DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 124 SO 014 556

AUTHOR Ferren, Ann S.
TITLE Field Testing of the "American Indian Archeology in the Middle School" Program.
PUB DATE Dec 82
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association (Washington, DC, December 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Studies; *Archaeology; *Curriculum Enrichment; *Curriculum Evaluation; Field Tests; Humanities Instruction; Interdisciplinary Approach; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Program Evaluation; Social Studies; *Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *American Indian Archaeology Program

ABSTRACT

Field testing of the American Indian Archaeology Project, designed for grades 5 through 8, revealed weaknesses in the quality with which the modules were implemented. The project offers supplementary materials, a resource guide, and teacher workshops for social studies or humanities teachers. Two aspects of the materials, feasibility and effectiveness, were evaluated in three schools with diverse populations. Methods included direct observation, open-ended interviews with teachers, and student questionnaires. Specific incidents (rather than a synthesis of findings) reveal that although the modules provided adequate information to teachers, they were not used as expected. Classroom questioning techniques were rote and uninspired. Also, the modules did not match the full range of student ability and interest in the field test classrooms, with higher grades reporting that the work was too easy. In every case teachers failed to provide a rationale for the study of modules and did not attempt to integrate content elements in a coherent pattern. The most positive aspect was that students did learn new concepts and vocabulary. The project emphasis on content rather than methods underestimated the dependence of teachers on textbooks, dittos, and prepared lesson plans. Finally, teachers did not sense any urgency to teach about Native Americans. (KC)

FIELD TESTING OF THE "AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL" PROGRAM

Ann S. Ferren

The American University

Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association

December, 1982

FIELD TESTING OF THE "AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL" PROGRAM

The basic premise underlying the "American Indian Archeology in the Middle School" project is that these materials can meet a genuine need in the curriculum. Clearly, the only way that curriculum materials can be of value is if the materials are used and thoughtfully integrated into the on-going middle school program. Because the burden of such use falls on the classroom teacher, this project was designed to include a field test of four of the modules to examine the issues of feasibility and effectiveness.

The field test will be reported in the context of the role of the humanities in elementary and secondary schools and how teachers decide what and how to teach. Some distinctions will be made between general curriculum problems and specific problems related to these materials. This paper will then turn briefly to some practical issues of importance to university-based archeologists who wish to see their discipline taken seriously in pre-collegiate education, and will address problems inherent in collaborative curriculum projects.

The Humanities in Elementary and Secondary Schools

The recent Rockefeller report on The Humanities in American Life states that a "dramatic improvement in the quality of education in our elementary and secondary schools is the highest educational priority for America in the 1980's."[1] The report goes on to suggest that it is through the humanities that the curriculum can be strengthened and the classroom experience enriched. The American Indian Archeology project is consciously a humanities project, and its funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities represents a commitment and challenge which we take seriously. We are not so bold as to claim that this project will have a major impact on the quality of education in our nation's schools, but we do want to stress that projects of this nature collectively can expand student awareness of the central ideas, values and human experiences that

define the humanities and encourage students to ask the larger questions that prepare them to live in an increasingly complex world.

There are some who would question whether a humanities project is responsive to the real needs in American education. The pressure for accountability has brought emphasis to "basics" in the form of reassertion of traditional values and the demand for minimum competency levels. We would argue that the areas of study presented in these modules are consistent with this focus on basics. The modules are intended to reflect respect for cultural traditions, demonstrate how we search for meaning in our lives, enlarge our sense of what has shaped our national heritage, promote the idea of cultural pluralism, and reveal the impact of time and change on our lives. These concepts are basic to the schools' commitment to preparing students for active, responsible, and sensitive citizenship.

Finally, while these materials are referred to as supplemental, they are not peripheral. They are written with awareness of the need to develop essential skills. The materials invite children to question, to think, to evaluate, to apply and not just to learn a body of knowledge. The teacher can use them as a basis for teaching the entire range of instructional objectives including testing hypotheses, gathering data, making inferences, building vocabulary, chronology, and map skills, to name just a few. The modules aim to open up possibilities rather than define specific and narrow goals. The emphasis is on content not method.

