

A CASE STUDY DOCUMENTING EXPERIENCE AND ITS IMPACT IN THE CLASSROOM

SUSAN PASS
PAUL J. RICCOMINI
DEBORAH M. SWITZER

There have been repeated calls for educational researchers to increase their use of interpretive and naturalistic research paradigms to study, understand, and explain what happens in classrooms.¹ A review of educational research literature, however, revealed only a few naturalistic studies of life in the classroom.² Encouragingly, it appears that the number of qualitative studies at the elementary level are increasing;³ however, studies of teaching at the secondary level are comparatively few.⁴ In addition, because of the difficulty in obtaining a random sample and controlling for variables, there are few pretest-posttest, control group studies in education. So, while many articles state *what should be done* in American classrooms, there are very few documenting what specific activities and strategies are being used.⁵ This study uses both naturalistic and empirical methodology to investigate the classroom dynamics of a novice teacher and a veteran teacher to better understand how experience impacts the classroom.

Now more than ever, as education in America has entered an age of efficiency and accountability, educators need to be informed of the best ways to design their classroom instruction.⁶ As more and more states adopt high-stakes testing, education might need to document what goes on in effective classrooms. The two teachers, who were asked by their administration to volunteer for this study, were viewed by the administrators to be effective in the classroom—one subject was a novice educator and the other an experienced veteran—with similar teaching philosophies and teaching strategies.

At no time is any attempt made to suggest that the findings of this study are typical of what happens in most American social studies classrooms. However, if educators are to assess accurately the nature of instruction in effective social studies classrooms to determine how and where changes might be made to better prepare American students, we need more detailed and accurate descriptions of what is happening in classrooms. Therefore, this case study might present some information in this regard.

Summation

Although conducted in social studies classrooms, readers will note that the findings of this investigation hold value for those involved in the teaching of other subjects as well. In the naturalistic study, I observed at least once a week for twelve weeks. An independent observer visited the experienced teacher's classroom at least twice a week and another observer visited the novice teacher's classroom at least twice a week. All three of us compared observations and data both during and after the study. Students and teachers were assessed with a variety of instruments, discussed later in this article.

In the empirical study, we investigate the impact of experience on student interest and sense of teacher effectiveness, using a pretest-posttest research design. This study arose out of Jack Fraenkel's earlier call for more researchers to conduct more naturalistic investigations of the classroom. In his study, Fraenkel developed an instrument to examine classroom dynamics but did not test for reliability and validity. He invited me to do reliability and validity on his teacher effectiveness instrument; encouraging me to investigate the role of classroom experience, which he did not address in his study.⁷ From his instrument, I developed one to look at student interest.

For clarification, the report of this investigation is divided into three parts: a review of the literature, the naturalistic study, and an empirical study looking at the role of experience and its impact upon students.

Review of the Literature

Since the 1970s, there have been numerous calls for social studies researchers to increase their use of interpretive and naturalistic research paradigms in order to understand, explain, and assess what happens in social studies classrooms.⁸ After two decades, studies assessing teaching at the secondary level remain comparatively few.⁹

Teacher Effectiveness

According to John McMillan, the basic components of assessment of teachers are as follow:

[Assessment] is a process of professional judgment; it has separate but related principles of measurement evidence and evaluation; ...has a positive influence on student motivation and learning; ...leads to enhanced instruction; ...is valid, fair and ethical; ...uses multiple methods; ...is efficient and feasible; and...incorporates technology.¹⁰

Recent research indicates that student evaluation of teacher effectiveness are more valid and reliable if multiple indicators of effective teaching are used.¹¹ Support for this might rise from the process model of instruction, where learning is affected by what is taught in relationship to their interests and abilities, how it is taught, and the personal relationship between the teacher and students.¹² According to Ellen Skinner and Michael Belmont, teacher involvement in the support and promotion of student self-efficacy can be the most important strategy for increasing student motivation.¹³

