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ABSTPACT
Tasks 5 and 6 describe the disseminat. on activities and a rating of the National Assessment for Educational progress social studies exercises by members of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). The dissemination activities, described in a one page report, include a special issue of the NCSS journal "Social Education." May 1974, and a special brochure. The rest of the document consists of the Task 6 report. Nine NCSS members rated the appropriateness of the social studies exercises for the 1970 s. The panel rated the exercises according to the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines of knowledge, abilities, valuing, and social participation; the general desirability of the exercises based on the NCSS guidelines; and the realistic national level of performance that would satisfy the panel's professional judgement. The results for guidelines indicate a small percentage of exercises dealing with social participation, about one-fifth dealing with valuing, and a majority of 46 percent dealing with knowledge. In the general desirability chategory less than 10 percent of the exercises have a rating of little or some value, while two-thirds of the exercises fall in the area of general desirability. In the category of estimation on the level of performance nationally, the panel thought many of the exercises were too difficult for many students. (DE)

# DISSEMINATION -- TASK V. [AND] SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATORS RATE THE NAEP SOCIAL STUDIES EXERCISES -- TASK VI, FINAL REPORT 

By Jean Fair and June Chapin


#### Abstract

The National Council for the Social studies has carried out a number of dissemination activities.


NCSS Project members have prepared two publications. 1) A special issue of the NCSS journal, Social Education, May, 1974, went to all subscribers, who include not only NCSS members, but school libraries and curriculum centers, and collepn and university libraries. 2) A Bulletin will be published by NAEP through the Government Printing office. The two were develcped with somewhat different emphases. The first focused on what could be learned from NAEP of direct relation to issues live in schools. The second emphasized reporting to the rrofession at large on matters basic to the National Assessment in Citizenship and Social Studies.

The NCSS Project has also reported on the Citizenship and Social Studies Assessments at NCSS annual meetings: in 1973 at three general sessions and one each before the Social Studies Supervisors Association, the State Social Studies Specialists, and the College and University Faculty Assembly, all sub-groups of NCSS; and in 1974 at a general session. Reporting and discussion sessions were also set up at the 1974 annual meetings of AERA and ASCD.

NCSS is also arranging to have Final Reports available through the NCSS central office and ERIC.

Shifts in funding and a consequent train of events in NAEP had to delay the availability of Social Studies Assessment data. Much of the analysis of the findings could not be made during the formal lifetime of the Project and could not be disseminated. Hopefully more can be done in the future.

Since NCSS interest in National Assessment will continue, some further dissemination activities will also continue.

NCSS has welcomed its opportunity to work with the National Assessment of Educational Progress. That the relationship has been a productive one is a mark of the professionalism of NaEP and NCSS.
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## Turposes

How do social studies educators rate the National Assessment of Educational frorress (liAEf) social studies test exercises? To help answer this and other questions, GAar contracted wi th the liational Council for the Bocial Btudies (:CSS) Representing NoSS was a steering committee with jean Fair as chairperson. (ither members of the committee were June Cilliard, Jana Kurfman, James zhaver, and Ronald Smith.

In the spring of 1973, this steering commitiee of NCSS selected a panel of nine social studies educa. tors. In addition, the author was designated as chairperson with major responsibilities in designing rating sheets and processing the data.

The main purpose of the panel, a group external to NAEt, was to rate each llaEf social studies exercise on the four ane levels. They did this task by choosing the one best answer to each of the following question:

1. Into which of the main components of the $10 . j: \%$ Guidelines do you think the exercise best fits?
 Knowleaste
 Abilities

social farticipation
2. Using the NCSS Guidelines as criteria, estimate the general desirability of the exercise.
 Little
 Some "oderate .,
$\qquad$ High $\square$ Very Great
3. Realistically, what level of performance nationally for the age group being considered would satisfy you for this exercise.

Percentage Expected Correct

$<20$


20-40


41-60


61-80


In exercises in which there was more than one subpart, the panel rated each subpart separately.