Social Studies Education in the 1980's

This project is a social studies project as well as a humanities project. Anthropology and archeology traditionally have not been a central part of the social studies curriculum. Twenty-five years of intensive curriculum reform has introduced a variety of disciplines, topics, and approaches, but the social studies curriculum remains remarkably the same. American history, world history, geography, and civics dominate the curriculum with a surprisingly similar curricular configuration in all 50 states. Where then does a project like

this fit? What hope is there for its successful use?

Unfortunately, there is evidence that many students dislike or are indifferent to social studies.[2] Consequently, many reforms in social studies education have introduced courses on controversial issues and contemporary problems designed to engage students. The introduction of mini-courses and units on minorities, law, women, the environment, and death are attempts to motivate students through the study of issues that are part of their everyday lives. The American Indian Archeology project is not of that nature; it does not try to capture student interest using superficial relevance. Rather, the project is designed to draw upon the synthesizing power of history and accept that American history is the core of the social studies program at elementary, middle, and secondary school levels. Further, the project addresses the difficulty of finding materials which accurately portray Indians, a topic included in every American history program.

The choice of the middle school for this project is not just chance. Social studies in the elementary school is a second class citizen compared to reading and math.[3] It is not until the middle school that social studies takes on a significant life of its own. The typical middle school program includes 5th grade American history, 6th grade world cultures, 7th grade geography, and 8th grade American history. The earlier grades focus on local environment, home and community. In the middle years, students begin to look at ways of living in the United States and throughout the world. The American history programs typically emphasize exploration of the New World, establishment of the colonies, and expansion westward. They must, therefore, make at least passing reference to Indians. Thus we have anchored our modules to the sequence in the social studies program that is in place in the schools and likely to stay in place, and the concepts built into the modules reflect the concepts introduced and reinforced throughout this middle school sequence.

A recent report on social studies education underscores that the textbook is really the focal point of curriculum. Some argue that the textbook industry in America controls the curriculum or at least that it reflects it. Clearly, textbooks must be written to fit the dominant curriculum pattern to assure a market. Increasing budget constraints in public education, however, mean that there is great pressure to rely on the textbook as the major medium of instruction, for there are limited funds for supplementary materials.[4] Quite bluntly, what is not in the text will probably not get taught. What made us think that this project could have an impact on this closed and predictable curriculum?

We assume that the teacher and the text are the primary determinants of the curriculum. No matter what the curriculum guide says, what gets taught is up to the teacher and is based on the text. The demand for supplemental materials, when budgets allow, most often includes maps, charts, posters, cassettes, and filmstrips, or those things which we would call audio-visual aids which enhance the teaching of the text. Additional supplemental material is teacher-made and most often includes tests and activities again based on the textbook. Teachers simply do not have the time or the interest to create, research, and try to expand much beyond the confines of the text.

If teacher background and interest are important in influencing what gets taught, then we must find a way to introduce teachers to this important material. If texts in use include only limited information about archeology and Indians and few middle school teachers have much training in or experience with anthropology and archeology, it would seem that supplementary materials congruent with the text could meet a real need. Based on our understanding, therefore, of what teachers teach, how they decide what to teach, and what kinds of materials they choose to work with, we decided to put close at hand the best possible supplementary information with a resource guide which includes modest suggestions for implementation and teaching methods. In short, we have tried to fill a gap

in teacher knowledge and teaching material and rely on teacher expertise to carry it off. These modules, then, are low cost, fit topics being taught, are for student use, and contain all the essential information required to teach a lesson.

University School Collaboration

This project is a humanities project, a social studies project, and also a collaborative project. One may wonder, why should university professors try to get involved in middle school curriculum? The Rockefeller report urges college and local school collaboration to "...use existing resources in improving education in the humanities."[5] A recent report on social studies education, however, includes this passionate plea:"...[U]niversity academics should not be encouraged or permitted to tell the schools what to do or to meddle where they have little or no experience, information, or competence."[6] The question may not be why to collaborate, but rather, if colleges and schools are to collaborate successfully, under what conditions might they do so?

