

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 034


SO 005 410

AUTHOR Gillespie, Judith A.  
TITLE Social Science Education Consortium Newsletter.  
Number 14.  
INSTITUTION Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., Boulder,  
Colo.  
SPONS AGENCY National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.  
PUB DATE Nov 72  
NOTE 12p.  
AVAILABLE FROM Social Science Education Consortium, 855 Broadway,  
Boulder, Colorado 80302 (Single copies free, quantity  
orders \$.20)

EEDS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Civics; \*Educational Innovation; Educational  
Practice; \*Educational Trends; Learning Laboratories;  
\*Newsletters; Projects; \*Social Studies  
IDENTIFIERS \*High School Political Science Curriculum Project

## ABSTRACT

A lead article, Instructional Uses of School Political Experiences, written by Judith A. Gillespie, describes the High School Political Science Curriculum Project, the materials for which are in the early developmental stages. As has been explained in SO 005 407 and SO 005 409, the approach utilizes the school as a political laboratory. An effort is made in the project to integrate political knowledge with actual experiences. Other inclusions in the newsletter are: 1) announcement of the new SSEC Directors, Teacher Associates and new Director of ERIC/ChESS; 2) announcement of new social studies materials; 3) discussions of the SSEC Task Forces on Consultation, Dissemination, Publications, Teacher Education, and Trends in Social Science and Education; 4) a summary of the preliminary survey of the international/intercultural dimension in general education undertaken by SSEC; 5) a brief description of "Profiles of Promise," brochures on innovative social studies practices, and a list of criteria used in selecting practices for publication; 6) a report of sites selected for 1972/73 SSEC Teacher Educator Workshops; and 7) a summary of the November 1972 issue of "Social Education." (SJM)



Social Science Education Consortium

# NEWSLETTER

NUMBER 14

Supported by the National Science Foundation

NOVEMBER 1972

## INSTRUCTIONAL USES OF SCHOOL POLITICAL EXPERIENCES

Judith A. Gillespie

*Judith A. Gillespie is co-director, with Howard D. Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, of the High School Political Science Curriculum Project at the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University. The project is part of the American Political Science Association's Political Science Courses Content Improvement Project for Elementary and Secondary Schools, which is sponsored by the APSA Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education and supported by the National Science Foundation. The materials are presently in the early developmental stages. They will be piloted in selected schools next year. A more complete explanation of the high school political laboratory will be made available in an occasional paper to be published this winter by the Social Studies Development Center, which may be obtained upon request by writing to the Center at 1129 Atwater, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.*

*Acknowledgment is due Karen Wiley, Consortium Staff Associate, for her thoughtful and extensive assistance in the preparation of this article.*

In an effort to make high school civics instruction more effective and meaningful, the High School Political Science Curriculum Project is currently developing a curriculum package which utilizes the school itself as a political laboratory. In the materials, the school is viewed as a micro-political system operating under fundamental principles of political behavior common to any political system. Using these principles to guide them, students observe and analyze school political life as well as put their political knowledge to work by participating in the school's ongoing political system. In the process, the principles themselves are tested and the students' understanding of political principles and action is deepened and refined.

### Integrating Classroom and Extraclassroom Experiences

As has been explained elsewhere,<sup>1</sup> the political laboratory approach provides maximum opportunity to systematically and explicitly integrate knowledge and inquiry skills acquired in the classroom with extraclassroom student experience. But why should such a systematic and explicit integration be necessary? The reason is related to what has traditionally been considered one of the prime goals of the schools—to develop effective and responsible citizens.

Many civic educators have long assumed that effective citizenship behavior is ensured if classroom instruction is designed using the best available principles and facts and the most effective classroom teaching methods. Under this assumption, classroom learning "automatically" leads to better informed, more able participation by students as they grow into fully participating adult citizens. Yet, others have argued that what is taught in the schools is irrelevant, abstract knowledge that has no meaning for real-life situations. Forcing the student to sit through an hour of civics

instruction every day—in fact "stealing" valuable time from him in which he might be learning from his own experiences out in the world. Experience itself is the best teacher, upon which the schools cannot improve, and thus the schools would do well to free the student for considerable periods of time to explore real-world experiences in the community in which he lives.

The assumption on which the political laboratory is built is that transfer is neither a natural, "automatic" process, nor one that is effective if it is disjointed from classroom instruction. The major premise is that formal civics instruction can increase the efficiency of experiential learning, can give such learning greater power, and can broaden its scope and boundaries greatly. It can do this by helping the student to sort out his experiences, helping him to make comparisons among his own experiences and between his own experiences and those of others (both historically and contemporarily), and helping him to structure and systematize his observations and generalize from them. But in order to do this, civics instruction itself must explicitly bridge the gap between the abstract systematizing, structuring frameworks presented in the classroom and the frequently random, complex experiences of the student outside the classroom.

Creating a bridge between political principles and participation experiences is not so easily accomplished if instruction remains confined to the classroom alone or if students are sent out into the community to participate in action programs with little guidance. The range and variety of participation experiences in which students can engage inside the classroom are limited. On the other hand, the opportunities in the community at large for student participation are usually so diverse and uncontrollable and are embedded in such a complex environment that the matching of principles learned in the classroom with participation experiences out-

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 073034

SP 00 540



side the classroom becomes extremely difficult.

Using the school itself as a political laboratory has advantages that other alternatives do not have. First, schools can provide a type of control over the match between political principles and participation experiences which neither community nor classroom activities can ensure. Schools provide both a wide variety of experiences and controlled conditions under which students can be systematically prepared for participation and given maximum evaluation of their performance. Secondly, schools can provide a continuity of participation experience which cannot be duplicated in community or simulated classroom efforts. In the well-defined instructional setting of the school, participation experiences can be linked on a long-term basis and skills and experiences can be sequenced in such a way that students develop habits of participation which have maximum likelihood of transfer to other settings. In these ways, schools can be used so that classroom learning is bolstered, modified, refined, and deepened, while complex experiences are sorted out, related and compared, and made more understandable. School political experiences can thus act as bridges for integrating classroom and extraclassroom experiences.

### The School as a Political System

Providing the match between classroom knowledge and political experience in the school requires at least three elements: a framework for looking at political life which will provide content and structural linkages for the match; identifiable school political experiences in which instruction can take place, and instructional methods which can maximize learning and transfer. Surely, none of the latter elements are effective unless the first can be carefully established. Unless schools can successfully be treated as political systems in their own right, the laboratory does not make sense.

