

Instructional Methods for Teaching Social Studies: A Survey of What Primary School Children Like and Dislike about Social Studies Instruction

Dr. Rajendra Kumar Shah

Associate Professor, Chairman of Education Subject Committee and Member of Research
Coordination Cell, Kailali Multiple Campus (KMC), Dhangadhi, Kailali, Seti, Far Western, Nepal
E-mail : drrajendrakumarshah@gmail.com

Abstract

Sufficient research studies are not conducted in the field of primary level social studies curriculum pertaining to effective instructional pedagogy. At the same time, research studies conducted in the field of primary level social studies fail to take into account one very important variable: How do the primary school children enjoy learning social studies? This paper is a survey research study designed to see what a group of primary school children liked and disliked about social studies instruction. By asking the questions the researcher hope to gain a better understanding of primary school children's preferences, attitudes and perceptions of social studies instruction. The major objective of this study is to gain a better understanding of what instructional methods the students enjoy in the social studies classroom. The findings of this study will be helpful for teacher in selection of proper teaching learning strategies.

Key words

Social Studies, Primary Education, Program

I. Study Context

Traditionally, teaching is simply pouring curricular information to the students. It seems that learning is solely left on the part of the students while neglecting the fact that teaching only matters when learning truly occurs (Shah, 2013). The traditional scheme is, in essence, one of imposition from above and outside. It imposes adult standards, subject matters, and methods upon those who are only growing slowly toward maturity (Dewey, 1916). So the gap is so great that the required subject matter, the methods of learning and of behaving are foreign to the existing capabilities of the young. They are beyond the reach of the experience the young learners already possess. Consequently, they must be imposed; even though good teachers will use devices of art to cover up the imposition so as to relive it of obviously brutal features (Dewey, 1916; Holt, 2005; Shah, 2015). Similarly according to the traditional belief, teaching was perceived as a business just to deal with the curricular provisions without connecting to social transformation, advancement and overall personality development of the student. Existing teaching learning activities and delivery system is unsatisfactory and is not suitable for the age of 21st century.

In the same context, Holt (2005) said that true learning-learning that is permanent and useful, that leads to intelligent action and further learning-can arises only out of the experience, interest and concerns of the learning (p.9). Every child, without exception, has innate and unquenchable drive to understand the world in which he lives and to gain freedom and competence in it (Dewey, 1954). Whatever truly adds to his understanding, his capacity for growth and pleasure, his power, his sense, of his own freedom, dignity, and worth may be said to be true education. Education is something a person gets for himself, not that which someone else gives or does to him. Actually, existing education do not emphasis on the needs, interests, aspiration and maturity of the learners. Mastery of over the contents becomes central focus of the education system. But we never think about what children like and dislike what the children want to do and do not want to do, what the children want to read and do not to read. Curriculum designers, educational planners and policy makers and parents should think over this serious challenge.

Beginning with the first education planning in 1954 in Nepal, delivery and quality of education has been emphasized. Education plan documents have progressively come up with various plans for improving classroom pedagogy-child centeredness, inclusiveness, individualism, joyful learning, active learning, continuous assessment and other such term has been used. Commissions on the Nepalese education system have expressed concerns about ineffective classroom teaching learning practices (Singh, 2008). The first education commission of Nepal, Nepal National Education Planning Commission 1956, formally commented on pedagogical practice of Nepal for the first time in Nepal. The report of this commission emphasized both expansion of the education in terms of access and qualitative improvement of delivery. Quality of education has been a major educational focus since the commencement of report of this commission and quality obviously remained an anticipated vision so far. This report clearly demands the respect for the individual differences and intelligent adaptation of the curriculum to various local conditions and to the individual differences of children. In effect this is related to child-centered principles. But the classroom scenario is changed even till the date. Educational commission's report has given more emphasis on the child centered teaching learning process. The common classroom pedagogical practices seemed to not be effective as pointed out by the National Education Commission 1992. This commission's report stated that the teaching-learning situation in primary schools is rather depressing. Students are encouraged to learn by rote, and assessments are made on the same basis (NEC, 1992).need and interests of the learner are addressed by the classroom teachers.