Student Interest/Motivation

Research on teacher behaviors that actively promote student intrinsic motivation to learn has been relatively scarce.¹⁴ Those factors resulting in good student motivation are teaching skill, organizational structure, teacher-student rapport, challenging curriculum, and fair grading and prompt feedback.¹⁵ Young African American students in an inner-city school rated teachers effective if the teachers possessed the following characteristics: good interpersonal skills, ability to communicate subject matter well, ability to motivate students, and high expectations for their students.¹⁶

In a comparative study of traditional versus constructivist approaches in the classroom, the students rated the constructivist teacher higher because of the active instructional approach utilized.¹⁷ "In an ideal school, all students' potential would be maximized to the fullest, diversity among both students and teachers would be highly valued, and opportunities for growth would be created by well-prepared teachers."¹⁸

John Zahorik conducted a study that involved sixty-five elementary and secondary classroom teachers in which he found that the most effective teaching technique in raising student interest was the use of hands-on, problem-solving activities. Zahorik found a direct correlation between learner-center teaching and student achievement, student motivation, and student perception of teacher effectiveness.¹⁹

Accountability

Rigorous testing that is used to determine whether students graduate, teachers win bonuses and schools remain open—an approach already in place in more than half the nation—does little to improve achievement.²⁰ As a result of the adoption of high-stakes tests, twice as many states fell below the national average on the SAT and ACT, "...because teachers are focusing so intently on the high-stakes tests that they are neglecting other things that are ultimately more important...."²¹

The Problem with Accountability

In America, more and more schools are transitioning to block scheduling, whereby fewer teachers can teach more students. With block scheduling, each class loses two weeks of instruction a semester that they would have had otherwise under the traditional scheduling model.²² It is more efficient for schools to use block scheduling; however, because it takes fewer teachers to teach the same number of students.²³

With widespread use of standardized testing at all grade levels, and less instructional time, many teachers feel compelled to use traditional views of learning and teaching.²⁴ Using inquiry-based, critical-thinking instruction takes time.²⁵ Consequently, “teachers who take this path must work harder, concentrate more, and embrace larger pedagogical responsibilities,” than if they only lectured, assigned textbook reading, and embraced seatwork.²⁶ Teachers must not only be familiar with the content, concepts, and principles underlying a topic of study, but they must also be prepared for the variety of ways in which these can be explored by students and have well-designed rubrics for evaluation.²⁷

The National Council for the Social Studies has repeatedly said that the main goal of social studies is to create effective citizens.²⁸ Some in the profession, however, posit that the ability to think is the primary goal of social studies education.²⁹ Others call for social studies to focus on critical analysis and problem-solving lessons.³⁰ Engagement in such types of critical thinking strongly influences the development of political efficacy, which in turn positively influences political participation.³¹

Naturalistic Investigation

A local public high school was interested in participating in this study and nominated two educators that were deemed effective by the administrators who observed them both the semester prior to the study. The setting for the study was a small, homogeneous high school located in rural, upstate South Carolina. The students involved in this investigation were from two separate classrooms, comprised of fifty-eight total students enrolled in eleventh-grade history.

The Teachers

The first teacher (Teacher A) was a student teacher that was the best student in his methods class the previous semester, where the school’s administration had seen him at work in the classroom. He was also observed during the first two weeks of his student teaching. Based on his classroom dynamics, he was asked to volunteer for this study. During this period, Professor Susan Pass also served as his university supervisor.

The other teacher (Teacher B) was a veteran teacher and coach of twenty-four years that both faculty and administrators told me was highly respected by peers, students, parents, and administrators alike. The administrators asked him to volunteer for this study after he received, for the fourth time, the teacher of the year award for his school district. Professor Pass was his professor in a postgraduate seminar the previous semester. Appendix A includes a summary of the instructional strategies employed by both of these teachers.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The blueprint for this investigation was the 1990 study conducted by Jack Fraenkel, entitled “A Portrait of Four Social Studies Classes.”³² As a result, certain hypotheses, grounded in data, began to emerge. Again, there is no attempt to generalize the findings of this study; instead, the purpose of this investigation is to better understand the classroom dynamics of the novice and experienced teacher in this case study.