Many have long argued that schools are not political places. This is difficult to accept, for if a key part of politics is making authoritative decisions that allocate valued objects, then certainly state legislatures, school boards, principals, and teachers will make such decisions of varying degrees of import for the running of the school system. The decisions of the superintendent, for example, are a result of the interplay of pressures from many groups of varying interests, all of which influence the final policy that governs the school system. Other types of experiences also come to mind. School participation is often political, for students advocate policies such as a new dress code, teachers unionize and at times strike for higher salaries, or corporations compete for school contracts. Certainly all of these types of activities are common experiences in the political life of schools.

These types of political involvement are more systematically documented by a great many sources. Nunnery and Kimbrough, for example, demonstrate just how political the role of the principal can be in regard to school elections.<sup>2</sup> Hamon Zeigler's study demonstrates how teachers' political attitudes and participation in educational politics can be explained by key background and school environment variables.<sup>3</sup> Neal Gross' study of superintendents and boards of education demonstrates how group pressures affect policy decisions and the role of principals, teachers, and parents in school politics.<sup>4</sup> Thus there seems little reason to doubt that schools are, indeed, political places.

### A Conceptual Framework

Yet to construct a meaningful course of study, more than a list of random political events needs to be developed. What is needed is a political framework that will promote conceptual and structural integration for the program and aid in the identification of school political experiences which can be used as instructional settings. The purpose that such a framework serves is well illustrated by Barker and Gump:

"If a novice, an Englishman, for example, wished to understand the environment of a first baseman in a ball game, he might set about to observe the interactions of the player with his surroundings. To do this with utmost precision he might view the first baseman through field glasses, so focused that the player would be centered in the field of the glasses, with just enough of the environment included to encompass all his contacts with the environment, all inputs and outputs: all balls caught, balls thrown, players tagged, etc. Despite the commendable observational care, however, this method would never provide meaning to a first baseman's transactions with his surroundings, and which in fact, constitutes the environment of his baseball playing behavior. By observing a player in this way, the novice would, in fact, fragment the game and destroy what he was seeking . . . he could never arrive at the phenomenon known as a baseball game by this means. . . . It would seem clear that a novice would learn more about the ecological environment of a first baseman by blotting out the player and observing the game around him."<sup>5</sup>

What is needed, according to the baseball analogy, is a way of looking at the politics of the school, the community, even the nation, that will blot out the individual players so that the rules and patterns of player interaction can be understood. This is important because we are less interested in what a specific actor in a specific leadership position does than we are in making sense out of the "game" of politics. We want to know what the *patterns* of leadership or decision-making are in order to determine the rules of the game. We also want to know how different patterns weave together to make the fabric of politics, to see why political systems change or are in conflict or stay the same. We want to know how the game turns out under different rules—whether systems or particular groups within them "win," or "lose," or "draw." To do this some type of overview or framework needs to be created which will provide an understanding of the school political system as a whole and make comparison with other political systems possible.

Such a framework should include the experiences that are common to every political system, whether that system is the school, community, or the nation-state. In all of these systems, individuals feel the impact of four fundamental political experiences—political change, political maintenance, political development, and political conflict. These four concepts can serve as organizers for a study of any political system. The framework is filled out by introducing political concepts that aid in explaining these four common experiences. These concepts include political values, such as political influence, political resources, and political ideology, as well as political activities such as political leadership, political participation, political communication, and political decision-making. The relationships among these concepts are diagrammed in Figure 1, A Framework for Viewing School Politics.

*Fundamental Political Experiences.* The four fundamental




FIGURE 1.

### A FRAMEWORK FOR VIEWING SCHOOL POLITICS

political experiences, shown on the right hand side of the diagram, are the basic kinds of experiences that the political system as a whole may undergo. These overall, systemic experiences are explained by the interactions of political values and political activities.

*Political change* is defined as an undirected difference in systemic patterns of values and activities over time. A shift in school policy from allocating money for new physical facilities to allocating money for new curriculum materials would be an example of political change, just as a shift in national policy from budgetary emphasis on the war in Vietnam to increased allocations for urban pollution research would exemplify political change on the national level.

Changes such as these demonstrably affect the lives of citizens in the school or national political system. Yet, at the same time, people are also influenced by unchanging aspects of the political system—the rules or decisions maintained by it—as they act in accordance with laws and regulations. *Political maintenance* is defined as a similarity in systemic patterns of values and activities over time. A rule about dress codes or graduation credits can affect participants in the school political system just as laws about school integration or voting affect every citizen.

People are also involved in the experience of *political development* in schools as in other political systems. Political development is defined as a *directed* difference in systemic pattern of values and activities over time. Development is similar to change, yet it includes only those differences which accumulate in the same direction over an extended period of time. For example, increases in diverse student representation in student activities which promote the formation of new decision-making groups in schools is a type of political development pattern. An example of political development on the national scene might be the development of a third party movement in which, first, a two-party system experiences an extension of the franchise, then a third party is born, and finally that party begins to take on leadership positions in the government. In both cases, development involves an increase over time in the activity of political participation.

Finally, *political conflict* is also an experience common in

schools as well as in state, local, national, and international levels of politics. Political conflict is defined as a set of multi-directed, competing differences in systemic patterns of values and activities over time. For instance, a change in student governing power in a school that brings to the surface more rightist and more leftist ideologies is a case of polarization typical of a conflict pattern. Similar cases occur when changes in national leadership polarize representatives' or electorate's positions.

*Political Values and Political Activities.* The four fundamental political experiences may be viewed as the products of the relationships between political values and political activities as illustrated in Figure 1. These relationships constitute the essential foci of any study which hopes to lead to an understanding of political experiences.

The analytical breakdown of the concept *political values* proposed for this framework includes three categories of political values: political ideology, political resources, and political influence. These political values are pictured in the lower box in the diagram.

*Political ideology* is defined as a set of beliefs about the principles, programs, and actions governing individual and group behavior in politics.<sup>6</sup> All participants in a system have a whole set of ideas about the system. They have ideas about what the system should accomplish and how those goals should be accomplished. These ideas constitute the participants' political ideologies. Few ideologies are highly articulated, but students, teachers, and administrators often have strong views on school governance, such as the nature of appropriate goals and rules under which schools should operate. As a value pattern of the political system, the substance and the range of these beliefs is important. They set limits on the political behavior of actors in a particular system.

Both political influence and political resources are valued by participants in a political system by virtue of the fact that they wish to see their political ideologies implemented. *Political influence* is defined as the set of deference relationships maintained between individuals or groups which affect the allocation of valued objects in a political system.<sup>7</sup> Influence patterns can be hierarchical or pluralistic, each type

having a strong affect on who makes decisions and has the power to get things done. Surely, it is because influence is hierarchical in many school administrations and because others value that influence held by the few that administrators are criticized as authoritarian. Student organizations, too, have many of these influence patterns.

