

MEASUREMENT OF TEACHER ATTITUDES IN RELATION TO  
THE "NEW CRITICISM" IN AMERICAN EDUCATION:  
AN ANALYSIS OF A SIX-WEEK INSTITUTE IN  
SOCIOLOGY

By

WILLIAM A. JOHNSON, JR.

Bachelor of Arts  
Northeastern State College  
Tahlequah, Oklahoma  
1967

Master of Science  
Kansas State College of Pittsburg  
Pittsburg, Kansas  
1968

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
May, 1972

AUG 10 1973

MEASUREMENT OF TEACHER ATTITUDES IN RELATION TO  
THE "NEW CRITICISM" IN AMERICAN EDUCATION:  
AN ANALYSIS OF A SIX-WEEK INSTITUTE IN  
SOCIOLOGY

Thesis Approved:

*Larry M. Perkins*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Gene Huff*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Donald E. Allen*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Daniel Selchmit*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*D. Blusham*  
\_\_\_\_\_

Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The significance of the events which combined to create this paper have been of the most meaningful in my life. The affective impact of the institute was much the same for myself and the other staff members as it was for the participants. I would like to extend my love and affection to those thirty-two teachers, for without them none of this would have been possible. The twelve high school students who gave of themselves in a way that was open and free will always be a cherished part of this experience, as I will relive it many times in my future thoughts.

To my thesis adviser and close friend, Dr. Larry Perkins, my adjectives of praise and thanks could never express the true value I place on his significance to my life. I find it difficult to imagine any thesis adviser who could have been more of a true friend and comfort in this most trying stage of my journey. It isn't necessary to give him credit for his guidance and encouragement throughout the creation of this paper, for all those who know him will easily see that this paper is my tribute to the things for which he stands. He truly lives by what he teaches, and has touched my soul with his love of mankind.

My thanks to Dr. Daniel Selakovich, who truly exemplifies what inquiry teaching is all about. Along with Dr. Perkins, he showed myself and the participants how this approach to teaching can truly facilitate experiential learning. His friendship and guidance during the creation of this paper will always be cherished.

I am indebted to Dr. Gene Acuff and Dr. Donald Allen for their criticisms and contributions. They have both played no small role in making this paper what it is and in influencing me to become who I am.

My appreciation is extended to the National Science Foundation for making funds available for both the institute and the writing of this paper through NSF Grant, #GW 5083.

Finally, I would like to attempt to express my love and appreciation to the person whose life I cherish above all things, my wife. I can only guess what it's been like for her living through this madness. For bearing with me and supplying me with strength through her love and understanding, I can never repay her. But I'll spend the rest of my life trying.

To my mother, whose unconditional love and understanding planted the seed within my soul to love my fellow man; and, to Dr. Joe James, who saw in me a reason to extend himself, and by so doing, put purpose in my life.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Preliminary Statement . . . . .	1
Rationale for the Study . . . . .	2
Educational Goals . . . . .	2
The "New Criticism" . . . . .	5
"The Medium is the Message" . . . . .	12
Humanizing the Schools . . . . .	21
Introduction to the Study . . . . .	31
The Problem . . . . .	31
The Institute . . . . .	32
II. RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	34
Introduction . . . . .	34
Existentialism in Education . . . . .	35
The Existential Model . . . . .	35
Education and the Existential Model . . . . .	43
The Inquiry Method . . . . .	47
The "Sociological Imagination" . . . . .	51
Summary . . . . .	55
III. METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN . . . . .	56
Introduction . . . . .	56
The School Opinion Survey . . . . .	57
Composition of Factors . . . . .	59
The Experimental Treatment . . . . .	61
Research Design . . . . .	63
Statement of Hypotheses . . . . .	67
Statistical Treatment . . . . .	70
Supplementary Data Collection . . . . .	72
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS . . . . .	74
Introduction . . . . .	74
Results from the <u>School Opinion Survey</u> . . . . .	75
Results from the <u>Institute Evaluation Test</u> . . . . .	82
Results from the Qualitative Forms of Data Analysis . . . . .	84
Teacher Interviews . . . . .	84
Daily Log . . . . .	97
Summary . . . . .	101

Chapter	Page
V. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	103
Conclusions from the Study . . . . .	103
Implications . . . . .	108
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	112
APPENDIX A - NSF INSTITUTE IN SOCIOLOGY . . . . .	123
APPENDIX B - TEACHER INTERVIEWS . . . . .	125
APPENDIX C - DAILY LOG . . . . .	165
APPENDIX D - SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY . . . . .	187
APPENDIX E - SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY (Items Segregated by Factors) . . . . .	196
APPENDIX F - EVALUATION OF THE NSF INSTITUTE IN SOCIOLOGY . . . . .	200
APPENDIX G - TEACHING PHILOSOPHY AND GENERAL EDUCATION IN SOCIOLOGY . . . . .	201

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. School Opinion Survey: Scale Intercorrelation Matrix . . . .	59
II. School Opinion Survey: T-Ratios on Pre- and Post-Measurements . . . . .	76
III. School Opinion Survey: Comparison of the Participant's Pre- and Post-Measurements and the County Teachers . . . .	80
IV. School Opinion Survey: T-Ratios on Participant's Pre- and Post-Measurements with County Teachers . . . . .	81
V. Institute Evaluation Test: Categorical Comparisons . . . .	83
VI. Institute Evaluation Test: Means, Frequency, and Analysis of Variance of Institute Groups . . . . .	84



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Research Design I . . . . .	64
2. Research Design II . . . . .	66
3. Analytical Possibilities for Research Design II . . . . .	67
4. t-test for Independent Samples . . . . .	71
5. t-test for Correlated Samples . . . . .	71
6. Teacher Interview Questions . . . . .	85

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Preliminary Statement

This research study focuses on the relation between a six-week institute which was conducted during the summer of 1970, at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, and the revolutionary movement that is now materializing in American education. The institute, which was composed of five staff members, thirty-two social studies teachers, and nine high school students, was concerned with introducing these teachers to the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching and the concepts and methods of sociology. The movement, which has been labelled the "New Criticism," is concerned with bringing an awareness of some of the basic issues within the educational institution, i.e., product versus process, subject matter or content versus teaching methods, the purposes and consequences of education, etc., to those who find themselves involved with the schools in one capacity or another. Its concepts and metaphors are embodied within the humanistic tradition, which emphasizes the problems and concerns of each individual, as opposed to the role structure of society. In order to better understand the nature of the relationship between this movement and the institute referred to above, it is necessary to have some comprehensive image of the changes in the

purposes and goals of American education with which this movement is concerned.

Chapter I is designed first, to offer the reader some insights into the basic issues involved in this movement as conceived by many of its most influential proponents and, second, to introduce the problem that is being investigated in this study.

## Rationale for the Study

### Educational Goals

During the past two centuries, American society and the world as a whole has undergone many rapid and radical changes, i.e., a breakdown in religious and familistic institutions, the emergence of large-scale, bureaucratic institutions in the spheres of technology and education (Martindale, 1966), the loss of a sense of "community," the rise of political "individualism," the diminishing influence of traditional, "sacred" patterns of evaluation, coupled with an overwhelming increase in the influence of rational, "secular" forms of judgment (Nisbet, 1966), etc. The problem of understanding and adjusting to these changes is significant at both the individual and institutional levels. Much time, energy, and money have been spent in attempting to better understand these changes, and to aid both individuals and institutions in their adjustments to them.

There is little agreement among sociologists and anthropologists concerning the number and type of institutions universal for all societies. But all would probably agree that some provision must be made within each society to guarantee that the culture is passed on to the

young, which is generally referred to as the socialization process. This is a necessary function if the society is to survive. In the more stable societies, which are characterized by gradual, mostly unnoticed change, this function is satisfied, for the most part, within the institutional structure of the family. But when a society is characterized by rapid technological innovation, industrialization, and urbanization, the educational function is satisfied through the formation of a highly formal, bureaucratic institution (Martindale, 1966). Although the means vary, the goals of such an institution are consistent across societies (Goslin, 1965). They are twofold, and somewhat opposed to each other.

On the one hand, individuals are "trained" to fill specialized roles in their respective societies. Goslin refers to this as "allocating individuals to positions in society." As the society advances scientifically and technologically, these positions become highly specialized, requiring many years of academic or technical training for those individuals who "qualify." This function of the educational institution is in line with Durkheim's (1893) "organic" form of social solidarity, which is based on the primacy of the division of labor. In his interpretation of Durkheim's analysis of the division of labor, Nisbet (1966) says:

With the rise of technology and the general emergence of individuality from the restraints of the past, it becomes possible...for social order to rest, not on mechanical uniformity and collective repression, but on the organic articulation of free individuals pursuing different functions but united by their complementary roles...and division of labor will provide all that is necessary for unity and order.

On the other hand, it is also the function of education to provide the young with a general understanding of the world in which they live; in essence, this means to provide the proper environment for them "to

learn how to learn." While the former is information and "fact" oriented, specialized within a "field" or discipline, the latter is oriented toward "inquiry" and "discovery" through the asking of questions that are relevant to the individual. Rogers (1967) refers to this as "experiential learning." With regard to this type, he says:

The other type of learning is primarily experiential, or significant or meaningful. The student says, "I am discovering --drawing in from the outside and making that which is drawn in a real part of me." ...The feeling in regard to any experiential learning is, "Now I'm grasping what I need and want" (p. 38).

While these two goals of the educational institution need not be in opposition to each other, they can easily become so when the bureaucratic structure allows the means and ends of the institution to become confused. Merton refers to this process as the "displacement of goals" (1968, p. 199). It has been stated that this is precisely what has occurred in American education today. Many find this trend toward occupational specialization and the rational ordering of men into "complementary" roles--bureaucratization--at the expense of a general, experiential type of education, to be a frightening prospect. No one recognized and feared the possible consequences of this trend more than Weber (1969), which is made clear in the following statement:

....it is still more horrible to think that the world could one day be filled with nothing but those little cogs, little men clinging to little jobs and striving towards bigger ones--a state of affairs which is to be seen once more, as in the Egyptian records, playing an ever-increasing part in the spirit of our present administrative system, and specially of its offspring, the students. This passion for bureaucracy...is enough to drive one to despair. It is as if.... we were deliberately to become men who need "order" and nothing but order, who become nervous and cowardly if for one moment this order wavers, and helpless if they are torn away from their total incorporation in it. That the world should know no men but these: it is in such an evolution that we are already caught up, and the great question is

therefore not how we can promote and hasten it, but what can we oppose to this machinery in order to keep a portion of mankind free from this parceling-out of the soul, from this supreme mastery of the bureaucratic way of life (p. 455).

The trend which Weber recognized during the early part of the twentieth century has found its climax in today's modern, overdeveloped world. It would seem that Riesman's (1950) prophetic account concerning the rise of the "other-directed" personality is rapidly becoming a reality in the world we are creating, and our system of schools bears no small amount of the responsibility for its creation.

#### The "New Criticism"

It is precisely this concern with the increased flight of the American education system toward a highly specialized, standardized form of training individuals for future positions in society, at the expense of a general education in which the student's problems and adjustments to his world are made relevant, that precipitated the New Criticism movement. There have been numerous criticisms concerning this basic dichotomy within the normative structure of the American educational order, and many have attempted to ameliorate the paradox with unique and ingenious plans of reform. These reforms range from basic alterations within the existing structure to the total destruction of what now exists, replacing it with something entirely new.

As more teachers and students are influenced by this movement, the institutional structure of the school finds itself in a near anomic state. This is certainly a natural or even necessary condition prior to and during a revolution with radical overtones. Teachers and administrators alike have begun to examine the values and normative structure

that have been prevalent and stable within the educational order for many years. Basically, the critics are saying that what has been given priority in the school system, e.g., training for future roles, knowledge for the sake of knowledge, order and discipline, etc., is dehumanizing to the individual and has little or nothing to do with education.

Many of the critics within this movement are classroom teachers, or have been at one time. Their educational philosophy constitutes a fairly cohesive school of thought, and their concerns center around the same basic issues within the educational environment. For the most part, their solutions to these issues follow a similar pattern, and the rhetoric and style of thought is remarkably parallel. Unlike their predecessors, the "Old Critics," i.e., Bestor, Lynd, Conant, Rickover, et al., who were pillars of the Establishment wishing to utilize the schools as more efficient instruments of economic development and national defense, these individuals tend to be not just un-Establishment, but intensely anti-Establishment in their outlook. Their views regard economic greed and the lust for military hegemony, which are imbued by the "sacred cow" institutions of free enterprise with its profit system, nationalism, and war, as inextricably destructive of both schoolchildren in particular, and humanity in general (Jones, 1970).

The movement was conceived mostly amidst the struggles of a number of these young teachers in the Negro ghettos of New York, Boston, and Los Angeles during the mid-1960's. At this time, a number of remarkably similar books appeared on the scene--Mary Francis Greene and Orletta Ryan (1965), The Schoolchildren Growing Up in the Slums; James Herndon (1965) The Way it Spozed to Be; Nat Hentoff (1966), Our Children Are Dying; Jonathon Kozol (1967), Death at an Early Age; and

Herbert Kohl (1967), 36 Children; to mention a few. According to Jones (1970):

....Each of these books is a rather straightforward narrative account of its protagonist's---usually its author's---attempt to teach over-large classes of deprived children in school situations characterized by public neglect and nonsupport, administrative incompetence, corruption and defensiveness, bureaucratic inefficiency and rigidity, and fellow teachers with attitudes of defeat, class and racial prejudice, authoritarianism, and emotional exploitation of their students (p. 4).

The New Criticism movement would probably have ended here if not for the efforts of John Holt. While the preceding authors had dealt with the lives of children from deprived areas and social classes, this represented the fate of only one segment of the American school population. It remained for Holt, in his three books---How Children Fail (1964), How Children Learn (1967), and The Underachieving School (1969) ---to represent his experiences as a teacher in some "...rather expensive and fashionable private schools for middle- and upper-class children." According to Holt, the tragically sterile and rigid occurrences that seemed to be representative of the educational experiences in underprivileged areas were also quite prevalent in the educational system as a whole. In fact, he found sterility and rigidity to be representative of schools, teaching, and adult-child interactions in general.

Holt feels that the five examples which follow depict how the schools stifle learning and, in fact, actually teach dullness and stupidity. First, they remove children from the reality of their environment and place them in a setting which is extremely artificial and barren. The schools do not begin to offer the richness of stimulation which is provided in their own homes, communities, and the natural world. Second, between the children and whatever reality is present in



the schools, "teachers" are interposed. For the most part, these are adults with preconceived notions concerning what is important for children to know, which answers are "right" and which answers are "wrong," and what is considered wasting time and what is not. The consequences of this are that children do not learn to perceive and understand reality, but what they do learn is to "psyche out" and meet their teachers' expectations, even if those expectations are insulting and degrading; the result being that the majority of our most "successful" students are the most docile students. Third, the schools take the essentially unified experiences of children and slice them up into categories that are artificial and unreal. These categories are referred to as "subjects," and children are forced to attend to these rather than to those things that are vital and whole for them. Fourth, physical and social activity, noise-making, and enthusiasm are repressed by the schools in the interest of order and quiet. All of these above mentioned behaviors are necessary for emotional, intellectual, and even physical growth, but they are also uncomfortable and inconvenient for adults to deal with. And fifth, the schools are run by very detailed, mechanical, clock-driven time schedules, rather than by taking their cues from the natural rhythms of living and learning as these surge through the organisms of the children.

The assumptions which lie behind these generalizations, and the observations on which they are based, are never made explicit in Holt's books. One need only turn to such books as George Dennison's (1969) The Lives of Children, and George Leonard's (1968) Education and Ecstasy, to discover a much more explicit expression of the assumptions underlying the New Criticism.

Dennison's book is much like the other books cited so far, but he is more concerned with philosophical issues, and therefore he gives a theoretical foundation for his experimental First Street School. He had earlier worked with Paul Goodman [Compulsory Mis-education (1962), and Growing Up Absurd (1960)], and his influence is evident in the conduct of this experimental school. Dennison's presentation of the basic principles underlying this school seems to express adequately the fundamental orientation of the New Criticism movement. These principles clearly depict those educational issues of concern to the New Criticism movement. First, there is concern for the present life of the child, as opposed to preparing him for later life. Second, it is believed that present conventional school routines---military discipline, schedules, punishments and rewards, standardization---have nothing to do with the learning process, but that in fact they interfere with "normal" human relationships and stifle experiential learning, and they oppose the basic truths of the human predicament that must be the basis for any true education. Finally, it is felt that what should be quite a simple procedure---running a primary school (or, for that matter, any school) ---has become a bureaucratic quagmire of unworkable centralization and lust for control.

Leonard's (1968) book tends to be quite different from those cited thus far. He is not a teacher, but a journalist, and although his book is certainly critical of education as it now exists, it is primarily a utopian survey of some recent developments in education that he feels might provide a basis for an entirely different kind of education--- education founded upon the belief that the proper goal of human existence is not work and the acquisition of material things, nor is it

competition for dominance over others, but rather ecstasy, "joy, ananda, the ultimate delight" (p. 230). According to Leonard, "education, at its best, is [an] ecstatic...activity of soul in accordance with virtue" (p. 20).

It would seem that the one main goal of the school is to produce "automatons" programmed to their social roles with an emphasis on following instructions and obeying orders. Leonard (1968) feels that the average child is not given many opportunities to respond to during the day. When the chance does come, his response is usually "echoic," meaning that the teacher receives the response he wants to hear. A continuation in this procedure produces an organism with little or no integrity. In many cases when the child does respond with honest feeling he gets "slapped down." The things that are communicated to him through this medium relate to sitting still, lining up in rows, following instructions, and other basic trivia. But the real crime comes when he is made to feel guilt for impulses that are natural and healthy. Because of this, Leonard feels that the present school system is designed to produce little more than unhappiness.

One might ask the question, how did mankind enter into this tragic business of damming up "the flood of human potential?" Leonard draws heavily from such sources as Freud (1930), Civilization and Its Discontents, Marcuse (1966), Eros and Civilization, Montagu (1967), On Being Human, and Mumford (1967), The Myth of the Machine, to explain historically our deplorable destruction of human freedom and creativity as Civilization has "advanced."

He sees man in his original state as a nomadic hunter who had "no job except learning," a truly free and ecstatic being; something

commensurate with Rousseau's "Noble Savage" (p. 73). With the discovery of agriculture and the sedentary way of life man was obliged to die a little. He had to sacrifice one of the basic features of ecstasy, the immediate and intrinsic gratification of totally imbibing activity, in favor of the deferred compensations of the dull drudgery which is plowing, sowing, and weeding. In order to accomplish this purpose, it was necessary to construct what Mumford calls the "Megamachine," which Leonard regards as the essence of Civilization. The Megamachine is depicted as "...a machine that concentrated energy in great assemblages of men, each unit shaped, graded, trained, regimented, articulated, to perform its particular function (role) in a unified whole (society)"<sup>1</sup> (p. 75).

Leonard considers "aversive control"---punishment---to be the key movement within this Megamachine. Since this great change in the life style of man occurred, education has meant "the internalization of the whip." In western society this means that natural feelings have been denied, spontaneity has been squelched, and three "abnormal compulsions" ---acquisition, competition, and aggression---have been put into their place. Leonard feels that these compulsions tend to stifle vitality and produce "robot-like standardization" of potentially unique human beings. They are influential in alienating the individual from himself and from others. They are the essential fuel of society's "inhuman, Moloch-like mechanism." In this respect, they have come to be viewed as the essence of human nature. Leonard believes that the school is

---

<sup>1</sup>Parenthetic concepts added by this writer.

the killer of human potential because it exists to teach these compulsions.

Ironically, he sees the hope of mankind's future freedom and return to ecstatic learning to be solely dependent upon the machine-like progression of this same Megamachine that has dammed the flood of human potential for so many centuries. In its pursuit of the machine ethic, efficiency, the Megamachine has finally developed the technology to the level where it can transform itself into a true machine. The history of the Megamachine has been one of reducing men to the status of machine-parts to further its efficiency. Leonard believes this is no longer the case. He feels it no longer needs to incorporate the total personality of men in order to accomplish its purpose. For the same reason that it once sought to dehumanize men before infusing them within its fabric, it now seeks to exclude them altogether. And according to Leonard, this is our liberation. This offers man an opportunity to return to his original state as hunter, free to explore his environment and enjoy the ecstasy of learning. He concludes by saying:

Every child, every person can delight in learning. A new education is already here, thrusting up in spite of every barrier we have been able to build. Why not help it to happen? (p. 239).

### "The Medium is the Message"

Teachers are becoming more and more aware of the fact that it's not what you teach, but how you teach, that is important. Marshall McLuhan (1964), in his book, Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man, has shed a great deal of light on the influence of the character and structure of the environment on the perceptions and attitudes of those who participate in it. The medium in the form of the environment is the

message. According to Postman and Weingardner (1969), the "message" refers to perceptions, attitudes, and sensitivities---nearly all of those things which the person learns to see and feel and value---that are communicated through the various media. These things are learned or internalized by individuals because their environment---media---is organized in a manner that either permits, encourages, or perhaps insists that they be learned. This is true whether the medium be a television set or a newspaper or an automobile or a Xerox machine or a classroom setting. The important question is not, "What's on TV?" or "What's in the newspaper?" or even "What course is this?" but, rather, "In what ways does the structure or process of the medium-environment manipulate our senses and attitudes?" (p. 17).

This basic insight contains much of the substance for the movement we have referred to as the New Criticism; especially in light of the traditional dichotomy in American education that a classroom lesson is made up largely of two components: content and method. Whether the content is viewed as important or as trivial, it is always considered to be

....the "substance" of the lesson; it is what the students are there to "get;" it is what they are supposed to learn; it is what is "covered." Content, as any syllabus proves, exists independently of and prior to the student, and is indifferent to the media by which it is "transmitted." Method, on the other hand, is "merely" the manner in which the content is presented. The method may be imaginative or dull, but it is never more than a means of conveying the content. It has no content of its own. While it may induce excitement or boredom, it carries no message.... (Postman and Wingardner, 1969, p. 18).

Most, if not all, of the schools engaging in the training of teachers are organized around the idea that content and method are separate, as described above. While teachers are told that the separation is

real, useful, and basically a good thing, and that it ought to be maintained in the schools, there is also the attitude that while they are separate, they are not equal. It is the content courses that are believed to be the real substance of education, while the methods courses are considered merely "fake." They are supposedly concerned with improving the ways and means of getting the content to the student, and they have no content of their own. With regard to the things that methods courses have been concerned with thus far, i.e., how to write lesson plans, when to use an overhead projector, and why it is desirable to keep the room at a comfortable temperature, their inferior status is easily defended. Dealing with this sort of trivia in the face of all the potential that teaching "methods" has to offer is further evidence that the "invention" of a dichotomy between content and method is both naive and dangerous. As the medium is the message clearly implies, "...the critical content of any learning experience is the method or process through which the learning occurs" (Postman and Weingardner, 1969, p. 19). It would seem that many of our most prestigious educators have failed to understand this critical point, e.g., Havighurst (1960), Conant (1963), Bruner (1960, 1966).

As expressed by Postman and Weingardner (1969), in Teaching As a Subversive Activity, and by Silberman (1970a) in Crisis in the Classroom, "...it is not what you say to people that counts, but what you have them do." According to Silberman:

What educators must realize...is that how they teach and how they act may be more important than what they teach. The way we do things, that is to say, shapes values more directly and more effectively than the way we talk about them...children are taught a host of lessons about values, ethics, morality, character, and conduct every day of the week, less by the content of the curriculum than by the way schools are organized, the ways teachers and parents behave, the way they talk to

children and to each other, the kinds of behavior they approve or reward and the kinds they disapprove or punish. These lessons are far more powerful than the verbalizations that accompany them and that they frequently controvert (p. 9).

What students do in most classes today is listen to the teacher lecture over material that may or not interest them, attempt to guess what it is he wants them to know, and remember it long enough to feed it back on a test. If they are good at this and can pretend they are interested---in essence, if they can give the teacher what he wants---we say they are "good" students and reward them competitively with high grades, teacher approval, outstanding awards, etc. If they are not highly competitive for grades, or if they are bored and do not wish to feign interest, we punish them with low grades and teacher disapproval, and saddle them with such derogatory labels as "slow-learner," "under-achiever," "dull," "deviant," and that classic among so-called "liberal" educators, the "disadvantaged," which in reality implies one that has no economic stake in the subject matter.

Postman and Weingardner feel that most of what passes for curriculum in today's schools is nothing more than a "strategy for distraction." They feel that it is designed to prevent students from discovering themselves and their environment in any realistic sense. That is, it does not allow inquiry into most of those crucial problems that make up the world outside the school. With regard to this connection, one of the main differences between those students categorized as "advantaged" and those categorized as "disadvantaged" is that the former has an economic stake in responding positively to the curriculum, while the latter does not. In other words, the real relevance of the curriculum for the "advantaged" student is that if he does as he is told he will



receive a tangible payoff.

In essence, we place a premium on following instructions and on figuring out what the teacher wants and responding positively; in a word, the teacher rewards docility. Those students who dare to follow their own imagination and dreams, to take a stand against what they are being coerced to do and think, to be different in the face of forced standardization of response, are punished by the means mentioned above and, what is more important, they are identified as "failures."

Just what does it do to a child's self-concept and sense of identity to be labelled as a failure? Glasser (1969a), in his book Schools Without Failure, has considered some of the consequences of this act. Working on the premise that identity is the basic human need, that all of us need to identify ourselves as "somebody," he depicts the tragedy that occurs in our public schools when we attempt to teach children how to succeed by failing them. The idea that prevails in many of our schools is that if you fail a child it will cause him to "buckle down" and do what is required of him; in essence "it will make a new man of him." What actually occurs, according to Glasser, is in line with Merton's "self-fulfilling prophecy." By labeling a child as a failure he internalizes this identity and, in turn, he behaves as he feels a failure should behave. Through this process there are many children in the schools who are convinced that they are failures. Glasser feels it is not important to spend time evaluating students, but that each and every one of us must spend time evaluating ourselves. Our perceptions of "self" are, by and large, based on how we feel others perceive us. This point has been vividly portrayed by Cooley (1922) in his concept of the "looking-glass self."

With this in mind, Glasser suggests that the necessary steps to a successful identification follow two basic routes, which he refers to as "success-need pathways." On the one hand, the person who arrives at a "success" identity always has someone who loves him. Of equal importance, he has the ability to care for someone else. Those who manage to create an identity that is on the success pathway believe that what they are doing in the world is worthwhile, because others in their lives have praised them and given them confidence. During the child's early life, when his sense of self is beginning to take shape, his parents and teachers are probably the most influential force contributing to his identity. This is why Glasser believes that our entire education program must follow the success-need pathway, so that the child can identify himself as a success.

Those who view themselves as failures come to possess the identity of a failure and chart their actions in relation to this identity. Their behavior is in contrast to the behavior of those who have followed the success-need pathway---the pathway of love and self-worth. They behave in a manner that reaffirms their failure identities. It is usually anti-social in one form or another. Students who display this anti-social or deviant type of behavior do so because they see themselves as failures, and this behavior cannot be changed without first reorienting them toward a success-need pathway. In the words of Glasser (1969b):

Basic, then, to the whole process of education is.... getting human involvement as a major part of the educational procedure. Without that, there isn't any education, without that there has to be failure....we can run schools that kids feel good about; it's not that hard to do....[it] requires us to develop our capacities to deal with little children as human beings, not as vessels to be filled full of knowledge

....Our schools have to become reservoirs of social responsibility, where people care for each other (Glasser, 1969b, pp. 12-13).

As the schools now stand, it is almost unheard of for students to play any role in deciding what problems are worth studying or what procedures of inquiry ought to be used. They are viewed mostly as objects to be filled with some "knowledge" that may or may not pertain to their lives, that may or may not be "meaningful" to them.

It is probably safe to say that most if not all of what is actually "learned"---remembered beyond the last quiz---in the classroom is that which the structure of the classroom itself---the medium---communicates. Postman and Weingartner (1969) have listed a few of these "learnings" or "messages" that are communicated to students through the classroom structure of modern American education, none of which can be found officially listed among the aims of teachers:

Passive acceptance is a more desirable response to ideas than active criticism.

Discovering knowledge is beyond the power of students and is, in any case, none of their business.

Recall is the highest form of intellectual achievement, and the collection of unrelated "facts" is the goal of education.

The voice of authority is to be trusted and valued more than independent judgment.

One's own ideas and those of one's classmates are inconsequential.

Feelings are irrelevant in education.

There is always a single, unambiguous Right Answer to a question.

English is not History and History is not Science and Science is not Art and Art is not Music, and Art and Music are minor subjects, and a subject is something you "take" and, when you have taken it, you have "had" it, and if you have "had" it, you are immune and need not "take" it again (The Vaccination Theory of Education? pp. 20-21).

It would seem that what the majority of students learn is to satisfy the demands of the classroom environment, not the demands of the question, or of reality. In most cases this "message" is communicated through the structure of the classroom, meaning that the organization of teacher and student roles, the rules and rights of the "game," define the expected behavior patterns. In other words, "the medium is the message."

Most classroom environments are organized in just such a manner as suggested above. The student is rewarded for giving the teacher only the answer he wishes to receive. If he happens to ask questions that are overly inquisitive or embarrassing to the teacher, i.e., how does a textbook writer arrive at his conclusions? Or, whose facts are those? Or, why are we doing this work?, he will probably receive some form of punishment, since behavior such as that is exhibited only by "wise guys." If one considers the fact that most classroom environments are managed in a manner to prevent questions such as these from being asked, it is quite easy to become very depressed. This depression is expressed vividly in Silberman's realization:

Most of all....I am indignant at the failures of the public schools themselves. "The most deadly of all possible sins," Erik Erikson suggests, "is the mutilation of a child's spirit." It is not possible to spend any prolonged period visiting public school classrooms without being appalled by the mutilation visible everywhere---mutilation of spontaneity, of joy in learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self. The public schools---those "killers of the dreams," to appropriate a phrase of Lillian Smith's---are the kinds of institution one cannot really dislike until one gets to know them well. Because adults take the schools so much for granted, they fail to realize what grim, joyless places most American schools are, how oppressive and petty are the rules by which they are governed, how intellectually sterile and esthetically barren the atmosphere, what an appalling lack of civility obtains on the part of teachers and principals, what contempt they unconsciously display for children as children.

....what is mostly wrong with the public schools is due not to venality or indifference or stupidity, but to mindlessness. To be sure, teaching has its share of sadists and clods, of insecure and angry men and women who hate their students for their openness, their exuberance, their color or their affluence. But by and large, teachers, principals, and superintendents are decent, intelligent, and caring people who try to do their best by their lights. If they make a botch of it, and an uncomfortably large number do, it is because it simply never occurs to more than a handful to ask why they are doing what they are doing---to think seriously or deeply about the purposes or consequences of education (1970a, pp. 10-11).

This "mindlessness" is the chief oppressor of those who would question the structure of the schools as they are now. To do so is to "rock the boat" and make things difficult for those in authority. The environment of the schools is arranged in such a manner that the asking of significant questions is not valued. But what is knowledge if not a response to questions? And how can new knowledge be discovered if new questions are not asked? Basically, the point is this: "Once you have learned how to ask questions---relevant and appropriate and substantial questions---you have learned how to learn and no one can keep you from learning whatever you want or need to know" (Postman and Weingardner, 1969, p. 23). But this, the most important of all man's intellectual abilities---the art and science of asking questions---is not taught in the schools. And it is not taught in the most devastating way possible: by arranging the environment---the medium---so that significant question asking is not valued. For those who do question, the price is dropping out of the Establishment. "The price of maintaining membership in the Establishment is unquestioning acceptance of authority" (Postman and Weingardner, 1969, p. 24). In the words of Fromm (1963):

....The danger of the past was that men became slaves. The danger of the future is that men may become robots. True, robots do not rebel. But given man's nature, robots cannot live and remain sane. They become "golems;" they will

destroy their world and themselves because they can no longer stand the boredom of a meaningless life (p. 76).

### Humanizing the Schools

Given these perspectives of the educational environment, it is not difficult to perceive the schools as being unfit to foster the development in children of relevant question-asking and of identifying what is meaningful in their lives, with the opportunity to pursue that meaning. If, as Herndon (1965) has implied, "...the absolute key to getting through school.... is that you must understand and somehow satisfy the bureaucracy" (p. 90), the main problem becomes one of bringing an awareness of this situation to as many teachers and administrators as possible; to make the schools more "humane" institutions where children have the opportunity, borrowing a phrase from Allport (1961), to "become" what their dreams and their potential might allow. The important question is, how can this be done?

Many suggestions for change can be found in recent books written by serious and intelligent men. Herndon, and many others like him, see almost no hope of making the schools more humane institutions "...for that, after all, would involve liberty, the last thing we may soon expect (Herndon, 1965, p. 198). Still, there are those who continue to devote their lives to bringing about this fulfillment, of which he is one. This study, and the institute from which it was taken, is conceived by this writer to be just such an effort. Before pursuing the study and its findings, it seems appropriate to offer a few suggestions in this area from some of the men who continue to pursue the revolution in American education as their "purpose in life."

One interesting development within this so-called revolution or

"New Criticism" is that much of the substance and purpose for the movement has stemmed from the ideas of men outside of, or not directly related to, the educational institution, e.g., Marshall McLuhan (1964), Norbert Wiener (1954), Carl Roberts (1961, 1967, 1969), Paul Goodman (1960, 1964), Alfred Korsybski (1958), I. A. Richards (1935), Lewis Mumford (1967), and Alan Watts (1951, 1970), to mention a few. Postman and Weingardner feel that these men have several things in common. First, they all tend to be "romantic" or "idealistic" in their views. That is, they feel that man's situation can be improved through innovations that are utopian-oriented. Second, their ideas are imaginative and courageous, moving beyond the scope and limitations of conventional assumptions. Third, they all have attempted to deal with the problems of the contemporary world, which means that their ideas are temporocentrically relevant, not calculatively construed to maintain the status quo in the face of both irrelevance and injustice. And Finally as stated above, most of them are not thought of as "educators," which is extremely important because it would seem that within the "Educational Establishment" it is difficult, if not impossible, to find ideas sufficiently daring and vigorous on which to build a new approach to education. In the words of Postman and Weingardner (1969):

....there are so few men currently working as professional educators who have anything germane to say about changing our educational system to fit present realities. Almost all of them deal with qualitative problems in quantitative terms, and, in doing so, miss the point. The fact is that our present educational system is not viable and is certainly not capable of generating enough energy to lead to its own revitalization. What is needed is a kind of shock therapy with stimulation supplied by other, living sources (pp. xiv-xv).

One of the most outspoken and germane of these "other, living sources" is Paul Goodman. In his two books that deal with our present

society and educational system, Growing Up Absurd (1960), and Compulsory Mis-education (1964), he has been critical again and again of the dehumanizing experience that is "mis-education" in our public schools.

According to Goodman (1964):

It is said that our schools are geared to "middle-class values," but this is a false and misleading use of terms. The schools less and less represent any human values, but simply adjustment to a mechanical system...The philosophic aim of education must be to get each one out of his isolated class and into the one of humanity (p. 21).

Trained in the schools, they go to the same quality of jobs, culture, politics. This is education, mis-education, socializing to the national norms and regimenting to the national "needs" (p. 23).

In his attempt to "realistically examine" the schools, Goodman (1964) concludes that "...the compulsory system has become a universal trap, and it is no good" (p. 31). He feels that you can teach people anything; if the right techniques of "socializing" and "communicating" are utilized they can be taught to adapt to almost anything. The essence of "human nature" is that man is almost indefinitely adaptable. "Man," as C. Wright Mills suggests, "is what suits a particular type of society in a particular historical stage" (Goodman, 1960, p. 4).

Growing up in America is interpreted today as "...a process of socializing some rather indefinite kind of animal, and "socializing" is used as a synonym for teaching him the culture" (1960, p. 8). Those young men who conform to the system become, for the most part, apathetic, disappointed, cynical, and wasted. The bright, lively children in our society, who possess the potentiality for noble ideals, honest effort, and some form of worthwhile achievement, find themselves transformed into "useless and cynical bipeds, or decent young men trapped or early resigned, whether in or out of the organized system" (1960, p. 14).



Goodman perceives his purpose to be, "...to show how it is desperately hard these days for an average child to grow up to be a man, for our present organized system of society does not want men. They are not safe. They do not suit" (1960, p. 14).

The products that are created within this rigid, highly-controlled, bureaucratic setting are something far less than what is potentially there in the beginning. For as Goodman has asserted, and others, such as Dubos (1970) have reaffirmed, "man will survive as a species for one reason: He can adapt to almost anything. I am sure we can adapt to almost anything" (Dubos, 1970, p. 2). And what we end up with is a product highly skilled in the "art of docility." In the words of Farber (1969):

Even more discouraging than the Auschwitz approach to education is the fact that the students take it. They haven't gone through 12 years of public school for nothing...Jesus, can they follow orders! Freshmen come up to me with an essay and ask if I want it folded, and whether their name should be in the upper right hand corner. And I want to cry and kiss them and caress their poor tortured heads.

Students don't ask that orders make sense. They give up expecting things to make sense long before they leave elementary school. Things are true because the teacher says they're true....

What school amounts to, then, for white and black kids alike, is a 12-year course in how to become slaves (pp. 92-93).

For those who choose to continue their "training" at the college level---usually they are informed by test scores and counsellors that they "qualify" in a numerical sense to continue their "education"---the process does not change much. If they are to succeed in college and graduate school they must remember and practice those things they have "learned" during their "12-year course in how to be slaves." Seeley's (1966) statement furthers our understanding of the educational process

as a dehumanizing experience:

What, in rough outline, educational institutions now do is to take the child---warm living flesh and spirit in the kindergarten and nursery school---and turn him into a sinew, skeleton, scar-tissue at the high school, college or grad school exit....

Not out of some inherent necessity of "growing up," indeed, this is growing down---but out of the very structure and content of education designed to that end. And rightly so, for what we have "needed" hitherto were not human beings but skilled ants, and the institutions appropriate to their production---our schools and colleges---have been and are mostly anthills.

Look at any high school today---close up. Then try to think of a process not patently punitive which would secure a different effect---better calculated to produce empty meaning, value, sense, sensibility out of life---to produce pseudo-robots ("free" enough to manage, but not free enough to ask "what for?"), to institute triviality as normative, to lead straight to the life of "kicks" as the only appropriate response....And college and university are not visibly worse or better. The educators speak of "educating the whole child, but unless he checks pretty nearly everything that makes a child and a human being at the door, they panic (p. 13).

And the statement by Martin (1970) also adds depth to our understanding of what occurs in the schools:

....the young more than ever seem beautiful but maimed, trying against all odds to salvage something from the mass. With daring and luck many seem to survive, and some few thrive, but too many others....already seem destined to spend their lives wrestling with something very close to psychosis....Theirs is a condition of the soul that marks the dead end of the beginnings of America---a dreadful anomaly in which one loses all access to others and the self: a liberation that is simultaneously the most voluptuous kind of freedom and an awful form of terror.