## Rationale

One concern of NAEP was the appropriateness of the NAEF test exercises for the $1970^{\prime}$ s. NAEP had started its initial formulation of social studies objectives in 1965. To guide their effort in the formulation of social studies objectives, liAEP involved social scientists, school peopl\%, and the community. The end result of NAEF efforts was the following five major objectives for the social studies:
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1. Have curiosity about human affairs;
2. Use analytic-scientific procedures effectively;
3. Are sensitive to creative-intuitive methods of explaining the human condition;
4. Have knowledge relevant to the major issues and concerns inf social scientists;
5. Have a reasoned commitment to the values that sustain a free society (1).
It appears that the NAEF social studies objectives defined the social studies as mainly a miniature version of the social sciences. Using these five social studies objectives, a contracting agency then designed test exercises representing samples of behavior from the universe of the stated objectives.

In 1971, however, the National Council for the Social Studies published its position paper entitled "Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines." (2) The committee which wrote the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines offered a somewhat different perspective of the social studies. The NCSS Curriculum Guidelines defined the social studies as essentially citizenship education with social proolems emphasized as the major concern of the social studies curriculum. The NCSS position statement also advocated the importance of social participation in trying to resolve the problems confronting society. The committee which wrote the NCSS
position paper identified the following four components as essential to the social studies curriculum: (1) knowledge; (2) abilities; (3) valuing; and (4) social participation.

The NCSS Curricuium Guidelines was viewed as a stimulus and guide for schools to evaluate their existing social studies curriculum and to work for improvement. The committee members largely responsible for the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines were higher education faculty members, in their thirties, who had recently received their social studies doctorates. Compared to the NAEP objectives, the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines may reflect more of the spirit of the times and be more at the cutting edge of where social studies is in the 1970's. Considerable overlap, however, does exist between the two different sets of objectives of the NCSS and the NAEP.

To point out more precisely the relationship of the NAEP exeroises to the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines, the first task of the panel members was to classify each exercise into one of the four main components stated in the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines. The panel's work on this task would give some indication of the balance of the various NAEP test exercises as compared to the NCSS framework. Schools and communities, for example,
would hardly be satisfied if almost all of the test exercises fell into just one $\operatorname{HCSS}$ category.

Secondly, again using the liCSS Curriculum Guidelines as criteria, the panel members were to "estimate the general desirability of the exercise." Why was this done? It would be possible for the NAEP test exercises to have a good balance of the four basic llCSS catepories (knowledre, abilities, valuing, and social participation) and still be considered of little value or not in keepine with what the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines recommended. Ey asking the panel to rate the general desirability of the exercise into one of five categories (little, some, moderate, hish, very great), it was hoped that social studies professionals could give their estimations of the general desirability of each NAEP test exercise.

Thirdly, the panel considered the question of "Realistically, what level of performance nationally for the age group being considered would satisfy you for this exercise?" Their professional judgment then could be used as a comparison with the actual levels of performance of students and adults. Unfortunately, due to delays in securing data from NACR on actual student performance on the social studies test iterns, $C$. Benjamin Cox, the investigator assigned to this task, could not make the comparisons of the pariel's ratings, and the student performance.

## Procedures

The nine social studies professionals and the chairperson met in the office of NAEP, April 12-14, 1973: Denver, Colorado. Their names and their professional status are listed below:

## Higher Education Faculty embers

1. Y. Arturo Cabrera, Bi-Lingual Education, University of Colorado
2. Patricia Glasheen, Elementary Education Department, Rhode Island State College
3. Jan Tucker, Secondary Education Department, Florida International lniversity

## Public School Personnel

1. Charles Beaty, Social Studies Consultant, Shawnee Mission (Kansas) Public Schools
2. Lynda Falkenstein, Social studies Consultant, Multonmah County, Portland, Oregon
3. Florence Jackson, Curriculum Supervisor, Bureau of Social Studies, New York City Fublic Schools
4. Roosevelt Ratiff, Curriculum Supervisor, MultiEthnic Studies, Tulsa Oklahoma Public Schools
5. Zada Koblas, Teacher, Hine apolis Fublic Schools

## Doctoral Student

1. Anne Powers, full-time doctorate graduate student, University of North Carolina

What were the characteristics of the panel? Pes ides being a very able group with a varied geographic background, they were a relatively young groups-mseven
under 45 and three under 30 years of age. The malefemale ratio was about equal. in addition, one third were members of minority groups. The representation of minorities on the panel was especially important in light of some of the criticism that llaEP test exercises are not appropriate to minority groups. Professionally, the panel was heavily represented by social studies consultants and higher education personnel, but underrepresented classroom teachers.