There are three models of collaborative projects with which I have some familiarity. One model bases the project at the school or in the school system; indeed, the project is written by the teachers, "owned" by the teachers, and administered by the teachers who are directly involved. Within some clear guidelines, they call upon the resources of a variety of university faculty members or just the resources of one university with which they have an established relationship. This is the model which the National Humanities Faculty has used successfully for the last ten years and through it has been able to influence curriculum development in many different schools and many different settings. In each case the project is designed to be unique to that school, not to be transported elsewhere, and the collaboration has a life span limited to the development of the project. Teachers from the outset understand the role they are to play, and the success or failure of the project rests with them. And there are failures. And some of the relationships with universities

are not successful.

A second model of collaboration merges the efforts of the school and the university with the base located in neither place. Constant negotiation and planning are called for as the project moves forward. Many regular meetings are held and a hard core of participants sift out who carry the project forward. Such a collaborative and equal relationship develops over time and is extremely inefficient. Much hard work goes into the planning stages, and the implementation takes place based on trust, cooperation, minimal conflict, and everyone pulling on his or her own oar. When such collaborations work, they are strong. Those that do not work, break down early on, very little takes place, and participants drift apart.

The third model of collaboration is the one that we are using. The project is based at the university, the teachers are brought in as resources, and we go out to the schools as resources. There is little time to work together; rather, we try to draw upon apparent strengths. The project appears to belong to the university, and the classrooms where the materials are to be used belong to the teachers. Staying at arms length detracts from continuity, and some misunderstandings are inevitable. We have no control over which teachers will participate, whether they will be available over a period of time, whether they will field test the modules on the day called for, or whether they will decide not to teach them at all. And the teachers clearly feel they have limited influence over what will be given them and when the modules will be available. The relationship is efficient, does not duplicate labor, and blends the expertise of both sides--when it works.

This project was launched with a Saturday morning workshop with teachers from four schools. They reviewed the proposal, analyzed the modules proposed, made suggestions about approaches, explained their needs as teachers, and described their perceptions of children and their learning styles. Out of that session

came essential guidelines for writing the modules, new information for academics about instructional objectives, and an awareness of the difficulties of writing for children this age. The teachers in turn received an essential introduction to the area of study.

During the project, this collaborative relationship has been cordial and useful, yet the time frame and differences in expectations have hampered our efforts. The modules have taken longer than expected to write, and they have required extensive revision. Teachers have been interested but find little time to "fit in" the modules. When teachers must respond to the priorities of their own classrooms instead of those of the special project, the collaboration breaks down.

Field Testing the Modules

There are three aspects of instructional materials that need to be evaluated: accuracy of the content, feasibility of use, and effectiveness of the material. The accuracy of the content, in this case, must be attested to by the subject matter specialists engaged in the development of the materials. The collaboration of several experts, as well as the review of the materials by a representative of the American Indian community for sensitivity to Indian values and accuracy, enables us to have some confidence in the content. Field testing of the materials with teachers and children, however, is essential to determine whether the modules meet the tests of feasibility and effectiveness. The data gathered through this formative evaluation will be used for modifying the modules before we consider the project finished. Only a very limited field test has been completed at this time.

A variety of methods of data gathering are appropriate for such a field test: direct observation of individual children, direct observation in the classroom, open-ended interviews with teachers, and questionnnaires for students. This broad based information gathering is necessary to distinguish between the strength of the materials and the strength of the teachers. Our goal is to

determine how well the material is used aside from the level of skill of the teacher or ability of the students. The observation instruments, questionnaires, and interview schedules are attached to this paper.

The issue of feasibility is central. If materials are to be used (and they are of no value if they are not used), they must be accessible to teachers, match the interests of students, provide adequate information so that teachers are comfortable with the content, motivate both students and teachers, and fit easily with the on-going program. The assumption underlying this project was that materials would be useful if they took advantage of the momentum of the regular classroom, tied into the American history program, and were interesting, challenging, and complete. The field test would let us know how close we came to these goals.

The issue of effectiveness of the materials is of equal importance. Enthusiastic participation in an activity without evident learning would not prove the worth of the materials. Teacher enjoyment without evidence of acquisition of fundamental concepts and fluency with correct terminology would not persuade us of the effectiveness of the modules. Measurement of learning has always been a problem, however, and the measurement of understanding of vocabulary or concepts, for example, is far easier to determine than the changing of attitudes or increased sensitivity. The field test was designed to focus primarily, therefore, on cognitive rather than affective learning.

