the most part have been made by the director of a workshop. The director, whenever possible, considers the desires of the workshop participants as he makes decisions.

The Role of the Workshop Director in Successful Implementation. The success of a workshop depends in large part on the leadership and organizational ability of the director. The director must have a carefully developed workshop plan; yet, the plan must be flexible so he can modify it to deal with unanticipated problems as well as the expressed desires of workshop participants.

The workshop director may have to devise novel answers to difficult teaching problems. One director, for example, found participants who taught the A.E.P. Public Issues booklets had difficulty using analogies to help students clarify their positions on public policy issues.[10] Most teachers did not find using analo-

---

[10] The purpose of analogies in the American Education Publications (A.E.P.) Public Issues booklets is discussed in: Donald W. Oliver, Fred M. Newmann, Mary Jo Bane, Cases and Controversy: Guide to Teaching (Middletown, Conn.: A.E.P., 1967), 5-6.

gies too hard, but they were overwhelmed by the multitude of teaching operations called for by the A.E.P. materials. The workshop director overcame this problem by devising a variation of micro-teaching in which the teacher-participants could concentrate on the skill of employing analogies.[11] Before teaching a particular lesson, they "tried out" analogies on a group of five students. Then teachers and students analyzed the results and if necessary, modified the analogies for use in the

---

[11] Micro-teaching might be described as follows: "A teacher instructs four or five students for a short time and then talks it over with another adult. An experienced observer would emphasize the fact that the teacher concentrated on a specific training skill or technique and utilized several sources of feedback, such as the supervisor, the students, the teacher's own reflections and the playback of video tapes. The experienced observer would also note that the teacher has an opportunity to repeat the entire process by reteaching the lesson and again having his performance critiqued, and that in the second and subsequent cycles he teaches different students." Dwight Allen and Kevin Ryan, Microteaching (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), 2.

regular classroom. Practice using analogies increased teacher pro- in handling not only that skill but also the full range of teaching strategies required by the A.E.P. materials.

Another workshop director modified the workshop structure to meet the special needs of elementary school children. The director met with the teacher-participants before the workshop started. They decided to teach a variety of materials in order to keep the children interested and to provide themselves with a broader experience. Half of the teaching period each day was devoted to the Boston West End unit developed by the Washington University Elementary Social Science Project.[12] Materials from other projects were taught in the remaining teaching time each morning.[13] During the analysis periods the director and the teacher-participants compared their experiences

---

[12]A description of the unit and some results of the formative evaluation of field test is contained in an unpublished paper. See Jimmie R. Applegate, "The West End Unit and Empathy Arousal," a paper read at the 49th annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, November 29, 1969, in Houston, Texas.

[13]Examples are: The "Origin-Pawn" materials developed by Richard deCharms at Washington University (St. Louis); social science curriculum materials developed by Ronald Lippitt and Robert Fox at the University of Michigan and published by Science Research Associates, Inc.; the Japanese Family unit from the MATCH Box project, developed by the Boston Children's Museum and published by American Science and Engineering; creativity materials developed by E. Paul Torrance.

with the different materials; they also discussed assumptions behind the various materials. Teaching and analyzing several packages of materials gave participants a wider perspective than if they had used only one curriculum.

The director's organizational ability and inventiveness is without doubt a major determinant of a workshop's success. At the same time the director must have an intimate knowledge of the curriculum on which the workshop is based. Carefully developed, yet flexible, plans are of no avail if the substantive aspect of workshop activity is substandard.

Equipment and Physical Facilities. Appropriate physical facilities can ease the task of organizing a teaching workshop. The best arrangement seems to be two to five adjacent classrooms, the number being dependent on the extent to which the director decides to "team" his teacher-participants. If the teacher-participants operate as a single group, then one room in addition to the regular classroom is sufficient. That room can be used as a base for planning and analysis, especially when some of the teacher-participants are teaching in the regular classroom.