A training session was first held using the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines and the rating forms. To insure that the panel understood the key ideas contained in the VCSS Curriculum Guidelines, an outline worksheet with the important phrases of the four NCSS categories was distributed. For example, Social Participation was quoted on the worksheet as follows:

Social Participation
Extensive involvement by students ....in the activities of their community
...may take the form of political campaigning, community service or improvement, or even responsible demonstrations
...commitment in the social arena
Released NAEP citizenship test exercises were then used as sample exercises. Each member of the panel rated the sample question privately and then a discussion followed on the group's rating. An example of a sample
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citizenship exercise is as follows:
A. Have you ever spoken out in a public meeting to defend someone or some idea? (Yes, No)

However, in working some sample exercises, individual members of the panel disagreed at times with the majority opinion. Jan Tucker, who had served as one of the four members of the NCSS position paper on Curriculum Guidelines and also was a member of the panel reviewing the NAEP social studies exercises, assisted in interpreting the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines. His comments were extremely helpful, but did not completely resolve all questions.

The differences inthe panel members' ratings may be due to the ambiguity in meaning found in the IICSS Curriculum Guidelines, different interpretations of meaning in the test exercises, and individual differences among the raters. For example, in the sample exercise just given, panel members may have different interpretations of what a public meeting is. Does a public meeting include student council meetings or do public meetings usually only include adults? The differing interpretations of the term may then influence the panel's responses, especially with regard to what level of performance would satisfy them at the different age levels.

After the training session, the raters proceeded at their own pace. The test exercises were only identified
by a code number and the panel did not know what objective the test exercise was originally designed to represent.

## Results

The panel rated each test exercise for each of the three tasks. Each panel member literally made over 1,000 ratings since many test exercises had sub-parts. The data of the panel were processed. The computer print-out, totaling 2.992 pages, consisted of a histogram as well as the mean and standard deviation for each of the three tasks on every single test exercise.

In the classification of the test exercises using the four main components of the ICSS Curriculum Guidelines, the panel placed the NAEP social studies exercises in the following categories (Table 1).

That interpretation can be made of the panel's classification using the four categories of the MCSS Curriculum Guidelines? Striking is the very small percentage of test exercises that were placed into the "Social Participation" category. This may be partly explained by the fact that HAEF is also responsible for assessing the area of citizenship. If the panel had also rated the citizenship exercises, the catogory "Social Participation" may well have increased. An examination

Table 1. Summary of lade social Studies Exeroises Classified by VCSS Guidelines

| NCSS Component | Fercentare | $\begin{aligned} & \text { liumber of } \\ & \text { OBservations } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rnowledge | 46.0 | 1,555 |
| Abilities | $31 \%$ | 1,041 |
| Valuing | 19\% | 646 |
| Social Participation | $2 \%$ | $\therefore \quad 53$ |
| No Response | $2 \%$ | 72 |
| Total | 100\% | 3.366 |
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ERIC
of the released citizenship exercises would appear to support this claim. lowever, the panel's ratings probably do give some indication of laEF's view of the social studies. "Social farticipation" is not stressed in the laEF social studies test exercises. According to the panel's ratings, "Abilities" plus "Valuing" equaled about one-half" of the social studies exercises with the "Knowledfe" category receiving the other half. Vany may be very pleased that the NAEP social studies exercises, according to the panel, do devote about one-fifth of their total to "valuing." An important question is if the knowledge category is too high. In practice, the testing programs of most schools probably devote a much higher percentage of test exercises to the "Knowledge" category. Many teachers and the public may be very satisfied with the amount of attention devoted to the "Knowledge" category. Using the HCSS Curriculum Guidelines as criteria in estimating seneral desirability of the exercises, the panel rated the exercises in the following categories (Table 2).