Higher-level National Education commission also raised some issues related to diversity education. This report pointed out inability of primary level education to represent cultural diversity and regional needs. This commission suggested reformative teaching at the primary level (HLNEC, 1998). The commission's report clearly indicates that teaching learning process adopted in the school level is unsatisfactory and most of the teaching learning processes are based on the rote learning. Education for All (EFA) documents stress and put forward the child centered education as vision regarding teaching-learning in the primary level in Nepal.

EFA documents pointed out the emphasis on rote learning and teacher centered approach as dominant pedagogical practices at the primary level. The child-centered approach, individualized instruction, formative assessments are pointed out to be practiced for reforming classroom pedagogical practices. EFA emphasized the inclusion of cultural, linguistic and other social values of the local communities in the existing education system (MOES 2002). Education for All (EFA) documents also laid more emphasis on the child centered and activities based teaching learning process. These ideas reveals that educational commissions of Nepal also laid more emphasis on the child centered activities and teaching learning activities and methods. But these ideas and thoughts are implemented in real situations.

Research studies carried out at centre for Educational Research Innovation and Development (CERID) have also repeatedly indicated that classroom teaching learning in the Nepalese schools is still dominated by rote learning. While studies related to classroom practices have mainly found classroom delivery to be teacher dominated with an emphasis on rote memorization of the content matter. The dominant approaches are lecturing, paraphrasing, drill, reading, and repeating from textbook and memorizing questions and answers. The classroom process, which is envisioned to be child centered, was found largely confined to the whole class teaching, with the effect that the weaker ones are left behind. A single language, single session, the same materials, the same method were the general practices in classroom delivery.

In the context Nepal, a major problem of the existing primary level is that in most of the cases the instructional approaches used in the classroom are not interactive, participatory and meaningful to the learner. The use of instructional materials for making learning meaningful is not found in most of the classrooms even at the primary level (CERID, 2005). So it is urgently required to study what primary level children in Nepal likes and dislikes while they are engaged in the teaching learning activities in the schools.

II. Rational of the Study

Of course, not all schools are alike. Still, most of the schools remain about what they have always been, bad places for children, or, for that matter, anyone to be in, to live in and to learn in (Holt, 2005). Because teaching learning activities are enjoyable for children, school environment is homely and teachers are not able to play their role as successful teacher (Dewey, 1916). Students often consider social studies to be dull and boring (Chiodo & Byford, 2006). Not only do students perceive social studies to be dull, but they also fail to see the relevance of social studies to their everyday lives (Schug, Todd & Beery, 1982; Shaughnessy & Haladyna, 1985). Why is this? Is it because the most of the subject matters is truly dull and boring; or is it because the instructional methods utilized by the teacher do not engage and inspire students to learn social studies. Shaughnessy & Haladyna (1985) concluded that it is the teacher who is key to what social studies will be for the student. Instruction tends to be dominated by the lecture, textbook or worksheets and social studies does not inspire students to learn” (p.694). Siler (1998) explained that teachers tend to use only one teaching style day after day, which denies students the opportunity of a variety of teaching techniques. Actually, curriculum is not localized, students need and interest are neglected in the classroom and students’ innate is not accepted by the concerned authorities and teachers are not able to identify the potentials inherent in the children. Thus, sole concern is based on the delivery of the education.

Ellis, Fouts, and Glenn (1992) stated that teacher often rely solely on text, lecturing, worksheets and traditional tests as methods of learning. However, research concludes that students have more interest in a topic when a variety of teaching methods are implemented (Bonwell & Eisen, 1991). The ability to use various techniques and methods for instruction is often neglected by educators. Teachers tend to have students participate in activities that do not encourage critical thinking, but instead encourage rote memorization of names, dates, & places. Van Sledright (2004) explained “the common preoccupation with having students commit one fact after another to memory based on history textbook recitations and lectures does little to build capacity to think historically” (p.233). In addition, Hoagland (2000) observed that teachers need to connect the content to the individual interests of the students, thus increasing student interest in the content and actively engaging students in the learning process. This entails utilizing a variety of teaching techniques that help engage students in the learning process. Some examples of engaging instructional methods include cooperative learning, role playing, and technology (Driscoll, 2005).

