

*economics on tv: an evaluation
of "the American economy"*

BASED ON A NATIONAL
SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL
SOCIAL STUDIES
TEACHERS

by

Ann F. Brunswick

LIBRARY
NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago
FILE COPY



National Opinion Research Center / UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DECEMBER, 1964

EVALUATION OF COLLEGE OF THE AIR COURSE, "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

ON THE BASIS OF

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

Conducted for
The Learning Resources Institute

by
Ann F. Brunswick

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

December, 1964

PREFACE

This survey was called into being to answer the need for an objective evaluation, on a national basis, of the television series, "The American Economy". The program had been sponsored by the Learning Resources Institute, the American Economics Association, the Joint Council on Economic Education, and the National Task Force on Economic Education. The basic objectives of the survey were formulated initially by a special committee of the aforementioned National Task Force. The Learning Resources Institute then contracted with the National Opinion Research Center to design and execute the survey.

In addition to the valuable data which concern the educational television program, a seeming wealth of information about high school social studies teachers has emerged in this study. We feel, therefore, that the account of this research will have value for the larger education community, in addition to the meaning we trust it will have for those concerned with educational television in general and for those, in particular, who were responsible for making available "The American Economy".

Through various statistical techniques, we have attempted in this research to ascertain the effects of the television program on the economics knowledge and teaching practices of those who watched it. The writer is fully aware, and asks that others reading this report be also, of the limitations of a statistical survey in assigning cause and effect responsibility. This survey was conducted after the fact. In order to make precise assertions of the causality behind observed behavior, an experimental, controlled before-and-after study, or matched group study, is needed. What we can do and what, in fact, this survey has done, is to determine whether a real relationship does exist and to control statistically certain of the factors which might possibly be responsible for it. When all such analyses point to the same conclusion, as these do, then it seems that the inference of causality may be justified. But it should be remembered that it is with inference that we are dealing. In those places in this report where caution is needed against making unwarranted interpretations of the data, we have tried to call attention to that fact.

The first chapter of this report consists of a brief summary of the major findings; its purpose is to give a general overview of the results. In the service of brevity, only the regular viewers of the television program are compared with the total sample of social studies teachers. But the findings presented in the body of the report also control

economics background, thus setting them in a fuller perspective. And, of course, the separate data chapters contain some detailed findings which are not mentioned in the summary. For these reasons, it is hoped that those persons interested in more than a cursory review of what this study determined will refer to the full report.

The professional economist, or educator, upon reading this report will doubtlessly arrive at conclusions and see implications which we did not consider ourselves competent to assess. This is in the nature of the role which the researcher here assumed: unfolding the facts and leaving conclusions and implications to those working closely in the affected fields.

Many people have given professional assistance and advice during the progress of the study. In particular, I wish to express my thanks and deep appreciation to the following persons: Professor G. L. Bach, Chairman of the National Task Force on Economic Education, who has advised on all matters of economic education which the survey entailed as well as provided valuable suggestions for the analysis and report; Dr. John Taylor, President, and Dr. Tom Robinson of the Learning Resources Institute, for their frequent help during the planning and execution of the survey; Mr. Paul Borsky and Mr. Paul Sheatsley of the National Opinion Research Center, particularly for their help in developing the survey design and for advice along the way; Dr. Elizabeth Lyman, NORC, who supervised the data being prepared for tabulation; and Dr. Seymour Sudman, also of NORC, who prepared the sample and provided assistance and advice on all analytical and statistical procedures.

Thanks are also extended, for their technical assistance, to: Mr. Pat Page of NORC for carrying out complicated computer operations; and to Mr. Len Soifer of the Datatab Corp., for handling the preparation of I.B.M. cards and machine tabulations.

With appreciation for all the assistance received from those mentioned above and others, the writer remains responsible entirely for the contents of this report.

Ann F. Brunswick
Study Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PREFACE	i
CONTENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
CHAPTER	
I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY	
1. Background	8
2. Research Objectives.	9
3. Definition of Terms	9
4. How Data Were Collected -- An Overview	10
5. Arranging for the Survey Session	10
6. The Survey Session	11
7. The Questionnaire.	11
III. SAMPLE DESIGN	
1. Sample of High Schools	13
2. The Respondents.	13
3. A Note About Sampling Estimates.	16
IV. WHO WATCHED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"?	
1. The Size of the Audience	19
2. Frequency of Viewing	20
3. Viewers of the Program During Its First Season	21
4. Economics Background	22
5. The Analytic Groups.	24
V. HOW AND WHEN DID THEY WATCH?	
1. Credit Received	26
2. Time of Day the Program Was Viewed	27
3. Awareness of the Program	28
4. Sources of Information About the Program	28

VI. EFFECTIVENESS OF "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

1. Teachers' Judgments on Value of the Program	33
2. Objective Measure of Effectiveness -- Economics Test Scores.	35
3. Performance on the Economics Test -- Other Populations	36
4. Test Performance in the NORC Sample.	38
5. Other Possible Reasons for Superior Performance -- The Index of Professional Activity	39
6. And Still Other Possible Reasons -- The Multiple Regression Analysis	41
7. Conclusions About the Effect of the Television Program on Test Scores. .	41
8. Changes in the Amount of Time Spent Teaching Economics Topics.	42
9. The Topics Which Are Receiving Increased Attention	44
10. A Final Indicator of the Program's Effectiveness -- Professional Quality of the Regular Viewers	45

VII. WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Personal and Background Characteristics

1. Age	46
2. Sex.	47
3. Income	48
3a. Total Gross Family Income.	49
4. National Origin.	50
5. Parents' Education Level	50
6. Father's Usual Occupation.	52

VIII. WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Academic Background

1. Academic Degrees	54
2. Number of Academic Degrees Earned.	55
3. Currently Studying for a Degree	55
4. Major Study for Degrees.	56
5. Date of Last Degree.	58
6. Scholastic Excellence -- Academic Honors Received.	59
7. Scholastic Excellence -- Rank in Senior Graduating Class	60

IX. WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Professional Interests

1. Membership in Professional and Academic Organizations	62
2. Offices Held in Professional Organizations	62
3. Attendance at Professional Meetings and Lectures	63
4. Readership of Professional and Technical Periodicals	64
5. Readership of Particular Publications	64

X. WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Time Spent Watching Television

1. Number of Hours a Week Usually Spent Watching TV	66
2. Number of Hours a Week Usually Spent Watching Educational TV	67

XI.	WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: <u>Teaching Experience</u>	
	1. Total Number of Years Teaching	68
	2. Number of Years Teaching High School Social Studies	69
	3. Proportion of Current Teaching Load That Is in the Social Studies	70
	4. Kinds of Social Studies Classes Being Taught	70
	5. Some Other Characteristics of High School Economics Teachers	71
	6. Expectations for Future Teaching	71
XII.	WHERE DO THEY TEACH?	
	1. Community Size and Degree of Urbanization	73
	2. Geographic Distribution of Teachers	77
	3. Number of Social Studies Teachers in the School	77
	4. Size of Pupil Enrollment	78
XIII.	WHICH HIGH SCHOOLS HAVE A SEPARATE COURSE IN ECONOMICS?	
	1. Where Are the Schools?	80
	2. Which Instructors Teach in These High Schools	81
XIV.	WHAT ECONOMICS IS BEING TAUGHT IN HIGH SCHOOL?	82
	1. Economics Topics Rated "Very Important"	83
	2. Plans to Include Any Economics Topic in Their Teaching	85
	3. Time Spent Teaching Economics Topics	85
	4. Economics and Problems of Democracy Teachers	89
	5. Preferences for the Analytical, Descriptive or Historical Emphasis In Economics Teaching	91
<u>APPENDIX</u>		
A.	1) NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES TAKEN AT UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL	94
	2) NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES TAKEN AT GRADUATE LEVEL	94
	3) NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN IN 12 SUBJECT FIELDS	94
B.	DISTRIBUTION OF ECONOMICS TEST SCORES	95
C.	CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT ON 11 ECONOMICS TOPICS	96
D.	READERSHIP OF TEN SELECTED PERIODICALS	98
E.	NUMBER OF PERIODS EXPECTED TO SPEND TEACHING ECONOMICS TOPICS	100

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. RESPONSE RATE AMONG SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS.	14
2. RESPONSE RATE ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC REGION.	14
3. RESPONSE RATE ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE	15
4. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION	15
5. COMMUNITY SIZE AND DEGREE OF URBANIZATION	16
6. PERCENTAGE STANDARD ERRORS OF THE ESTIMATE.	17
7. PROPORTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO VIEWED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"	19
8. FREQUENCY OF VIEWING "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"	20
9. VIEWING PATTERNS ACCORDING TO ECONOMICS BACKGROUND.	23
10. ECONOMICS BACKGROUNDS OF VIEWERS.	24
11. PROPORTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO VIEWED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY" FOR CREDIT.	26
12. TIME OF DAY THE PROGRAM WAS VIEWED.	27
13. HOW TEACHERS HEARD ABOUT "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"	29
14. HOW MUCH "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY" ADDED TO KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS	34
15. SCORES ON 25 FACTUAL ECONOMICS QUESTIONS.	36
16. AVERAGE SCORES ON 25 FACTUAL ECONOMICS QUESTIONS.	37
17. SCORES FOR CREDIT TAKERS VERSUS OTHER REGULAR VIEWERS	38
18. MEAN SCORES ON ECONOMICS TEST ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY.	40
19. ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE.	40
20. NUMBER OF ECONOMICS TOPICS ON WHICH TEACHERS SPENT INCREASED TIME	43
21. AGE OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS.	46
22. PROPORTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN AMONG SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS.	47
23. ECONOMICS BACKGROUND AND VIEWING AMONG MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS	47
24. TEACHING INCOME OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS.	49
25. FATHER'S HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE	51
26. MOTHER'S HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE	51
27. FATHER'S OCCUPATION REPORTED BY SAMPLES OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS, OF COLLEGE ECONOMICS INSTRUCTORS, AND OF THE GENERAL POPULATION	52
28. NUMBER OF ACADEMIC DEGREES EARNED	55
29. PROPORTIONS OF VIEWERS AND NON-VIEWERS CURRENTLY WORKING TOWARDS AN ADVANCED DEGREE	56
30. MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR ALL ACADEMIC DEGREES	57

TABLE

PAGE

31. MAJOR STUDY FOR LAST DEGREE	58
32. DATE WHEN LAST DEGREE WAS RECEIVED	59
33. AVERAGE NUMBER OF HONORS RECEIVED	60
34. RANK IN COLLEGE GRADUATING CLASS	61
35. MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	62
36. NUMBER OF TIMES TEACHERS HAVE HELD OFFICE IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS	63
37. NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND LECTURES ATTENDED	63
38. NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL PERIODICALS READ REGULARLY	64
39. NUMBER OF HOURS A WEEK USUALLY WATCH TELEVISION	66
40. NUMBER OF HOURS A WEEK USUALLY WATCH EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION	67
41. TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING	69
42. NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES	69
43. PROPORTION OF TEACHERS' CLASSES THAT ARE IN SOCIAL STUDIES	70
44. SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES AND DEGREES OF URBANIZATION: BY ECONOMICS BACKGROUND	74
45. SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES AND DEGREES OF URBANIZATION: BY TELEVIEWING	75
46. DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT SIZES AND DEGREES OF URBANIZATION	76
47. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS	77
48. PROPORTIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS WITH DIFFERENT PUPIL ENROLLMENTS	79
49. SCHOOLS WITH SEPARATE ECONOMICS COURSE	80
50. PROPORTION OF INSTRUCTORS IN SCHOOLS WITH SEPARATE ECONOMICS COURSE	81
51. NO. OF ECONOMICS TOPICS CONSIDERED "VERY IMPORTANT" TO TEACH	84
52. RANKING OF ECONOMICS TOPICS CONSIDERED "VERY IMPORTANT" TO TEACH	86
53. NO. OF TOPICS TEACHERS WILL SPEND SIX PERIODS OR MORE TEACHING	88
54. RANKING OF ECONOMICS TOPICS ON WHICH TEACHERS WILL SPEND SIX PERIODS OR MORE	89
55. PROPORTIONS TEACHING ECONOMICS TOPICS FOR SIX OR MORE PERIODS	90
56. PREFERENCES FOR ANALYTIC, DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORIC APPROACHES	92
57. RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL APPROACHES	93

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following pages highlight some of the findings from a national survey of high school social studies teachers. The National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, conducted this research for the Learning Resources Institute. Its objective was to evaluate the television series, "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY." From September 1962 to May 1963, this program was presented in half-hour segments, five times a week, over some 240 television stations throughout the country. One of the program's primary target audiences was high school social studies teachers and this research is concerned solely with their reactions to the presentation of the program during 1962-1963. The survey has yielded information about all high school social studies teachers, as well as the special data on the characteristics of teachers who watched the television program and the effectiveness of the program for those who watched it.

A. WHO WATCHED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"?

1. The Size of the Audience: About 1 in 5 high school social studies teachers watched the program at some time during the 1962-63 season. If this proportion is projected onto the total population of high school social studies teachers, reported at between 60,000 - 65,000, it would appear that approximately 12,500 teachers watched some part of "The American Economy" series.

Most viewers watched on an "occasional" basis: three-quarters of the teachers (73 percent) reported that they had watched less frequently than one program each week. About 1 in 4 viewers, an estimated 3,500 social studies teachers, were "regular" viewers who watched at least one program each week; half of these regular viewers reported that they watched three or more of the programs every week. About a fifth of the regular viewers, one percent of all social studies teachers, indicated that they had taken the television course for college or in-service credit.¹ Because their number is small, in this report these "for-credit" viewers are grouped with other regular viewers.

¹ If we compare this figure with the number of credit viewers estimated by the Joint Council on Economic Education, 5,500, it is apparent that high school social studies teachers were only one portion of the credit-takers.

2. Their Background of College Economics: About 5 in 6 (84 percent) of all social studies teachers have had at least one one-semester college economics course, better than 2 in 5 (44 percent) have had at least three.

The Regular Viewers: Teachers who watched "The American Economy" regularly have taken more college economics than other teachers: two-thirds (67 percent) of the regular viewers have had three or more college economics courses.

3. Their Academic Background: Just about every high school social studies teacher has a bachelor's degree, and 2 in 5 hold a higher degree. However, only 1 teacher in 25 has majored in economics. One in 9 teachers has majored in physical education for a degree.

Two thirds of the teachers have earned a degree within the past ten years, and 2 out of every 5 teachers are currently working toward another degree.

Slightly more than half of the teachers (56 percent) reported that they were graduated in the top quarter of their college class.

The Regular Viewers: Teachers who watched "The American Economy" regularly have more advanced degrees: 3 in 5 have some degree beyond the bachelor's. Only slightly more among them (six percent) have majored in economics but very few of them (two percent) have ever majored in physical education.

Regular viewers completed their formal education longer ago than the other teachers: better than half (57 percent) have had their last degree more than ten years. They are somewhat less likely than the non-viewers to be working currently for some degree -- only 1 in 3 is doing so.

Slightly more regular viewers were in the top quarter of their college graduating class, about two-thirds of them (65 percent) reported this standing.

4. Their Professional Interests: Nearly all high school social studies teachers belong to some professional organization; 3 in 5 of all the teachers belonged to at least three of them. About half (49 percent) have held some professional office. Somewhat more than half (54 percent) attended at least five lectures and professional meetings in the year preceding the survey. Only 1 teacher in 20 indicated that he read no professional periodicals regularly; half of the teachers reported that they read at least three of them regularly.

The Regular Viewers: On each of these measures, those teachers who watched "The American Economy" regularly reported a greater degree of professional involvement than the other teachers. Three-quarters of the regular viewers belonged to at least three professional organizations; almost three-quarters of them have held some professional office. Better than 7 in 10 (72 percent) attended a minimum of five professional meetings or lectures in the past year. Three-quarters of them read at least three professional publications regularly.

5. Some Personal Characteristics: The median age of all the high school social studies teachers was 33.5. Four-fifths of them are men. Their median teaching income was just over \$6,000.

The Regular Viewers: Compared to other social studies teachers, regular viewers were older, with a median age of 43.8 years. Although still predominantly male, there are more women among them than among the other teachers: the ratio of women to men was 1 in 4 for all the regular viewers and 1 in 3 for regular viewers who have had three or more college economics courses. Regular watchers were earning higher teaching salaries, their median teaching income being close to \$7,500.

6. Their Teaching Experience: The average (median) number of years which the entire group has been teaching was 8.4; 1 in 5 of the teachers (19 percent) have been teaching twenty years or longer. They have been teaching high school social studies, specifically, for a shorter time -- a median of 5.6 years. Just 1 in 9 of the teachers indicated as much as twenty years of this experience.

Most of the teachers (71 percent) teach only social studies classes, but few (13 percent) teach a separate course in economics.

The Regular Viewers: As a group, regular viewers have been teaching twice as long as teachers who never watched "The American Economy" -- a median of 14.3 years. They have been teaching high school social studies more than two times longer than non-viewers -- a median of 10.8 years.

Nearly all of them teach social studies exclusively; 9 in 10 of the regular viewers taught nothing else. And they were about four times more likely than the non-viewers to be teaching a separate course in economics -- 42 percent of those who watched "The American Economy" regularly were teaching such a course.

7. Location of Teachers: Proportionately, more of the teachers in metropolitan areas of under 2 million population, than in other size communities, were regular viewers of the program. Those located in the central cities of all metropolitan areas were more likely than teachers in suburban and fringe districts to view the program regularly. Hardly any of the teachers in the smallest towns and rural counties watched "The American Economy" regularly.

Regular viewers were more likely to be teaching in large schools: about half of them were teaching in high schools which have ten or more social studies teachers or have 1,500 or more pupils. Only about 3 in 10 non-viewers teach in schools this large.

B. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

Statistical analysis, in the absence of a controlled laboratory type experiment, can show only that a true relationship exists between two conditions, a relationship not arising from chance. The cause behind an effect may be inferred but cannot be proved by these statistical procedures.

1. Difference in Economics Test Scores: To see whether watching "The American Economy" improved teachers' understanding of economics, all social studies teachers in the sample were given a carefully selected shortened form of the standardized "Test of Economic Understanding." This test was prepared by a national committee of distinguished economists and educators, under the chairmanship of Dr. John Stalnaker, President of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, and has now been taken by thousands of high school students, college students, and others. The performance of watchers of "The American Economy" on this test was compared with that of other social studies teachers.

Regular viewers achieved significantly higher scores on this test than did occasional viewers and non-viewers:

Regular viewers attained a mean score of 18.9 compared to 17.0 for other teachers, on the 25 question test used. One out of three regular viewers scored 23 or more (nearly perfect) compared to only one out of ten other teachers.

There was considerable variation in the scores of teachers on the test, reflecting, one would assume, comparable variation in economic understanding. The standard deviation was approximately 5 for regular viewers, 4 for non-viewers.

2. Was the TV Program Responsible? Watching "The American Economy" regularly appears to have been responsible for a part of the higher test scores of regular viewers. When comparing scores only for teachers who have taken at least three college economics courses, the average score of regular viewers with that

many economics courses was just half a point higher than the comparable non-viewing group. However, when allowances were made, through statistical controls, for differences in previous economics training plus professional activities which may measure motivation and reflect exposure to other information sources, a statistically significant part of the higher scores of regular viewers was still attributable to the TV program.

Furthermore, when five additional factors were introduced for statistical control, in order to test their importance and interaction in explaining test scores, watching the television program three or more times a week was found to have the largest weight. In this combination, when teachers were alike in all other of these respects, viewing the program three or more times a week added almost four points over not viewing at all. This compared to almost two points gained for having five or more college economics courses over not having any. The weight for teaching a course in Economics or Problems of Democracy was only slightly better than one point. These weights, of course, apply only in this particular combination of factors, among which thorough televiewing of "The American Economy" apparently played the largest role when all else was held constant. The combination of all these factors explained but 15 percent of the total differences in test scores. It is clear, therefore, that there are still other factors which are responsible for a major part of the differences among high school social studies teachers with regard to their economics understanding as measured on this test.

Impact on Teaching Practices: Regular viewers of "The American Economy" indicated they have increased the amount of time they spend in their classrooms on economic topics, compared to other social studies teachers.

Three out of ten regular viewers reported they are now spending more time on at least six out of 11 economic topics listed. This compares to only about half as many of the other teachers who indicated such an increase over the past two years.

Teachers were asked to indicate for each economic topic whether they are now spending more time teaching it than they did two years ago. About a third of all regular watchers reported spending substantially more time on: the role of markets, prices and profits; economic stability and growth; the distribution of incomes, labor and labor problems; the development of modern economic institutions; and money and banking.

