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CHAPTER I

THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

1. The Purpose

Among today's educators, there are many adherents to the principle of pupil participation in classroom planning. Supporters of this practice use as their most important argument a belief that this type of participation provides for training in, and develops an appreciation of, our democratic way of life.

In the more highly departmentalized teaching in the secondary grade levels, the most important goal of the social studies program would appear to be identical with the forementioned purpose for permitting pupil participation in planning. Therefore, social studies teachers in particular, it would seem, would be those teachers most immediately interested in incorporating such a practice, though teachers in all areas are interested in the perpetuation of democratic institutions.

In this survey, an attempt has been made to determine:

1. Approximately what proportion of selected junior high-school teachers of social studies permit pupil participation in classroom planning

2. The extent to which such planning is used
3. The reasons for which it in some instances is not used.

2. Method of Gathering Data

**Nation-wide survey coverage.** To make certain that information was not obtained predominantly from any one geographical area of the nation, a questionnaire was sent to the social studies department of at least one junior high school in every state, although more questionnaires were mailed to the more populous states than to the less populous ones. A total of 101 questionnaires were mailed to junior high schools selected at random from a secondary school directory. Three questionnaires were returned with an indication in each case that the school is no longer in operation. Of the 98 schools actually contacted, questionnaires were returned from 59.

**Two sections in questionnaire.** Since this survey was an attempt to determine the reasons for which some teachers do not use pupil-teacher planning as well as to determine the extent to which adherents of the principle actually do use it in their classrooms, the questionnaire of necessity was separated into two sections.

**Section One.** In section one there were check list items to determine the following about each respondent: (1) location, (2) present grade level of teaching, (3) sex, (4) education background, (5) experience, (6) type of social
studies program he now teaches, (7) type of class grouping in his school, (8) average size of each of his classes, (9) average length of each class period, (10) number of times he meets each class weekly, (11) whether or not he uses pupil-teacher planning, and (12) his reasons, if any, for opposing the practice.

Since respondents of both points of view on the subject of pupil participation in planning used the section one checklists, the returns were segregated into two groups which represented favorable and unfavorable opinions about pupil-teacher planning.

As will be explained in detail later, an attempt was made to determine whether or not any items in section one appeared to influence a teacher's philosophy regarding this practice.

Section two.— Section two was to have been done by only those teachers who indicated in item 13 in section one that they permit pupils to share in planning. In this section was a checklist including:

1. Items representing various degrees of pupil participation in planning
2. Items representing observations which teachers could select if those teachers had changed from strictly teacher planning to pupil-teacher planning
3. Miscellaneous questions regarding such topics as the effect of prior experience in group planning
methods upon the pupils, and whether or not the respondent democratizes to a greater extent his classroom procedures as the year progresses.

4. Opinions as to the most valid methods which might be used to evaluate the degree of improvement that is brought about by allowing pupils to share in planning.

**Space for comments.**—At the end of the questionnaire, space was provided for comments by all respondents regardless of views.

3. Method of Organizing Data

**Comparison of segregated returns by checklist item frequencies.**—Once returns were segregated according to views for or against pupil participation in planning, comparisons were made among the responses checked for each question on a percentage basis in section one except item 14, which, by its nature, could have been answered by only those opposed to pupil-teacher planning. This was done to discover which factors, if any, might appear to determine a teacher's philosophy on the subject. Tables which show the results of these tabulations appear in chapter 2.

**Determining the degree of pupil participation.**—Section 2 was, as explained earlier, to have been answered by only those who indicated they make use of pupil-teacher planning. The first checklist in this section included items indicating
different ways in which pupils are allowed to share in the planning. The list was arranged to determine whether pupils were permitted to share in such broad planning as helping to determine the units to be studied, or a smaller scope of participation such as selecting their own respective projects within a teacher-prescribed unit. This part of section two included 10 checklist items.

Of these 10 items, however, three items represented a degree of participation which is much wider than is represented by the other seven items. These items referred to opportunity for pupil selection of:

1. The sequence of units to be studied for the year
2. Each unit as a need arises during the year
3. The sequence of topics within a course of study which requires those specific topics.

Therefore, there was also a tabulation made to obtain a comparison by sex, educational background, grade levels now being taught, and teaching experience of the number of respondents who permit any one or a combination of these wider degrees of pupil participation in planning.

Obtaining views of those who changed to group planning procedures.— Item 16 in section two asked, "In your experience of teaching social studies, have you always permitted pupil participation in planning?"

Then item 17 provided for a checklist of seven items which those who answered item 16 affirmatively were to have
completed. These items represented different improvements which a teacher who changed from teacher planning to pupil-teacher planning might have observed as a result of having made the change. The frequencies of these items are compared.

**Determining importance to pupil of prior experience in pupil-teacher planning.** — Many teachers who do not use pupil-teacher planning methods have been known to state that they could use such practices if their pupils had had previous experience with that type of classroom procedure. To determine whether or not this prior experience is helpful to other teachers who are known to use that type of planning, item 18 in the questionnaire in section two was worded, "Do you believe pupils show better participation in classroom planning if they have had experience of this sort with previous teachers?"

The frequencies of negative and affirmative answers have been compared.

**Rest of section two of questionnaire.** — In the remaining two questions of section two, the teachers were asked whether or not the classroom practices became more democratic as the year progressed, and they were asked to state what they believe to be the most valid methods that may be used to evaluate the degree of improvement that is achieved by permitting pupils to share in planning. The results of the answers to these questions have been tabulated.
4. Related Literature

Many of the items that appeared in the questionnaire were the result of this writer's reading of some of the valuable literature that has been written on this subject.

A definition of "pupil-teacher planning".— When the questionnaire was being prepared, and later when the returns were being tabulated, the fact that there are considerable differences in the degree to which pupils are permitted to participate in classroom planning was brought to mind. Perhaps it might be well in considering what some sources of available literature say about this topic to quote one author's definition of the term "pupil-teacher planning".

Rehage tells of his experiment with eighth grade social studies pupils at the University of Chicago Laboratory School in which he sought a comparison of the effect of teacher-directed and pupil-teacher planning procedures.

In his article he stated that the practices associated with the term "pupil-teacher planning" vary widely. He also writes, "For the purpose of the experiment which is briefly reported here, cooperative planning among pupils and teacher is regarded as a method by which a problem-oriented, experi-

mental minded group can determine its goals and direct its efforts toward the achievement of those goals."

Views of different authors on desired degree of pupil participation in planning.—A narrower view of pupil-teacher planning is given by Burton who states, "Planning with and by pupils in a subject matter unit is limited. These units are typically planned in advance. Pupil participation will usually be confined to dividing the work of finding and analyzing sources, compiling material in answer to questions assigned, arranging for presentation of summaries to the whole group, planning and conducting group discussions. Some teachers give pupils much opportunity to assist in making up quizzes or tests, and in creating better type evaluation instruments."

Miel gives a broad view of pupil-teaching planning as she writes, "Teachers help children still more when they widen the range of planning and give children opportunity to make short-term plans within cooperatively-developed long-range plans."