*Political resources* are defined as the material, information, and skill means held by individuals or groups that affect the allocation of valued objects in a political system. These resources determine how decisions will be implemented. As a value pattern of the political system, the kinds and distribution of these means are important. The distribution is determined by defining who holds these resources, and who receives resources allocated by political decisions. In the school setting, a wide variety of political resources are available. In addition to money, many individuals possess knowledge about what is going on in the school or special skills in getting along with others that support their roles within the political process.

*Political activities* may be analyzed into four components—communication, participation, leadership, and decision-making. These are diagrammed in Figure 1 in the upper and middle boxes.

*Political communication* activities are those through which information is transmitted in a political system. As a system characteristic, the focus of the concept is on the network of formal and informal communication lines among political actors.<sup>8</sup> Political actions depend upon the structure of the communication system available for leaders to assert policies and for followers to voice support or discontent. In schools, multiple levels of communication media, such as newspapers, memoranda, peer-group interactions, and messages transmitted over the loudspeaker system can be captured by this concept.

*Political participation*, a second kind of political activity, can be defined as those political activities through which interests are organized in a political system.<sup>9</sup> As an activity pattern, participation can be viewed in terms of the kinds and amounts of participation open to a population and undertaken by it. Here, the emphasis is on action as distinguished from information. Organized political activities in schools range from rallies to club meetings, school board meetings to problem-solving groups.

*Political leadership* is defined as those political activities through which influence is exercised in a political system.<sup>10</sup> Leadership can be exercised by use of force, charisma, authority, or wealth. Each of these aspects of political leadership are commonly found in the school setting. Student leaders as well as the principal certainly exercise influence in each of these ways in most schools.

*Political decision-making*, illustrated in the center box of Figure 1, is considered a fourth kind of political activity. Political decision-making is defined as those political activities through which choices are made between alternative courses of action in a political system. Decision-making is a central activity in the political system in which political values and other political activities interact to produce authoritative allocations of valued objects. In schools, decision-making is an everyday activity evidenced in both administrative and student settings.

In Figure 1, decision-making is illustrated as a four-step process. First, information is put into the system. This information is converted into sets of alternative courses of action (or non-action, as the case may be). Then choices are

made from among the alternatives. Finally, the implementation of the choices, or decisions, leads to outcomes—specific allocations of valued objects. These outcomes may signal a change for the system, maintain its current status, push it in one or another developmental direction, or stimulate conflict. The single outcomes themselves from the decision-making process are not the same, however, as the fundamental political experiences. It is, rather, the accumulation of outcomes which builds those experiences.

### Relationships Among the Concepts

This framework can aid in the understanding of school, as well as other political systems. It is important to note that it is not the concepts alone contained in the framework that are important for an understanding of political systems. The concepts are only a starting point. Once they are understood, we must go on to study the *relationships* among the concepts—how they interact with each other and affect each other. The relationships among the concepts must be the primary focus of the study of political systems for it is the relationships that enable us to answer the fundamental questions about how valued things are authoritatively allocated for a society and how the fundamental political experiences come about. For instance, within the focus of the framework, we shall be interested in determining how changes in leadership can bring about political conflict or how changes in political participation can help to maintain behavior patterns in the school political system. The answers to these questions can only come from an examination of the interaction of political values and political activities.

The framework outlined above provides a way of looking at school politics which is based on common political experiences and from which we can gain a coherent idea of how the game of politics in schools is played. Furthermore, it gives us a basis for making comparisons with different levels of the American system as well as with other national systems themselves. By viewing school politics in this way, the school political laboratory can provide a basis for studying politics through the matching of school political participation experiences of students with useful concepts and principles applicable to other political experiences and systems.

### Instructional Activities

Within the dimensions of the conceptual framework and of the political experiences available in the school, a surprising variety of school-based political activities can be devised. These activities match ideas in the framework with specific political observation, analysis, and participation experiences in the school.

Three kinds of instructional activities are used to promote the interaction of student experience with the framework. The first kind is knowledge-building activity, including the learning and reinforcement of new political ideas and data. The second is skill-building activity, including the learning of analytical, methodological, and participatory skills useful in organizing and analyzing data as well as in promoting effective political participation. The third is participation activity, including the provision of participation experiences on a regularized basis so that the students come to participate habitually in political activity. None of these objectives can be achieved through any one of the three general categories of activities alone. The activities are designed to be part of an integrated program and sequenced to facilitate steps in the learning process.

An example of the way in which the political laboratory approach can combine knowledge-building, skill-building, and participation activities to promote fruitful learning is a series of activities dealing with the importance of information in political decision-making.

Students begin by studying part of a unit on political decision-making in which relationships are drawn between communication and decision-making. They draw generalizations about these relationships and test some of them in the school setting.

Their first activity is a skill-building activity concerning collection of data through participant observation. They read about skills of participant observation and discuss fruitful ways to conduct such activities in the school setting. Students then enter into several groups' meetings in the school in order to try out this skill. Their efforts are then evaluated.

Students then undertake a knowledge-building activity designed to aid them in testing their hypotheses about the relationship between communication and decision-making. The students begin this activity by choosing three different student organizations which meet the following criteria: (1) at least one student in the class is a member of the group; (2) the organization's decision-makers meet frequently; (3) the decision rules by which issues are decided are the same (e.g., majority vote for each group); and (4) the composition of the decision-making group is similar for each organization (e.g., if one group has a major split on most policy issues, so should the others). Student organizations which might be selected include the language club, the school newspaper staff, the math club, the environmental club, and student government organizations.

Next, the students review the issues which each group considers important enough to make a policy decision about. For each group, the class chooses one issue on which to focus. The issue chosen for each organization must have at least three possible alternative solutions.

A student or group of students from the class attends each group's meetings. One of the three organizations serves as a control group. Students from the class who are normally members of this group introduce a policy issue and then let the group discuss the alternatives in its normal way, uninterrupted by inputs from the student observer(s). Student observers keep notes on how alternatives are discussed and the resolution of the issue on forms prepared for this purpose. They continue to attend the group's meetings until the issue is resolved. This probably takes no more than three meetings.

The other two organizations serve as experimental groups. One is a test case for the difference made in the decision-making process by information produced in support of a single alternative. Students from the class who are members of this organization research one alternative presented in the group's discussion of a policy issue and bring as much information in support of that position to the meetings as possible. Student observers take notes on how the amount and types of information presented affect the decision-making process.