....The tag ends of two dozen different transplanted foreign cultures have begun to die within us, have already died, and the young have been released into what is perhaps the first true "American" reality---one marked, above all, by the absence of any coherent culture....

If all this is so, what sense can one make of the public schools: They are stiff, unyielding, microscopic versions of a world that has already disappeared. They are, after all, the state's schools, they do the state's work, and

their purpose is the preservation of things as they were ....Their main structural function is to produce in the young a self-delusive "independence"---a system of false consciousness and need that actually renders them dependent on institutions and the state. Their corrosive role-playing and demand systems are so extensive, so profound, that nothing really human shows through---and when it does, it appears only as frustration, exhaustion, and anger.

That, of course, is the real outrage of the schools: their systematic corruption of the relations among persons. Where they should be comrades, allies, equals, and even lovers, the public schools make them "teacher" and "student"---replaceable units in a mechanical ritual that passes on, in the name of education, and "emotional plague;" a kind of ego and personality that has been so weakened, so often denied the experience of community or solitude, that we no longer understand quite what these things are or how to achieve them.

Examining American society and the educational order with this sort of critical scrutiny is somewhat of a desensitizing experience in itself. But even if the above depiction is mostly true, and I fear that it is, concerned and dedicated men must find it in their purpose and meaning of life to act in some manner that will bring about the changes necessary for our survival. This means they must first develop the ability to understand and communicate with the young. For, as Margaret Mead (1970b) has stated so well, "today, nowhere in the world are there elders who know what the children know...." (p. 25). This is to say that no one who has not been reared within the last twenty years knows what those who have been reared during this period know. "These young dissidents realize the critical need for immediate world action on problems that affect the whole world. What they want is, in some way, to begin all over again" (p. 25). And if we are to realize this new beginning, and somehow we must, there must first come the ability to "listen" to what the young have to say. This does not mean to merely be quiet and give them the opportunity to verbalize their feelings.

to listen with empathy, and attempt to understand how and why they feel as they do. Without this type of listening there can be no communication. In the words of Rogers (1952):

....Real communication occurs....when we listen with understanding. What does this mean? It means to see the expressed idea and attitude from the other person's point of view, to sense how it feels to him, to achieve his frame of reference in regard to the thing he is talking about (p. 84).

Unless we can communicate with the young in this fashion we miss the entire point. And what is probably their most important statement is that education, as they now receive it in our school system, is irrelevant, meaningless, and offers little hope for human life on a "human scale." They are trained to be "personnel," and to function smoothly as a cog in the giant megamachine that is society. If they could speak freely and honestly---without fear of being "put down" or ridiculed---to those who push them through this dehumanizing process, the questions they asked would prove very difficult to deal with by those in power. Many are asking the questions anyway, and they are surprised to find that there are teachers who feel the same as they do.

We are in the midst of a revolution that is omnipresent, affecting every person to the core of his existence. Some choose to dichotomize issues and throw stones, others choose to ignore the issues with the hope that they will go away, still others attempt to listen and communicate with their fellows, because they "know" that their survival is at stake.

What, then, can be done to fit the schools so that they lend to the survival of our world? How can they be made to better facilitate life on a "human scale?" According to Holt (1970):

We must get rid of the notion that education is different and

separate from life, something that happens only in school. Everything that happens to us educates us, for good or for bad. To answer, "What makes a good education?" we must ask, "What makes a good life?"

The purpose of education can no longer be to turn out people who know a few facts, a few skills, and who will always believe and do what they are told. We need big changes, and in a hurry (p. 52).

These changes must be made in light of the fact that change is the primary characteristic of our environment. If this is understood, there remains no reason to continue to gear education toward the acquisition of factual information and concepts that no longer serve to aid the individual in his adjustment to the world around him. In the words of Postman and Weingardner (1969):

....survival in a rapidly changing environment depends almost entirely upon being able to identify which of the old concepts are relevant to the demands imposed by the new threats to survival, and which are not....

It is not possible to overstate the fact that technologically wrought changes in the environment render virtually all of our traditional concepts (survival strategies)---and the institutions developed to conserve and transmit them---irrelevant, but not merely irrelevant. If we fail to detect the fact that they are irrelevant, these concepts themselves become threats to our survival.

Clearly, there is no more important function for education to fulfill than that of helping us to recognize the world we actually live in and, simultaneously, of helping us to master concepts that will increase our ability to cope with it. This is the essential criterion for judging the relevance of all education (pp. 208-212).

In essence, the main function which our educational institutions must serve is the promotion of the ability to learn---each student must be aided in his effort to learn how to learn. This can be accomplished most effectively---perhaps only---in a classroom environment that encourages the student to question the world around him; one that is humanistically and individually oriented. But how can these needed

educational changes and reforms become a reality? Seeley (1966) feels that it is first necessary to realize the crisis of the present situation on this highest authority. A perception of the gravity and severity which surround this situation, with regard to the survival of mankind as something more than a robot, must be attained by those with the authority to instigate the needed changes. He feels that society must accept the responsibility "...to 'humanize' its children, or help them humanize themselves, not mechanize or 'program' them" (p. 14).

And there is ample evidence that this can be done. One need only look at Neill's (1960) Summerhill, which has been functioning since 1921, to get some idea of the feasibility of such a venture. He has created a remarkable community on the basis of an exceedingly simple but powerful idea: "A free child is a happy child. A happy child does not fear or hate; he can love and give. The loving, giving child can live positively" (Morris, 1966, p. 150). Morris adds one important dimension that is implicit in Neill's argument, and that places it within an "Existentialist" framework: "The free child eventually becomes the responsible child; it is freedom itself which makes this awareness possible. He who becomes responsible becomes capable of authenticity. Neill is creating authentic individuals" (p. 150).

The general theme behind education that is individually and humanistically oriented is expressed vividly by Borsodi (1968):

....the true function of education is to help the individual to realize the highest potentialities of which homo sapiens are capable. The essence of the distinction between Education and Adjustment is that Adjustment socializes the educatee while Education individualizes him by bringing out the qualities which are latent, potential, and undeveloped in him.... It cultivates what is unique in each educatee instead of adjusting everybody to the prevailing or emerging institutions of society, without regard to what they happen to be.

We individuate educationally when we...recognize that every individual is unique and idiosyncratic and emphasize the fact that he is a human being, and not a mere unit in a herd, a mere part of an aggregation of humans, or a mere cog in a social machine....

There is neither any need, nor is there any temptation, in the practice of education which is individually and humanistically oriented, to resort to the promotion of any interest other than that of the individual educatee; it is only by abandoning the recognition of the primacy of the individual and making some other interest---some social interest usually---primary, that such an ulterior temptation and ulterior need develops....(pp. 558-562).

And this revaluation of our priorities is again related in the following quote from Cousins (1971):

What our society needs is a massive and pervasive experience in re-sensitization. The first aim of education should not be to prepare young people for careers but to enable them to develop respect for life. Related lessons would be concerned with the reality of human sensitivity and the need to make it ever finer and more responsive; the naturalness of loving and the circumstances that enhance it or enfeeble it; the right to privacy as an essential condition of life; and the need to avoid the callousness that leads to brutalization. Finally, there is the need to endow government with the kind of sensitivity that makes life and all its wondrous possibilities government's most insistent concern (p. 31).

And again by Fromm (1968):

Any real hope for victory over the dehumanized society of the megamachine and for the building up of a humanist industrial society rests upon the condition that the values of the tradition (humanistic) are brought to life, and that a society emerges in which love and integrity are possible (p. 93).

All that has been said in these few pages contains the basic rationale for this study. That is, the desire and the hope that by choosing a day in one's life and saying, "I'll begin today, and contribute what I can to the revitalization of life and education to those whose lives I touch;" that this realization is something worth knowing and living for. And that an institute with the basic purpose of making teachers and administrators aware of the insights contained in this

introduction is something worth participating in and contributing to. Finally, that what will come out of such a venture is one small contribution to the hopes and dreams of a better life for everyone. As Martin (1970) suggests:

....Whatever there is on the other side of this confusion will be, at best, not so different from what we already have now, on occasion, in our best moments. No new senses, no third sexes, no cosmic orgasms, no karmic rebirths. No, if we are daring and lucky, what will be "revolutionary" will simply be that more of us, all of us, will have more of a chance for a decent human life---good comrades and lovers, a few touches of ecstasy, some solitude and space, a sense of self-determination.

....I don't have any other answer. We will do what we do now ---but we will do it better. We will sit talking with friends around a table, do some decent work, hold one another guiltlessly in our arms, touch a bit more softly, more knowingly. We will understand a bit more and dance a bit more and even think a little more---and all, perhaps, a bit more intelligently, more bravely.

That isn't much, but it is also almost everything, and what we are forced to do now is learn how to do all that for ourselves. There is no one to show us how---no program, no system. One can only have such lives by trying to live them; and that is what the young are trying to do these days, all on their own, whether we help them or not. The few real teachers I know, those really serving the young, are simply those who try to live such lives in their company, as freely and humanly as they can. The rest of "education" is almost always rhetoric and nonsense (p. 89).

## Introduction to the Study

### The Problem

The problem that is being pursued in this study is the evaluation ---tentative success or failure---of a six-week summer institute for secondary social studies teachers. The purpose of the institute was to transmit an awareness of the problems and concepts contained in the rationale section of this paper to these teachers, and to help



facilitate a problem-centered, inquiry approach as a method of teaching social studies. A secondary purpose was to impart at least a fragment of the "sociological imagination" as an aid to understanding and analyzing the problems of individuals and the issues embodied in the institutional structure of a rapidly changing society and world.

The teachers selected to participate in this institute were all high school and junior high school social studies instructors, i.e., history, geography, government, etc. By obtaining the tools for sociological analysis, and by utilizing a problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching, it was assumed they would be better equipped to facilitate a classroom environment to promote "experiential" learning. Therefore, the rationale for the institute was based on a concern that the entire classroom orientation be centered around helping the student discover and experience those things which were meaningful to him.

### The Institute

The institute was held at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, during the months of June and July, 1970. It was financed through a grant obtained from the National Science Foundation, whose concern in this important area of national adjustment has been testified to many times by donations of this sort.

The participating teachers were selected from the Tulsa, Oklahoma, City School System, with two Stillwater, Oklahoma, teachers in attendance. There was a total of thirty-three teachers in all. Twenty-six of the Tulsa principals also attended an orientation session held during the first two days of the institute.

There was also a course in sociology at the Stillwater High School

taught by the staff and participants of the institute. This class was composed of twelve students from the High School who were labelled by the principal as the "ringers" of the school. It met from 8:00 A. M. to 12:00 P. M. daily during the six weeks of the institute.

A strong incentive was provided for the teachers to attend the institute. They were: (1) chosen for their merit as social studies teachers, (2) paid \$75.00 per week for the six-week period, and (3) given eight hours graduate credit, with tuition and books free, for their participation (six hours credit for the summer institute and two hours credit for the follow-up sessions during the school year).

During the school year following the institute there were five periodic meetings between the teachers and staff in which the application and practice of those things obtained from the institute were discussed. These sessions were concerned mainly with helping the teachers verbally work through some of the difficulties they had encountered while attempting to apply the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching in their own classrooms.

## CHAPTER II

### RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

As stated earlier, the purpose of the institute was the transmission of a certain philosophy of teaching which draws heavily from the Existential school of thought, and the imparting of at least a fragment of the "sociological imagination" to these social studies teachers. The philosophical orientation of Existentialism in education is best exemplified in the teaching approach that has been referred to as the "problem-centered, inquiry approach" (Selakovich, 1965, p. 15). From the learner's point of view, Roger's (1967) term, "experiential learning" (p. 38), offers the most productive categorization within this orientation.

The utilization of what Mills (1959) has termed the "sociological imagination" as a tool for understanding and analyzing the "autonomy" problems of individuals and the issues embodied in the social institutions of a rapidly changing society and world, offers the teachers a conceptual basis from which to draw. Hopefully, this model will enable them to better understand and communicate with their students, and to better facilitate a classroom environment designed for experiential learning and utilizing the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching.

## Existentialism in Education

### The Existential Model

The existential model of a man considers "education" to be a process whereby the individual is awakened to the factors which influence his life, and aided in coming to realize that he is a "being in the process of becoming" (Allport, 1962, p. 377); it sees education as a potential aid in the development of "authentic" individuals. In order to better understand this viewpoint of man, it is helpful to see it in relation to other, more popular psychological models.

The various psychological models of man can be lumped into three broad and general categories. Van Kaam (1963) refers to these three psychological stances as: (1) willfulness, (2) will-lessness, and (3) existential will. The first, willfulness, can be seen as a purely subjective orientation toward the world of reality, "...an absolute.... power of the subject not bound by reality outside of itself" (pp. 116-117). This view is not founded upon the spontaneous experience of man as first of all a willful, isolated entity, which implies a split between man's will and reality. According to Van Kaam:

....This position of man in the world as an absolute will power makes him essentially a cut off, schizoid being who dominates all of reality in himself and in his environment without taking into account any reality in himself, in history and in culture....which....leads necessarily to willfulness....Such a person assumes a compulsive, instead of dialectical, attitude toward his existence in the world. Compulsive command replaces respectful dialogue (pp. 117-118).

In essence, the willful model of man is one which sees the person affirming some categorical perceptions of reality, and displaying behavior which conforms to these perceptions, while at the same time not considering all the possible meanings involved in his unique

situation, e.g., the structural and historical reality of the body and the world. It is omnipotent subjectivism.

The opposite view of willfulness, or the view that stresses the other aspect in this dualistic dichotomy---the reality of body and world---is embodied in the theories of the deterministic psychologies. While subjectivism stresses the absolute, rational power of the subject, not bound by reality outside of his own will, determinism places a one-sided emphasis upon body and world at the expense of man's free will. Historically, we find absolute objectivism replacing absolute subjectivism. And according to Van Kaam (1963), this view led to the development of will-lessness. Where the subjective model of willfulness had explained all of man's behavior in terms of his omnipotent will, the objective, deterministic model of will-lessness explained everything by means of past influences of the body and the world.

This will-less model of man sees him as nothing more than a reactor to either environmental factors or bodily drives and instincts. Allport (1962) has classified this deterministic view of man into two categories. The first he refers to as man the "reactive being." Within this category he places such outlooks as behaviorism, operationalism, positivism, naturalism, and physicalism, which he feels have been mistakenly referred to as "scientific psychology." According to Allport, when man is seen through this set of spectacles he is no different in kind from other living reactors of the animal kingdom. He is thought of in terms of past conditioning and reinforcements which make for potential re-conditioning; in terms of environmental determinism. This positivistic view of man "...sees reality as ordered but not as personal; it sees consciousness as a nuisance; it looks at man as reactive,

not proactive....the result strikes many of us as threadbare, even pitiable" (p. 375).

The second deterministic psychology he refers to as man the "reactive being in depth." The dominant outlook in this category stems from the Freudian psychoanalytical tradition, which he contends is a close kin of traditional positivism---the only real difference being the added depth dimension. The main thrust in this theory lies in the organism's tendency to reduce pain and achieve pleasure. The casual factors of behavior are still to be found in the past history of the individual as they are in the behavioristic model of man. According to Allport (1962), "Both have a dismaying disregard for the person's phenomenology of the future, for his sense of personhood and sense of freedom....What one becomes is essentially what one is, and what one was" (p. 375-376).

Van Kaam (1963) feels that the will-less model of man has certain inherent dangers that must be reckoned with if man is to accept his personal freedom, guilt, and responsibility. Determinism, whether it be behaviorism, operationalism, or Freudonian psychoanalysis, imparts the inclination for man to experience himself as a product rather than a process. Metaphorically, he is likened as to a helpless raft drifting in a stormy sea, unable to alter his course by his personal decisions. The individual may find himself searching for certain agents or events in his life history which can be made responsible for his own personal indecisions and failures. Their discovery would, of course, unburden him of the potential anxiety and feelings of guilt which are necessarily connected with the acceptance of responsibility. The belief that one is nothing more than a "puppet" being manipulated by

some mysterious libidinal instincts or hidden conditioned responses is certainly a comforting escape from the responsibilities that go with personal decisions, and therewith, from guilt and anxiety. And after all, has not this image of man been convincingly depicted by the most popular theories of psychology? Van Kaam sees this conviction serving as a rationalization or cover for those individuals who refuse to recognize their personal responsibilities and to admit their "... unwillingness to face conflict and dialogue both of which necessarily emerge when one is willing to take a stand and to choose freely among countless possibilities" (p. 120).

The deterministic psychologies have "taken the monkey off the individual's back," and placed it on organic sources or society. From this point of view the person becomes a puppet without control of his past, present, or future. He can easily conclude, "what does it matter which paths are available, my course has been chartered by my life history and there is nothing I can do about it." This removes the burden of responsibility for one's actions and sets the stage for the mass production of automatons.

In essence, the phenomenon of will-lessness can be described first, as the individual's impersonal subservience to his impulses or to the opinions of others while at the same time refusing to be open to all meanings of reality as it is revealed through his own spontaneity; and second, as his subsequent allowance of impulsive behavior or behavior which is an impersonal conformity with the opinions of others, and which fails to consider all of the perceptible meanings of his particular situation (Van Kaam, 1963). In other words, the will-less person allows himself to be the "determined" one without considering his own

influence or freedom to choose among the available alternatives and throw his weight in the chosen direction.

The third view of man's will sees him as the existential "being-in-the-world," or "being in the process of becoming." Existential psychology sees the person as having the ability to take some stand, even in the boundary situation of failure, neurosis, or organic affliction, without denying the limitations of the situation. It is founded on the existential or dialectical nature of the human will. Within this model the will of the individual is neither omnipotent, as seen by the subjectivists, nor impotent, as expounded by the deterministic objectivists. Existential will is depicted as the human ability to respond to reality as it uniquely presents itself to each individual, without denying the historical, cultural, and organic limitations of the situation. Van Kaam (1963) feels that each unique, existential situation is an invitation and a challenge that demands a personal response; ".... existential will is the fundamental readiness to face and affirm reality as it reveals itself in the daily situation" (p. 121).

Allport (1962) sees the existential point of view as one that strives to cultivate two attitudes in the individual which, if taken separately, seem almost antithetical, but when fused together in a "world-view" offer the individual strength and authenticity for the future. The first attitude he refers to as "tentativeness of outlook." In the words of Allport:

....Since certainties are no longer certain, let all dogmas be fearlessly examined, especially those cultural idols that engender a false sense of security: dogmas of race supremacy, of naive scientism, of unilinear evolutionary progress. Let one face the worst in oneself and in the world around him, so that one may correctly estimate the hazards (p. 378).

When the insights that stem from such tentativeness stand alone within



the psychological makeup of the individual he can easily find himself in "ontological despair." But when fused with a "firm commitment to chosen values," which is Allport's second criterion for the development of authenticity, there is an attainment of purpose and a recognition of freedom that cannot emerge otherwise. Certainly the commitment is a gamble, but are not all of the decisions one makes in life a wager of one type or another? One runs the risk of losing, but one can also win. "And who is to say that we have a test for truth more absolute than our own commitment insofar as it is validated by fruitful consequences?" (p. 378).

The commitments of each individual serve as a life force to give purpose and meaning to life and to orient life toward the present and the future, not the past. To use Allport's terms, they provide "functional autonomy" to the "personal dispositions" of each unique, human personality. Allport and other social psychologists such as Tiryakian (1968) feel that the existential image of man's will offers a challenging contrast to the behavioristic-operationalistic-psychoanalytic image of the self as an "...isolated, bleak, negative, lifeless, past-determined, choiceless creature" (p. 76). Existentialism depicts man as....

....a volitional being who seeks to find meaning in his transactions with reality, to which he is intrinsically related by the nature of his existence; he is a being who fundamentally seeks meaning and a sense to life which can not be reduced to biological gratification, a being who is animated by a whole gamut of moods and feelings as much as one guided by the intellect. This does not mean that the human being is a sweet, syrupy creature; however, what emerges is the whole of human being in experience (Tiryakian, 1968, p. 76).

What this image of man really says is that a human being is more than a reactive being or a reactive being in depth. Indeed, if he were

nothing more than what these images depict, we could be confident in the conclusions drawn from the deterministic models. But an existential image of man recognizes the paradoxes of the life process, e.g., that an individual is both structure and process, both biological and noetic, one who changes his identity even while he retains it (Allport, 1962, p. 381).

One should not make the mistake at this point of removing all deterministic factors from the existential model. Although the deterministic psychologists have greatly over-emphasized the effect of organic and cultural sources at the expense of removing the human will from the decision process, one's historical and cultural position cannot be discounted.

May (1963b) feels that mental health is associated directly with the capacity of the individual to become aware of the gap which lies between a stimulus and a response, together with the capacity to use this gap constructively. To borrow a concept from Mead (1934), he realizes that his identity of self lies in the "act" which is his to choose, and that he is responsible for the consequences of that "act." In this respect, the only possible path which leads to a consciousness of freedom and responsibility is one which brings the individual to an awareness of the deterministic experiences in his life. That is, an awareness of the psychological and sociological factors which brought him to his present situation and, in turn, should introduce him to the "tentativeness of outlook" that is necessary for freedom of choice and existential commitment. In the words of May:

The implications of this point are very significant. Freedom is thus not the opposite to determinism. Freedom is the individual's capacity to know that he is the determined one, to pause between stimulus and response and thus to throw his weight, however slight it may be, on the side of one particular response among several possible ones.

Freedom is thus also not anarchy: the beatniks are a symbolic protest against the aridity of our mechanistic society, not an expression of freedom. Freedom can never be separated from responsibility (pp. 102-103).

This account makes clear the position of existential psychology; a position between the dualistic views of subjectivism and determinism. The "authentic" individual is neither willful nor will-less. He is a being-in-the-world who is cognizant of the deterministic forces in his life and is, therefore, free to choose from the alternatives available to him, to become who and what he chooses to become.

It is important to realize that what is unique about human existence is that people are free, which means they are not programmed by either cultural or biological factors, unless they "choose" to believe that they are. John Williams (1969) has referred to this as "the biggest trick of all." Jean-Paul Sartre (1956) speaks of this type of choice as an act of "bad faith," which I will speak of more in the last section of this chapter. Individuals are capable of creating a character of their own by the decisions and choices to which they commit themselves. Unlike other living creatures that are biologically programmed for survival, man must necessarily face the challenge alone of discovering meaning and purpose for his life. The matter is really quite simple. It is only the "tricks" that cloud and complicate the issue. If one chooses to "trick" oneself, which is the choice that most people make, he has the vast majority of psychological and sociological theory at his disposal to aid him in his act of "bad faith."

This does not mean that the existential choice is the easy choice. Quite the contrary, for as it was stated earlier, the deterministic model offers the individual the easy path to reduction of anxiety and guilt. But as May (1963b) has stated, "...freedom requires the

capacity to accept, bear, and live constructively with anxiety" (p. 107). The authentic individual who possesses what Allport (1962) has termed "fundamental autonomy," realizes that anxiety is a necessary part of "tentativeness of outlook." As Kierkegaard has stated, "...anxiety is the dizziness of freedom." And in the words of May, "...to be free means to face and bear anxiety; to run away from anxiety means automatically to surrender one's freedom" (p. 107).

What this really implies is that, more than anything else, existentialism is humanism. The existential model affirms the priority and dignity of man as the ultimate source of all values, while at the same time realizing that some men choose to "escape" from the responsibility of their freedom by passively identifying themselves with some "pre-determined, all-encompassing absolute---whatever it may be" (Genova, 1965, p. 19).

#### Education and the Existential Model

The importance of adopting an existential view of man within the educational environment cannot be overstated. Students need the opportunity to pursue learning in a meaningful and experiential manner. Education of the existential will must be allowed to thrive if we are to survive as human beings and not as automatons. In order to bring about this goal, we must first question the purposes and consequences of education as it is now conceived.

Historically, it has been the case that individual freedom has been subordinated to the "will" of the group; whether this "will" be a utilitarian conception of democracy as is the "rule of the majority"---what Toqueville (1962) referred to as the "tyranny of the majority"---or some

fascist or "power elite" conception based on vested, economic interests. Whatever the "reason" or rationale, the controllers of societies have found it to their advantage to "program" the members through some propaganda scheme, which is usually referred to as the socialization process or, in the more technologically advanced societies, as "education."

This is how the megamachine was created, and with the tremendous changes brought about by discoveries in science, technology, and especially the rational organization of men for the purpose of "efficiency" ---bureaucracy---we find the image of man being continually reformed to more closely resemble that of a machine. As May (1963b) has stated, there is an ever increasing tendency to "...abdicate in favor of the machine" (p. 100). In the words of Marcel (1952):

Western civilization is no longer taking account of the individual and there seem no grounds for hoping that it will ever do so again....Society knows only a few of the dimensions of the individual; man in his wholeness considered as an individual no longer exists for it. The West has created a society which resembles a machine (pp. 172-173).

For the most part, this conception of man as a machine outlines the purposes and consequences of education as it stands today. Efficiency looms many times more important than personal integrity. We teach children that it is important to be right and to win, not that life is necessarily confusing and absurd, and that courage and commitment can be found only in the tragedy and absurdity of life. And we teach them that what is right is always determined by authorities, which implies that this decision could never be made by them. They are told that if they wish to be "successful" in life---this is the biggest trick society has to offer---they must first do as they are told and learn the needed tools for success. Since, in the majority of cases, this trick is successful, the schools seem to operate rather smoothly in

replenishing the wornout parts of the megamachine with bright and shiny new cogs.

For the most part, educational schools of thought, whether they refer to themselves as experimentalists or progressives, have contributed the philosophical rationale for the maintenance of the megamachine. But, generally speaking, they have all contained flaws so far as education viewed from the existential point of view is concerned. They all make the same mistake: that of believing the young are things to be molded in some fashion that will align them with some a priori notion of what they should be. According to Morris (1966), within these conceptions of education, the young are to be used or employed on behalf of: (1) a pre-determined idea of "human nature" which they must live up to, (2) an objective body of knowledge or subject matter (content) which they must "learn," (3) an objective view of culture which stands "outside" of them; expectations of how they should live their lives, or (4) some set of dispositions which are deemed fundamental and which they should internalize and pass on. In the words of Morris:

In every case the process of education is understood to have its aim and point outside the learner. The child, by virtue of what is to be done with him and for him, is eventually seen as an object rather than a subject. His activity of learning is aroused and promoted in the name of considerations residing outside his own self-determination and self-direction (p. 108).

Tiryakian (1968) feels that this process of "objectification" is founded on the ontic rather than the ontological level of existence. Ontic refers to things that are discrete; things or objects that can be located in space and given empirical validity through the human senses. Ontological, on the other hand, refers to the ground or space from which empirical entities emerge; it transcends the empirical realm, and "....

is the source of unity and identity of phenomenal manifestations or appearances" (p. 77). He sees the ontological level of human existence as the basis for the development of "authentic" individuals. When one operates within this realm he is aware of his own ontological basis and that of others. The "authentic" self avoids the manipulation of other persons as objects for his own satisfaction; he does not objectify human beings.

Yet, when we look at the compartmentalized nature of mass society, there is an increasing tendency to view one's fellows as objects. This is what we do when we relate to one another on the basis of social roles, especially the specialized roles which operate within the bureaucratic setting. There is an emptiness and alienation from our own ontological existence and from that of others. And is this what the schools breed when they emphasize competition, winning, intellectual superiority, etc. When they treat the student as an object to be molded into some pre-determined fashion, are they not emphasizing an objectification of his self for some a priori goal that stands outside his own ontological self? It could just be that this reduction of man to an object of social techniques, one that is capable of being manipulated in accordance with some "socially engineered" schemes of what is good or bad, is the greatest danger of all to the establishment of a genuine social community which elevates man's freedom of choice and ontological existence to the highest level.

The goals and values of education, as seen from an existential stance, place the student in the center of the process. He is what is important; he is the pivotal point. Therefore, the task of education, from an existential point of view, is not preparation for life. Life is

seen as the test of education, and ideas are verified by each individual as they serve him from day to day. As stated by Mayer (1962): "We are not merely lawyers or doctors or artists or teachers, but human beings exploring the preciousness of the moment, strenuously striving for significance. Specialization....is never adequate...." (p. 129-130). Even in the face of the vast pressures toward conformity and control, it is possible to reaffirm the meaning of freedom and the value of individual autonomy. If we can embrace this as the ultimate goal of education, there is hope for a world in which freedom and authenticity will thrive. In the words of Mayer:

In a society which is concerned with the externals of education, which is governed by technology and the multiplication of desires, which is other-directed in its status consciousness, existentialism fills a desperate need. It calls for strenuous self-examination so that life may not be wasted with triviality and superficiality and so that authentic individuals can emerge both with a sense of limitation and a sense of unfulfilled possibilities (p. 131).

### The Inquiry Method

The term "inquiry" has received a variety of interpretations within the educational environment. In many ways it has been made to fit the various schools of thought as their proponents have deemed necessary. That is, many schools of thought in education have interpreted it to mean what best fits their needs. Within the confines of this study it is seen as a method of teaching which places the student and his concerns in the center of the educational process; it is that method which best facilitates a dialogue between the student and his world. While this approach was not always adhered to during the institute, for the most part it was given the main emphasis.



In the literature that deals with inquiry as an approach to teaching, the term "discovery" is sometimes used synonymously. An example of this is seen in the following statement by Bruner (1967):

The immediate occasion for my concern with discovery---and I do not restrict discovery to the act of finding out something that before was unknown to mankind, but rather include all forms of obtaining knowledge for oneself by the use of one's own mind---the immediate occasion is the work of the various new curriculum projects that have grown up in America during the last six or seven years. For whether one speaks to mathematicians or physicists or historians, one encounters repeatedly an expression of faith in the powerful effects that come from permitting the student to put things together for himself, to be his own discoverer (p. 4).

Although this writer feels that Bruner is much too content-oriented, this is one occasion when he recognizes the importance of each individual deciding for himself what is worth discovering.

To restate what has been stated throughout this paper, inquiry as a teaching method is nothing more than the realization that "the medium is the message," which means that one learns from all of one's environment, and that education must focus on the student as an existential "being-in-the-world" whose freedom to choose from many possible alternatives places him in the "active" role of helping to determine his "self." Once this is realized, it becomes impossible to approach a classroom full of students as a "group," and to come at them with some predetermined content designed to be "for their own good." As stated by Suchman (1967):

Any teacher who takes the time to determine the level of conceptual readiness and intrinsic motivation of each of his pupils....finds that it makes no sense to teach an entire group of children as a group. He can never presume that any two children start from the same set of concepts and move with equal speed and along parallel lines of conceptual growth.

Actually, the problem becomes even deeper than this. Can a teacher give concepts to pupils under any circumstances?

Is an active pupil role a necessary condition for true conceptual growth? Is it clear from the research on teaching strategies that the more active and autonomous the learner becomes in a learning process and the more he takes responsibility for decisions regarding the collection and interpretation of information, the more meaningful the learning becomes and the more motivated the learner becomes.... (pp. 55-56).

Within this context, inquiry can be seen as an attitude or philosophy which supports the concept of experiential learning. Its main thrust evolves around the autonomy and openness of the learner in a continuous dialogue with his world. The inquiry method is probably the most supportive of an educational philosophy which stresses the subjective, problematic situations of life, not absolute answers. This view sees education as a process which never ends. It is founded on the existential reality of the individual. In the words of Mayer (1962): "The center of existential education is the dialogue between the teacher and student and, even more important, the inward dialogue which is part of the education process of all individuals" (p. 127).

This approach to the learning and socialization processes is based on the belief that knowledge can never be objective; that within all systems of analysis there is at least one unprovable assumption. Each person must therefore be assisted in his effort to develop a pattern of thinking that enables him to understand his own unique situation, and the alternatives available to him in this situation. The basis of this theory of learning is the assumption that the potential for levels of motivation, imagination and creativity is provided by the enthusiasm of the learner; potential that is not available through the instrumental approaches of positive and negative sanctions. According to Kean, et al. (1967):

The educational philosophy advanced by those holding this

view is that it is necessary to improve the interface between persons, or to put it in terms which they would prefer, to find ways to enable individuals to communicate more effectively. It is argued that important information only moves when people are emotionally in contact with each other....Those who accept....[this view] .... are presently developing a new view of education, often called dialogue. They argue that education takes place when people are in personal contact, that it is the changes during this process of contact which truly constitute the educational process....

Those involved in developing the theory of dialogue attempt to discover new ways in which the "reality" of the outside world and the "subjective" views of the individual can be brought into, and kept in, creative tension. It appears that to be effective, dialogue must be based on a study of problems rather than disciplines, on a recognition that authoritarian relationships cannot exist in real education ....Important new understandings cannot be achieved without fundamental change in the view of each person about the nature of the universe in which he lives and this will necessarily involve disruption of his existing views about himself (pp. 20-21).

This dialogue or inquiry approach to education is, in essence, the process by which the "existential will" is awakened in the individual; the process by which he comes to realize that he is a "being-in-the-world," free to make decisions that determine his own personal destiny. From the point of view of the learner, inquiry promotes an atmosphere in which he can experience meaningful dialogue with his world; it promotes "experiential learning." But this type of learning cannot thrive where the teacher is opposed to inquiry. "There can be no significant innovation in education that does not have at its center the attitudes of teachers, and it is an illusion to think otherwise" (Postman and Weingartner, 1969, p. 33). Which, again, brings us to the purpose of the institute. It is the teachers and administrators who must be made aware of the goals and values of an inquiry approach to education. The attitudes and behaviors that are necessary for this approach

to work amount to a definition of a different role for the teacher and, for that matter, the administrator, from that which he has traditionally assumed. As stated by Postman and Weingardner:

The inquiry environment, like any other school environment, is a series of human encounters, the nature of which is largely determined by the "teacher"....

...when the teacher assumes new functions and exhibits different behaviors, so do his students. It is in the nature of their transaction. And nothing is more important to know about inquiry methods than this (pp. 37-38).

### The "Sociological Imagination"

The teachers involved in this institute were exposed to situations that demanded they question the goals and values of education, and their role as teachers in this process. They were encouraged to question the purposes of their methods of teaching, and the effect of these methods on the normative school environment and the attitudes of their students. For, as Silberman (1970a) has asserted, the greatest obstacle to overcome if the schools are to be revitalized is that of "mindlessness;" to get teachers and administrators to ask why they are doing what they are doing. This means it is necessary for them to give serious thought---to question---the purpose or consequences of education.

As an aid to understanding and analyzing the normative and value aspects of society and its institutional structure---especially the schools, and the problems of individuals as they attempt to "become" persons within this setting, the teachers were introduced to the sociological form of imagination. The images within this conceptual schema offer an illumination that can be quite useful as a tool for social analysis. In the words of Mills (1959):

It is not only information that they need---in the Age of Fact, information often dominates their attention and overwhelms their capacities to assimilate it. It is not only the skills of reason that they need---although their struggles to acquire these often exhaust their limited moral energy.

What they need, and what they feel they need, is a quality of mind that will help them to use information and to develop reason in order to achieve lucid summations of what is going on in the world and of what may be happening within themselves. It is this quality, I am going to contend, that journalists and scholars, artists and publics, scientists and editors are coming to expect of what may be called the sociological imagination (p. 5).

This is not to say that a sociological perspective is what is needed to solve all of the problems of the school environment or society. In fact, the misuse of this perspective is just as dangerous, if not more so, as the "mindlessness" referred to by Silberman. To depict man as either willful or will-less from a sociological point of view is to undermine his potential as a human being.

The contemporary issue has more to do with determinism than the subjectivism. The psychological theories of behaviorism and psychoanalysis, when considered within a sociological framework, have tended to imprison man within the institutional structure of his society. From this perspective, man is viewed as a will-less puppet of his social heritage. His identity and his behavior are the products of his being socialized with a certain society or culture. He is "determined" by his social structure, "...his character, his fate, are determined by where he happens to be born within that structure. All else is irrelevant to [this] sociological quest" (Cuzzort, 1969, p. 206).

The perpetuation of this point of view, is expressed by Jean-Paul Sartre (1956) is an act of "bad faith." It removes the dimension of choice from the human situation. The individual deceives himself by

saying, "Because I must," which is a way of hiding from himself the anxious thought that it might be otherwise---the thought that his behavior is a product of his own choosing. Sociological determinism makes it easy to pass the buck for the responsibility of one's actions onto society. Berger (1963) describes it in the following way:

To put it very simply, "bad faith" is to pretend something is necessary that in fact is voluntary. "Bad faith" is thus a flight from freedom, a dishonest evasion of the "agony of choice." "Bad faith" expresses itself in innumerable human situations from the most commonplace to the most catastrophic. The waiter shuffling through his appointed rounds in a cafe is in "bad faith" insofar as he pretends to himself that the waiter role constitutes his real existence, that, if only for the hours he is hired, he is the waiter...The terrorist who kills and excuses himself by saying that he had no choice because the party ordered him to kill is in "bad faith," because he pretends that his existence is necessarily linked with the party, while in fact this linkage is the consequence of his own choice. It can easily be seen that "bad faith" covers society like a film of lies. The very possibility of "bad faith," however, shows us the reality of freedom. Man can be in "bad faith" only because he is free and does not wish to face his freedom. "Bad faith" is the shadow of human liberty. Its attempt to escape that liberty is doomed to defeat. For as Satre has famously put it, we are "condemned to freedom" (p. 143).

Man will undoubtedly remain a "prisoner of society" so long as he permits himself to remain ignorant of its influence over him. It is the knowledge and understanding of the way that society operates--the sociological imagination---that allows him to begin to free himself of its controls; the recognition that he is a "being-in-the-world" with the unique ability to "choose" his own destiny. But a sociological perspective that is marked by determinism simply perpetuates man's tendency to accept things as they are, regardless of the moral implications. To employ sociology for this purpose is to use it in "bad faith."

Riesman's (1961) classical book, The Lonely Crowd, is an example of how sociological imagination can serve to aid the individual's

perspective of historical and cultural influences. The existential model of the person closely parallels what Riesman refers to as the "autonomous" personality. According to Riesman, "tradition-directed," "inner-directed," and "other-directed" are all deterministic models of personality which conform to their corresponding historical setting--- large, blind movements of population growth and economic and technological change. He refers to those individuals who "...respond in their character structure to the demands of their society or social class at its particular stage on the curve of population...." (p. 241) as the "adjusted." The main difference between "adjusted" and "autonomous" individuals is the ability of the "autonomous" to transcend their culture at any time or in any respect. The "autonomous" person "...may or may not conform outwardly, but whatever his choice, he pays less of a price, and he has a choice" (p. 243). Perhaps it would be closer to reality to say that he does not "trick" himself into believing that he has no choice, for everyone has a choice. Riesman believes that the "autonomous" person....

....living like everyone else in a given cultural setting, employs the reserves of his character and station to move away from the adjusted mean of the same society....For autonomy, like anomie, is a deviation from the adjusted pattern, though a deviation controlled in its range and meaning by the existence of those patterns....the definition of the autonomous refers to those who are in their character capable of freedom, whether or not they are able to, or care to, take the risk of overt deviation (pp. 249-250).