The first stage of the field test of a module was with an individual child. As each module was written it was read individually aloud by a 5th, 6th, or 7th grader at the kitchen table of the curriculum specialist. The relaxed setting encouraged free expression from the children about what was interesting, what was difficult, what words they knew, and what else they had studied that related to the content. The children freely said "That's boring," "That's out of order," "What's that word?," "I don't think that section fits," "Why not ask this question?," "You had better define that word," "A picture would help,"

and so on.

As regular consumers of instructional materials, children are very savvy and astute in their observations. The comments revealed not just personal meanings but also to what extent the materials matched their learning experiences and social studies knowledge. Despite no pictures, no floss, no gloss, (these were computer printout form), the children found certain modules very compelling. Others they pronounced marginal and still others they said were not valuable or important.

This stage of field testing was very important for establishing guidelines for tone, reading level, format, and organization for the modules. In only a limited way did the field test affect content. In a few instances, the children indicated when an idea was too elaborate and some of the modules were shortened. Those modules that were called boring were rewritten.

The second stage of the field test was in the classroom with groups of children. The material was used with a 6th grade art class from an affluent white neighborhood. The same module was taught in an inner city black 7th grade geography class. Another module was taught in an 8th grade U.S. history class which was racially and culturally mixed. While the three schools do not represent a sample, they do represent diversity. The comments that follow are not meant to be generalizeable but rather indicative of the areas of concern which will affect the final preparation of these materials.

It is truly a humbling experience to watch your curriculum materials taught. Our hope that teachers and children would engage directly and enthusiastically with the content was not realized. The amount of teaching, the level of thinking, and the evidence of learning was below expectations and it is hard to blame only the project materials. It seems fair to say that the materials were handled no more poorly than the regular classroom program

because no teacher distinguished the observed lessons from the regular program. Indeed each stressed that the lesson and student behaviors were typical.

I have sat in hundreds of classrooms as a trained observer and used dozens of instruments to try to unravel the complexity of the teaching/learning interaction. I have observed teaching from preschool through graduate school for a dozen years. I have seen effective teaching and ineffective teaching. I do not happily report to you the problems with carrying out the testing nor the superficial treatment of the materials in the classroom. Indeed, the realities and limitations of American education were evident in our project. And there is no reason for us to expect to be immune.

The most pervasive problem was time. Considerable education research is currently focused on "time-on-task" as a key variable in student achievement. In our project both how the school impinged on class time and how the teachers used class time were problems that detracted from the teaching and learning.

Teachers found it difficult to schedule in advance a day to teach the module and the days were interrupted with unexpected school visitors, "Book Character" days, all school assemblies, visits by museum educators, and the like. There were so many diversions outside the teacher's control and unrelated to classroom instruction, it is a wonder that any teaching took place.

In addition, time was wasted in every class with organizational details. Rather than get all the materials in preparation for the lesson, one teacher had the students take 15 minutes of class time to go to the storeroom for clay and then exhorted them to work faster because they were "running out of time." The sequence of social studies instruction necessary to make these supplementary materials valuable was not apparent in these classrooms. The classes met infrequently and follow-up to a lesson would be days, even weeks later. Social studies apparently still takes second place behind the reading

and math programs. Under the circumstances described, it is simply not possible to determine the feasibility and effectiveness of the materials except in a very limited way.

Analysis of Data

The first issue focused on in the field testing was feasibility. Could teachers use the materials as intended? Was the content accessible to the students? To focus the data gathering the following kinds of questions were used:

Classroom Observation:	Were the materials employed as expected? Could the teacher carry out the lesson as intended? Was the teacher's understanding of the material apparent? Was the lesson integrated into the rest of the curriculum?
Teacher Interview:	Was the material provided adequate or was additional study and preparation necessary? What practical difficulties were encountered in conducting the lesson? What additional instructional aids were necessary? Desirable? How does the module complement the present curriculum?
Student Questionnaire:	Would you recommend this lesson to a friend? What other ways can you think of t learn more about archeology and American Indians?

To illustrate the tentative conclusions to be drawn from the data, I would like to describe specific incidents rather than present a synthesis of the findings.