Procedures

Upon receiving permission from the teachers, students, and parents, I spent one day a week observing the two classes. In addition, the novice teacher had his cooperating teacher observe him on a daily basis,

while another veteran teacher at the same school volunteered to visit the experienced teacher's class at least twice a week.

Although Teacher A had more students, both had relatively homogeneous classes, with the students being from predominantly rural, white, middle-class backgrounds. Beginning the third week of the semester, the study ran for twelve weeks, finishing three weeks prior to the end of the semester. Teacher A taught the class by himself, under the observation of the cooperating teacher, for the entire length of the study. Teacher B also taught his class for the entire twelve weeks.

Data Sources

Data were obtained by a variety of methods. The teachers maintained a daily log and wrote a philosophy of education statement. Questionnaires on their teaching strategies were also completed by both teachers. In addition, each student also completed a questionnaire. Each teacher, along with a randomly selected sample of his students, was also interviewed. Both teachers and students identified the teachers' style of instruction, style of interaction among the students and teacher, and the nature and frequency of classroom activities. In addition, data on each student available in the school office, including grade point average, were collected. Class assignments, grade-book entries, and lesson plans were also examined. Finally, both the observers and researcher wrote observations' sheets that we compared for correlation of observations.

The primary purpose of the data collection was to describe each teacher's style and method of teaching with particular focus on those aspects that appeared to be of most significance to the teacher's effectiveness (as verified by the empirical study) and specific techniques that might be of interest to the reader.

Participants

Teacher A is a twenty-two year old white male who began student teaching that spring semester and was the top student in his methods class the previous semester. The school administration asked him to volunteer for this study because they saw him in the classroom during the previous semester and their opinions were confirmed by two weeks of observations made at the start of his student teaching semester.

Teacher B is a sixty-year-old African American teacher and coach. He has been teaching and coaching for twenty-four years. Administrators and faculty report that he is respected and well-liked by students and parents.

Of Teacher A's thirty-nine students, 51 percent were female and 49 percent male. With the exception of two African American males and one African American female, all of his students were white. His classes consisted of eleventh-grade regular-track students enrolled in American history. The mean GPA for his students was 2.77 out of a possible 5.0).

Teacher B chose to have his combined American history class as part of this study. It consisted of nine Advanced Placement or honors students and ten regular-track students. All but one of the students in his class were white. The class was 52 percent female and 48 percent male. The mean GPA for the honors students in this class was 3.47, with an overall class GPA of 3.14. Enrollment in this eleventh-grade history class, unlike that of Teacher A's class, was elective.

Teacher A: Findings

Class activities. Assignments consisted of written answers and oral presentations to questions posed by the teacher, who supplemented the textbook with outside work and learning activities.

The teacher-centered learning activities included teacher-student and student-student discussions, debates, and small-group work (see Appendix A). Lectures were short in duration (about fifteen minutes) and mainly used to "set the stage" for a student activity and debriefing after that activity. There were only two films and no filmstrips shown. The films were used to enhance prior learning. There were also group projects, in which the students taught their peers part of a unit or reviewed for weekly quizzes and unit

tests. In addition, a midterm and final exam were given. Finally, there were written essays at least once a week and group presentations several times a week.

Classroom atmosphere. Both observations and student data revealed that Teacher A placed emphasis on creating a non-threatening, nurturing classroom atmosphere. After selection for this study, he taught the class the entire time (with his cooperating teacher in the classroom but not interacting with the class). He did appear to have more active classes than Teacher B, but at no time did the researchers or any of the school's faculty or administration observe classes out of control. His cooperating teacher said that he was very good, as a first-time student teacher at classroom management.