These compare to about a quarter to a fifth of non-viewers who reported they were spending increased time on these topics. But there were no significant differences between viewers and non-viewers on increased time devoted to comparative economic systems, international economic problems, and underdeveloped economies.

C. WHAT ECONOMICS IS BEING TAUGHT IN HIGH SCHOOLS?

The study provides data on how much time is spent by teachers on particular topics in economics and their general preferences for analytical or descriptive approaches in teaching economics. Regular viewers and other teachers are compared on these matters. However, the extent to which the differences are a result of the television program can not be determined from the findings.

1. Time Spent Teaching Economics Topics: Teachers were asked about the number of class periods they would spend teaching eleven different areas of economics during the school year. About half reported that they would spend six periods or more on each of at least three topics. About 1 in 6 teachers planned to spend this much time on at least seven of the eleven topics.

The Regular Viewers: Regular viewers were spending more time teaching these topics than the other teachers. Upwards of three-quarters of them (77 percent) indicated that they would spend a minimum of six periods on three or more of the topics. One in 3 regular viewers planned to spend this much time on at least seven of the topics.

2. Which Topics Received Most Attention: The topic receiving most classroom time was "comparative economic systems." About half (49 percent) of all those teaching economic topics and 7 in 10 of the regular viewers, planned to spend at least six class periods on this.

About half or more of all regular viewers reported plans to spend six or more class periods during the school year on: the development of modern economic institutions; international economic problems; the underdeveloped economies; the distribution of incomes; the role of markets, prices and profits; and economic stability and growth. By contrast, only a third to a quarter of non-viewers indicated plans to spend six or more class periods on these topics.

3. Method Preferred in Teaching Economics: Information was obtained on teaching approaches and methods. Three problem situations were posed. On each, the teachers were asked to rank three alternative approaches in terms of how much they stress them in their own teaching of the topic. The three alternatives represented analytical, descriptive and historical emphases.

Among all teachers, the descriptive approach was most popular, then the analytical and, finally, the historical. Only about a quarter (27 percent) of the teachers elected the analytical approach first for any two or for all three of the situations.

Furthermore, when asked directly whether they generally favored the descriptive or the analytical approach in their teaching about economics, half of all the teachers answered the descriptive, and a quarter the analytical. The remaining quarter said they gave equal emphasis to the two.

Regular Viewers: Regular viewers stressed the analytical approach more heavily than the other teachers did. Better than 2 in 5 regular viewers (44 percent) ranked the analytical approach in first place for at least two of the three situations, followed by descriptive and historical approaches. And almost 2 in 5 indicated that they generally emphasized the analytical aspects in their teaching about economics matters.

D. WHICH HIGH SCHOOLS OFFER A SEPARATE COURSE IN ECONOMICS?

Separate courses in economics are offered in about 2 out of 5 high schools. These are concentrated especially in the large metropolitan centers. Almost three-quarters (73 percent) of high schools in the central cities of the largest metropolitan areas (2,000,000 or more population) offer a separate course in economics; in the suburban and outlying parts of these metropolitan areas and in the central cities of the smaller metropolitan areas, slightly more than half the schools (56 and 55 percent, respectively) have a separate course in economics. In cities of 10-50,000 the proportion is less than 1 in 2 (44 percent) and in the smallest twons and rural areas only 3 in 10.

The Regular Viewers: Regular viewers were more likely than other instructors to be teaching in a high school which offered a separate course in economics: about 2 in 3 regular viewers (64 percent) but fewer than half the non-viewers (46 percent) were in these schools.

Chapter II

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY

1. Background:

During the eight months from September 1962 to May 1963, the television course "The American Economy" was shown on about 182 CBS television stations and an additional 54 educational and 5 independent television stations throughout the country. "The American Economy" was presented by the Learning Resources Institute, a non-profit organization representing the educational community, and established to develop, promote, and coordinate college courses for credit on television networks. The course was co-sponsored by the American Economic Association, the Joint Council on Economic Education, and The National Task Force on Economic Education.

While of general value to all citizens, the course was designed especially to be of value to the high school social studies teacher. It included five half-hour lessons per week for thirty-two weeks. Emphasis was placed on developing an understanding of how our economic system works, on analyzing questions of economic policy and familiarizing viewers with economic facts, concepts, and institutions. Every fifth lesson was concerned with educational methods appropriate for the teaching of high school economics. The course was offered for college credit in more than 350 institutions as well as for in-service credit by a number of Boards of Education.

At the conclusion of the television course, an evaluation of its impact and effectiveness was considered desirable as a guide to future programming. With this purpose in mind, the Learning Resources Institute contracted with the National Opinion Research Center to design and execute a national survey to evaluate the effectiveness of "The American Economy", among high school social studies teachers. Preliminary research objectives were formulated by an advisory group of the National Task Force on Economic Education.

2. Research Objectives:

The primary objectives of this research may be outlined as follows:

- 1) To describe the size and characteristics of the audience for the television course among high school social studies teachers.
- 2) To describe certain characteristics of their viewing such as when and how often they watched, the extent to which the course was taken for college or teacher in-service credit, and how much the teachers felt the program contributed to their knowledge and skills.
- 3) To evaluate the extent to which the television series may have increased the economic understanding of its viewers.
- 4) In so far as possible, to determine whether the television series had any effect on the actual classroom teaching practices of the viewers.
- 5) In addition, it was recognized that a representative, national sample of high school social studies teachers would yield, perhaps for the first time on a national basis, systematic information about personal and academic backgrounds, teaching experiences and practices, professional motivations and activities, and the like. Such information would be of considerable use to persons responsible for teacher training and curriculum planning, in the field of economics in particular and in the social studies generally. Furthermore, because this objective was of such a broad nature, it served well as the stated rationale for the survey when appealing for cooperation from school administrators and teachers.¹

3. Definition of Terms:

From the outset, it was necessary to define clearly and to limit certain terms basic to the survey, namely: a) which courses were to be considered social studies; b) which teachers were to be considered social studies teachers; and c) which kinds of high schools would be included. The following are the definitions adhered to throughout this research:

- a) Any subject that was taught within the social studies department of the school was accepted as a social studies subject. The following represents the kinds of high school subjects which might be within the purview of the social studies department:

¹ A brief report is in preparation which deals with these general data about social studies teachers. It will be sent to the many teachers and administrators who cooperated in the survey and asked to see the results.

Geography, Economic Geography, Earth Science
American, World or other History
Social Science
Civics, Citizenship, Government
Problems or Challenge of Democracy
Economics, Economic Institutions
Occupations
International Relations
Consumer Education

b) To be eligible for participation in the survey, the teacher must be teaching at least half of his classes in a social studies subject. If he taught social studies less than half-time, he was not included. It will be particularly important to keep this qualification in mind when reading the material describing the characteristics of social studies teachers: that we are dealing primarily with full time social studies teachers and only with those who teach social studies at least half-time.

c) All the high schools in this survey were public schools; none were junior high schools. Only four-year and three-year high schools were included, plus in the few cases involving a joint or combination junior-senior high school, just those social studies teachers responsible for teaching in grades 9 - 12.

4. How Data Were Collected -- An Overview:

The survey instrument was a two-part written questionnaire, both parts together designed to conform to the length of the usual high school class period. All questions were of the short-answer type and most were prepared with pre-coded answer categories. Most questionnaires were completed at a group meeting of all the social studies teachers in that school; the administration of the questionnaire was always under the supervision of an NORC representative.

The survey proceeded in two stages: 1) making the arrangements for a date and time when all the social studies teachers in the high school could be called together to fill in the questionnaire; 2) administering the questionnaires at the survey session.

5. Arranging for the Survey Session:

Initial contact for setting up the survey was made through a letter from the study director to the superintendent of schools responsible for each of the selected schools. This letter outlined briefly the survey's purposes and procedures, emphasized the importance of having cooperation from every selected school, and explained that a representative from the National Opinion Research Center would call in a few days. The purpose of the call was to answer any questions that

the school official might have and to find out how he wished her to proceed with the matter. This initial contact led subsequently to a meeting between the NORC representative and the high school principal and/or chairman of the social studies department, to set upon the specific time and date for the survey session and to determine exactly how each teacher would be notified about the session. Care was taken to describe the survey only in terms of its general interest in social studies teachers. In the cases where the school wished to see the questionnaire beforehand, the school officials cooperated in not informing the teachers that there were questions on economics. This was important, as they realized, to avoid any response bias that might be introduced if the teachers were aware ahead of time of our special interest in economics and should elect to participate or to stay away on this basis.

The public explanation of the survey defined it as one designed to obtain information from a nationally representative sample of high school social studies teachers as to their educational backgrounds, teaching experiences and views of certain subject areas. All participants were assured that no particular schools or teachers would be identified in the report of the findings.

6. The Survey Session:

If all the social studies teachers in a school had the same hour free, the survey session was scheduled for that time. In other cases, a department meeting was held after school hours at which the teachers answered the questionnaire. In some of the larger city schools, if the teachers did not have a common free period and no after-school time could be arranged, the department chairman made an office available to the NORC representative for an entire school day to which the teachers came to answer questionnaires during their free periods.

Whenever the survey could not be completed by all the teachers at the same time, the importance of keeping the nature of the questions confidential was stressed and the teachers were requested to avoid any discussion of the survey until all the teachers in that school had participated.

Most of the schools responded in January and February, 1964. None participated after March.

7. The Questionnaire:

Part A consisted of 25 factual, multiple-choice questions, each with four answer alternatives. These were taken from the "Test of Economic Understanding"²

²"Test of Economic Understanding", published by Science Research Associates, Inc., 259 East Erie Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.

a standardized test developed by a committee of leading economists, educators and psychometricians under the chairmanship of Dr. John M. Stalnaker, President of the National Merit Scholarship Corporation. This test has been administered to some 8,000 high school students and smaller numbers of college economics students and high school teachers.

The series of questions in Part A provided an objective measure of economic understanding appropriate to the content of the "The American Economy" television series. The teachers' instructions described them as "designed to record some of your views on how an economy operates". Any explicit reference to this being a "test" was carefully avoided, since it was assumed that some teachers might react negatively to being "tested".

Because a 30 minute maximum time limit had to be observed for completing Part A, teachers handed in this part of the questionnaire before proceeding to the second part. Part B asked about the teachers' personal and academic backgrounds, teaching experiences, professional activities, viewing of "The American Economy", and classroom practices in teaching economics.

Teachers did not enter their names on the questionnaire. Instead, each questionnaire had matching identification numbers on Parts A & B and the two parts were reassembled after they were handed in.

Chapter III

SAMPLE DESIGN

1. Sample of High Schools:

Because there was no master list of all social studies teachers in the United States, a simple probability sample of teachers was not possible. Instead, a representative national sample of high schools was used. A sample of 580 high schools was drawn from a listing prepared by the NORC in October 1963 especially for this purpose. The listing included all public high schools (except those which were junior high schools only) which were operating in the Fall of 1963 and which were located in the NORC's 72 primary sampling units and the 144 counties that they represent. The 72 NORC sample points constitute a nationally representative sample proportionate to population and the high schools located within them could be assumed also to form a representative sample of all public high schools.

For this sample, the high schools within certain sample points have been weighted, by dividing their overall probability of selection (about 1 in 12, or .0833) by the probability of selection which that sample point carried in the national sample. Thus we developed a weighted national sample of high schools which was proportionate to total population and, consequently, to high school population. All percentage findings presented in this report are based on weighted data, although some unweighted totals of respondents are presented and were used for deriving estimates of sampling error.

2. The Respondents:

Within each of the 580 selected high schools, all instructors teaching social studies at least half-time were eligible as respondents in the survey. Some of the schools (13) proved not to have any half-time social studies teachers. Questionnaires were returned by 2,986 teachers at 527 schools (unweighted numbers). About 200 of these questionnaires were discarded, for the most part because the teachers indicated that they were teaching social studies less than the required proportion of time.

The findings presented in this report are based on completed questionnaires returned by 2,791 high school social studies teachers. Table 1 below presents information about the response rate, based first on the total sample of 580 schools, second, on the total number of half-time or more social studies

teachers in these schools, and finally, based on the total number of social studies teachers within only the cooperating schools. We see that only about 1 school in 17 refused cooperation; within schools which did cooperate, an average of about 10 of each 11 eligible teachers returned questionnaires.

Table 1

RESPONSE RATE AMONG SCHOOLS AND TEACHERS

	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Teachers in All Schools</u>	<u>Teachers in Cooperating Schools</u>
Cooperated	88%	83%	91%
Refused	6	17	9
No eligible social studies teacher	6	(Not applicable)	

The response rate varied for different regions of the country and in different sized communities. Table 2 presents the proportions of teachers who cooperated in the four major sections of the country and Table 3 presents this information for four different sized communities. The base for these tables is the total number of eligible social studies teachers in all schools, including the schools which did not cooperate.

Table 2

RESPONSE RATE ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHIC REGION

	<u>Teachers in All Schools</u>
Northeast	86%
North Central	91
South	78
West	89
ALL REGIONS	83%

Table 3

RESPONSE RATE ACCORDING TO COMMUNITY SIZE

	Social Studies Teachers in <u>All Schools</u>
Metropolitan: 2,000,000 and over	75%
Metropolitan: under 2,000,000	82
Small Cities: 10,000 to 50,000	88
Small Town, Rural	87
ALL COMMUNITIES	83%

Because of regional and community size differences in response rate, the findings of this survey can be expected to reflect a somewhat higher proportion of teachers in the north central and western states and in small cities, towns and rural counties. Accordingly, they understate somewhat attributes of teachers in the northeast and south, and in the metropolitan areas.

This will be seen when we compare the characteristics of the sample of social studies teachers with appropriate population data. Table 4 presents the distribution according to geographic region, first for the general population,¹ in the second column for all teachers in secondary schools,² and, in the third column, for our sample of responding high school social studies teachers.

Table 4

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION

	<u>General Population</u>	<u>All Secondary School Teachers</u>	<u>Sample of High School Social Studies Teachers</u>
Northeast	24%	23%	21%
North Central	29	29	33
South	31	33	26
West	16	15	20

¹ John W. C. Johnstone, Volunteers for Learning: National Opinion Research Center Report No. 89; 1963.

² Statistics of Education in the United States 1958-59 Series: No. 1 Public Secondary Schools.

Information was not available on the distribution of all secondary school teachers according to community size and degree of urbanization. Table 4, however, indicated how closely this distribution approximates that of the general population and it may be sufficient for our purposes to compare here the sample of responding social studies teachers with only the general population data.³

Table 5

COMMUNITY SIZE AND DEGREE OF URBANIZATION

	<u>General Population</u>	<u>Sample of High School Social Studies Teachers</u>
Metropolitan: 2,000,000 and over	22.6%	17%
Central City	11.4	5
Suburbs & Outskirts	11.2	12
Metropolitan: Under 2,000,000	39.5	34
Central City	21.4	17
Suburbs & Outskirts	18.1	17
Small Cities: 10,000 - 50,000	14.5	19
Small Town & Rural	23.4	30
Total Central City	32.8	22
Total Suburbs & Outskirts	29.3	29

In Table 5, we see that it is the central cities within the metropolitan areas where the lowered response rate has led to some under-representation in the final sample of respondents. However, none of the discrepancies is large enough to have a significant effect on the major findings reported here.

3. A Note About Sampling Estimates:

Any sample findings, such as appear in this report, are estimates of population parameters. They must be considered in terms of their standard error of the estimate-- how near or how far away they might be from the true population value which one would obtain if repeated samples of the same population were drawn or if the entire universe were studied. Accordingly, the percentage findings in this report should be inter-

³ Johnstone, J.W.C., op. cit.

preted as indicating a percentage range within which the true percentage is likely to fall. The magnitude of the range will depend, in each case, on the size of the sample on which the percentage was based: the larger the sample, other things being equal, the smaller the range or standard error of the estimate. The standard error of estimate also will vary according to the size of the percentage: those percentages at the extremes fluctuate less than the middle values.

In Table 6 we present the standard error of the estimate associated with each of the sample groups at different percentage levels. These are based on the raw, unweighted number of respondents; because of some clustering in our sample -- an average of five teachers at each of the schools -- estimates of standard error have been derived from two-thirds of the actual unweighted number of respondents.

Table 6

PERCENTAGE STANDARD ERRORS OF ESTIMATE

For Various Sample Groups and Different Percentage Estimates

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

<u>Percentage</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>
5,95	.5	1.4	.8	1.1	1.1
10,90	.7	1.9	1.1	1.5	1.5
15,85	.8	2.3	1.3	1.8	1.8
20,80	1.0	2.5	1.5	2.0	2.0
30,70	1.1	2.9	1.7	2.2	2.3
50	1.2	3.2	1.9	2.4	2.5

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
5,95	.6	.9	1.4	1.8	2.1	2.4
10,90	.8	1.3	2.0	2.5	2.9	3.3
15,85	1.0	1.5	2.4	3.0	3.4	4.0
20,80	1.1	1.7	2.6	3.3	3.8	4.4
30,70	1.2	1.9	3.0	3.8	4.4	5.1
50	1.3	2.1	3.3	4.2	4.8	5.6

Each of the entries in Table 6 represents one standard error. By doubling this value we obtain the range above and below which the observed percentage might be expected to vary in 95 samplings out of 100 -- the 95 percent confidence or significance level. In order to compare percentages for different analytic groups, the standard error of the difference should be computed -- by squaring the standard error of each percentage, summing these two squares and then extracting the square root of the sum. When the observed difference between percentages exceeds twice this amount, it is statistically significant at the 95 percent confidence level. Unless otherwise noted, all differences discussed in this report satisfy the 95 percent confidence level.

Chapter IV

WHO WATCHED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"?

One in five of all high school social studies teachers watched some program in "The American Economy" series during the 1962-63 season. Three-quarters of them watched but occasionally; the remainder watched regularly--at least one program per week. Credit viewers numbered but one percent of all high school social studies teachers.

Teachers who had taken more college economics were more likely to watch the program than the teachers with little or no economics background.

1. The Size of the Audience:

Almost one in five (18 percent) of the high school social studies teachers are known to have viewed some program or programs in "The American Economy" series the first year of its presentation, 1962-63. Just about four in five of the teachers (78 percent) have never at any time watched a program in "The American Economy" series. Apparently one teacher in fifty (two percent) was a new recruit to the program this past year when a shortened version of the series was offered on 45 educational television stations and the complete series was available on seven other educational television channels.

We could determine also that another two percent of these teachers viewed the program at some time or times but data were missing as to which of these two years viewing occurred, or whether it was both years. These findings are summarized in Table 7 below.

Table 7

PROPORTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO VIEWED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

	<u>All Teachers</u>	<u>Viewers Only</u>
	N=2791*	N=591*
Viewed this year and last	5%	20%
Viewed last year only	13	61
Viewed this year only	2	9
Viewed, year not specified	2	10
Never viewed	78	

*N's represent the actual number of respondents. But all percentages were computed on the weighted sample.

If we project these proportions onto the parent population of high school social studies teachers, estimated at between 60,000 - 65,000¹, we could expect that about 12,500 such teachers watched and remembered watching some part of the series during the 1962-63 season; that about 3,100 of the teachers who watched the first year also watched something in the series during 1963-64; and that about 1,250 of the teachers who had not watched previously, watched one or more programs during the second year.

2. Frequency of Viewing:

When we asked the teachers to indicate whether they had ever watched "The American Economy", we asked them also how frequently they had done so. The response categories and their frequency of mention are given in Table 8. Column A presents these data for the total sample. The proportions in Column B are based on only those teachers who viewed the program in the first year.

Table 8

FREQUENCY OF VIEWING "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>
	TOTAL SAMPLE	FIRST YEAR VIEWERS
NEVER watched	78%	
Watched THIS YEAR ONLY	2	
Watched first year, NOT EVERY WEEK	13	73%
Watched first year, AT LEAST ONCE A WEEK	2	8
Watched first year, ABOUT TWICE A WEEK	1	5
Watched first year THREE OR MORE TIMES A WEEK	2	14
Data missing as to which year viewed	2	

Because viewers concentrated so heavily in the least frequent viewing category (less than once a week), for the analysis viewers were divided into just two groups: those watching less often than once every week, conceivably including those who watched just once during the whole period that the series was shown, and those watching a minimum of one program each week. The first of these groups, constituting about three-quarters of all viewers, have been labeled "occasional" viewers. As can be seen in the table above, about 13 percent of all social studies teachers viewed a program "occasionally" during the 1962-63 season. The second group are the "regular" viewers who reported that they watched at least one program, and more often more than one program, each of the 32 weeks that the

¹ Estimate provided by the National Council for the Social Studies.

series was shown. "Regular" viewers accounted for slightly better than one-quarter (27 percent) of all who viewed the first year and five percent of the total sample of high school social studies teachers.