1. The modules were not employed as expected. Pottery making is a part of many middle school programs but in the classes observed it was not "taught." Rather, it was treated as an activity which required little engagement of the mind and was based primarily on demonstration and imitation. The emphasis was on the project not the process. One teacher put four shapes on the board and said, "You can choose any of the four to make today." She offered no explanation for the selection of shapes and encouraged no discussion of the meaning or use of such pots. I'm not sure she even noticed when not one of the children in the class tried to copy a shape; rather, they all just did as they pleased--

pounding, rolling, pinching clay while discussing the Superman movie which had been on TV the night before. The focus of the "teaching" was to produce something. The teacher made no reference to Indians, to method, to meaning. Most telling were the children's comments, "You don't need to know anything to make pots." "I know the Indians probably did it differently but I'd rather do it my way." The students saw pottery making as an activity, not as an expression of what they had learned.

2. The modules provided adequate information to the teachers. The teachers did not have any difficulty understanding the material, connecting the modules with the rest of the curriculum, or determining appropriate instructional aids--when they chose to. Interestingly enough, they did not choose to do these things in their class use of the modules; rather they demonstrated their understanding in the workshop setting with us. In the classroom, for example, the questions were rote and uninspired. Have you ever done any digging? What is an artifact? What does an archeologist do? Would you like to be an archeologist? The teachers did not ask questions designed to elicit thoughtful reflection on the material. At no time were children presented with a problem to be solved--yet the materials we believe are designed to help children think hypothetically, consider evidence, and draw conclusions. When we taught a class we asked, Could an archeologist tell whether or not your pot was made by an Indian? If you had to walk a half mile to get water, would that influence the way in which you make the pot? The students responded enthusiastically, with commitment, and with a variety of ideas to our questions.

In sharp contrast, in the workshop with their peers the teachers asked questions such as: What makes a "true" civilization? What is the yardstick anthropologists use to determine a "simple" culture? How does Indian family structure influence the way of life? Yet in their own classrooms the emphasis

was on read and retrieve. The teachers did not make connections with other lessons and did not seem to recall the many wonderful ideas they had brainstormed during the workshop on ways to reinforce skills and the kinds of additional materials they could bring in. I have no explanation for this decision to present the material "stripped down." The teachers, I suspect, are so used to the narrative approach that they use any material in that way and do not design inquiry lessons.

3. The modules did not match the full range of student ability and interest in the field test classrooms. The seventh grade class read, discussed, and responded to the pottery module with interest and enthusiasm. They were especially clear about the importance of learning about "other than white people." They suggested that learning about Indians provided a necessary "balance" with what they usually learn. What did they like best about the lesson--the doing. They were not as interested in knowing something as experiencing something. They did not have apparent standards for their production, they did not look at each other and declare, "That's good. That's not good." When the teacher gave evaluations to each pot the students were indifferent. They were lost in the activity and tried to apply what had been in the module. They said it felt good to be doing something with their hands, though many initially had been concerned about getting dirty. This was a very different classroom from the one described above which was also product oriented, but the students were not engaged in the product and could talk about other things as they went along. These children were into the making and cared about what happened to their efforts. The other children walked away quite indifferent. Thus, the same modules were responded to in very different ways due to differences in the teachers and the children.

The advanced eighth grade class reported that the modules were too easy,

the line drawings turned them off, and they would not recommend the lesson to a friend because it was not very challenging. (They did, however, add that younger students in 5th and 6th grade would find the material interesting.) The eighth grade teacher asked a series of pivotal questions in her lesson including: What is your understanding of what an archeologist is? Why is archeological evidence found in layers? The students were competent in answering the questions but became restless. I am not sure whether the teaching approach or the material was not challenging. If the emphasis is on reading and retrieval, then the materials are not suitable for advanced levels of students. If students are used to a rich assortment of classroom materials and activities, then they will find the modules spare.

Perhaps it is easiest to demonstrate the significant difference in sophistication and learning opportunities between the two classes described above with another example. When asked in what other ways they might learn about Indians and archeology, the inner city 7th graders could only think of encyclopedias or to ask the librarian. The eighth graders suggested visiting a dig, bringing in an archeologist to speak to the class, magazine articles, museums, films, slide shows, library research, and attending a camp or archeology program for teens. The teacher's guide which accompanies the modules will try to redress this imbalance.