Teacher A was friendly toward his students and took it as his first goal in the semester to get to know them and their learning styles. He often joked and didn't seem to mind when students would interrupt his admittedly short lectures. In fact, all of the observers thought that Teacher A encouraged spontaneous discussion and debates.

Much of his classroom's dynamic might be attributed to Teacher A's overall demeanor. He is enthusiastic about the subject, non-threatening, and has a good sense of humor. He demonstrated by words and actions in the classroom that he had respect for his students.

Although Teacher A did not demonstrate as much mastery of the subject and was found to convey less confidence in teaching the subject than Teacher B, he still admitted when he made a mistake. The students' ratings reflected that they respected him for this. I observed that, when he did not know the answer to a student's question, he said that he would look it up and have the answer the next class, which he always did. He said that everyone can learn, especially from mistakes, and every student in his classes has the right to learn. More than one student wrote that they liked him and wanted him to remain at the school, so that they could take another course from him. When asked, he said that he is continually rethinking his lessons and how to improve them—trying to learn more about the subject and his students to better address their individual learning styles. Lesson goals and objectives were always written on the chalkboard and referred to by Teacher A as he started his lessons.

Course objectives. Teacher A said that his educational objectives included subject matter mastery, and the development of life-long learners, capable of contributing to the common good and becoming active participants in democracy. In addition, his submitted philosophy of education statement and class logs revealed that he also wanted to increase critical-thinking skills among his students and improve their reading and writing skills.

Teacher B: Findings

Class activities. Because his class included honors students in it that needed to be prepared for a high-stakes exam, namely the AP U.S. history test, Teacher B provided more reading material than Teacher A. The regular-track students in the same class seemed fully capable of keeping up.

Teacher B also concentrated more on writing essay exams because, as he said, they are a major part of the AP exam. Unlike Teacher A, Teacher B engaged his students in a number of document analysis activities. He used inquiry techniques to teach his students how to analyze documents and incorporate their findings into frequent essays.

Teacher B also required more assignments than Teacher A that made the students defend a position in oral and written formats. Teacher B held an exam a week, alternating between essay and multiple-choice formats. Homework was assigned every day but was started in the classroom, resulting in some students not having much homework that night. Teacher B also gave a longer midterm and final exam than Teacher A. When it came to test items, Teacher B's tests (unlike those given by Teacher A) included pictures, cartoons, charts, maps and/or tables to be analyzed. Teacher B also engaged students in small-group work, as well as class presentations on a topic every week.

As seen in Appendix A, Teacher B spent time on simulations, brainstorming sessions, discussions, and debates designed to increase students' critical-thinking skills. He showed a film only once and said

that he just could not afford the time away from direct instruction. He did lecture more, and for a longer period of time, than Teacher A; however, all of his lectures included student questions and discussions.

There was definitely more reading in this class—mainly of historical materials that the teacher had copied. Although the students used the same textbook as Teacher A, the textbook was heavily supplemented with outside readings. On the whole, Teacher B assigned almost twice as much reading and writing than Teacher A.

Classroom atmosphere. All involved in this study observed that Teacher B was very much in control of his class. All he had to do was look around and students immediately got quiet. No one ever saw a class that was out of control. Although Teacher B's class was more quiet than Teacher A's, his classes were always intent on learning and the atmosphere in the classroom appeared to be one of mutual respect. Students also commented on how free they felt to make comments in the class—as long as it was related to the topic.

Usually, his students had to raise their hands and be recognized before making a statement or asking a question. On rare occasions, Teacher B allowed his students to just socialize and that happened only when the work was done and a few minutes before the bell was about to ring to close the class. Teacher B, although more formal than Teacher A, seemed more relaxed and patient, as well as better organized. Like Teacher A, he demanded and constantly reinforced the notion that everyone can and is expected to do well in his class. When students succeeded, Teacher B rewarded them with pizza parties, a free-homework night, and other incentives. I was told that students really tried hard to get into his classes. More than Teacher A, he tried to explain often why it was important for students to learn the lesson and how the lesson was relevant. His students seemed to always be paying attention. In addition, Teacher B allowed more wait time for student answers than Teacher A.