A caution that democracy in a classroom does not mean that the pupils may choose to do whatever they wish without limitations is given by Murcell. He states, "The well-meaning


teacher supposes that democracy means letting everyone decide on everything, irrespective of motivation, maturity, reliability, or competence. Democracy is neither permissive nor autocratic. It is rational, and its rule depends on shared understanding.  

Importance of earlier pupil training in group planning. The extent to which pupils are permitted to share in classroom planning may have to depend upon, at least for awhile, their previous experiences with this type of learning.

An important question which was in the questionnaire was "Do you believe pupils show better participation in classroom planning if they have had an experience of this sort with previous teachers?"

Ronald P. Daly, supervisor of elementary education in the New York State education department, writes, "Just how much responsibility can be given to the children at any grade level depends, of course, on their background of experience in this sort of planning and on their maturity. Children who lack this background may misunderstand the purposes of pupil-teacher planning and assume that they have been given freedom to do as they please."


2/Ronald P. Daly, "Pupil-Teacher Planning," The Education Digest (December, 1955), 21:38-9
A similar view is taken by Baxter, Lewis, and Cross who write, "With guidance and continuing practice, self-purposing matures. If from nursery school throughout the elementary school period, children are given opportunities for having a hand in determining classroom activities, they grow to assume an amazing degree of initiative and cooperative concern for the work of the classroom and for their own progress."  

Use of group planning in industry. — All the writers who deal with this topic are in a broad general agreement as to the purposes of pupil-teacher planning. These goals are referred to in the checklist items of the questionnaire.

DeZafra compares the use of group planning in the classroom with its use in industry. He writes, "Pupil participation in the planning of classroom procedures is thoroughly in line with practices already current in enlightened corporations where increased employee participation has paid off in many ways to all concerned."  

Subject matter achievement with pupil-teacher planning. — Opportunity was given in the questionnaire which was used in connection with this thesis for teachers who had changed from


2/Carlos DeZafra, Jr., "Three Steps to Pupil-Teacher Planning," The Clearing House (April, 1951), 25:451-4
teacher-directed planning to pupil-teacher planning to indicate whether or not greater subject matter achievement resulted from the change.

Rehage, in telling of his experiment with two eighth grade social studies classes at the University of Chicago Laboratory School which lasted for 30 weeks, explains how the two groups were matched on the basis of scores on three criterion tests, intelligence quotients, and an acceptance-rejection index obtained from sociometric data. He served as teacher for both groups.

In the experimental group the pupils and teacher together worked out the particular objectives to be attained and the means to be used to attain them. He writes that plans developed in the experimental group were used by the teacher also in the control group, but the latter group had no opportunity to participate in their formulation. Thus, both groups carried out the same set of activities and spent approximately the same amount of time doing do. The aim was to have the groups differ only in the way in which the plans were initiated.

Included in what Rehage wrote about his findings from this experiment is the following:

"The results of the year's experience indicated that there was no significant difference between the two groups in the amount of social studies subject matter learned.
"The sociometric data, when combined in the form of the acceptance-rejection index for each pupil, did not reveal any significant differences between the experimental and control groups. However, sociograms drawn on the basis of first and second choices for friends indicated that the internal structure of the experimental group had undergone a more thorough modification than that in the control group during the period of the experiment." 1/

Importance of the teacher's personality in group planning methods.--- In chapter 2 there will be an analysis of data which will attempt to determine whether or not certain key background factors influence a teacher's viewpoint on the subject of pupil-teacher planning.

Since, according to figures that will be shown there, teachers in a number of cases with similar key background factors show opposing views on the use of pupil-teacher planning procedures, the personality of the teacher, which the questionnaire associated with this thesis was not equipped to investigate, is of unquestioned importance in shaping the practices which that teacher uses.

Lindberg states, "The role of the teacher is to help children understand and use the group process. The process is dynamic. Hence a teacher must be very flexible... There is no one type of teacher who is best fitted to help children work cooperatively, for children gain much from working with people of widely varying backgrounds." 2/

1/ Kenneth J. Rehage, op. cit., p. 114
She also states that the development of a flexible personality and techniques for working with groups are dependent upon each other. She continues, "No series of steps can be prescribed for developing either. Personality is augmented in a dynamic situation as one uses the group process. Techniques are discovered as one works to improve the group situation. Personality, techniques, process—all are dynamic and interactive. If the development of any one is held back, all are stunted."

5. Summary

The purpose of the survey upon which this thesis is based was to determine:

1. The proportion of social studies teachers in junior high schools who use pupil-teacher planning
2. The extent to which such planning is permitted
3. The reasons for which some teachers do not use that procedure.

A survey was sent to 98 schools, from which 59 replies were made. The schools represent all sections of the nation.

The questionnaire was divided into two major sections with all respondents answering section one, one question of which required an affirmative or negative answer as to whether or not the respondent was using a pupil-teacher planning procedure. For those not using it, a checklist was provided

1/Lucille Lindberg, op. cit., p. 107
for the indicating of reasons for which the respondent might be opposed to the practice.

Section two was for only those respondents who indicated they do use pupil-teacher planning. In this section an attempt was made to determine the extent to which these teachers permit pupil participation in planning.

The items in the questionnaire were obtained from many reading sources. The various writers whose books and articles were consulted are in a broad, general agreement as to the purposes of the group planning method, though not necessarily as to the degree to which pupil participation in such planning ought to be permitted.
CHAPTER II

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES

1. Differing Viewpoints on Pupil-Teacher Planning

The tables which appear in this chapter will reveal that teachers are rather sharply divided on the subject of pupil-teacher planning, and that among those who favor the method, there are varying degrees to which pupil participation in planning is encouraged.

The data in this chapter have been tabulated from the results of 59 questionnaires which were completed by junior high-school social studies teachers from different parts of the nation.

To the question, "Do you permit any pupil participation in the planning of the activities that occur in your social studies classes?", 34 stated they do and 25 reported that they do not.

2. Comparative Influence of Key Background Factors in the Formation of These Viewpoints

Some factors seem to be influential in determining a teacher's opinion on this subject while others appear not...
to be influential. In some cases a factor seems important in determining the views of a teacher according to that teacher's sex.

Grades now teaching.-- The first item each respondent was asked to check was the grade level he or she is now teaching. The purpose of this was to try to determine whether or not classroom planning is inclined to be more teacher-centered the higher the grade level that is being taught.

Table 1. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers' Planning Practices according to Grade Levels They are now Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Now Teaching</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, and 9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 and 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tabulations in table 1 indicate no strongly positive correlation between a teacher's grade level assignment within a junior high school and her views on pupil-teacher planning.
Degrees earned.-- An attempt has been made in table 2 to determine whether or not the degrees a teacher has earned influence her views on the subject of pupil-teacher planning.