The second issue on which we focused in the field test was the effectiveness of the materials. The value of learning materials must be based on what students learn. The following questions guided the data gathering:

Classroom Observation:

- Did the teacher use technical terms and vocabulary frequently?
- Did the students use terminology accurately?
- Could the teacher and students provide examples to illustrate the concepts discussed?
- Were references made to previous learnings and other disciplines?
- Was a level of interest and enthusiasm about archeology apparent?

Teacher Interview:
- What do you think the students learned from the lesson? Evidence?
- What follow-up lesson or additional instruction will you provide?
- What changes in your attitudes and knowledge about archeology and Indians are you aware of?
- What skills did you teach in addition to the information?

Student Questionnaire:
- What did you find most interesting about this lesson?
- (Assessment by quiz or teacher questioning based on the specific content of the module being taught.)

Again, to underscore the preliminary conclusions to be drawn from the field test data, I would like to describe discrete incidents rather than a synthesis of the findings.

1. The materials did not serve to reinforce previous learnings or make connections with other disciplines. Limited references were made to other previously studied material. The teachers, in every case, failed to provide a rationale for the study of the module. They did not give an overview of the purpose of the lesson, did not establish the objectives of the lesson, did not rehearse the skills to be used, and did not mention other related areas of study. When students asked questions such as how the material related to their previous study of the mound-builders, the teacher provided a limited response. The teachers did not attempt to integrate the content elements into a coherent pattern. In short, the modules were treated as discrete experiences, dropped into the middle of the learning sequence, to be taken on their own terms.

2. The students had mixed responses about archeology and what it can teach us. One class was fascinated by archeology and wanted to talk about what would happen if someone dug up the site of their last Fourth of July picnic. More interesting was the eighth grade class which had a typical adolescent response. After a serious and engaging discussion of what archeologists do, they listed special qualities an archeologist would need including: patience, curiosity, drive, cleverness to figure out relationships, well educated, and cautious. Then they all agreed that archeology was far too tedious and declared they would be content

just to read about what someone else has discovered and then only if they had a special interest in other cultures. They understood the scientific process but did not value it. "You have to be too serious." "It's kind of boring and takes all the fun out of messing around somewhere." "You can't find enough to make all the effort worthwhile. After all, you might not find anything so who wants to do that." And the final blow came when a student said, "Besides, you can't get rich doing this."

3. The students did learn new concepts and vocabulary. The most positive aspect of the field test was the immediate and conscientious use of proper terminology and vocabulary. If a student began to talk and could not remember the right word, he looked it up. Students appeared to take great pleasure in gaining entry into a new field by using terms such as grid, ceramic change, and artifact. This would surely be a minimum essential for the introductory study of any field and the students' apparent success is probably a result of the continuous reinforcement of vocabulary building throughout the elementary and middle school program.

4. Students reported consideration of archeology as a career as the most interesting aspect of the modules. As students read and thought about what archeologists do they became more interested in how they do it. Using their basic curiosity they asked wonderful questions such as: How do you dig and take notes at the same time? Do you have to have a team to be able to get everything down and be so careful? What happens if you dig for days and find nothing? What do you do if you don't have a good memory? Who gives permission to archeologists to dig? Can anybody be an archeologist? If you keep what you find instead of telling others about it, are you still an archeologist? There was no intentional career education objective in the module, but it certainly was effective for that purpose.

Educational Implications

What can we draw from this experience to date? First, materials simply

cannot teach themselves. No curriculum project can control the quality of teaching, and it should be noted that each of these teachers was recommended to us as well above average. We tried to account for the impact of differences in teaching and children and look just at the materials. It is perhaps best to say at this point that the materials have not yet really been taught and, consequently, assessments of feasibility and effectiveness are tenuous at best.

Second, we must admit that developing teaching materials for someone else is extremely difficult. Teachers have always been torn between teaching the curriculum and teaching that which they have created and has special meaning for them. To some extent the pressure for accountability has pushed schools toward the "teacher proof" curriculum where objectives, sequences, and activities for students are preplanned. Our project was based on the belief that one teaches out of one's strengths, out of what one knows and believes, and that following such a "teacher proof" curriculum strips the material of life and leaves a sterile sequence of experiences in the classroom. We saw children occupied, busy, engaged in tasks, but being active is not the same as learning.