In other words, he views autonomy in somewhat the same manner as the existentialists view freedom. It is neither completely willful nor completely will-less, but the available alternatives are in many ways defined by the cultural milieu. The setting is "determined" by history, but the "autonomous" person is aware of the choices in his life; he has

not "tricked" himself into believing that he is not free to choose his course of action. As Allport (1962) would say, he is truly a being in the process of becoming.

### Summary

I have argued continually throughout this paper that teachers must face up to their responsibility to question the purposes and consequences of education. The students in their trust have a right to inquire into, and have a dialogue with, the world of which they are a part. The moral implications of this argument cannot be emphasized enough. If man is to realize a new and better world, one built to a "human scale" and with individual freedom and responsibility at its core, our students and teachers must be given an opportunity to explore openly the issues of the day. They must be stimulated to ask the important questions that stand at the very core of man's existence in the world and survival upon the earth. It is believed that the acquisition of a "sociological imagination"---one couched in the freedom of the individual to "choose" his course of action---can aid both the teacher and his students in their pursuit of this noble goal.

In summary, the purpose of this institute stems from a desire to make a contribution to the revitalization of education in America and the world. This writer feels that the existential model of man as a being-in-the-world offers the greatest hope for the realization of this goal.



## CHAPTER III

### METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN

#### Introduction

In order to evaluate what actually occurred during the institute a variety of quantitative and qualitative data collection procedures were utilized, all of which were designed to measure the beliefs and attitudes of the participating teachers. It was felt that by focusing on a wide range of methods to tap these beliefs and attitudes, a better understanding of the changes, if any, that occurred in the mind of each participant could be obtained.

The first method of data collection was designed to quantitatively measure the attitudes toward education of the participants. In this analysis we were concerned with how the educational attitudes of the teachers in the institute compared with those of the principals, students in the summer course, and other teachers in the Tulsa County School System<sup>1</sup>, both before and after their participation in the institute.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Tulsa School System is composed of 16 school districts. District 1 contains all the schools within the Tulsa city limits and will be referred to as the Tulsa City School System. Districts 2 through 16 contain all the schools in Tulsa County that are not in District 1 and will be referred to as the Tulsa County School System. All the participants in this institute were drawn from the Tulsa City School System, with the exception of two Stillwater teachers. The School Opinion Survey has been administered to the Tulsa County School System and this data is available for the purpose of comparison.

## The School Opinion Survey

The instrument that was used to measure educational attitudes was developed by Tuel and Shaw (1966), and is called the School Opinion Survey (Appendices D and E). This Survey was built upon several assumptions. The first assumption contends that the "educational environment" is a construct that can prove useful in describing the total environment that effectively influences academic learning. Second is the belief that there are several levels within this educational environment which extend from the intrapersonal through a scope which widens to the national level. Third is the belief that philosophy, values, objectives, and techniques form a vertical continuum or hierarchy which ranges from what can be termed the abstract, philosophical, or attitudinal, to the concrete, operational, or behavioral. Fourth is the belief that there is a high correlation or association between an individual's philosophy of education or educational attitudes, the educational objectives he espouses, and the techniques he utilizes to carry out educational procedures. And finally, it was assumed that the individual's attitudes along this hierarchy, and the degree to which they were associated, could be measured.

The final one hundred items of the Survey were arrived at by the following procedure. Various small samples were utilized to test the original pool of three hundred items. These items reflected a variety of abstract and concrete educational factors, ranging from philosophical positions to values to objectives to the techniques utilized to accomplish the objectives. Those items which were found to be ambiguous or which seemed to display a restricted range of responses were eliminated

from the original pool. The vocabulary level and meaningfulness of the items had to be carefully controlled because the Survey was intended to measure the educational attitudes of parents, teachers, administrators, high school students, etc. The preliminary screening of the original pool of three hundred items reduced the number by fifty, leaving two hundred and fifty items to be administered to all the teachers, administrators, counselors, and tenth grade students and their parents in a California school district of medium size. The data which resulted from this measurement were then subjected to factor analysis with varimax rotation, which resulted in the extraction of ten prominent factors accounting for over 70 per cent of the total variance. The ten strongest loadings on each of the factors were selected, leaving a one hundred item survey composed of ten factors with ten items each. The first three factors seemed to represent philosophical orientations, while the remaining seven represented the techniques which would be utilized to implement the various educational philosophies (Tuel and Shaw, 1966).

Table I, extracted from the article by Tuel and Shaw, gives the name attached to each of the ten scale factors and their intercorrelation matrix. It is believed that the scales of the School Opinion Survey can serve to: (1) compare the educational attitudes of the teachers in the institute with those of the principals, students in the summer course, and other teachers in the Tulsa County School System, and (2) show the changes, if any, that occur in the educational attitudes of these teachers after the six-week institute.

TABLE I  
SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY: SCALE INTERCORRELATION MATRIX

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Factor	Scale Name
-.06	-.17	.33	-.07	.26	.18	.24	.19	.25	1	Humanist
	.04	-.24	.30	-.18	-.02	-.22	.13	-.14	2	Realist
		.06	.09	.15	.14	-.06	.11	-.18	3	Experimentalist
			.09	.52	.49	.49	.39	.47	4	Individual Attention
				.08	.33	-.24	.26	-.22	5	Group Activities
					.33	.40	.43	.36	6	Professionalization
						.02	.38	.03	7	Non-Academic
							.20	.38	8	Academic Discipline
								.31	9	Scientific Objectivity
									10	Strict Control

#### Composition of Factors

The composition of each factor of the School Opinion Survey is depicted in the following outline extracted and condensed from Tuel and Shaw (1966, pp. 957-961):

1. Humanist: Chiefly concerned with individual differences, individual personal development and human objectives as opposed to strictly intellectual subject-matter oriented objectives. Stressed self-realization of the consequences of one's own behavior, personal enjoyment of learning, development of critical thinking, and breadth of curriculum. Presupposed a philosophical structure which saw reality as centered in the human being as an individual and a value system which focused on the enhancement of the individual personality.
2. Realist: Appeared qualitatively to be the antithesis of Factor I, i.e., a sort of "antihumanist" scale. However,

the two factors actually proved to be uncorrelated (see Table I). Stressed intellectual development, attention to "objective facts," avoidance of controversial issues, and the irrelevance to education of individual differences in feeling, interests, and motivation. Such values evidently stemmed from a philosophical system which located reality outside of the individual in ideas, society, or the material universe, i.e., idealism, social relativism, or realism.

3. Experimentalist: This scale was composed of two equal parts of opposite valence. Half of the items took a social relativist or experimentalist position, stressing the relativity of knowledge or truth, and irrelevance of religion to education, and the social origin and changeability of moral law. The other half of the items (which were all negatively correlated with those of the first half) described a theistic or absolutist position, emphasizing the immanence of God as the source of truth and moral law. There would have been equal justification for naming Factor III the "Theist" or "Absolutist" scale, on the one hand, or the "Relativist" or "Experimentalist" scale on the other. Because the last seemed the most appropriate option in an educational setting, the scale was named the Experimentalist factor.
4. Individual Attention: Stressed individual attention and counseling, and closer home-school and parent-teacher relationships. Advocated individual counseling on personal problems, individual attention to pupils and encouragement of creativity, parent orientation, parent-teacher conferences, home visits by teachers, school social workers, and better training of counselors. Common to all these characteristics was the concept of increased attention given by school staff to individual students in their school, classroom, and home environment, i.e., the "pupil personnel orientation."
5. Group Activities: Emphasized competitive and team sports, co-educational physical education, outdoor play and field trips, extracurricular activities and group projects, grading on the curve, PTA activities, and local school board autonomy. The outdoor, athletic, non-academic and small group emphasis were apparent. Any individual focus was conspicuously absent.
6. Professionalization: Advocated larger school districts and the aspects of staff professionalization usually associated with them: higher salaries for teachers and administrators, clerical help for teachers, educational research, school psychologists, and individual attention programs to assist the emotionally disturbed pupil and to encourage the gifted.

7. Non-Academic: Stressed non-academic and practical curriculum elements such as student government, shop and craft classes, art and music classes, consumer education, and other techniques aimed at preventing dropouts and retaining the interest of poorly motivated or non-academically oriented students, e.g., better lighting and library, methods courses for teachers, and having incidental expenses of education assumed by the school. The essence of this factor seemed to be the special provisions in curriculum, school plant, services, and class presentation necessary to interest and retain non-academically oriented students.
8. Academic Discipline: Advocated increased time spent in study: more hours in the school day, weeks in school year, longer class periods and less free time. Also stressed were "solid" highly verbal college-preparatory type subjects involving concentrated study: foreign language, social studies, writing of themes and emphasis on great literature.
9. Scientific Objectivity: Concerned with relatively impersonal scientific teaching methods: use of teaching machines, team teaching, stress on mathematics and use of personality, IQ, standardized and "objective" tests. Also included were state regulation of education, free medical care for students, and child-study training. The dominant element was the use of "impersonal scientific educational methods."
10. Strict Control: Concerned with the theme of strict discipline and moral training: strict enforcement of school rules, strictness of discipline, spanking of misbehaving pupils, stringent laws against truancy, teaching of morals, and self discipline in school. Corporal punishment was advocated and the belief expressed that punishment usually produces the desired results. "Control" was the dominant element.

### The Experimental Treatment

The six-week institute was designed to be the experimental treatment of this study. Since it was concerned with aiding the teachers in the development of tools to assist their students in the process of discovery ---individual, personal development and human objectives as opposed to strictly intellectual subject-matter-oriented objectives---participation

in this institute should have influenced their educational attitudes and teaching techniques or objectives to some degree. The treatment effect---the institute---is difficult to specify fully because of the complex record of action. The over-all purposes of the institute have been developed to some length in Chapters I and II, but this does not necessarily indicate that these purposes were accomplished, or, what is more important, that the actual behavior of the staff members was in line with the purposes and goals of the institute as they were stated earlier. The difficulty lies in adequately explaining what the input of the staff members actually was. This constitutes the experimental treatment as it was presented to the institute members.

One source which aids in understanding the institute is the "teaching philosophy" of one of the staff members (Appendix G). This document is important for two reasons. The first relates to the unusual circumstances through which it was created. During the course of events which led to the actual beginning of the six-week institute there was some confusion between the two principle staff members concerning just what the purposes and goals of this institute actually were. In answer to a request by one staff member the other prepared a written statement which contained his philosophical position with regard to both teaching methodology and sociology in general. This statement served to bring the two educators into a closer understanding with each other, and to bring the purposes and goals of the institute into a clearer focus.

The second reason for the unusual importance of this document is more closely related to the actual institute input---experimental treatment. This is true because the paper was reproduced and distributed to each of the participants and served as the initiatory source for a number

of the discussion sessions. The teachers were conscious of the fact that this philosophy of education was written and adhered to by one of the staff members, and the issues contained therein were discussed many times in the presence of these staff members, both separately and together. For the most part, these issues parallel those discussed in Chapters I and II, which indicates that these two chapters are in many ways a reflection of the actual institute input---experimental treatment. It is for these two reasons that this document aids in clarifying the input of the staff members.

The other source which helps to clarify the institute input is the daily log of events (Appendix C). This log is a record of the events which occurred each day. It serves as a sequential representation of the staff input and of the resultant behavior of the participants.

The two sources mentioned above assist in interpreting the actual input of the staff members. The basic criteria of the institute input---experimental treatment---have been thoroughly discussed in Chapters I and II. Examination of the teaching philosophy (Appendix G) and the daily record of events (Appendix C) should help to coordinate the reader's insights gained from these two chapters with the sequential events of the six-week period and with the educational philosophy that was actually presented to the participants. This input is the experimental treatment, and the effect of this treatment on the educational attitudes of the participants is the main concern of this study.

### Research Design

A measurement on the School Opinion Survey was taken before and



after the institute. Using the institute as the intervening variable or treatment effect in this design, and measuring the educational attitudes of the teachers both before and after the treatment effect, without controlling for possible extraneous variance, limits the potential effectiveness of Research Design I (Figure 1).

Pretest	Experimental Treatment	Posttest
$Y_b$	X	$Y_a$

Figure 1. Research Design I

According to Kerlinger (1964), at face value this procedure would seem to adequately accomplish the experimental purpose, since it controls all the possible sources of independent variance that are associated with the subject's characteristics. Actually, the situation is not that simple. There is a possibility that other factors which have not been accounted for in this design may have contributed to the change in scores.

Campbell and Stanley (1963) have discussed these factors in detail. Kerlinger summarizes their effect upon the dependent variable. The first effect is related to the measurement procedure and stems from the changes that may occur in subjects due to the process of measuring them. In this case the post measurement is affected by the increased "sensitization due to the pretest." Campbell refers to such variables as reactive measures, because they cause the subject to react.

The other two important sources of extraneous variance are referred to as history and maturation. Both can potentially operate in the interval between the pre- and post-measurements. Variables or events

that are specific to the particular experimental situation are referred to as history. The longer the time interval between the measurements, the greater the chance that history will effect the subjects and thus the post-measurement. Maturation is related to events that are not specific to the particular experimental situation, but that are connected with the growth of the organisms that are being measured.

Kerlinger (1964) feels that the inadequacy of this design does not stem from the fact that these sources of extraneous variance can operate, ("they operate whenever there is a time interval between pretest and post-test" (p. 296)) but from the fact that nothing is constructed within the design to test or control for their possible influence. This is why he refers to Research Design I as a "poor" design. While maturation and history would not seem to be factors of concern in this experiment, "sensitization due to the pretest" is always a factor that must be dealt with in experiments which utilize the pretest-posttest design.

In order to control for the possible effect of these three extraneous factors, and any others that might contribute to the pre-post difference in scores, a control group was added to the experimental design--- Research Design II (Figure 2). The control group was composed of the principals that attended the orientation phase of the institute. Ideally, subjects would be randomly assigned to both experimental and control groups, but in this case both groups were formed by occupational selection. This imposes a limitation upon the experiment.

	Pretest	Experimental Treatment	Posttest
Experimental Group	$Y_b$	X	$Y_a$
Control Group	$Y_b$	(No X)	$Y_a$

Figure 2. Research Design II

This design offers the most adequate control of factors other than the experimental treatment. According to Kerlinger (1964) it:

....overcomes the great weakness of Design I, namely, it supplies a comparison control group against which the difference,  $Y_b - Y_a$ , can be checked. With only one group, we can never know whether history, maturation (or both), or the experimental manipulation of X produces the change in Y. When a control group is added, the situation becomes radically altered.... Similarly, the effect of testing---Campbell's reactive measures---should be controlled. For if the testing affects the members of the experimental group it should similarly affect the members of the control group (p. 310).

Figure 3 shows that there are two analytical possibilities with the type of design being utilized in this experiment---Research Design II. The first method is to analyze the D scores ( $D_e - D_c$ ) with a t-test or F-test. In this case we are testing to see if the difference between the D means of the experimental and control groups is significant. To do this subjects must be randomly assigned to both experimental and control groups. Since this is not the case in this study, this alternative is eliminated. The second method is to analyze the before and after measures of each group and compare these differences. In this case it is necessary to use the correlated t-test on each group because there are before and after measures on the same subjects. By comparing these differences---t-test values---the effect of the experimental treatment

can be ascertained. If the differences in the experimental group proved significant while those of the control group did not, there would be good reason to assume that the treatment effect---the institute---was the primary force in bringing about this change (Kerlinger, 1964).

Experimental			Control		
Before	After	Difference	Before	After	Difference
$Y_b$	$Y_a$	$Y_b - Y_a = D_e$	$Y_b$	$Y_a$	$Y_b - Y_a = D_c$

Figure 3. Analytical Possibilities for Research Design II  
(Kerlinger, 1964, p. 309)

#### Statement of Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this experiment were derived from the ten factors of the School Opinion Survey. Since each of these factors is concerned with an attitudinal dimension of education, the scores from each factor were measured and tested for change. A review of the factor composition section of this chapter suggests that the institute input corresponded more closely to those constructs measured by some of the factors than to those measured by others. Consequently, the principle hypotheses were constructed from those factors which seemed to closely reflect and measure the changes that occurred through the application of the experimental treatment. A brief discussion of these factors and their close relation to the actual input of the institute should help to clarify the rationale for making such a discrimination.

Of the three factors which measured philosophical orientation, the

Humanist factor seemed more closely related to the experimental treatment than did the Realist or Experimentalist factors. In some ways it seemed that the Realist factor was qualitatively the antithesis of the Humanist factor. Examination of Table I in this chapter reveals that they are actually uncorrelated. The Humanist factor is composed of items that attempt to measure the type of things with which the institute was concerned. It reflects at a philosophical level those issues which, when taken together, represent a large portion of the institute input. It might have been more appropriate to label it the "Individualist" factor. The first principle hypothesis was based on the association between this Humanist factor and the experimental treatment.

1. There will be a significant change in the educational attitudes of the teachers, as measured by the Humanist factor, due to their participation in the institute.

Of the remaining seven factors which dealt with educational objectives and techniques, only three seemed to closely correspond to the experimental treatment. The first of these was the Individual Attention factor. This factor stressed objectives and techniques which were closely related to the philosophical orientation of the Humanist factor. It measured attitudes toward those things which reflect "individualism" in the educational structure, and was positively correlated higher than any of the other factors with the Humanist factor. The second principle hypothesis stems from the Individual Attention factor's apparent association with the experimental treatment.

2. There will be a significant change in the educational attitudes of the teachers, as measured by the Individual Attention factor, due to their participation in the institute.

The third and fourth principle hypotheses were derived from the Scientific Objectivity and Strict Control factors. These two factors

reflect many of the things which were depicted negatively during the institute. They seemed to advocate objectives and techniques that were in opposition to the humanistic or individualistic orientation in education. The Scientific Objectivity factor could more appropriately have been labelled "Objective Testing." It was mostly concerned with evaluating and categorizing students via certain impersonal, objective techniques. The reader should recall from Chapters I and II that this increasing trend toward quantitatively evaluating human beings is one of the main concerns of those who would make the schools more humanistic. The Strict Control factor seemed appropriately labelled. "Control" was also an important issue with regard to humanistic education. Both strict control of student behavior and the overemphasis of objective types of evaluation and categorization received a great deal of attention during the six-week period. They represent a substantial portion of the experimental treatment the participants received. Consequently, the third and fourth principle hypotheses stemmed from the relation of the institute input to these two factors.

3. There will be a significant change in the educational attitudes of the teachers, as measured by the Scientific Objectivity factor, due to their participation in the institute.
4. There will be a significant change in the educational attitudes of the teachers, as measured by the Strict Control factor, due to their participation in the institute.

While these four factors are very closely related to the experimental treatment, the remaining six factors, i.e., Realism, Experimentalism, Group Activities, Professionalization, Non-Academic, and Academic Discipline, cannot be completely disassociated from this input. Therefore, six secondary hypotheses were constructed to measure any changes

that occurred on these factors. The following general hypothesis served as a pivotal representative for these six factors:

5. There will be a significant change in the education attitudes of the teachers, as measured by the above six factors, due to their participation in the institute.

Utilizing the pre-post design described in the Research Design section of this chapter, the above hypotheses were tested by the following statistical procedures.

### Statistical Treatment

Interpretation of the differences evolved from the application of the correlated t-test mentioned earlier. This test is designed to measure the difference between two means for correlated samples. The procedure for testing the significance of the difference between the two means may be applied without actually computing the correlation coefficient between the paired observations. Ferguson (1966) refers to this method as the "difference method." The correlation is present because the subjects are either paired for their similarity on some criterion or they are "self-paired," meaning that a single individual is measured on two occasions (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967). The pretest-posttest procedure, with the experimental treatment between measurements, is an example of "self-pairing."

The t-test for independent samples is concerned with determining if the difference between the two means is within the limits of random or chance fluctuation, or if the difference is actually great enough to be considered significance. This is determined by dividing the difference between the two means by the standard error of the difference between

these means. The standard error is a measure that determines the limits within which a mean can vary by chance. If the mean varies outside the limits of the standard error the variation is considered to be statistically significant. The t-test (Figure 4) computes the standard error of the difference between the two means ( $SE(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)$ ) so that the differences between these means ( $\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2$ ) can be judged to be chance or significant (Kerlinger, 1964). The correlated t-test measures the same variation while controlling for the correlation due to "self-pairing" (Figure 5).

---


$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{SE(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)}$$

where:  $SE(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2) = \sqrt{\frac{s_{X_1}^2}{N_1} + \frac{s_{X_2}^2}{N_2}}$

---

Figure 4. t-test for Independent Samples

---


$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{s_{\bar{D}}}$$

where:  $\bar{D} = \frac{(\sum D)}{N}$

and:  $s_{\bar{D}} = \frac{s_D}{\sqrt{N}}$

---

Figure 5. t-test for Correlated Samples

Although the data of this study do not meet all the assumptions that are necessary for the application of the t-test, it is believed



that this technique is still as good or better for the prevention of a Type I error than any nonparametric method. Hsu and Feldt (1969) have tested the validity of analyzing data of this sort via F-tests (the t-test is equal to the square root of the F-test, therefore, the same assumptions hold for both tests). The general purpose of their study was to investigate the effect of score scale limitations, i.e., number of scale scores, kurtosis and skewedness of the distribution, heterogeneity of variance, sample size, etc., on the probability of Type I error in F-tests involving independent groups.

Their findings indicate that when the above conditions are not extreme, the probability of Type I error is very close to that associated with normal theory F-test. The use of a correlated t-test eliminates the disturbance from such things as heterogeneity of variance, unequal sample size, etc., making the validity of the test even greater for data of this type.

The hypotheses stated above were assessed on the basis of the pretest and posttest scores obtained from the application of the School Opinion Survey. The values from the t-test served to determine the significance of any changes that occurred.

#### Supplementary Data Collection

A second method of data collection was derived by asking the teachers to evaluate the institute on a ten item test (Appendix F). These items reflect many of the important factors surrounding the purpose and goals of the institute. A five-point scale on each item, similar to the one utilized in the School Opinion Survey, yielded scores

with a possible range from 0 to 40---0 being the lowest possible rating and 40 the highest possible.

A score was calculated for each participant, and various categories ---sex, race, age group, etc.---were established. The differences between these categories were determined by the application of the appropriate means-difference statistical procedure, i.e., t-test or F-test. These differences served to evaluate the variation in meaning of the institute between the categories mentioned above.

The third method of data collection was initiated by asking the teachers to write a brief statement---two or three paragraphs---during the first week of the institute, concerning what they expected to gain from being a participant in the institute. From this information, and other relevant sources, a list of open-ended questions was constructed, which were used in an interview session with each teacher toward the end of the six-week period (Appendix B). The information obtained from these interviews was used to qualitatively ascertain the meaning of the institute for each individual.

The final method of data collection was a log of the activities that occurred each day in the institute (Appendix C). These activities were recorded at the end of each day based on the investigators observations of the group. This log served to clarify and lend continuity to the forms of analysis described above, and to portray the institute input in a sequential manner.

Taken together these methods of evaluation permit examination of many aspects of the participant's attitudes toward education, and help determine how useful an institute of this type is in bringing about the changes in the school environment discussed in the first two chapters of this paper.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA AND PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

#### Introduction

As stated earlier, this paper is concerned with the relation between a six-week institute for social studies teachers and the current humanistic movement in education. Chapter III outlined the analytical procedures being utilized to evaluate this institute with regard to the attitudinal dimensions corresponding to those important issues discussed in Chapter I and Chapter II.

Chapter IV is concerned with the analysis of the data obtained from the following procedures: (1) Utilizing the design and statistical technique described in Chapter III, the results of the pre-post measurements on the School Opinion Survey (Appendices D and E) are presented for the teachers (experimental group), principals (control group), and high school students that participated in the institute. A comparison of the attitudes of these teachers with those of the Tulsa County School System was also obtained for both pre- and post-measurements. (2) The results of the Institute Evaluation Test (Appendix F) are presented by categorical comparisons of sex, race, age group, education, and teaching level. The t-test was utilized to determine any differences between these categories. (3) A discussion of the various meanings acquired by the

teachers through their participation in the institute is also presented. This discussion is based upon the qualitative forms of attitudinal assessment utilized in the study, i.e., teacher interviews (Appendix B) and daily log of events (Appendix C).

### Results from the School Opinion Survey

The School Opinion Survey was utilized to examine any changes in the educational attitudes of the teachers as a result of their participation in the summer institute. In order to accomplish this purpose, pre- and post-measurements were obtained for both the teachers (experimental group) and the principals (control group). Measurements were also obtained for the high school students in the experimental class. These scores (pre-post) were then subjected to t-tests for each of the groups mentioned above (Table II). The statistics for the principals indicate no significant change of attitudes on any of the ten factors, which means the control group served to nullify the possible sources of extraneous variance discussed in Chapter III. The null hypothesis can be rejected on four of the ten factors, two of which were principle hypotheses. Examination of these factors demonstrates that the significant changes occurred on four of the educational objectives and techniques factors and on none of the educational philosophy factors.

The reader should recall from Chapter III that these factors were obtained through the application of the varimax rotation factor analytic procedure. The ten factors produced rather neat item clusters and the ten strongest loadings on each factor were chosen to represent their respective factors. This is the procedure that yielded a one hundred

TABLE II  
SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY: T-RATIOS  
ON PRE- AND POST-MEASUREMENTS

Teachers										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean Difference:	-1.39	1.18	-0.64	-0.29	0.32	-1.43	-0.54	-1.64	-4.47	-5.36
Standard Deviation:	0.86	0.66	1.02	0.46	0.46	0.59	0.53	0.58	0.86	1.12
T-Ratio:	-1.61	1.77	-0.63	-0.62	0.69	-2.40	-1.01	-2.84	-5.17	-4.76
Number:	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
Probability Function:	.1151	.0841	.5400	.5486	.5002	.0221	.3207	.0083	.0001	.0002
Principals										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean Difference:	1.06	0.81	1.00	0.13	1.06	0.44	0.94	-0.13	1.50	0.56
Standard Deviation:	0.81	0.95	0.98	0.75	0.62	0.63	0.73	0.49	0.76	0.63
T-Ratio:	1.31	0.86	1.02	0.17	1.71	0.69	1.28	-0.25	1.96	0.89
Number:	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Probability Function:	.2065	.5899	.3266	.8644	.1052	.5058	.2185	.7974	.0656	.6086
High School Students										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean Difference:	1.44	-1.22	0.67	0.33	-0.56	0.67	0.11	0.44	-0.56	1.33
Standard Deviation:	0.84	2.29	1.63	2.80	2.33	1.33	1.21	1.43	1.69	3.14
T-Ratio:	1.73	-0.53	0.41	0.12	-0.24	0.50	0.09	0.31	-0.33	0.43
Number:	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
Probability Function:	.1197	.6124	.6945	.9039	.8115	.6342	.9262	.7597	.7484	.6833

item survey. Tuel and Shaw (1966) then proceeded to examine the items within each factor in order to ascertain and label what they might be measuring. By following this course of action they arrived at names for each of the ten factors. This is standard operating procedure since the varimax technique does not lend itself to the testing of hypotheses. Therefore, any a priori hunches concerning the number and character of factors are somewhat useless. One simply takes what the varimax gives.

This point is not made to discredit the author's survey. It is a very efficient tool for tapping educational attitudes. Nor is it meant to censure the varimax technique. As an orthogonal rotation procedure it has much to offer. Although techniques are available to test hypotheses by the use of factor analysis (Horst, 1965), they have not been necessary here. The factor labels are somewhat arbitrary and somewhat conjectural, and their selection has depended on knowledge of the educational environment. Whatever the choice of labels, it is the constellations of items that are important, not the labels. (Appendix E segregates the items of the School Opinion Survey into their respective factors). The composition of these factors was discussed in Chapter III. This composition is used in constructing the principle hypotheses. The reader should recall that the four principle hypotheses were constructed from the four factors that were closely associated with the experimental treatment---institute input. Of these four, only two were found to exhibit significant changes---Scientific Objectivity and Strict Control. Significant changes also occurred on two of the six secondary hypotheses---Professionalization and Academic Discipline.

Of the factors which displayed significant changes, the two secondary hypotheses were significant at a somewhat high level of probability

concerning Professionalization ( $p = .02$ ) and Academic Discipline ( $p = .008$ ). The significant changes on the principle hypotheses were very impressive---Scientific Objectivity ( $p = .0001$ ), Strict Control ( $p = .0002$ ). There were no significant changes on the ten factors for the principals (control group) and high school students.

The lack of significant changes in the educational attitudes of the principals supports the significance of the experimental treatment---institute input---as the main causal factor in the participant's attitudinal changes. The fact that the high school students did not experience a change in their educational attitudes seems a bit confusing. One reason for this lack of changes in the student's attitudes probably stems from the variability in the educational attitudes to which they were exposed. They were never given an opportunity to make complete adjustments to any one teacher, or even group of teachers. Since the time limitations of the institute demanded a weekly turnover in the groups of teachers to which they were exposed, they never really had the opportunity to relate personally with any of the teachers for an extended period. In many ways they experienced the "guinea pig syndrome;" that is, they felt they were being used to test something, and that their attitudes toward what was happening were not important.

Another reason for the lack of significant changes among the high school students is the fact that the experimental class in which they participated wasn't even remotely related to the type of instruction to which they were accustomed. Furthermore, they were very aware of the situation, and they knew that when this short period of experimentation was concluded, the educational conditions to which they were returning would be the same as before. To identify and internalize the ideas and

attitudes of change which the institute was advocating meant disorganization and dissonance upon returning to the traditional high school atmosphere.

The pre- and post-measurement statistics on the School Opinion Survey for the institute participants have been compared, along with the statistics for the County Teachers<sup>1</sup> (Table III). Observing the pre- and post-means of the participants on the four factors exhibiting significant changes, the large mean differences on the Scientific Objectivity (9) and Strict Control (10) factors can be seen. The actual mean differences with pre-post direction are presented in row one of the teacher section of Table II. The teachers who participated in the institute are employed in the same school system as the County Teachers. A comparison of the pre- and post-means of the participants with those of the County Teachers portrays the actual differences between these two groups both before and after the experimental treatment. In one respect the County Teachers are serving as a second control group for the study. Even without the follow-up measurement indicated in the pre-post design, the first analytical alternative (Chapter III, Figure 3) suggested by Kerlinger (1964) has been utilized---t-ratios between the difference means of the control (County Teachers) and experimental groups for before and after measurements (Table IV).

Tables II, III, and IV depict a quantitative explication of the changes in the educational attitudes of the teachers that occurred due to the influence of the institute. The conclusions and implications of these results will be discussed later in the paper.

---

<sup>1</sup>See Chapter III, p. 56 for an explanation of the County Teachers.



TABLE III

SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY: COMPARISON OF THE PARTICIPANT'S  
PRE- AND POST-MEASUREMENTS AND THE COUNTY TEACHERS

Participant's Pre-Measurements										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean:	30.24	10.04	24.10	29.51	21.66	28.69	27.64	25.11	23.99	26.18
$\sum x^2$ :	9009.12	10485.45	9378.05	10311.06	6460.88	7422.09	6879.86	5037.24	7385.30	6773.88
S.D.:	4.44	4.79	4.53	4.75	3.76	4.03	3.88	3.32	4.02	3.85
Number:	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00	458.00
Participant's Post-Measurements										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean:	28.93	12.71	26.82	32.39	22.82	29.43	28.82	23.50	19.75	19.18
$\sum x^2$ :	393.86	253.71	494.11	302.68	230.11	322.86	388.11	157.00	779.25	1228.11
S.D.:	3.82	3.07	4.28	3.35	2.92	3.46	3.79	2.41	5.37	6.74
Number:	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00
County Teachers										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean:	30.32	11.54	27.46	32.68	22.50	30.86	29.36	25.14	24.21	24.54
$\sum x^2$ :	316.11	212.96	334.96	356.11	275.00	329.43	286.43	305.43	610.71	954.96
S.D.:	3.42	2.81	3.52	3.63	3.19	3.49	3.26	3.36	4.76	5.95
Number:	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00	28.00

TABLE IV

SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY: T-RATIOS ON PARTICIPANT'S  
PRE- AND POST-MEASUREMENTS WITH COUNTY TEACHERS

Participant's Pre-Measurements with County Teachers										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean Difference:	1.31	-2.67	-2.72	-2.88	-1.16	-0.74	-1.18	1.61	4.24	7.00
Pooled Standard Error:	0.86	0.92	0.88	0.91	0.72	0.78	0.75	0.64	0.80	0.79
T-Ratio:	1.53	-2.92	-3.10	-3.17	-1.61	-0.95	-1.57	2.53	5.31	8.86
Probability Function:	.1224	.0040	.0025	.0020	.1046	.6554	.1133	.0114	.0000	.0000
Participant's Post-Measurements with County Teachers										
Factor:	Humanist	Realist	Experi- mentalist	Individual Attention	Group Activity	Profession- alization	Non- Academic	Academic Discipline	Scientific Objectivity	Strict Control
Mean Difference:	-0.08	-1.50	-3.36	-3.17	-0.84	-2.17	-1.71	-0.03	-0.22	1.64
Pooled Standard Error:	0.85	0.91	0.87	0.91	0.73	0.78	0.75	0.65	0.79	0.78
T-Ratio:	-0.10	-1.64	-3.86	-3.47	-1.16	-2.79	-2.30	-0.05	-0.28	2.12
Probability Function:	.9210	.0982	.0003	.0009	.2456	.0057	.0208	.9583	.7737	.0326

## Results from the Institute Evaluation Test

The Institute Evaluation Test (Appendix F) was designed to measure the participant's attitudes toward ten items, including instructional materials, teaching methods, and discussion sessions, that were given special emphasis during the institute. The underlying rationale for this test was to allow the participants to make an evaluation of the institute based on some common experiences with the institute input. Categorical comparisons were then made to determine the possible variations in the meaning of the institute among the participants. Of the five categories selected for comparison---sex, race, age group, education, and teaching level---none exhibited a significant difference in meaning (Table V). The greatest difference in the evaluation of the institute was in the age group category, with the older group ratings averaging about 1.5 points higher than the younger group. The range of possible scores was from 0 (lowest rating) to 40 (highest rating). The actual scores ranged from 29 to 38, with a mean of 34.

During the six weeks of the institute the participants had an opportunity to apply the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching in an actual classroom setting. They divided into five groups based on self-selection, and each group conducted a unit for one week with the high school class. The daily log (Appendix C) is a day by day summary of these events as they occurred. It was felt that perhaps these varied experiences at the high school played a role in each individual's evaluation of the institute, because the encounter was smoother, with less conflict, for some groups than for others. In order to determine if these experiences were significantly different for the five groups, an

TABLE V  
INSTITUTE EVALUATION TEST: CATEGORICAL COMPARISONS

Category	Number	Mean	Standard Error	Calculated t Ratio	Tabulated t Ratio (.05 level of significance)
<u>Sex:</u>			1.26	.30	2.056 df = 26
Male	22	34.05			
Female	6	33.67			
<u>Race:</u>			1.24	.15	2.056 df = 26
Black	6	33.50			
White	22	33.68			
<u>Age Group:</u>			1.02	1.41	2.056 df = 26
30 and under	11	33.09			
over 30	17	34.53			
<u>Education:</u>			1.04	.76	2.056 df = 26
Bachelors	12	34.42			
Masters	16	33.67			
<u>Teaching Level:</u>			1.04	.50	2.056 df = 26
Junior High	16	34.19			
Senior High	12	33.67			

F-test was administered using the measurements on the Institute Evaluation Test (Table VI).

TABLE VI  
INSTITUTE EVALUATION TEST: MEANS, FREQUENCY, AND  
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF INSTITUTE GROUPS

Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V
$N = 5$ $\bar{X} = 34$	$N = 6$ $\bar{X} = 34.5$	$N = 8$ $\bar{X} = 32.63$	$N = 5$ $\bar{X} = 34.4$	$N = 5$ $\bar{X} = 35.6$

---

Analysis of Variance					
Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	Calculated F-Ratio	Tabulated F-Ratio (.05 level of significance)
Total:	205.86	28			
Between	30.09	4	7.52	1.03	2.78
Within	175.77	24	7.33		

### Results from the Qualitative

#### Forms of Data Analysis

##### Teacher Interviews

Both the teacher interviews (Appendix B) and the daily log of events (Appendix C) allowed the researcher to assess many changes that occurred in the teacher's educational attitudes. Figure 4 is a list of open-ended questions that were used in personal interviews with the participants. These questions seemed to permit the teachers to express the

spectrum of meanings they attributed to their participation in the institute.

- 
1. What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
  2. What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
  3. What affect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology had upon you as a teacher?
  4. What occurred during the institute that you did not expect to happen?
  5. What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
  6. What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
  7. What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
  8. Is there anything you would like to add that you feel the questions haven't given you a chance to speak of?
- 

Figure 6. Teacher Interview Questions

Questions one and four are highly associated and have been analyzed together. While question one is concerned with the expectations of the teachers prior to their arrival at the site of the institute, question four asks them to relate the things that occurred during the six-week period that were outside the range of their expectations. When viewed together, these two questions portray the gap that existed between the teacher's expectations concerning what they felt the institute would offer them, and what they actually received from their participation in it.

Nearly all of the teachers (about 90 per cent) expected the institute to be conducted in the traditional, lecture-type manner, and felt that there would be many conventional requirements, such as tests, book reports, projects, required of them in order to receive a satisfactory grade. This is supported by the following statements extracted from the interviews:

....I thought it would be a nice summer away from school, with some old, stuffy teachers. We'd do a lot of book reading, and testing and stuff like that.

....I really expected to have a lot more written work. I didn't want the written....I liked the way the institute was handled to this effect....

Mostly, I expected to experience the same old thing, you know, lots of tests, reports, and other forms of "busy work." This isn't what happened at all.

A large majority (about 83 per cent) stated that of the things that occurred during the institute which they did not expect, the most impressive and valued were: (1) the informal approach which allowed them to structure their own learning experiences and relate to the staff members on a person-to-person basis, rather than only through the teacher-student role structure; and (2) the sense of personal closeness or community which they developed with their fellow teachers. Some of the teachers also mentioned that they obtained a new perspective on prejudice, especially the aspects that relate to judgments concerning race. The following are supportive extractions:

I think the unstructured and the informal manner...this was my first encounter with this at the college level. I mean, they tried to be informal at other places, but this was strictly what we had. It was a person-to-person thing, it wasn't teacher to pupil or anything like that, it was a personal thing....I thought it was great....I just came off a whole years institute at \_\_\_\_\_ University, and I got more here in six weeks than I got in that whole year.

....I think that it really hit it when I realized that I can relate to a black man as a woman, and not in the context of the fact that he's black. And in our society I think that's probably one of the hardest things to do, given our value system.

The deep contact and friendships that have developed between the teachers. I thought it would be a cold classroom affair where I'd come to class and take notes and go to the library every night, and feed it back on the test. I didn't expect the interpersonal relationships that we have had. I think it's great.