These data on rates and frequency of viewing confirm almost exactly earlier estimates of the proportions of high school social studies teachers who watched "The American Economy". A survey of social studies and business education teachers conducted in New Jersey by the New Jersey Center for Economic Education found also that five percent of the teachers said that they viewed the program regularly and 12 percent reported that they watched it occasionally. It is interesting to note that comparable estimates were derived even though the samples in the two surveys were quite different: NORC included only social studies teachers; business education teachers were not included unless they happened to teach at least half of their classes in what that school considered social studies. The NORC sample was drawn from 72 standard metropolitan areas and counties in 35 different states and the District of Columbia.

In summary, we observe that about one in five high school social studies teachers watched the television series sometime during the 1962-63 season and that about one teacher in twenty did so with regularity.

3. Viewers of the Program During Its First Season:

Only teachers known to have viewed the program in the 1962-63 season are included in the major analysis of viewers; teachers who watched only during the second year it was shown or who did not specify when they watched are included in the subgroupings for economics background but not in the television subgroups. This exclusion was necessary in order to insure comparability of response, since there are several important respects in which the viewing experience the second year "The American Economy" was shown differed from the first year. In the second year, most teachers who watched could have seen only the Highlights of Economics (short version) as against the full series that was available nationwide the year before. Secondly, our survey coming in the middle of the school year meant that those viewing only this past year did not have the opportunity to complete even the abbreviated program, while those watching the year before, of course, had had the opportunity to complete the course. In addition, our questionnaire was designed to assess changes in classroom practice that might conform with what the television series demonstrated. For those who viewed this past year only, no time had elapsed during which the television teachings could have been put to use.

For these reasons, the analysis according to television subgroups includes only those teachers who watched one or more of the programs the first year, 1962-63.

4. Economics Backgrounds:

Of major significance, beyond knowing that the rate of viewing among social studies teachers was one teacher in five, is to determine the economics backgrounds that the teachers brought with them to their viewing of the program. We asked the teachers to indicate how many courses in economics they had taken at the graduate level and how many they had at the undergraduate level. The replies to the two questions were then combined, or added, to yield groupings of the teachers according to the number of academic economics courses taken: none, one or two, three or more.² The last category was subdivided into three or four, and five or more courses, in the general economics background groupings when televiewing was not taken into consideration.

Of the entire sample of social studies teachers, about one in six (16 percent) had never studied economics at the college level or beyond, somewhat fewer than half (40 percent) had had one or two courses (one year or less), and a slightly greater number than that (44 percent) had had at least three college and/or graduate economics courses.³ This latter group is made up of 24 percent of the sample with three or four courses and a fifth of the teachers who reported at least five college and/or graduate economics courses. A more detailed presentation of the numbers and kinds of graduate and undergraduate studies can be found in Appendix A.

The television series was geared to a basic level of contemporary economics thinking. And yet we see that those teachers with substantial amounts of prior economics training (three or more economics courses) were more likely to view the program than were those with fewer economics courses or with no academic economics training whatsoever. And further, we see that the relationship to prior economics background is reflected less among those who viewed just "occasionally" and is more noticeable for those who watched "The American Economy" regularly.

² We considered graduate and undergraduate economics courses to be additive because graduate courses usually presume a certain amount of undergraduate economics training. When such prerequisites are lacking, the courses probably are at a level not much beyond an undergraduate course and therefore not warranting preferential weighting.

³ Teachers who took "The American Economy" for credit probably included it in reporting the number of their college economics courses. Since all credit takers account for only 1 percent of the sample, these results would remain about the same were we to exclude the television course from the count.

Table 9

VIEWING PATTERNS ACCORDING TO ECONOMICS BACKGROUND

	No Prior Economics Course N=378*	1 - 2 Economics Courses N=1111*	3 or More Economics Courses N=1269*
Never watched	89%	86%	76%
Watched occasionally	8	12	16
Watched regularly	3	2	8

*N's total less than the entire sample because the relevant data were missing for certain respondents.

In summary, relating economics background as measured by the number of undergraduate and graduate courses in economics which the teacher has had, to the likelihood of viewing the television program, we see that those with more academic experience with the subject matter were more likely to watch the series than were those with no academic economics courses or with only one or two such courses.

This finding should not be a surprising or disappointing one. Students of mass media have noted that the role of the mass media is more one of reinforcing and supporting existing attitudes than of developing new ones: people select from their environment stimuli that are meaningful to them in terms of their previous experience. Furthermore, recent studies in the field of adult education and the audience for educational television channels⁴ show that those who participate in adult education programs and watch educational television are more likely to be those who start with higher educational levels. Thus the fact that teachers with economics training were the ones most likely to view "The American Economy" and to view it regularly is consistent with what has been found in related investigations.

A word might be entered here about the small group, numbering 37, who viewed the series for credit. Credit viewers accounted for but six percent of all those

⁴ The following references, in particular, are recommended:
 John W.C. Johnstone, op. cit., pp. 80 & 136
 Ithiel de Sola Pool & Barbara Adler, "Educational Television: Is Anyone Watching?", Journal of Social Issues, 1962, No. 2 (Vol. XVII), p. 57
 Robert W. Hattery, Great Decisions 1962: A Survey of Kit Buyers in Two Wisconsin Communities, Milwaukee: Institute for World Affairs Education, University Extension Division, University of Wisconsin, p. 19

viewing the program in 1962-63 and they constituted but one percent of the entire sample.⁵ In all discussions of findings they have been combined with the 126 teachers (unweighted number) who viewed the series regularly since, of course, their number was too small to provide, by themselves, any reliable statements as to their characteristics and behavior. As to the matter of their economics background, it seems safe to say that they at least conform to the already observed tendency for regular viewers to have more economics background than those who viewed only occasionally and those who never viewed. Table 10 presents the proportions with varying economics backgrounds within each of the viewing groups, where "credit" viewers have been separated from other "regular" viewers.

Table 10

ECONOMICS BACKGROUNDS OF VIEWERS

Watched "The American Economy":

	<u>Total</u> N=2758*	<u>Never</u> N=2140*	<u>Occasionally</u> N=352*	<u>Regularly</u> N=126*	<u>Credit</u> N=37*
No prior Economics course	16%	17%	10%	14%	-
1-2 Economics courses	40	43	35	19	21
3 or more Economics courses	44	40	55	67	79

*N's total less than entire sample because some data were missing.

Thus, even for those among the regular viewers who were viewing "The American Economy" for college or in-service credit, substantial college economics training was the rule. It should be remembered, however, that some of the 37 credit viewers may be including "The American Economy" in their count of the number of courses they have taken. The questions which determined the teacher's economics background asked merely: "About how many courses did you take in Economics at the undergraduate level?" and the counterpart of this question was asked about courses taken at the graduate level.

5. The Analytic Groups:

For the most part, the data from this survey have been analyzed by grouping teachers into the following combinations:

⁵ The Joint Council on Economic Education has estimated the total number of credit viewers for "The American Economy" at 5,500. Thus it would seem that high school social studies teachers formed a relatively small portion of all credit viewers.

A. Three televiewing groups: 1) those who never watched "The American Economy", 2) those who watched occasionally, that is, less often than once a week, and 3) those who watched the program regularly, that is, one or more programs each week.

B. Three economics background groups: 1) those with no prior economics course at the college or graduate level, 2) those with one or two such courses, and 3) those with three or more college or graduate economics courses. For presenting data according to economics background without controlling for televiewing, there were sufficient cases to break the last group into: 4) teachers with three or four economics courses and 5) those with five or more. These five categories are used in the presentation of data for the economics background groups.

C. The television by economics groups, that is, teachers with differing television behavior (never watched, watched occasionally, watched regularly) who have like economics backgrounds: in this breakdown of the sample, numbers of regular viewers are too small among all but teachers who have had three or more economics courses to permit reliable comparisons. Therefore, discussion of results for the double breakdown by extent of televiewing within comparatively homogeneous economics groupings is limited to the group with three or more economics courses. Since, however, most differences involve the high economics (three or more courses) teachers against those with fewer or no economics courses and the regular viewers against the occasional and those who never viewed, this comparison is sufficient to test whether differences noted for the broad television groups hold up when economics background is held constant. If differences do hold up when economics background is held constant, we can reason that they involve more than economics training and are related either to the televiewing experience itself or to the characteristics of teachers choosing this experience.

Chapter V

HOW AND WHEN DID THEY WATCH?

In this chapter we observe that credit-takers were just about equally divided between those receiving college credit and those receiving in-service credit. The time of day when the teachers watched the television program varied to some extent with frequency of viewing: more of the regular viewers than the occasional watched in the early morning. The viewing groups also showed differences in how they heard about the program: almost half of the occasional viewers cited the television page of the newspaper; more than a third of the regular viewers had been notified about the program by either their principal, school superintendent, or board of education; among those who said that they had heard about the program but never watched it, the source of information was most often another teacher.

Among the entire sample, the most usual sources of information about the program according to frequency of mention were: the television page of a newspaper, another teacher, notification by a principal or superintendent or board of education, an announcement in a professional journal, a mailing from a professional organization, and hearing about it at a professional meeting.

1. Credit Received:

On the first matter, the type of credit received, we noted earlier that one percent of the entire sample and six percent of those who viewed the program the first year did so for academic credit. The type of credit received was almost evenly divided between college credit (3.2 percent) and in-service credit (2.6 percent). Among all regular viewers, just better than one in five viewed for credit: 12 percent received college credit and 10 percent in-service credit. Table 11 gives the proportions of the different economics background groups, of all regular viewers and of the regular viewers with three or more economics courses who viewed "The American Economy" for credit.

Table 11

PROPORTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO VIEWED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY" FOR CREDIT
NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

Received:	<u>Total</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	Regular Viewers:	
						<u>All</u>	<u>With 3+ Eco. Courses</u>
College credit	3.2%	---	2%	5%	4%	12%	14%
In-service credit	2.6	---	2	5	2	10	11
No credit	94.2	100%	96	90	94	78	75

We see that teachers who have three or more economics courses are more likely to view for credit than those with but one or two courses. This confirms what we observed in Table 10 on page 24 where four in five credit viewers are shown to have had at least three economics courses.

2. Time of Day the Program was Viewed:

We asked the teachers: "At what time of day last year did you usually view 'The American Economy' programs?" Half of all those who watched any of the programs last year watched before 8:00 in the morning. But regular viewers were much more likely to view at the early morning hours, 70 percent of them did so, than were the occasional viewers, among whom 42 percent viewed before 8:00 a.m. The next most popular time period was in the evening after six, when 38 percent of the entire sample of viewers said they usually watched. Occasional viewers were twice as likely as the regular viewers to watch in the evening. Thus while occasional viewers are rather evenly divided as to their early morning or evening viewing, regular viewers predominantly favored the morning hours. But there were no substantial differences according to economics background.

Table 12

TIME OF DAY THE PROGRAM WAS VIEWED

	<u>Total</u>	<u>WATCHED THE PROGRAM:</u>			
		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
		<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco. Courses</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco. Courses</u>
Watched early morning, before 8	50%	42%	39%	70%	68%
Watched in the morning, after 8	1	2	2	--	--
Watched early afternoon, before 3	* ⁽¹⁾	*	--	--	--
Watched in the afternoon, after 3	11	12	15	8	7
Watched in the evening, 6 or later	38	44	44	22	25

(1) In all tables, an asterisk is used when the proportion is smaller than a half of one percent. A dash indicates that there were no cases at all in that category.

Table 12 (cont.)

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:			
	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>
Watched early morning, before 8	50%	54%	52%	44%
Watched in the morning, after 8	2	*	2	*
Watched early afternoon, before 3	--	1	--	--
Watched in the afternoon, after 3	4	10	5	20
Watched in the evening, 6 or later	44	35	41	36

It is understood, of course, that time of viewing is dependent on a factor beyond the control of the viewer, that is, the time that the program is shown locally. About 87 percent of the CBS network affiliates which carried the series showed it in the early morning period, before 8 a.m. While all of the educational television stations carried the program later in the day, the network program was available in many areas where educational TV was not. Even so, the fact that occasional and regular viewers showed a marked difference in their time of viewing suggests that availability was not the sole determinant for the heavy concentration of early morning viewing among the regular viewers. Regular viewers probably had just about the same degree of choice in terms of program availability as occasional viewers. These data suggest, therefore, that those who took their viewing seriously, i.e. watched "The American Economy" regularly, were more likely to do so at a time when there were fewer competing activities and fewer other demands on their time.

3. Awareness of the Program:

Not every teacher who remembered hearing about "The American Economy" actually watched it. Approximately 1 teacher in 8 (13 percent) of all the social studies teachers reported that they had heard about the program even though they never watched it. This would mean that close to 2 in 5 (38 percent) of all teachers who knew of the television series never looked at it.

The aware non-viewers varied somewhat according to economics background: 1 in 8 (13 percent) of the teachers with no economics but twice that proportion among teachers who had taken five or more economics courses (26 percent) who had never watched the program indicated that they had heard about it.

4. Sources of Information About the Program:

All those who had ever heard about "The American Economy", even if they had never watched it, were asked to indicate how they had learned about the program. Ten possible sources of information were listed with an open category of "other".

HOW TEACHERS HEARD ABOUT "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES*

	NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES*				
	Total Responding*	None	1-2	3-4	5 or more
Announcement, TV page in newspaper	35%	34%	38%	35%	33%
From another teacher	25	24	22	22	32
Notification by principal, supt. or Board of Education	23	12	21	20	31
Announcement, professional or technical journal	21	15	16	20	29
A mailing from professional organization	19	29	17	13	23
At a professional meeting	15	13	14	14	19
From another person, not a teacher	9	9	16	3	6
Announcement in a magazine	8	4	8	8	10
Newspaper announcement, not on TV page	7	8	4	9	7
Mailing from a non-professional organization	6	7	4	6	7
Other	7	22	5	11	2
Average number of different sources mentioned	1.75	1.76	1.67	1.63	1.98

* Proportions are based on the 35 percent of social studies teachers who had watched or at least heard about the program.

WATCHED "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

	Never		Occasionally		Regularly	
	All	3+ Eco	All	3+ Eco	All	3+ Eco
Announcement, TV page in newspaper	25%	21%	46%	43%	34%	37%
From another teacher	33	36	19	23	18	22
Notification by principal, supt. or Board of Education	22	23	20	25	35	40
Announcement, professional or technical journal	22	25	17	20	29	35
A mailing from professional organization	19	19	14	15	31	26
At a professional meeting	14	12	17	18	19	24
From another person, not a teacher	9	4	14	6	*	1
Announcement in a magazine	9	11	6	7	12	12
Newspaper announcement, not on TV page	5	5	8	10	9	11
Mailing from a non-professional organization	7	7	6	7	7	7
Other	2	3	7	6	12	4
Average number of different sources mentioned	1.68	1.65	1.73	1.79	2.07	2.20

Table 13 lists these alternatives, together with their frequency of mention by the economics groups and by the viewing groups. Data presented in the table as well as the discussion about them which follows are based only on teachers who heard about the program. This is about a third (35 percent) of the total sample. The 65 percent of the teachers who said they had not heard about the program are excluded from this discussion.

The source of information most frequently cited by the total sample of social studies teachers was "an announcement on the television page of a newspaper." Slightly better than one in three (35 %) of all the teachers mentioned the television page. While the different economics background groups showed no differences on this item, occasional viewers (46 percent of all who viewed last year) were more likely to cite the newspaper television page than were regular viewers or non-viewers, among whom 34 and 25 percent, respectively, said they heard about the program this way.

For the sample as a whole, one in four noted that he had heard about "The American Economy" from another teacher. The extremely high economics background group, those with five or more courses, mentioned this more than did teachers with lesser economics background. The difference is larger, however, among the televiewing groups: teachers who never watched the program reported that they heard about it from another teacher more often than did those who actually viewed the programs.

Slightly fewer than one in four teachers (23 percent) indicated that they received notification about the program from a school principal, superintendent or board of education, that is, notification from an official school source. Frequency of mention of this source of information increased with increasing economics background, and regular viewers more often recalled this kind of notification than did occasional viewers or non-viewers. While only 12 percent of those with no economics courses cited such notification, almost a third (31 percent) of those with five or more economics courses did. And while only about one in five of the occasional viewers and of the non-viewers mentioned it, slightly better than a third of the regular viewers did so.

This finding may deserve further comment. It suggests an interrelationship with data presented later in this report about school settings (Chapters XII and XIII). There we note that regular viewers were more often teaching in larger schools and schools where economics was taught as a separate course in the social

studies curriculum. It would seem likely from these data that these were the schools also where there was greater activity on the part of education officials to bring the program to the attention of the social studies teachers. The writer does not feel, however, that these data, ipso facto, lead to the conclusion that greater school backing and publicity leads to the teachers' greater participation in the program. To arrive at this conclusion, too many factors need to be held constant which were not, e.g., whether or not the teacher teaches a course in economics and whether or not economics is taught as a separate subject, within schools and systems with like amounts of official publicizing of the program.

One in five (21 percent) of the teachers who had heard about or watched "The American Economy" indicated that they had seen an announcement about the program in a professional or technical journal. The likelihood of mentioning this also increased with increasing economics background: from 15 percent of those without any economics courses to 29 percent of those teachers with five or more such courses. (In Chapter IX where we discuss differences in readership of professional journals, a similar difference in frequency of reading these publications will be observed.)

Almost one in five of the teachers (19 percent) recalled hearing about the program through a mailing from a professional organization. There were no consistent differences according to economics background but regular viewers (31 percent) were more likely to note having received a mailing from a professional organization than were occasional viewers (14 percent) or non-viewers (19 percent).

About one in seven (15 percent) of all those who had heard about the program indicated that they heard about it at a professional meeting. One in 11 (nine percent) heard about the programs from some person who was not a teacher and one in twelve (8%) saw an announcement of the programs in a magazine. About one in fourteen (7%) of the teachers saw a notice for the program in some part of the newspaper other than the television page; almost an equal number (six percent) received a mailing about the program from some kind of organization other than a professional one.

About one in fourteen teachers indicated that he had heard about "The American Economy" through some means other than the alternatives we had listed. Most usually mentioned of these additional sources was accidentally tuning it in.

One more variation in the sources of information cited should be mentioned, that is, the number of different sources mentioned by the teachers. Overall, the

average number of sources mentioned was one and three-quarters. Among the different economics background groups, those with five or more economics courses mentioned hearing about the program through more different sources than did those with lesser economics backgrounds. And regular viewers recorded more different channels of information about the program than did those who viewed but occasionally or who had never watched it.

EFFECTIVENESS OF "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY"

In this chapter we observe that the teachers' subjective evaluations of the worth of the program were related to how much they watched it: teachers who watched more felt that they learned more, irrespective of their economics background.

Using the "Test of Economic Understanding" as an objective measure of the program's effectiveness, regular viewers scored better on this test than other teachers. Even when contributing factors such as economics background and degree of professional activity were controlled through statistical analysis, a small but statistically significant effect on test scores was attributable to the television program.

Data were collected also about actual teaching practices. After seeing "The American Economy", regular viewers were spending more time teaching eleven listed economics topics than they had spent on them before the program, compared to the change evidenced by non-viewers over the same period of time.

1. Teachers' Judgments on Value of the Program:

We asked those teachers who had ever watched the program: "All in all, how much would you say that 'The American Economy' program added to your knowledge and skills as a high school social studies teacher?" The following answer alternatives were provided, from which the teachers were asked to select one: "Added a great deal," "Added somewhat," "Added a little," "Didn't add anything that I didn't know before."

The question was worded to tap reactions not only to the economics content but also to the material dealing with teaching techniques. No attempt was made in this question to separate these aspects. Close to one in five of the teachers who had watched the program at all (19 percent) endorsed the most favorable reaction that it had "added a great deal." There was no difference in frequency of this response among the different economics background groups.

As might be expected, there were substantial differences according to amount of televiewing. Teachers who watched the program more often felt that they had learned more from it: four times as many regular viewers (40 percent) as occasional viewers (10 percent) reported that they had gotten "a great deal" from the program.