Table 2. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers' Planning Practices according to Degrees Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extent of Study</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work beyond master's degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 2 there is some correlation between the level of studying a teacher has done and his or her classroom practices regarding pupil-teacher planning. Of those who reported that they do not use the pupil-teacher planning method, 60 per cent do not have a master's degree compared with 35 per cent of those who do permit pupil-teacher planning. On the other hand, 59 per cent of those who do use pupil-teacher planning have a master's degree or higher compared with 40 per cent of those who do not permit the practice who have done a similar amount of study.
The biggest difference, of course, is among those teachers who have done work beyond a master's degree. Of the 18 respondents who have studied beyond a master's degree, 14 use pupil-teacher planning procedures. Furthermore, 41 per cent of all respondents who use pupil-teacher planning have worked beyond a master's degree, whereas only 16 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning have worked beyond that level of study.

Semester hours in education.—To keep the questionnaire as simple as possible, the types of bachelor's or master's degrees were not segregated in the checklist. Furthermore, "work beyond a master's" was meant to include those who have obtained a doctorate degree.

However, a separate question was asked about the approximate number of semester hours the respondent has earned in education. These were grouped in brackets of 10 hours to make tabulation of responses easier.
Table 3. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers’ Planning Practices according to Semester Hours Earned in Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Earned in Education</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 or over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that 64 per cent of the respondents who use pupil-teacher planning have acquired 31 or more semester hours in education, whereas 52 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning have acquired 31 or more semester hours in education. Furthermore, 22 of the 35 respondents who have acquired 31 or more semester hours use pupil-teacher planning, and 12 of the 19 who have earned 41 or more semester hours in education use the procedure.

Total years of teaching experience.-- To determine whether or not a teacher’s philosophy might have become rigid because of extensive experience, along with an advance in age, respondents were asked to indicate their total years
of teaching experience regardless of grade levels. The numbers of years were grouped in intervals of five.

Table 4. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers’ Planning Practices according to Total Years of Teaching Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Years of Experience</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When this questionnaire was being prepared, this question was included with the expectation that if there were to be any correlation it would be of a negative nature between the frequency of the number of years of experience and the respective per cents of the teachers within each five-year bracket who would indicate a use of pupil-teacher planning.

Actually, for those with 20 years or less experience, the table shows no trend whatever. Of the 32 respondents
who have had 20 years or less experience, 16 use pupil-
teacher planning, and 16 do not. The frequencies are identical
also in the 6 to 10-year bracket and in the 0 to 5-year
bracket.

The big surprise is the distribution for teachers with
21 years of experience or more. In this survey there were
26 such teachers, of whom 17 reported the use of pupil-
teacher planning while only nine did not. In some instances
these more experienced teachers have earned a substantial
number of semester hours in education which seems to be a
stronger factor in these tabulations than is teaching experience.

Experience in teaching junior high-school social studies.—
Many respondents who have had over 20 years of experience
in teaching have not had all of that experience in their
present social studies teaching assignments. Of the 26
who have taught for more than 20 years, only 12 have taught
junior high-school social studies for that period of time.

In table 5, the frequencies of the various numbers
of years of experience are being compared.
Table 5. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers' Planning Practices according to Years of Teaching Experience in Junior High School Social Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Teaching Junior High School Social Studies</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 or over</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 5 there is no important correlation throughout, but it will be noticed that of the eight whose experience has been in the social studies field at the junior high school level for 26 or more years, seven do not use pupil-teacher planning. A comparison of this table with table 4 seems to indicate one important point—that while 11 teachers who have taught for 26 years or more use pupil-teacher planning, only one of the 11 have been teaching social studies for that entire period of time. Other teachers with extended periods of teaching experience who favor pupil-teacher planning have spent only a part of their years of experience in the social
studies area at the junior high school level. It will also be observed that of the 17 teachers who use pupil-teacher planning and whose total experience exceeds 20 years, but five have spent 21 or more years teaching junior high-school social studies. Possibly the older teachers who were transferred into social studies teaching and who took refresher education courses became more democratic in their practices.

**Type of social studies program.**—In order to determine whether or not the type of social studies program is a factor in determining a teacher's classroom planning practices, each respondent was asked to indicate which of these three is true of his or her social studies program:

1. Social studies taught as one general subject, such as seventh grade social studies or eighth grade social studies
2. Social studies separated into specific subjects such as history, geography, civics, and current events
3. A fusion of social studies with other areas of the curriculum so as to constitute a core program.

It was anticipated that of these three types of programs, the greatest amount of pupil-teacher planning would be found in a core program, with a lesser amount in programs in which
social studies, only, are taught, and the least in those teaching programs in which the social studies are separated into specific subjects.

Table 6. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers' Planning Practices according to Types of Social Studies Programs in which They Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Program</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Social studies as one general subject</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Social studies separated into specific subjects</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A core program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is no strong trend noted in the frequencies for the first two types, although the figures run a little higher for the teachers who do not use pupil-teacher planning. Forty-seven teachers reported they either teach social studies as one general subject or have them separated into specific subjects.
Of this 47, there are 25 who use pupil-teacher planning and 22 who do not. Furthermore, 83 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning have either one program or the other, whereas 74 per cent of the teachers who do use pupil-teacher planning have either one or the other of these programs.

The core program does appear to be a possible factor, but the figures involved are small since only 12 respondents reported such a program. But of those 12, nine use pupil-teacher planning and three do not. Furthermore, 26 per cent of those teachers who do use pupil-teacher planning have a core program, whereas only 12 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning have the core.

Teaching programs including other subjects. The questionnaire specified that a subject fused with social studies in a core program would not be considered as another subject. Nevertheless, to determine whether or not teachers might be using some form of integration and be making use of pupil-teacher planning in the process if they are teaching a subject other than the social studies, a question regarding this appeared as item 7 in the questionnaire.

The returns indicate little, however, since 33 of the 59 respondents teach no subjects other than social studies unless it is done in a core program. Of the remaining 26, the frequencies are scattered. Seven didn't answer the item; one teacher teaches some physical education; one teaches
grade six for one half of each day; three teach some classes in mathematics; one has science; one teaches a foreign language, and 12 teach English, not fused to social studies.

English is the only subject with any appreciable frequency in this checklist, and of the 12 who have it in their program, seven use pupil-teacher planning, and five do not.

The questionnaire failed to ask if these teachers teach other subjects to any of the same pupils to whom social studies are taught. This is another reason for which nothing valid may be concluded from the above figures.

Basis for class grouping. — A question was asked about the method used in each respondent's school for grouping the classes. This was done to determine whether there is more or less pupil-teacher planning in heterogeneously-grouped classes than in classes formed on another basis.
Table 7. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers’ Planning Practices according to Types of Class Grouping Used in Their Respective Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis for Grouping</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I.Q.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Reading scores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Average achievement in all subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Heterogeneity</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one other basis for grouping reported by a person opposed to pupil-teacher planning is a consideration of both the reading and mathematics achievement scores.

Among those who incorporate the use of pupil-teacher planning, each of the following bases for grouping were reported once: (1) heterogeneity except in reading and mathematics classes; (2) I.Q. and reading achievement; (3) heterogeneity except for a skills development class and a modified skills development class for grades 8 and 9; and (4) heterogeneity except for some low-level reading
classes. Two who favored pupil-teacher planning reported groupings on the basis of I.Q. scores and the average achievement in all subjects.