....The people are the really key factor which I didn't expect. Beginning with the instructors. They sat a different tone....It was a very open, relaxed type of thing, where it seemed like they were more concerned about us as people than as just teachers who would take what they had given them and go back and feed it into the system. They were really concerned about us experiencing things as human beings....if you come to grips with it perhaps you'll understand what inquiry really is and apply it to your own life; then you go back and you can't help but be a different person in the classroom, not just because of the knowledge you learned about it, but how you became involved as a person with it.

....I never expected the informality, the downright friendliness, human qualities of the people in charge, and that's everyone of them. This institute has been quite an experience and revelation for everybody concerned. The general lack of structure was not there, but because we accomplished so much in that setting.

....First, I was expecting to do a lot of research work, and second, I was expecting to do a lot of studying for tests.... These things add pressure to some people, like myself, and by having an unstructured institute....I feel that I've been more at ease. I've come to know the instructors and become closer to them, and I feel that I have gained much more from this type of unstructured institute than I would've from a structured institute.

Question two asked the teachers to evaluate the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies after they had experienced the experimental treatment. About 85 per cent of the teachers responded positively toward inquiry, with no negative responses and about 15 per cent either neutral or ambivalent. The following extracts tend to represent the positive feelings of the teachers:



....I think education has to go this way to meet the needs of the students. It's going to be hard, but I think it can be done.

I really think that there's probably very little other way to get to the issues of social studies, because if you're preparing people to be a social being their whole life is going to be one of inquiry if they're going to cope with their environment. I just really don't think there's any other way to teach it.

I think it's great. I think it's necessary if we're going to meet the needs of the students in preparing them to live in the society that they're going to inherit. Because the emphasis on the memorization of facts is not really challenging all the faculties of the student. To me it gives you an opportunity to operate on a broader basis, as far as the student and his skills and abilities are concerned. And you're really after a thinking product, and this affords the opportunity to develop that type of person. I'm really for it.

It's great. The inquiry method will give each child in the classroom a chance to participate in the discussions, in the class as a whole. You can use special inquiry methods to motivate even the slower children to participate.

....It showed me an awful lot about human relations....I think it was invaluable getting to use this kind of thing with an experimental class. I would never have dreamed that I could go out and take a dozen kids so different and say this is your class, and have it turn out that way. I didn't know I could be comfortable with that, and I can be. I'd never have known it if we hadn't had that class out there. That class was probably the best part of the institute.

Some of the teachers said that they felt inquiry had been a part of their teaching approach before they attended the institute, implying that while they had been utilizing this method in the past, they were not aware it had received so much attention in the area of teaching methodology. They were positively reinforced by the fact that much of their past approach to teaching could be referred to as inquiry, which they now viewed as the "best" method of engaging the student's interest and commitment. These extractions testify to this insight on their part:

I think it's an approach that we all have used in the past....I think everybody has used it some extent. Maybe we didn't call

it inquiry....but we've been using it for years and I think it reinforced my ideas, that this is the way to teach.

....I've really been doing it to a certain extent all along. I just haven't been calling it inquiry.

I have used it some, but I didn't know what I was using.

Some of the teachers mentioned that the inquiry approach was the best method for allowing the student to "feel" his way through certain crucial issues. They felt that through inquiry the student became better equipped to arrive at his own conclusions on these issues, and to find himself as an individual---experiential learning.

....it gives the student a chance to express his own views; a chance to find himself as an individual. They can really come to some kind of a conclusion as to what they actually think, and not society as a whole.

While none of the teachers expressed a completely negative attitude toward the inquiry approach, there were some whose feelings concerning this teaching method could be classified as ambivalent (about 15 per cent). Their attitudes were mostly based on a feeling of insecurity with regard to an "open" type of classroom environment, which could be interpreted as a perceived threat to their authority and control of the classroom.

To be honest I have mixed emotions about it now. It's caused personal conflict in many areas, which I wasn't expecting.... In order to be able to teach inquiry you have to be a much more open person than I was before. I just got challenged that way. I didn't realize that I was as much of an authoritarian person as I have been in the classroom.

For the most part, this feeling of anxiety toward inquiry stemmed from the attempt of the staff to allow the high school students in the experimental class to initiate their own learning experience. In doing this, much of the control of the class was removed from the role of the teacher; certainly a new and possibly threatening experience for many of

these participants.

While there were some objections to this procedure, none of the teachers seemed to object to the fact that the staff allowed them to direct their own learning experiences during the six weeks of the institute, i.e., they selected the topics to be pursued in the discussion sessions, they delved into areas of individual interest in their free time, an institute library was made available by the staff to enhance their opportunities for experiential learning, they were never told to learn something for the purpose of passing a test---tests or special assignments were never given by the staff. During the interview sessions reference was made time and time again to the positive aspects of this approach. Nearly all of the teachers felt that this was one of the central values of the institute, but that control by the high school class of their particular learning experiences distracted from their effectiveness as teachers. The paradox is apparent.

Question three asked the teachers to evaluate the utility of sociological concepts and methods in their role as teachers. The large majority of them (about 90 per cent) felt that sociology had positive utility in aiding the teacher and student in communication with each other, and in understanding the world around them. The following extractions from the interviews are representative of this point of view:

The entire institute was conducted on a human level, not a knowledge. The problems we dealt with were real, and the concepts were introduced as a way of analyzing problems. It couldn't have been better.

....having this many good concepts come up from people I did respect has been a real stimulus to me to sort of dig deeper into a lot of these things. And I want to see some of the things happen in the classroom that I've seen happen here.

I don't see how you can get them out of the high school. They're a part of life, which I suppose if I've got a quarrel

with the school system as a cultural phenomenon, it's that the classroom has been so objectified that it no longer represents a life situation, and I think that's why it's turning so many students off. The teacher's not a living being, the teacher is an institution, and we've dehumanized it to the point that the classroom no longer represents life, therefore, it's no longer interesting to students.

I think it's probably the most useful thing you can do in the classroom. To me the gut issues in the social studies are the type of things that you talk about in sociology. To me the types of problems you deal with in sociology is what makes the study of social studies relevant.

I think the issues are the ones that we have to deal with now. They are the issues that affect us, and if we dodge them we're in trouble.

I think they're valuable because they're relevant to the things that are going on now, and it's what the teacher should know about, and the students for that matter. Cause they're interested in it, and they can see it around them, they can relate it to their own lives....I think it's not only valuable for them to know these facts, but to adopt attitudes that would be in balance with them.

I feel that it has given me a better understanding, and as far as conceptualization is concerned, helped me in dealing with some of the everyday problems that schools bring up.

Many of the teachers mentioned that some of the issues would be difficult to deal with in their present school environment, indicating that the normative structure of their school was prohibitive of an inquiry into some of the more controversial topics, e.g., sexual behavior, political activism, some religious issues, etc.

....I have a completely different attitude on descent now. It's just given me a very deep insight. I'm somewhat afraid of what will come about when I start talking about some of these controversial issues in my classroom. I'm afraid of the effects and of the controversies that will come about through studies like this, but it needs to be done. How I'm going to control it in the classroom, I don't know. It rather scares me....

The issues that have brought out in the institute, I feel are very good. But I find that in the school system where I work that some of these issues are "no-no," as far as a discussion in the classroom goes. I feel that until we can change the attitudes of the people who control the curriculum and frame-

work of the high schools, that we can't go into some of the issues that we have discussed here at the institute.

The issues which we've discussed I feel will be a great help to the students. However, some of the issues, because of the conditions under which I work, probably would be prohibited from the type of in-depth inquiry we have given them here.

For the most part, those that expressed a negative attitude (about 7 per cent) toward the sociological issues that were discussed during the institute felt that the liberal or radical side of these issues were over-emphasized. This was possibly a valid point. While some of the other teachers also mentioned this as a possibility, many felt that their own classroom inquiry sessions could be adjusted to bring out many varied approaches to the issues.

Nearly all of those teachers expressing a positive attitude toward the educational value of dealing with sociological issues in the classroom, mentioned that they now felt more comfortable and confident concerning their ability to relate these issues to their students. They saw the institute as an experience which broadened their insights into many of the issues of concern to students, and which enhanced their ability to emphasize and relate in a meaningful manner to the student's problems.

I think it's going to make me look a little bit closer at my students. Take stereotyping for example. If we take this one kid, he's a trouble maker, we type him as a trouble maker rather than see what's bugging him. And maybe finding out that it's not me that bothering him, it's something else that's bugging him. To me this is a way this will help me.

....More than anything, I think that it's the sensitivity that we've learned....to the extent that I'm trying to be more aware of the way other people feel and respond and not trample upon these responses....I had trouble hearing what people were really saying in spite of their words. Perhaps me not sensing this feeling I've hurt them and made them be quite. This completely stifled their inquiry into something because their own personal feelings were hurt. And I hope that maybe I can keep from doing this as much.

What I've learned would be in dealing with the students themselves; attitudes toward them.

Question five asked the teachers what they thought could be done to improve the institute. A majority of the teachers felt that the experimental high school class could have been organized more effectively. They were not expressing a negative attitude toward this class, because most of them (about 75 per cent) seemed to feel that it was one of the best aspects of the institute.

I definitely think it was a good idea (the experimental high school class). The institute wouldn't have been the same without it. I really enjoyed it.

For me the class is what happened. That's where it was.

I think it was a good thing, I really do. Since this is my first institute, it gave me a chance to work through some of my inadequacies practically, not just theoretically. It was a good thing.

Still, a large percentage (about 60 per cent) expressed their ideas concerning better ways to organize this class.

Personally, I would like to have had a little more time with the high school class; more than a week, and I'm not sure how this could have been done.

....I felt we should've had more student contact. Perhaps more experimental high school classes, or at least more contact with the one we had. I felt this was one of the best things about the institute, the experimental class. I thought it was great. I really enjoyed it.

A more realistic (high school) class setting....Like they've given us so much freedom that it's not a realistic situation. I think this is the greatest fault. And also to have less teachers at a time teaching....

This type of class was not realistic....The one thing that I criticize in the handling of the students is some sort of control....Most of the things we were able to do with this small group couldn't be done with a normal size class, thirty to forty....

Perhaps....to have say three experimental high school classes instead of one. We'd all have a chance to teach more. Also make them larger. The high school class was definitely a good

thing. It gave us opportunities to confront students in a classroom while the attitudinal changes were occurring in us, and to see if these changes were practical in the classroom.

....since my group was so large, if we could have had maybe two members each day work something with the high school class, and then rotate and let two more conduct the class, I expect that maybe we would have all had a better opportunity to become involved with the high school class.

Based primarily on a conversation I had yesterday afternoon in which we were discussing what role the students had played in the institute, and finding out that several of my colleagues do not view students as an integral part of the institute, but as peripheral activity, I would say that more teachers ought to be involved with more students a greater percentage of the time. You could have two or three classes (high school), and have maybe a fluctuation....ideally, you should have each teacher involved with the class the entire course of the institute.

Most of the teachers (about 93 per cent) were very affirmative concerning their experiences in the institute, and felt that any improvements could only be attained through minor alterations in the format. When asked what they felt could have been omitted from the institute, nearly all of the teachers (about 87 per cent) said that nothing could be left out if the same positive effects were to be obtained. The following extractions from the interviews depict some of their reasons for advocating no change:

Really, I can't see anything that was a waste. Again, because of the nature of the institute, even the social gatherings that we've had....I've think they've been as much a part of our learning and gaining insights into ourselves and the sociological problems that we are interested in....I can't see anything that I would call frivolous or that could have been left out....

....I really can't think of any of it that I would rule out.

I don't think anything could've been omitted. I just can see a few additions. I think we've been real fortunate to have had this staff at this institute. You all have really been great.

Actually, I don't know of anything that I thought was a waste of time. Now that's the honest truth, I can't think of anything that wasn't valuable in some way.

Question seven was concerned with finding out what the teachers considered their most important personal gain from the institute to be. The single most important thing which a large percentage (about 65 per cent) of the teachers felt they had gained from their participation in the institute was a heightened "sensitivity" toward the viewpoints and values of other individuals. Many said that this institute was the most "human" experience of their careers, and even their lives. Some of the teachers had participated in other summer institutes during their teaching careers. They pointed out that these institutes were conducted in the traditional manner. They were information or "fact" oriented, requiring the participants to digest a large quantity of factual material and "regurgitate" it on tests. They were also conducted on the basis of maintaining the barriers between participants and staff. Most of the teachers were impressed with the relaxed atmosphere of this institute, and by the fact that every effort was made by the staff to remove the teacher-student role barriers. These attitudes toward the institute are presented in the following extractions from the interviews:

I've had some bad experiences with college teachers and university teachers....now I feel there are some human Ph.D.'s. In other words, there are some humans willing to come off the pedestal, as the kids say, and sit down and talk with you, rather than stand up and preach to you.

I think the most important thing would be a feeling that others ideas and actions can be acceptable to me.

....I learned to respect the rights of other people, the ideas of other people; the rights of the students....

I feel like I've been challenged to the roots, as to everything I believe in or want as a human being. My whole value system has undergone inspection....I felt like for the last three years, since I got out of college, I hadn't had any experiences



like this. I just feel much more human....it seems bewildering to have undergone such a soul-searching experience as this institute was, and to find that some people were not changed at all. I'm much happier as a person than I was when I came over here. And I have a much healthier respect for things around me. There's just nothing like coming in contact with really beautiful people, and being able to relate with them day after day. You can't help but grow.

I really think this has been quite a human experience for everyone. If it was more structured the human aspect might have been lost....I think a deep appreciation for people.... A little more acceptance of people on the basis of their individuality. And to find that there's hope for us all, and there's worth in us all.

....it was very informal, which I really did like; not demanding that you do this or do that. This is what we've done to a lot of our students, and we've forgotten about this. I think it's really opened some eyes. I know it has mine. The experience I've gained from the institute, I wouldn't trade it for anything....The most important thing....is the closeness that we as teachers got as human beings....Still, you don't know everything about a person, but that was one of the most important....it really touched me. Plus, our professors were really opposite of what I was thinking they were going to be.

Many of the teachers (about 50 per cent) said that their experiences with inquiry teaching and experiential learning during the institute was by far the most impressive of their careers.

....perhaps the most important thing is that by being in this institute I have learned what is meant by inquiry, not vicariously as told by some authoritarian educator who thinks he has all the answers, but first hand by engaging in the inquiry process; by trying things; but putting out our viewpoints.

I can now try the inquiry method, whereas, I didn't have the confidence last year. I feel like I gained the confidence, that now I know enough about it that I can practice it in the classroom.

....A lot of the hang-ups that traditional teachers have, before coming to this institute, I had. And it really impinged on my thinking a great deal. I really got up tight sometimes when we hit on some of these issues that threatened me. I would speak out and find out that I was wrong, and really, this was good for me, because it sort of changed my opinion. This changes my perspective on a lot of things in education, and I don't know if I can go back now and teach at all like I used to. I think the kids will have a lot more to say about what is taught and what is learned in my class from now on.

....what I've gained is reinforcement on the inquiry approach....

Just learning about this inductive method; all the things that are involved in it. It involves many things....not just simply asking questions. The entire approach to teaching is different than what most of us have been using. It seems to overshadow all the rest.

There did not seem to be a consistent trend in the responses to the last question, which asked the teachers if they felt there was something else that they needed to say concerning the institute. Most of them said that the other questions had allowed them to express their feelings adequately, and if comments were added, they seemed to reflect those things which the individual had spoken of earlier in the interview. Basically, the interviews depict a very positive feeling toward the accomplishments of the institute. The high scores on the Institute Evaluation Test (Table VI) are further evidence of these positive feelings. Nearly all of the teachers valued the experience, and felt that many of their perspectives and attitudes concerning the purposes and goals of education had been altered. They expressed a strong desire to experiment with the problem-centered, inquiry approach in their own classrooms. Many also felt that their images of society and the world had been enhanced through their contact with the sociological form of imagination. Together, these gains should enable them to better understand and empathize with the plight of the student, and to help promote an atmosphere of experiential learning.

### Daily Log

The main purpose of the daily log (Appendix C) was to record the institute input, and the reactions to this input, in a sequential manner. This record, if digested in toto, portrays an image of the events that

occurred during the six-week period, and their relation to the main goals of the institute. A look at a few of the high points in this sequential pattern should contribute to the over-all evaluation concerning the effective results of the experimental treatment.

The most impressive of these events was the discussions which resulted from the presentation of the "teaching philosophy" (Appendix G), which was discussed in Chapter III. This philosophy generated many heated discussions through the week, and resulted in a shared sense of community among those teachers and staff members present on these occasions. The many statements in the interviews concerning sensitivity and human experiences relate closer to this shared experience, and the resultant events, than to any other single event in the institute. As stated in the daily log:

....The remaining groups met at the University....and experienced what was later to be recognized as the highest point of the institute...the participants found themselves involved in a discussion that extended to the very core of their beliefs and values. Many were very threatened by the experience, but all felt that they grew closer to, and gained a greater understanding of, their fellow participants.

The first social event of the institute took place on the evening of this same day, which allowed the participants and staff members to move mentally closer in the more informal atmosphere. The discussions concerning the issues involved in this teaching philosophy, and many others that were now beginning to emerge, were continued at this party. In many ways, the events which surrounded this day's activities were the incipient stage of any attitudinal changes that occurred due to the influence of the institute.

Another important derivation from this log is the manner which it depicts the various degrees of success or failure experienced by the

teachers as they experimented with inquiry teaching during their week at the High School. This experience was more positive for some than for others. Four of the five groups seemed to have a minimum of conflict with the school students, but with one of the groups (Group III) there was a high degree of conflict, as witnessed in the following statement extracted from the daily log:

....After the break the clergymen arrived and led a discussion on the role of the Church with regard to sex....The session actually progressed into a debate between the three representatives of the Church....The students proved very unruly for about the first thirty minutes of this presentation; a factor that tended to make the three guests quite uncomfortable. But they settled down after a while and became committed to the discussion. When asked why they did this they said that it was to punish the members of Group III for their authoritarian approach in the teaching of this subject. They felt that the teachers had not been receptive to their suggestions, and had forced them to limit their investigation of the subject into a narrow channel. When the teachers heard this they were shocked, because they felt that their approach was very liberal and open-minded, and that they had covered the subject quite thoroughly....During the afternoon session an attempt was made to analyze what had occurred between the students and teachers of Group III. Some of the basic sociological concepts were utilized to help facilitate a sociological understanding of the situation. The authority structure of the group was examined. Most of the teachers realized that they had somehow managed to stifle the students attempts to direct their own search into the subject matter.

....it was discovered that Group III was quite disappointed with their effort at the High School this week. It remains to be seen whether or not such an experience is beneficial or detrimental. Perhaps the mistakes that were made during the week will serve as lessons for the members of this group, and perhaps this is a better teacher than success. Actually, any generalizations concerning the effect of this total experience on the group are spurious, because the experience was different for each member, and any meaning that stems from it is limited to how the individual views and evaluates it; each person must assess and give meaning to the experiences within his own frame of reference, and what embitters and turns one person against the inquiry approach to teaching might serve as a source of positive motivation for another. One thing is certain, inquiry teaching, if done right, is not a situation in which the authoritarian personality will be at ease. The atmosphere is one of discovery and often confusion, and this

will probably prove to be much too unstructured for the individual who seeks to control and manipulate those around him.

Returning to the Institute Evaluation Test section of this chapter, and looking at the mean scores for each of these five groups (Table VI), it would appear that Group III might have been influenced by this somewhat negative experience. Although the variation in scores between these groups was not significant, Group III did rate the institute lower than any other group.

The final high point depicted by the daily log was the events which surrounded the last few days of the institute. At this point everyone seemed quite ready to return to their homes and relax for the remainder of the summer. But the strong emotional ties that had developed during the summer made it more difficult to break off the relations at this point. The teachers planned a surprise party for the staff which was a very touching event for everyone in the institute, but especially for the staff members. The following extraction from the daily log portrays these final few days of the institute:

...Some attempt was made to orally evaluate the institute, but after the individual interviews and the written measurement today, most of the teachers were "burnt out" on evaluation. Interest quickly changed to the prospects of tonight's party. Everyone was anxious about the event, and the teachers seemed to enjoy the fact that they had created an uncertain situation for the staff members. At any rate, everyone was looking forward to the party and the informal session....

...The party...was one that everyone will remember for a long time. Some of the participants had worked up a beautiful presentation that seemed to emotionally touch everybody, but that was most comforting and rewarding to the staff members. They included everyone in the program, but it was geared to let the staff know just how much the institute had meant to them. After the dinner and special program everyone met at (a staff member's) house for some parting exchanges....The conclusion of the institute was an occasion for tears and sorrow, as many of the staff and participants had grown very close to one another....

The interviews and the daily log illustrated many of the positive attitudes held by nearly all of the participants concerning their experiences during the institute. The follow-up sessions during the school year evidenced their continued enthusiasm. In talking privately with many of them it was discovered that a majority had greatly modified their approach to teaching, integrating the inquiry method whenever possible.

One of the teachers from the institute was chosen to coordinate the limited supply of inquiry materials in the Tulsa School System, i.e., the Prentice-Hall Series, Inquiry into Crucial American Problems, and the Sociological Resources for the Social Studies (see Institute Materials section of Bibliography for an extended listing of these materials). This allowed the materials to be moved around from school to school to afford every participant the opportunity to utilize them. Most of the teachers did so, and affirmed the positive utility of both the materials and problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching. Many said that their students were very excited over the chance to explore some of the issues they considered relevant to their lives.

#### Summary

Four main effects have been identified from the institute. First, the teachers have come to perceive the student in less formal terms, and more as an individual. Second, they have changed their perspectives concerning the evaluation and control of student behavior, moving in the direction of decreased standardization and conformity, and increased freedom of expression and diversity. Third, they have come to value the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching as a medium which increa-

ses the awareness of both teachers and students, and which offers new hope for solving today's challenging problems and comprehending tomorrow's unknown world. And fourth, they have shared a highly sensitive experience which brought them much closer together into what some felt was the most "human" experience of their teaching careers, and even their entire lives.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Conclusions from the Study

The changes that occurred in the educational attitudes of the teachers were mainly due to a realization on their part of those issues contained in the first two chapters of this paper. The single most important change evidenced by these results is isomorphic with the main values emphasized throughout the rationale and related literature sections of this paper. The participant's images of the student evolved from a somewhat formal, control-oriented position, to one in which the student is viewed as a unique "being in the process of becoming;" one that sees him as capable of defining his own sphere of meaning and selecting his own course of action. The existential model advocated by Allport (1962) and others in Chapter II was incorporated into their personal image of the student. They also readily adopted the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching as the method, which best facilitates the learning process when viewed from an existential position---experiential learning. In fact, the results from this data analysis indicate that with regard to most of those issues presented in Chapters I and II, these teachers held attitudes which affirmed the position taken by the institute itself.

Of the statistically significant changes ascertained from the School



Opinion Survey measurements, the most significant changes were recorded on the Scientific Objectivity and Strict Control factors, both of which reflect educational objectives and techniques. No significant changes were discovered with regard to the philosophy factors.

The results presented in Chapter IV indicate that certain changes in the educational attitudes of these teachers did indeed occur due to the influence of the summer institute. These changes were basically in the areas of educational objectives and techniques as measured by the School Opinion Survey (Appendix E), and most significant on the factors which dealt with scientific objectivity and strict control of students. Before discussing these factors and their relation to the fundamental purpose of the institute, an explanation concerning the hierarchical levels of the "educational environment" should shed some light on why significant changes occurred on only the technique factors.

Tuel and Shaw (1966) contend that the "educational environment" is a construct based on a continuum or hierarchy from the abstract to the concrete. Educational philosophy and values occupy the most abstract position in this hierarchy, while objectives and techniques are considered to be more concrete. Much of what was discussed and emphasized during the institute pertained to the abstract area of this hierarchy, but the concrete areas were not neglected. What is more important, the concrete factors could be observed and practiced, since they are embodied within the methods and techniques of teaching and evaluating students, while the abstract factors are incorporated within one's philosophy of education. Abstractions deal with the reasoning and thinking capacities of the individual, and are often intertwined with a good deal of dissonance. Changing one's philosophy of anything is not apt to occur rapidly,

especially if the person is in the adult stage of development.

Perhaps it is necessary to alter concrete phenomena---objectives and techniques---before any significant changes in philosophy and values can be attained. At any rate, the measurable significant changes that occurred within this group of teachers were all representative of the concrete dimension of the educational environment. Looking at the "philosophy of teaching" (Appendix G) that was discussed in the experimental treatment section of Chapter III, while it does contain objectives and techniques, it is mostly an indication of the educational values considered important by the staff member. The issues that pertain to these values were discussed many times during the institute. These discussions allowed each person to weigh the pros and cons of the issues with regard to his own frame of reference. Some found it enlightening; others found it threatening. It would appear that simply discussing something as abstract as values does not necessarily promote significant changes in an individual's philosophy. This is understandable. After all, the philosophy that one holds toward life and its many facets is not something that appears in a flash. It is the culmination of one's life history, and is deeply embedded within the total personality of the individual. Changes that occur in this dimension take time, for one must psychologically work through the various meanings as they relate to the mental balance of his present situation.

Tuel and Shaw have labelled the three educational philosophy areas Humanist, Realist, and Experimentalist. The teachers in this study exhibited a much higher preference for the Humanist and Experimentalist philosophical positions---average on pre-post means of 29.5 and 27.0 respectively---and a very low preference for the Realist position---average on

the pre-post means of 12.0. This implies a high regard for the humanistic point of view, and a moderately high regard for the experimental point of view. Perhaps the majority of the teachers had already accepted this philosophical orientation before they attended the institute, and what was encountered during the summer simply reaffirmed what they already believed to be true.

However, this does not explain the significant changes on the four technique factors. One explanation for these changes is that the technique factors are embodied within the concrete dimension of the educational environment. They are directly related to behavior and can be observed and practiced. The teachers were subjected daily to the teaching techniques of the staff members. They observed them in action and witnessed the pragmatic value of their teaching methods. They also observed the direct relationship between these "methods" and the humanistic educational philosophy. As referred to in Chapter I, "the medium is the message," and no teacher can separate the methods and techniques he utilizes in the classroom from his basic philosophy of education.

The teachers were also given the opportunity to practice these techniques with the experimental high school class. As evidenced by their interview statements and by the daily log, in most cases they received positive feedback from these students, a factor which probably played an important role in bringing about the significant changes. Possibly the changes that occurred on the technique factors prefaced some later changes in educational philosophy. Or perhaps they were simply a reflection of seeing the pragmatic utility of the methods as performed by the staff members, coupled with the positive feedback from the high school students on their own performances. The important thing is

that they did occur, and that they were the product of an institute designed to bring about just these changes. This is indeed a significant result where this study is concerned, because the composition of these two factors, along with those of the humanist factor, comprise the basic tenets that were dealt with in the institute.

As stated in the composition of factors section of Chapter III, the Scientific Objectivity factor is made up of items which emphasize the present trend toward standardization and conformity of behavior. It places a premium on "objectivity" at the expense of the individuality of the student. The issues which surround this factor were discussed many times during the institute, with emphasis being placed on humanistic values. From the existential point of view the individual is not seen as something that can be measured objectively and categorized for the sake of future judgments and manipulations of behavior. Actions of this sort are viewed as profane proceedings against areas considered sacred to the individual. As stated in Chapter II, the individual is seen as a unique "being in the process of becoming," free to choose his course of action, and responsible for the decisions he makes. He has the right to choose what is meaningful to his education and what is not. Judgments made concerning what he should or should not learn, whether they be based on scientific "objectivity" or some other criterion outside the subjective reality of the individual, are seen as profane acts against the existential will of the person.

A combination of the Scientific Objectivity and Strict Control factors produces a collection of items whose affirmation was diametrically opposed during the institute. The issue of control was confronted again and again, with emphasis placed on the importance of making the

individual aware of his freedom of choice and responsibility for his actions. Standardization of behavior and control of the individual are in conflict with the education of the existential will. Apparently the influence of the institute was the primary factor in bringing about this realization to the participants, which accounts for the highly significant change in their attitudes concerning these two factors.

The mean score of 34 of a possible 40 points on the Institute Evaluation Test indicates a very high rating of the institute by these teachers. Since the teacher's credit for their participation in the institute was already established at the time this test was given (on the last day of the six-week period), and they were confident that any judgments made on their part concerning the institute would not affect this credit, it seems logical to assume that their responses were true reflections of their feelings. The events of the summer and the changes that occurred in their attitudes were apparently highly valued. Looking at the interviews one finds over and over again statements by the teachers concerning the importance of this institute to their teaching careers. But these feelings were expressed in an atmosphere of acceptance and praise. It is difficult to say if the gains they made in this atmosphere will survive the onslaught of the bureaucratic quagmire that is the public schools. The important thing to realize from these conclusions is that the institute did indeed influence the teachers to change their attitudes.

### Implications

The results of this study support the rationale concerning the util-

ity of an institute of this sort for the purpose of bringing an awareness to teachers of the predicament of education in American and the world. While these participants were basically aware of, and in sympathy with, some of the issues discussed in Chapter I, the institute served to make them aware of many more of these issues, and served as an agent of incipient change for the "New Criticism" movement.

The issues discussed in the rationale section of Chapter I were dealt with many times during the six-week period of the institute. Basically, this consisted of simply taking the time and energy necessary to examine the purposes and consequences of education. As stated by Silberman (1970), much of the tragedy that occurs in our public schools today is due to the fact that teachers and administrators often fail to question the purposes and consequences of their actions. Many never bother to ask why they do what they are doing. It simply never occurs to them to question their behavior and the results of this behavior for the goals of education.

Issues such as education vs. training, methods vs. content, success vs. failure, individuality vs. conformity and docility, subjectivity vs. objectivity, humanistically and individually oriented education vs. education for standardization and social control, received a great deal of attention through the entire course of the institute. One of the main purposes of the institute was to make the participants aware of these issues, and to initiate question-asking on their part concerning the purposes of education and the consequences of their behavior in the classroom with regard to these purposes.

This existential model of the individual is the foundation for the utilization of the inquiry method of teaching and sociological form of

imagination. Education of the existential will can only be attained by recognizing the freedom of the individual to choose his own meaningful course of action---experiential learning. This can best be accomplished through the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching. Sociological concepts and methods can serve to aid the individual in recognizing this inevitable freedom of choice and the accompanying responsibility for one's action.

In essence, the teachers viewed most of the values contained in the experimental treatment as an acceptable and desirable alternative to those which now guide and direct the educational process. In this respect, there is no denying the positive influence of the institute. But it is also important to the over-all purpose of this paper to ascertain how these newly acquired attitudes will effect their future careers as teachers. In order for any of these new attitudes and behaviors to flourish in the public schools, the movement must disseminate into all areas of the educational environment, and especially to those whose decisions will most profoundly influence the future direction of education. In this respect, both parents and administrators will have a great deal to say with regard to the selection of priorities. After all, it is the present priorities that are the basis for the criticisms mentioned in Chapter I: training the individual to function smoothly as a cog in the machinery of society, valuing content over method in the classroom, attempting to make the person a success in life by failing him, and treating young people as things to be molded in some predetermined fashion. Unless changes can be made in these priorities it is of little consequence to make teachers aware of the profaning of the individual and injustice that occurs in the public schools. It would seem that the

issue is one of power, and in most cases teachers are as powerless as are students.

The revolution now occurring in education is a part of the total institutional upheaval confronting America today. The institutional sacred cows, such as the rigid school curriculum, free enterprise with its profit system, nationalism, war, are being challenged by many of the youth and by intellectuals of the colleges and universities. The present power structure answers these challenges with slogans of "law and order," and "my country, right or wrong." If, as Postman and Weingartner (1969) have declared, the educational issues depicted in the first two chapters of this paper are matters concerning the survival of mankind, then it would seem that our chances for survival are slim indeed, unless an adjustment in our priorities occurs very soon.

This revolution's most basic concern is the restoration of the individual to the center of all human endeavors. In closing, the words of Mumford (1964) express the urgency of this concern:

So if I feel free to speak disparagingly of the still current ideological background for the automation of knowledge, it is with the assurance that the more alert scientific minds of our generation have themselves led the way. Today our fundamental irreducible unit is not the atom but the human personality, in all its biological complexity and cultural multiformity. And it is now plain that only by restoring the human personality to the center of our scheme of thought can mechanization and automation be brought back into the service of life. Until this happens in education, there is not a single advance in science, from the release of nuclear energy to the isolation of DNA in genetic inheritance that may not, because of our literally absent-minded automatism in applying it, bring on disastrous consequences to the human race. These consequences would have no parallel in previous history, since in both cases they would be irreversible and irretrievable. For that possible miscarriage, our educational institutions would have to take no small share of the blame (p. 364).



## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allport, G. W. (1960). "The Open System in Personality Theory." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41(3), 301-310.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1961). Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1962). "Psychological Models for Guidance." Harvard Educational Review, 32(4), 373-381.
- Becker, E. (1967). Beyond Alienation: A Philosophy of Education for the Crisis of Democracy. New York: Braziller.
- Benne, K. D. (1967). Education for Tragedy: Essays in Disenchanted Hope for Modern Man. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Berelson, B., and G. A. Steiner (1964). Human Behavior: An Inventory of Scientific Findings. Chicago: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Berger, P. (1963). Invitation to Sociology. New York: Doubleday.
- Berman, L. M. (1968). New Priorities in the Curriculum. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Bettelheim, B. (1950). Love Is Not Enough: The Treatment of Emotionally Disturbed Children. London: Collier.
- Blackham, H. J. (1965). (Editor). Reality, Man and Existence: Essential Works of Existentialism. New York: Bantam Books.
- Blount, N. S., and H. T. Klausmeir (1968). Teaching in the Secondary School. Third Edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Borsodi, R. (1968). Seventeen Problems of Man and Society. West Alexandria, Ohio: School of Living.
- Brickman, W. W., and S. Lehrer (1966). (Editors). Automation, Education, and Human Values. New York: Crowell.
- Broom, L., and P. Selznick (1968). Sociology: A Text With Adapted Readings. Fourth Edition. New York: Harper & Row.
- Bruner, J. (1960). The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1966). Toward a Theory of Instruction. New York: Norton.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967). "The Act of Discovery." In R. F. Allen, et al. (Editors). Inquiry in the Social Studies: Theory and Examples for Classroom Teachers. Social Studies Reading No. 2, Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 3-13.
- Burke, K. (1954). Permanence and Change: An Anatomy of Purpose. Kansas City: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Bush, R. M., and D. W. Allen (1964). A New Design for High School Education: Assuming a Flexible Schedule. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Campbell, D. T., and J. C. Stanley (1963). Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Campbell, J. (1949). The Hero With a Thousand Faces. New York: World.
- Cass, J. (1970). "The Crisis of Confidence---and Beyond." Saturday Review, 53(38), 61-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971a). "Has the Bubble Really Burst?" Saturday Review, 54(16), 61.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971b). "What Higher Education Is All About." Saturday Review, 54(21), 51ff.
- Childs, J. I. (1950). Education and Morals: An Experimentalist Philosophy of Education. New York: Wiley.
- Clark, R. (1971). "Demeaning Human Dignity." Saturday Review, 54(16), 29ff.
- Conant, J. B. (1963). The Education of American Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cooley, C. H. (1922). Human Nature and The Social Order. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Cousins, N. (1971). "See Everything, Do Everything, Feel Nothing." Saturday Review, 54(4), 31.
- Crary, R. W. (1969). Humanizing the School: Curriculum Development and Theory. New York: Knopf.
- Cuzzort, R. P. (1969). "The Use of Sociology As Bad Faith: The Views of Peter L. Berger." In Humanity and Modern Sociological Thought. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 206-213.
- Dennison, G. (1969). The Lives of Children. New York: Random House.
- Douglas, J. D. (1970). (Editor). Freedom and Tyranny: Social Problems in a Technological Society. New York: Knopf.

- Drayer, A. M. (1963). Problems and Methods in High School Teaching. Boston: Heath.
- Dubos, R. (1965). Man Adapting. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970). "Mere Survival Is Not Enough." Life, 69(4), 2.
- Durkheim, E. (1893). The Division of Labor in Society. Translated.
- Erikson, E. H. (1968). Identity: Youth and Crisis. New York: Norton.
- Farber, J. (1969). The Student as Nigger. New York: Pocket Books.
- Ferguson, G. A. (1966). Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. St. Louis: McGraw-Hill.
- Frankel, V. (1963). Man's Search for Meaning. New York: Washington Square Press.
- Fraser, G. S., and T. J. Switzer (1970). "Inquiries in Sociology: Teachers and Students Reactions." Sociological Resources for the Social Studies Newsletter (9).
- Freud, S. (1930). Civilization and Its Discontents. New York: Cape and Smith.
- Friedenberg, E. (1965a). Coming of Age in America: Growth and Acquiescence. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1965b). The Dignity of Youth and Other Atavisms. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Fromm, E. (1941). Escape from Freedom. New York: Farrar and Rinehart.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963). "The Present Human Condition." In H. Ruitenbeek. (Editor). Varieties of Modern Social Theory. New York: Dutton, 72-78.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1965). Socialist Humanism. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968). The Revolution of Hope. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gadlin, H., and B. E. Garskof (1970). (Editors). The Uptight Society: A Book of Readings. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.
- Genova, A. C. (1965). "What is Existentialism." Wichita State University Bulletin, 41(4), 3-20.
- Glasser, W. (1969a). Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper & Row.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969b). "The Effect of School Failure on the Life of a Child." National Elementary Principal, 49(1), 8-18.

- Goodlad, J. I. (1966). The Changing School Curriculum. New York: The Fund For The Advancement of Education.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and R. H. Anderson (1963). The Nongraded Elementary School. Chicago: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Goodman, M. (1970). (Editor). The Movement Toward a New America: The Beginnings of a Long Revolution. New York: Knopf.
- Goodman, P. (1960). Growing Up Absurd. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1964). Compulsory Mis-education and The Community of Scholars. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1965). People or Personnel and Like a Conquered Province. New York: Vintage Books.
- Goslin, D. A. (1965). The School in Contemporary Society. Dallas: Scott, Foresman and Co.
- Green, M. F., and O. Ryan (1965). The Schoolchildren Growing Up In The Slums. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Greene, M. (1967). (Editor). Existential Encounters for Teachers. New York: Random House.
- Havighurst, R. (1960). American Higher Education in the 1960's. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
- Hentoff, N. (1966). Our Children Are Dying. New York: Viking Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1971). "Why Students Want Their Constitutional Rights Now." Saturday Review, 54(21), 60ff.
- Herndon, J. (1965). The Way It Spozed To Be. New York: Bantam Books.
- Holt, J. (1964). How Children Fail. New York: Dell Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1967). How Children Learn. New York: Pitman Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1969). The Underachieving School. New York: Pitman Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1970). "Why We Need New Schooling." Look, 34(1), 52.
- Horst, P. (1965). Factor Analysis and Data Matrices. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hsu, T., and L. S. Feldt (1969). "The Effect of Limitations on the Number of Criterion Score Values on the Significance Level of the F-Test." American Educational Research Journal, 6(4), 515-527.
- Hudgins, B. B. (1966). Problem Solving In The Classroom. New York: Macmillan.