Although the classroom atmosphere was more businesslike, his relaxed and gentle demeanor made his classroom a pleasant place to learn in. Goals, objectives and assignments were always on the board and referred to by Teacher B at the beginning of each class. Teacher B also demonstrated genuine enthusiasm and interest in both his subject and his students.

Course objectives. Teacher B said that his primary goal was to get his honors students to score high on the AP U.S. History examination. He also said that he wanted to raise their Emotional Quotient, which he defined as each student being all that they could be and having the ability to get others to also improve. Teacher B started off the semester working to motivate his students, which met with almost immediate success. He had good participation in class debates and discussions. Teacher B never appeared to be frustrated and always conveyed the attitude that he liked every one of his students; they seemed to respond in kind.

Summary

These two teachers displayed many similarities that contributed to student learning. Each demonstrated a willingness to get to know their students as individuals; tried to design learning activities that fit their students' different learning styles; created a relaxed but task-orientated classroom; had a positive attitude towards each student; demonstrated enthusiasm and interest in the subject; used humor; conveyed the attitude that students can learn and are expected to learn; gave prompt feedback on graded assignments and classroom work; listened actively to the students and asked questions that made their students think; and used a variety of teaching strategies to enhance the lessons. Finally, each teacher used inquiry-based, student-centered learning to foster the growth of critical-thinking skills. The empirical study, however, would reveal certain differences between these two teachers.

The Empirical Study

Instruments

Two instruments were employed in this investigation to learn how these two teachers differed on student ratings of teacher and course and student ratings of interest/motivation/sense of value in learning the subject. Both instruments were judged to be reliable and a Delphi technique revealed validity.

Teacher Effectiveness

The instrument assessing teacher effectiveness was one developed by Jack Fraenkel. Two factors were identified with the teacher-effectiveness instrument. Factor 1 dealt with students' perception of their teacher's excellence. Factor 2 dealt with students' perception of the excellence of the course as created by the teacher. This instrument is reliable with a Cronbach's alpha of .86 for the overall instrument (.97 for Factor 1 and .56 for Factor 2). Validity was established using the Delphi technique. The instrument was found to be valid in reporting what it was designed to do; namely, student perception of teacher and course effectiveness.

Student Interest/Motivation/Sense of Value in Learning the Subject

This instrument was also based on Fraenkel's earlier instrument of teacher effectiveness. Items were changed, however, to measure interest and motivation.

The instrument was assessed on usefulness and reliability and its items appeared to have strong communalities and acceptable reliability (the standardized item alpha was .5749). Three factors arose from the data analysis; namely, student interest, motivation, and sense of value in learning the subject. Communalities for all items were good and a scree plot showed an acceptable "U" curve. The alpha values on all three factors were good. Factor one (interest) had an alpha of .6179; factor two (how students valued the good that they would receive from learning the subject) was .6857; and factor three (student efficacy or motivation derived from deductive lessons) was a .6023.

Hypotheses

The first null hypothesis was that there was no difference between the motivation/interest of secondary history students taught by an experienced teacher and secondary history students who were taught by a student teacher. The second null hypothesis is that no difference exists in secondary history student ratings of teacher and course effectiveness when taught by an experienced teacher and secondary history students' ratings of teacher and course effectiveness when taught by an inexperienced teacher.

The first alternative hypothesis was that there is a statistically significant difference between student interest/motivation of secondary history students who were taught by an experienced teacher and student interest/motivation of secondary history students taught by a student teacher. The second alternative hypothesis was that there is a statistically significant difference in ratings of teacher/course effectiveness between secondary history students who were taught by an experienced teacher and secondary history students who were taught by a student teacher.