Stahl (1994) explains that using cooperative learning requires students to become active learners. Furthermore, Stahl (1994) believed that, “cooperative learning provides opportunities for students to learn, practice, and live the attitudes and behaviors that reflect the goals of social studies education” Using various teaching techniques is considered by many a best practice, and numerous studies conclude positive results with regard to the use of various instructional methods. Dow (1979) concluded that direct observation, data gathering, reading, role-playing, constructing projects, and watching films are all excellent ways to provide students with new information. Using film to enhance social studies instruction has been found to be an effective instructional method (Russell, 2007; Russell, 2008; Paris, 1997). In 2006, researchers concluded that using simulations heightened student interest and increased understanding (Russell & Byford). As well, researchers have found that the discussion method is a valuable method for teaching social studies (Harwood & Hahn, 1990; Byford & Russell, 2007). In 2006, researchers concluded that 85% of the 8th grade teachers who participated in the study used whole class presentation (lecture) as a method of instruction. As well, the researchers concluded that 64% of teachers had students reading textbooks and 54% had students complete a worksheet as part of the class activities. This data exemplifies that teachers utilize lecture-based instruction and non-engaging activities despite numerous research findings.

Hawes and Hawes (1932) defined child centered education as “an educational theory or system that emphasis the pupil and his or her individual characteristics as central in conducting instruction instead of focusing on subject matter, external authority and educational requirement and curriculum should be constructed according to the pupils’ interest and needs. This requires a departure from teachers dominated teaching to students learning. Child centered education as emphasized in the aim of primary education system in Nepal, has been reiterated in major educational documents.

Child centered approach requires tailoring pedagogy process around the need and interests, learning style background and etc. of the children. Children’s learning through their own experience is important aspect. Rousseau emphasized the fact that the child should be free from direct experience. Dewey advocated that children pursuing their own studies would be motivated to

speculate, observe, gather, information and test out guesses or hypothesis to solve their own problems (Dewey, 1930). It has also been advocated that if it is not children's experiences and interests that direct the curriculum content, their experiences and interests need to be considered by the teachers. This is termed as a child centered pedagogy (Collins, Insley, and Soler, 2001). child centered pedagogy takes account of children's experiences and interests, but decision is made by the teachers.

In the historical lane of the development of primary education system in Nepal comes Primary Education Project in 1984, Basic and Primary Education Project-I (BPEP-I) in 1992, BPEP-II in 1997 and Education for All (EFA) in 2002. All these education plans focused on quantitative expansion as well as qualitative improvement. BPEP and EFA documents envisioned children centered education regarding teaching learning at the primary level in Nepal. But the classroom scenario is rather depressing. Some primary teachers are still untrained and lack adequate qualification. At the same time, most of the teachers have not I. Ed. or B. Ed. qualification. In the situation like this, this study has been carried out in order to find out the need and interests of children who are study studying social studies in primary level in Nepal.

A number of plan and program with child centered policy have been designed and implemented in Nepal since the establishment of democracy in 1954. Accordingly, a number of primary education project have implemented with support foreign experts and aids. But the pedagogical practices in the Nepalese schools are mainly teacher dominated, treating students as homogenous group and laying high demand on rote memorization. Such a blanket pedagogical approach is not conducive to the children in general and those who differ from majority in the classroom in some way in particular. Slogan "quality education for all" needs to pay attention to the appropriateness of pedagogy to the children at the individual level.

In the context Nepal, the major problem of the existing primary level Social Studies is that in most of the cases the instructional approaches used in the classroom are not interactive, and participatory. In most of the social studies classroom in Nepal, lecturing, paraphrasing, drill, reading, and repeating from the textbooks and memorizing questions and answers are used frequently (CERID, 2005). In the most of the social studies classrooms in Nepal, interaction between the students during classroom teaching, the use of extracurricular activities and projects works are almost non-existent (CDC, 2005). It clearly indicates that the teaching learning approaches adopted in primary level social studies in Nepal have not been successful to foster the development of intelligence, creativity, creative thinking and independent learning. It requires active involvement of children in the learning process.

Although a number of programs, policies and project have implemented in the sector of primary education in Nepal, existing teaching learning practices is not satisfactory. It calls for further detailed study in teaching learning process in Nepal. So, this study has been carried out in order to investigate about the teaching learning process adopted in primary level social studies that is what Primary School Children Like and Dislike about Social Studies Instruction.