Students who are members of the third organization attend its meetings. In this case, they choose two alternatives to research and argue for, some of the students concentrating on one alternative, the rest on the other. These students, too, take notes on the effects of this alternative information pattern on the decision-making process of this third group.

After these data have been gathered, the class meets as a

group to compare observations and make generalizations about the influence of information on the decision-making process. Students then begin actual participation activities. Some members of the class decide on some long-run project in decision-making in which they can be active participants. They will use these long-range activities to develop effective participant roles based on their findings about decision-making. These students will be trained in decision-making skills and use those skills on a long-run basis. They will report to the class on their observations, successes, and failures in participating in the decision-making process.

## Conclusion

Using the school as a political laboratory by developing and implementing activities such as the one described above would fulfill meaningful objectives for civics and government instruction. The activities included in the lab are being designed to form an integrated program for reinforcing classroom learning and using political knowledge in effective political participation.

As an alternative way to study politics and government in high schools, the political laboratory approach breaks with some familiar assumptions about schools. The school is normally viewed as a series of classrooms, open or closed, in which subjects such as civics are taught. The lab transforms the image of the school as a building composed of classrooms into one of a dynamic social and political unit which transcends internal physical boundaries. In this way the gate is pushed open for study and experience in a dynamic political system. Actually, the lab is built on the assumption that this "new" way to look at schools is closer than other alternatives to the way students have normally seen the school setting. As Coleman has indicated, peer group activities have always been of key importance to student attitudes and behavior in schools.<sup>11</sup> Because the lab focuses on the students' own individual and group experience within schools, it should provide a more readily understandable framework for meaningful learning of new ideas than other alternatives.

The lab also breaks with some standard assumptions about civics instruction. In most civics classrooms, student learning is normally reinforced and transfer is attempted through case studies and verbal examples. Rarely is the student required to transfer knowledge directly into a practical everyday political situation. At the other extreme, most community participation activities conducted in civics courses are not systematically related to formal classroom instruction. In both cases the control which promotes effective integration between political knowledge and experience is lost. The lab, on the other hand, explicitly operationalizes the assumption that for "learning by doing" to be effective, the integration between political knowledge and participation experience must be systematic and carefully guided.

Because the lab is based on such assumptions, many questions should be raised which have not been treated here. The lab, as it is carried out, will produce changes in the social and political fabric of schools. The implications of such changes cannot be determined at this time, but the effects of increased information alone would imply increases in awareness of political activity on the part of all participants in the school system and new norms for behavior. The introduction of a lab will, at a minimum, give a school data about itself and increase the stakes and opportunities of participants for making effective changes. In addition, it

may well be that, for the first time in many schools, some of the people on whom changes will depend will not only be student government leaders but a variety of interested students who are well-trained in analyzing and participating in school political life.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup>Recent articles and papers dealing with the rationale for the political laboratory approach are: "Teach About Politics in the 'Real World—the School'" by Judith A. Gillespie and Howard D. Mehlinger, in *Social Education* (Oct. 1972) pp. 598-603; "Using the School as a Political Laboratory for Civics and Government Instruction" by Judith A. Gillespie, unpublished paper delivered at the SSEC's Annual Invitational Conference, Denver, Colo., June 1972, and an article by Judith A. Gillespie to be published in the fall 1972 issue of the *Journal of the Minnesota Council for the Social Studies*.

<sup>2</sup>Michael Y. Numery and Ralph B. Kumbrough, *Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections*. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.

<sup>3</sup>Harmon Ziegler, *The Political Life of American Teachers*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967.

<sup>4</sup>Neal Gross, *Who Runs Our Schools?* New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1958.

<sup>5</sup>R. G. Barker and P. V. Gump, *Big School, Small School*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1961, pp. 15-17.

<sup>6</sup>Robert E. Lane, *Political Ideology*. New York: The Free Press, 1962, pp. 14-15.

<sup>7</sup>Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950, pp. 55-74.

<sup>8</sup>Karl W. Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government*. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

<sup>9</sup>Manias Olsen, Jr., *The Logic of Collective Action*. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.

<sup>10</sup>Dorwin Cartwright, "Influence, Leadership, Control," *Handbook of Organizations*. James G. March, ed. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

<sup>11</sup>James S. Coleman, *Adolescents and the Schools*. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

#### NEW SSEC DIRECTORS

The Social Science Education Consortium has announced the election of Lee Franklin Anderson and Emily Girault to its Board of Directors. The two new Board members are replacing Arno Bellack and Nicholas Hieburn, whose terms expired this year.

Anderson is currently a professor of political science and education at Northwestern University. He has been the director of the American Political Science Association's Political Science Education Project since 1970 and is a member of the National Advisory Committee for the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. Among Anderson's most recent publications is "Political Education and the Public Schools: The Challenge for Political Science" (co-authored with Richard Remy) which appeared in the Summer 1971 issue of *Political Science*. Publications in progress include *International Socialization*, being co-authored with Judith Toney, and *The Logic of Social Inquiry*, a book for junior and senior high school students.

Girault is currently an associate professor of social science education in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. As a visiting associate professor of education at Stanford University during 1970 and 1971, she co-directed, with Richard Gross, several National Science Foundation institutes and workshops for sociology teachers. She co-authored with Robert Fox, Ronald Lippitt, and Lucille Schaible an SSEC publication entitled *Inservice Teacher Education to Support Utilization of New Social Science Curricula* (1967). Among her other publications is "Current Trends in Problem Solving," Chapter 5 of *Problem-Centered Social Studies Instruction*, a 1971 publication of the Na-

tional Council for the Social Studies, edited by Richard E. Gross and Raymond Meussig.

Board members continuing their terms in office are James Becker, Director, Social Studies Development Diffusion Project, Indiana University; Robert Fox, Director, ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education; Howard Mehlinger, Director, Social Studies Development Center, Indiana University, and Lawrence Metcalf, Professor of Secondary and Continuing Education, University of Illinois.

#### NEW TEACHER ASSOCIATES JOIN SSEC STAFF

The SSEC's Teacher Associate (TA) Program, since its inception in 1965, has played a vital role in the SSEC's overall effort to further communication and cooperation among those involved with the "new social studies" and to acquaint the educational community with the many recent innovations in content and methods in social science education.