This table indicates as many teachers with heterogeneously-grouped classes oppose pupil-teacher planning as use it. Heterogeneity, alone, then, does not seem to determine a teacher's planning procedures.

Since in each case in which other bases or a combination of bases are used for grouping there is a degree, at least, of homogeneous grouping, homogeneity may be a factor. Of the 14 teachers who reported class grouping in their respective schools according to achievement scores in all subjects or some other modified type of homogeneity, 12 practice pupil-teacher planning. But the most popular type of class grouping is undoubtedly heterogeneous.

Average size of classes.—The size of the classes a teacher has according to this survey makes little or no difference in her use of pupil-teacher planning. Most teachers report average class sizes of from 31 to 35 pupils, with the second most common average size being in the 26 to 30 bracket. In both of these groups, more teachers use pupil-teacher planning than do not.

There were six teachers who have classes averaging in size from 36 to 40, and of these, four reported the use of pupil-teacher planning as against two who did not. This indicates that teachers who really favor allowing the pupils
to share in planning are not deterred by class size.

Length of class periods.— Since pupil-teacher planning requires more time than teacher-centered planning, respondents were asked the length of their class periods to see if this might be a factor affecting a teacher's attitude about the group planning process.

Table 8. A Comparison of Social Studies Teachers' Planning Practices according to the Length of Class Periods in Their Respective Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minutes per Class Period</th>
<th>Do Not Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
<th>Use Pupil-Teacher Planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 or over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One teacher who uses pupil-teacher planning reported that the length of the class periods depends upon which period it is in the day's program. The period may range either from 35 to 40 minutes or from 41 to 45 minutes. One teacher
who does not use pupil-teacher planning reported that she has a core program three hours daily.

For reasons that seem not easily explainable, 11 of the 13 teachers who teach classes that are from 46 to 50 minutes in length use pupil-teacher planning. Otherwise, table 8 indicates frequencies for periods of longer or shorter length than that as about even. The length of periods, therefore, does not seem to be a serious factor in determining a teacher's decision as to whether or not to use pupil-teacher planning.

Number of periods per class weekly. There was an item referring to this in the questionnaire, but the evidence is very strong that it is of negligible importance.

Of the 59 respondents, 47 indicated that they meet each class five times weekly with the frequencies being a close 25 to 22 in favor of those who use pupil-teacher planning. All other frequencies were three or less, and consequently, no trends were apparent.

Classes for a double period. A teacher with a class for two periods in succession would have time for group planning some days and a wide range of activities on other days. An attempt to determine whether or not the availability of double periods with classes encouraged a use of pupil-teacher planning was the purpose of the item which referred to this topic in the questionnaire.
The tabulation shows that of the 19 respondents who have double periods, 12 use pupil-teacher planning while seven do not. Furthermore, 35 per cent of the teachers who reported using pupil-teacher planning have double periods with at least some of their classes, whereas 28 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning have double periods.

**Distribution of teachers' viewpoints according to sex.**

Of the 59 respondents, four failed to indicate their sex. Of the remaining 55, there were 27 men and 28 women. Of the 27 men, 13 use pupil-teacher planning while 14 do not. Of the 28 women, 17 use pupil-teacher planning while 11 do not.

**Comparison of views of men teachers according to their professional preparation and experience.**

In table 2 in which a comparison of views on pupil-teacher planning according to degrees earned is made, it has been found that there is a tendency for a majority of the teachers with work beyond a master's degree to use pupil-teacher planning. In table 3 in which a comparison of views according to semester hours in education is made, a decided majority of those teachers who have received credit for 31 or more semester hours in education use pupil-teacher planning.

On the other hand, it will be noted from this survey that pupil-teacher planning is more widely-used by women teachers than by men teachers. The question, therefore, arises as to whether it is the sex of the teacher, or his or
her professional preparation that is the stronger determinant of that teacher's views on pupil-teacher planning.

An analysis of the replies of the 27 male respondents reveals that of the 14 who oppose the use of pupil-teacher planning, five have a master's degree including three who have worked beyond a master's degree. On the other hand, of the 13 men who reported using pupil-teacher planning, 11 have a master's degree, including nine who have worked beyond a master's degree.

As far as the number of semester hours in education is concerned, of the 14 men who oppose pupil-teacher planning, eight have had 30 or less hours in education while only three have had 41 or more. In contrast, of the 13 men who use pupil-teacher planning, only one has 30 or less semester hours in education while eight have 41 or more.

There appears to be a definite tendency for the views of men teachers regarding pupil-teacher planning to be affected by the amount of professional preparation they have had. The survey, on the other hand, revealed no correlation between the length of experience or the grade level taught and the views of men teachers on this subject.

Comparison of views of women teachers according to their professional preparation and experience.—Professional preparation seems to be of virtually no importance in the determination of the views of women teachers on the subject.
of pupil-teacher planning. Of the 17 women who reported that they use pupil-teacher planning, seven have either obtained a master's degree, or have worked beyond that point. Of the 11 women who do not use pupil-teacher planning, five have either received their master's degree, or have done still further study.

Furthermore, of the 17 women teachers who use pupil-teacher planning, only one has acquired 41 or more semester hours in education, while of the 11 women who do not use pupil-teacher planning, four have received credit for 41 or more semester hours in education.

The percent of those women who have had 30 or less semester hours is about the same for those who use pupil-teacher planning as for those who do not. Seven of the 17 who reported using pupil-teacher planning have had 30 or less semester hours in education, while four of the 11 who do not use pupil-teacher planning have had 30 hours or less.

Years of experience, however, may be a stronger factor with women than with men. Of the 28 women teachers who responded to this survey, six have taught social studies for 26 or more years, and none of these six uses pupil-teacher planning.

Seven women respondents reported they have had 10 years of experience or less in the social studies area, and all seven reported a use of pupil-teacher planning.
Professional preparation and the grade level being taught seem to have little if any effect upon the pupil-teacher planning views of women social studies teachers in a junior high school. There appears to be an indication, however, of some negative correlation between the length of a woman teacher's social studies teaching experience and her willingness to use pupil-teacher planning.

Reasons for which pupil-teacher planning opposed. -- The 25 respondents who do not use pupil-teacher planning were asked to indicate their reasons on a checklist.

The reasons and the frequency with which each was given follow:

1. "The administration frowns upon such practices." (0)
2. "You formerly tried it but you felt behavior problems resulted." (5)
3. "You have never tried it for fear of disorder." (2)
4. "You feel it is a decision for which the children have neither enough maturity nor knowledge." (15)
5. "You have insufficient facilities." (7)
6. "Other teachers in your building do not use it." (0)

Reasons other than those in the questionnaire checklist which were inserted by respondents follow:

1. "The necessity for following the state syllabus requirements." (1)
2. "It was formerly tried, but time didn't warrant it. The pupils learn more when the teacher plans the work carefully." (1)

3. "Our course of study is too full, and the pupils take us too far afield." (1)

4. "Not enough facilities nor time" (1)

The tabulations show that 60 per cent of those who do not use pupil-teacher planning are convinced that the pupils are not mature enough and do not have the knowledge to share in planning. Lack of facilities is the next most common reason given. One teacher mentioned the reason for having to follow the state syllabus, yet another respondent from that same state uses pupil participation in planning.