Design

In an attempt to test the research hypothesis, the convenience sample had a nonrandomized pretest-posttest control group design. The independent variable was experience and the two dependent variables were students' ratings of their interest/motivation/sense of value in learning the subject and students' rating of teacher and course effectiveness.

Procedure

The classes were taught in block-scheduled periods of ninety minutes over twelve weeks. Again, Appendix A shows the teaching techniques used by both teachers. Both teachers required higher thinking skills and used student inquiry as a method of instruction. Also, both required reading and writing skills, while Teacher B also worked on document analysis skills at least two times a week. All classes were given both instruments as a pretest and as a posttest.

Results

On the qualitative instrument of teacher effectiveness, Teacher B scored higher (4.8158) than Teacher A (4.6589), however, there was no significant statistical difference ($F=2.919$, $Sig=.093$). A comment made by one student enrolled in the regular-track class seemed to be relevant; namely, the student said, “If this is social studies, why isn’t it boring?” On the qualitative instrument of student interest, motivation, and sense of value in learning the subject, Teacher B’s students scored higher on their rating instrument posttest (4.0947) than Teacher A’s students (3.7385), but the difference between the two classes was again not statistically significant ($F=.074$, $Sig = .787$).

I wanted to see if one teacher improved student scores by a proportionally higher rate than the other. However, after examining the mean differences between the pre and posttests of both instruments, it was found that there was no significant statistical difference between the two teachers in improving students’ scores at a higher rate than the other. There appears to be a level playing field created by students when it comes to rating a teacher’s effectiveness and their motivation.

Limitations

This study had two limitations. First, the students were placed with their current teachers, the teachers were volunteers, and no random assignment could occur. Second, it would have been more equitable to use classes of similar student academic abilities.

Summation

There was no significant statistical difference between Teacher A and Teacher B when it came to student rating of teacher effectiveness (see Appendix B for a copy of the instrument). The mean scores of the student rating of teacher effectiveness are as follows:

Teacher	N	Pre-Means	Post-Means
Teacher A	39	4.3282	4.6589
Teacher B	19	4.3816	4.8158

In addition, the mean scores of student interest/motivation/value for both teachers, in which there is again no significant statistical difference, are as follows:

Teacher	N	Pre-Means	Post-Means
Teacher A	39	3.1572	3.7385
Teacher B	19	3.7385	4.0947

The rate of increase or improvement—i.e., the differences in pretest and posttest interest/motivation/sense of value in learning the subject—for both teachers are as follows:

Teacher	N	Mean Difference Posttest and Pretest
Teacher A	39	.5813
Teacher B	19	.5842

The difference between the pretest and posttest student ratings of teacher and course effectiveness, as created by the teachers, are as follows:

Teacher	N	Mean Difference Posttest and Pretest
Teacher A	39	.3308
Teacher B	19	.4342

Conclusion

Since most texts and assessments stress basic skills outcomes, teachers are pressured to use traditional, direct methods of instruction to teach to the objectives of the minimum competency and basic skills achievement tests.³³ There are very few experimental research studies in education because it is

extremely difficult to control for variables.³⁴ Although case studies can't be used to make universal claims, they still can shed some light on classroom dynamics and teacher activity. Given the difficulties of getting random sampling and controlling for variables, use of case studies might be necessary, as educators are called to become more and more accountable and efficient.

Accountability has become well-rooted in the educational landscape and will only be supplanted when naturalistic and empirical studies indicate a better approach. The major challenge of this century will be the advancement of teaching. Resolution of that challenge "will depend on our ability to develop teaching that goes far beyond dispensing information, giving a test, and giving a grade."³⁵ The two teachers in this case study represent a partial picture of what effective teachers in a high school do on a daily basis in their classrooms. Perhaps what they do is worthy of consideration by those who wish to improve classroom effectiveness in this age of accountability.