Table 14

HOW MUCH "THE AMERICAN ECONOMY" ADDED TO KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Viewers</u> (100)	<u>None</u> (10)	<u>1-2</u> (20)	<u>3-4</u> (30)	<u>5 or more</u> (50)
Added a great deal	19%	17%	17%	20%	17%
Added somewhat	45	64	36	42	52
Added a little	30	17	42	31	23
Didn't add a thing	6	2	5	7	8

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u> (100)	<u>3+Eco.</u> (30)	<u>All</u> (100)	<u>3+Eco.</u> (30)
Added a great deal	10%	9%	40%	40%
Added somewhat	45	49	45	42
Added a little	37	32	14	16
Didn't add a thing	8	10	1	2

Looking at the less favorable reactions to the program, overall, slightly more than a third of all viewers (36 percent) felt that the program "added a little" or "didn't add anything" that the teacher did not know before. Interestingly enough, this did not vary significantly or consistently with the number of economics courses that the teachers had taken: those with only one or two courses responded this way more often than the teachers with at least five economics courses.

But we do see sharp differences again between occasional viewers and regular viewers in their proportions reacting in these ways: 45 percent of the occasional viewers as contrasted with but 15 percent of the regular viewers reported these reactions. And as we shall observe in the data reported in the next section of the findings, the actual performance of the occasional viewers on the objective economics test appears to corroborate their verbal evaluation here.

The conclusion to be drawn from these findings is that what the teachers felt they had gained from the series was related primarily to the degree of their exposure to the program rather than to how much economics they knew beforehand. The more

favorable reaction of regular viewers, as compared to those watching but occasionally, was as true for those of them who had three or more economics courses as for those with lesser economics backgrounds. One might argue that teachers who were gaining something from the program would be more likely to continue to watch it regularly while those who were not getting very much from it would decide not to watch so often. That is, that the program's value to the teacher determined the frequency with which he watched it. If this is the case, then the question is why certain teachers were sufficiently interested to view more often than were the others, and it clearly is not because of prior limitations in their economics backgrounds. If anything, the reverse is true: teachers watched more and gained more from the programs as their economics backgrounds increased.

2. Objective Measure of Effectiveness -- Economics Test Scores:

As described earlier, 25 multiple choice questions were selected from the Test of Economic Understanding which has been developed and standardized by a committee of economists and educators under the Chairmanship of Dr. John Stalnaker.¹ In deriving the scores, teachers were given credit for the number of items answered correctly. Any items which were answered incorrectly, or on which more than one answer had been circled, or which had been omitted were subtracted from the total possible score of 25.

Table 15 below presents the score distribution in terms of cumulative frequencies, for the entire sample of 2791 high school social studies teachers and for the different sample groups. Almost one teacher in fifty answered all 25 items correctly, one in nine had at least 23 correct and about one in three (32 percent) had a score of 20 or more. Close to half of all the teachers had answered at least 18 of the items correctly, the median score falling just below 18 (17.90).

Appendix B presents the full array of scores for the total sample and for each of the analytic groups. We shall be most concerned in this discussion with differences among the analytic groups and any inferences that can be deduced therefrom about the effectiveness of "The American Economy" in increasing economic understanding among social studies teachers. In Table 15 we see that regular viewers more often scored

¹ Available through Science Research Associates, Chicago, Illinois.

Table 15

**SCORES ON 25 FACTUAL ECONOMICS QUESTIONS
(Cumulative Proportions)**

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

<u>Score</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>
23 and higher	12%	4%	8%	17%	18%
20 and higher	33	24	26	36	48
18 and higher	50	41	41	55	66
16 and higher	67	57	58	73	79
14 and higher	79	72	74	83	87
12 and higher	89	83	86	88	96
Not cumulative: 1-11	11	17	14	12	4

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

<u>Score</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
23 and higher	10%	17%	9%	14%	33%	31%
20 and higher	32	41	30	42	53	52
18 and higher	49	60	47	59	63	65
16 and higher	67	77	59	70	79	76
14 and higher	80	87	71	77	84	81
12 and higher	89	93	84	84	90	86
Not cumulative: 1-11	11	7	16	16	10	14

23 or higher than did the other teachers. Table 16 on page 37 presents the mean average scores and standard deviations for the analytic groups.

3. Performance on the Economics Test -- Other Populations:

Careful item analysis preceded the selection of the 25 economics questions for the test used in this survey. The 25 item form, as such, has not been applied elsewhere. However, some perspective can be gained from a knowledge of scores achieved on the

Table 16

AVERAGE SCORES ON 25 FACTUAL ECONOMICS QUESTIONS

	TOTAL	NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				
		<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	
Mean	17.1	16.0	16.4	17.7	18.6	
S.D.	4.3	2.01 4.2	4.2	4.6	4.2	

	WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
Mean	17.0	18.2	16.5	17.4	18.9	18.7
S.D.	4.3	4.3	4.8	5.1	5.1	5.4

fifty item Test of Economic Understanding. No assumption is made that the two sets of data are precisely comparable, or that the social studies teachers would have achieved exactly double their scores on the full test. In order to make a comparison, however, the scores presented in Table 16 above should be doubled.

National norms for seniors in high school with one economics course show a mean score of about 30; high school seniors who have never taken an economics course earned an average score of 24.

In a local study in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania, 71 high school and junior high school teachers who were taking "The American Economy" for college credit earned a mean score of about 41. A group of teachers who had not watched the program earned a mean score of about 34.²

Viewing for college credit required attendance at 2-hour bi-weekly meetings held at the college. It is conceivable that the superior performance of the Allegheny viewers over those in the NORC sample could be due to their all being college credit takers. In the NORC sample, only half of the credit-takers earned college credit, the other half in-service training credits. And together they accounted for only a fifth of all the regular viewers. However, they achieved considerably poorer scores than other regular viewers. The following table presents mean scores separately for regular viewers who took the course for credit and for those who did not.

² American Economic Review, June 1964.

Table 17

SCORES FOR CREDIT TAKERS VERSUS OTHER REGULAR VIEWERS

	<u>3+Eco.</u>			
	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Not Credit</u>	<u>Credit</u>	<u>Not Credit</u>
Mean	17.09	19.37	16.49	19.42
S.D.	6.75	4.43	7.06	4.54

The lower mean scores of NORC credit takers relative to other regular viewers seems likely to be a function of their great heterogeneity. Unfortunately, as mentioned earlier, the NORC credit-takers are too few in number to permit any reliable conclusions.

4. Test Performance in the NORC Sample:

- a) Regular viewers achieved higher scores than occasional viewers or non-viewers.
- b) Occasional viewers differed very little in their average score from those who never viewed and the small difference that does exist tends to the disadvantage of the occasional viewers. As Table 10 on page 24 indicated, there were proportionately fewer of the occasional viewers than of the non-viewers who had never taken an economics course. Thus the inferior performance of the occasional viewers cannot be attributed to lower economics background. The reason probably lies with other of their teaching and personal characteristics which we will consider later. The main point to be noted, and it appears again and again in the findings, is that occasional viewers behave much more like non-viewers and both are different from the regular viewers.
- c) As might be expected, scores generally increased with increasing economics background.

To test the statistical significance of these differences, that is to see whether they could be expected to hold up under repeated samplings or whether they were attributable to chance sampling fluctuations, first a double classification analysis of variance was run. This tested the likelihood that both the televiewing factor as well as the economics background factor were contributing to the observed differences or whether it was really only economics background differences which were significant and accountable for the variance between groups. The F ratios indicated that both of these factors did have a significant effect. In other words, we found that regular viewing of "The American Economy" was associated with superior performance on the economics test, even when economics background was controlled. And of course, economics background had a statistically significant effect when televiewing was controlled.

5. Other Possible Reasons for Superior Performance -- The Index of Professional Activity:

The question still remained, however, whether one could conclude that this superior performance of the regular viewers was due to their viewing of "The American Economy" or to some other characteristics common to those who watched the program regularly. As we shall see later, regular viewers differ from the other teachers on just about every dimension studied in this survey. Thus, it might well be that other of their characteristics were responsible for their excelling on the test. A third control was devised therefore, an index of professional activity, to determine whether this factor might account for the differences observed among televiewing groups.

Six items were selected to form this index: a) the number of professional organizations to which the teacher belonged; b) the number of times he has held office in a professional organization; c) the number of professional and academic meetings and lectures attended over the past year; d) the number of professional and technical periodicals which the teacher reads regularly; e) whether the teacher taught a class in economics or Problems of Democracy during the 1963-64 and/or '62-63 academic year; f) the highest academic degree the teacher had achieved or currently was working toward.

These six items were taken as possible indicators that other sources of economics information were available to certain of the teachers which might account for their superior knowledge. Each of the six items was arbitrarily weighted 0-3, 3 representing the greatest amount of that factor and 0 indicating that there was no contribution from that factor. For example, in the case of the number of professional periodicals read regularly, replies of "five or more" were assigned the weight of 3, of "three or four" were assigned a weight of 2, of "one or two" were weighted 1 and "none", of course, received no weight. When the various answer categories for the other five items had been treated similarly, the teacher's weighting on all six items was added together. This became his professional motivation and activity score.

Professional activity was introduced as the third variable in a multiple classification analysis of variance, by sub-dividing each economics background and televiewing group, e.g., regular viewers with three or more economics courses, into two parts: high activity teachers, who scored 10 or better on the professional activity index; low activity teachers, who scored less than 10. The economics test means for each of these groups is presented in Table 18.

Table 18

MEAN SCORES ON ECONOMICS TEST ACCORDING TO DEGREE OF PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITY

<u>Activity Score</u>	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:		
		<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3 and more</u>
High	17.6	17.4	16.5	18.2
Low	16.9	15.7	16.4	18.1

	WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
High	17.5	18.3	16.9	17.1	19.3	19.0
Low	16.9	18.2	16.2	17.5	17.9	17.9

The analysis of variance was run to test whether televising still had a significant effect on economics test scores when both economics background and professional activity were controlled for. To correct for the unequal numbers of cases in the different groups, the method of "weighted squares of means" was used. Again, televising was found to have a significant effect, regardless of economics background and also of the degree of professional activity, with a probability that differences of the magnitude observed here could arise from chance sampling fluctuations at less than one in a hundred and close to one in a thousand.

Table 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
(Method of Weighted Squares of Means)

<u>Source</u>	<u>Sum of Squares</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Mean Square</u>	<u>F Ratio</u>
Televiewing (columns)	240.948	2	120.474	6.73
Eco. by Professional Activity (Rows)	539.733	5	107.946	6.03
Error	78, 158.146	4369	17.9	—

TESTS OF SIG:

For Televiewing effects: $F_{(2,4369)} = 6.73 > F_{.01(2,\infty)} = 4.60$
 $< F_{.001(2,\infty)} = 6.91$

For Economics with Professional Activity:

$F_{(5,4369)} = 6.03 > F_{.001(5,\infty)} = 4.10$

Of course the highly significant relationship with economics background remained. And we found also that the degree of professional activity also contributed significantly to the differences in scores. Interestingly, although the combination of televiewing behavior with certain economics background groups was significant (the economics background and televiewing interaction), the interaction of professional activity with economics background and with televiewing and with the two together was not significant.

6. And Still Other Possible Reasons -- The Multiple Regression Analysis:³

As a final evaluation of the contribution of regular viewing of "The American Economy" to achievement on the economics test, a multiple regression equation was run. In addition to frequency of televiewing, the multiple regression equation took into account economics background, rank in college graduating class, whether or not the teacher taught a class in Economics or Problems of Democracy, sex, age, professional activity, and highest academic degree.

In the optimum combination of this particular set of variables, which the equation provides, watching the television program three or more times a week carried the largest weight in explaining higher test scores. With everything else held constant, this much televiewing added almost four points over no televiewing at all. The economics background factor had a coefficient of almost two points for those who had taken five or more college economics courses as against those teachers who had never taken an economics course. Teaching a course in Economics or Problems of Democracy had a coefficient of slightly higher than one point.

The conclusion from this analysis is that, among the factors tested in this particular set of data, watching "The American Economy" three times a week or more was the factor most highly associated with success on the test. However, the combination of factors in this equation accounted for only 15 percent of the total variance, indicating that a significant portion of the variation in test scores has not yet been accounted for.

7. Conclusions About the Effect of the Television Program on Test Scores:

All of the analyses for statistical significance confirms that there is a statistically significant relationship between regular televiewing and higher test scores. These data in themselves cannot prove that the relationship is a cause and effect one

³ Thanks are extended to G. L. Bach and P. Saunders of the Carnegie Inst. of Technology for help in developing and interpreting the multiple regression equation. A fuller account of the results from the multiple regression analysis will appear in an article they are preparing for the American Economic Review, June 1965.

since such a conclusion cannot be stated with certainty until there is an experimental study where all other relevant factors are controlled. The consistency with which the televising effect was noted however, supports the inference that televising was responsible for part of the higher achievement of regular viewers.

8. Changes in the Amount of Time Spent Teaching Economic Topics:

We asked the teachers: "For each of the (following) topics, please indicate. . . whether you will be spending more, less or the same amount of time discussing that topic in your classes this school year (1963-64) compared to the time that you spent on it two years ago (1961-62)." There followed a list of 11 economics study areas, for example: "Development of modern economic institutions", "The role of markets, prices and profits in organizing economic activity", etc. (For a full list of these 11 topics please see Appendix C). Space also was provided for those teachers who were not teaching social studies two years ago to record that fact. The purpose of this question was to obtain information about actual teaching practices, as opposed to economics knowledge per se, which could provide some insight into whether viewing "The American Economy" had any effect on what the teachers did in the classroom. Thus the question asked the teacher to compare what he was doing during the current academic year, which was the year following exposure to the television series, with what he had done two years earlier, the year before the television program.

Of course we recognized that this was only an impressionistic and subjective evaluation. We did not have an objective measure of what the teacher was doing. Even so, this would be sufficient to compare one group of teachers with another, since any response bias that would be operating should be constant. Furthermore, the teachers had no idea that their answers referred in any way to "The American Economy", since our first question about the program appeared three pages later in the questionnaire, and at no time were they informed of this objective of the survey.

First we can compare the numbers of topics which were accorded increased attention within the different analytic groupings. Aside from those teachers who have never taken any economics course, the economics background groups and the televising groups all show quite similar proportions as to those who will be spending more time on any of the topics. (Table 20)

A difference appears between the televising groups when we consider the number of economics topics on which the teachers planned to be spending more time. Considering the proportions who answered that they would be spending increased time on at least six of these topics (Summary Table 20), we see that about twice as many of the regular

Table 20

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS TOPICS ON WHICH TEACHERS SPENT INCREASED TIME
(Cumulative Percentages)

Number of Topics	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:		
	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never All 3+Eco.	Occas. All 3+Eco.	Regularly All 3+Eco.	
TOTAL	29%	29%	26%	26%	29%	28%	24%	
1 or more	71	71	75	74	71	72	76	
2 or more	63	63	68	67	62	66	73	
3 or more	51	37	48	55	49	54	61	
4 or more	38	25	38	45	37	41	53	
5 or more	25	12	25	29	24	27	38	
6 or more	16	8	15	21	15	16	32	
7 or more	10	6	10	12	9	12	21	
8 or more	7	4	6	9	6	9	13	
9 or more	5	2	4	7	5	7	8	
10 or more	4	2	3	6	4	6	6	
All 11 topics	3	2	2	5	3	4	4	

SUMMARY TABLE

Number of Topics	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:		
	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never All 3+Eco.	Occas. All 3+Eco.	Regularly All 3+Eco.	
TOTAL	49%	63%	52%	45%	51%	46%	46%	
No more than 2	49	63	52	42	45	42	39	
No more than 5	84	92	85	79	81	84	70	
6 or more	16	8	15	21	19	18	32	

viewers as the other teachers showed a time increase on this many of the topics. When we compare all regular viewers and those with a background of three or more economics courses, we can see that economics background does not change these proportions: 30 percent of all regular viewers and 32 percent among those of them who have had at least three economics courses responding with this number of topics.

Thus we conclude that on this measure of classroom practices, regular viewers, regardless of their economics background, evidenced more change than did the other teachers in terms of increasing the amount of time they planned to spend discussing the listed economics topics.

In interpreting these findings, it must be remembered that they do not prove a causal connection between watching the program and changing the time spent in teaching the topics. What can be stated with certainty is only that there was an association between regular viewing of "The American Economy" and the increased attention, on the whole, to these topics. The inference that the television program was responsible seems tenable but this cannot be proved in a statistical survey such as this.

9. The Topics Which Are Receiving Increased Attention:

On some of the topics, similar proportions of all groups of teachers indicated that they were spending more time, regardless of whether or not they watched "The American Economy". Included here are the three which were accorded the greatest change among the non-viewers and, therefore, among the sample as a whole. All of them deal with matters of international concern. Foremost was "comparative economic systems -- capitalism, socialism, communism, etc.", to which 45 percent of all teachers said they were giving more attention than two years ago. A third of the teachers were spending more time on "international economic problems" and on "under-developed economies".

Three domestic problems showed little or no difference according to viewing: "government finance, taxation and spending", where the considerable proportion of almost 3 in 10 viewers and non-viewers alike reported an increase; "problems of monopoly and government regulation of business" and "consumer economics, personal finance", on each of which about 1 in 5 teachers indicated that he was spending more time.

The topics which distinguished the viewers, or at least the regular viewers, from the other teachers were:

a) "Distribution of incomes, labor and labor problems, savings, profits, social security" where about a third of the regular and occasional viewers (36 and 33 percent, respectively) and but a quarter (24 percent) of the non-viewers reported they were spending more time.

b) "Development of modern economic institutions, such as corporations, banks, labor unions" on which a third of the regular viewers (35 percent) were spending more time while less than a quarter of the occasional viewers and non-viewers were doing so (23 and 22 percent, respectively).

c) "Booms, depressions, inflation, policies to stabilize the economy, and economic growth" was receiving increased attention from a third (35 percent) of the regular viewers, compared to a quarter (27 percent) of the occasional viewers and a fifth (21 percent) of the non-viewers.

d) "Role of markets, prices and profits in organizing economic activity" was cited by slightly less than a third (31 percent) of the regular viewers, a quarter (27 percent) of the occasional viewers and a fifth (22 percent) of the non-viewers.

e) "Money, banking and monetary policy" is receiving increased teaching time from almost a third (31 percent) of the regular viewers but 1 in 5 occasional viewers (20 percent) and non-viewers (18 percent).

It will be seen from the above listing that among the topics which distinguished regular viewers and non-viewers were the two major analytical approaches to the behavior of the total economic system which had been stressed by "The American Economy": "the role of markets, prices and profits" and "economic stability and growth". A complete breakdown of the responses on this question appears in Appendix C.

10. A Final Indicator of the Program's Effectiveness -- Professional Quality of the Regular Viewers:

The fourth measure we can adduce for evaluating the program's effectiveness is a logical inference from all the data that have been collected. The quality and level of the teachers who chose to give "The American Economy" their regular attention might be considered an indicator that the program was providing something of value. The fact that a third of the regular viewers had at least five academic economics courses, and a similar number three or four, is a significant finding in this regard. Similarly, it will be noted that the regular viewers are different from the others on practically every dimension of personal, academic background and teaching characteristics that the survey tapped. The fact that the program held the attention of this group of teachers, accounting for five percent of the high school social studies instructors, can be interpreted as one kind of evidence of its value.

WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Personal and Background Characteristics

The median age of all the high school social studies teachers was 33.5. Four-fifths of them are men. Their median teaching income was just over \$6,000. We note that regular viewers, on the whole, are older than the other teachers. Although still predominantly male, there were more women among them than among the other teachers. And their teaching income was higher. Analysis of some family background characteristics showed no differences between viewers and non-viewers in these respects.

1. Age:

About one in three (36 percent) of all the high school social studies teachers were under 30 years of age and only a slightly greater number (39 percent) were between 30 and 45 years old; only one quarter of the teachers were 45 years or older, with one in twenty having reached the age of sixty.

But there was a considerably larger proportion of older teachers among the group who had five or more economics courses than in the other economics groups: 42 percent were at least forty-five years old. And an even greater proportion than this among the regular viewers were older teachers: almost half of the regular viewers (48 percent) were forty-five years or older. Controlling for high economics background, viewers -- both occasional and regular -- were still older than those teachers who never watched the program. Table 21 presents the proportions of the different economics and viewing groups at different age levels. Median age has been presented as a summary measure to simplify the comparisons between groups.