In connection with a discussion of the reasons for which pupil-teacher planning is opposed, reference ought to be made to some questions near the end of the questionnaire which only those 34 respondents who do use pupil-teacher planning were to have answered.

In item 18, the question was asked, "Do you believe pupils show better participation in classroom planning if they have had experience of this sort with previous teachers?" Of the 34 who use pupil-teacher planning, 25 answered this question "yes", only three answered "no", and two failed to give an answer. Four others inserted answers as follows: "Not necessarily--sometimes", "depends
upon the nature of the previous experience", "not necessarily so with the type of work we do", and "in general, but not always".

Since none of the 25 respondents who do not use pupil-teacher planning indicated in item 14 that their not doing so is because other teachers in their building do not use it, the inference might be drawn that in many of these respondents' buildings some teachers do use it. Furthermore, the opinion is very strong among teachers who do use the procedure that it is much easier to carry out if the pupils have had prior experience in that type of classroom procedure. Is it not therefore probable that many teachers who do not now use the procedure might find, upon trying it, that their pupils would already have had some experience in it? In fact, these teachers might receive a pleasant surprise upon experimenting with pupil-teacher planning.

5. Varying Degrees of Pupil-Teacher Planning

There are differing degrees to which pupils may be permitted to share in classroom planning. The difference may range all the way from permitting pupils to select their own individual projects within a prescribed unit of work, to the teacher's allowing the entire year's work to be determined by needs which arise from the pupils, with the satisfaction of such needs resulting from cooperative planning by the teacher and the pupils.
Frequency of use of various examples of pupil-teacher planning.—Item 15 in the questionnaire provided a checklist of ten different examples of pupil-teacher planning. A respondent was to check any of the examples of pupil-teacher planning that he permits.

Item 15 was worded as follows, with the tabulated frequencies of responses appearing after each checklist phrase:

"If you do use pupil participation in class planning, you permit opportunity for the selection of:

1. The sequence of units to be studied for the year (5)
2. Textbooks to be used (4)
3. Each unit as a need arises during the year (6)
4. The sequence of topics within a course of study which requires those specific topics (8)
5. Activities within a unit of work (32)
6. Audio-visual aids to be used (12)
7. Field trips (11)
8. Individual projects (31)
9. The objectives sought in each phase of the program (7)
10. The procedure of evaluating the results of each unit or project." (11)

Other ways in which pupils share in the planning were inserted by respondents as follows:

1. Selection of some units as needs arise (1)
2. Selection of units occasionally in current events only (1)
3. Selection of activities within a unit of work to a limited degree; usually in the second half of the year (1)

4. A block of two units of work for grade eight only (The respondent teaches grades seven and eight) (1)

5. Selection of projects for the upper half of the class only (1)

6. Selection sometimes of the procedure of evaluating the results of each unit (1)

Even though 34 of the 59 respondents reported they are making use of pupil-teacher planning, only a relatively small per cent of teachers, it would seem from this survey, permit the pupils to share in a broad scope of planning such as helping to decide the sequence of units, helping to select the topics within units, helping to set up the goals to be attained, or helping to decide how each unit's accomplishments might be evaluated.

Comparison of frequency of extended degrees of pupil-teacher planning used according to sex.— Of the ten checklist items which represented different ways in which pupils might share in the planning of classroom activities, the three items which represented more extensive degrees of pupil-teacher planning were the permitting of pupil selection of the sequence of units to be studied for the year, each unit as a need arises during the year, and the sequence of topics within a course of study which requires those specific topics.
Of all the 34 respondents who reported a use of pupil-teacher planning, only 12, including seven women and five men, use any of these more extended examples of pupil-teacher planning.

Of the five men teachers, none checked more than one of these three items. One man permits a pupil choice in the selection of the year's units, and the other four men permit a pupil choice of the sequence of topics within a course of required topics. No men teachers permit units to be selected as needs arise.

Of the seven women who permit more extensive degrees of pupil participation in classroom planning, three checked two of the items, and one woman checked all three. Of these seven women, four permit pupil selection of units as needs arise, and two permit the selection of the sequence of topics within a course of required topics.

All this indicates that not only do a larger per cent of women than men in the social studies field at the junior high-school level permit pupil-teacher planning, but more women permit a greater degree of pupil participation than do men.

Increased democratization as year progresses. Not only do teachers who purport to use pupil-teacher planning techniques differ in their degree of practice of it, but teachers, themselves, may vary their own practices as the year progresses. Experienced teachers are frequently heard advising younger
teachers to be comparatively strict earlier in the year, and then to become more democratic when proper respect from the pupils has been clearly established.

In this survey, of the 34 teachers who use pupil-teacher planning, only five reported they use democratic practices at the very beginning of the school year, while 24 indicated they democratize their teaching practices increasingly as the year progresses. Two failed to answer the question, and two others indicated they start the year with democratic practices, but permit a greater degree of democracy as the year progresses. Another specified she uses democratic practices in teaching after the sixth week of school.

4. Observations of Those Who Changed from Teacher Planning to Pupil-Teacher Planning

There were 15 teachers who reported they now use pupil-teacher planning but have not always used it. They were asked to check whatever they felt has resulted from their having changed to pupil-teacher planning methods.

The frequencies follow:
1. "The pupils became more interested in the activities." (10)
2. "There was better cooperation among pupils." (10)
3. "There was an improvement in reading skills." (2)
4. "There was a better pupil-teacher relationship." (13)
5. "The pupils showed a greater understanding of democracy." (7)

6. "The pupils showed greater subject matter achievement." (4)

7. "The pupils indicated a desire to continue the practice." (9)

One respondent left some of the above items unchecked, not to imply a negative answer, but because, in that person's belief, there has been no actual evidence that those improvements resulted from pupil-teacher planning.

The results clearly indicate that most teachers who changed from teacher planning to pupil-teacher planning felt there was an increased pupil interest, better cooperation among pupils, and a better teacher-pupil relationship. But few seem to believe there had been an improvement in such academic things as reading skills and subject matter achievement. This conclusion may well tie in with the Rehage experiment which was referred to in chapter 1.

5. Suggested Methods of Evaluating Effect of Pupil-Teacher Planning

The last question which was asked of those who use pupil-teacher planning was, "What do you believe are the most valid methods that may be used to evaluate the degree of improvement that is achieved by permitting pupils to share in planning?"
Of the 34 who indicated that they use pupil-teacher planning, 17 offered suggestions. There was no checklist with this question. Consequently, there were many different suggestions.

Six persons referred to the use of tests as one of the best methods. Some of these people mentioned standard tests. Teacher-made tests were also mentioned, and in some cases, it was not specified as to whether such tests should be standard or teacher-made.