Some workshops have been organized around three or four teams of teacher-participants. Team A, for example, may be responsible for several consecutive days of teaching; the team shares planning and instructional duties. Meanwhile team B is using most, perhaps

all, of each morning preparing to teach after team A is finished. Some members of team B, however, will have to observe team A teaching to provide the necessary continuity once team B begins teaching. At the same time team C is observing the teaching of team A and is responsible for leading the analysis sessions based on that teaching. Once team B starts to teach, team A observes and leads the analytical discussions, and team C prepares to teach.

Workshops organized on a team basis operate smoothly if each team has a room where it can meet undisturbed. If the rooms are close to each other, intergroup communication is encouraged. Another room in the immediate area for typewriters and duplicating equipment facilitates the preparation of lesson plans and supplemental student materials. The extra room can also be used for storing audio-visual equipment needed for daily teaching.

Audio and video tape recorders are useful for analysis of teaching as well as for classroom instruction. Analysis of teaching often is made easier if there is a permanent record of the teaching. Teacher-participants sometimes cannot agree on what happened during the class; this disagreement can be resolved by viewing or listening to a video or audio recording. Tapes also can be used to encourage self-analysis by having a participant observe his own teaching behavior.[14]

Recruitment of Teacher-Participants. Planning for a summer workshop should begin early, possibly as soon as November or December.

---

[14]Our experience indicates that teachers are often less anxious about analyzing and evaluating their own behavior than they are in having a group of teachers analyzing their behavior.

An early start enables a district administration to make the necessary budgetary allocations. In addition preliminary information describing the workshop can be sent to teachers before they have committed themselves to other summer activities. Early planning also increases the possibility a qualified workshop director can be identified.

Teachers do not "break down the doors" to participate in the workshops. Many teachers have had disagreeable experiences in situations labeled as workshops, and they are cautious about a full day program that lasts for six weeks. Given these considerations it becomes important that the teaching workshops are carefully organized, well publicized, and contain incentives for teachers to attend.

Knowledge that the workshop is designed to help teachers learn how to teach a particular new curriculum is one of the strongest incentives. In the St. Louis area we have conducted workshops based on the A.E.P. Public Issues Series (Harvard Social Studies Project), the Holt Social Studies Curriculum (Carnegie-Mellon Social Studies Project), and units from the Washington University Elementary Social Science Project. Publicity has emphasized the practical nature of workshop activity.[15]

---

[15]Publicity and sponsorship of the workshops has been a joint effort of schools in St. Louis and St. Louis County, Washington University, the Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratory, and the St. Louis-St. Louis County Social Studies Project (Title III of ESEA).

Another incentive for participation in a teaching workshop is the possibility of receiving university credit. Up to six hours of graduate credit have been given to teacher-participants. In some cases, school districts have reimbursed teachers for tuition fees. If, in addition, school districts would provide teachers with stipends, teachers probably would be much more willing to attend the workshops.

Evaluation of the Teaching Workshop

Evaluation of St. Louis area teaching workshops is based on data gathered from a variety of sources. One workshop director developed a bried questionnaire which was completed by workshop participants; another director asked his participants to write their perceptions of the workshop experience. Other directors have written final reports in which they summarized their objectives for the six week session and evaluated the success of their efforts. In addition, each of the workshops was observed by at least one of the authors.

Overall reaction to teaching workshops was favorable. The following statements by participants are representative:

> I think that sometimes when the classroom door is closed closed, teachers get sloppy in their teaching techniques and each daily lesson becomes a little less meaningful. Being with other teachers gives you the

> the opportunity to discuss common problems and also reappraise yourself as a teacher. I found this workshop to be extremely beneficial.
>
> I thought that the workshop was very useful, interesting, and highly practical....
>
> I think it was highly successful in giving me the practical background to walk into a classroom in September and feel comfortable with the Oliver materials....

Although some participants felt that the teaching workshop helped them "reappraise" themselves as teachers, most teachers were more interested in specific ways the workshops might affect their teaching.