Table 21**AGE OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS**

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES					WATCHED THE PROGRAM					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5+	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+ Eco.	All	3+ Eco.	All	3+ Eco.
Under 30 yrs.	36%	40%	44%	36%	19%	39%	33%	27%	12%	11%	12%
30-44 years	39	34	38	44	39	40	39	48	41	45	
45-59 years	20	20	15	18	32	18	22	26	34	41	34
60 and older	5	6	3	2	10	4	5	8	6	7	9
Median	33.5	33.8	31.4	33.1	41.3	33	34.1	37.3	41.8	43.8	42.7

Thus we observe that higher economics background and also the likelihood of having watched "The American Economy" are associated with increased age. Those who never watched "The American Economy" were younger than those who did, even when comparing teachers with like economics background.

2. Sex:

Four out of five of the high school social studies teachers were men. This proportion increased with increasing economics background but was lower for the regular viewers as compared with those who viewed only occasionally or who never viewed.

Table 22

PROPORTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN AMONG SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5 or more	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+ Eco	All	3+ Eco.	All	3+ Eco.
Men	80%	74%	76%	87%	87%	81%	90%	81%	82%	73%	67%
Women	20	26	24	13	13	19	10	19	18	27	33

As can be seen from Table 22, women social studies with higher economics backgrounds were much more likely to view the program regularly than were men with comparable economics backgrounds.

These findings become even more clear when we examine the proportions of men and women with different economics backgrounds and with different viewing behaviors. As can be seen in Table 23, among those with three or more economics courses, 18 percent of the women but only 6 percent of the men viewed "The American Economy" regularly.

Table 23

ECONOMICS BACKGROUNDS AND VIEWING AMONG MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS

Weighted N=	MEN		WOMEN		Viewed Program:			
	(3718)	(895)	(3557)	(862)	All		3+ Eco.	
					MEN	WOMEN	MEN	WOMEN
No Eco. courses	14%	21%	83%	81%	78%	59%		
1-2 Eco. courses	38	49	13	13	16	23		
3-4 Eco. courses	26	17	4	6	6	18		
5 or more	22	13						

In conclusion, we found that the proportion of men to women social studies teachers in the entire sample was 4:1, the proportion among all regular viewers was about 3:1, and among regular viewers with three or more economics courses, it was 2:1. Thus we see that women, proportionate to their numbers among high school social studies teachers, were more likely to view the program regularly than were men; this was particularly true of women with high economics backgrounds.

3. Income:

Slightly better than half of all the social studies teachers (54 percent) were earning between \$5,00 - \$7,499 annually and before taxes, from their teaching. One quarter of the teachers earned less than this and about one in five teachers (21 percent) earned \$7,500 or more. When this salary distribution is compared with that for all personal incomes in the U.S.¹, we note that high school social studies teachers fare considerably better than the average. In the total population, 7 in 10 earned less than \$5,000, about 1 in 4 earned between \$5,000 and \$7,499 and only 1 in 8 (12 percent) earned as much as \$7,500. However, fewer of the social studies teachers are in the highest income bracket: three percent of the social studies teachers compared to five percent in the general population are earning \$10,000 or more.

There was a slight rise in teaching income with increased economics background, which became quite pronounced for teachers with 5 or more economics courses as compared to the others. The largest difference, however, lies with the teachers who viewed the program regularly. Regular viewers had substantially higher teaching incomes than the other teachers. This observation held true even when economics background was held constant and only teachers with like economics backgrounds were compared.

Table 24 presents these data on gross annual teaching incomes. For a simple comparative measure between groups, median incomes have been derived. We emphasize that these medians are only approximate measures. The interval between the income categories (\$2,500) is too large to permit any precise determination of median incomes. They are used here only as summary measures to point up differences between the analytic groups.

¹ CURRENT POPULATION REPORTS -- CONSUMER INCOME SERIES, No. 43, Sept. 29, 1964, Page 34, Table 18.

Table 24

TEACHING INCOME OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5&more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
Under \$5000	25%	29%	32%	24%	10%	26%	20%	26%	13%	15%	19%
\$5000-7499	54	57	53	55	53	55	54	50	56	35	36
\$7500 & over	21	14	15	21	37	19	26	24	31	50	45
(\$7500 - 9999)	(18)	(13)	(12)	(17)	(31)	(16)	(22)	(19)	(25)	(41)	(39)
(\$10,000 & over)	(3)	(1)	(3)	(4)	(6)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(9)	(6)
Median \$ (Interpolated)	6150	5925	5850	6175	6875	\$6075	6375	6200	6675	7475	7200

Whereas only about a fifth of all teachers earned as much as \$7,500, half of the regular viewers did so. The modal income for all other groups is in the \$5,000 - \$7,499 range. For regular viewers, it is between \$7,500 and \$9,999. And the proportion of regular viewers earning as much as \$10,000 is three times as large as it is for the entire sample of high school social studies teachers.

We conclude, therefore, that regular viewers earned substantially higher salaries from their teaching than did other social studies teachers.

3a. Total Gross Family Income:

We also asked the teachers to record which income category matched most closely their incomes when they added on any non-teaching income plus income from other members of their families. As would be expected, the entire income distribution shifted upward, with only one teacher in nine (11 percent) reporting a gross family income of less than \$5,000 and slightly better than a third (36 percent) income between \$5,000 and \$7,499. Just over half of all the teachers (55 percent) reported gross family incomes of at least \$7,500.

This is considerably higher than family income reported for families in the general population in 1960, of whom 44 percent were earning less than \$5,000, 25 percent had incomes between \$5,000-7,499, and 31 percent had a before taxes income of \$7,500 or more.²

² STATISTICAL ABSTRACT OF THE UNITED STATES, 1962, P. 330.

The figures reported above for the high school teachers are based on only 89 percent of the sample (eleven percent omitted the question). Therefore, although they are useful in indicating the general nature of the income distribution, there might be some disparity between what is reported here and the proportions we would have found had all respondents completed this question. For this reason, we will not present the distribution within the analytic groups; data were missing from almost 20 percent of the group of regular viewers.

In general, comparison of the reported data for the economics background and televiewing groups maintains the same kinds of differences noted in the preceding section dealing with teaching income only: more of those with higher economics background have family incomes of at least \$7500 than do those teachers who have had fewer or no economics courses. The difference between the lowest group -- no economics courses, and the highest -- five or more courses, is smaller than when comparing teaching incomes only. This is true also for the differences according to televiewing. Although regular viewers still have proportionately more teachers in the higher income categories, when we consider total family incomes, the differences have been narrowed, especially the difference between occasional and regular viewers.

4. National Origin:

For the sample of social studies teachers as a whole, one percent were foreign-born and 99 percent were born in the United States; 84 percent of the teachers had fathers who also were born in the U.S.A. There were no differences between analytic groups -- either economics background or televiewing -- that exceeded what might result from chance sampling fluctuations.

It is of interest to compare the findings for the high school social studies teachers with comparable data that are available from a national cross-section of the United States population, conducted by NORC in 1955. The national survey showed that nine percent of the population was foreign-born and 27 percent (as opposed to 16 percent of the social studies teachers) had fathers who were born outside the U.S.A. Thus it would seem that high school social studies teachers, as compared to the general population, are more often native-born and similarly more often have fathers who were born inside this country.

5. Parents' Education Level:

The mothers of these social studies teachers have a slightly higher education level than do the fathers: almost four in ten (39 percent) of the fathers never went beyond grade school as compared with three in ten of the mothers. About one in four (26 percent) of the mothers completed high school as compared to only one

in five of the fathers. Just about a quarter of either group of parents had some college experience.

As can be seen in Tables 25 and 26, the analytic groups show few clear and consistent differences in terms of parents' education.

Table 25

FATHER'S HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
8th grade or less	39%	40%	37%	40%	44%	38%	41%	37%	40%	48%	41%
Part high school	17	15	18	16	20	16	16	28	22	14	15
Graduate H.S.	20	25	21	18	16	21	18	18	19	15	15
Part College	11	8	12	12	9	12	12	8	8	11	14
Graduated College	7	6	6	9	5	7	7	5	6	6	7
Postgraduate work	6	6	7	5	6	6	6	4	4	6	8

Table 26

MOTHER'S HIGHEST SCHOOL GRADE

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 or more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
8th grade or less	30%	33%	26%	33%	36%	29%	34%	36%	34%	39%	31%
Part high school	19	18	19	17	20	18	16	20	21	23	25
Graduated HS	26	23	30	25	22	27	23	26	27	21	24
Part college	13	13	14	13	12	14	15	10	10	9	10
Graduated college	9	10	8	11	6	9	9	5	7	8	10
Postgraduate work	3	3	3	1	4	3	3	3	1	--	--

6. Father's Usual Occupation:

As another measure of the socio-economic backgrounds from which the teachers came, we asked them to indicate which of nine standard census occupational categories best described their father's usual occupation during their teenage years. About one in seven of the teachers (14 percent) reported a professional career for their fathers. Slightly more (17 percent) indicated that their fathers had been engaged as proprietors or managers. Almost one in five (19 percent) had fathers who were farmers or farm managers. Better than two in five (43 percent) reported blue collar occupations for their fathers.

The analytic groups showed no clear or consistent differences in regard to father's occupation. But it is interesting to compare the proportions of this sample of high school social studies teachers whose fathers were engaged in different categories of work with parallel data we have from a national sample of college economics instructors that the National Opinion Research Center surveyed in 1961 and also with the 1955 NORC national sample.

Table 27

FATHER'S OCCUPATION REPORTED BY SAMPLES OF HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES
TEACHERS, OF COLLEGE ECONOMICS INSTRUCTORS, AND OF THE GENERAL POPULATION

	Social Studies <u>Teachers</u> (2791)	College Economics <u>Instructors</u> (263)	General <u>Population</u> (2370)
Professional	14%	33%	5%
Proprietor, Manager	17	34	12
Farmer, Farm Manager	19	8	36
Clerical, Sales	6	5	4
Craftsman, Foreman	21	10	17
Semi-skilled, Operative	13	5	13
Service	3	3	2
Farm Labor	1	*	2
Unskilled Labor	6	1	6
	44	19	40

We note from this comparison that high school social studies teachers are drawn from the ranks of professional families somewhat more often than is true for the general population, but nowhere nearly as frequently as the college economics instructors. There are slightly more high school social studies teachers who have emerged from the proprietor-managerial ranks than is true of the general

population, but the college instructors have twice as many. The social studies teachers had better than double the number coming from farm backgrounds than the college instructors had, but this is still only about half the proportion found in the general population. About 2 in 5 of the social studies teachers came from blue collar backgrounds as did the general population; in this respect their occupational backgrounds differed most sharply from that of the college economics instructors, among whom only half as many came from blue collar backgrounds.

Chapter VIII

WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Academic Backgrounds

Just about every high school social studies teacher in this sample had a bachelor's degree; 2 in 5 had a higher degree. Regular viewers of "The American Economy" were more likely to have an advanced degree than other teachers. However, somewhat more of the non-viewers than viewers were currently studying for an advanced degree.

Looking at the subjects in which they majored, very few teachers have ever taken a degree in economics and viewers were not significantly different from non-viewers in this regard. About 1 in 9 teachers, but considerably fewer of the regular viewers, took their last degree in physical education. Almost half of all the teachers have earned an academic degree within the past five years. Consistent with age differences noted earlier, regular viewers earned their degrees longer ago than non-viewers. Finally, on two measures of academic excellence which were used, regular viewers rated somewhat higher than the other teachers.

1. Academic Degrees:

Hardly any of the social studies teachers participating in this survey (one tenth of one percent) reported that they had no academic degree. Three teachers in every five (60 percent) currently have a bachelor's degree and nothing more, but just about half of these (32 percent of the total sample) are working for another degree.

Almost two in five of all the social studies teachers (39 percent) have a master's degree, or a fifth year or sixth year diploma -- advanced education degrees. A fifth of these teachers (eight percent of the total sample) are currently working toward a higher degree.

Not quite one high school social studies teacher in a hundred has a Ph. D. or Ed.D. degree.

As might be expected, more of the teachers with three or more economics courses have advanced academic degrees: whereas about a third of those who have taken no economics courses (36 percent) and those who have taken only one or two (32 percent) have an advanced degree, a substantial majority (57 percent) of those with five or more economics courses have a degree beyond the bachelor's.

Comparing those who watched "The American Economy" and those who did not, more of the regular viewers (61 percent) than of the occasional viewers (51 percent) or of

those who never watched (37 percent) have degrees beyond the bachelor's. But when economics background is held constant, we do not find very different proportions of viewers and non-viewers who have advanced degrees: among social studies teachers who have had at least three economics courses, 56 percent of the regular viewers, 54 percent of the occasional, and 48 percent of those who never watched had degrees beyond the bachelor's.

2. Number of Academic Degrees Earned:

Differences in the number of degrees earned is, of course, consistent with what we observed about the highest degrees earned: three in five of all social studies teachers have but one academic degree but teachers with greater economics' background and teachers who watched "The American Economy" are more likely than the others to have additional degrees. The difference between viewers and non-viewers seems largely a function of the greater economics background of viewers, for when that is held constant, differences between viewers and non-viewers are reduced.

Table 28

NUMBER OF ACADEMIC DEGREES EARNED

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

<u>No. of Degrees</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:</u>				<u>WATCHED THE PROGRAM:</u>					
		<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
One	60%	62%	68%	57%	43%	63%	53%	49%	44%	39%	44%
Two	39	37	31	42	54	36	45	50	55	58	51
Three or more	1	1	1	1	3	1	2	1	1	3	5

3. Currently Studying For a Degree:

Two in five of these social studies teachers are currently working toward some academic degree; a third are working toward a master's degree or its equivalent and about three in 100 social studies teachers are currently working toward a doctorate. The remaining two percent are earning other kinds of degrees, e.g., sixth year diplomas.

The economics background groups showed but slight differences in the proportions now working for a degree: 35 percent of those without any economics course as against 42 percent of those with three or more economics are currently working toward an advanced degree. The televiewing groups showed larger but not quite significant differences: those who never watched "The American Economy" were somewhat more likely to be working currently for a degree than were the teachers who watched the program.

Table 29

PROPORTIONS OF VIEWERS AND NON-VIEWERS
CURRENTLY WORKING TOWARD AN ADVANCED DEGREE

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	TOTAL	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
		<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+ Eco.</u>
Working toward Ph.D	3%	3%	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%
Working toward 6 year diploma	1	1	1	2	2	2	3
Working toward Master's	35	37	37	22	25	25	25
Working toward other degree	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
Not working toward degree	60	58	56	72	66	67	64

4. Major Study for Degrees:

We analyzed the major subjects of study in two ways. First, we determined the number of teachers who had earned a degree in any of four areas: 1) economics, 2) some other area of social studies, 3) education, including educational administration, 4) any subject area besides these three. Then we analyzed in greater detail the major for the teacher's last earned degree.

Just one in twenty-five of the high school social studies teachers earned a degree in economics, and six out of seven (87 percent) have a degree in some other area of the social studies. About one in five have a degree for which they majored in education or education administration. About the same number have a degree in some subject other than economics, social studies or education.

As can be seen in Table 30 below, only slightly more of the regular viewers have majored in economics (6 percent) and/or another of the social studies (87 percent) than have the total group of teachers, for whom these proportions are 4 percent and 81 percent, respectively. And occasional viewers have majored in education, 27 percent, somewhat more often than has the sample of teachers as a whole for whom the proportion was 19 percent.

In addition to the four broad categories of study into which all the degrees earned by a teacher were classified, we used a more detailed major subject classification to analyze the data about the teacher's last earned degree. Since a majority of the teachers had only one academic degree, we can expect this analysis to provide a good insight into the more specific academic preparations for the social studies teachers.

Table 30

MAJOR AREAS OF STUDY FOR ALL ACADEMIC DEGREES*

Area	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:							
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never			Occas			Regularly	
						All	3+	Eco	All	3+	Eco	All	3+
Economics	4%	--	--	1%	17%	4%	9%		4%	7%	6%	9%	
Social Studies	81	63%	84%	89	77	80	82		80	87	87	82	
Education, Adm	19	23	15	20	24	18	21		27	26	19	20	
Other	19	36	18	13	15	19	14		20	11	21	16	

* Percentages add to more than 100 because some teachers reported more than one degree.

Only two and one half percent (2½ %) of all the social studies teachers majored in economics for their last degree, two-thirds of them (67 percent) majored in some other area of the social studies, a fifth (22 percent) took their degrees in education or educational administration.¹ The only other major subject mentioned with any degree of frequency was physical education, sometimes combined into a physical education and health degree: about one in nine of all the teachers (11 percent) had such a major for his last degree.

Again, there was a tendency for occasional viewers to have obtained their degree in education more often than regular viewers. The same tendency was true for those majoring in physical education: occasional viewers and also non-viewers more often reported this major than did those who watched the series regularly. However, this seems largely a function of differences in economics background, because once the number of economics courses is held constant, these differences between the viewing groups are reduced greatly.

¹ If the teacher majored in the education of a particular subject, e.g., social studies education, it was classified according to the subject area rather than to education. Only if the teacher indicated an education degree, not specified as to a particular study, or education administration, was it classified here.

Table 31

MAJOR STUDY FOR LAST DEGREE *

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	Total	None	1-2	3-4	5 & more	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+ Eco.	All	3+ Eco.	All	3+ Eco.
Economics	2.5%	--	--	1%	11%	2%	6%	3%	6%	4%	6%
Other											
Social Studies	67	56	72	72	61	68	67	58	66	71	68
Education & Administration	22	26	18	22	29	21	24	30	31	23	24
Guidance	2	1	1	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	3
Phys. Ed. & Health	11	16	14	10	2	11	7	15	7	2	3
Business Administration	1	*	*	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	3
Other Business	1	--	1	1	4	1	3	1	2	--	--
English	3	4	3	3	1	3	2	1	1	4	5
Foreign Languages	1	2	1	2	*	1	*	2	4	1	2
Science, Biology, etc.	2	4	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
Other	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	1	2	6	6

* If two majors were reported, both were counted. Therefore, totals reach more than 100 %.

5. Date of Last Degree:

About one in five (19 percent) of the teachers have earned a degree within the past two years, 1962-64; almost half (45 percent) have earned a degree within the last five years, 1959-64. Another fifth (22 percent) earned a degree between five and ten years ago and just a third earned their last degree ten years ago or longer. Fifteen percent of the teachers received their last degree twenty or more years ago.

Those with the greatest number of economics courses are more likely to have earned their degrees longer ago. Non-viewers, just as they were more likely to be working currently for another degree, are more likely to have earned a degree recently: while half of those who never watched "The American Economy" (49 percent) earned a degree within the past five years, only about a fifth (21 percent) of the regular viewers did so. Even when controlling for economics background, among

teachers with three or more economics courses, over a half of the viewers but only about a third of the non-viewers have had their last degree for more than ten years.

Table 32

DATE WHEN LAST DEGREE WAS RECEIVED

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5 or more	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+ Eco	All	3+ Eco	All	3+ Eco
'62-'64	19%	17%	25%	16%	11%	21%	16%	13%	7%	7%	5%
'59-'61	26	29	27	33	17	28	28	21	14	14	16
'54-'58	22	22	23	22	21	22	21	21	20	22	26
'44-'53	18	18	14	19	25	16	18	26	39	28	29
'43 or earlier	15	14	11	10	26	13	17	19	20	29	24

6. Scholastic Excellence -- Academic Honors Received:

Just under half (48 percent) of all these high school social studies teachers reported some academic honors for their college undergraduate studies -- making dean's list or Phi Beta Kappa or graduating cum laude, etc. Those who had had some economics courses were somewhat more likely to have earned academic honors than were teachers who have had no economics courses: 41 percent of those with no economics as against 49 percent of those taking at least one economics course reported some academic honors. Those with the greatest number of economics courses were most likely to report academic honors, 54 percent of the teachers who have had five or more economics courses reported receiving some academic honors.

Among the televiewing groups, occasional viewers were least likely to have received any academic honors: only 42 percent of the occasional viewers as against 48 percent of those who had never watched "The American Economy" and 53 percent of the regular viewers received some academic honors for their undergraduate achievement. When economics background was held constant, however, these differences largely disappear: of those with at least three economics courses, 48 percent who never watched "The American Economy", 51 percent who watched occasionally and 54 percent of the regular viewers received some academic honors.

These data on academic honors were analyzed in another way. For each of the analytic groups, we derived an estimate of the average number of honors earned by dividing the total number of honors received by the number of teachers who received any honors.

Table 33 presents these averages. The direction of the differences between groups reflected in these averages is consistent with what was reported above for the proportions who received any academic honors. They are also consistent with differences noted in the economics test scores: regular viewers received the greatest number of academic honors, on the average, and occasional viewers the smallest, even when economics background was controlled.