An observation of increased pupil interest was also mentioned by six. Another respondent, however, gave the opinion, "An abstract thing like interest is most difficult to isolate, and to measure the effects is even more difficult."

Closely allied to an observation of interest is an observation of pupil participation in the classroom activities to which reference was made by three. Three others mentioned an observation of the pupils' school citizenship or behavior.

Two persons stated that no valid methods exist for the determining of the degree of improvement that is achieved by the use of pupil-teacher planning.

The following other methods of evaluating the effect of the use of pupil-teacher planning were each mentioned once:
(1) observing growth in pupil ability to work independently,
(2) observing the amount of cooperation among pupils,
(3) observing the pupils' maturity in action and thought,
(4) observing whether or not there is an amicable relationship
between teacher and students, (5) use of discussions and group reports, (6) observation of the use pupils make of available school and community sources of information, (7) observation of pupil citizenship several years later, (8) self-evaluation by students, (9) listening to comments made by students and parents, and (10) observing the feelings of a substitute teacher after an experience of having taught in a different "student-teacher atmosphere".

This question in the survey was asked simply to obtain teachers' opinions rather than to attempt to prove anything. It is true that improved interest, participation, or cooperation which might result from the use of pupil-teacher planning is something that may be observable, but there is a question, as some indicated, as to whether or not these results may be validly measured. It is doubtful that subjective observations have much validity.

Actually, the results from this question would tend to indicate that even among teachers who favor pupil-teacher planning, and who believe some benefit has resulted, there is a serious question as to how the degree of such benefit may be specifically determined.

5. Respondents' Comments

At the end of the questionnaire, space was provided for comments for each respondent regardless of his views on pupil-teacher planning.
Ten of the 59 who responded made comments. Of these 10, three do not use pupil-teacher planning, while seven do use it.

Comments of some who do not use pupil-teacher planning.— The following comments were made by three teachers who do not use pupil-teacher planning:

"I have a prescribed amount of material to cover. There is very little time for in-class planning. We do plan projects for open house."

"Earlier in my career, I had more pupil planning and I realize its value. As an older teacher, I find many reasons for directing and guiding all but brief assignments in pupil participation."

"There are no behavior problems if a teacher has her work well-organized and develops the desire to learn and to do right in her pupils!"

The last comment was made by a teacher who indicated she prints assignments for a block of time, usually two of three weeks. After explaining her type of assignment, a sample copy of which she included with her completed questionnaire, she stated, "Both the student and the teacher know where they are going and they like it!"

Comments of some who do use pupil-teacher planning.— The following comments were made by teachers who do use pupil-teacher planning:

"Just as every student is an individual, so every class
group is different and must be dealt with accordingly."

"It promotes cooperation and develops a democratic feeling which is needed."

"Our ninth grade is drawn from many different schools, and many students come to us with no experience in this area. I find it necessary to proceed cautiously, or else the advantages could easily be nullified."

"I feel that if the pupils are allowed to participate, the teacher will need to have veto power and to do a lot of guiding."

"Group planning teaches individual as well as group responsibilities. Leadership is far easier to recognize and to cope with if this type of planning is used."

"I do not feel a teacher should say, 'Now, what are we going to study next?' I think a teacher should do a great deal of planning and then give the students a choice of a few units. Usually I have in mind what we will do. One young teacher told me she would not give her students so much freedom another year. I think there needs to be a controlled selection. Students need to feel the teacher's guidance."

"Not all our planning is done by the students. I do a great deal of it. A 14-year old boy once told me it was the teacher's task to help a student see the areas of information he might investigate and not to leave all planning to the students, as they would miss many valuable experiences without adult guidance."
CHAPTER III
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Summary and Conclusions

The purpose of the survey, the results of which have been analyzed in chapter 2, has been to determine:

1. The proportion of social studies teachers in junior high schools who use pupil-teacher planning
2. The extent to which such planning is permitted
3. The reasons for which some teachers do not use that procedure.

The writer had definite reasons for wanting the purpose of the survey fulfilled. There was not a complete absence from his own mind of some doubt as to the merits of pupil-teacher planning as well as to the extent of its use. The chief reason for such doubts stemmed from what seems to have been a misconception of the term "pupil-teacher planning". Furthermore, these doubts also resulted from what had been a somewhat conservative, subject matter-centered, philosophy of education.

In preparing this thesis, the writer feels his thinking was greatly clarified as to the meaning and purposes of "pupil-teacher" planning. This clarification came not
only from the literature related to the topic which was consulted, but also from the checklist responses and inserted comments by the responding teachers.

The questionnaire associated with this thesis was sent to 98 junior high-school social studies teachers. At least one questionnaire went to a school in every state in the nation. Of these 98 questionnaires, 59 were returned. Of the 59 respondents, 28 were women, 27 were men, and four failed to indicate their sex.

Thirty-four indicated they use pupil-teacher planning, and 25 indicated they do not. Of the 28 women teachers, 17 use pupil-teacher planning, and 11 do not. Of the 27 men, 13 use pupil-teacher planning, and 14 do not.

While a majority of the respondents indicated a use of some pupil participation in planning, only 12 of the 59 permit any extended degree of it such as pupil selection of the sequence of units for the entire year, the selection of units as needs arise, or the selection of the sequence of topics within a prescribed course of study.

A decided majority of the teachers who reported a use of pupil-teacher planning democratize increasingly their practices as the year progresses.

There are some factors which, according to this survey, seem to influence a social studies teacher's decision as to whether or not to use pupil-teacher planning, while other
factors appear to be of little importance. Furthermore, factors which may be important in helping shape the views of teachers of one sex in the use of pupil-teacher planning do not appear to be important to teachers of the other sex.

Factors important to both men and women teachers.-- The factors which appear to have some influence on the pupil-teacher planning views of both men and women social studies teachers in the junior high school are these:

1. Whether or not a teacher has a core program
2. The use of homogeneous grouping in the school
3. The existence of double periods for a class.

Nine of the 12 respondents who have a core program use pupil-teacher planning. Seven of these make use to some degree of pupil-teacher planning, and five are among the relatively few who reported using extended forms of it.

The majority of the schools from which responses came use heterogeneous grouping. Only seven teachers reported homogeneous grouping in all subjects, of which six teachers use pupil-teacher planning. Furthermore, a majority of the teachers who work in schools with a modified form of homogeneity, such as grouping by reading, mathematics, or I.Q. scores only, also use pupil-teacher planning.

Heterogeneous grouping is apparently not a factor since 17 respondents with that type of class grouping use pupil-teacher planning, while an identical number with the same type of grouping reported they do not use the procedure.
It therefore seems that an absence of homogeneous grouping does not necessarily prevent a majority of teachers from using pupil-teacher planning. On the other hand, the presence of some form of homogeneous grouping does seem to encourage its use.

Having a class for a double period provides that longer interval of time which may be desired for pupil-teacher discussions regarding class activity plans. Of the 59 teachers who responded to this survey, 19 have double periods with at least one of their classes, and of these 19, there are 12 who use pupil-teacher planning and seven who do not. This seems to mean that a majority of teachers who have double periods use them for the group planning practice.