NOTES

1. Jack Fraenkel, "A Portrait of Four Social Studies Teachers," *Social Science Record* (1990): 50, 67-97.
2. Jack Fraenkel, "A Portrait of Four Social Studies Teachers" (paper presented at American Educational Research Convention, April 1992).
3. Jere Brophy, "Fifth-grade U.S. History: How One Teacher Arranged to Focus on Key Ideas in Depth," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 20, no. 3 (1992): 12-21.
4. Jeffrey Cornett, "Teacher Thinking About Curriculum and Instruction: A Case Study of a Secondary Social Studies Teacher," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 18, no. 1 (1990): 248-73.
5. Jack Fraenkel, "A Portrait of Four Social Studies Teachers," 1990.
6. William Leonard, "Are You a Standards-Based Teacher?" *Science Teacher* 6, no. 2 (February 2003): 33-37.
7. Jack Fraenkel, phone conversation with the author, March 12, 1988.
8. Barbara J. Armento, "Research on Teaching Social Studies," in M.C. Wittrock, ed., *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1986); S.B. Palonsky, *900 Shows a Year: A Look at Teaching from a Teacher's Side of the Desk* (New York: Random House, 1986); J.P. Shaver and A. G. Larkins, *Research on Teaching* (New York: Macmillan, 1973).
9. Jeffrey Cornett, "Teacher Thinking About Curriculum and Instruction, 248-73; Linda McNeil, "Contradictions of Control," *Phi Delta Kappan* 69, no. 6 (Spring 1986): 432-38; Joseph Onosko, "Barriers to the Promotion of Higher Order Thinking," *Theory and Research in Social Education* 19, no. 4 (1991): 1-67; S.B. Palonsky, *900 Shows a Year*.
10. James McMillan, "Basic Assessment Concepts for Teachers and School Administrators," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, La., April 24, 2002), 5.
11. James Koon and Haydn Murray, "Using Multiple Outcomes to Validate Student Ratings of Overall Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal of Higher Education* 66, no. 1 (Fall 1995): 61-81.
12. Christopher Orpen, "Academic Motivation as a Moderator of the Effects of Teacher Immediacy on Student Cognitive and Affective Learning," *Education* 115, no. 1 (Fall 1994): 128-37.
13. Ellen Skinner and Michael Belmont, "Motivation in the Classroom: Reciprocal Effects of Teacher Behavior and Student Engagement Across the School Year," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 85, no. 4 (December 1993): 571-82.
14. John Patrick, *Critical Thinking in the Social Studies* (ERIC Digest 30, Bloomington, Ind.: Eric Clearinghouse, 1994).
15. J. Hammons, "Motivators and Demotivators of Student Learning: A Faculty View," *Michigan Community College Journal: Research and Practice* 5, no. 1 (Spring 1999): 29-44.
16. Neal Pean and Fran Campbell, "At-risk Students' Perceptions of Teacher Effectiveness," *Journal for a Just and Caring Education* 5, no. 3 (July 1999): 269-284.
17. J. Byer and M. Dana-Wesley, "Students' Response to Active Instructional Approaches in a Social Studies Methods Course," *Southern Social Studies Journal* 24, no. 2 (Spring 1999): 57-70.
18. Festus Obiakor, "Transforming Teaching-Learning to Improve Student Achievement," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Institute for the Transformation of Learning, Milwaukee, Wisc., October 26, 2000), 3.
19. Barbara McCombs and Marie Quiat, *Results of a Pilot Study to Evaluate the Community for Learning (CFL) Program* (Philadelphia, Pa.: Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success, 2000).
20. Linda McNeil, "Contradictions of Control".