Table 33

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
Average no. honors received					<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
	1.41	1.47	1.55	1.53	1.50	1.53	1.44	1.45	1.60	1.80

7. Scholastic Excellence -- Rank in Senior Graduating Class:

One in five of all the social studies teachers reported that he had been in the top ten percent of his graduating class and slightly better than half (56 percent) had graduated in the top quarter. About a third (32 percent) were in the second quarter. One teacher in nine was in the third quarter. Only 1 in 100 teachers reported that he had been in the bottom quarter of his graduating class.

As Table 34 shows, those without any economics courses were only half as likely as those who had taken some economics to have been graduated in the top ten percent of the class. Differences according to the number of such courses taken were very small. But regular viewers were more likely than occasional viewers or those who never watched "The American Economy" to have been in the top tenth of their graduating class. This difference is even larger when comparing only those who have had at least three economics courses.

The higher academic standing of regular viewers was statistically significant when comparing all teachers who have had at least three economics courses: more of the regular viewers with this many economics courses than of the occasional and non-viewers graduated in the top quarter of the class.

For the most part, these measures of academic excellence did not produce very large differences between the viewing groups. But they pointed in a consistent direction: somewhat lower academic achievement of occasional viewers, especially in comparison with the regular viewers. It is important to note that recollections of honors received

Table 34

RANK IN COLLEGE GRADUATING CLASS

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	<u>Total</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
p 10%	20%	11%	21%	22%	24%	20%	22%	21%	23%	27%	32%
p 1/2 not top 10%	36	40	36	32	38	35	33	40	35	38	40
cond 1/2	32	37	32	33	28	33	31	26	32	30	21
ird 1/2	11	9	12	12	10	12	12	9	10	5	7
ttom 1/2	1	4	1	2	*	1	1	4	*	--	--

and of academic standing can suffer from inaccuracies in recall, especially over long periods of time. On this basis, one might attach greater accuracy to the responses of the non-viewing group than the others, their degrees having been obtained more recently.

Chapter IX

WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Professional Interests

A majority of all the teachers belong to at least three professional organizations and almost half have held an office in one or more of them. A majority of the teachers attended five or more professional meetings or lectures in the twelve months preceding the survey. Half of the teachers reported that they read three or more professional publications regularly.

On all of these measures, regular viewers indicated a higher degree of professional activity than the other teachers.

1. Memberships in Professional and Academic Organizations:

Only one social studies teacher in 25 belongs to no professional organizations whatsoever. Roughly a third (35 percent) belong to one or two such organizations, another third of the teachers (32 percent) reported membership in three professional organizations, and just under a third (29 percent) belong to more than this. Teachers with the greatest number of economics courses, five or more, are more likely to belong to three or more professional organizations than are teachers who have had fewer economics courses or none at all. And regular viewers more often belonged to three or more professional organizations than did the occasional viewers or the non-viewers, although this seems largely a function of their greater economics backgrounds.

Table 35

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Number of <u>Organizations</u>	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
None	4%	4%	6%	5%	1%	3%	2%	7%	*	1%	1%
1-2	35	39	37	34	30	36	34	35	30%	25	24
3 & more	61	57	57	61	69	61	64	58	70	74	75

2. Offices Held in Professional Organizations:

About half of all the social studies teachers at some time have held an office in a professional organization. Quite similar proportions indicated that they had held such office once (15 percent) or twice (17 percent) and three times or more (17 percent).

As on the matter of professional memberships, those with the greatest number of economics courses were more likely than other teachers to have held professional office and to have done so more often. And regular viewers have held more offices than occasional viewers and those who never watched "The American Economy", even when their greater economics background is allowed for.

Table 36

NUMBER OF TIMES TEACHERS HAVE HELD OFFICE IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

No. of Times	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco.	All	3+Eco.	All	3+Eco.
Never	51%	57%	60%	45%	34%	54%	43%	40%	27%	28%	28%
Once	15	18	14	16	16	15	15	20	27	11	12
Twice	17	15	13	22	19	16	20	18	23	29	24
Three & more	17	10	13	16	31	16	22	22	23	32	36

3. Attendance at Professional Meetings and Lectures:

There are few social studies teachers who say they have not attended any professional meeting or lecture during the past year. The majority, 54 percent, have attended at least five such meetings. While differences among the economics background groups are not too marked, considerable differences exist among the televiewing groups, even when controlling for economics background. Regular viewers attended considerably more such meetings than occasional viewers and those who never watched "The American Economy": 72 percent of the regular viewers, but only 55% of those who watched occasionally and 53 percent of those who never watched attended five or more professional meetings.

Table 37

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS AND LECTURES ATTENDED

No. Attended	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco.	All	3+Eco.	All	3+Eco.
None	6%	6%	6%	7%	4%	6%	5%	1%	*	2%	2%
1-2	14	13	16	13	11	14	13	15	12%	9	8
3-4	26	32	25	23	26	26	23	29	33	18	19
5-6	24	21	23	29	20	25	27	21	25	14	15
7-9	12	14	9	14	14	11	13	16	12	19	24
10 and more	19	14	20	14	26	18	18	18	18	38	32

4. Readership of Professional and Technical Periodicals:

But 1 in 20 of the social studies teachers reported that he does not read any professional periodicals regularly. Slightly fewer than half, 45 percent, regularly read one or two. Half of the teachers reported that they read at least three professional publications regularly.

Reading of professional periodicals increased with increasing economics background: 63 percent of those with five or more economics courses as against 39 percent of teachers with no economics courses read at least three professional publications regularly. And regular viewers read more of the professional publications regularly: 67 percent of the regular viewers read at least three professional publications compared to 48 percent of those who never watched "The American Economy". This difference between regular viewers and those who never watched remains significant even when economics background is controlled: among those who have had at least three economics courses, 76 percent of the regular viewers contrasted with 54 percent of those who never watched the program read at least this many professional publications regularly

Table 38

NUMBER OF PROFESSIONAL AND TECHNICAL PERIODICALS READ REGULARLY

Number of Periodicals	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
None	5%	8%	7%	4%	2%	5%	2%	8%	2%	1%	1%
1-2	45	52	47	45	35	48	44	38	36	23	23
3-4	36	29	35	41	36	35	37	36	44	48	46
5-6	9	8	6	7	20	8	12	12	15	20	21
7 & more	5	2	5	3	7	4	5	6	4	8	9

5. Readership of Particular Publications:

We listed 10 publications and asked the teachers to indicate how frequently they read each of them. The list included two daily newspapers, THE NEW YORK TIMES and WALL STREET JOURNAL; a weekly magazine, BUSINESS WEEK and a monthly, FORTUNE; and six journals and teachers' periodicals likely to be read by high school social studies teachers: AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW, AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY, SOCIAL EDUCATION and SOCIAL STUDIES. This list was selected with the idea in mind that we were reaching a population of social studies teachers, not just economics teachers, although our major interest was to find out how much they consulted periodicals that would provide information about economics.

The detailed findings on the frequency with which each of these publications was read can be found in Appendix D. It will be noted here only that regular viewers reported regular readership of each of these publications more often than the other teachers did.

Chapter X

WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Time Spent Watching Television

The median number of hours a week which these teachers reported that they usually watch television was 9.6. There was hardly any difference between viewers and non-viewers in this regard. In terms of how much time they watched educational television programs, however, regular viewers reported a greater number of hours than other teachers.

1. Number of Hours a Week Usually Spent Watching Television:

In order to see whether teachers who watched "The American Economy" regularly also generally watched more television, we asked the teachers to indicate the number of hours they usually spend watching television in an average week during the school year. One in 25 of the social studies teachers reported that he watched no television at all. Of the remaining teachers, just half watch fewer than 10 hours a week and the other half watch 10 or more hours a week. There were no significant differences among the economics background groups in this regard. Nor were there any among the televiewing groups, which reported remarkably similar numbers of hours a week that they spend watching television.

Table 39

NUMBER OF HOURS A WEEK USUALLY WATCH TELEVISION

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

<u>No. of Hours</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:</u>				<u>WATCHED THE PROGRAM:</u>					
		<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5& more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
None	4%	2%	5%	1%	4%	3%	3%	7%	*	1%	1%
Less than 5	16	16	15	18	16	16	18	14	12%	20	22
5-9	32	38	29	33	33	32	32	33	39	31	28
10-14	27	21	25	31	30	27	30	26	30	33	37
15 and more	21	23	26	17	17	22	17	20	19	15	12
Median	9.6	8.8	10.0	9.3	9.7	9.7	9.3	9.2	9.8	9.5	9.9

Information about the televising behavior of the general public indicates that the average man spends two and a half hours a day at his television set.¹ There are also data that show that people who have been to college spend about a quarter less time watching television than do the less educated.² Using these general data as guidelines, we might expect an average weekly time expenditure in our sample of about 13 hours for television. As noted above, the actual median time reported was just under 10 hours. However, the comparative information is based on a daily estimate which was multiplied to approximate the weekly report given by the social studies teachers. This could account for some difference between the two sets of data.

2. Number of Hours a Week Usually Spend Watching Educational Television:

A somewhat greater number of the teachers reported that they watched no educational television programs than reported that they watched no television at all, 7 percent watching no educational television and 4 percent no television generally. About half the teachers watch between one and three hours of educational television a week (48 percent) and slightly fewer (44 percent) watch four hours a week or more.

Differences among the economics background groups were small, although teachers with the greatest number of economics courses watched educational television more than the others. For the televising groups, there was a consistent relationship between their viewing of "The American Economy" and the amount of time they generally spend watching educational television. Those who watched "The American Economy" also watch more educational television in general.

Table 40

NUMBER OF HOURS A WEEK USUALLY WATCH EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

No. of Hours	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5 & more	Never	Occas	Regularly	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	
None	7%	10%	8%	3%	7%	7%	6%	11%	*	3%	4%	
1-2	34	37	33	40	30	36	38	27	30%	23	26	
3-4	27	31	27	23	28	28	27	22	24	22	20	
5-9	24	17	21	28	27	21	23	29	37	33	40	
10 & more	8	5	11	6	8	8	6	11	9	19	10	
Median	3.6	3.3	3.6	3.5	4.1	3.5	3.4	4.1	4.7	5.2	5.0	

¹ Leo Bogart, "American Television: A Brief Survey of Research Findings," Journal of Social Issues, 1962, No. 2, (Vol. XVII), p.37.

² Gary A. Steiner, The People Look at Television, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963, p.75.

Chapter XI

WHO ARE THE TEACHERS?: Teaching Experience

On the average, these instructors have been in the teaching profession for eight and a half years; the regular viewers have been teaching considerably longer than this. Similarly, while the group as a whole has been teaching high school social studies an average of five and a half years, the regular viewers have been doing so more than twice as long.

Almost three-quarters of the teachers in the entire sample, and an even higher proportion of regular viewers, are teaching social studies exclusively. Few of these instructors teach a course in economics, but regular viewers are four times as likely as non-viewers to be teaching such a course. When queried about their career preferences five years in the future, fewer than half of the entire group indicated a wish to continue in their present teaching. But slightly better than 3 in 5 of the regular viewers are committed to their present teaching.

A separate analysis of the instructors who were teaching a course in Economics or Problems of Democracy indicated that they achieved significantly higher scores on the economics test than other teachers, more of them watched "The American Economy", and they were twice as likely as other teachers to have majored in economics for a degree.

1. Total Number of Years Teaching:

For 1 in 9 of the social studies teachers, this is the first year of teaching. A quarter of the teachers have taught between two and four years. Almost two-thirds (64 percent) have been teaching at least five years, and better than two in five (43 percent) have been teaching at least ten years. Slightly fewer than 1 high school social studies teacher in 5 (19 percent) have been teaching as long as twenty years.

As we see from Table 41, differences among the analytic groups follow rather closely the differences noted for them with regard to age: those with the greatest number of economics courses, five or more, have been teaching longer than other teachers and teachers who watched "The American Economy" have been teaching for a longer time than teachers who never watched the program. When economics background was controlled, differences between occasional and regular viewers were not large enough to be significant.

Table 41

TOTAL NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING
(Cumulative Proportions)

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

No. Years	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
First Year	11%	9%	17%	8%	5%	12%	9%	8%	1%	2%	1%
At least 2	89	91	83	92	95	88	91	92	99	98	99
" " 3	80	81	74	82	90	78	83	87	93	96	97
" " 4	73	67	67	75	86	70	77	79	90	94	95
" " 9	64	64	57	63	80	61	66	74	86	88	88
" " 14	43	43	34	43	62	39	46	57	70	67	63
" " 19	28	30	21	25	43	24	29	42	47	47	42
20 & more	19	21	13	17	30	17	20	26	30	31	35
Median	8.4	8.3	6.6	8.3	13.2	7.6	9.1	12.3	14.4	14.3	13.3

Number of Years Teaching High School Social Studies:

A number of these teachers have taught subjects and/or grade levels other than what they are teaching now. For while 11 percent indicated that this was their first year of teaching, we now find 16 percent who indicated that this was their first year of teaching high school social studies. And where only 37 percent had been in teaching less than five years, we now find that almost half of the teachers, 47 percent, have been teaching high school social studies less than five years. Whereas 43 percent have been teaching at least ten years, only 30 percent have been teaching high school social studies for this length of time. And while close to 1 in 5 of the teachers has been engaged in teaching for at least twenty years, only 1 in 9 teachers has been teaching high school social studies for this long.

Table 42

NUMBER OF YEARS TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES
(Cumulative proportions)

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

No. Years	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:							
		None	1-2	3-4	5&more	All		3+Eco		All		3+Eco	
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
First year	16%	15%	21%	12%	11%	18%	15%	9%	3%	3%	1%		
At least 2	84	85	79	88	89	82	85	91	97	97	99		
" " 3	73	72	66	76	82	70	75	83	90	94	96		
" " 4	63	51	58	67	76	60	67	74	84	88	91		
" " 9	53	46	48	52	70	49	54	69	79	77	75		
" " 14	30	27	22	30	44	26	32	39	49	52	49		
" " 19	18	18	13	16	32	15	19	26	32	39	37		
& more	11	11	6	10	21	9	12	16	22	19	23		
Median	5.6	4.2	4.8	5.4	8.9	4.9	6.0	8.1	9.8	10.8	9.9		

The differential between total years teaching and number of years teaching high school social studies does not appear noticeably different for any of the analytic groups and the same relationship is noted as before: those with five or more economics courses have been teaching high school social studies longer, as have viewers when compared to those teachers who never watched "The American Economy".

3. Proportion of Current Teaching Load That Is in the Social Studies:

We asked the teachers to indicate whether they teach: "only social studies", about 3/4 of their classes, 1/2 of their classes, or less than 1/2 their classes in social studies. Those who have taken the greatest number of economics courses are more likely than those who have had no economics courses to be teaching "only" social studies. And regular viewers are much more likely to be teaching "only" social studies than are those who never watched "The American Economy".

Table 43

PROPORTION OF TEACHERS' CLASSES THAT ARE IN SOCIAL STUDIES

<u>Proportion of Classes</u>	<u>NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:</u>					<u>WATCHED THE PROGRAM:</u>					
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas.</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
All	71%	65%	71%	70%	76%	69%	68%	78%	86%	89%	89%
Three-quarters	17	20	16	21	11	17	18	16	11	9	9
Half	12	15	13	9	13	14	14	6	3	2	2

4. Kinds of Social Studies Classes Being Taught:

A majority of these teachers, 60 percent, are teaching one or more classes in American History. The next most frequently taught type of courses is European, Ancient, Medieval or World History and 42 percent of all the social studies teachers are teaching one or more of these.

In the total group of teachers, slightly better than a third, 37 percent, are teaching one or more courses in Civics, Citizenship, Government, or Political Science; better than a quarter (28 percent) are teaching at least one course called Social Studies; just fewer than 1 in 5 (18 percent) are teaching a course in Problems or Challenge of Democracy. Just about the same proportion, 18 percent, are teaching Geography, Economic Geography, Earth Science or the like.

Seventh in frequency of being taught was Economics or Economic Institutions, 1 in 8 (13 percent) of all the social studies teachers indicating that they were teaching a course in this area. Among regular viewers of "The American Economy", however, this was second to American History as the most frequently taught kind of social studies:

42 percent of all regular viewers indicated that they teach such a course, as contrasted with 16 percent of the occasional viewers and 11 percent of non-viewers teaching an Economics course. This proportion is even higher among the regular viewers who have had at least three economics courses, about half of whom (51 percent) are teaching a course in economics, compared with 22 percent of the occasional viewers and 15 percent of the non-viewers with three or more economics courses.

Thus, as might be predicted, teachers responsible for a course in economics are much more likely than others to have viewed "The American Economy" regularly.

5. Some Other Characteristics of High School Economics Teachers:

Certain data were run to compare teachers responsible for a course in Economics with other high school social studies teachers. For this analysis, instructors teaching Problems or Challenge of Democracy, a course with heavy economics content, are included with the Economics instructors.

On the economics test, the Economics teachers achieved a mean score two points higher than other teachers, 18.45 compared to 16.46, with a standard deviation of about four in both cases. Such a difference in means could occur by chance fewer than one time in a hundred.

One in four Economics teachers viewed "The American Economy" at some time, compared to about 1 in 7 (15 percent) of the other teachers and almost three times as many were regular viewers: eight percent of the economics instructors compared to three percent of the other teachers.

Economics teachers have taken more economics courses themselves: almost 3 in 5 (58 percent) have taken three or more such courses, but only 2 in 5 (39 percent) of the other teachers have this much economics. Concomitantly, six percent of the Economics instructors but only three percent of the other teachers reported a major in Economics.

6. Expectations for Future Teaching:

We asked the teachers: "In terms of your own professional career, which of the following would you most like to be doing five years from now?" and then listed six alternatives, including: continuing to teach what they are at present; teaching in high school but different subjects; teaching at the college or university level; teaching in some other kind of school; school administration; and a final open alternative of "something else".

Somewhat fewer than half of all the teachers (45 percent) indicated a desire to continue teaching in high school what they are teaching now. But significantly more of the regular viewers, 63 percent, indicated this preference. Occasional viewers also were more likely than those who never watched "The American Economy" to wish to continue in their present teaching, 54 percent indicating this preference contrasted with 42 percent of those teachers who never watched the program. Even when economics background was held constant, and comparisons made only among teachers who have had at least three economics courses, the same relationship among the viewing groups emerged: 61 percent of the regular viewers, 51 percent of the occasional viewers, and 38 percent of those who never watched indicated a preference for five years hence to be teaching what they are teaching now.

About a fifth of all the teachers (19 percent) say that they would like to be teaching at a college or university and about 1 in 6 (15 percent) say they would like to be working in school administration. Those who watched "The American Economy" regularly are less likely than those who never watched to indicate this preference. Similarly, while about 1 in 11 of all the teachers (9 percent) indicated that they would like to be teaching different high school subjects, only 2 percent of the regular viewers felt this way.

These data suggest that those who watched the television series feel more committed to their current teaching as a long-range career. Of course, it should be remembered that non-viewers are more often younger and continuing for an academic degree than the viewers and thus more likely still to be defining their careers. Whatever the reasons for their lesser motivation to continue in their present careers, and there are no data from this survey that explain this, it is interesting to note that this difference does exist.

Chapter XII

WHERE DO THEY TEACH?

Teachers in small metropolitan areas, those with a population under 2 million, more often viewed the television program regularly than other teachers. Also, teachers in metropolitan centers were more likely than teachers in the suburban and fringe districts to have watched "The American Economy" regularly. Teachers in the smallest towns (under 10,000 population) and rural counties least often watched the television program. There were no significant differences according to the geographic location of the teachers.

Regular viewers, more often than other teachers, were located in larger schools -- schools with greater numbers of social studies teachers and with larger pupil enrollments.

1. Community Size and Degree of Urbanization:

One in six of these instructors teaches in a school in a large metropolitan area -- a metropolitan area with a population of 2 million or more. They are divided about 2:1 between the suburbs and outskirts, and the central city, respectively. A third of the teachers are located in small metropolitan areas, those with a population of less than 2 million. In the small metropolitan areas, teachers are equally divided between the urban centers and suburban communities.

About 1 in 10 teachers was in a city with a population of less than 50,000; and 3 in 10 of the teachers were in a small town or rural county, lacking a population center as large as 10,000 in population.

These proportions reflect to some extent the differential response rate discussed in Chapter III, page 16, where we noted that the central cities of large metropolitan areas are somewhat underrepresented in our sample. For this reason the proportion of teachers from small communities in this sample is somewhat larger than the actual population proportion. For purposes of comparing the analytic groups, however, we can use the total sample distribution as the reference point.