- Ilich, I. (1970). "Why We Must Abolish Schooling." The New York Review of Books, 40(1), 9-15.
- Jones, A. H. (1970). "The New Criticism of American Education: A Review of a Movement." Supervisors Quarterly, 6(1), 3-10.
- Kaufman, G. (1964). Up the Down Staircase. New York: Avon Books.
- Kean, R., et al. (1967). "Dialogue-Focuser: Education." In Dialogue on Education. Kansas City: Bobbs-Merrill, 15-23.
- Kelley, E. C., and M. I. Rasey (1952). Education and the Nature of Man. New York: Harper & Row.
- Kelman, H. C. (1968). A Time to Speak: On Human Values and Social Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Keniston, K. (1963). "Alienation and the Decline of Utopia." In H. M. Ruitenbeek. (Editor). Varieties of Modern Social Theory. New York: Dutton, 79-117.
- Kerlinger, F. N. (1964). Foundations of Behavioral Research. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kneller, G. F. (1958). Existentialism and Education. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Kohl, H. (1967). 36 Children. New York: Signet Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969). The Open Classroom. New York: A New York Review Book (Vintage).
- Korsybski, A. (1958). Science and Sanity. Fourth Edition. Lakeville, Conn.: International Non-Aristotelian Library.
- Kozol, J. (1967). Death At An Early Age. New York: Bantam Books.
- Leonard, G. (1968). Education and Ecstasy. New York: Delta.
- Lowe, W. T. (1969). Structure and the Social Studies. London: Cornell University Press.
- Lynd, H. M. (1963). "Clues to Identity." In H. M. Ruitenbeek. (Editor). Varieties of Modern Social Theory. New York: Dutton, 3-54.
- Marcel, G. (1952). Man Against Mass Society. Chicago: Regnery.
- Marcuse, H. (1955). Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry Into Freud. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Marin, P. (1970a). "Children of the Apocalypse." Saturday Review, 53(38), 71ff.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970b). "The Open Truth and Fiery Vehemence of Youth: A Sort of Soliloquy." In H. Gadlin and B. E. Garskof. (Editors). The Uptight Society: A Book of Readings. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 352-365.
- Marmor, J. (1971). "Psychiatry and the Survival of Man." Saturday Review, 54(21), 18ff.
- Martindale, D. (1966). Institutions, Organizations, and Mass Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- May, R. (1963a). "Centrality of the Problem of Anxiety In Our Day." In H. M. Ruitenbeek. (Editor). Varieties of Modern Social Theory. New York: Dutton, 120-132.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1963b). "Freedom and Responsibility Re-examined: Development." In E. Lloyd-Jones and E. Westevelt. (Editors). Behavioral Science and Guidance: Proposals and Perspectives. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers Colleges, Columbia University, 95-110.
- Mayer, F. (1962). New Perspectives for Education. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University Press.
- Mead, M. (1970a). Culture and Commitment: A Study of the Generation Gap. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970b). "Youth Revolt: The Future is Now." Saturday Review, 53(2), 23ff.
- Miller, R. I. (1967). The Nongraded School. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mills, C. W. (1959). The Sociological Imagination. New York: Grove Press.
- Montagu, A. (1967). On Being Human. Second Edition. New York: Hawthorn Books.
- Morris, V. (1966). Existentialism in Education. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mumford, L. (1964). "The Automation of Knowledge." In W. W. Brickman and S. Lehrer. (Editors). Automation, Education, and Human Values. New York: Crowell, 364.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967). The Myth of the Machine: Technics and Human Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- McLendon, J. C. (1966). (Editor). Social Foundations of Education: Current Readings From The Behavioral Sciences. New York: Macmillan.

- Nader, R. (1971). "The Dossier Invades the Home." Saturday Review, 54(16), 18ff.
- Neill, A. S. (1960). Summerhill---A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart.
- Nisbet, R. A. (1953). Community and Power. New York: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1966). The Sociological Tradition. New York: Basic Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970). The Social Bond. New York: Random House.
- Nordstrom, C., E. Z. Friedenberg, and H. A. Gold (1967). Society's Children: A Study of Resentment in the Secondary Schools. New York: Random House.
- Obenhaus, V. (1965). Ethics for an Industrial Age: A Christian Inquiry. New York: Wiley.
- Oliver, D., and J. Shaver (1966). Teaching Public Issues in the High School. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Otto, H. A. (1971). "Communes: The Alternative Life-Style." Saturday Review, 54(17), 16ff.
- Perkins, L. M. (1970). "Teaching Philosophy and General Education in Sociology." Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University. (Unpublished mimeograph).
- Perls, F. S. (1969). Gestalt Therapy Verbatim. Lafayette, Calif.: Real People Press.
- Postman, N., and C. Weingardner (1969). Teaching as a Subversive Activity. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Prowledge, F. (1967). To Change a Child: A Report on the Institute for Developmental Studies. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Read, H. (1966). The Redemption of the Robot: My Encounter With Education Through Art. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Reiss, A. J. (1965). (Editor). Schools in a Changing Society. New York: The Free Press.
- Resnik, H. S. (1971). "Promise of Change in North Dakota." Saturday Review, 54(16), 67ff.
- Rich, J. M. (1968). Education and Human Values. Menlo Park, Calif.: Addison-Wesley.
- Richards, I. A. (1935). Practical Criticism. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

- Riesman, D. (1961). The Lonely Crowd. Abridged Edition. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Rischin, M. (1965). (Editor). The American Gospel of Success: Individualism and Beyond. Chicago: Quadrangle.
- Rogers, C. R. (1952). "Communication: Its Blocking and Its Facilitation, Etc." A Review of General Semantics, 9(2), 83-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1961). On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967). "The Facilitation of Significant Learning." In L. Siegel. (Editor). Instruction: Some Contemporary Viewpoints. San Francisco: Chandler, 37-54.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969). Freedom to Learn. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Rogers, V. R. (1970). Teaching in the British Primary School: Ways to Manage Child-centered, Experience-based Programs and Practices for Responsible, Individual Learning. New York: Macmillan.
- Roszak, T. (1968). The Making of a Counter-Culture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and Its Youthful Opposition. Garden City, N. Y.: Anchor Books.
- Sartre, J. (1956). Being and Nothingness. Translated. New York: Philosophical Library.
- Schafer, W. E., C. Olexa, and K. Polk (1970). "Programmed for Social Class: Tracking in the High School." Transaction, 7(12), 39ff.
- Schneider, K. R. (1968). Destiny of Change: How Relevant Is Man in The Age of Development? Dallas: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Schrag, P. (1970). "End of the Impossible Dream." Saturday Review, 53(38), 68ff.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1971). "Dossier Dictatorship." Saturday Review, 54(16), 24-25.
- Seeley, J. (1966). "Progress from Poverty." Liberation, 11(5), 9-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1969). "Youth in Revolt." Britannica Book of the Year 1969. Chicago: Encyclopaedia, Inc., 313-315.
- Selakovich, D. (1965). Problems in Secondary Social Studies. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Shulman, L. S., and E. R. Deislar (1966). (Editors). Learning by Discovery: A Critical Appraisal. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Silberman, C. E. (1970a). Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Random House.



- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970b). "Murder in the Schoolroom." The Atlantic Monthly, Three Parts, June, 83-95; July, 83-97; August, 85-98.
- Smith, F. R., and C. B. Cox (1969). New Strategies and Curriculum in Social Studies. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Snedecor, G. W., and W. G. Cochran (1967). Statistical Methods. Sixth Edition. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Soderquist, H. O. (1964). The Person and Education. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill.
- Sontag, S. (1967). "What's Happening in America: A Symposium." Partisan Review, 34(1), 13-63.
- Stinchcombe, A. I. (1964). Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Suchman, J. R. (1967a). "Learning Through Inquiry." In R. F. Allen, et al. (Editors). Inquiry in the Social Studies: Theory and Examples for Classroom Teachers. Social Studies Reading No. 2, Washington, D. C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 55-58.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1967b). "The Pursuit of Meaning: Models for the Study of Inquiry." In E. M. Bower and W. G. Hollister. (Editors). Behavioral Science Frontiers of Education. New York: Wiley.
- Tiryakian, E. A. (1965). "Existential Phenomenology and the Sociological Tradition." American Sociological Review, 30, 674-688.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1968). "The Existential Self and the Person." In C. Gordon and K. J. Gergen. (Editors). The Self in Social Interaction. I. New York: Wiley. 75-86.
- Toqueville, A. (1862). Democracy in America. Translated. Cambridge: Sever and Francis.
- Tuel, J. K., and M. C. Shaw (1966). "The Development of a Scale to Measure Attitudinal Dimensions of the Educational Environment." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 26(4), 955-963.
- Tuel, J. K., and Rosemary Wursten (1965). "Dimensions of the Educational Environment." California Journal of Educational Research, 16(4), 175-188.
- Ulich, R. (1964). (Editor). Education and the Idea of Mankind. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Van Kaam, A. (1963). "Freedom and Responsibility Re-examined: Commentary." In E. Lloyd-Jones and E. Westvelt. (Editors). Behavioral Science and Guidance: Proposals and Perspectives. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers Colleges, Columbia University, 110-128.

- Waller, W. (1965). The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Wiley.
- Watts, A. (1951). The Wisdom of Insecurity. New York: Vintage Books.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1970). Does It Matter? Essays on Man's Relation to Materiality. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Weber, M. (1969). "Some Consequences of Bureaucratization." In L. A. Coser and B. Rosenberg. (Editors). Sociological Theory. Third Edition. London: Macmillan. 454-455.
- Wiener, N. (1954). The Human Use of Human Beings. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Wilhelms, F. T. (1967). Evaluation as Feedback and Guide. Washington Washington, D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, NEA.
- Williams, J. (1969). "The Biggest Trick of All." Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University. (Unpublished mimeograph.)

#### Institute Materials

Fraenkel, J. R. (1970). (Series Editor). Series: Inquiry into Crucial American Problems. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

#### List of Books in Series:

1. Fraenkel, J. R., Crime and Criminals: What Should be Done About Them?
2. Holmes, F. R., Prejudice and Discrimination: Can We Eliminate Them?
3. Way, W. L., The Drug Scene: Help or Hang-up?
4. Durfee, D. A., Poverty in an Affluent Society: Personal Problem or National Disgrace?
5. Bressler, L. A., and M. A. Bressler, Country, Conscience, and Conscription: Can They Be Reconciled?
6. Kane, F., Voices of Dissent: Positive Good or Disruptive Evil?
7. Tretten, R. W., Cities in Crisis: Decay or Renewal?
8. Nelson, J. L., Teen-agers and Sex: Revolution or Reaction?
9. Mitchell, M. G., Propaganda, Polls, and Public Opinion: Are the People Manipulated?

10. Urick, R. V., Alienation: Individual or Social Problem?
11. Seely, G. M., Education and Opportunity: For What and For Whom?
12. Wolf, A., Foreign Policy: Intervention, Involvement, or Isolation?

American Sociological Association, Sociological Resources for the Social Studies. Dallas: Allyn and Bacon. (The following materials were available in June, 1970, for use in the institute.)

1. Leadership in American Society: A Case Study in Black Leadership.
2. The Incidence and Effects of Poverty in the United States.
3. Images of People.
4. Testing for Truth: A Study of Hypothesis Evaluation.

APPENDIX A

NSF INSTITUTE IN SOCIOLOGY

Participant Characteristics

	1	2	3	4
Age:	31	29	32	36
Sex:	Male	Male	Male	Male
Race:	Black	White	Black	Indian
Highest Deg:	BS (1961)	MS (1968)	BS (1961)	MS (1967)
Major Subj:	Sociology	Soc. Studies	History	Soc. Stud. (PE)
Subj. Taught:	Geography	History	Soc. Studies	Economics
Type School:	Jr. High	Jr. High	Sr. High	Jr. High
	5	6	7	8
Age:	26	23	25	53
Sex:	Male	Female	Male	Male
Race:	White	White	White	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1968)	BS (1969)	BS (1967)	MS (1950)
Major Subj:	History-Ed.	Soc. Studies	Soc. Studies	Soc. Studies
Subj. Taught:	World Hist.	World Hist.	Sociology	Soc. Studies
Type School:	Sr. High	Sr. High	Sr. High	Jr. High
	9	10	11	12
Age:	48	51	26	26
Sex:	Female	Male	Male	Male
Race:	White	White	White	Black
Highest Deg:	BS (1947)	MS (1949)	BS (1966)	BS (1966)
Major Subj:	Journalism	Hist., Eng.	Soc. Studies	Soc. Science
Subj. Taught:	History	Hist., Sociol.	Econ., Civics	Civics, Econ.
Type School:	Sr. High	Sr. High	Jr. High	Jr. High

	13	14	15	16
Age:	47	42	25	27
Sex:	Male	Male	Male	Female
Race:	White	Black	White	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1950)	MS (1968)	BS (1969)	BS (1966)
Major Subj:	Hist., Geo.	Soc. Studies	History	Geog., History
Subj. Taught:	Geography	History	Geo., Civics	History
Type School:	Jr. High	Jr. High	Jr. High	Sr. High
	17	18	19	20
Age:	46	34	25	26
Sex:	Male	Male	Male	Male
Race:	White	Black	White	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1969)	BS (1964)	BS (1967)	BS (1966)
Major Subj:	Hist., Phil.	Sociology	Soc. Studies	History
Subj. Taught:	Hist., Soc.	Geography	History	History
Type School:	Jr. High	Jr. High	Jr. High	Jr. High
	21	22	23	24
Age:	48	30	45	35
Sex:	Male	Male	Female	Male
Race:	White	Black	White	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1954)	BS (1962)	MS (1970)	MS (1970)
Major Subj:	Soc. Studies	History	Guidance, Eng.	History
Subj. Taught:	Geography	Hist., Soc.	Guidance, Hist.	History
Type School:	Jr. High	Sr. High	Sr. High	Jr. High
	25	26	27	28
Age:	60	56	27	46
Sex:	Male	Male	Male	Female
Race:	White	White	White	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1950)	MS (1965)	MS (1968)	BS (1949)
Major Subj:	Soc. Studies	Soc. Studies	History	Soc. Studies
Subj. Taught:	Hist.(DeptHd)	Dept. Head	Hist, Pol, Sc.	Dept. Head
Type School:	Sr. High	Sr. High	Sr. High	Jr. High
	29	30	31	32
Age:	42	23	50	29
Sex:	Female	Female	Male	Male
Race:	White	White	Black	White
Highest Deg:	MS (1956)	BS (1969)	MS (1957)	BS (1963)
Major Subj:	Phys. Ed.	Sociology	Soc. Studies	History
Subj. Taught:	Economics	Soc. Studies	Soc. Studies	Soc., Psych.
Type School:	Jr. High	Stillwater Hi	Stillw. Jr. Hi	Stillwater Hi

## APPENDIX B

### TEACHER INTERVIEWS\*

(1)

- (I)\*\* What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Basically, I was a sociology major in undergrad school, and it's been about nine or ten years since I've had any experience in sociology, so I wanted to get a reaffirmation of some of these concepts so that I could integrate them into my geography classes.
- (I) Did you have any other expectations?
- (T) Getting hours for my Master's degree.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I feel that inquiry is basically a state of mind, and I feel that it can be used very effectively within the school. It is not a cure-all for getting rid of all the problems that you have, but I believe that if it is used effectively along with other methods it can be very exciting.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) First, let me refer to an example, like stereotypes. This wasn't even in my vocabulary when I came here. I've had this some years ago, but it sort of eroded away. I feel that it has given me a better understanding, and as far as conceptualization is concerned, helped me in dealing with some of the everyday problems that schools bring up.
- (I) What occurred during this institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) Basically, for a while, and we've talked about this for quite some time, almost everybody in the institute assumed that we had reached a point where we were being honest with ourselves and each other. This is something you won't find every day. For maybe the first week, or the first couple of weeks, we were kind of hold'n back, and then it reached a point there for about a week where everybody seemed to just open up and let go.

---

\* The number designated to each interview corresponds with the number designated to each teacher in Appendix A.

\*\* (I) refers to the interviewer; (T) refers to the teacher.

- (I) This is not really something that you expected to happen then?
- (T) Right.
- (I) I know that you have attended more institutes than anyone here. Have you found that this occurred in the other institutes you were a part of?
- (T) No! No! This is the type of thing that I was talking about. I think these little informal discussions that we've had....you know, people gained at least a respect for the opinions of others.
- (I) To what do you attribute this, more than anything else?
- (T) I think the informal discussions that we have, more than anything else. But also, the fact that everybody is from Tulsa is important.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Personally, I would like to have had a little more time with the high school class; more than a week, and I'm not sure how this can be done. Other than this, I don't see very much that could be done.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) (Long pause) I can't really think of anything.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I've had some bad experiences with college teachers and university teachers, and in this institute....you know, now I feel that there are some human Ph.D.'s. In other words, there are some humans willing to come off the pedestal, as the kids say, and sit down and talk with you, rather than stand up and preach to you.
- (I) Is there anything you would like to add that you feel the questions haven't given you a chance to speak to? Any further comments on the institute?
- (T) I sort of had my doubts about the informality at first, but now I feel that this has been the greatest aspect of it. In other words, I wondered if people would just completely quit coming to class because the roll wasn't checked. After this, I'm pretty well convinced that they were able to keep us interested. I've hobbled over here a few days in which I really didn't feel like it, but I feel like I'd miss something if I didn't attend.

(24)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Mostly, I guess, some different ideas as far as methodology and teaching goes.
- (I) Is that all?
- (T) Insights into these different ideas and stuff. I felt that I had adequate knowledge for content in myself, but I was looking for a way to get this knowledge out, rather than pile more in than I could handle.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I think it's an approach that we all have used in the past, just from the conversations that went on in the class....the discussions. I think everybody has used it to some extent. Maybe we didn't call it inquiry, or inductive, or anything like that, but

we've been using it for years and I think it reinforced my ideas, that this is the way to teach.

- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think it's going to make me look a little bit closer at my students. Take stereotyping, for example. If we take this one kid, he's a trouble maker, we type him as a trouble maker rather than see what's bugging him. And maybe finding out that it's not me that's bothering him, it's something else that's bugging him. To me this is a way that this will help me.
- (I) Okay. Anything else concerning the concepts and methods of sociology?
- (T) Okay, now, as far as the content...as far as the real concepts are concerned, I think a lot of concepts are put into words that we really don't feel like we have these concepts. Readin' the book and stuff like that. I can read the book, and wouldn't get out what I got out of just a few minutes' discussion.
- (I) You might say that we've gone past the concepts in some cases.
- (T) Right! We sure have.
- (I) What occurred during this institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) I think the unstructured and the informal manner....this was my first encounter with this at the college level. I mean they tried to be informal at other places, but this was strictly what we had ....like it was a person-to-person thing, it wasn't teacher-to-pupil or anything like that, it was a personal thing.
- (I) What are your feelings about this?
- (T) I thought it was great!
- (I) Do you think it worked out good?
- (T) I just came off a whole year's institute at Wichita University, and I got more here in six weeks that I got in that whole year.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) That's a tough one. I'm very impressed with this one, it's hard to come up with something, you know, just right off the bat. But I think a little bit of, what do ya call it, you know that group therapy....
- (I) Sensitivity?
- (T) Right! I think a little heavier of sensitivity would've helped. 'Cause I feel that a lot of times we're not really...we get so far, and then they back off. I mean this is my feelings on it.
- (I) Is there anything that you feel should have been done or covered in this institute that wasn't?
- (T) No, not really. I honestly can't think of a thing.
- (I) What do you think could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Omitted?
- (I) Is there anything that you felt was unnecessary?
- (T) (Long pause) Not really. Like I say, if I was organizing this institute myself, I would organize it along these same lines. One thing I didn't mention before; I felt we should've had more student contact. Perhaps more experimental high school classes, or at least more contact with the one we had. I felt this was one of the best things about the institute; the experimental class. I thought it was great. I really enjoyed it. After experimenting in the



class, and then coming back and talking in the room with the group; this really helped me.

- (I) You lived with most of those in your group, didn't you?
- (T) Yes. All of them, except for one.
- (I) Do you feel that to be an important factor?
- (T) Oh, it is. I definitely say that in the group interaction....in our group this is why we felt good about it, 'cause we could depend on one another, and it was this close association.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think the most important thing would be a feeling that others' ideas and actions can be acceptable to me. In other words, I came really close in the group situation, in the total group, not just our small group, in that the things people say and the things people do, they don't bother me....'course I'm that way anyway, but more so. And the most important thing is that I can depend on somebody else's opinion. Like if I get in trouble in the classroom back in Tulsa, I know I got thirty-two other people.
- (I) Are you saying that you feel it was important that all the teachers were from the same school system?
- (T) Oh, definitely, very important. I think this is the only way. Now if we can go back and bring some of this into our buildings to the other teachers I think we can get somewhere. I know a lot of people think that the administration is going to make us go back to the old thing, but I don't think they will. And I think I'll be more likely to try new things, regardless of what they are. And go with the students; if they're interested in something, go with them, and forget the subject matter. And I think that the most important thing about this whole institute is that we're not locked in. We can go anywhere we want to go.
- (I) Is there anything you would like to add that you feel the questions haven't given you a chance to speak to? Any further comments on the institute?
- (T) I think there should be more of them....institutes of this type. And I think this is the type of in-service that should be carried on.

(15)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) When I first signed up to come to this institute I thought it would be the use of sociology in the classroom, and I teach world geography and have just a few hours of sociology, and I thought it would be materials I could use along this line to help me in the classroom.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I'm one hundred and one percent for it. I think education has to go this way to meet the needs of the students. It's going to be hard, but I think it can be done.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the methods and concepts of

- sociology had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think these methods that's been discussed in the classroom and in our group meetings tend to make me feel that I could use a large amount of these materials, especially some of the issues that are considered controversial, in my classroom. And I intend on using them.
- (I) Did you use them before?
- (T) To a certain degree, yes. But I feel one hundred percent better about them now.
- (I) What, if anything, occurred during this institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) Most classrooms I had as an undergraduate you were just a student in with all the others. There's a common bond between the individuals in this class. I think this is sociology in action. Even with the students (experimental high school class) there's a common bond that tends to unite people together.
- (I) Do you think the fact that you are all a part of the same school system mattered?
- (T) I don't think so. I think that if you get a lot of people together for a period of time you get the same results.
- (I) Do you think the fact that you are all a part of the same school system will have a future effect on what comes out of this institute?
- (T) I don't know how the others feel, but I think it will, one hundred percent. I think that if anyone happens to get in trouble, on a certain issue or something like that, with the principal or administrator, they'll be about thirty other teachers that will be willing to come to your aid. And I think that....I know my relationship with the other teachers, that I'm a hundred percent for carrying it on when we go back home.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another?
- (T) Well, let me think. Gosh, I'll need to debate on that one. I would like to have more materials that I could take back to the classroom to use. Materials that would show the different points of view. I think materials would be the only point that I could come up with.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one? Do you feel that anything was done that was unnecessary?
- (T) Nothing. I think it was all pretty relevant to me.
- (I) How about the high school class?
- (T) Oh, that's....I'm one hundred percent for that. I mean you can't have any kind of....you have to have kids, man, if you're going to have anything. That's where it's at. I'd like to of had even a larger class. I think a larger class would've been a lot different.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) All right. I learned to respect the rights of other people; the ideas of other people; the rights of the students, too....one hundred percent for that. Gosh, boy, you can't hardly put that in words.
- (I) Okay. Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow you to do?
- (T) I've enjoyed it tremendously. It's what I call free expression of ideas.

(6)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Probably my first reaction was that I might come up and do more reading into the various methods of inquiry and perhaps get a sociological framework, and to examine and critique a set of materials.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I really think that there's probably very little other way to get to the issues of social studies, because if you're preparing people to be a social being, their whole life is going to be one of inquiry if they're going to cope with their environment. I just really don't think there's any other way to teach it.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and I would add the issues that we've gone into, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) One thing, I definitely am not going to do some of the things I did last year. More than anything, I think that it's the sensitivity that we've learned in this institute this summer, to the extent that I'm trying to be more aware of the way other people feel and respond and not trample upon these responses. I know that probably this is what interfered most with my using inquiry last year. I had trouble hearing what people were really saying in spite of their words. Perhaps be not sensing this feeling I've hurt them and made them be quiet. This completely stifled their inquiry into something because their own personal feelings were hurt. And I hope that maybe I can keep from doing this as much.
- (I) What occurred during this institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) I think that most of all I learned things about myself that I haven't really known before. One of these has to do with my feelings on race. Theoretically, I've always been unprejudiced. And I think to a large degree I've discovered what it is to act on my theoretically unprejudiced beliefs. Probably the closest that it's ever come is that I have realized that I can relate....I think that it really hit it when I realized that I can relate to a black man as a woman, and not in the context of the fact that he's black. And in our society I think that's probably one of the hardest things to do, given our value system.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I think for one thing you could have us not be grouping so early. It had its advantages, but it also had its disadvantages. For example, in my group we had just a total dichotomy of personalities. Maybe it's good, because you're often going to have to work in situations where you're going to have to accommodate the differences in beliefs; this is the whole essence of a liberal society. I think it might of helped if the institute had been longer. Like eight weeks, instead of six. That's about all, except I think that the fact that it's had different people with different points of view has made it so worthwhile.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Don't think you could omit the practicum class.

- (I) What are your feelings about that class?
- (T) It was really...that's where I found...I started feeling things I don't like to feel, and really not knowing what to do with it. I didn't know what to do with somebody like Eddie; turned him off totally. Although toward the end of the week...I don't know, there's something that happened outside of class. I realize that he's saying something, but I don't know how to respond. I find myself being more authoritarian than I want to be. I want...just jump down on somebody. And I think I've learned that the class has got to do it if it's going to be a lasting experience...lasting where they make them aware of what they're doing to the whole class. But I think that definitely that class was a good thing. I think it would be nice if we had a larger class, so that we could get more of the variance. Say about twenty-five. These kids were not very representative of the type of kids you encounter in most classrooms. They were kids that the system hadn't treated too good, and many of them were alienated from the system. Maybe if we had gone to the "socsies," or the "silent majorities," we could have dealt with that point of view better.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all of these teachers are from the same school system?
- (T) I think this is probably one of the best things that we've had going, as far as the usefulness of the institute. We've got a group that can work in one school system, and perhaps really have an impact because we're concentrated enough. The personal impact of the institute has been such that I don't know how many of us will be able to go back and, if we don't have a political impact, stand it.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think the materials are great, I mean, obviously. The Prentice-Hall stuff is some of the best stuff that's come along, as far as giving us some tools. But perhaps the most important thing is that by being in this institute I have learned what is meant by inquiry, not vicariously as told by some authoritarian educator who thinks he has all the answers, but first-hand by engaging in the inquiry process; by trying things; by putting out our viewpoints. Probably the most important thing is that I have learned the limitations within inquiry. And this is that it's not going to occur in depth, it's not going to give understanding in real depth, until the people that are engaging in inquiry will trust one another and their feelings. I think that it might be good if all teachers had to undergo a sensitivity institute. To me this is what, to a very large degree, this institute has been. Maybe that's the most important part, the sensitivity training we've undergone in there.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No, I think your questions were very good.

(30)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?

- (T) A new concept of inquiry method. How to teach differently, rather than the old lecture style.
- (I) Were you familiar with inquiry before you came here?
- (T) Yes, to some extent. I utilized what I knew about it in the classroom. I just didn't feel like I knew it well enough.
- (I) Were you a sociology major in undergraduate school?
- (T) Yes, I was. And I didn't teach in my field, consequently I was limited on knowledge to use the inquiry. I felt like I needed a better background in order to ask the right questions.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Oh, I think it's great, I really do. It will answer the questions the kids really are concerned about. I think it's a very, very difficult method of teaching, much more difficult than the standard lecture method. And, as Dr. Perkins says, it constantly makes you tense; you know, you're never comfortable when you walk into the classroom, because you never know exactly what you're going to say or what you're going to do. This will make me feel very uncomfortable for a while.
- (I) What effect has the contact with the concepts, the methods, and also the issues we've discussed in class, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) A very deep effect, particularly in the area of prejudice. I kinda had the idea that it really didn't exist; you know, that there was no such thing as prejudice, until we've talked about it in the classroom. Talking person-to-person with the Negroes in class has given me a completely different attitude on prejudice. I have a completely different attitude on descent now. It's just given me a very deep insight. I'm somewhat afraid of what will come about when I start talking about some of these controversial issues in my classroom. I'm afraid of the effects and of the controversies that will come about through studies like this, but it needs to be done. How I'm going to control it in the classroom, I don't know. It rather scares me, see what I mean?
- (I) Yes, I do. What occurred during this institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) The deep contact and friendships that have developed between the teachers. I thought it would be a cold classroom affair where I'd come to class and take notes and go to the library every night, and feed it back on the test. I didn't expect the interpersonal relationships that we have had. I think it's great.
- (I) What do you feel could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) A more realistic class setting. Having thirty to thirty-five students, and having more control over the administrators in the high school than you normally would have. Like they've given us so much freedom that it's not a realistic situation. I think this is the greatest fault. And also to have less teachers at a time teaching, and give each teacher a chance to have an experience in the class.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) (Long pause) I can't think of anything.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained for being a part of this institute?
- (T) A little confidence. I can now try the inquiry method, whereas I

didn't have the confidence last year. I feel like I gained the confidence that now I know enough about it that I can practice it in the classroom.

- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No.

(12)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I expected to receive information on the teaching of the inquiry approach, and really getting the students involved in the learning process, in the classroom. And up to this point I feel that I have received it to a great extent, and I've received a lot of new insights and ideas, and a lot of other things; to me it's been real enjoyable. I hope I can go back and instill some of these things in my classroom.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I feel that the teaching of the inquiry approach in social studies is a real nice way. I feel it's a lot better way than the old traditional method. The reason for this is because it gives the student a chance to express his own views; a chance to find himself as an individual. They can really come to some kind of conclusion as to what they actually think, and not society as a whole.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods, and also the issues that we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) The issues that have been brought out in the institution, I feel are very good. But I find that in the school system where I work that some of these issues are "no-no's" as far as a discussion in the classroom goes. I feel that until we can change the attitudes of the people who control the curriculum and framework of the high schools, that we can't go into some of the issues that we have discussed here at the institute. One good example is sex; some of the things that we went into with the group on sex can't be dealt with in the regular classroom because of the feedback that can make it hard on the teacher as far as bread and butter goes. I think that it really boils down to the bread and butter issue as far as the teacher is concerned.
- (I) How do you feel about the experimental high school class that we utilized in this institute?
- (T) This class was not realistic; it's not, as far as I'm concerned, the type of class that we'll face when we return to our classrooms in the fall. I feel that it's a good way to teach, and it seemed to keep the kids interested to a great extent. The one thing that I criticize in the handling of the students is some type of control. We had a big hangup of not knowing what to do because we had so many in the group. I think that it is a good way of teaching, but I feel that there should be a little more control. Most of the things we were able to do with this small group couldn't be done with a normal size class, thirty to forty. I also feel that the students got to know the teachers as human beings. If nothing

else, I feel that the students found out that our behavior and our objectives and our motives, and everything as far as human behavior is concerned, is about the same as their's. And this is the way students should think.

(I) What occurred in this institute that you did not expect to happen?

(T) I didn't expect....I really expected to have a lot more written work. I didn't want the written....but I liked the way the institute was handled to this effect. I do feel that we should have had some type of plan, written down, of each group's action; what happened, and say the evaluation of each group. This should've been written up so that each teacher could get a copy of it, and possibly we could have tried these things in the classroom. We would have had something to refer back to, something that was written down. I feel that if I had something to refer back to now, that I could do a better job of teaching these concepts and issues in my classroom in the fall. As far as the institute is concerned, I think it has been great. This is my first institute, and after this one I think I'm going to apply every summer. I'm going to become a professional institutor like my friend Elijah. We definitely need a follow-up on this institute to help disseminate these concepts and methods to the other teachers in the school system.

(I) What do you think could be omitted if we had another institute?

(T) I don't think anything could have been omitted. I feel that all work and no play makes anybody dull. And I feel that along with learning all that we have learned this summer, that we have had fun in learning these things, and it was real interesting to me. But a lot of teachers have a hangup here. They feel that learning is supposed to be painful. I don't agree. Learning should be fun.

(I) What do you consider to be the most important thing that you have gained from being a participant in this institute?

(T) The teaching, as far as the inquiry approach. I must admit that I was basically a traditional teacher, even though I had tried some of these things as activities in my classroom before coming to this institute, in the four years that I have taught. A log of the hang-ups that traditional teachers have before coming to this institute, I had. And it really impinged on my thinking a great deal. I really got uptight sometimes when we hit on some of these issues that threatened me. I would speak out, and find out that I was wrong, and really, this was good for me, because it sort of changed my opinion on some of the things I really believed in and I really felt was right. This changed my perspective on a lot of things in education, and I don't know if I can get back now and teach at all like I used to. I think the kids will have a lot more to say about what is taught and what is learned in my class from now on.

(I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?

(T) Not really. I think that I sort of mingled it all up into what I was saying. I would like to add that this has been one hell of an institute, as far as I'm concerned.

(5)

(I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in

- this institute?
- (T) Realistically, probably not too much. I thought it would be a nice summer away from school, with some old stuffy teachers. We'd do a lot of book reading and, you know, testing and stuff like that. So I wasn't expecting a lot. I thought some good would come out of it, since I've never had any sociology, and I felt that this was perhaps an area of weakness and to get just some cognitive level of knowledge would help me.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I think I understand it now, which I'm not sure I did at all when I came over. About the only contact I'd had with it was using some of Fenton's materials, which were very structured inquiry. To be honest, I have very mixed emotions about it now. It's caused personal conflict in many areas, which I wasn't expecting. You know that inquiry is a...in order to be able to teach inquiry you have to be a much more open person that I was before. I just got challenged that way; I didn't realize that I was as much of an authoritarian person as I have been in the classroom.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and also the issues we've discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I'm not so sure how much of it I can fit in with the concepts of sociology, because we've dealt so much with just the problems approach to it, although we have gotten some of these other things. To me we have almost every type of ideology represented here, and to me the input has been tremendous. And it's sort of like I was stagnant for a while; having this many good concepts come up from people I did respect has been a real stimulus to me to sort of dig deeper into a lot of these things. And I want to see some of the things happen in the classroom that I've seen happen here.
- (I) What occurred in the institute that you didn't expect to happen?
- (T) I'd say the people. The people are the really key factor which I didn't expect. Beginning with the instructors. They set a different tone, which I didn't expect. It was a very open, relaxed type of thing, where it seemed like they were more concerned about us as people than as just teachers who would take what they had given them and go back and feed into the system. But they were really concerned about us experiencing things as human beings. Perhaps they want attitudinal changes rather than anything else, then if you come to grips with it perhaps you'll understand what inquiry really is and apply it to your own life; and then you go back, and you can't help but be a different person in the classroom, not just because of the knowledge you learned about it, but how you became involved as a person with it.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers are from the same school system?
- (T) This didn't affect me, because I didn't know any of them. I did appreciate the fact that there was a good cross-cultural representation. This was my really first, close contact with black teachers. You know, bowling with them, playing softball, going to parties with them. living with them in a dorm. These were things I had never experienced before. I do think it's good that we're all from one system, because when we go back we can see what kind



- of impact we'll have.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Perhaps, if it were possible, to have say three experimental high school classes instead of one. We'd all have a chance to teach more. Also make them larger. The high school class was definitely a good thing. It gave us opportunities to confront students in a classroom while the attitudinal changes were occurring in us, and to see if these changes were practical in the classroom.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Perhaps less methods of instruction, or teaching "techniques" as they are sometimes referred to, and more inquiry into personal attitudes and sociological problems. Some teachers wanted more of this technique crap, but basically, I think it's a waste of time.
- (I) What do you consider to be the most important thing that you have gained from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) We've already got into some of it. It's more or less....I feel like I've been challenged to the roots, as to everything I believe in or want as a human being. My whole value system has undergone inspection, and it's come from various sources; from discussions in here, at the dinner table, at the bar, at somebody's house for a party, just putting me in an environment where for once I felt completely unpressured. I read at the pace I wanted to. I had plenty of time for social activity and didn't feel like the animal in the cage. And I was just hit with provocative ideas. I felt like for the last three years, since I got out of college, I hadn't had any experiences like this. I just feel much more human. I'd say John Williams would have to be the highlight, if you're picking out one incident. He got me going more in what he said in an hour and a half than anyone I'd ever come in contact with.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) I think it pretty well covers it all. One thing, it seems bewildering to have undergone such a soul-searching experience as this institute was, and to find that some people were not changed at all. I'm much happier as a person than I was when I came over here. And I have a much healthier respect for things around me. There's just nothing like coming in contact with really beautiful people, and being able to relate with them day after day. You can't help but grow.

## (2)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) It was really unclear of what I expected, really. We were told that we'd deal with the sociological approach to our teaching; maybe a different sociological slant that we could take back, and possibly some new techniques of teaching.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I'm not really sure what inquiry is at this time.
- (I) What is it to you?
- (T) I would say that from what I've seen so far, what we've talked

about and what we've experienced at the high school, that we put teacher in a lesser role as the leader of the class, and that it's more open-ended for the students. I think this has a lot of merit. I really don't know how I'll use it next year yet, but I think that it has definitely had enough influence on me that I'll try something along the lines of what I just mentioned that I thought inquiry was.

- (I) What effect has the contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and also the issues we've discussed in class, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I'm not sure what you mean by "effect."
- (I) Has any change occurred, either positive or negative, in your values or your philosophy of teaching?
- (T) I think that definitely I'll be more open minded. What I've learned would be in dealing with the students themselves, attitudes toward them. I'm not talking about dealing with the teaching or the subject matter or anything, but as far as my own feelings toward the students, I think I've gained some insights there. I hope I can be more objective.
- (I) What occurred during this institute that you didn't expect to happen?
- (T) Gee, I don't know. I didn't really know to what extent we found out that we'd be dealing with kids. I didn't expect it to be the kind of laboratory thing, if you want to call it that, that we've had. I'd say that what I didn't expect to find would be the contact with the students to the extent that I've changed my attitude toward them. And I really enjoyed the morning sessions that we've had here, and the afternoon sessions, too. I think we've really gained some insights into each other. If nothing else, I think I know more about thirty-two other people that I didn't know. Another thing I'd say that I didn't expect to gain is that the level of instruction, as far as I was concerned, has been very good. To me it seemed more like a person-to-person approach, rather than a teacher-to-student approach. If you've never had that experience before, you don't expect that.
- (I) How do you feel about utilizing an experimental high school class as we did in this institute?
- (T) I definitely think it was a good idea. The institute wouldn't have been the same without it. I really enjoyed it.
- (I) What do you think could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) These are "tuffies" on the spot. I really have never been to any others to make comparisons, and so I couldn't make any comparisons that way. (long pause) Well, I would say that we had plenty of time to talk when we had our week at the high school. If the thing was held just about the same....(long pause) Guess this is my structure hanging out, but I can't really think of anything else unless it would be more on sociological concepts....I don't know really what I'm saying. But maybe something more along that line-- what is the structure of sociology....this was done to some extent, but I'm not really sure I have things organized in my mind....if I should have, even. I think the sessions here have been worth a lot, and really I think this is where we learn a lot, is when we talk. I don't know how it could be improved, frankly.