The program is designed to bring social studies consultants, department chairmen, and classroom teachers to the Consortium for one year to develop their leadership capabilities in elementary and secondary social science education. The TAs work as regular members of the SSEC staff for an academic year, becoming familiar with new trends, ideas, and materials in the social studies. Their presence adds creative and energetic classroom teachers and school personnel to the SSEC staff. However, the major purpose of the program is to develop the TAs' expertise in innovative curriculum materials, teaching processes, and ideas. This experience prepares the TAs to assume creative leadership roles and serve as catalysts of change in social science curriculum development when they return to their own schools and school systems.

The three new Teacher Associates are:

*Alan Markowitz*, social studies teacher, Sheepshead Bay High School, Brooklyn, New York. Markowitz received his B.A. in social studies from Brooklyn College in 1963 and his M.A. in social science education from Brooklyn College in 1966. He also received an Advanced Certificate in Educational Administration and Supervision in 1969. He has taught in Brooklyn since 1963.

*Francis Pratt*, social studies teacher, Acton-Boxborough High School, Acton, Massachusetts. Pratt received his B.A. in history from Eastern Nazarene College in 1959 and an M.A.T. from Harvard in 1958. He also received an M.A. in Latin American history in 1965 from the University of the Americas in Mexico City. He has done additional graduate work at Notre Dame and Framingham State College. He has taught at Acton-Boxborough High School since 1958.

*Robert Watford*, instructional specialist for social studies, North Allegheny School District, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Watford received his B.A. in social science from the University of Pittsburgh in 1958 and his M.A. in political science and economics from Bucknell University in 1964. He has taken additional graduate work at Carnegie-Mellon University, Indiana University, and Pennsylvania State University. He has been employed by North Allegheny Schools since 1958 as a teacher, director of personnel, and social studies curriculum specialist.

The three TAs were selected on the basis of a number of criteria, including their potential for effective innovation and their districts' willingness to support their efforts.

The TAs are currently involved in many of the Consortium's activities. They are well started on the important task

of becoming familiar with the ideas and materials of the major social studies projects. They have spent many hours in the SSEC's Resource and Reference Center and, in cooperation with the librarian, are responsible for the acquisition of new materials and for maintaining and improving the information retrieval system. They also maintain liaison with curriculum projects throughout the country by correspondence and visits. In addition, they are alert to innovative practices in schools and are preparing this information for dissemination.

The TAs are also working with the Curriculum Materials Analysis System (CMAS). They will be developing a working knowledge of the system, enabling them to perform analyses of curriculum materials and to work in close cooperation with other staff members on such activities as the Team Regional Inservice Analysis and Dissemination (TRIAD) program, inservice workshops, the *Data Book*, and revisions of the CMAS.

#### ROBERT FOX APPOINTED DIRECTOR OF ERIC/ChESS

Robert Fox has taken over the directorship of ERIC/ChESS in Boulder, replacing Nicholas Helburn, who has returned full time to his position as chairman of the Department of Geography at the University of Colorado. Fox is on leave from the University of Michigan, where he is professor of education and also has served as director of the Lab School for the last 20 years.

Fox brings to ERIC a rich professional background in the field of education. He has extensive experience in elementary teaching and administration. He is a member of the Board of Directors of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, has served as advisor to the Education Policies Commission, and was chairman of the Committee on Visitation and Appraisal for Multipurpose Institutions of the National Commission for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Fox's major research interest is in the social climate of the classroom. He has studied social power in the classroom, the relation between social variables and learning, and cross-age interaction in the school. A second major research interest has been in the process of innovation and change in education. The identification and diffusion of new teaching practices and the factors involved in developing a school climate supportive of change have been specific foci of his efforts in this area. His third major interest area is the development of curriculum materials for teaching behavioral sciences in elementary and secondary schools, utilizing as a teaching method the problem-solving techniques of the social scientist.

Recent publications include a series of pamphlets dealing with classroom social relations and learning—*Problem Solving to Improve Classroom Learning*, *Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environments*, and *Role Playing Methods in the Classroom*, published by Science Research Associates. A forthcoming book, *Understanding Classroom Social Relations and Learning*, will present a summary of research studies and implications for improvement of learning. Fox is also co-author, with Ronald Lippitt and Lucille Schaible, of the well-known *Social Science Laboratory Units*, an upper elementary behavioral science curriculum published by Science Research Associates.

Fox hopes to bring some new perspectives to the ERIC Center as an elementary educator, administrator, and cur-

riculum developer. He sees as major needs increasing the input from social sciences into the ERIC system and increasing the output of ERIC publications. He would like to develop ways for ERIC resources to be utilized more readily by those interested in social science education. Fox views the ERIC system as an open channel for presenting new ideas in social science education to the educational community and for obtaining feedback on those ideas.

Fox has made a special request of SSEC *Newsletter* readers: "As ERIC/ChESS depends heavily on cooperation of those out in the field, any initiative taken by SSEC *Newsletter* readers in informing ERIC of new programs and materials in social studies will be much appreciated by the ERIC staff."

#### NEW ERIC/ChESS PUBLICATIONS

Many ERIC/ChESS publications are now available through the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO). When ChESS does not co-publish with another organization such as SSEC, a special rider form is attached to the printing job at GPO's Denver plant. The Superintendent of Documents then determines if it is interested in printing and selling the proposed publication. If it is, it overrides the ChESS order with the number of copies it would like to distribute nationally. To date, all four ChESS publications submitted to the Superintendent of Documents have been accepted; a fifth is now in process.

The documents and their GPO stock numbers are:

*IS, 19, 20: Will They Vote?*, by Nicholas Helburn and Joanne Binkley. 1780-01082. Price 35¢. 46 pp.

*Teaching International Relations*, by James Becker. 1780-1064. Price to be determined. 27 pp.

*Environmental-Ecological Education: A Bibliography of Fiction, Nonfiction, and Textbooks for Elementary and Secondary Schools*, by Lois B. Watt and Myra H. Thomas. 1780-0886. Price 40¢. 24 pp.

*Everyman's Guide: An ERIC Search System for Social Studies Teachers, Consultants, and Librarians*, by Sharon Ervin. 1780-0828. Price 30¢. 15 pp.

*The Status of World History Instruction in American Secondary Schools* by William Pulliam is now being reviewed.

These publications may be obtained from: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. They are also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS), P.O. Drawer 0, Bethesda, Maryland 20014.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS OF NEW SOCIAL STUDIES MATERIALS

A course for middle grades, currently being piloted in selected schools, is *People and Technology*. Developed by the Education Development Center, Inc., as a follow-up program for *Man: A Course of Study*, the materials are concerned with the impact of technology on social and cultural environments. According to the developers, students approach the study of technology from two perspectives: "technology as man's instrument and strategy for fulfilling his own desires and designs; and technology as a major component of man's environment and mold of his culture,



never completely determining the shape of society nor acting independently of human choice, but always defining the quality of human life." The materials employ primary sources to encourage students to formulate and consider questions while developing skills and new views about technology.