21. Gail Winter, "More Schools Rely on Tests, But Study Raises Doubts," *New York Times*, December 28, 2002.
22. Diane Resnick, Unpublished research conducted for Bellaire High School, Houston, spring 1997.
23. Ibid.
24. Mark Windschitl, "Framing Constructivism in Practice as the Negotiation of Dilemmas: An Analysis of the Conceptual, Pedagogical, Cultural, and Political Challenges Facing Teachers," *Review of Educational Research* 72, no. 2 (Summer 2002): 131-175.
25. William Leonard, "Are You a Standards-Based Teacher?"
26. D.K. Cohen, "Educational Technology and School Organization," in R.S. Nickerson and P.P. Zoghbiates, eds., *Technology in Education: Looking Toward 1010* (Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1988), 255.
27. Mark Windschitl, "Framing Constructivism."
28. National Council for the Social Studies, "Standards and Position Statements," ncss.org/standards/positions/effectivecitizens.html.
29. Patrick; Jan Fair and Gregor Kachaturoff, "Teaching Thinking/Another Try!" *Social Studies* (March-April 1988): 79, no. 2: 64-69; W.D. Ehrhart, "Why Teach Vietnam?" *Social Education* 52, no. 1 (January 1988): 25-26.
30. Cameron White, *Transforming Social Studies Education: A Critical Perspective*. (Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1999).
31. Edith Guyton, "An Analysis of the Cognitive Antecedents of Political Variables" (paper presented at the American Educational Research convention, New Orleans: La., April 23, 1984).
32. Jack Fraenkel, "A Portrait of Four Social Studies Teachers," *Social Science Record*, 1990.
33. Linda Darling-Hammond, Jacqueline Ancess, and Beverly Falk, *Authentic Assessment in Action: Studies of Schools and Students at Work* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1995).
34. Jack Sheridan, "Teaching Social Studies" (lecture at the University of Houston, March 12, 2001)
35. Linda Darling-Hammond, "The Right to Learn and the Advancement of Teaching Research, Policy, and Practice for Democratic Education," *Educational Research* 6, no. 1 (1996): 5-17.

APPENDIX A

Classroom Teaching Strategies

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Teacher B</u>	<u>Teacher A</u>
Brainstorming Sessions	Often	Often
Debates	Often	Rarely
Lecture	Occasionally	Occasionally
Films	Rarely	Rarely
Teacher-Led Discussions	Often	Often
Presentations	Often	Occasionally
Role-playing	Often	Rarely
Small-Group Work	Seldom	Often
Student-Led Discussions	Often	Rarely
Student Presentations	Often	Occasionally
Silent Reading	Seldom	No
A Problem	Often	Occasionally
Simulations	Often	Rarely
Writing	Often	Occasionally

Definitions (during a six-week period):

No = never

Rarely = one to four times

Seldom = five to eight times

Often = nine to 12 times

APPENDIX B

Student Ratings of Teacher Attributes

	1	2	3	4	5	
<u>Attribute</u>	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	<u>Attribute</u>
Doesn't know subject	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Knows subject matter
Dull	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Enthusiastic
Unfair	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Fair
Disorganized	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Organized
Lacks sense of humor	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Possesses sense of humor
Boring	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Exciting
Discourages thinking	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Encourages thinking
Doesn't vary activities	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Varies class activities
Tests are unfair	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Tests are fair
No respect for students	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	: <u> </u> :	Has respect for students

APPENDIX C

Student Interest, Motivation, and Sense of Value in Learning the Subject

Strongly Agree				Strongly Disagree
5	4	3	2	1

History is interesting:				
5	4	3	2	1

By learning of others' mistakes in the past, we can avoid similar mistakes:				
5	4	3	2	1

The study of history promotes higher thinking skills:				
5	4	3	2	1

I like reading:				
5	4	3	2	1

I like writing:				
5	4	3	2	1

Lectures can be interesting, if I can participate in asking questions or making statements:				
5	4	3	2	1

I agree that history should be a required subject in school:				
5	4	3	2	1

In my spare time, I read historical books (like biographies and war stories):				
5	4	3	2	1