- (I) Is there anything you feel could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I don't know about the afternoon sessions....they've been pretty good. I think if you weren't at the high school that week, you were kind of left out....you didn't know exactly what was going on or what was being talked about. But if you were at the high school you missed the morning sessions, which were always great. So I really don't know. The way things proceeded I don't see how this could've been helped. That situation is probably just one of the things that there's no way to overcome. So I'd say no....I don't see how you could a....how it could be changed or that there was anything that was a waste of time.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think I've already answered it, but I'd say I've gained some insight on....I think I'm getting things organized as to how I'm going to try to implement some of these things in the classroom. Plus the fact that we....I think we all know each other better-- I'm talking about the thirty-three of us. Plus the fact that we've got each other we can call upon for reinforcement.
- (I) Would you say the fact that all the teachers are from the same school system is beneficial or not?
- (T) I think in this case it's a good thing, because we all have fairly common problems. I feel like I know thirty people I can call on for help and support when I'm having problems. As a matter of fact, I wish there was another person in the institute from my own school, so we could talk things over.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) There was something a few minutes ago, but I can't remember what it was now....so I'd....I'd....no.

(3)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) (Long pause) We weren't....or I wasn't given any specifics as far as the goals of the institute were concerned. The way I understood it was that we were going to get some background on how we might use social studies as an integrated discipline; the various areas within social studies, with emphasis on history and sociology. And that we were to be exposed to....well, not a new way of teaching, but an abandonment of the old, traditional way. That's about it.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I think it's great. I think it's necessary if we're going to meet the needs of the students in preparing them to live in the society that they're going to inherit. Because the emphasis on the memorization of facts is not really challenging all the faculties of the student. To me it gives you an opportunity to operate on a broader basis, as far as the student and his skills and abilities are concerned. And you're really after a thinking product, and this

- affords the opportunity to develop that type of person. I'm really for it.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed in class, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think the concepts have been a little more real and meaningful than if we'd been introduced to them in the traditional classroom approach. As it is, I think a great deal of the concepts we've sort of activated as people responded to a given situation, and to others' ideas about different things. Therefore, it had a little more meaning for all of us. I'm not certain I'm making myself clear. I'd also add that to me John Williams was probably the high point of the institute. His appearance just for one day had an impact on probably everybody there; I know it did on me. The entire institute was conducted on a human level, not a knowledge level. The problems we dealt with were real, and the concepts were introduced as a way of analyzing the problems. It couldn't have been better.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I really don't know. I really think this has been quite a human experience for everyone. If it was more structured, the human aspect might have been lost.
- (I) Is there anything that you feel could have been omitted, or if we had another institute, could be left out to improve it?
- (T) (Long pause) Really, I can't see anything that was a waste. Again, because of the nature of the institute, even the social gatherings that we've had...I think they've been as much a part of our learning and gaining insights into ourselves and the sociological problems that we are interested in...I think they've had about as much meaning as any of the meetings we had in the classroom. So I can't see anything that I would call frivolous or that could have been left out, because of the nature of the institute.
- (I) What occurred in the institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) The whole thing...the whole institute. I never expected the informality, the downright friendliness, human qualities of the people in charge, and that's every one of them. This institute has been quite an experience and revelation for everybody concerned. The general lack of structure of the institute has also been surprising. Not only because the structure wasn't there, but because we accomplished so much in that setting. People have made gains on an academic level. I think it was real rewarding for most people.. ..they were pleasantly rewarded.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think a deep appreciation for people....individuals. A little more acceptance of people on the basis of their individuality. And to find that there is hope for us all, and there's worth in us all. I spoke earlier of this institute being a human experience, and I don't know really how to clarify that....to break it down into some kind of symbolic form. But I think that most of the people in it have felt it and admitted it.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No...you know one thing, some persons probably have a little bit

of difficulty in bringing a lot of the things that happen into a particular context; where they can see how things relate, how one thing builds on another. But it probably would have taken more structure to aid them, and that would have been at the expense of some other very important gains.

(14)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) First, I really had no idea what it was about. After my first day here, I felt that I could gain knowledge in trying to better myself in teaching the inquiry method. I had no concrete knowledge, as such, about the inquiry method, even though after it was explained to me I felt that I had been doing it all along, but not as efficiently as I could have or should have been doing.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) It's great! The inquiry method will give each child in the classroom a chance to participate in the discussions, in the class as a whole. You can use special inquiry methods to motivate even the slower children to participate.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed in class, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) The issues which we've discussed I feel will be a great help to the students. However, some of the issues, because of the conditions under which I work, probably would be prohibited from the type of in-depth inquiry we have given them here. Of the twelve issues dealt with in the Prentice-Hall series, I feel that I could use about seven of them effectively within my class. This will give them a chance to do some reading in the areas where their interests lie.
- (I) What occurred in the institute that you did not expect to happen?
- (T) I shouldn't say this, really (laughing). There were two things in particular which I didn't expect to happen. First, I was expecting to do a lot of research work and, second, I was expecting to do a lot of studying for tests. Basically, these things add pressure to some people like myself, and by having an unstructured institute as we have had, I feel that I've been more at ease; I've come to know the instructors and become closer to them; and I feel that I have gained much more from this type of unstructured institute than I would've from a structured institute. By having it in this manner I feel that I have retained much more than I would've if I'd had a lot of pressure on me.
- (I) What could we do to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) After my group went out to the high school, I felt that if we could have--since my group was so large--if we could have had maybe two members each day work something with the high school class, and then rotate and let two more conduct the class, I expect that maybe we would have all had a better opportunity to become involved with the high school class.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a

- part of this institute?
- (T) That's a hard decision to make. I'll have to go back to the high school, with the students. I think this was the most touching thing to me. Here I think I learned how to cover up my frustrations, and accept a number of things in an unstructured situation that I ordinarily would have structured or not have accepted it at all. Also, during the critique (afternoon sessions), I feel that everybody was there trying to help each other with their faults which they had during the week they were out there. And by doing this, it would most likely help a person become aware of the faults which he had and didn't recognize.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Yes, probably the group as a whole, I felt could have taken a short field trip. Where, I don't know. Somewhere in this area. But I feel that one afternoon field trip probably would've been advantageous for the group. Maybe a few more guest lecturers would've been good.

(21)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) To begin with, I really felt that there would be some rules and regulations given to me, that would make it real definite as to what you were supposed to do in the inquiry approach. I felt that someone would give me the magic answer. But now I realize that there isn't one, but I've learned a lot...in that I've found that a lot of it is going to have to come from me.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Well, I'm real interested, but I'm still kind of vague as to what I'm gonna have to do, but I want to try it. I'm gonna give it a trial. I may be wrong, but I feel like at first I'm gonna have to set up the old traditional method to kinda get my...to learn my children. I don't feel like that with the inquiry, where I put them around in chairs...this is a hangup that I have, that I...I won't "learn" them. I've been accustomed to a seating chart to learn my students, so I feel like I might have to resort to that in the beginning. But I might not have to do that. It might work better the other way around.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed in class, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) Frankly, a lot of it's been over my head, because as I indicated, I hadn't been in any classroom activities for fifteen years. I haven't done much reading, except in my field, and lots of terminology has gone over my head. I just have to piece a little of it together. I got something, there's no doubt about that. You could hardly sit six weeks in a classroom atmosphere and not get something out of it. But I feel like if I'd been better prepared, better read, and had been doing some reading, maybe in sociology, or in the field of education, I would've gotten more out of it.

- It's my fault; I can't blame anybody but myself. I just haven't been stimulated to do that.
- (I) What could we do to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I can't really think of anything. It was a real fine institute.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Well....I don't know if I could speak really....again, it's a lack of understanding of a lot of terminology. Maybe a....I kinda feel like I have less background than most of them in there, and consequently, this would prevent me from getting out of it what most of the participants got. I think that most of them are getting more from the institute than I am.
- (I) What are your feelings about the experimental high school class?
- (T) I think that's good, I really do. I think its....course, I again didn't contribute as much as others did on the teaching aspect, but this is probably good. I learned a lot from it.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers were from the same school system?
- (T) Well, I liked that. We have common problems, even though we may not come from the same school....we still have common problems. I believe this was a real successful approach. I sure do.
- (I) Is there anything that occurred in the institute that you didn't expect to happen?
- (T) Yes, I don't know of any one particular turning point, but I've become interested in inquiry. Nor that I....well, frankly, I wasn't too interested in it before, because as I told you I'd been doing the traditional way of teaching, the way I'd been taught, for the last twenty-three years. I've listened to some of the successes some of the people have had, and the association with them has meant a whole lot. I've picked up things in the class with regard to what I'm going to do. I've found out that you're going to have to ask "why?" a lot of times, and that key question that you need to ask the student to open him up. I'm not sure that I can come up with the key question--that disturbs me a little bit.
- (I) Is there anything else that you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) My thinking about the institute has changed tremendously since I was told when I came over here that a....that....I didn't have anything to worry about as far as....as grades, for example.... there wasn't any danger of flunking out. This let me relax a lot, and I think I've learned more than I did when I was under pressure for grades. Here I've been more relaxed, and feel more receptive to the things that are being put out.
- (I) Do you think the others feel that way too?
- (T) I'm sure they do.

(16)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) If I had any expectations at all, it was simply an academic course in sociology. I had no pre-material on the institute to make a judgment with, so I made my judgment from my knowledge of sociology, which wasn't much, and thought it would be an academic course in

- that subject.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) The same as before I came, I suppose. I don't think there is any such thing as inquiry teaching. The methodology that they have been talking about, as nearly as I can label it, is discovery. This methodology is still aimed toward getting to a set of pre-determined goals, just using a different route, one the kids haven't figured out yet. Now inquiry I believe in, but I think if you teach inquiry you're going to get landed on--hard and fast!
- (I) How do these two differ?
- (T) Well, inquiry, as the word implies, is open ended. It means that your function, I suppose, would be an input of data where students felt a need for data. But you're going to have to let them come to their own conclusions, and their conclusions may not be those that society has predetermined that they want them to come to.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I'm not sure what that means.
- (I) Take, for instance, the issues contained in the SRSS episodes and the Prentice-Hall series.
- (T) The only SRSS material I've seen developed, that I was involved in personally, was the one on prejudice; that was the issue, and they used the questionnaire methodology; how to develop a questionnaire. And, I think a trained teacher in a structured classroom, who wanted to go through that, could go through it successfully, in terms of....you could get the students to operate within that model. But I'm not sure that it's relevant to any of the controversial issues....on the high school level.
- (I) Can the issues be used in the high school?
- (T) I don't see how you could get them out of high school. They're a part of life which, I suppose if I've got a quarrel with the school system as a cultural phenomenon, it's that the classroom has been so objectified that it no longer represents a life situation, and I think that's why it's turning so many students off. The teacher's not a living being, the teacher is an institution, and we've de-humanized it to the point that the classroom no longer represents life; therefore it's no longer interesting to students. They don't care what's going on in there, beyond those that are motivated to perform by something outside the school.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Based primarily on a conversation I had yesterday afternoon in which we were discussing what role the students had played in the institute, and finding out that several of my colleagues do not view students as an integral part of the institute, but as a peripheral activity, I would say that more teachers ought to be involved with more students a greater percentage of the time. You could have two or three classes (high school), and have maybe a fluctuation....ideally, you should have each teacher involved with the class the entire course of the institute.
- (I) Does that mean that you view the experimental high school class as a good thing?
- (T) For me the class is what happened. That's where it was.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers were from the



- same school system?
- (T) Well, as this institute has turned out, I think it's been a good thing. It could also have turned out to be a bad thing. But, good in that you have a group of people here who have struggled with some very unusual problems for teachers. And, have struggled each in their own way, I think very sincerely and very honestly. I have come out of it with the feeling that there are about six people in this institute, that if I feel troubled next year I can turn to; I can call on the phone at three o'clock in the morning and say, "hey, I'm in trouble," and will fully expect sympathy and whatever help or support they've got to offer. I taught in this system three years, and then took a leave of absence, and I never felt that way. I never had a colleague that I would turn to on any level whatsoever. I can even imagine developing some of my social life around some of these people, and that's something I've never done. Teachers have never been a part of my social life, because I have no desire whatsoever to become ingrown in the profession.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) There have been times when the structured part of it, the morning session, the afternoon session, have been boring, unproductive, uninteresting, to me personally, but it's just a judgment I really can't make; I don't know what that meant to other people. Something that may have been very boring to me may really have hit it inside with somebody else. I really can't think of any of it that I would rule out.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) At the risk of sounding pompous, probably the conviction that I'm going to have to go into the classroom next year and do what I think is right. I'm going to have to try to reach my students on a level that's completely different than anything I've ever tried before. I'm going to have to demand of them that I can be a person, and I'm going to have to demand of them that they be people, too. And that whatever the subject, it's a vehicle to use to gain understanding with ourselves and with our society, which I think has become a much more realistic educational goal than teaching the facts of Greek civilization or anything else. I've been told that that's going to put my job on the line. I don't know if it will, but if it does, then I suppose I'll have to get out of the teaching profession.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Not really. It would be pretty random babbling at this point, I'm afraid.

(28)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Basically, I was told, of course, that this would be a new approach to teaching. So I really came to learn a new method to pass out the material, so to speak, to the students.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the

- teaching of social studies?
- (T) Well, basically, I think it's a way to interest more students. But since I teach on the junior high level, I feel I'm still forced to give them some content in order to use this method, in that I don't feel I can walk in the first day and ask the right questions and we spend eighteen weeks. I think this method is somewhat more receptive to the high school, and even more so to the college student, because they have more background to draw on.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I feel I'm probably in the minority here. I feel we have an obligation to teach problems, because as adults our students are going to have to face these problems, but I also think we have an obligation to teach a certain amount of loyalty. I feel we have an obligation to show the dangers of anarchy. I don't think we're supposed to teach anarchy, and somehow or other I've picked up this idea that some of them in class feel that this is part of our obligation.
- (I) Do you feel that there are certain issues that should not be discussed in the high school?
- (T) Not really, if they're handled right. I think that some of us have the tendency to be bigoted in a way, in that we try to mold the child to our point of view. I feel that the role of the teacher is to point out both points of view, and let the child develop their own.
- (I) What do you think could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Oh, dear, that's hard to say. I really think that it would have helped in my case if I could have done some reading the first week or two, because for a while I was lost. I eventually feel that I have caught up because I have read most evenings two or three, and sometimes four or five hours. But in the beginning, I guess it was my lack of background, at least I felt I had a lack of background, that made me apprehensive.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Oh, that's difficult. I had this funny feeling--course I was in the first group, that I was in the vulture pit, in that....and I was terribly uneasy much of the time because I felt that everything I said and everything I did was to be criticized, and I found that I could not function as well as I probably would have under more normal circumstances; course I don't know how this could be avoided.
- (I) How do you feel about having an experimental high school class for an institute of this sort?
- (T) I think this is almost essential, but I feel that in many ways this class was so unrealistic as to what we will experience at other times. Now I don't feel this was as true with my group, because we were there in the beginning and the latitude was not allowed, or at least they weren't aware of the amount of latitude that they had, put it that way, at that time, so it was more near what I might run into than perhaps other groups. This class was also not very representative of what most classes are composed of.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I would say I have a broader point of view on these issues than I had before. I'm basically conservative, and although I have children

of my own of teenage and older, I feel we have good rapport, but still I feel for the most part, even when we talk that we reflect the values and the home life that we have had. And we are in a minority group, so that in many ways I was outside the thinking of some people. And I think that in this way it was a great help to me.

- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Not really. There was just one thing that I think happened in this group, and I don't really know how it could have been changed. But I think in a way there was kind of a polarization, that some people didn't respect the opinions of others, and therefore it had a tendency to quiet certain people, and I was one of them. And I think this is bad, but I really don't know what the solution would have been to this.

(17)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I guess I really hoped...I'd hoped to find additional stimulation from the professors with whom I would be associated, in order to be able to continue successfully and effectively as a teacher, and I put this in my own personal terms... I guess mental and emotional stimulation.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I like it, but I'm doubly impressed that the content of the teacher has to be of a really significant quantity for it to be acceptable. Because of the kinds of questions that this type of approach requires, there must be a great deal of material to which the teacher has been exposed or he may be able to refer to, as this kind of teaching progresses, because it's been obvious in here that although those of you in this institute who have used the method have asked questions and attempted to generate discussion and self-examination, that there's been a hell of a lot of content characteristic of each to the teachers.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) Gee, this is a puzzle, because I'm not exactly sure about the whole thing. I think, to some extent, the issues of dissent, economic inequities, types of religious expression and a number of these issues that haven't been widely publicized, these are issues that I've done some reading in and I really don't think there's been any particularly new issues raised during this institute; other than a method of teaching or creating a classroom environment where these issues can be developed effectively. That to me is where it all is; how these issues can be dealt with in the classroom effectively and how classroom involvement can be developed, rather than the great master up there giving the final word.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I've had some question about whether a paper should be written. In

- the past I've always gotten a great deal out of papers that I've written. I don't know, I think really digesting this institute will take me a period of time. I don't feel comfortable in attempting to evaluate it now, because...and I think that's a good thing about it, because I have many feelings of concern about the issues that have been developed in this institute, and I think it's going to be months, hell, maybe a year, maybe more, before all of this really becomes meaningful. Maybe in a week, a star'll appear and I'll say, "aha, the exact meaning of the institute."
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I have some questions about...yes, there is one area I would, certainly. So many of us, and I really think there was a lot of talent in my group that went out to the school to relate to these students, and I really have questions about more precise instructions on how we might approach this. Seems like I had the feeling that a whole bunch of us were just lumped in with a bunch of students, and I think we could of related much more effectively, each of us, had we discussed our methods of approach better, had it been made clearer to us. I really have a lot of misgivings, because I felt terribly frustrated when our group went to the high school. There were little areas in which I saw some glimmer of good relationship, but I had the feeling, and I think it was generally shared by our group, that there was a lot of frustration. Perhaps this is good. Perhaps I developed a lot of insight there that I'll understand later.
- (I) What are your feelings about the utility of an experimental high school class in an institute of this sort?
- (T) As I reflect on it now, it may have been a better thing for the students than I thought it was at the end of our week. I think there should have been more students. This is why it seemed so unrelated to what our teaching year actually is. There was a little bit too much artificiality about it. It didn't seem real to me.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute are from the same school system?
- (T) I think that's an excellent idea. I really do. I feel that what we've learned, which certainly isn't too definitive for me right now, but I think that there's a general feeling of psychological comfort in knowing that we've all been certainly exposed to new material, and have discussed ways of dealing with the new materials, and even our classroom techniques....one of our most serious defects, it seems to me in the observation, was rhetorical questions asked by some of us. But I think it's excellent. I think there'll be much more of a carryover in something like this than there would be if somebody went back to where they came from alone. I think that was of extreme value. Maybe we'll all have more soul with each other.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I felt refreshed because, as I said originally, I like to be with ....in a college environment because I feel that college teachers can pretty much say what they want to say, or talk in areas where they want to talk, or bring up issues in areas that they think might be productive of discussion, without fear or any apprehension about it being intercommed or something like that. First of

all there's a free, open discussion that's available; this was extremely important to me. Also, in seeing some of the changes in behavior on the part of other teachers, I really felt refreshed, because I've, in the main, a hell of a lot more respect for the teachers in my environment than I had before. Here anything can be said; any issues can be discussed, and you don't feel that some state official is going to walk in and say that's a no-no. I think just mental freedom.

- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) I think perhaps there's one thing that might have been added. To some degree I had the feeling that in the institute there was such a sophomoric urgency on the part of some participants to assure you and the other staff members that we are on the right side of the question, that we are true, honest-to-God liberals, or something like that. Establishing credentials. I think perhaps some of this junk could have been gotten out of the way by saying that there are no right sides, this could have been clearer. There are no right sides to any question; I know it was emphasized from the beginning I think, but I'm not sure it registered well enough. That if we took a stand on any issue it wouldn't in any way diminish our status. I think there were a couple of participants who felt somewhat slighted because they had failed to reach the accepted state of liberalism. I wish that could have been avoided; that part I wish could have been avoided. It's been a real fun and pleasant experience for me, and I guess I'm now preparing to return to the real world.

(29)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) An experience in inquiry teaching; materials for inquiry teaching.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Well, I'm not sure. I feel that in my judgment, I can't evaluate it until I've actually tried it in my own room.
- (I) Do you have any emotional feelings about it now?
- (T) No.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I felt that at times there was a retreat to pessimism, and at times an intellectual over-kill.
- (I) What do you mean by that--would you like to expound on that a little further?
- (T) No.
- (I) Feel free to say anything.
- (T) That's all right.
- (I) I was wondering what you meant by "an intellectual over-kill." I had trouble interpreting that.
- (T) Where you beat subjects to death. From my own....oh, how shall I say it--I can't think of a word right now.

- (I) How do you feel about these materials we've been using?
- (T) I would use parts of them. Other parts I wouldn't, because I teach in junior high. I think that some of them are a little bit beyond the maturity of junior high students.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) This is a new experience for me. I have nothing with which to compare it. I felt that some of my colleagues were somewhat intolerant of other opinions. So I never really did say what I felt.
- (I) Feel free to do so now.
- (T) I am. I'm talking about degrees of intolerance. Sometimes there was tolerance, quite a great deal, but other times very much intolerance.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Probably some of the looseness; a little more structure would have been desirable. Some of those sessions were going nowhere, fast.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Well, perhaps a closer evaluation of my value system. I still believe the same things as before, but this gave me an opportunity to look at those beliefs a little bit closer.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) I think I've said it all.

## (9)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I feel like I've reached the place I was expecting to, and that was to further develop the inquiry approach in my own mind, after having been introduced to it last year.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I think it's great. It's the only way to teach. I've gained a great deal since I've been here. I've gained the knowledge, but I'm still concerned as to if I'll be able to ask the right questions.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think that's been great. I've been drawing up this outline, and I've found a place where I can include them right in my curriculum, the ones I think are most important--prejudice, discrimination, the drug scene, just almost any of them can be worked into the format I'm going to be using.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I really like the knowledge; any knowledge at all in sociology. I've never had a sociology course before, and I think that maybe if we had just a week of factual, conceptual sociology, this would be very beneficial. And I think maybe a larger high school class would have been more realistic. I thought the idea of having an experimental high school class was just great, but this particular class did not represent reality; not only in size, but also in

types of students.

- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I don't think anything could've been omitted. I just can see a few additions. I think we've been real fortunate to have had this staff at this institute. You all have really been great.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Well, as I told you earlier, actually what I've gained is reinforcement on the inquiry approach. I saw an expert do it, and in watching his development in the class of certain subjects, that we were just drawn right into it, directly, we could see that the right questions have been asked, and the right materials have to be selected.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Well, I think...it's really been a very pleasant experience for me, really. I had what I felt like was a miserable experience last year, but after coming home and putting some of what I attained to use, I found out that it was rather valuable; more than rather, I gained a great deal. That was one important reason I decided to come here.

(11)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) This appeared to have great possibilities in the way that the institute was set up, but since it was going to be different than any graduate or undergraduate work I had done before, I really didn't have any, shall we say, expectations in mind, except the fact that I knew there'd be some new materials involved and that we would be working with some high school students. However, I do feel that we could have accomplished as much by not having the students as we did in having them. I think a great deal has come from being here with this group of teachers; I think there's been quite a bit established and learned from this that is kind of separate, actually, from the experience we had out at the high school.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute were from the same school system?
- (T) I feel that since we were brought here to learn about the inductive method and to more or less utilize and evaluate materials that are written to reinforce and to implement this method, that it was helpful that teachers from one area were brought here, because we were able to understand each other's problems--lot of mutual ground there. There is the possibility that had teachers been brought from another area, that they could have added to what we were doing, or on the other hand, they perhaps might have learned from the experience that was taking place. I think I would support the fact that they all came from one school system.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I feel personally that I did use inquiry in the last year to much success. However, one of the great criticisms that inquiry has come

under, in particular from those in administrative capacities, has been the fact that discipline tends to break down when students get together and work in groups. I would say this about that point: inquiry actually demands a greater amount of discipline than does traditional teaching. The whole concept of discipline in inquiry teaching is actually directed at the student; the student must begin to discipline himself or inquiry will break down. As far as I'm concerned, inquiry demands more discipline because to conduct it there has to be a pretty mutual trust between the students and teacher. However, I don't feel that inquiry is the great salvation of education.

- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) To really try to evaluate this is so dang intangible, because of the way we've handled it. There hasn't been any tremendous stress on papers, tests....
- (I) Do you think there should've been?
- (T) No, I'm not advocating that. As far as improvements--I would hardly suggest, given the situation again, that the high school be informed that it's going to be their class. I think they should know that it's going to be, shall we say, a free flowing thing, it's going to be pretty unstructured, but I think that there's still a point of responsibility on the teacher's part.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Yes, I'd like to direct, specifically now, to the atmosphere of our various discussion sessions. There seemed to be a group within our larger group that seemed to, I think, have an air of disrespect for attitudes and for the opinions of other people. And this.... although it wasn't always directly spoken, it was quite apparent in their response and their reactions to things that were said. I feel like we were here to listen to everybody and anybody that had anything to say. And I think that as this group continued to behave in the manner in which they did, I almost want to say inflict their attitudes, impose upon us, it alienated a number of people. They hated to say anything because they knew how it was going to be responded to. It quite concerned me. I found their whole presentation a bit distasteful, and I don't think it was particularly becoming to such a group. I think that had this not been prevalent, that you probably would've heard a lot of people speak that you didn't hear, and I think that we're the loser for that.

(18)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I really didn't know what to expect, because this is a new experience for me. This is the first institute I've attended. I knew it was a sociology institute and that it would involve something in sociology.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I feel pretty good about it. I think I will really enjoy it. I've really been doing it, to a certain extent, all along. I just



- haven't been calling it inquiry.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I feel that they are relevant to the times now. As teachers and as citizens, too, everyone is searching for an answer for what's going on. We can't get to the bottom of the problem. We know these things are happening, but what are we going to do about them? I think the kids will be really interested in it, and as far as myself goes, I'm really definitely for that type of treatment. I really like it.
- (I) What are your feelings about the utility of an experimental high school class with an institute of this sort?
- (T) I think it was a good thing, I really do. Since this is my first institute, it gave me a chance to work through some of my inadequacies practically, not just theoretically. It was a good thing.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute were from the same school system?
- (T) I think it was pretty good. I think this type of thing should be exposed to more teachers.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Really I can't....oh, there might have been a few topics that we kind of skimmed over that might could go into detail a bit more, but I couldn't ask for a better, as far as I'm concerned....you're not uptight; I was very relaxed. And it was very informal, which I really did like; not demanding that you do this or do that. This is what we've done to a lot of our students, and we've forgotten about this. I think it's really opened up some eyes. I know it has mine. The experience I've gained from the institute, I wouldn't trade it for anything.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) No. The only thing that I would like to see a little bit different if I was attending another one--as far as the high school class is concerned, I would like to have a few more students. A larger class. And I also wish we could have spent more time with them as teachers.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) The most important thing, I think, is the closeness that we as teachers got as human beings, because we didn't have this when we first came. We all knew each other on the surface, and I think in one or two of our sessions we really got it on the line in finding out who stood where. Feelings were laid out. Still, you don't know everything about a person, but that was one of the most important....it really touched me. Plus, our professors were really opposite of what I was thinking they were going to be.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No, I can't think of anything right now. To more or less sum it up for myself, I've really enjoyed the institute. I've learned more ....I don't have a scale to know how much I've learned, but this institute has given me a lot of insight on a lot of things.

(20)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I think I expected a lot of sociology, which really didn't materialize. And I really hadn't banked on the emphasis on inquiry; I thought we'd take a more traditional approach to studying sociology.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I felt pretty positive about it before I came, since I had already had contact with it earlier in my teaching career. I think what I got out of this more than anything else was that I was able to see some problems in inquiry that I hadn't seen before. What I can see now is that you've really got as many problems with inquiry as you do with any other type thing; they're just different types of problems.
- (I) Do you think it's a good way to teach?
- (T) I think it's very good.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think it's probably the most useful thing you can do in the classroom. To me the gut issues in the social studies are the type of things that you talk about in sociology. To me the types of problems you deal with in sociology is what makes the study of social studies relevant.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) If we could have had more kids in the experimental class I think that would have helped. If possible, I'd provide about twenty-five kids to work with. I think the high school class was certainly an added plus for the institute, and I'd have it again if there was another institute. Really, that's about the only criticism I can think of right now.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute were from the same school system?
- (T) I think it's great. I think you're going to feed more ideas back into the school system this way. We've got many of the same types of problems to deal with that you wouldn't have....you know every school system has got a little bit different slant on things. We can all kind of approach the same types of problems.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) (Long pause) I can't think of anything off hand. (Long pause) I really can't.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Like I said before, I think the most beneficial thing was the fact that we encountered some real problems in taking this type of approach to teaching. And it wasn't on a theoretical basis; I mean these were real problems that we had to deal with. The discipline thing; the fact that some kids are turned on and some are turned off at various times. You had an opportunity to try to cope with these.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?

- (T) Oh, I think the types of personalities we had involved as far as staff was concerned had a lot to do with my positive feelings. The fact that there seemed to be an atmosphere of freedom; I never felt that I had to be reluctant to say what I was thinking. If I wanted to criticize, I wouldn't be reluctant to do so. It was pretty much a free exchange of ideas. So I don't know; you might take this whole institute and try to restructure it the same way it has been this year, and put different personalities in it, and I'm quite sure it would come out entirely different. But to me that's what made it great, was the fact that it was loose.

(31)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I expected to receive the modern methods of teaching; that is, to receive the inductive method and more information in the inquiry method of teaching social studies.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I feel that it's quite valuable, and I feel that I can turn back to the classroom and really put it into operation where it will become more useful to the students whom I come into contact with.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I feel that I can give more information to the students on this material. I have been exposed to them in our library, but not as much as I have here, and I feel that I can take this material now and really carry back and use it in my classes, and I feel that it will be more valuable to the students now that I've become better acquainted with it.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) As of now, I have received some valuable information from the speakers that we have had. I feel that possibly we could invite more speakers to come in from different fields to give us more information. And, actually, I feel that if our group had been given two or three more days with the high school class that we could have gotten more information over to them.
- (I) What are your feelings about the utility of having an experimental high school class with an institute of this sort?
- (T) I think it was quite valuable, because actually we had students of different groups; that is, from my observing them, they had different I.Q.s, and that's what we actually have in our classrooms; that's why I think it was a valuable group, because we actually got better acquainted with them because there were such a small number of them, whereas in my class there are thirty-five or forty students.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Actually, I don't know of anything that I thought was a waste of time. Now that's the honest truth, I can't think of anything that wasn't valuable in some way.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a

- part of this institute?
- (T) Well, I'll tell you, the inquiry method of teaching and the inductive method of teaching and this SRSS material have been very, very valuable to me, because I have become real well acquainted with them and I feel that I can carry it back and actually use it in my classroom.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) Well, actually, the association that I've had with the teachers and with the instructors and all, I feel that it's really been helpful to me. It has given me a broader knowledge of the social studies field.

(22)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I expected to get a broader perspective on the teaching of sociology, and, moreover, let's say the new social studies inquiry method. I was expecting to find more information and materials that I could use when I returned to teaching.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Frankly, I can't see where the inquiry method is different from some of the methods I've been using all along. In certain areas it's more extensive, and some things are more or less....you have more freedom as far as classroom participation is concerned. But I really think inquiry is really nothing....it's just....I don't think it's that new to me. I have enjoyed some of the things that they suggested in my classrooms, especially in different teaching situations that I have been in, I was so limited as far as materials and so forth, I guess they thought they were getting at I have been using a long time. But I really learned a lot, like how to bring out certain points, and like....I was using it, but I think I know more how to control it now.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) They have very little value, I think, as far as my approach goes and the way that I teach sociology. Really, I haven't had that much exposure to this material before coming over to the institute, because the materials that I usually used are the books and reference material that I have received from the supervisor of the school, and they were not really geared toward the content that this institute has emphasized.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) The only improvement that I could think of would be a better library; more books and more time for reading and library work. This is my first institute, and I thought that this was really a good situation, and I've enjoyed the institute as far as the working relationship, but I've got somewhat of a problem as far as making a re-entry back into this society, since I have lived out of it so long I see people as hypocrites or "Toms," and I do everything

I can to maintain my composure during class because....I'm not an angry young man, but I feel that sometimes things are said that I really can't accept, and many times I've wanted to say something but I was afraid of hurting someone. But I feel that some of the things that are said are just a bunch of bullshit, mostly racial things because I'm really a go-Africa-man, and since I have lived over there for a while....I'm not waving the black flag, but what I'm saying is that when we were discussing issues like prejudice and stereotypes I got uptight with the way many of these people looked at it.

- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I really don't think of anything, except....let me think for a minute. Actually, I can't think of anything at the moment that I would say should be omitted. I can't think of anything, really.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Nothing really left a mark on me from this institute. I got one thing from this institute; that was more or less saying to myself that I'm not really lost; that there is a way, it'll just take time. I've gotten a lot of ideas from this institute as far as using my classroom next year, how to attack different situations that might be embarrassing for me, and stuff like that. I can certainly say that some of the things I've gained I won't forget next week.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No. I think that most of the questions you asked got to the point.

(32)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) You know, of course, that I'm changing school systems this year, coming to Stillwater. I have more sociology than anybody at Stillwater High, so that meant I would be teaching sociology, and personally, I didn't feel like walking into a high school classroom in sociology without some present training in the field. So I was expecting and looking forward to the institute helping me this fall and in later years, also. Of course, at the time I heard about the institute, it was to be an institute in sociology; there have been numerous other things in this institute that will help me a great deal, not just sociology.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I definitely think they have affected me. I'm going to use most of these materials in my sociology class this fall, and I'm looking forward to the challenge. Maybe the materials are somewhat liberal in the attitudes they present, but if that seems to be the case, I'll introduce supplementary materials to represent other points of view.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Now I wish that I had received it in my undergraduate work; at

least have been exposed to it, which I wasn't. I feel like now .... I mean I sit in there and I listen to the problems being discussed and the way this thing has gone I'm just sorry for the kids that I've been in contact with before, that I haven't used more of it. I have used it some, but I didn't know what I was using. Course I don't know how much success I'll have with it, but I'm certainly going to try.

- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Gosh, it's hard to say. I didn't like the idea of having so many teachers with the students at once. Course I realize that size and time make any other arrangement difficult.
- (I) How do you feel about having an experimental class with an institute of this sort?
- (T) I think it was a good thing, but I'd like to see the class larger than it was. Something else that I've never worried particularly about, but I think too many of the teachers in this institute were still tied up and worried about these grades; what kind of a grade they were going to get. This contributed to the bad arrangement of having too many teachers involved with the students at once; they were so worried about their grade that they felt they should be involved at all times. This contributed to the confusion.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I can't think of anything right off hand.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I guess probably the exposure to the inquiry type approach. It was used on us in the morning and afternoon sessions, and I saw it in action as far as using it with the students. I found my toes stepped on quite often, things that I had done in the past. I guess this would have to be the biggest benefit here.

(23)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I expected to get some materials that I could use in my classroom, because I was not yet comfortable with the inquiry method. I believed in it, but had an awful lot of questions about it. I didn't know exactly what it meant or how to use it. I wanted crutches--I guess you could say--to help me get started. I thought once I had that, I could go from there. And I wanted to see it at work, and that's all I knew about the institute, so it's about all I expected.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Very good, because I've seen many aspects of it. I think the most important thing is that I've seen Larry Perkins, who I think is just about the greatest, show me what real open-ended inquiry was. It showed me an awful lot about human relations. And I've found, too, the materials that I wanted. Our two staff members are so very different, and I feel they have both given me a great deal. I think it was invaluable getting to use this kind of thing with an experimental class. I would never have dreamed that I could go out

and take a dozen kids so different and say this is your class, and and have it turn out that way. I didn't know I could be comfortable with that, and I can be. I'd never have known it if we hadn't had the class out there. That class was probably the best part of the institute.

- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think there were a great many people here who were not aware of so many implications for society. I haven't changed my viewpoints a great deal. I think I've been oriented toward the kinds of things we've been concerned with in this institute for a long time. So nothing has come as a shock to me. I very rarely disagree with the sociologists in this institute; with a lot of people who react to them, I do.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute are from the same school system?
- (T) I wouldn't want that to be my only institute experience, but I think it's marvelous. It's been one of the best things.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) It's been such a fine experience, I can't think of any ways to improve it. I'd hate to see you...you try improving it and you're going to do away with something you've done, and I haven't seen anything that I'd want to eliminate.
- (I) You just answered my next question. I was going to ask what could be omitted to improve the institute. Can you think of anything that you would like to have had more of?
- (T) No, I can't. Unless, the one thing that's probably least possible, and that is more chance to work with the kids. We threw too many of us at them as it was; that might be something you could change. Somehow arrange it so that eight people didn't move in on seven kids. Maybe more kids would solve that problem.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think Larry Perkins is the one thing that was most important. He taught me a great deal about how to relate to people. I always felt that there was value in every man's judgment and values and so on, but I have watched the love flow out of him, and there's a great lesson in it. I think that's the best of all. It's meant a lot to me.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No. Maybe tomorrow I could think of something, but I can't right now.

(10)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I think that perhaps I had a little different insight than the others. I was in somewhat on the planning of the thing. Of course we were looking at the big picture of the thing, with the idea that we wanted to bring in new materials that we didn't have before. We

wanted to experiment with them. We knew there was going to be an experimental class with which we could work and find out if these materials were realistic, if they were practical and could be used. And then with the idea that each member represented a school in our system, we'd be taking this back to our school system and using it in our own classrooms, and spreading the word to the other teachers with the idea of getting the new material into the system. We knew this was kind of a long-range plan. I think I went into this with a great deal of expectation and enthusiasm, and I think it's satisfied pretty much what I had in mind. I've been thoroughly impressed by the enthusiasm of the entire group.

- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Well, surprisingly, I've been a teacher for twenty-two years, and I think basically I'm pretty much of a traditional type teacher, in that I indulge in the lecture method mostly, yet in my lecture I always provided room for discussion so that I thought I was making the material relevant to today and today's problems. In this respect I was haphazardly, I guess, using the inquiry method. At least there was an endeavor to make things relevant. This institution gave me a kind of clarification and better understanding of the inductive method, and I can't wait till I get back next fall and try it out.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think their value is tremendous; I mean this seems to be what it's all about today. We're in a period of upheaval and I think these are the problems that are bothering not only the younger generation, but also concerned older generation, and I think these are the things that are necessary to discuss. If a thing doesn't have any relevance for today, there's really no point in teaching it.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I'm not really sure if I could make any good suggestions for change. I think the format you have used is excellent. The only thing I can see that might make it better is to make it eight weeks instead of six.
- (I) What are your feelings about the utility of an experimental high school class in an institute of this sort?
- (T) As I said in answer to your first question, I knew this was to be part of the institute, and I think it has been a very good thing. I think to actually have the opportunity to experiment with this approach to teaching and work out the rough points has made a world of difference in my confidence, and will facilitate my using it when I return to my own classroom.
- (I) How do you feel about the fact that all the teachers in this institute were from the same school system?
- (T) I think that in our particular institute this was great. But more important was the fact that we had a staff that complemented each other. They were different enough to make it interesting, and yet they complemented each other in almost every respect. I think we had the right teachers for the job.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Not anything, really.



- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I think the thing that impressed me the most was the fact that there were no tests and no papers to write. Now this may seem like a lazy, easy summer, but I think actually this created a positive attitude. I was really quite surprised myself to find that with the pressure off I was able to think more, actually, I did much more reading with more understanding than I probably would have done otherwise. I found that I could read for my own personal meaning, and not to memorize content for a test. I didn't become tired reading near as fast as I do when I'm reading something that I have to read; and I read faster and with greater comprehension, and I'm sure much more than I would've otherwise. This was something tremendous to me. To me this is the real purpose of the university.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No, I can't think of a thing.

(13)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I wasn't real sure as to what it would consist of, this being my first institute. I didn't know whether it would be a real in-depth study of sociology, because I had a two-hour course in sociology probably thirty years ago, and of course my main discipline is geography. So I thought it would be testing materials and studying sociology, and doing more written work than we did, and maybe tests. I didn't know that we would have this experimental high school class here, but I'm pleasantly surprised, and it's my honest opinion that it's a heck of a success, and I wrote in my evaluation that I don't see how any other institute could better this one as far as effectiveness is concerned because the pressure was lifted and we found out that right quick. You gave us some things that we could read, but you didn't say read 'em and we'll have a test or report, which I thought...in fact these high school kids expressed the same thing about their class.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) Oh, it's great. Now here's another thing: I thought...I still believe that I use inquiry, but I didn't use it in the way that it's been used here. And that high school class here is a heck of a good thing to have a lab like that to learn it. Course in geography we don't get into too much of the social problems like this, and I can see where it would be much better in a sociology class, or history, or government, but I intend to work it into my geography somewhat, because I think it's great. It gets kids to think, and it gets them to form their own opinions. And I think also, out of this inquiry, that I've come to the point that two people can be right, yet they don't agree. So I think it's great.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I don't know that you could make it better. Someone mentioned some time ago to bring the same group back next year. I wouldn't

do that, because if we want to get this to catch on, the more different groups you get in here each summer, the quicker it's going to spread; it's just like fire. But I'm not sure that you could improve it.

- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I would have to say that the methodology was the most important to me personally. I mean the inquiry method of teaching. Now if you wanted to structure it some to the point of teaching more sociology, you might do that if the people were interested in it...really learning sociology....Don't misunderstand me, it's not that I'm not interested in it, and I think I've learned something about how sociologists work and how they attack the different problems, but geography is a more structured program. You have basic facts in geography that we have to teach.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) I'm not trying to make you feel good or anything, but I have enjoyed this institute personally a great deal. I think I got quite a bit of what I wanted; after I found out the first week what we were going to do and how it was going to be operated, I think that my goal probably was methodology of teaching more than conceptual sociology. And I think it was very valuable to me. I plan to fit most of these episodes right into my geography course, and I feel that they're extremely relevant to my discipline at this time.

(25)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Perhaps some teachers, when they get along in years, get set in their ways. I don't know, but this institute, in the main, has been a very fine thing. I've enjoyed it, and I think I've gotten some things from it. Whether I'll be elastic enough to change and start making more use of them....although I think in a way, I do a lot of lecturing and a lot talking in my classes, but at the same time I use this type of approach, the inquiry method. I think this is the only way you can keep your classes on a working basis. But I think the institute has been an excellent institute as far as I'm concerned, and I believe it's been a pretty cohesive group in the fact that they were all working toward the idea of trying to discover what they could about sociology and the inquiry approach to teaching it.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) Well, being kind of from the old school in regard to....I don't know what went on in the class, but I felt that the class had been run rather loosely, that is the high school class, and I believe had a....I think most of the various groups had that certain feeling that they had to keep drawing the group back, that it had been allowed to get a little too....I don't know the word to use, I won't say "unsupervised"....a little bit too informal, perhaps. I just say what in my opinion might help improve it. As far as the other thing goes, I'm all for the way this institute has been run.

- The no tests, no papers-type of deal is just as good for learning, if people are concerned with learning, as if the director had said this has to be a tight ship all the way through.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Well, I always like to be associated with people, and this association this summer has certainly been valuable to me. I think that probably it's been a kind of re-evaluating of my own position with regard to an attempt to do a little bit more of this type of teaching, and possibly less of a....the thing that has concerned me a long time is the fact that in many areas of social studies there's been no opportunity, that is officially, to explore the needs of the day as far as society is concerned. If one follows the present plan-of-study that is set up in our school system he doesn't have a chance to cover the present day problems and things like that. I think that a realization, at least being down here with the group, that the trend is going more to incorporate the problems of the day and social problems, even to the exclusion of some of the other things and tossing them out as unnecessary, has given me a little more reinforcement to go that way.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) No. I'd recommend it to anyone who has the opportunity to attend one.

(26)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) I felt like I might be able to tie some of these things together that I'd been working on for several years. The problems approach and inductive teaching, and things of this sort. I've toyed with the ideas, but I've never had the construction of it; exactly how to get into the full thing, until this institute.
- (I) What are your feelings concerning the inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies?
- (T) I know what I'm going to do in my 3:00 classes, at least next year will be altogether different. I'll use the inquiry method, but to a limited extent in my history class. But in sociology, economics, and government I'm definitely going to use inquiry.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think the issues are the ones that we have to deal with now; they are the issues that affect us, and if we dodge them, we're in trouble. I'm not sure if I'll use all of them, but I will definitely use the ones that I am comfortable with.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I was real happy with the way this worked out this summer. I don't like a lot of structure, a lot of reading, papers to write, and things of this sort. It seemed like this one led me into more reading than I'd have done otherwise, and reading that I wanted to do. I'd like to see you have an experimental class again, but I'd

- like to see you have a larger class, if possible. It might even be a good idea, if it was possible, for you to have two. Then maybe you could run some sort of a comparison or something like that.
- (I) What could be omitted from the institute if we had another one?
- (T) I can't think of anything off hand. Possibly because of age and some other things, I'm not quite as liberal as some of the people in the institute. Some of the things that you have brought out, you and the other staff members, in the institute, I have disagreed with, perhaps. I'm just not that liberal yet, but I feel like I have recognized the needs of the students. I go with them just as far as I can possibly go. I've listened to some of the remarks made in the classroom, even in the high school class, some profanity I should say....I never use it in my classroom. Those type of words are just not in my vocabulary as far as my classroom goes, and I don't think that I'm being prude or anything like that--I just don't do it. Lots of young teachers now think that this is the way they impress students, and I don't think this is the way at all.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) I suppose my fellowship with the various teachers being in the same system, and I'm quite sure that during the year we will confer quite a few times. If I need help, or if somebody else needs help, and certainly the passing around of materials, and things of that sort, I think is the best thing to be attained from the institute.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) The major thing is that I'd like to see all social studies teachers get involved in the same thing. I'm not quite sure that it ever could be made available, and that many of our social studies teachers would take advantage of it. I'm quite sure, when I go back to my school--I have twelve social studies teachers--at least three of them I could possibly do something with. The only thing I know to do is to get the kids talking about relevant things in my classes and hope that these teachers get worried and want to find out for themselves what's going on.

(8)

- (I) What did you expect to receive or gain from being a participant in this institute?
- (T) Course I didn't know for sure just how it was going to be set up, and didn't know they were going to use this inductive method. So I was hopefully thinking maybe at least I could get some materials in my hands that I could use in geography class. And some of the materials I liked, although they are sociology materials, they can be used in a geography class. But then after I was here two or three weeks, and not only heard them talking about this inductive approach, but saw them using it in class, I decided that was something that I wanted to use. Although I had heard of it for years, this was the first time I had seen it the way it was. I'm hopeful that I will be able to use it in my classes, and it will solve many problems if I can use it as successfully as I've seen it used

- here. If that does happen, this course will have been of such value that it can't be expressed in words.
- (I) What effect has this contact with the concepts and methods of sociology, and the issues we have discussed, had upon you as a teacher?
- (T) I think they're valuable because they're relevant to the things that are going on now, and it's what the teacher should know about, and the students, for that matter. Cause they're interested in it, they can see it around them, they can relate it to their own lives, and for this reason I think it's real valuable. I think it's not only valuable for them to know these facts, but to adopt attitudes that would be in balance with them.
- (I) What could be done to improve the institute if we had another one?
- (T) If they had another institute in sociology and education, I don't know any way it could be improved. I think we're going to have one next summer in geography, and if they can bring in as many fine materials in geography as they have in sociology, and can use the inductive approach, or can join sociology and geography and different things together, well, this will also be good. And maybe we'll be able to refine this inductive approach, cause most of us won't be able to master it in just one year.
- (I) What is the most important thing that you have gained from being a part of this institute?
- (T) Just learning about this inductive approach. All the things that are involved in it. It involves many things, you know, not just simply asking questions. The entire approach to teaching is different than what most of us have been using. It seems to overshadow all the rest.
- (I) Is there anything else you would like to speak to that you feel the questions didn't allow?
- (T) There's one thing I will add. I think that Dr. Perkins is probably the best model for the inductive approach that I've ever seen. I'd like to hope that I might become about fifty per cent as good as he is before I come back next summer.

## APPENDIX C

### DAILY LOG

#### First Week

Monday: Dr. Perkins met with the experimental high school class on the first day of the institute, while Dr. Selakovich met with the secondary principals from the Tulsa School System and discussed the problems-centered, inquiry approach to the teaching of social studies. In the afternoon session, Perkins met with the participants in the institute at the University, and this session was devoted mostly to getting acquainted and discussing the goals of the institute and the responsibilities of those who were involved. A tentative schedule was distributed, and the teachers divided into five groups ranging in size from five to eight people. Each group was responsible for teaching the experimental high school class for one week using the inquiry approach. The subject matter would be selected by the high school class about a week before the group presented it to them. This gave each group about one week in which to prepare the necessary materials--a unit--for their presentation to the high school class.

Selakovich met with the principals again in the afternoon, and continued to discuss the inquiry approach to teaching and the "new" social studies. The School Opinion Survey was administered to all those involved in the institute on this day, i.e., the experimental high school class, the principals, the teachers, and the institute staff. There was some interest in organizing both a bowling team and a softball team to participate in the summer athletic program of the University. The four SRSS Episodes in Sociology were distributed among the teachers for them to examine and become familiar with; the materials from Prentice-Hall also arrived and were distributed among them, with the exception of two of the books which were delayed in shipping. This group of teachers seemed to be very excited about the institute, the materials, and the chance to work with an experimental high school class while practicing the problem-centered inquiry approach to teaching. They seemed anxious to begin.

Tuesday: Perkins and Selakovich met with the principals for both a morning and afternoon session, and the principals returned to Tulsa at the end of this day. Selakovich met with the high school class during the morning session, and Group I also attended this session to become familiar with the students and to

discuss the topic they would be presenting next week. The main goal of this session was for the students to define some problem they wished to attack. Selakovich detected some communication problems, and felt that this would be a good opportunity to utilize the SRSS Episode on Testing for Truth. The teachers conducted their morning session at the University with Johnson spending about thirty minutes with each group discussing the goals of the institute and their part in the fulfillment of these goals. Dr. Crockett and his staff from Arts and Sciences Extension furnished a large coffee maker and many cups to provide coffee for the staff and participants of the institute. He also furnished a large room in the Life Sciences Building of the University for morning and afternoon sessions. The Stillwater High School Administration furnished a room at the High School in which the experimental class was conducted.

Selakovich met with the teachers during the afternoon session at the University, and spent some time discussing the problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching and the "new" social studies. It was decided during this session that it would be best to begin tomorrow at the High School with the SRSS Episode on Testing for Truth, and allow Group I to begin their unit next Monday. Mr. Muncy and Miss Kime volunteered to present the episode on Testing for Truth to the high school class tomorrow, but since this did not allow them much time to prepare, they asked Johnson to assist them with statistics involved in this particular episode--chi square. Each group will attend the morning high school class at least once between now and Friday for the purpose of observing the interaction between the class and those presenting the Testing for Truth Episode, and to get some idea from the class on the areas or issues they wish to pursue. The room in the Life Science Building of the University will be stocked with sociology and social science books furnished by the staff. The object of this is to provide books of interest to the participants so they may read as much and as often as they desire. Hopefully, the staff will provide the incentive to explore certain areas and issues that are discussed during the six weeks the institute is scheduled to occur. This library will be run informally, with the teachers simply removing any book they desire to read from the shelves and keeping it as long as they desire.

Wednesday: Selakovich met with the high school class along with Group II and Group III. Muncy and Kime began the episode on Testing for Truth with the class. Perkins met with the remaining participants at the University and began a series of sociological discussion sessions that would continue throughout the institute. The tentative schedule calls for Perkins and Selakovich to alternate during the morning sessions for the remainder of the institute; while one is with the high school class, the other will be conducting a discussion session at the University with the remaining participants. They will alternate with these groups each week. Johnson and one of the staff members will always be available to assist the teachers with any problems they are having, while one of the groups and the remaining

staff member will be with the high school class working through their unit. This high school class meets from 8:00 A. M. to 12:00 noon. The afternoon sessions will be devoted to: (1) discussing those problems that occurred during the morning session at the high school; (2) planning what to do the following morning with the group that is conducting their unit at the high school; and (3) discussing relevant sociological and teaching methodological issues. In the session conducted this afternoon, the teachers seemed to be very excited and enthusiastic over the prospects offered by the institute. They have somewhat relaxed now and are becoming better acquainted with each other and the staff members. Miss Kime spoke to the others about some of the problems encountered by her and Mr. Muncy during their morning with the high school students. She indicated that the students had chosen prejudice as the topic they wished to research, and also as the topic they wished to pursue with Group I the following week. The students had divided into two groups with Muncy advising one group, and Kime advising the other. They ran into difficulty with regard to certain areas of the Testing for Truth episode, e.g., questionnaire construction, sampling techniques, coding, testing for significance, etc. Johnson said that he would meet with the two groups tomorrow morning to aid them in these areas of difficulty. Leadership in the high school class seems to be vacillating between two male students; Jess, a senior Indian student, and Jimmy, a senior black student. When the students divided into the two groups to pursue the Testing for Truth episode, Jimmy and Jess ended up in the same group with all the rest of the boys in class, while the girls all segregated into the remaining group. The girls felt that they needed a male to aid in the decision making, and Jess saw this as his opportunity to assume leadership without competition for it. But when he came to this group he professed that he did not wish to pursue the topic of prejudice, but felt that sex would be a more appropriate topic. The girls reacted "thumbs-down" to this, and the topic of drugs was selected as a compromise. Muncy expressed that he was somewhat confused with this episode, and that he would welcome any help that might be available.

Kime organized the other group, which was composed of the remaining boys in the class, and they actively pursued the topic of prejudice for the remainder of the morning. The afternoon session ended with almost everyone in the institute excited about the potential of the high school class as a laboratory for experimenting with the new problem-centered, inquiry approach to teaching.

Thursday: Today saw Perkins and Johnson at the High School, with Groups IV and V also in attendance to observe the proceedings and become familiar with the high school students. Muncy and Kime continued in their pursuit of the episode on Testing for Truth. Selakovich spent the morning at the University with the remaining groups, discussing the organization of their units. The morning at the High School began with Johnson



lending assistance to the group which Kime was leading. This group was having some difficulty establishing a testable hypothesis. They were still concerned with prejudice, and wished to relate it in some meaningful manner to social class, but they seemed to be more interested in the interviewing itself than in the establishment of a testable hypothesis and the creation of a questionnaire which was directly related to that hypothesis. Eddie and Jimmy had interviewed some of the people in their Black community the night before, and there was general agreement that we might all profit by listening to this tape. We brought both groups together and circled the chairs while Eddie proceeded to play the tape. The tape lasted for about thirty minutes, and provided the group with some very interesting issues. Eddie and Jimmy recognized this moment as one which offered the group an excellent opportunity for communication, but since no one seemed to know what to do or say, it was decided that a short break was probably in order at this point. When we returned from the break, the groups separated again and the opportunity for communication seemed to have slipped away.

Jess did not attend class today. He has apparently experienced some difficulty in assuming leadership with the group of girls, and I fear that we may be losing him. Jim Hill agreed to become a member of the all-girl group. He seems to have a good deal of confidence in his ability to make decisions and follow through with them. Muncy seemed to be experiencing some trouble getting this group to make a decision on their hypothesis. Johnson took advantage of this opportunity to enhance the self-concept of these students by letting them know that their ideas were very good and that the hypotheses they were considering were all topics that would prove interesting if pursued. They were concerned with the area of drugs, and with attitudinal comparisons between high school and college students. They spent the remainder of the morning working up a questionnaire that probed these attitudes toward drugs, and set about to administer it to high school and college students.

In Kime's group it seemed that no agreement could be reached concerning what hypothesis should be tested, and so it was decided that they would simply go out into the community and interview people in a random fashion. Eddie and Jimmy agreed to extend their interviews to the White community. At the conclusion of the high school class, Kime approached Eddie and asked him if he would consider bringing his taped interview to the afternoon session at the University so that the other teachers might have the opportunity to hear it. He agreed to do so.

Eddie brought the tape to the afternoon session and we began by hearing it. Between the end of the morning session at the High School and the beginning of the afternoon session at the University, Eddie and Jimmy had gone into the White community to interview more people. The teachers and staff listened to the tape, and found it very interesting. This tape got close to some sensitive issues, and since there were

some seven Black teachers in the institute, plus Jimmy and Eddie, the discussion opened up nicely and became quite heated. The communication opportunity that had been allowed to slip away this morning was seized at this time by those present at this session. Feelings were expressed openly, and a sense of comradeship seemed to emerge during the latter part of this session. The meeting concluded with a summary of events to this date, and bringing together all of the goals and plans of action for the remainder of the week.

Friday: Today saw Perkins at the High School, and Selakovich at the University. Johnson found a room and some video-tape equipment so that the group might have an opportunity to see a session taped by Selakovich in which he discusses some of the problems encountered by beginning teachers with a group of practice teachers under his supervision. The film was scheduled for the afternoon session.

At the High School, the students were still working within the two groups. In the group led by Kime, some of the students brought their interviews to class and the session began with them playing the tape for the group. By listening to the tape, it became evident that there was general confusion as to the purpose of the interviews. This stems from an inadequate definition of the problem to be investigated and statement of the hypothesis to be tested. The tape was reviewed for its faults, and the boys in the group reorganized their interview questions and left to collect more data. The confusion in this group is beginning to cause some hard feelings. Perhaps we can look for a conflict situation to emerge sometime in the near future. Muncy's group seems to be progressing very well. He brought the questionnaire to be distributed by the students. It asked the question, "Would you support the legalization of marijuana?" The students were to sample both college students and high school students to test the null hypothesis that there is no difference in the attitudes of college and high school students where drugs are concerned. The data they will gather will be in the form of frequency responses to be placed into cells appropriate for a chi square test of independence. While they were distributing the questionnaires at the University, Muncy and Powers took some pictures. This group is well organized and appears to be learning a great deal from this experience.

During the afternoon session, Selakovich and Muncy set up the video tape, and we watched the above mentioned film. Many of the problems of prejudice came through in this film, and we spent the remainder of the afternoon discussing these problems. We said good-bye for the weekend, anticipating a new start on Monday.

### Second Week

Monday: Selakovich spent the morning at the High School, where he will be in attendance for the entire week. Muncy and Kime continued their groups, with the hope things could be concluded

today and that Group I could begin their episode on Prejudice. The discrepancy between the two high school groups became evident today, as Muncy's group was highly organized and found themselves in the latter stages of the hypothesis testing procedure. They had gathered all of the data and used the first part of the morning session to tally their frequency counts for each cell. Johnson spent a short time explaining the theoretical basis of a probability conclusion based on a chi square test of independence, and showing the procedural steps involved in calculating a chi square. Kime's group seemed to find themselves at loose ends, and a certain amount of confusion had set in as to just what they were trying to accomplish and what they would have when the project was finished. Most of the group did not report to class this morning, because they were in the field attempting to gather some last-minute information from residents of the community.

Perkins spent the morning at the University with the remaining groups (Group I attended the High School session to observe). He will be in attendance there for the remainder of the week. He probed into some issues concerning the inquiry approach to teaching, and Black-White understanding, with each person attempting to work through the philosophical aspects at his or her own level of awareness, and to become acquainted with the problems and perspectives of their fellow teachers.

During the afternoon session the participants and staff of the institute met back at the University, which will continue to be the format for the remainder of the institute, to discuss the problems encountered to date and those that can be anticipated in the future. The two main topics for this session were: (1) a review of the events that have occurred at the High School to date, and especially those that occurred this morning, and (2) a presentation by Johnson on the theoretical foundation of a probability conclusion based on the distribution of a chi square test of independence. Concerning the former, after the morning break, Kime and Muncy brought both groups together for a review of what had been accomplished through the pursuit of the Testing for Truth episode, and some collective criticism. During this session, Kime made reference to the fact that the group led by Muncy had progressed somewhat further toward gaining an understanding of hypothesis testing and probability conclusions than the group led by herself. At this time the conflict situation that had been emerging for the past week, climaxed. For a short period of time there seemed to be complete chaos, with the brunt of the hostility directed toward Kime for daring to make such an accusation. It was some thirty minutes before control of the group could be regained and organization restored. They attempted to pull things back together and were able to carry on a somewhat rational discussion for the remaining hour of the class. They closed this session with the hope that the Testing for Truth episode could be completed during the first part of the class tomorrow morning, and Group I could begin with their presentation of the Images of People episode, which is concerned mainly with stereotyping and prejudice. After this

discussion, Johnson presented a short lecture on the probability and assigned some problems using chi square to be turned in during the afternoon session tomorrow. This concluded the day's activities.

Tuesday: Selakovich will remain with the high school class for the remainder of this week, while Perkins will continue to meet with the remaining groups at the University. Johnson will be open for use in both locations, depending on what needs arise. Kime and Muncy utilized the first part of the morning session to conclude the Testing for Truth episode. They brought both groups together and discussed what had been accomplished by pursuing this episode, and what they could have done to make it better.

After the morning break, Group I began their episode on Images of People. Apparently they encountered some of the usual problems that can be expected when beginning a project of this sort with a new group of students, but all things considered, they felt that the session was very successful. The afternoon session was spent discussing some of the problems encountered by Group I during their morning with the high school class. Selakovich presented a summary of the staff meeting that took place yesterday after the institute was adjourned for the day. The main emphasis was placed upon each group organizing their unit for presentation to the high school class, and for further use in their own classroom during the coming fall semester.

The leadership structure among the participants in the institute is beginning to emerge. After a week together, the teachers are now starting to speak their mind without fear of being "put down." Among the older teachers there are a couple of department heads who are very concerned with the utility of the problems-centered, inquiry approach to teaching, and with the development of this approach around a sound structure of available materials, e.g., the SRSS episodes, the Prentice-Hall materials, the units developed by each group, etc. Their views are seen as somewhat conservative by a group of the younger teachers who are more concerned with the desires and needs of individual students than with the development of a structured approach to teaching. It will be interesting to observe their interaction through the remainder of the institute, and since they are all from the same school system, to see what role the emergent leadership structure plays upon their return to this school system. During the latter part of this session, Johnson passed out a chi square worksheet and spent about an hour discussing this statistical technique and working some problems with the class. Most of these teachers have a lack of confidence in their ability to understand the theoretical foundations of simple probability theory and to work with the statistical techniques such as chi square. The softball team plays their first game this afternoon.

Wednesday: Group I continued at the High School with the episode on Images of People. They worked through some of the exercises

in this episode with the class, and felt that with the exception of a few moments, the morning was highly successful.

During the afternoon session, some of the members of Group I discussed the good and bad points of their morning at the High School. The participants were noticeably of high spirits today, and everybody seemed to have undergone some experience that has bound them closer together and developed a sense of community which is shared by a majority of the participants and staff. This sense of community and esprit de corps seems to be traceable to the sharing of two events:

(1) The softball team played its first game yesterday afternoon. Most of the males under fifty years of age came out to play, and many of the other members of the institute were there to offer support. It seems that a certain closeness was born at this time between all who participated in this first game, which we lost. Irvin Brown was chosen to be the coach, a duty he is somewhat accustomed to assuming, and he proved to be an excellent selection for that position. He has a built-in competitive spirit, but is sensitive to the fact that all who offer their skills in this quest must be utilized if the group is to grow toward attaining a sense of community during the six weeks we will be together. We will play about seven games during the summer, and this shared activity could prove to be a significant factor in evaluating the success of the institute. (2) The morning session was conducted by Perkins and was one in which the inquiry approach proved to be an important factor in allowing the group to get to the heart of certain issues and to feel or empathize with others in the group for possibly the first time. Between these two shared experiences, the incipient qualities of a sense of community seemed to emerge. The remainder of the afternoon was spent discussing further plans for the high school class, with emphasis placed on the organization of Group I's unit, which is primarily built around the SRSS episode on Images of People. Two films concerning prejudice and discrimination have been scheduled for viewing tomorrow afternoon. If these films prove interesting enough, they will be shown to the high school students the following day.

Thursday: This morning, Selakovich and Group I were again at the High School with the experimental class. Group V also attended to gain a better perspective of this class and to watch the manner in which Group I was handling the presentation of their unit--prejudice and stereotyping. The remaining groups met at the University with Perkins and experienced what was later to be recognized as the highest point of the institute. Perkins and the participants found themselves involved in a discussion that extended to the very core of their beliefs and values. Many were very threatened by the experience, but all felt that they grew closer to and gained a greater understanding of their fellow participants.

The participants in the institute have listed some fourteen topics they feel are worthy of discussion at some time during the institute. This list was duplicated and

distributed to all members of the institute. Topics for future discussions will be taken from this list. During the afternoon session, Group I reviewed the events of their morning at the High School. The topic of discussion at the High School was the same as that which the teachers were discussing at the University--prejudice and stereotyping. The two discussions paralleled each other in many ways, with the main differences stemming from differences in levels of abstraction. Both Perkins and Selakovich are as skilled in the method of inquiry teaching as one might think it is possible to be. But they approach this method of teaching with different goals in mind. While Selakovich's skills stem from his ability to exploit inductive reasoning to its fullest capacity, leading the group down a path of conclusions to that point where they are able to see the "right" answer, Perkins' skills seem to lie in his ability to stimulate a group to engage in dialog for the purpose of broadening their understanding of each other and, hence, of the concepts with which they are dealing, and to allow each person to draw his own conclusions from the experience and fit it into his own meaningful frame of reference. It will be interesting to observe the interaction of the participants with these two varying methods of teaching. The afternoon session broke up early today. Group II gained some structure for their unit from the high school class this afternoon. They requested that drugs be their next topic for discussion, and Group II has already begun preparation for their week at the High School. The Prentice-Hall book on The Drug Scene has not arrived yet, and Group II is planning its unit without the aid of this supplement. With the early adjournment, Group II took this opportunity to preview three films that might be appropriate for viewing during the presentation of their unit next week.

We had our first social event this evening. The staff, i.e., Crockett, Selakovich, Perkins, Muncy, and Johnson, furnished some beer and pop, and we all met at Boomer Lake to talk informally and get to know each other better. The party began at about 7:00 P. M., and continued until about 10:00 P. M. The morale of everyone in the institute seems to be very high, and seemed that all those who attended the party had a good time and enjoyed the social exchange. The leadership among the participants in the institute seems to be centering around two of the black members, i.e., Irvin Brown and Elijah Adair, and Charlie Cobb for the younger members, and around some of the department heads, i.e., O. D. Bell, James Teel, and Wes Gulliksen for the older members. There remains this apparent dividing among the participants into two factions or ideological orientations, marked specifically by age differentiation, with some noticeable exceptions. The younger, more liberal faction, seems to be exerting greater influence upon the temper or frame of mind of the institute to this point.

Friday: Group I finished the unit on prejudice and stereotyping at the High School this morning. They used the film, The Eye of the

Beholder, to sum up the week's activities, and found it excellent for the purpose of explaining nearly all of the issues that had been discussed during the week, but somewhat inadequate as an instrument to stimulate discussion. It was Friday, and the students seemed a little restless. They also seemed somewhat bored with the topic and ready to begin something new. Johnson met with the remaining participants at the University, and led the discussion session this morning. The discussion centered around the distinction between the concept approach and problems approach in sociology. At the conclusion of the discussion session, the teachers summed up what they felt they had gained in their two weeks of participation in this institute. They also indicated those areas they would like to pursue during the remainder of the institute. Most of them felt that the most important thing they had gained from the institute was a sense of community with their fellow teachers that would last a great deal longer than the time span of this institute. Something that could not be passed on to those teachers in their school system that had not shared this experience with them. Many have become aware of situations in life that they were oblivious to previously. The Blacks and the Whites of the institute had gained a certain empathy for each other that is truly remarkable.

During the afternoon session, Group I summarized their week at the High School. Also, the format for next week's unit was outlined briefly. The leadership of the group seems to be stabilizing around those individuals mentioned earlier, with Irvin Brown assuming most of the responsibilities of this role; both functionally (coach of the softball team), and intellectually (offering many ideas in the discussion sessions that are respected and internalized by other members of the group).

### Third Week

Monday: Perkins and Selakovich changed places for the new week-- Perkins moving to the High School, and Selakovich joining the remaining teachers at the University. Selakovich conducted a discussion on the "new social studies," which evolved into a discussion of citizenship and responsibility of an informed populace. Group I returned to the High School this morning to finish their unit on prejudice and stereotyping. When this was wrapped up, Group II introduced their topic--drugs. They spent the remainder of the morning talking with the class about how they would like to approach this subject, and discussing various things that might seem interesting to try.

During the afternoon, the discussion centered around the responsibility of the teacher when the student confides in him. This discussion arose from the morning session at the High School when the topic was drugs. It dealt with the rules that are present in most high schools concerning the use of drugs, and with the teacher's conflicting responsibility to these rules and to the student who confides in him with reference to his use of drugs. After the session ended, Group II

met for an hour or so in our adjacent planning room, to plan the next day's activities at the High School. Group III also took this opportunity to have their first planning session, since the high school students selected the topic they wished to cover next week--sex. Some of the teachers in this group are a little apprehensive about the topic, but this will probably work itself out in time.

Tuesday: Group II decided to show the film, A Long Day's Journey Into Night, by Eugene O'Neill, because one of the members of this group has access to a film library in Tulsa. The film contains four reels and lasts approximately three hours, including the time for rewinding and changing reels. It deals with drug addiction and alcoholism in a somewhat Victorian setting. After two reels of the film, all concerned were bored to tears and most felt that it failed to relate to the problems of drug usage in contemporary society. Muncy brought his video taping equipment and set it up in the room adjacent to the room in which the film was shown. At the conclusion of the film, the students and Group II gathered around a table and discussed the merit of this film and some issues relating to the problems of drugs, while Muncy recorded the sessions on video tape.

The afternoon discussion progressed into an issue that has continuously emerged during our sessions at the University --the individual vs. society. Most of the issues that are relative to sociology and, thus, the subject matter of this institute, must confront this basic problem and deal with it in some way. While dealing with this problem, the feelings and commitments of most of the participants surfaced sufficient for dialog, and the exchange that took place was somewhat heated, to state it conservatively. The problem is central in our society at the present time. It finds national expression in what is often referred to as the "law and order" issue. Law and order vs. individual freedom; and the concept of justice stands firmly in the center of this issue. The issue is one that is difficult to fake, and most people find that their philosophy of life is embodied deeply within their commitment to this problem of social control and freedom; so much so that to discuss it is to dichotomize most social groups. This offered the first real opportunity during this institute to find out just where most people stand, and to explore the various philosophies of life represented here.

Wednesday: Group II continued at the High School presenting the topic of drugs to the students. Adair assumed the leadership of the group, and has been leading most of the discussions with the high school students. He is an outspoken, articulate, young Black teacher, and his confidence and self-assurance command respect from both the students and his fellow teachers. During the first half of the session they discussed the effect that the presence of drugs has on the school environment. Then for the remainder of the morning, the discussion focused around a presentation on drugs and the law, which was presented by one of the local detectives on the police force. The



students were very impressed by his deep concern and commitment where drug abuse was concerned. He did a lot to blur their stereotype of the police officer as a "pig." The afternoon session centered around a discussion of what occurred during the morning at the High School, and what would be the best approach to bringing the subject to a close. The teachers received their first pay checks, and everyone seemed to be in good spirits because of this.

The bowling league was formed, and bowled for the first time Tuesday evening. About twelve of the institute participants are bowling in the league. The softball team lost its third game in a row Tuesday afternoon in an overtime heart-breaker. One of the noticeable things about this team is the attitude of acceptance. Although everyone is committed to winning, no one is humiliated by a team member who makes a mistake or doesn't do as well as he might have. The feelings and personality of each individual person is given a premium. These people truly respect and care for each other, and they have shown this by placing a higher value on the worth of each individual than on competition and its premium on winning. The participants announced today that there would be a social get-together on Thursday evening at the same place as before; the difference being that they would furnish the refreshments this time. Everyone seems to be anxiously anticipating this party, with the hopes that it will prove as stimulating and entertaining as the last one.

Thursday: Group II utilized the simulated society approach with the high school students this morning. They asked the students to set up their own society, with laws and rationales for the laws. They were specifically to deal with drugs and drug legislation. The students were very receptive to this approach, and they asked the teachers to leave them alone while they worked out the details. They used the entire four hours of the morning session, declining a break when it was offered to them.

Johnson spent most of the morning working with Group III on their topic--sex. They seem to be getting things together now, and except for the "delicacy" of the topic, they are now quite well prepared to move into the high school setting with some good inquiry material. During the afternoon session, Group II reported on the simulation experiment and developed their plans for closing the topic of drugs. After this, Perkins spoke on the subject of communicating through a silent dimension. The subject has been explored extensively in Edward Hall's The Silent Language, and is concerned with cultural influences on human perception; the way in which the individual's culture limits and defines his perception of time, space, color, etc. His presentation stimulated a very good discussion period in which we explored this cultural variable, and each person took a little time to analyze his own mind set with regard to this "silent" dimension of his personality.

The second social event took place Thursday evening at the same picnic area as before, and we let our hair down a little and everybody had a really good time. Most of the

participation in these social affairs is by the younger, more liberal, teachers in the institute. It does give them the opportunity to come closer together in an informal setting, and to develop friendships that could carry over into next year's return to the Tulsa School System. It also provides an opportunity to socialize with the staff of the institute on an informal basis, which lends support in the attempt to weaken the boundaries between students and teachers.

Friday: The concluding day of the third week of the institute saw Perkins at the High School with Group II, as they brought the unit on drugs to a close. A friend of Miss Kime's came over from Tulsa to lead an informal discussion with the high school students on the uses and abuses of drugs. His expertise with the subject matter derives from his former capacity as a user of drugs. The students were very impressed with this individual, and they seemed to respect his opinion very much. They asked him questions concerning the effects of certain drugs and how and why he became an ex-drug user. His presentation was very informative to all those who were present. Selakovich concluded his week at the University by summing up the week's topic--methodology and techniques of teaching the problem-centered, inquiry approach to social studies. The afternoon session was devoted to wrapping up the week's activities and outlining tentative plans for Group III's unit on sex, to be presented next week. Five of the high school students decided to attend the afternoon session today, something we have been asking them to do for the entire week. They participated in the evaluation of the institute to this point.

One of the striking factors within the system of evaluation of the students is their affinity to younger teachers. They seem to vibrate closer to those teachers that are both young and somewhat liberal. Most of the teachers in Group I were over forty years of age, while those in Group II were mostly around thirty. The students felt that the week on drugs was far more successful than the week on prejudice and stereotyping. Of course, there are many more variables that contribute to this evaluation by the students, but they felt that these two were very important. It will be interesting to observe the interaction between the students and the teachers in Group III next week. Group III is composed of six very young teachers and one middle-aged male and female, but the ideological orientations of these eight members run from very liberal to moderately conservative, whereas in the former two groups, the ideological orientation of the members was somewhat the same within each group. This variance, along with the sensitiveness of the topic--sex--should contribute to some communication complications during Group III's presentation next week. During the evaluation of the institute, most of the participants agreed that it had far exceeded their expectations. The sense of community that had developed during the first half of the summer was something no one really expected to happen. In fact, many felt that things had gone

so well that it would be difficult for the second half to equal it. It seemed as though they wanted to cast this feeling into a sacred mold to prevent it from passing with time.

#### Fourth Week

Monday: Selakovich is with Group III at the High School this week, while Perkins conducts discussions at the University with the remaining teachers. The teachers in Group III "collided" with the high school students this morning. They had prepared a list of subtopics for the students to examine, and they brought a great deal of resource materials for them to explore. The students felt that the teachers were controlling and directing their behavior with regard to the subject matter, and they did not like being told what to study. They totally rejected this approach and told the teachers they didn't want to do it that way. Finally, they divided into three groups, with about four students and three teachers in each group. Each group decided what issues it would pursue, and the students were allowed to change groups if they wished to do so. Actually, it was more confusing than informative, but no one interfered with them, as there is a lot to be learned from this sort of confusion.

During the afternoon session, the teachers discussed the events of the morning at the High School, and attempted to discover why communications seemed to break down. Group III plans to show a film on sex education to the students tomorrow. Perhaps the communication gap will close with the passing of time, as both students and teachers have the opportunity to talk and become better acquainted.

Tuesday: Group III presented the film to the high school students this morning. It was a film depicting the value of remaining a virgin prior to marriage, and the mental pain and anguish that can result from not following this orientation in life. It followed the college life of two girls; one gets involved sexually with a boy who discards her after obtaining his goal, while the other "plays her cards wisely" and after refusing to submit to her passions, wins the hand of the boy she has held at bay. Many of the teachers, while discussing this film during the afternoon session, felt that the film was very one-sided, presenting only that one point of view that is somewhat prevalent in America and other Christian societies. They felt that rather than leave the matter open for the individual to weigh the evidence and draw his own conclusions, the film chose to deal with half-truths and draw value oriented conclusions from these half-truths, while some of the other teachers felt that the film represented the correct values and normative structure for young people to follow, and saw it as excellent in the moral message it delivered. Some of the students were also divided in their evaluation of the film, and they attended the afternoon session and joined in the debate. This led to a discussion of the so-called "new sexual morality," in which the boundaries between the liberals and conservatives in the institute were reinforced a great deal.

The discussion progressed to one in which the "generation gap" became the focus of attention. Margaret Mead's new book, Culture and Commitment, was utilized to analyze this communication gap between generations. It was felt by most that the afternoon's exchange was a profitable one for all; regardless of how one viewed the value of the film.