As can be seen in Table 44, differences among the economics background groups were small, except for a somewhat greater concentration of those teachers with five or more economics courses in the metropolitan areas, especially the large ones. And teachers who have not had any economics courses are somewhat more likely than the total group to be in small towns and rural counties, less likely to be in the suburbs and outskirts of large and middle-sized cities.

Table 44

**SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT
SIZES AND DEGREES OF URBANIZATION**

<u>Size:</u>	BY NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				
	TOTAL	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>
Metropolitan: 2,000,000 and over	17%	13%	16%	15%	22%
Central city	5%	4%	4%	5%	8%
Suburbs	12	9	12	10	14
Metropolitan: Under 2,000,000	34	32	35	31	38
Central city	17	17	17	15	19
Suburbs	17	15	18	16	19
Small Cities: 10,000 - 50,000	19	19	21	19	14
Small towns and rural counties	30	36	28	35	26
All Central city	22	21	21	20	27
All Suburbs	29	24	30	26	33

The televiewing groups however, showed considerable differences. In Table 45, we note that regular viewers were more often located in the metropolitan areas of less than two million population than were the other teachers, and especially in the central cities of these areas. Regular viewers, correspondingly, were considerably less often to be found in small towns of under ten thousand and in rural areas.

Table 45

**SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN COMMUNITIES OF DIFFERENT
SIZES AND DEGREES OF URBANIZATION**

By viewing of "The American Economy"

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

Size	TOTAL	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
		All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
Metropolitan: 2,000,000 and over	17%	17%	18%	16%	20%	19%	18%
Central City	5%	5%	6%	6%	7%	7%	7%
Suburbs	12	12	12	10	13	12	11
Metropolitan: Under 2,000,000	34	33	31	33	35	48	56
Central City	17	16	15	17	18	26	30
Suburbs	17	17	16	16	17	22	26
Small Cities: 10,000 - 50,000	19	19	16	19	19	19	21
Small towns and rural counties	30	31	35	32	26	14	5
11 Central City	22	21	21	23	25	33	37
11 Suburbs	29	29	28	26	30	34	37

It may be of interest to look at these data in another way -- the distribution of teachers with different economics backgrounds and different televiewing behavior within the different sized and urbanized communities. The differences we have discussed show up more clearly in the presentation in Table 45 but the same patterns emerge.

One particular difficulty with Table 46 is that only the weighted N's are available. The raw N is identical for the large metropolitan areas and slightly smaller in the small metropolitan areas. It would be substantially different, however, in the non-metropolitan communities. Because of this, accurate estimates of sampling error cannot be computed when the data are presented in this way.

2. Geographic Distribution of Teachers:

About a fifth of all the teachers surveyed were in the northeast: somewhat more of those who had had at least five economics courses and fewer teachers who had not had any economics courses. Also, somewhat more of the teachers who viewed the program occasionally were in the New England and Mid-Atlantic States.

A third of all the teachers were in the North Central states and about a quarter (26 percent) were in the south. A fifth of these social studies teachers were in the Mountain and Pacific states. There were no consistent differences among the groups according to geographic region.

Table 47

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5 & more	Never		Occas		Regularly	
					All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	
Northeast	21%	14%	20%	20%	28%	19%	21%	29%	35%	24%	27%
No. Central	33	37	30	41	26	34	39	31	24	30	31
South	26	25	31	23	22	27	21	25	25	24	31
West	20	24	19	16	24	20	19	15	16	22	11

3. Number of Social Studies Teachers in the School:

The data reported in the next two sections deal with how many of the social studies teachers are in large and small schools. They do not report the proportion of schools in different sized communities, of given sizes, etc. Thus when we consider how many teachers are in larger schools, we automatically find a larger proportion than we would if we addressed our attention to the question of how many schools of this size there are: e.g., in a school with 10 social studies teachers, that school will appear 10 times in our count since it will appear once for each of the ten teachers.

The purpose of this analysis is to compare the analytic groupings of teachers, viewers and non-viewers in particular, as to their likelihood of teaching in large or small schools; and using the base of the number of teachers in given sized schools works well for this comparison. We would emphasize that the proportions presented for the total sample are for purposes of comparing the sub-samples and should not be considered indicative of how many schools there are with that number of social studies teachers.

Slightly more than a third of all the instructors (36 percent) were teaching in schools where there were no more than two other social studies teachers: 12 percent were in schools where they were the only such teacher, 11 percent in schools where there was one other and 13 percent where there were two other social studies teachers. Both the teachers who had taken at least five economics courses and the regular viewers were much less often teaching in schools with this small a number of social studies teachers. Interestingly, when economics background was controlled, we continue to observe that viewers were less often in these small schools: among teachers who had three or more economics courses, more of those who never watched "The American Economy" (37 percent) than of the viewers (18 percent) were in schools this size.

Another third of the teachers were in schools with three to eight social studies teachers and there was no significant divergence among the analytic groups.

But when we consider the largest schools, those which have at least 10 social studies teachers, we find considerable variation among the analytic groups. Overall, 31 percent of the teachers reported that they taught in schools with nine or more other social studies teachers, but 41 percent of those who had taken five or more economics courses and 47 percent of those teachers who had watched "The American Economy" regularly were teaching in schools this large. When economics background was controlled, even among teachers with three or more economics courses, viewers were considerably more likely to be teaching in these larger schools than non-viewers, the proportions ranging from 44 percent of the regular viewers and 42 percent of the occasional viewers to 31 percent of the non-viewers.

We see from these data that teachers were more likely to view the program when they were in schools with a greater number of other social studies teachers. This is consistent with the findings presented above on differences in viewing related to differences in size of the community, where we noted that the smallest areas had fewest regular viewers.

4. Size of Pupil Enrollment:

As another measure of school size, we obtained from each school information about the number of pupils enrolled there as of January 1, 1964 or as soon thereafter as such a count was available. It should be emphasized that this discussion, like that in the section above, is concerned with the proportions of teachers teaching in schools of given sizes, and cannot be taken to represent the proportion of schools that there are with these enrollments.

Table 48 presents the proportions of the teachers at schools with varying sized pupil enrollments. The same trends are observed as in the comparison of numbers of social studies teachers in the schools: more teachers among those who have had at least five economics courses (42 percent) are teaching in schools with 1,500 or more pupils than is true for the total sample of teachers (31 percent). And 50 percent of the regular viewers, compared with 35 percent and 30 percent of the occasional viewers and non-viewers, respectively, are teaching in schools this large. Even when controlling economics background, significantly more of the regular viewers than of those who never watched "The American Economy" were teaching in larger schools.

Table 48

PROPORTIONS OF SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS IN SCHOOLS
WITH DIFFERENT PUPIL ENROLLMENTS

<u>No. Pupils</u>	<u>NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:</u>					<u>WATCHED THE PROGRAM:</u>					
	<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1-2</u>	<u>3-4</u>	<u>5 & more</u>	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occas</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
						<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco</u>
1-99	10%	16%	8%	14%	4%	11%	12%	5%	*	3%	4%
100-199	7	7	8	9	5	8	9	9	2%	2	1
200-499	18	15	20	16	18	18	17	17	17	13	10
500-999	19	17	21	19	15	19	17	19	22	17	18
1000-1499	15	13	15	14	16	14	13	15	20	15	21
1500-2499	25	26	23	23	32	24	25	28	32	39	35
2500 & more	6	6	5	5	10	6	7	7	7	11	11
Median	890	900	800	800	1260	830	850	1020	1220	1490	1410

Chapter XIII

WHICH HIGH SCHOOLS HAVE A SEPARATE COURSE IN ECONOMICS?

High schools in the large metropolitan centers are most likely to offer a course in economics. The availability of such a course in high school decreases consistently as community size becomes smaller.

Regular viewers more often than other instructors were located in high schools which taught economics as a separate subject.

1. Where Are the Schools?:

Table 49 below indicates that high schools in the central cities of the largest metropolitan areas are most likely to offer a separate course in economics; better than 7 in 10 of these schools are doing so. Only somewhat more than half of the high schools in the suburban and fringe districts of these largest metropolises offer a separate economics course. This is equivalent to the proportion in city centers of smaller metropolitan areas. The suburban and fringe districts of these smaller metropolitan areas approximate the small towns: somewhat less than half of the high schools offer a separate economics course, while in the smallest towns and rural places, only 3 in 10 high schools are providing an economics course.

Table 49

<u>Schools:*</u>	<u>HAVE</u>	<u>DO NOT HAVE</u>
All	39%	61%
In large Metropolitan areas (2,000,000 or over)	61	39
Central City	73	27
Suburb/fringe	56	44
In small Metropolitan Areas (Under 2,000,000)	49	51
Central City	55	45
Suburb/fringe	46	54
Small towns: 10,000 - 50,000	44	56
Rural Places	30	70
Total Central City	58	42
Total Suburb/fringe	49	51

*Percentages are based on the number of high schools in different sized communities, therefore they total 100 percent horizontally.

2. Which Instructors Teach in These High Schools?:

Slightly fewer than half the teachers (48 percent) were teaching in high schools where economics is offered as a separate subject. Teachers who had had at least five economics courses were in these schools somewhat more often than teachers who had taken fewer economics courses. But the differences between sample groups were much greater when televiewing experience was considered. Almost two-thirds of the teachers who had watched "The American Economy" regularly taught in these schools. When holding economics background constant, about three-quarters of the teachers who had taken three or more college economics courses and who viewed the program regularly, reported that economics was taught as a separate subject in their schools.

Table 50

IS ECONOMICS TAUGHT AS A SEPARATE SUBJECT?

	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
Yes	48%	46%	45%	47%	56%	46%	49%	48%	53%	64%	74%
No	52%	54	55	53	44	54	51	52	47	36	26

Chapter XIV

WHAT ECONOMICS IS BEING TAUGHT IN HIGH SCHOOL?

None of the differences between regular viewers and other teachers reported in this chapter can be considered proof of the television program's effects. Information and controls are lacking that might afford a relative evaluation of before and after behavior such as is necessary to prove causation. Therefore, the reader is reminded that these findings are intended only to describe what these teachers were doing with regard to teaching certain aspects of economics during the school year 1963-1964.

When asked to evaluate the importance of teaching about the eleven economics topics listed on the survey, regular viewers of "The American Economy" rated more of these topics "very" important than did other teachers. Among the entire group of teachers, comparative economic systems was most often rated "very" important. Among regular viewers, the role of markets, prices and profits ranked second but it ranked considerably lower among non-viewers. Four-fifths of all the teachers, but just about every regular viewer, indicated that they were teaching some economics topics in their social studies classes. Judging from the amount of time they spent teaching the eleven listed topics, regular viewers were spending more time teaching economics topics than the other teachers.

Just as comparative economic systems was rated most important to teach, more time appears to be spent actually teaching it than is spent on any of the other listed topics. Also receiving considerable attention, and more from regular viewers than from non-viewers, are: the development of modern economic institutions; distribution of incomes; international economic problems; underdeveloped economies; the role of markets, prices and profits; economic stability and growth.

Instructors teaching a course in Economics or Problems of Democracy were analyzed separately with regard to how many class periods they taught these topics. For the most part, regular viewers as a group spent more time on these topics than the Economics and Problems of Democracy teachers as a group.

Finally, an inquiry into the methods preferred for teaching economics showed that regular viewers stress the analytical approach somewhat more often than they do the descriptive and more than other teachers do. Generally, among the entire group of social studies teachers, the descriptive approach is stressed most.

1. Economics Topics Rated "Very Important":

We asked the teachers: "For each of the topics listed below, please indicate whether you yourself think it is (1) very important, (2) somewhat important, or (3) hardly important at all to include that topic in a high school social studies program." Then followed the 11 topics that we discussed in Chapter VI in connection with evaluating changes in the amount of time spent teaching economics.

For the purposes of comparing viewers and non-viewers, we computed for each teacher the number of topics, out of the total possible 11, that he had rated as "very" important to teach. As is true of this entire chapter, the discussion will carry no implications that the viewers' ratings were a result of their exposure to "The American Economy" programs. The purpose of this question was to determine whether teachers who watched the program were more sensitive to the importance of economics teaching; since there was no comparable information about them before they watched the program, their sensitivity cannot be interpreted as a result of their viewing. Indeed, it is quite likely that they started out with greater concern and interest in teaching economics.

What we see in Table 51 is that not very different proportions of all the teachers rated as many as three of these topics "very important". From thereon, however, regular viewers concentrated more heavily at the upper end of the distribution -- rating a greater number of topics as "very important" than either the occasional viewers or those who never watched "The American Economy". Occasional viewers and non-viewers were remarkably similar in the number of topics to which they attached great importance.

It is apparent that regular viewers, even when controlling for their greater economics background, considered more of the economics topics "very important" to teach than did the other teachers.

The number of teachers rating any particular one of the economics topics "very important" to teach showed considerable variation. For example, 88 percent of all the teachers rated "very important" the study of "Comparative economic systems (capitalism, socialism, communism, etc.)." There was little variation among the sub-groups on this item. On the other hand, only about six in ten of all the teachers (59 percent) considered the problem of "Role of markets, prices and profits in organizing economic activity" something that was "very important" to teach. But eighty-four percent of the teachers who had viewed "The American Economy" regularly rated this topic "very important".

Table 51

NUMBER OF ECONOMICS TOPICS CONSIDERED "VERY IMPORTANT" TO TEACH
(Cumulative Proportions)

Number of Topics	WATCHED THE PROGRAM:									
	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:				
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5 & More	Never	Occas	Regularly	All	3+Eco
All Eleven	12%	14%	11%	11%	13%	11%	10%	13%	14%	18%
At least ten	19	21	19	16	22	17	15	19	21	33
At least nine	28	29	24	30	35	27	29	28	31	45
At least eight	38	41	31	41	46	35	40	41	42	57
At least seven	51	52	45	52	62	48	52	56	61	72
At least six	64	60	61	62	74	61	64	66	73	82
At least five	76	70	73	74	90	75	79	75	83	90
At least four	90	83	90	90	95	89	91	93	93	94
Not cumulative: 1-3	9	16	9	10	4	10	8	7	7	6
None	1	1	1	*	1	1	1	--	--	--

For the total group of teachers, the topic of "comparative economic systems" mentioned previously was by far the most uniformly agreed upon one of great importance. Rated this highly next most frequently, by 7 in 10 of the teachers, was "Government finance, taxation and spending" and "Distribution of incomes". Least often rated "very important", by fewer than half of the teachers, were studying "Under-developed economies" and "International economic problems". Table 52 presents the rank order of the eleven topics, and the proportion rating each "very important" -- for the total sample and, for comparative purposes, for all the regular viewers and for those of them who had at least three college economics courses.

Interestingly, when teachers of courses in Economics or Problems of Democracy were compared with others, the only topic on which there was substantial difference was the role of markets, prices and profits, rated "very" important to teach by 70 percent of the Economics teachers and 55 percent of other teachers. (Appendix E)

2. Plans to Include Any Economics Topic in Their Teaching:

In order to determine if the teacher included any economics at all in his social studies classes, we asked: "Do you yourself plan to include any economics topics at all in one or more of the social studies classes that you are teaching this year?" In this way we were referring to both the part of the year prior to the time of the survey and expectations for the remainder of the 1963-64 school year. As might be predicted from what we know now about the regular viewers, they had such plans significantly more often than did the other teachers, even when controlling for their greater economics background. Thus, 81 percent of all the teachers, 99 percent of the regular viewers and 100 percent of the regular viewers who had had at least three college economics courses planned to teach some economics during the year. Again, occasional viewers were quite like the non-viewers; 83 percent of all occasional to 79 percent of non-viewers, and 90 percent of occasional viewers who had had three or more economics courses compared to 86% of the non-viewers with this many courses planned to be teaching some economics.

3. Time Spent Teaching Economics Topics:

For the same 11 topics mentioned earlier, we asked the teachers to indicate about how many periods during the 1963-64 school year they planned to spend teaching each topic, adding together all the classes that they taught. Table 53 presents the number of topics that teachers said they would spend as much as six classroom periods teaching. The actual teaching loads of the teachers are reflected in these data and we recall that regular viewers had greater proportions of their classes in the social studies and

Table 52

RANKING OF ECONOMICS TOPICS CONSIDERED "VERY IMPORTANT" TO TEACH

	<u>TOTAL Sample</u>		<u>Regular viewers</u>		<u>Reg. View 3+ Eco.</u>	
	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1) Comparative economic systems (Capitalism, socialism, communism etc.)	1	88%	1	91%	1	89%
2) Government finance, taxation and spending.	2	70	4	79	3	84
3) Distribution of incomes -- labor and labor problems, savings, profits, social security.	3	69	5	77	4	83
4) Development of modern economic institutions, such as corporations, banks, labor unions.	4	66	3	81	6	80
5) Problems of monopoly and government regulation of business.	5	65	8	66	7	77
6) Booms, depressions, inflation, policies to stabilize the economy, and economic growth.	6	62	6	76	8	75
7) Role of markets, prices and profits in organizing economic activity.	7	59	2	84	2	85
8) Consumer economics, personal finance, etc.	8	58	11	56	9	61
9) Money, banking, monetary policy.	9	51	7	69	5	81
10) International economic problems.	10	45	10	62	10	59
11) Under-developed economies (India, Latin America, etc.)	11	41	9	63	11	58

also were more likely to be teaching a class in economics than were other teachers. There is one other qualification to bear in mind when reading this table. The data are based on only that part of the sample who indicated that they would be teaching any economics topic at all. Better than a quarter of the teachers who did not have any college economics course (27 percent) did not qualify and are omitted in this tabulation. Similarly, 23 percent of those who had had only one or two economics courses are not represented. All but 12 percent of those with three or more economics courses are included. In terms of the televiewing groups, 21 percent of the non-viewers and 17 percent of the occasional viewers are omitted but just about all of the regular viewers are represented. It should be understood therefore, that this discussion applies only to those teachers who were teaching some economics topic, not to the entire sample, and that the proportions of the sample thereby excluded differ among sub-groups.

These data indicate that, even when limiting the sample only to those who planned to include some economics topic in one or more of their classes, regular viewers reported a greater number of topics on which they would be spending six or more periods than did the other teachers. And occasional viewers reported more such topics than did those who never watched "The American Economy".

This finding held true even when economics background was controlled. Another trend was observed in these data: there was little difference between all the teachers who never watched the program and those of them who had had three or more economics courses. Similarly, little difference was observed between all of the occasional viewers and those of them who had had three or more college economics courses. But among regular viewers we note a differential reaction: teachers who have taken more economics courses and who watched "The American Economy" regularly were spending more time teaching these economics topics than were other teachers who also watched the programs regularly.

We can again observe differences in the plans of teachers to spend as much as six periods discussing the various topics. The topic by topic analysis provides some insight into the relative emphasis each of these problems receives in practice, as opposed to the relative importance verbally ascribed to them. (Section 1 of this chapter) As before, "Comparative economic systems" was most often mentioned by all groups of teachers. "Consumer economics" ranked seventh among all teachers who were teaching any economics, but eleventh among regular viewers. "Role of markets, prices and profits," which was ninth among all teachers, ranked considerably higher among regular viewers.

Table 53

NUMBER OF TOPICS TEACHERS WILL SPEND SIX PERIODS OR MORE TEACHING
(Cumulative Proportions)

Number of Topics	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:			
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3&More	Never	Occas.	Regularly	
	4%	2%	2%	6%	All 3+Eco.	All 3+Eco.	All 3+Eco.	
All eleven	4%	2%	2%	6%	3%	4%	9%	12%
At least ten	6	3	3	8	5	7	16	21
At least nine	8	7	5	12	7	10	20	25
At least eight	11	9	8	14	9	12	22	28
At least seven	16	13	11	20	13	16	33	41
At least six	24	26	18	28	20	24	44	50
At least five	33	36	28	36	29	31	54	62
At least four	42	50	36	44	38	39	71	70
At least three	52	62	45	56	49	52	77	76
At least two	62	67	58	64	59	61	81	79
At least one	72	74	67	75	70	72	86	86
None	28	26	33	26	30	28	14	14

On the other hand, "Government finance, taxation and spending" had lower relative rank for actual time spent among regular viewers than among all teachers. The topic on which fewest of the whole group of teachers indicated that they would spend as much as six periods was "Problems of monopoly and government regulation of business," but for regular viewers it was "Consumer finance".