Interest in practical concerns was indicated clearly by the responses of teacher-participants from one workshop to the question: What aspects of this workshop did you find most useful and most important? One person listed the teaching experience itself and the opportunity to observe other teachers using the A.E.P. materials. He also valued the workshop director's "suggestions of the spectrum of strategies" that are appropriate to the materials. Another teacher-participant mentioned discussing teaching methods and watching another teaching team work with a lesson she had planned and taught. She, as did the first participant, appre-

ciated the "review by the workshop director of his specific approaches to various lesson plans...." A third teacher-participant listed the small group planning sessions and the large group discussions of shared teaching problems as the most important aspects of the workshop.

The teachers of this particular workshop, therefore, viewed at least three of the components--planning, teaching, and analysis--as important to learning how to teach a new curriculum. The teacher-participants were much less interested in examining the assumptions behind the new materials. In fact this component was seen consistently as the least important part of the teaching workshop. Several participants did not feel that it was necessary to understand the assumptions behind curriculum materials in order to be able to teach them effectively. One person felt the readings had been arbitrarily chosen. "I cannot help wondering," she continued, "if the person responsible for choosing these materials could have produced logical lesson plans...for the days they were used." Another person attributed the failure of the theory discussions to the lack of time. Whatever the cause for the difficulties with the discussion of assumptions, it seems that for most people the gap between theory and practice was not bridged.

Integrating theory into practice is a complicated intellectual issue, one that can be expected to involve problems. Many of the other workshop difficulties, however, were much simpler in nature.

One workshop had to be reorganized because only two teacher-participants were recruited. Difficulty in implementing the daily schedule was experienced in another workshop because the morning and afternoon sessions were in buildings a considerable distance from each other. A thrid workshop's time schedule was thrown out of balance because all morning was devoted to teaching; not enough time was available for the other components. Careful pre-workshop planning, however, should overcome most of these recruitment and organizational problems.

In summary, the evaluation data suggests that teachers responded with interest to the "practical" components of the workshop model while they were not convinced of the value of the theoretical portion of a workshop. In addition a number of organizational and recruitment problems occurred that might be avoided by careful planning. The general spirit of reaction to the workshop model is captured aptly by the teacher-participant who said, "It's most useful to be able to 'do' as well as read about these strategies."

Conclusion

The teaching workshop is proposed as one way to deal with the widespread concern that teachers are inadequately prepared to teach new socill studies materials. Planning for teaching, teaching, and analysis of teaching confront teacher-participants with an array of implementation problems. It is our contention, supported by limited evaluation data, that avtive involvement in using new materials is a productive approach to the retraining of social studies teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, D. and Ryan, K. Microteaching. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

Applegate, J. "The West End Unit and Empathy Arousal," A paper read at the National Council for the Social Studies, Houston, November, 1969.

Berlak, H. and Tom, A. "Toward Rational Curriculum Decisions in the Social Studies," The Indiana Social Studies Quarterly, 20 (Autumn, 1967), 17-31.

Morrissett, I. and Stevens, W. "Curriculum Analysis," Social Education, 31 (October, 1967), 483-86, 489.

Oliver, D., Newmann, F. and Bane, M. Cases and Controversy: Guide to Teaching. Middletown, Conn.: A.E.P., 1967.

Shaplin, J. "Practice in Teaching," Harvard Educational Review, 31 (Winter, 1961), 34-38.

Shaver, J. and Berlak, H. Democracy, Pluralism, and the Social Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Tom, A. "An Approach to Selecting Among Social Studies Curricula," An occasional paper of the Metropolitan St. Louis Social Studies Center. St. Louis: The Center, 1969.

Tyler, L. and Klein, M. Recommendations for Curriculum and Instruction Materials. Los Angeles: University of California, 1967.

Withall, J. "An Objective Measurement of a Teacher's Classroom Interactions," Journal of Educational Psychology, 47 (April, 1956), 203-212.