Factors important to one sex only.—Professional preparation seems to be important in determining the pupil-teacher planning views of men teachers. The per cent of men who have done advanced study or who have earned 31 or more semester hours in education who use pupil-teacher planning is larger than is the per cent of men who have done little or no advanced study, or who have earned 30 or less semester hours in education but who use that type of planning. This relationship of preparation to practice has not been found among women teachers.

There is among women, however, a pronounced relationship between the length of social studies teaching experience
and the use of group planning. The percentage of those with little experience who use it is higher than is the percentage of those who have had lengthier experience who use it. No such trend is noticeable among the men teachers.

This may well indicate that while men, generally, in the social studies field at the junior high school level may be more conservative in their views than are women, the views of men may be more easily changed by additional study. On the other hand, the women teachers at this grade level and in this subject area have a tendency to acquire a philosophy of teaching in their earlier years and then to allow it to change little even after further study.

This contention can be further strengthened by the fact that of the 13 men who reported a use of pupil-teacher planning, eight have changed from teacher-directed planning, and of these eight one has a master's degree and five have studied beyond a master's degree. Furthermore, all of these eight men who changed have had over 30 semester hours in education, and six of the eight have had 41 or more semester hours.

Of the 17 women who use pupil-teacher planning, only six reported they have changed from teacher-directed planning, and of the six who changed, three have only a bachelor's degree and one has no degree. Four of the six women who changed have 30 or less semester hours in education, and none of the six has over 40 hours.
In the summary of literature related to the topic of this thesis, the importance of personality was cited in connection with the willingness or ability to use pupil-teacher planning. Some teachers are flexible enough to adjust their practices to their change of views.

This survey made no attempt to determine the personality features of the respondents. There are, however, some personality traits more common to men, and others more common to women. The female personality appears to be more naturally suited for the use of pupil-teacher planning at the junior high school level. Male personalities seem more suited to a businesslike, subject matter-centered, teacher-dominated approach.

However, the male personality is apparently flexible to the extent that men teachers well into middle age seem able to change from their otherwise conservative practices to newer procedures when they are exposed to advanced study in the field of education. On the contrary, those female teacher personalities which are not readily suited for the use of pupil-teacher planning are in many cases inflexible to the extent that additional study in education courses has little effect upon pupil-teacher planning practices.

Final summary of sex as a factor.—The sex of a social studies teacher in the junior high school is unquestionably an important factor in determining that teacher's planning practices. A larger proportion of women teachers use pupil-
teacher planning than do men. But the views of women teachers are less likely to change as a result of advanced study than are the views of men. Rather, the views of women teachers with continued experience tend to harden and to become callous to newer ideas.

But the fact remains that a higher percentage of women do use pupil-teacher planning, and those teachers which use the more extensive types of teacher-pupil planning tend to be women.

Factors which are unimportant in shaping classroom planning procedures. — The following factors seem to have little bearing upon a junior high-school social studies teacher's classroom planning procedures:

1. Grade level being taught
2. Total years of teaching experience
3. Whether social studies are taught as one general subject or are separated into specific subjects
4. Heterogeneous grouping
5. Length of the class periods, excluding double periods
6. Size of the classes
7. Number of periods a teacher meets a class weekly
8. The geographic section of the nation in which a school is located.
Miscellaneous observations.— Various unrelated observations might well be summarized at this time.

First of all, of the 25 respondents who reported they do not use pupil-teacher planning, 15, or 60 per cent, gave as a reason their belief that pupils have neither enough maturity nor knowledge. This was the most common reason given by those opposed to pupil-teacher planning. This reason may be used against a broad extent of pupil-teacher planning, such as pupil selections of units as class needs arise, if the philosophy behind the opposing view is one calling for subject matter-centered objectives. Yet even a teacher with a conservative philosophy of education could not properly use this argument against a limited form of pupil-teacher planning such as pupil selection of individual activities and projects, the selection of field trips to be taken, or of the audio-visual aids to be used.

Both the writers of books and magazine articles on education as well as the respondents to this survey who use pupil-teacher planning agree very strongly that the success a teacher has with a class in the use of pupil-teacher planning is at least partly dependent upon the previous experience the pupils have had with that type of teaching procedure.

Regarding the possible interference from the administration of a school building, no teacher reported this as a reason for not using pupil-teacher planning.
Of the 34 teachers who reported a use of pupil-teacher planning, 15 replied that they have not always used it. Most of these 15 felt that each of the following resulted from the change: (1) increased pupil interest, (2) better cooperation among pupils, and (3) a better pupil-teacher relationship, with the last being the most commonly indicated. Few of the 15 who changed from teacher-dominated to pupil-teacher planning felt there was improvement in reading skills or social studies subject matter achievement.

As for the best way of evaluating the results of the use of pupil-teacher planning, one-half of the 34 who use the procedure offered suggestions. Observations of pupil interest and the use of tests were each suggested six times. Other observations were also mentioned. Two, however, stated that no measure of improvement resulting from the use of pupil-teacher planning could possibly be valid.

2. Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of this survey, the following are recommended:

1. An increased program of in-service training
2. Financial incentive in teachers' salary schedules for recurrent study even after maximum steps are reached
3. Further use of teachers' committees to study such areas as course of study content and goals
4. Encouragement from building administrators to teachers to use pupil-teacher planning methods

5. Increased scheduling in junior high schools of double periods for social studies classes

6. Provision in more school systems for sabbatical leave and for visitations to other schools

7. Experimentation by more schools with the core program. Homogeneity is not recommended even though pupil-teacher planning may be more widely used in homogeneously-grouped classes.

**Increased in-service training.**—The purpose for the recommendation of an increased program of in-service training is that education courses taken by a teacher while he is actually teaching will prove more meaningful than did the undergraduate courses he took before he ever actually took charge of a classroom. Early in-service training would seem very necessary for the younger women teachers, for if the findings of this survey are correct, the views of these women may become fixed after a comparatively few years, after which further study might be comparatively useless from the standpoint of effecting changes in their classroom planning procedures. If a woman early in her career favors pupil-teacher planning, she will probably retain that view.

Men social studies teachers at the junior high-school level to not, perhaps, become as definitely fixed in their views as do women teachers. But they are inclined to be somewhat conservative in practice. According to this survey,
they are more often influenced by ideas obtained from advanced courses in education. Consequently, continued in-service study for men teachers is also desirable.

**Financial incentives for recurrent study.**—Closely allied with the recommendation for more in-service training, is the suggestion of continued and possibly expanded financial incentive for recurrent study. This is especially necessary for those teachers who have reached the maximum salary step in their school systems. In too many cases, teachers on the maximum step of the salary schedule feel neither compulsion nor incentive for further study, but rather they acquire a feeling of immunity from any further responsibility for professional growth. They receive the most the salary schedule offers. Meanwhile, they are protected by a long period of tenure service, and nothing is required that will make them re-examine their teaching practices.

**Use of teachers' committees.**—The use which some principals and superintendents make of faculty study committees to bring about changes in course of study content and goals may be most beneficial. Such committee meetings in which views are exchanged between fellow workers of the same professional level can do much to stimulate new thinking.