Table 54

RANKING OF ECONOMICS TOPICS ON WHICH TEACHERS WILL SPEND SIX OR MORE PERIODS

	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>Sample</u>		<u>Regular</u> <u>Viewers</u>		<u>Regular View.</u> <u>3+ Eco.</u>	
	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Rank</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1) Comparative economic systems (capitalism, socialism, communism, etc).	1	49%	1	70%	1	68%
2) Distribution of incomes -- labor and labor problems, savings, profits, social security.	2.5	35%	5.5	50%	2	60%
3) Development of modern economic institutions, such as corporations, banks, labor unions.	2.5	35%	2	58%	4	57%
4) International economic problems	4	32%	3	55%	6	55%
5) Under-developed economies (India, Latin American, etc.)	5	31%	4	54%	8	49%
6) Government finance, taxation and spending	6	30%	10	37%	9	45%
7) Consumer economics, personal finance, etc.	7	29%	11	34%	11	41%
8) Booms, depressions, inflation, policies to stabilize the economy, and economic growth.	8	28%	7	48%	4	57%
9) Role of markets, prices and profits in organizing economic activity.	9	27%	5.5	50%	4	57%
0) Money, banking, monetary policy	10	26%	8	45%	7	53%
1) Problems of monopoly and government regulation of business.	11	20%	9	39%	10	44%

4. Economics and Problems of Democracy Teachers:

When we observe that regular viewers are spending more time teaching these economics topics, we may merely be repeating the observation that teachers who watched "The American Economy" regularly more often were teaching a course in economics. They might be expected then to spend more time on any and all economics topics. In order to see whether these data reveal something about the particular interests and emphases

of regular viewers, we can compare the responses to those when the sample is divided between instructors who are teaching an Economics or Problems of Democracy course and all the other teachers. The size of the residual difference between viewers and non-viewers over and above that derived for the economics teachers can suggest whether we have found anything more than the generalized greater economics teaching of the regular viewers. This still can tell us only that there is an association between regular viewing and these economics topics which is not completely explained by their heavier economics teaching load. But the relationship can possibly be due to other factors beside the television program.

Appendix E presents the full set of responses concerning the number of periods the specialized teachers versus all others are teaching each of the topics. Table 55 below presents, for each topic, the difference in the proportion of specialized teachers over other teachers who are spending six or more periods teaching the topic (Economics Teacher Difference), the increase of regular viewers over the total sample (Regular Viewing Difference), and the difference between regular viewers and the total sample after subtracting the difference for economics teachers (Residual). We are probably understating the Regular Viewing Difference and the Residual by a point or two because regular viewers are being compared with the total sample which includes them as well.

Table 55

PROPORTIONS TEACHING ECONOMICS TOPICS FOR SIX OR MORE PERIODS

	<u>Eco. Teacher Difference</u>	<u>Reg. Viewing Difference</u>	<u>Residual</u>
Development of modern eco. institutions	10%	23%	13%
Role of markets, prices and profits	18	23	5
Problems of monopoly	1	19	18
Distribution of incomes	14	15	1
Economic stability and growth	13	20	7
Money and banking	16	19	3
Government finance	11	7	-4 [#]
International economic problems	1	23	22
Underdeveloped economies	-3*	23	26
Comparative economic systems	6	21	15
Consumer economics	13	5	-8 [#]

[#]The economics teaching differential was greater than that for televiewing.

*A slightly greater proportion, not statistically significant, of "other" teachers than of Economics and Problems of Democracy teachers reported six or more periods on this topic.

We observe in Table 55 that, for all but two of the topics, regular viewing differentiates the teachers more than does whether they teach an economics course. The inference, then, is that the greater amount of time regular viewers are spending on these topics than other teachers is due to more than only a generally greater amount of economics teaching.

Approximately two-fifths of the Economics and Problems of Democracy teachers, and fewer than a third of those not teaching these courses, were spending a minimum of six class periods on: distribution of incomes (44 percent); development of modern economic institutions (41 percent); role of markets, prices and profits (38 percent); government finance (37 percent); economic stability and growth (37 percent); consumer economics (37 percent); money and banking (36 percent).

Preferences for the Analytical, Descriptive or Historical Emphasis in Economics Teaching:

We used two different approaches to investigate which of these emphases the teachers stressed most in teaching about economics topics. First, we presented three actual economics topics: 1) Labor unions; 2) Farm problem; 3) Economic growth, booms and depressions. With each of these topics we provided three alternative ways of teaching about it, one representing the historical approach, another the analytical, and a third the descriptive. The teacher was asked to rank the three alternatives under each topic in terms of what he stressed most, second most and what he stressed least when teaching about that topic. If the teacher did not cover that topic in any class, a separate answer code was available to him to record that information.

Table 56 presents the frequency with which each of the three approaches was ranked first. As an index of the relative emphasis placed on each of these approaches, a summary score was devised by weighting by three the number of teachers ranking all three of any one approach in first place, multiplying by two the number who twice ranked a particular approach in first place and multiplying by one the number who ranked that approach first only once. These numbers were summed and then divided by the number of respondents to provide the summary score.

Regular viewers placed greater emphasis on the analytical approach than other groups of teachers did. Among regular viewers, the descriptive approach had a lower weighting than the analytical. Teachers who have had the greatest number of economics courses also weighted the analytical approach above the descriptive. However, even when controlling for economics background, regular viewers scored more highly on the analytical approach than the other teachers of comparable economics background.

Table 56

PREFERENCES FOR ANALYTIC, DESCRIPTIVE AND HISTORIC APPROACHES
IN TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL ECONOMICS

Approach	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:				
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never All	Occas. All	Regularly All		
ANALYTIC										
Three 1st Choices	9%	9%	9%	8%	13%	9%	8%	14%	18%	24%
Two "	18	10	19	18	22	16	17	25	27	28
One " Choice	38	40	35	35	45	40	42	34	34	29
No "	35	41	37	39	20	35	33	32	25	27
Summary Score	1.02	.87	.99	.94	1.27	.99	1.00	1.10	1.31	1.34
DESCRIPTIVE										
Three 1st Choices	3%	3%	5%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%
Two "	34	44	31	35	29	35	35	30	26	22
One " Choice	47	40	49	48	46	46	48	47	43	46
No "	16	13	15	14	23	15	14	21	29	29
Summary Score	1.24	1.36	1.25	1.27	1.10	1.28	1.26	1.12	1.02	.98
HISTORIC										
Three 1st Choices	1%	*	1%	1%	*	*	1%	*	1%	1%
Two "	14	17	15	14	12	14	14	18	11	17
One " Choice	44	44	44	49	39	45	44	43	44	32
No "	41	39	40	36	49	41	41	39	44	51
Summary Score	.75	.79	.76	.78	.63	.74	.73	.79	.69	.67

The descriptive approach was emphasized most often by the total group of teachers and by those who never watched "The American Economy". The historical approach apparently receives least emphasis among teachers.

Our second measure for preferences among teaching approaches was a purely verbal one, asking the teachers: "All in all, in classes that you teach, would you say there is greater emphasis on the descriptive aspects of economics or on the analytical?" The results of this question appear in Table 57.

Table 57

RELATIVE EMPHASIS ON DESCRIPTIVE AND ANALYTICAL APPROACHES IN TEACHING ECONOMICS

	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:					WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
	TOTAL	None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
ore on DESCRIPTIVE	48%	60%	49%	44%	42%	50%	47%	43%	35%	36%	27%
ore on ANALYTICAL	26	15	27	31	27	24	26	32	33	38	42
qual emphasis on both	26	25	24	25	31	26	27	25	32	26	31

Overall, just about half the teachers reported a greater emphasis on the descriptive aspects of economics. About one in four said he emphasized the analytical and the same number reported that he gives about equal emphasis to the two approaches.

More of the teachers who have not had any college economics courses indicated that they place greater emphasis on the descriptive approach than did teachers who have had some economics courses. And more of those who never watched the television program than those who watched it regularly indicated that they place greater emphasis on the descriptive aspects. Among the entire group of teachers, emphasis is placed on the descriptive aspects about twice as often as it is on the analytical. Only among the regular viewers who have had at least three college economics courses does the preference in approach shift clearly to the analytical. But regular viewers, regardless of economics background, prefer the analytical approach more often than teachers who never viewed "The American Economy".

APPENDIX A

1) NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES TAKEN AT UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
None	19%	2%	13%	1%	19%	7%
One	24	3	16	6	13	6
Two	26	19	32	22	24	24
Three	13	33	11	21	19	27
Four	8	19	15	27	13	18
Five	3	7	3	4	3	4
Six and more	7	17	10	19	9	14

2) NUMBER OF ECONOMICS COURSES TAKEN AT GRADUATE LEVEL

WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	<u>Never</u>		<u>Occasionally</u>		<u>Regularly</u>	
	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>3+Eco.</u>
None	75%	49%	49%	26%	38%	22%
One	10	14	21	20	18	18
Two	7	17	15	27	13	15
Three	4	10	8	13	14	20
Four	1	2	4	8	4	6
Five	1	2	1	2	4	6
Six and more	2	6	2	4	9	13

3) NUMBER OF COURSES TAKEN IN 12 SUBJECT FIELDS
(Total Sample Only)

						<u>None</u>	<u>Information Missing#</u>
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5&more</u>		
A. Basic, Introductory or General Eco. (100%)	38%	39%	4%	2%	*	12%	5%
B. Money and Banking (100%)	17	3	*	*	1%	69	10
C. Public Finance (100%).	10	2	*	1	*	76	11
D. Economic Theory (100%)	13	5	*	1	*	72	9
E. Business Cycles (100%).	4	1	*	*	*	84	11
F. Business and Government (100%)	13	4	1	1	*	71	10
G. Labor Economics (100%)	11	3	1	1	*	74	10
H. Consumer Economics (100%)	12	3	*	1	*	74	10
I. Economic History (100%).	24	5	1	*	*	61	9
J. International Economics (100%)	7	1	*	*	*	81	11
K. Comparative Systems (100%)	13	2	*	*	*	74	11
L. Economic Statistics & Research Methods(100%)	6	2	*	*	*	81	11

#It is likely that omitted answers represent "no courses" in that field.

APPENDIX B

DISTRIBUTION OF ECONOMICS TEST SCORES

SCORE	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5 & more	Never All	3+Eco	Occas. All	3+Eco	Regularly All	3+Eco
3	*	--	*	*	--	*	--	*	*	--	--
4	*	--	*	1%	*	*	--	1%	3%	2%	3%
5	*	*	1%	--	--	*	--	--	--	--	--
6	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1	1	1
7	1%	1%	1	1	1%	1%	*	3	4	2	1
8	1	4	1	1	1	1	1%	2	*	1	1
9	2	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	2	1	2
10	3	7	3	3	*	3	2	2	*	*	1
11	4	3	6	3	1	4	2	6	6	3	5
12	5	5	6	2	5	5	3	3	4	2	--
13	5	6	6	3	4	4	3	10	3	4	5
14	6	9	8	4	4	7	4	5	3	4	5
15	6	6	8	6	4	6	6	7	4	1	--
16	7	8	8	6	4	7	4	6	8	10	6
17	10	8	9	12	9	11	13	6	3	6	5
18	9	8	9	9	9	9	10	8	7	4	5
19	8	9	6	10	9	8	9	9	10	6	8
20	7	8	7	7	8	8	7	6	7	4	4
21	7	7	6	7	9	7	8	6	7	10	11
22	7	5	5	5	13	7	9	9	14	6	7
23	6	3	4	9	9	5	9	3	6	16	10
24	4	1	2	7	5	4	7	4	6	7	8
25	2	*	2	1	4	1	1	2	2	10	13

APPENDIX C

CHANGES IN AMOUNT OF TIME SPENT ON 11 ECONOMICS TOPICS*
(Televiewing Groups Only)

	TOTAL	Never		Occas.		Regularly	
		All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
1) Comparative economic systems:							
More Time	45%	45%	50%	42%	40%	45%	46%
Less Time	8	8	11	9	14	6	6
Same Time	41	41	34	44	40	43	40
Data missing	6	6	5	5	6	6	8
2) Underdeveloped economies:							
More Time	33	32	33	34	37	34	35
Less Time	13	13	18	12	16	14	19
Same Time	48	48	43	48	42	47	40
Data missing	6	7	6	6	5	5	6
3) International economic problems:							
More Time	34	33	34	37	40	33	35
Less Time	10	11	16	7	9	9	11
Same Time	50	50	44	51	45	53	48
Data Missing	6	6	6	5	6	5	6
4) Distribution of incomes, labor and labor problems:							
More time	27	24	28	33	30	36	38
Less Time	12	13	19	9	13	10	12
Same Time	56	57	48	54	54	48	41
Data missing	5	6	5	4	3	6	9
5) Economic stability and growth:							
More Time	23	21	25	27	29	35	43
Less Time	12	14	22	8	10	5	5
Same Time	58	58	47	61	57	55	45
Data missing	7	7	6	4	4	5	7
6) Development of modern economic institutions:							
More Time	23	22	24	23	25	35	39
Less Time	10	10	11	8	13	11	14
Same Time	63	64	61	67	61	49	40
Data missing	4	4	4	2	1	5	7

*Percentages are based only on teachers who were teaching social studies two years ago and who planned to include some economics topics in their current classes. This represents about 3 in 5 of all teachers, slightly more of the occasional viewers and almost all the regular viewers.

APPENDIX C, CONT.

	TOTAL	Never		Occas		Regularly	
		All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
7) Role of markets, prices and profits:							
More Time	24%	22%	30%	27%	35%	31%	38%
Less Time	10	11	12	6	6	9	12
Same Time	61	61	55	64	56	55	43
Data missing	5	6	3	3	3	5	7
8) Money and banking:							
More Time	20	18	22	20	17	31	35
Less Time	15	15	20	13	19	17	19
Same Time	59	60	52	62	57	50	43
Data missing	6	7	6	5	7	2	3
9) Government finance:							
More Time	28	28	35	26	26	29	32
Less Time	12	12	16	12	16	12	12
Same Time	54	53	43	57	53	52	47
Data missing	6	7	6	5	5	7	9
0) Problems of monopoly:							
More Time	18	17	19	17	22	23	26
Less Time	12	11	15	16	22	16	17
Same Time	65	66	61	65	55	54	48
Data missing	5	6	5	2	1	7	9
1) Consumer economics, personal finance:							
More Time	21	20	20	27	22	19	19
Less Time	18	18	21	11	15	29	38
Same Time	53	54	54	56	57	45	35
Data missing	8	8	5	6	6	7	8

APPENDIX D

READERSHIP OF TEN SELECTED PERIODICALS

	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				WATCHED THE PROGRAM:					
		None	1-2	3-4	5&more	Never		Occas		Regularly	
						All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
NEW YORK TIMES:											
Read Regularly	20%	9%	20%	20%	30%	18%	21%	27%	32%	35%	36%
" Occasionally	26	43	46	49	45	46	46	43	52	53	50
" Hardly ever, Never	31	46	32	28	18	33	29	24	6	9	11
Data missing*	3	2	2	3	7	3	4	6	10	3	3
WALL STREET JOURNAL:											
Read Regularly	5	1	3	5	9	4	6	5	6	18	22
" Occasionally	39	22	32	45	57	37	48	43	52	50	55
" Hardly ever, Never	51	73	60	43	29	55	41	42	27	28	19
Data Missing	5	4	5	7	5	4	5	10	15	4	4
BUSINESS WEEK:											
Read Regularly	7	2	5	9	13	6	9	10	13	16	22
" Occasionally	40	27	41	38	52	40	47	45	40	41	47
" Hardly ever, Never	46	66	48	45	28	48	39	33	31	31	23
Data Missing	7	5	6	8	7	6	5	12	16	12	8
FORTUNE MAGAZINE:											
Read Regularly	3	2	2	4	4	2	3	6	8	6	8
" Occasionally	31	25	25	31	47	30	38	32	39	41	47
" Hardly ever, Never	58	68	66	56	41	61	52	49	34	45	36
Data Missing	8	5	7	9	8	7	7	13	19	8	9
SOCIAL EDUCATION:											
Read Regularly	12	8	12	12	15	10	11	19	18	34	31
" Occasionally	21	16	22	16	29	20	21	23	25	24	25
" Hardly ever, Never	58	67	59	62	46	62	60	43	39	35	36
Data Missing	9	9	7	10	10	8	8	15	18	7	8
SOCIAL STUDIES:											
Read Regularly	14	7	15	15	13	12	12	17	20	22	25
" Occasionally	31	24	34	28	37	30	33	40	31	32	32
" Hardly ever, Never	47	62	45	50	38	51	48	31	33	39	36
Data Missing	8	7	6	7	12	7	7	12	16	7	7

* Sometimes respondents replied only about the periodicals which they read. Where the "missing data" category is large, it is likely that much of it belongs with the "Hardly ever, Never Read" category.

APPENDIX D, CONT.

NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES: WATCHED THE PROGRAM:

	TOTAL	NO. OF ECONOMICS COURSES:				Never		Occas		Regularly	
		None	1-2	3-4	5&more	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco	All	3+Eco
AMERICAN ECONOMIC REVIEW:											
Read Regularly	2%	*	2%	2%	5%	2%	3%	2%	4%	7%	7%
" Occasionally	23	16%	20	22	36	21	26	28	30	40	45
" Hardly ever, Never	65	76	68	65	49	68	62	53	46	43	36
Data Missing	10	8	10	11	10	9	9	17	20	10	12
AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW:											
Read Regularly	10	8	10	10	14	10	11	12	15	17	20
" Occasionally	33	24	34	32	38	32	34	35	37	45	37
" Hardly ever, Never	49	63	49	49	41	51	48	43	34	30	34
Data Missing	8	5	7	9	7	7	7	10	14	8	9
ANNALS AMERICAN ACADEMY POLITICAL & SOCIAL SCI.:											
Read Regularly	3	1	3	2	7	2	3	8	12	11	11
" Occasionally	18	12	18	17	24	17	18	22	24	22	20
" Hardly ever, Never	71	83	72	70	63	74	72	60	51	57	56
Data Missing	8	4	7	11	6	7	7	10	13	10	13
JOURNAL MODERN HISTORY:											
Read Regularly	5	3	6	4	6	5	5	4	3	6	7
" Occasionally	16	11	16	18	17	15	15	22	24	21	24
" Hardly ever, Never	70	81	70	68	67	73	73	60	52	60	58
Data Missing	9	5	8	10	10	7	7	14	21	13	11

APPENDIX E*

NUMBER OF PERIODS EXPECTED TO SPEND TEACHING ECONOMICS TOPICS

	TEACH ECO. OR P.O.D.	DO NOT TEACH THESE	TOTAL
1. Development of Modern Economic Institutions:	(1203) [#]	(2154)	(3357)
0	7%	8%	8%
1-5	52	61	57
6-10	30	23	26
11 or more	11	8	9
2. Role of markets, prices and profits:	(1183)	(2124)	(3307)
0	7%	15%	12%
1-5	55	65	61
6-10	25	16	20
11 or more	13	4	7
3. Problems of monopoly:	(1188)	(2134)	(3322)
0	8%	11%	10%
1-5	71	69	70
6-10	15	16	16
11 or more	6	4	4
4. Distribution of incomes, labor, and labor problems:	(1194)	(2166)	(3360)
0	7%	10%	9%
1-5	49	60	56
6-10	33	23	26
11 or more	11	7	9
5. Economic stability and growth:	(1182)	(2127)	(3309)
0	6%	13%	10%
1-5	57	63	61
6-10	27	17	21
11 or more	10	7	8
6. Money and banking:	(1164)	(2130)	(3294)
0	14%	22%	19%
1-5	50	58	55
6-10	29	15	20
11 or more	7	5	6

*For percentages in the middle range, about 50 percent, a difference of five percentage point is significant at P₀₅. For percentages near the extremes (10 percent or less) a difference of three percentage points is significant at P₀₅.

Weighted N's.

APPENDIX E, CONT.

	<u>TEACH</u>	<u>DO NOT TEACH</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
7. Government Finance:	(1182)	(2159)	(3341)
0	7%	15%	12%
1-5	56	59	58
6-10	24	21	22
11 or more	13	5	8
8. International Economic Problems:	(1186)	(2153)	(3339)
0	12%	12%	12%
1-5	55	56	56
6-10	21	23	22
11 or more	12	9	10
9. Underdeveloped economies:	(1184)	(2175)	(3359)
0	9%	14%	12%
1-5	62	53	57
6-10	19	21	20
11 or more	10	12	11
0. Comparative economic systems:	(1197)	(2184)	(3381)
0	4%	7%	6%
1-5	43	46	45
6-10	25	27	26
11 or more	28	20	23
1. Consumer economics, personal finance:	(1190)	(2150)	(3340)
0	10%	30%	23%
1-5	53	46	49
6-10	23	16	18
11 or more	14	8	10