If we had it to do over again, I would push for putting more of our energy into teaching the teachers and less into developing materials. We did not help the teachers to teach better. We emphasized content not methods, and the project was weak at the delivery level. Even with one of our faculty members doing a demonstration lesson it did not help the teacher interact differently with her students. In fact the teacher wished the lesson had been taped so she could play it for the next class rather than teach it herself. We underestimated how dependent teachers are on textbooks, dittos, and prepared lesson plans. Teachers asked for a manual which would include objectives and test items. We worked at cross purposes believing that it was the content that was hard to master and that if we provided it the teacher could decide: What can I teach with this? What is important for my students to know?

A third issue presented itself. I do not have an appropriate response but wish, rather, merely to report it. At a time when I believe social studies educators are thinking about teaching with a multicultural emphasis, I did not sense any urgency among teachers to teach about Native Americans. The professional literature in the field of social studies education is solid and addresses many significant issues and yet the teachers did not reflect these priorities. The burning desire in the last decade to fight sexism and racism and narrowness seems to have faded. The mini-course to "right wrongs" and fill gaps may be a thing of the past. The gaps and oversights in the curriculum may be so seriously ingrained that our teachers do not notice and only staff development along with teaching materials would make a project with our goals fulfill expectations. The teachers spotted sexist comments or culturally insensitive references in draft materials but when they got into the classroom that sensitivity disappeared and they had boys distribute clay and had girls clean up.

Finally, are there some words of wisdom for academics who would like to influence the curriculum and the quality of instruction in our schools? How best can the resources of the community be made available? What is the role of the avocational archeologist, the state historical society, or the museum educator? If these resources are brought into the school merely as a diversion, they will not have much impact. If archeology is treated as enrichment, isolated from the curriculum, it will have no effect. Our task is to relate the work of the archeologist to the child's own personal experience of discovering his or her world. Our task is to raise the intellectual level of the classroom by challenging the students and moving them toward inquiry and away from passive receptivity.

In sum, we came to this project with enthusiasm and idealism. So did the teachers. We thought we could make an impact, meet a need, and provide a

challenging learning experience for children in the middle school. I still believe there is a role for archeology and the study of Indians in the Middle School. I still believe that content is essential and that teachers should supply the approach. I am more realistic now, however, and know how important the teachers' guide and teacher training is.

NOTES

[1] Commission on The Humanities, The Humanities in American Life (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1980).

[2] Irving Morrissett, ed., Social Studies in the 1980's (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

[3] Ibid., p. 33.

[4] Ibid., p. 38.

[5] Commission, p. 22.

[6] Morrissett, p. 10.

REFERENCES

Commission on The Humanities, The Humanities in American Life (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1980).

Morrissett, Irving, ed., Social Studies in the 1980's (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1982).

American Indian Archeology in the Middle School NEH Project #

Class _____

School _____

Date _____

Observer _____

INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	NOTES
Student Interest enthusiasm questions active-passive extended learning comfortable request for additional material		
Teacher Interest enthusiasm questions examples connections with other learnings comfortable suggestions for further study		
Reinforcement of Basic Skills writing experiences reading skills vocabulary building critical thinking skills analysis of data time and number skills		
Competence with New Material accurate use of terms, basic facts extended examples synthesis of concepts extension of ideas to other situations application, problem solving inquiry approach		
Affective Components recognition of values expressed respect for Indians attitude toward differences connections with own culture		

AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What difficulties did you encounter with the material?

2. Was the material provided adequate or did you do additional study and preparation?

3. What practical difficulties did you encounter in conducting the lesson?

4. Were additional instructional aids necessary? desirable?

5. How does the module complement your present curriculum?

6. What do you think the students learned from the lesson? evidence?

7. Estimate the degree of interest of the students in the lesson?

8. What follow-up lesson or additional instruction will you provide?

9. What changes in your attitudes or knowledge about archeology and indians are you aware of?

10. What skills did you teach in addition to the information?

11. On a global basis, what is your evaluation of the material?

AMERICAN INDIAN ARCHEOLOGY IN THE MIDDLE SCHOOL

Student Questionnaire

1. What did you find most interesting about this lesson?

2. Would you recommend this lesson to a friend? Why or why not?

3. What other ways can you think of to learn more about archeology and American Indians?