Table 2. Summary of NA:P Social Studies Exercises Classified by Ceneral Desirability

| Degree of | Fercentare | Ilumber of <br> Observations |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Desirability | $26 \%$ | 879 |
| Yery Great | $40 \%$ | 1,356 |
| High | $21 \%$ | 722 |
| Zoderata | $6 \%$ | 194 |
| Some | $3 \%$ | 97 |
| Little | $4 \%$ | 118 |
| Mo Response | $100 \%$ | 3.366 |
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According to the pariel, less than $10 \%$ of the social stuciles exercises have "Little" or "Some" value accordine to the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines. If one uses the first two categories ("High" and "Very Great") as the criteria for desirability, the panel judged about two-thirds of the NAEP exercises as falling in the area of general desirability. If one defines desirability as including the first three categories ("High," "Very Great," and ""oderate"), then approximately $87 \%$ of the test exercises, using the panel's interpretation of the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines, are desirable.

On the third task, an estimation on the level of performance nationally that the panel member would be satisfied with, the panel classified the social studies exercises as shown in Table 3. It would appear that the panel thought that many of the social studies exercises would be considered difficult for many students. In addition, the relationship of how the different age groups performed on the same or different test exercises merits important consideration, but was not part of the author's task.

Table 3. Summary of NAEP Exercises Classified by Level of Performance Nationally that Would Satisfy Panel

Satisfaction Level of Panel with Regard to Percentage of Students obtaining correct Response

| Less than $20 \%$ | $2 \%$ | 79 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| Between 20 to $40 \%$ | $3 \%$ | 186 |
| Between 41 to $60 \%$ | $13 \%$ | 673 |
| Between 61 to $80 \%$ | $34 \%$ | 1,858 |
| Greater than $80 \%$ | $48 \%$ | 2,611 |
| Total | $100 \%$ | 5,407 |
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Summary
It should be emphasized strongly that the data presented in Tables 1,2 , and 3 are summary data, and therefore hide and gloss over many fine points in the individual test exercises. For example, on a single test exercise, the panel may have judged the item to be of little value in terms of desirability, but expected a large percentage of students to be able to answer the item correctly. on the other hand, the panel may have judged the exercise to have high value in terms of desirability, but would be satisfied if only a small percentage of students would be able to get the correct reponse. To make the best interpretation, it would be necessary to examine each exercise and the panel's rating of it. Again, individual examination of each test exercise fits in with NAEP's philosophy of looking at each test exercise rather than concentrating on summary data.

The reliability of the panel was calculated for each test item. sometimes the panel was unanimous in their classification of an exercise while at other times, they spread their responses across every available category. Even with a training, session, it should be remembered that the nine panel members are human
beings with different frames of reference, mut the fact that the panel differed on some test exercises should be an extremely fruitful area for further investigation. For example, it would be of interest to see how the minority members of the panel rated the exercises as compared to the rest of the panel. Unfortunately, sufficient computer funds were not available for the author to perform these operations.

Nith these limitations kept in mind, it appears from the panel's ratings that the liAEP test exercises are closely related to the philosophy of the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines (with the exception of the category, Social Participation), possess some obvious degree of desirability according to the NCSS Curriculum Guidelines, and professionals would be satisfied if more than $61 \%$ of the students were able to get the correct response on most IIAEF social studies exercises. However, it would seem very important that HAEP look very carefully at exercises that the panel judged to be of little value in terms of desirability. The investigator regrets that there was no available budget to pursue this area of investigation.
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1. Skills Area Exercises
}

## A. Obtaining information




Exercise Description


| 302012 | Perceives social implications in pictorial art／ <br>  <br> 302019 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mother and Child |  |
| 302014 | Relitical cartoon／Rich City |
| 302017 | Recording／Walk a Mile |

II．Knowledge Area Exercises
302017 Recording／Carefully Taught
1．Vnderstands some of the basic characteristics of eco－
nonic systems that are common to all industrial societies． がす。

1．Has knomledge of worldwide spatial distributions and inter－

iocation of Great Lakes
Location of major river/ Location of major river/Amazon focation of major river/Mississippi location of major riveriUnreleased Locarion of major river/Ohio 404017 1810507 $404015:$ 404018: 404016. 404018. -1
9
4
9 4
8
8
9