One booklet from *People and Technology* is *Volta: The River That Turned Lake!* The booklet was prepared for the Education Development Center by a young Ghanaian artist, and presents a large quantity of information in a vivid format. Accompanying media for the booklet include films, plays, guides, stream tables, maps, and charts. Inquiries about the program should be directed to Bette McLaughlin, Social Studies Program, Education Development Center, Inc., 15 Mifflin Place, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.

*Economics in Society* (formerly the ECON 12 project at San Jose State College) is now in the process of publication by Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. The materials, co-authored by Suzanne Wiggins Helburn, John Sperling, Robert Evans, and Bette Lott, will be produced as a series of six paperbound books, estimated to be available by mid-1973.

A staff training kit has been prepared by Suzanne Wiggins Helburn and James E. Davis to accompany *Economics in Society*. The contents of the kit include a coordinator's manual, lesson ditto masters, a game, three recordings, a film strip, and a poster. Lessons include a variety of both textual content and teaching strategies used in the *Economics in Society* course. The purpose of the kit is to enable teachers, social studies supervisors, administrators, economic education center directors, and college methods teachers to become skilled and actively engaged in teaching *Economics in Society*.

The kit will be displayed at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies in Boston in November 1972. Inquiries should be addressed to Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 2725 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, California 94025.

Began in 1971 under a grant from the National Science Foundation, the *Human Sciences Program*, developed by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), is a three-year course of study for youngsters ages 11 through 13. The materials are designed to integrate the natural and social sciences and are organized around student questions which develop awareness of the interrelationships between the sciences. Particular attention is paid to students' social, biological, and moral development.

In a position paper prepared by BSCS the project developers outline their purposes: "to produce human sciences curricula that treat scientific understanding accurately within a personal and social context; and to produce improvement in curricular organization, approaches to learning, and to instructional procedures so that motivation, involvement, and individual competencies may be improved over existing conditions." (From "A Multidisciplinary Human Sciences Program for Middle Schools: A Preliminary Statement," Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, September 1971.)

A special set of materials designed to answer the developers' specific developmental questions is currently being piloted in selected schools. The revised materials will be completed in the fall of 1973, according to the project staff. Further information is available from the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, University of Colorado, South Boulder Road, Boulder, Colorado 80303.

Materials from the Integrated Studies Project, University of Keele, England, are for use with students age 8 through 13. These new materials are among the few which attempt to integrate the humanities with the arts and social sciences. Of particular interest to social studies, social science teachers are Units 1 and 3.

Unit 1, *Exploration Man*, is a beginning unit designed to introduce students to the philosophy and rationale of integrated studies. The unit has no student materials, since project research indicates that the concepts developed in the unit are best understood when retrieved from students' individual experiences and environment.

The third unit, *Living Together*, consists of a series of vividly illustrated pamphlets and posters, as well as sets of color slides and an accompanying tape. According to the project "text and visuals are interrelated in such a way that their full significance may be grasped."

A sample kit is available on request, including sample sheets, slides, and the teachers' books. To order sample kits, write to the Oxford University Press, Education Department, Walton Street, Oxford OX2 6DP, England. Other inquiries and orders should be addressed to the Oxford University Press, Press Road, Neasden, London N.W. 10 ODL, England.

The Schools Council Nuffield Humanities Curriculum Project, headquartered at the University of East Anglia in Norwich, England, has developed materials to support inquiry-based instruction crossing the disciplinary boundaries between English, history, geography, and social studies. According to the project, "The problem is to give every man access to a complex cultural inheritance, some hold on his personal life and on his relationships with the various communities to which he belongs, some extension of his understanding of, and sensitivity towards, other human beings. The aim is to forward understanding, discrimination and judgement in the human field." (Schools Council Working Paper No. 2, *Raising the School Leaving Age*, 1965.)

Though the materials were originally designed to accommodate 14- to 16-year-old students of average or below-average abilities, the project materials have been used successfully at all ability levels and with older students. Teaching methods call for directed discussion of what the project refers to as "evidence": extracts from newspapers, plays, poetry, novels, complete short stories, photographs, cartoons, pamphlets, etc. Students "take responsibility for their own learning."

Individual unit titles are *Law and Order*, *Living in Cities*, *Poverty*, *People and Work*, *Relations Between the Sexes*, *The Family*, *Education*, and *War and Society*.

Orders and inquiries should be directed to the publisher, Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 48 Charles Street, London W1X 8AH, England.

## SSEC TASK FORCES ORGANIZED

Task Forces on Consultation, Dissemination, Publications, Teacher Education, and Trends in Social Science and Education met immediately following the Invitational Conference during SSEC's Roundup last June. The purpose of the Task Forces is to utilize the professional input of SSEC's members to help shape the general policies, goals, and activities of the Consortium. The results of their June 1972 deliberations as well as their recommendations follow.

Ronald Lippitt is the chairman of the Consultation Task Force with James E. Davis representing the SSEC staff. The Task Force decided to proceed with the establishment of a Consultation-Training Network. Areas of network services were outlined and areas of network members' competence were defined. Additional discussion centered on membership certification procedures, means of recruiting prospective network members, and future training events in consultation skill development.

Douglas Alder is chairman of the Dissemination Task Force and W. W. Stevens, Jr., represents the SSEC staff. A proposal was suggested for a Developer-User Conference in which curriculum developers, publishers, and users would come together to discuss mutual goals and problems in dissemination of social studies curriculum materials. The Dissemination Task Force also recommended that the 1973 Roundup topic have the theme "Changing Public Schools." It was suggested that, in addition to curriculum diffusion, teacher education and consultation should be included in discussions of possible mechanisms for changing schools.

The chairman of the Publications Task Force is Edith King, with Karen Wiley assisting from the SSEC staff. The Publications Task Force discussed the role of the membership in the SSEC publications program and suggested kinds of publications that could be developed and published by the Consortium. The Task Force was particularly interested in areas of concern to social studies educators that are not being adequately covered by other organizations' publication programs.