**Encouragement from building principals.**—The building principal is in a key position to lend encouragement in the incorporating by teachers of more modern practices. Without appearing to be trying to force his philosophy upon any of his more conservative faculty members, he should at all
times be in a position to make related professional literature readily available. He ought also to encourage such a procedure as pupil-teacher planning throughout his building, since, as has been found in this survey, each teacher who uses the technique finds his work much easier if the pupils have had previous experience with the procedure.

**More double periods.**—The administrator can also help bring about more pupil-teacher planning in the social studies department, and probably in other subject areas as well, if more double periods are scheduled. With that longer interval of time which the double period provides, there is more opportunity for cooperative planning as well as for activities.

**Sabbatical leave and visitations.**—The school system should liberalize the time allowed for teacher visitations to other systems. Much may be gained by such visits. Furthermore, more systems should grant sabbatical leave to teachers. This would give a teacher more time for travel and professional study as well as a new perspective of his work.

**Increased experimentation with the core program.**—Increased experimentation with the core program is suggested for the junior high school, particularly if it includes a subject area with which the social studies could be fused. In this survey, three-fourths of the teachers who have a core program use pupil-teacher planning. There are many educators who are opposed to the core, but it is not the purpose of this
thesis to dwell upon either its advantages or disadvantages.

Homogeneity not recommended.-- While many teachers who have classes which are homogeneously grouped use pupil-teacher planning, this writer is, nevertheless, opposed to homogeneity of more than a limited degree. It is more desirable, it would seem, to have pupils of differing intellectual and social levels working together. This is especially true if the goals of a good social studies program are to be fulfilled. The teacher should provide for the different capacities of the pupils.

3. Importance to Teacher of a Clear Philosophy

It might be stated in conclusion that some social studies teachers are opposed to pupil-teacher planning because they have only a clouded concept of it. Others who may know the mechanics of pupil-teacher planning may oppose its use because they have a narrow subject matter-centered philosophy of education.

Teachers must not limit their thinking to a mere verbal presentation of subject matter content which they hope will equip their pupils with the proper ideals for democratic living. Rather, they must clarify their own philosophy of teaching as well as of life itself and arrive at a philosophy upon which really democratic as well as dynamic teaching procedures may be properly based.
APPENDIX A

THE COVERING LETTER

Junior High School,
Whitman, Mass.,
January 5, 1957.

Attention: Social Studies Department

Dear Sirs:

There appears to be differences of opinion among social studies teachers relating to the use of pupil participation in classroom planning at the junior high school level.

I would greatly appreciate the filling out of this enclosed questionnaire by any member of the social studies department of your school. Please have that teacher insert it in the enclosed envelope and send it to me. Your school is one of a number which are located in various parts of the country which I am contacting.

The teacher's name need not be signed to the questionnaire, but the name of the city or town in which your school is located is requested. Not more than one teacher from your school should contribute.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

William W. Peabody

WWP

Enclosure 2
APPENDIX B

THE QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION ONE

Name of School ________________________  Grade levels you teach: ( )7 ( )8 ( )9
Location ________________________________

1. Sex: ( )Male ( )Female

2. Degrees earned: ( )None ( )Bachelor's ( )Master's ( )Work beyond master's

3. Approximate number of semester hours in education courses (graduate or undergraduate):
   ( )Under 10 ( )11-20 ( )21-30 ( )31-40 ( )41 or over

4. Years of teaching experience (regardless of grade or subject area):
   ( )0-5 ( )6-10 ( )11-15 ( )16-20 ( )21-25 ( )26 or more

5. Years of teaching experience in the social studies area at the junior high school level:
   ( )0-5 ( )6-10 ( )11-15 ( )16-20 ( )21-25 ( )26 or more

6. The social studies program in your school includes:
   ( )Social studies as one general subject; e.g., seventh grade social studies or eighth grade social studies
   ( )Social studies separated into specific subjects such as history, geography, civics, and current events
   ( )A fusion of social studies with other areas of the curriculum so as to constitute a core program

7. You also teach:
   ( )Mathematics ( )Art ( )English, not fused with social studies
   ( )Science ( )Music ( )A foreign language
   ( )No other subject matter area than social studies
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8. The grouping of the junior high school grades in your school is:
   ( ) By I.Q. scores  ( ) By reading achievement
   ( ) By average achievement in all subjects  ( ) Heterogeneous

9. Average number of pupils in each of your classes:
   ( ) Under 20  ( ) 20-25  ( ) 26-30  ( ) 31-35  ( ) 36-40
   ( ) Over 40

10. Number of minutes per class period:
    ( ) Under 35  ( ) 35-40  ( ) 41-45  ( ) 46-50  ( ) 51-55
    ( ) 56 or over

11. Number of periods you meet each class weekly:
    ( ) 3  ( ) 4  ( ) 5  ( ) 6  ( ) 7  ( ) 8 or more

12. Do you have any of your classes for double periods?
    ( ) Yes  ( ) No

13. Do you permit any pupil participation in the planning of the activities that occur in your social studies classes:
    ( ) Yes  ( ) No

14. If you DO NOT permit pupil participation in class planning, your reasons for not doing so are:
    ( ) The administration frowns upon such practices
    ( ) You formerly tried it but you felt behavior problems resulted
    ( ) You have never tried it for fear of disorder
    ( ) You feel it is a decision for which the children have neither enough maturity nor knowledge
    ( ) You have insufficient facilities
    ( ) Other teachers in your building do not permit it

SECTION TWO

If you DO practice the permitting of pupil participation in planning, please complete Section Two. If you DO NOT practice it, please do only Section One.
Space is provided at the end of Section Two for your comments regardless of your views.

15. If you do permit pupil participation in class planning, you permit opportunity for pupil selection of:

( ) The sequence of units to be studied for the year
( ) Textbooks to be used
( ) Each unit as a need arises during the year
( ) The sequence of topics within a course of study which requires those specific topics
( ) Activities within a unit of work
( ) Audio-visual aids to be used
( ) Field trips
( ) Individual projects
( ) The objectives sought in each phase of the program
( ) The procedure of evaluating the results of each unit or project

16. In your experience of teaching social studies, have you always permitted pupil participation in planning?

( ) Yes ( ) No

17. If you formerly did not permit it, but later changed, you found:

( ) The pupils became more interested in the activities
( ) There was better cooperation among pupils
( ) There was an improvement in reading skills
( ) There was a better teacher-pupil relationship
( ) The pupils showed a greater understanding of democracy
( ) The pupils showed greater subject matter achievement
( ) The pupils indicated a desire to continue the practice

18. Do you believe pupils show better participation in classroom planning if they have had experience of this sort with previous teachers?

( ) Yes ( ) No
19. Each year you:

( ) Use democratic practices at the very beginning of the year
( ) Democratize your teaching practices increasingly as the year progresses

20. What do you believe are the most valid methods that may be used to evaluate the degree of improvement that is achieved by permitting pupils to share in planning?
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