9 101012 | -4 |
| :--- |
| $M$ |
| 8 |
| 8 | 404020 203025 $403001:$

## 404012

 40400 t 389
4 404023

405046

$\because$
=cIse

| BEST COPY AMAILABL 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ．ictery |
| Hexformance Eev （aerceat） |  |  |  |
| $\therefore$ | － | A： | Adult |
| 9 | 13 | 17 |  |
| －－ | 41－60 | 61－31 | $>80$ |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | $62-8$ | 61－E0 |
| 61－80 | 780 | ； 80 | ＞ 80 |
| 41－60 | 61－80 | 61－c0 | 61－80 |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | 61－80 | 61－80 |
| 6i－80 | 61－60 | －－ | －－ |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | ；${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $>80$ |
| 61－80 | 780 | － 2 | ＞ 80 |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | $\therefore \mathrm{Bl}$ | $>80$ |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | － 6 | $>80$ |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | $\therefore 6$ | $>80$ |
| 41－60 | 61－80 | 61－60 | ＞ 80 |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | ）eए | $>80$ |
| 61－80 | 61－80 | － 30 | ＞ 83 |
|  | 61－80 | $\therefore 80$ | － 80 |
|  | 41－50 | 61－－3 | 61－80 |
|  | 61－80 | 61－5 | 61－80 |
|  | 41－60 | 41－60 | 41－60 |
| －－ | 41－60 | 61－20 | 61－80 |
|  | 41－60 | 61－80 | 61－80 |
|  | 41－60 | 61－80 | 61－80 |
|  | 61－80 | 61－80 | ＞ 80 |
| －－ | 61－80 | 6i－80 | 61－80 |
| 41－60 | 61－80 | 61－80 | 61－80 |
|  | 41－60 | 61－0 | 61－30 |
| －－ | －－ | 61－60 | 61－80 |
|  | －－ | $61-80$ | 61－80 |


Three problems of lazge cities 101002
$405045 A$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Minoe problems of lange cities } \\
& \text { Moles in the histury and culture of }
\end{aligned}
$$


＋ resources
US and USSR similarities and differences
US and USSR similarities and differences／Unreleased
US and USSR similarities and differences／Government
ownership and control
Organization for world peace／UN
Major goal of UN／Peace
Purpose of the Common Market
Cultural effects on physical environment／Tribalism
and nationalism in Africa
Big business＇effect on foreign nation Importance of water routes／Columbus Sense of historical time／Unreleased Sanse of historical Sense of historical time／Travel 50 nph Sense of historical time／Telegraph Sense of historical time／Unreleased

Sense of historical time／Compass
Sense of historical time／Unreleased Industrial society／Unreleased

Industrial society／Individual craf Industrial society／Rural to urban

Industrial society／Unreleased
US and USSR similarities and differences／Natural



| Nat＇l Level of Acceptable Performance：Actuel （Percent） |  |  |  | Reailstically Satisfactory Performance Level：Pazel （Percent） |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Age | Age | Age | Adult | Age | Age | Age | Adult |
| 9 | 13 | 17 |  | 9 | 13 | 17 |  |


| 为品品品品品品 |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| ヘ｜｜｜｜｜｜ |
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| :---: | :---: |
| ®® | 发品 |
| $\left.11.11\right\|^{\text {a }}$ | $111^{\wedge}$ |
| ¢ | ¢ |
| $1\|1\| 1^{\wedge}$ | $11^{\wedge} \frac{1}{6}$ |
| $\left\|\left\|\left\|\left\|\left\|\frac{8}{\frac{0}{0}}\right\|\right.\right.\right.\right.$ |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{\infty} \propto \& \\ & i_{0}^{1} \wedge \wedge \end{aligned}$ |
| 11｜1星0 | 11180 |
| 1｜｜｜¢ ¢ | $1 \mid \infty$ |
|  | 11 Noनp |
|  | めN®11 |
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$\overbrace{}^{\circ}:$ ise $^{\%}$ Exercise Description
Realistically Satisfactory
Performance Level: Panei
Acule

8




[^0]:    2. Identifies sources most suitable to solve a particular problem of find particular information.