Group III plans to continue the discussion of this film with the high school class tomorrow morning, after which they have something special in store for the remainder of the morning. The students wanted to take this opportunity to discuss certain important questions they had about sex with some open-minded members of the cloth. Some of the members of Group III obtained the services of three clergymen for a discussion of sex and the Church. This will take place on Wednesday morning.

Wednesday: Group III was in their third day with the high school students, discussing sex from as many points of view as possible. The students at the High School discussed the film and some other things pertaining to sex for the first hour or so of the morning. After the break, the clergymen arrived and led a discussion on the role of the Church with regard to sex. Each clergyman--Baptist, Presbyterian, Catholic--presented his views with relation to the Church, then the students directed questions to the three-man panel. The session actually progressed into a debate between the three representatives of the Church, which the students alertly perceived and called attention to when the gentlemen had left. The students proved very unruly for about the first thirty minutes of this presentation, a factor that tended to make the three guests quite uncomfortable. But they settled down after a while and became very interested and committed to the discussion. When asked why they did this, they said that it was to punish the members of Group III for their authoritarian approach in the teaching of this subject. They felt that the teachers had not been receptive to their suggestions, and had forced them to limit their investigation of the subject into a narrow channel. When the teachers heard this they were shocked, because they felt that their approach was very liberal and open-minded, and that they had covered the subject quite thoroughly. The lesson that they learned from this was indeed beneficial--often a teacher can feel that he is very successfully communicating with his students, while the students feel that the opposite is true, and often a teacher might feel that things aren't going well at all in his class, while the students' evaluation of the course is nothing short of excellent.

During the afternoon session an attempt was made to analyze what had occurred between the students and teachers of Group III. Some of the basic sociological concepts were utilized to help facilitate a sociological understanding of the situation. We looked at the authority structure of the group and attempted to integrate this structure with the norms and values that controlled it. Most of the teachers realized that they had somehow managed to stifle the students' attempts to direct their own search into the subject matter. At this time

the situation is somewhat confusing for both Group III and the high school students, but it would appear that much has been gained by the mistakes that have occurred thus far, which is analogous to the growth of individual personalities in many respects. It remains to be seen just what utility these conflicts have for those involved.

Thursday: This is the final day of the fourth week because of the three-day Fourth of July weekend. Group III concluded the unit on sex this morning. The Catholic priest that participated in the panel yesterday, returned this morning and presented the students with a "psychometric love test"--a test designed to measure one's capacity as a lover. He procured the test from Cosmopolitan magazine, and the validity of it is certainly questionable. But the students enjoyed taking it, and it did make one overriding point--a good lover is one who considers his partner first---a point that is worth emphasizing early in the child's life. During the afternoon session it was discovered that Group III was quite disappointed with their effort at the High School this week. It remains to be seen whether or not such an experience is beneficial or detrimental. Perhaps the mistakes that were made during the week will serve as lessons for the members of this group, and perhaps this is a better teacher than success. Actually, any generalizations concerning the effect of this total experience on the group are spurious, because the experience was different for each member, and any meaning that stems from it is limited to how the individual views and evaluates it. Each person must assess and give meaning to the experience within his own frame of reference, and what embitters and turns one person against the inquiry approach to teaching might serve as a source of positive motivation for another. One thing is certain; inquiry teaching, if done right, is not a situation in which the authoritarian personality will be at ease. The atmosphere is one of discovery and often confusion, and this might prove too unstructured for the individual who seeks to control and manipulate those around him.

Group IV will present their unit to the high school class next week. It looks like the topic will be taken from the Prentice-Hall book on Crime and Criminals.

It would seem that there was a peaking at the close of last week. The members were all less enthusiastic during the fourth week, and it might be accurate to say that interest is declining since the high point last week. Perhaps a second emotional peak will be attained during the final two weeks of the institute. If not, the remainder of the six-week session may prove to be a very difficult race to finish.

### Fifth Week

Monday: Group IV is the youngest of the five groups, with an average of twenty-four years. They introduced their unit to the students this morning by starting off with a sort of informal talk session in which the students made known their desires and

interests in dealing with the topic of crime. Perkins is again at the High School, while Selakovich is conducting the morning discussions at the University. Group IV had scheduled a tour of the county jail and the kids were very excited about the prospect of visiting this place and observing what goes on there. They also sat through the proceedings of three court cases. The deputy sheriff took them through the jailing area and seized this opportunity to preach the "law and order" doctrine to some potential converts. His name was "Junior," and the kids saw him mostly as a "joke."

During the afternoon session, some of the high school students came to the University to discuss their trip to the jail and courtroom with the teachers. Everyone involved at the High School this week felt that the trip was very informative and perhaps the most successful beginning for any unit presented thus far. This is interesting, considering the conflicting ideologies represented in this group. It will be interesting to observe the progression of this week at the High School, with the potential for conflict within this group.

Perkins has a guest speaker scheduled for the afternoon session tomorrow. Mr. John Williams, of the Oklahoma State University Department of Sociology, is going to speak to the members of the institute on "The Nature of the Rational."

Tuesday: Group IV scheduled the first half of the morning session at one of the nearby lakes. They met at the High School and loaded the students into three cars to transport them to the lake. They spent this time at the lake setting up a simulated society which focused on the law and criminal behavior. After about two hours of this they returned to the High School and spent the remainder of the morning discussing how one might become a criminal in an environment of discrimination and poverty. The students seem to be very interested in this subject, and they also seem to like the way things have been handled so far this week.

During the morning session at the University, Selakovich talked with those participants in attendance on the rational role of the teacher. This was a fitting introduction to the afternoon setting in which Williams spoke on "The Nature of the Rational" and its place in man's everyday life. You might say that for those who attended both the morning and afternoon sessions at the University, the day ended with a great deal of confusion. The main points in the morning and afternoon presentations could be seen as being diametrically opposite. Where Dr. Selakovich had emphasized the importance of utilizing the rational as an "objective" measure of truth, Mr. Williams had pointed out that the rational was only a tool to aid man in living his life to the fullest, and that "objectivity" from a purely rational point of view was not attainable. Some of the teachers were very impressed with Mr. Williams' presentation; others were not only unimpressed, but perhaps somewhat offended. But one thing is certain, whether impressed or not, being confronted with both sides of any issue serves to broaden one's perspective and tolerance, and I feel

that the majority of the teachers profited from the experience. Many of the participants were so impressed with what Mr. Williams was saying that they expressed a strong desire to have him return again before the institute is over.

A third social party has been scheduled for Thursday evening at Miss Kime's apartment.

Wednesday: For some reason, a trip was scheduled this morning to the city jail--apparently for comparison of what goes on in the county jail. Some confusion was present, and it seems the male members of the high school class cut out, leaving only the four girls to tour the jail. When they returned to the High School they attempted to discuss what they had seen, with mostly negative results. Finally they were able to get a good discussion started, which everyone felt was somewhat of a miracle with more teachers than students present.

During the afternoon session things seemed to drag by without evidence of interest or excitement. Most of the time was spent planning for the party tomorrow evening, with some discussion of the events that occurred at the jail this morning. One important occurrence concerned the distribution of grades for the institute participants. The staff made a special point early in the institute to de-emphasize grades and their importance for this institute, hoping that this would place a value on cooperation in activities during the summer weeks we were together. The participants were told that they would not have to worry about making a grade, and that they could concentrate their attention on things of their interest that had special meaning for them, because formal assignments would be limited. But even with this devaluation of grades, many of the participants could not bear the ambiguity of the situation. The value of stratifying by grade distribution is deeply embedded in the personality of a great majority of our society, and teachers are no exception. Their concern over grades when no concern was necessary, points to an issue in American education that is ubiquitous. Students coming through our educational system are achievement-oriented and highly competitive if they are successful. Their socialization process tends to place value on being a "winner," and for many who are not winners, their lives revolve around vicarious achievements and victories. We are much more concerned with the student's success in relation to some extrinsic goal than with the "unfolding" of his personality by inquiry and discovery of the world of which he is a part. Grades, it would seem, are valued over kindness, love, and good will--which says a great deal for the state of our society today.

Thursday: The morning session at both the High School and the University were somewhat uneventful, and things went pretty much as they had before.

The afternoon discussion centered around the topic of "justification" in education. Does the teacher have to justify what he does and see some functional purpose in what is

taught? Educational methodology is based upon justifying what techniques are best for certain purposes. It has a goal in mind, and a procedure for best attaining that goal. The issue is: Should education be a process whereby the student internalizes what he is told is "right," or should it be one in which he explores his environment with an understanding teacher whose main concern is with the "unfolding" of a unique personality, and who sees his role as one of friend and helper, not as an authority and disciplinarian? My prejudice shows through in my statement of the issue. They discussed this issue without drawing any definite conclusions concerning what might be the best approach.

The softball team plays again this afternoon, and the party is still to be held tonight at Miss Kime's house.

One noticeable thing concerning the leadership within the institute is the grouping factor. Since the most important contribution each participant makes to the functioning of the institute is made within the group in which he is a member, the leadership factor in this institute has tended to segregate its influence into the five separate groups, with a hierarchy of leadership emerging within each of the groups. Not that the members as a whole are completely without leadership, but this leadership tends to be fairly equally divided between those individuals that are also the key figures within their respective groups. Those individuals mentioned in an earlier statement concerning the leadership in the institute, i.e., Irvin Brown, Elijah Adair, Charlie Cobb, O. D. Bell, James Teel, and Wes Gulliksen, are representatives of four of the five groups in the institute. Millard House has recently been very influential in the discussions and also in the informal activities.

Friday: The party at Miss Kime's apartment was enjoyed by those who attended. By this time most of the participants in the institute look at each other as close friends, with the possible exception of six or seven members who have remained aloof.

Jim Morrow presented some pictures of the McAlester Prison to the high school students this morning. They enjoyed them very much and also the narration by Morrow, who had taken the slides personally on a specially authorized trip through the prison. The slides and discussion took about two hours of the morning, after a slow and somewhat hectic start. The students' evaluation of the week was quite positive. They had enjoyed most of the special activities, and felt that they learned a great deal from both the activities and the discussions.

During the afternoon session some of the students attended to assist in evaluating what had occurred during the week. One of the Black students said that he felt the session this morning with the slides was the best thus far. It was an opinion shared by most of those in attendance that the unit on crime and criminals was one of the most successful thus far. Next week Group V will present their unit on poverty.



## Sixth Week

Monday: Selakovich will be at the High School this week with Group V as they present their unit on poverty. Perkins will be at the University this week with the remainder of the institute participants. Johnson will be gathering data this week for the purpose of evaluating the institute. Part of this data will consist of personal interviews with each of the participants.

During the afternoon session, what occurred at the High School this morning was discussed. Mr. Bell was the leader of the group this morning, and he controlled most of the presentation. Group V has decided to have one person in charge of the presentation each day, with the remainder of the group acting as resources to be tapped if necessary. They will rotate the leadership position each day, giving each individual in the group an opportunity to make one major presentation during the week. They showed the film "Superfluous Peoples" this morning, which is an hour-long documentary of those categories of people in our society considered useless or without productive value, e.g., the Blacks, the old, the poor, etc. The discussion of this film centered around the question, "How can these people get out of the superfluous situation they find themselves in?" The students were very interested in this subject, and Bell utilized the techniques of inquiry to their fullest potential.

A dinner has been scheduled for Thursday evening at one of the restaurants in town, with a party at Johnson's following the dinner.

Tuesday: Group V appears to have learned a great deal from the experiences of the other four groups. They are conducting a well-organized inquiry into the issues of poverty, rotating the leadership responsibilities for each day's activities. This gives every member of the group the responsibility of controlling the presentation for at least one day of the week, and no one member is burdened with carrying the ball for all the others. This is the oldest age group in the institute, with an average age of about fifty years. Some of the students have commented that they enjoy the younger teachers more than the older ones, generally speaking. I suppose this is a testimony to the gap between age groups that grows greater as one progresses in age. At any rate, it seems that, for the most part, the inquiry approach to teaching, with the intrinsic value placed on meaning and relevance in the student's world, not on an external body of knowledge, is more easily accepted by those teachers who have not lost their idealistic approach to life--teachers relatively new to the "system."

One of the important factors concerning the structure of the institute is the fact that thirty-one of the thirty-three teachers will be employed in the Tulsa City School System in the Fall of 1970. Many of the important issues that have been dealt with in this institute indicate that changes are necessary in some areas, e.g., subject matter emphasis, curriculum structure, general philosophy of education, etc., if the present needs of our society are to be met. This

change will demand political action in some areas. There is a general consensus among the staff and participants of the institute that the sense of community stemming from this summer spent together could and should serve as a valuable aid in politically uniting the social studies teachers in this School System.

Wednesday: Group V continues to conduct a successful inquiry into the issue of poverty. They rotated leadership of the group for the third time today, concentrating on poverty and hunger in the world and its relation to the population problem. The students were very attentive and interested in this issue. During the afternoon session, an attempt was made to evaluate the progress at the High School thus far this week. For the most part, interest is waning at this point. The teachers find themselves in the process of mentally moving back to Tulsa. Most of them are looking forward to some rest and relaxation during the month of August. The plans for the party tomorrow night are progressing smoothly. This is an event planned without the advice or assistance of the staff. The teachers have some surprises in store for the staff, and they are going about the planning of this party in a very secretive manner. Everyone seems to be looking forward to this last get-together with each other. It should be a party to remember.

Thursday: The institute was completed for the most part today. Selakovich and Group V continued with the issue of poverty at the High School. Johnson led the discussion at the University this morning. The discussion centered around bringing together most of the concepts that had been used during the institute, and evaluating their utility as aids in understanding man's social environment. We looked at some of the issues within the framework of different sociological models. In many ways this session could be seen as the second and final peak of the institute. For many of the participants it was a time in which a great deal of synthesizing from the entire institute took place. It served as an opportunity to unite those issues and concepts that had been looked at separately until this time. In many ways this session served the same purpose that a final test would have served. It allowed the participants to bring together all they had learned and absorbed during the summer; to synthesize the separate parts into a whole with a different meaning for each individual in the institute.

During the afternoon session the teachers were given an opportunity to evaluate the institute in a written manner. Johnson administered the School Opinion Survey and one other measurement tool that called for a written response to the institute. Some attempt was made to orally evaluate the institute, but after the individual interviews and the written measurement today, most of the teachers were "burned out" on evaluation. Interest quickly changed to the prospects of tonight's party. Everyone was anxious about the event, and the teachers seemed to enjoy the fact that they had created an

uncertain situation for the staff members. At any rate, everyone is looking forward to the party and the informal session which could conceivably be an allnight affair.

Friday: Things were wrapped up early at the High School so that we could all meet at the University for good-byes that morning. The party at the Colony Club is one that everyone will remember for a long time. Some of the participants had worked up a beautiful presentation that I'm sure touched everyone, but it was most comforting and rewarding to the staff members. They included everyone in the program, but it was geared to let the staff know just how much the institute had meant to them. After the dinner and special program, everyone met at Johnson's house for some drinks and parting exchanges. This session lasted until about 3:00 A. M., and most of the participants wore the signs of lack of sleep on their faces this morning.

The conclusion of the institute was an occasion for tears and sorrow, as many of the staff and participants had grown very close to one another. Prospects of following up the institute with valuable changes in the Tulsa City School System led most of the participants to gear their emotions to the future which, if successful, could prove to be the most positive evaluation of the institute.

APPENDIX D

SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to determine the opinion of individuals with respect to a variety of factors that relate to how public schools operate. You may feel that you do not have adequate knowledge of all of the questions asked, but please answer all questions on the basis of the opinions you have formed at this time. Please mark your answers with a soft black pencil. If you change your mind about an answer after you have already marked it, be sure to erase your first answer completely.

Section One

In this section, read each item then blacken one of the 5 answer spaces to the left of that question. Blacken A if you Disagree Strongly, B if you Disagree (mildly), C if you are Uncertain, D if you Agree (mildly), or E if you Agree Strongly. For example, look at SAMPLE ITEM 0. If you chose C (Uncertain), your mark next to that item should look like this:

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) (●) ( ) ( )

0. Sample Item.

D  
i  
s  
a  
g  
r  
e  
e  
S  
t  
r  
o  
n  
g  
l  
y  
U  
n  
c  
e  
r  
t  
a  
i  
n  
A  
g  
r  
e  
e  
S  
t  
r  
o  
n  
g  
l  
y

A  
g  
r  
e  
e  
S  
t  
r  
o  
n  
g  
l  
y

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

1. The most important task of the school is to help children to understand the world in which they live.

- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|---|
| D   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| i   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| s   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| a   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| g   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| r   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| e   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| e   |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
|     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |   |
| S   | D   | U   |     |     |  |  |  |  | A |
| t   | i   | n   |     |     |  |  |  |  | g |
| r   | s   | c   |     |     |  |  |  |  | r |
| o   | a   | e   |     |     |  |  |  |  | e |
| n   | g   | r   | A   |     |  |  |  |  | e |
| g   | r   | t   | g   |     |  |  |  |  | e |
| l   | e   | a   | r   |     |  |  |  |  | e |
| y   | e   | i   | e   |     |  |  |  |  | e |
|     |     | n   | e   |     |  |  |  |  | e |
|     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  | e |
| A   | B   | C   | C   | E   |  |  |  |  |   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |   |
2. The individual desires and interests of students should in no way affect the construction of the curriculum.
  3. "Facts" are not fixed, but can change with the situation.
  4. Education is essentially a process in which the teacher helps the student realize his potential self.
  5. The power of judgment is by nature equal in all men.
  6. The objective scientific method is the best road to truth.
  7. The real value of the curriculum depends on changes it brings about in the behavior and lives of the students.
  8. Controversial issues should not be discussed in the classroom.
  9. Teachers should suggest problems and encourage pupils to find for themselves solutions which will work.
  10. The best discipline is for a child to be brought to realize the natural consequences of his behavior.
  11. The only objective of the school is intellectual development.
  12. Knowledge and truth are relative, not absolute.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|--|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |  |  |  |

- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| D   |     |     |     | A   |  |
| i   |     |     |     | g   |  |
| s   |     |     |     | r   |  |
| a   |     |     |     | e   |  |
| g   |     |     |     | e   |  |
| r   |     |     |     |     |  |
| e   |     |     |     |     |  |
|     |     | U   |     |     |  |
| S   | D   | n   |     | S   |  |
| t   | i   | c   |     | t   |  |
| r   | s   | e   | A   | r   |  |
| o   | a   | r   | g   | o   |  |
| n   | g   | t   | r   | n   |  |
| g   | r   | a   | r   | g   |  |
| l   | e   | i   | e   | l   |  |
| y   | e   | n   | e   | y   |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
13. An individual's feelings of adequacy about himself will be directly reflected in the effectiveness of his behavior.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
14. It is best to ignore feelings and let the facts speak for themselves.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
15. The main purpose of education is to turn out active people who DO things.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
16. Enjoyment of learning for the sake of learning is an important educational goal.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
17. Teachers need the right to administer corporal punishment to maintain discipline.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
18. Differences among human beings are usually superficial.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
19. Schools should teach, not just known facts, but ways to discover new facts.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
20. Teachers should concentrate on developing skills, especially critical thinking.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
21. It is not the teacher's job to determine guilt or give out punishment.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
22. The teacher should not have to be concerned about motivation.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
23. Facts change as new knowledge is developed.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
24. The teacher's primary job is to help each child achieve his own potential.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |

- |     |     |     |     |     |  |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|---|
| D   |     |     |     |     |  |   |
| i   |     |     |     |     |  |   |
| s   |     |     |     |     |  |   |
| a   |     |     |     |     |  |   |
| g   |     |     |     |     |  | A |
| r   |     |     |     |     |  | g |
| r   |     |     |     |     |  | r |
| e   |     |     |     |     |  | e |
| e   |     |     |     |     |  | e |
|     |     | U   |     |     |  |   |
| S   | D   | n   |     |     |  | S |
| t   | i   | c   |     |     |  | t |
| r   | s   | r   | A   |     |  | r |
| o   | a   | t   | g   |     |  | o |
| n   | g   | a   | r   |     |  | n |
| g   | r   | i   | r   |     |  | g |
| l   | e   | n   | e   |     |  | l |
| y   | e   | n   | e   |     |  | y |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |   |
25. Punishment seldom produces the educational results it is intended to produce.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
26. A child's interest in a subject is unrelated to how well he does it.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
27. There are really NO principles which are universal and unchanging.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
28. A good education is a broad education.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
29. A child's feelings have no bearing on his learning.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
30. The most important objective of education is to teach effective problem-solving skills.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
31. Schools exist primarily for the purpose of helping children realize their own individual potential.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
32. It is best not to make exceptions to the rules for individual cases.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
33. Truth is relative; it is never absolute.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |
34. Schools should give students more training in self-discipline.
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |  |  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |  |

## Section Two

In this section read each item and indicate by blackening one of the answer spaces what CHANGES, if any, you believe should be made to improve public education. Take number 1 (individual counseling of pupils), for example. If you believe there should be Much Less than now you should blacken A; if you believe there should be a Little Less than now you should blacken B; if you believe it should be Just the Same as now, blacken C; if a Little More than now, blacken D; and if Much More than now, blacken E.

M				M
u				u
c				c
h				h

L	L	S	M	M
e	e	a	o	o
s	s	m	r	r
s	s	e	e	e

- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 1. Individual counseling of pupils.    |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 2. Competitive sports.                 |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 3. Pay for administrators.             |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 4. Student government.                 |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 5. Hours spent in school.              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 6. Use of teaching machines.           |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 7. Strict enforcement of school rules. |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 8. Counseling on personal problems.    |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 9. Team sports.                        |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 10. Clerical help for teachers.        |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 11. Shop and crafts classes.           |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |



- |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| M |   |   |   | M |  |
| u |   |   |   | u |  |
| c |   |   |   | c |  |
| h |   |   |   | h |  |
| L | L | S | M | M |  |
| e | e | a | o | o |  |
| s | s | m | r | r |  |
| s | s | e | e | e |  |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 12. Weeks in the school year.              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 13. Personality testing.                   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 14. Strictness of discipline.              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 15. Attention to individuality of pupils.  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 16. Extracurricular activities.            |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 17. Pay for teachers.                      |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 18. Student organizations.                 |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 19. Emphasis on great literature.          |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 20. Use of I.Q. tests.                     |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 21. Spanking of misbehaving pupils.        |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 22. Interest by parents in school matters. |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 23. Time allotted to outdoor play.         |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 24. Help for emotionally disturbed pupils. |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 25. Books in library.                      |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 26. Longer class periods.                  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |  |

M  
u  
c  
h  
  
L L S M M  
e e a o o  
s s m r r  
s s e e e

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

27. Use of standardized tests.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

28. Stringent laws against truancy.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

29. Parent-teacher conferences.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

30. P.T.A. activities.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

31. Educational research.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

32. Methods courses for teachers.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

33. Free periods.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

34. State regulation of education.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

35. Teaching of morals in school.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

36. Orientation for parents of new pupils.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

37. Grading on the curve.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

38. School psychologists.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

39. Efforts to prevent school drop-outs.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

40. Individual attention for each pupil.

A B C D E  
( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )

41. Use of objective tests.

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| M |   |   |   |   | M |  |
| u |   |   |   |   | u |  |
| c |   |   |   |   | c |  |
| h |   |   |   |   | h |  |
| L | L | S | M | M |   |  |
| e | e | a | o | o |   |  |
| s | s | m | r | r |   |  |
| s | s | e | e | e |   |  |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 42. | Closer home-school relationships.                    |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 43. | Extent of counselor education                        |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 44. | Field trips.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 45. | Teaching of abstract ideas.                          |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 46. | Consumer education.                                  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 47. | Writing of themes.                                   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 48. | Child-study training.                                |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 49. | Encouragement of creativity.                         |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 50. | Co-educational physical education.                   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 51. | Large school districts.                              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 52. | Incidental expenses of education paid by the school. |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 53. | Emphasis on social studies.                          |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 54. | Free medical care of students.                       |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 55. | School social workers.                               |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | 56. | Group projects.                                      |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |     |  |

- |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| M |   |   |   | M |  |
| u |   |   |   | u |  |
| c |   |   |   | c |  |
| h |   |   |   | h |  |
| L | L | S | M | M |  |
| e | e | a | o | o |  |
| s | s | m | r | r |  |
| s | s | e | e | e |  |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                                     |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                                     |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 57. Summer school for acceleration. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                             |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                             |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 58. Lighting of classrooms. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                                     |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                                     |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 59. Group discussions with parents. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                    |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                    |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 60. Team teaching. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                              |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 61. Home visits by teachers. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                                      |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                                      |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 62. Autonomy of local school boards. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |   |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 63. Attention given to gifted children. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                                |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                                |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 64. Training in art and music. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                              |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                              |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 65. Foreign language course. |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |                            |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----------------------------|
| A   | B   | C   | D   | E   |                            |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 66. Stress on mathematics. |

## APPENDIX E

### SCHOOL OPINION SURVEY (Items Segregated by Factors)

#### I. Humanist

1. The most important task of the school is to help children to understand the world in which they live. (1)\*
2. Education is essentially a process in which the teacher helps the student realize his potential self. (4)
3. The real value of the curriculum depends on the changes it brings about in the behavior and lives of the students. (7)
4. The best discipline is for a child to be brought to realize the natural consequences of his behavior. (10)
5. An individual's feelings of adequacy about himself will be directly reflected in the effectiveness of his behavior. (13)
6. Enjoyment of learning for the sake of learning is an important educational goal. (16)
7. Teachers should concentrate on developing skills, especially critical thinking. (20)
8. The teacher's primary job is to help each child achieve his own potential. (24)
9. A good education is a broad education. (28)
10. Schools exist primarily for the purpose of helping children realize their own individual potential. (31)

#### II. Realist

1. The individual desires and interests of students should in no way affect the construction of the curriculum. (2)
2. The power of judgment is by nature equal in all men. (5)
3. Controversial issues should not be discussed in the classroom. (8)
4. The only objective of the school is intellectual development. (11)
5. It is best to ignore feelings and let the facts speak for themselves. (14)

---

\* Parenthesized numbers indicate items in Section One (Appendix D).

6. Differences among human beings are usually superficial. (18)
7. The teacher should not have to be concerned about motivation. (22)
8. A child's interest in a subject is unrelated to how well he does in it. (26)
9. A child's feelings have no bearing on his learning. (29)
10. It is best not to make exceptions to the rules for individual cases. (32)

### III. Experimentalist

1. "Facts" are not fixed, but can change with the situation. (3)
2. The objective-scientific method is the best road to truth. (6)
3. Teachers should suggest problems and encourage pupils to find for themselves solutions which will work. (9)
4. Knowledge and truth are relative, not absolute. (12)
5. The main purpose of education is to turn out active people who DO things. (15)
6. Schools should teach, not just known facts, but ways to discover new facts. (19)
7. Facts change as new knowledge is developed. (23)
8. There are really NO principles which are universal and unchanging. (27)
9. The most important objective of education is to teach effective problem-solving skills. (30)
10. Truth is relative; it is never absolute. (33)

### IV. Individual Attention

1. Individual counseling of pupils. [1] \*\*
2. Counseling on personal problems. [8]
3. Attention to individuality of pupils. [15]
4. Interest by parents in school matters. [22]
5. Parent-teacher conferences. [29]
6. Orientation for parents of new pupils. [36]
7. Extent of counselor education. [43]
8. Encouragement of creativity. [49]
9. School social workers. [55]
10. Home visits by teachers. [61]

### V. Group Activities

1. Competitive sports. [2]
2. Team sports. [9]

\*\* Bracketed numbers indicate items from Section Two (Appendix D).

3. Extracurricular activities. [16]
4. Time allotted to outdoor play. [23]
5. P.T.A. activities. [30]
5. Grading on the curve. [37]
7. Field trips. [44]
8. Co-educational physical education. [50]
9. Group projects. [56]
10. Autonomy of local school boards. [62]

#### VI. Professionalization

1. Pay for administrators. [3]
2. Clerical help for teachers. [10]
3. Pay for teachers. [17]
4. Help for emotionally disturbed pupils. [24]
5. Educational research. [37]
6. School psychologists. [38]
7. Teaching of abstract ideas. [45]
8. Large school districts. [51]
9. Summer school for acceleration. [57]
10. Attention given to gifted children. [63]

#### VII. Non-Academic

1. Student government. [4]
2. Shop and crafts classes. [11]
3. Student organizations. [18]
4. Books in library. [25]
5. Methods courses for teachers. [32]
6. Efforts to prevent school drop-outs. [39]
7. Consumer education. [46]
8. Incidental expenses of education paid by the school. [52]
9. Lighting of classrooms. [58]
10. Training in art and music. [64]

#### VIII. Academic Discipline

1. Hours spent in school. [8]
2. Weeks in the school year. [12]
3. Emphasis on great literature. [19]
4. Longer class periods. [26]
5. Free periods. [33] (-)
6. Individual attention for each pupil. [40]
7. Writing of themes. [47]
8. Emphasis on social studies. [53]
9. Group discussions with parents. [59]
10. Foreign language course. [65]

---

(-) Indicates scale reversal.

IX. Scientific Objectivity

1. Use of teaching machines. [6]
2. Personality testing. [13]
3. Use of I.Q. tests. [20]
4. Use of standardized tests. [27]
5. State regulation of education. [34]
6. Use of objective tests. [41]
7. Child-study training. [48]
8. Free medical care for students. [54]
9. Team teaching. [60]
10. Stress on mathematics. [66]

X. Strict Control

1. Teachers need the right to administer corporal punishment to maintain discipline. [7]
2. It is not the teacher's job to determine guilt or give out punishment. [21]
3. Punishment seldom produces the educational results it is intended to produce. [25]
4. Schools should give students more training in self-discipline. [34]
5. Strict enforcement of school rules. [7]
6. Strictness of discipline. [14]
7. Spanking of misbehaving pupils. [21]
8. Stringent laws against truancy. [28]
9. Teaching of morals in school. [35]
10. Closer home-school relationships. [42]



APPENDIX F

EVALUATION OF THE NSF INSTITUTE IN SOCIOLOGY

The following is a list of items representing areas of emphasis within the institute. Please rate these items according to the value they have had for you personally.

- |   |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| V |   |   |   | V |  |
| e |   | A |   | e |  |
| r |   | v |   | r |  |
| y |   | e |   | y |  |
| L | L | a | H | H |  |
| o | o | g | g | g |  |
| w | w | e | h | h |  |
- 
- |     |     |     |     |     |  |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|--|
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 1. The SRSS materials.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 2. The Prentice-Hall materials.  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 3. The utility of having an experimental high school class in an institute of this sort.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 4. The inquiry-centered problems approach to teaching.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 5. The concepts and methods of sociology.  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 6. The fellowship of the teachers and staff during the six-week period.  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 7. The morning discussion session.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 8. The afternoon evaluation sessions.  |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 9. The limited structure, i.e., assignments, tests, term papers, etc., of the institute.   |
| ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | 10. The supplementary gains from being chosen to participate in this institute, i.e., eight hours graduate credit, free tuition and books, \$75 per week, etc. |

Using the remainder of this sheet and the blank one attached, please evaluate the institute in your own terms.

## APPENDIX G

### TEACHING PHILOSOPHY AND GENERAL EDUCATION IN SOCIOLOGY

Larry M. Perkins  
April, 1970

I have never set down on paper my convictions about teaching, partly because I am not sure I have ever analyzed them. My teaching philosophy has a good deal of MYTHOS about it, because teaching is a mystery to me. This present effort will be an effort at putting my teaching understandings over into the area of LOGOS, i.e., self-analysis.

In my seven years of college teaching I have had to "force" myself to get out from behind the data and concepts, and interact with students. It is easy for me to interact with concepts and let students fit themselves into this kind of dialogue as best they can. Many students like to have this kind of structure, since the content emphasis approach protects the student's facade as well as my own. There is no denying the fact that some students can do quite well with a content emphasis theme, and appreciate this approach to learning. However, I am unable to teach consistently with this approach, since the "social cost" is very high, I think, for most people in this kind of class. The "social costs" consist of indifference, alienation, system-beating, object manipulation, grade emphasis, dishonesty--in a word, "character erosion."

I would like to think that I approach each class as an opportunity

for me to join with a group of students in enlarging our understandings about a subject area as well as develop an appreciation of ourselves and others. I usually raise a question related to reading material we are dealing with. I make every effort to find questions that are beyond my comprehension to answer. I once heard a college student say "Don't raise false questions with me. If you know the answer to a question, then give me the answer and let's get to the questions where there are no answers. In other words, let's not play cat and mouse games." I don't deny that answers are available, but they cannot be held tightly since they are only temporary, short-run explanations. I have noticed that class discussions generally provide a variety of explanations as well as new issues for discussion. Sometimes I give my interpretive preferences, but no student (I like to think) is duty-bound to accept my explanation. As you might guess, the questions that I raise in class have a heavy emphasis on value issues. I have noticed that during a discussion I tend to ask various people, who give every indication of being involved in the discussion, "What do you think?" or "Do you agree with that?"

A question I raised with an urban sociology class today might give some hint as to what occurs in class. I asked, "What does it mean to live life in an environment built to human scale?" I suggested we might examine the "human scale" issue in education, religion, the city, transportation, etc. I honestly have no answers to this question. I have some ideas, but they are my personal observations, and not "pat" answers. Mumford (assigned reading) speaks of human scale but without providing concrete examples.

I have had many students say they come out of my class so

intellectually stimulated that they nearly "croak" when they move the next hour into a lecture-type course. I have also had some students say (courageously) they get nothing out of a discussion or the whole course.

I refuse to believe in the oft-mentioned contention that many class discussions are a "pooling of ignorance" or always end up in bull sessions. My dictum is - a view or opinion honestly expressed is valid and welcome. A student who seeks to contribute without convictions or belief will be exposed, if I have my way. A student who gives me textbook definitions devoid of understanding is indeed in a sorry state of affairs. There is no subject-matter, be it history, sociology, mathematics, or chemistry, that is worthy of being learned without understanding. I take understanding to mean that knowledge should have relevance (not necessarily utility) for the student. If he does not find meaning in the material, then he should not be penalized. My exams generally consist of broad-based essay questions. I ask the student to (1) structure the question, (2) bring knowledge (data) to bear if he thinks it important to him, and (3) his personal synthesis (understanding) of the question. In the student vernacular, I am looking for good human vibrations. I penalize hypocrisy and fraud. The student who runs amok and goes rational on me will not get an A (probably a B or C, depending on how serious it is). A student who writes reams without conviction can get a C or a D. I am mindful that some students have great skill with words, but it is difficult to fake feelings over two or three exams. I am looking for an integrated essay logically ordered, with data or experience built into it and a strong measure of understanding. I make numerous comments on the exam to point up to the

student (and me) his insights and honesty. Exams are a moral issue. Very few students (four or five in 2½ years of this kind of testing) have disputed the grade received. Why? I'm not sure. I'm heavy on the A and B, with a few C's and D's. I do my best to be honest and accepting of the student's attempt at communicating with me. A student who writes with conviction will probably fare well.

To say that when a student completes this course he should be at "this level" of knowledge accumulation or skill is but a statute of limitations. I view it as a fallacy to assume that uniformity in performance criteria is the goal of education. Well, what should a student get out of a class such as urban sociology? I think the student will have to determine that for himself. As a behavioral objective I would like to think that each student discovers or acquires more understanding and meaning for his personal life as he relates to the urban environment. If a student wants to become a technical expert on urban planning, my course will give the foundation or base support. He will have to acquire the necessary expertise in his own fashion: a specialized reading course would probably be useful for this purpose.

I have discovered that a curious thing happens to my judgment of a good or bad class (a specific class session as well as an entire semester course) contrasted with the student's evaluation. When I think we have had a good session (course) it generally means that I had the class initiative under my control. When the initiative is with the students, they think the class (or course) was good. Terribly confusing to me personally! I am more concerned with the student's evaluation of a class since there are more of them than me.

For this kind of class to succeed demands a strong measure of good

will on the part of all of us in the room. We have to trust each other. Also, we have to work at discussion, it just does not happen on a day-to-day basis. Some days are completely disastrous for all of us. These occasions are so painful to me personally that I usually go completely neurotic until I meet the class again and work out of it. Some classes have a high level of conflict as issues polarize. I have discovered that I tend to resort to humor as a way of helping (me) us maintain our good will for one another.

Formal pedagogy is in a deplorable state of affairs given the heavy demands made on formal education as a form of secular salvation. Teachers refuse to believe that they cannot "deliver" when parents and students support formal education. My teaching approach has gaping holes in it (in the structure and actual functioning). Based on my experience and best judgment, teaching as the work of a trained expert is no longer adequate. Teaching and learning are difficult to program on an 8 A. M. to 5 P. M. basis when motivation and interests are mercurial on the part of students and myself.

In the classroom I represent many things to the students: friend, adult, teacher with authority, teacher with knowledge, representative of the State of Oklahoma, a parent. I am all of these things, and more. I try to go beyond these role designations and represent a fellow human being searching for a new meaning synthesis. If I seek an industrial evaluation of this kind of teaching, I suppose the best that could be said is that I am inefficient and wasteful of a student's valuable time. I continue to view teaching as a desperate act. If all students commenced thinking on an issue at once the classroom would not contain us. On occasion this has happened to me, and it is generally frightening.

All of the above may be coherent, or confused and irrational. I make no apologies, since most of life is lived with the rational, irrational, and nonrational.

### Course Objectives for a High School Introductory Sociology Course

Note: These objectives are at the heart of what I consider to be general education.

The most that can be said for course objectives is that they are guesses or possibilities in the area of student attainment. More than likely none of the listed objectives will occur, and yet the course could very well succeed beyond any student or teacher expectations (or fail).

I note that the following objectives tend to be normative statements:

1. Students should come away from the course with increased sensitivity to who they are in relation to: (1) other members of the class; (2) their parents; (3) school environment; (4) peer groups; (5) the adult world.
2. Students should understand and value their own "experiencing" and that of others.
3. The student-teacher classroom climate should be supportive of discussion, whether it be in the area of: (1) racial beliefs; (2) religious beliefs; (3) sexual understandings; or any other area of shared interest.

8  
VITA

William A. Johnson, Jr.

Candidate for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: MEASUREMENT OF TEACHER ATTITUDES IN RELATION TO THE "NEW CRITICISM" IN AMERICAN EDUCATION: AN ANALYSIS OF A SIX-WEEK INSTITUTE IN SOCIOLOGY

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Muskogee, Oklahoma, December 18, 1942, the son of William and Helen Johnson.

Education: Graduated from Central High School, Muskogee, Oklahoma, in 1960; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Northeastern State College, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, with a double major in Sociology and Psychology, in May, 1967; received the Master of Science degree from Kansas State College of Pittsburg, with a major in Sociology, in August, 1968; completed requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in May, 1972.

Professional Experience: Graduate Teaching Associate, Department of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, September, 1968 - December, 1970; National Science Foundation Fellowship, Oklahoma State University, July, 1970 - June, 1971; Instructor of Sociology, Oklahoma State University, January, 1971 - May, 1971; Assistant Professor of Sociology, Central State University, Edmond, Oklahoma, June, 1971 to present.

Professional Organizations: American Sociological Association, Southwestern Sociological Association.