The chairman of the Teacher Education Task Force is John P. Lunstrum, and Frances Haley represents the SSEC Staff. The two major issues to which the Teacher Education Task Force addressed itself were humanization of teacher education in social studies/social science education and patterns of interinstitutional cooperation in teacher education. It was recommended that the SSEC should commission papers developing conceptual designs or models for these areas. A second recommendation was that either topic could be the subject of the 1973 Roundup. A final recommendation of the Task Force was that its membership be expanded to involve people responsible for teacher education in the schools, as well as program designers and researchers concerned with reform and change in teacher education.

Raymond English is chairman of the Trends in Social Science and Education Task Force, with Mary Jane Turner assisting from the SSEC Staff. The basic purpose of the Trends Task Force was defined as the identification of new developments in social science and emerging needs in education with a view to recommending specific research and development to improve social education at elementary, secondary, and community levels. The recommended plan of action included: (1) establishment of a task force on the affective domain as it relates to social science education; (2) identification of representative scholars in the disciplines as resource persons; (3) consultation with these scholars with the object of developing state-of-the-art papers on the social science disciplines and their implications for education; (4) identification of and consultation with representative scholars in educational theory and practice and in the history of education; (5) clarification of the opposing schools of thought on values and identification of workable alternative value systems; (6) identification of feasible alternative approaches to ethnic-cultural pluralism in the United States; (7) classification of types of educational systems, with a view

to identifying the type of curriculum innovation desirable and feasible in each, (8) identification of the technological needs of social science and education; and (9) development of a newsletter to keep SSEC members and others informed of the Task Force's work and to encourage criticism and suggestions.

## DEFINING INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION

The SSEC received a contract for \$5,400 from the Institute of International Studies of the U.S. Office of Education to undertake a preliminary survey of the "international/intercultural dimension in general education." The project reviewed briefly the objectives, practices, and evaluation methods related to the "intercultural dimension" in kindergarten through grade 14. The project began in late June 1972 and terminated on October 30, 1972, with the submission of a report that includes a background paper on the need for the intercultural dimension in education, the goals and a definition of intercultural education, a review of current practices and relevant research, and suggestions for needed educational strategies and research for the future.

Intercultural education was defined by the principal investigators and consultants for the purpose of this project as "a structuring of learning experiences that will help both students and teachers understand and use concepts for understanding and working toward solutions of individual and intergroup problems—local, national, and world-wide—that arise from cultural diversity. Intercultural education, so defined, should enhance the learner's awareness of himself, his group, and his country in a world context; it should help him accept, cope with, and profit from cultural diversity; and it should help him recognize, analyze, and manage social conflicts based on differences in cultural values, including education for peace. To be effective, intercultural education must have a major experiential component, supported by a sound rationale."

Work on the project was carried out primarily by Paul Boharman, Professor of Anthropology, Northwestern University; Irving Morrisett and W. W. Stevens, Jr., of the SSEC; and Edith King, Associate Professor of Educational Sociology, University of Denver.

A number of SSEC members who have particular expertise in the area of international/intercultural education were contacted to make suggestions for the study and to review and critique the efforts of the principal investigators of the project. For this, a telephone interview technique was used. SSEC members and other experts were contacted by phone, sent written materials for their review and reactions, and then recontacted one week later for a taped telephone interview to give their reactions to the materials.

The resources of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education (ERIC/ChESS) and the Resource and Reference Center of the SSEC also contributed significantly to the search of the literature on practices, models, research, and programs in intercultural education.

## PROFILES OF PROMISE

The first issues of *Profiles of Promise* are now available. Prepared jointly by the ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education (ERIC/ChESS) and the Social Science Education Consortium (SSEC), these de-

scriptive brochures highlight innovative social studies and social education practices which teachers and administrators can easily adapt to their own classrooms or schools.

Four *Profiles* will be published each month through May 1973. The subscription cost for 30 issues is \$10.00. Five copies of all 30 issues cost just \$20.00. Bulk rates are furnished upon request.

Perhaps you are engaged in, or know about, classroom and school innovation which should be publicized, and would be interested in submitting them to ERIC/ChESS for inclusion in *Profiles of Promise*. Listed here for your use in submitting innovations are the criteria used in selecting practices for publication. These criteria have been compiled from a variety of sources. In addition to the suggestions of the National Advisory Board and staff of ERIC/ChESS, the editors of *Profiles of Promise* have drawn heavily on the work of Herman Ohme, as set forth in his article, "Needed: Exportable Models of Significant Change in Education." (*Phi Delta Kappan*, June 1972, pp. 655-58)

A program must meet most of the following criteria in order to be selected:

- 1) The innovation is related to social studies/social science education, or is a specific application of social science concepts to the improvement of educational practice in any field in elementary and secondary education.
- 2) The practice or program is innovative; that is, it is relatively new and different—not currently used by a substantial number of teachers or schools.
- 3) The innovation deals with conditions which are common to many classrooms or schools around the country.
- 4) The innovation lends itself to adoption or adaptation by other teachers or schools with a reasonable expectation of a successful outcome.
  - a) skills and/or equipment required are normally available or can be obtained;
  - b) the investment of time, money, or energy does not differ greatly from that which is already expended; the practice or program does not require funding from any source other than the school district.
- 5) The innovation provides for involvement of or communication with parents and community groups.
- 6) The innovation has been evaluated. There is evidence that the program has achieved the goal it was designed to achieve.
- 7) The school or classroom teacher is willing to receive visitors or answer letters of inquiry about the innovation.
- 8) The innovation has been adequately documented so that information needed to describe it is available.

To submit practices for publication, or to subscribe to 30 issues of *Profiles of Promise*, write: Profiles of Promise, 855 Broadway, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

#### SITES SELECTED FOR TEACHER EDUCATOR WORKSHOPS

Four Teacher Educator Workshops will be conducted in 1972-73 as part of the SSEC's core program funded by the National Science Foundation. Sites selected for these workshops are: Central Connecticut State College, New Britain Connecticut; University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, Eau Claire, Wisconsin; Grambling College, Grambling, Louisiana; and Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky. Participants at the workshops are social scientists and educationists from small colleges and universities who are engaged in teacher training.

The workshop objectives include: (1) to instruct social science and education professors in the scope, materials, and strategies of selected new social science curriculum projects; (2) to provide trainers of teachers with skills and tools for the analysis and evaluation of units and courses emerging from the new social science curriculum projects so that these new materials and strategies, and their analyses and evaluations, will be used in college courses for prospective teachers, and (3) to provide social scientists and educationists with the skills necessary to adapt the new social science curriculum materials to higher education courses, focusing especially on formats, materials, and strategies for new interdisciplinary courses and social science methods courses.

Workshop activities include adaptation and modification of social studies curriculum project materials for use with college students; teaching demonstrations of project materials and games and simulations; and work with the Curriculum Materials Analysis System and the ERIC system.

#### NCSS SESSIONS OF SPECIAL INTEREST

Two sessions to be held at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) this November in Boston are:

*Is Social Studies With It? Three Teachers' Views.* Last year's three SSEC Teacher Associates are conducting a special session on Friday, November 24. Barbara Capron (Belmont, Massachusetts, Public Schools), Stanley Kleiman (Livingston, New Jersey, Public Schools), and Tedd Levy (Norwalk, Connecticut, Public Schools) will discuss current national trends in social studies education.

Their discussion will be based on information gathered from the many visits they made during their tenure as Teacher Associates during the 1971-72 academic year. They visited curriculum development projects, school districts, and individuals involved in curriculum decision-making to gain a clear view of the directions social studies/social science education may be taking in the future. Their observations and the discussion of them will undoubtedly be valuable to those attending the session.

*The NCSS Curriculum Guidelines—Review, Reaction and Revision.* This session, to be held Saturday, November 25, will examine in detail the NCSS *Curriculum Guidelines Position Statement*. The *Guidelines*, designed to provide assistance in the selection and development of curricula, will be discussed by the participants and audience with an eye toward future revision of the document. Discussants for this session are Modria N. Caraway (Lamar Fleming Junior High School, Houston, Texas), Peter Martorella (Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania), and Anna Ochoa (Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida).

#### NOVEMBER 1972 ISSUE OF SOCIAL EDUCATION

The Social Science Educator Consortium and the NCSS Curriculum Committee cooperated in the production of the November issue of *Social Education*, which includes a wide variety of useful ideas and tools, plus abundant information on materials and resources for the social studies teacher. The issue is designed to assist teachers in assessing needs and determining objectives in the social studies curriculum;

in selecting instructional materials to fulfill those needs and objectives, in obtaining feedback on the success of materials in classroom use, and in keeping informed about innovative developments in social studies education.

The heart of the issue is a lengthy section containing analyses of 26 national social studies project curriculum materials. This is designed to update the materials analyses which appeared in the April 1970 issue of *Social Education*, "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-six National Social Studies Projects," by Norris M. Sanders and Marlin L. Tanek. Frances Haley explains in her introduction to the 26 analyses in the November issue that some of the original Sanders and Tanek materials have been deleted from this issue and other materials have been added, reflecting changes in the status of national social studies projects during the intervening two years.

Haley also explains in her introduction the basis of the analytical format employed in this issue. The SSEC and the NCSS Curriculum Committee merged analytic and evaluative criteria from both the SSEC's *Curriculum Materials Analysis System* (CMAS) and the NCSS' *Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines*.

James E. Davis and James S. Eckenrod, in their article "A Process for Selecting Instructional Materials," elaborate further on the CMAS and the *Guidelines* and how they can be combined to help make the process of materials selection and curriculum construction in schools more rational.

In "Choosing and Evaluating New Social Studies Materials," Dana Kurfman looks at some recent trends—such as

mini-courses and increased elective offerings for students—which have marked implications for materials selection. He suggests some simple guides that can help teachers and administrators cope with these trends and offers three short forms for gathering evaluative data on the use of materials to help in curriculum materials selection.

Recognizing the trends cited by Kurfman and their impact on curriculum materials development and selection, the designers of the November issue sought to broaden the scope of the issue to include the vast field of "supplementary materials" as well as materials from the national projects. Tedd Levy, a Teacher Associate at the SSEC during 1971-72, produced a descriptive guide to recently produced realia, print packages, slides, sound materials, films, other visuals, paperbacks, and games and simulations. He includes brief descriptions of a wide variety of these supplementary materials, including information on costs and publishers'/producers' addresses.

Several of the regular contributors to *Social Education* devote their columns to questions related to the theme of the issue. Donald Schneider, in the Media Department, suggests some guidelines for evaluation and selection of non-text media. Jack Nelson, in the Book Department, provides an excellent annotated list of outstanding books on social science education that should be included in every professional library. And ERIC/ChESS devotes its column to recent documents that evaluate current treatments of cultural diversity in social studies materials on both the United States and other parts of the world.

#### BOULDER OFFICE STAFF

Irving Morrisett, *Executive Director*

W. Williams Stevens, Jr., *Associate Director*

James E. Davis, *Assistant Director*

Marcia L. Hutson, *Administrative Assistant*

Ellen Schultheis, *Administrative Assistant, Special Projects*

Kenneth A. Butts, *Business Manager*

#### Staff Associates

Sharon Ervin

Robert S. Fox

Frances Haley

William C. O'Connor

Mary Jane Turner

Karen B. Wiley

#### Teacher Associates

Alan Markowitz

Frances E. Pratt

Robert H. Watford

Single copies of the SSEC Newsletter are available to individuals free upon request. For bulk orders of the Newsletter for use in conferences, workshops, classrooms, etc., please remit 20 cents per copy ordered.



Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.  
 855 Broadway  
 Boulder, Colorado 80302

IS IT TIME TO RENEW YOUR DATA BOOK SUBSCRIPTION?

If the October 1972 supplement to the SSEC *Social Studies Curriculum Materials Data Book* is the last you are to receive under your present subscription, don't forget to renew so you will receive the March and October 1973 supplements. Use the form below to renew your subscription.

If you have never before subscribed to the *Data Book*, you may also use the form below to do so. The *Data Book* is an analytical guide to new social studies curriculum materials, innovative textbooks, and games and simulations. It includes analyses of over 150 materials packages, texts, and games and simulations, with information about costs, content, teaching/learning strategies, media, and evaluation results. To help you find new materials for entire courses, or for supplementing course material, the *Data Book* is exceptionally helpful. It is bound in a sturdy, attractive two-volume set of looseleaf notebooks which can be easily up-dated by insertion of the new data sheets received in each supplement.

Please send me:

- Volumes I and II (including all supplements to date) @ \$30.00\_\_\_\_\_
- Annual Subscription (two supplements) @ 12.00\_\_\_\_\_
- One Supplement only @ 7.50\_\_\_\_\_

All orders must be prepaid or accompanied by an official purchase order from your institution.

Bill me \$\_\_\_\_\_ plus handling and postage. (Purchase order must be enclosed.)

I am enclosing \$\_\_\_\_\_. Postage will be paid by SSEC if payment accompanies order.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Professional Position \_\_\_\_\_

Institution, agency, etc. \_\_\_\_\_

Street address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Return this form to:  
 SSEC  
 855 Broadway  
 Boulder, Colorado 80302