III. Aim and Objectives of the Present Study

The major intention of the present study is to find out what primary school children like and dislike about the social studies instruction. So, two crucial questions are raised here which are: How do primary

school children like to learn social studies? And what do primary school children dislike about social studies instruction? By asking these questions the researchers hope to gain a better understanding of primary school children's preferences, attitudes and perceptions of social studies instruction. The major objective of this study is to gain a better understanding of what instructional methods the students enjoy in the social studies classroom. In order to develop and design a sound pedagogy for primary school children, first of all, children's need and interests should be explored. Teaching learning should not be painful and children's interest, need and maturity should be basis for classroom delivery. So, the present study has the following objectives:

- to find out the more interesting teaching learning strategies in the primary level social studies,
- to find out the uninteresting interesting teaching learning strategies in the primary level social studies, and
- to deliver a set of recommendations and suggestion regarding the more effective and child centric teaching learning

IV. Method

This research study utilized a survey method as described by Creswell (2005). Survey research has evident potential value in helping solve theoretical and applied educational problems. It studies large and small populations by selecting and studying samples chosen from the population to discover the relative incidence, distribution and interrelations of sociological and psychological variables (Kerlinger, 1978). Surveys are generally taken, as in the case of this study, as sample survey. Survey studies are conducted to collect detailed description of existing phenomena with the interest of employing data to justify current conditions and practices or to make more intelligent plans for improving them. Describing about the importance and scope of survey research Sukhia et. al. (1971) writes:

The survey approach to educational problems is one of the commonly used approaches; it is followed in studying local as well as state, national and international aspects of education. It goes beyond the mere gathering and tabulation of data. It involves interpretation, comparison, measurement, classification, evaluation and generalization—all directed towards a proper understanding and solution of significant educational problem (p.180).

A variety of data were collected and efforts were made to obtain information about the existing primary level Social Studies curriculum from different angles. For this, different sets of data were gathered from various documents, interviews, observations, and through the survey of school resources. Simple analytical tools were used accordingly. In this sense, it can be termed as a type of descriptive research. Descriptive research is more than just a collection of data; they involve measurement, classification, analysis, comparison and interpretation (Koul, 2002). Survey brings into the focus of our attention existing educational problems and also suggests ways of meeting them. Worthwhile survey studies collect three types of information. These three types of information are:

- of what exists by studying and analyzing important of present situation,
- of what we want by clarifying goals and objectives possibly through a study of the conditions existing elsewhere or what experts consider to be desirable, and
- of how to get there through discovering the possible means of achieving the goals on the basis of the experiences of others or the opinions of experts.

Utilizing a convenient sample methodology, a total of 1000 students from grade one to five of primary schools of Kailali district participated in this study. Kailali district is a suitable district to conduct the present research. The researchers chose to use this district for the study because the results of research can be more easily generalized to other schools in the country. To preserve the anonymity of the subjects, all demographic data concerning students have been roughly approximated. Any conclusions or interpretation of the data should take this into consideration.

Each student was given the survey which utilized an open ended response format. The survey was administered to students in their respective social studies class. To encourage full participation and reliable feedback from the students, several things were mentioned at the beginning of the study and explained to the students by the researchers. It was explained to students that no names were required on their survey because we wanted them to answer the questions without fear of repercussions or punishment. Students were informed that this survey was not for a grade, but rather an opportunity for them to provide valuable feedback regarding how they like to learn in the social studies classroom. Also, students were asked to refrain from evaluating their individual teachers in this study.

The researchers told the students that the purpose of this study was not to determine the popularity, or lack thereof, of the students' teachers. Instead, we wanted to know what methods make learning social studies engaging and interesting. Students were encouraged to have multiple responses to each question when applicable. Of the 1000 (N) students of primary school, a total of 950 (n) responses were collected in this study. 25 students were absent and 25 students did not participate in the survey study. After the survey, the researchers read the answer thoroughly and analyzed each response of the student and categorized them accordingly. At last contextual meaning was derived and report was prepared.

V. Results

The results of the survey data were not surprising with regards to why students dislike social studies. However, some of the data concluded findings that the researchers considered promising. Each open-ended survey question will be presented following the statistical outcome for each category that emerged from the data.

Table No. 1

Question-1: How do you like to learn social studies ?

S. N.	Activities	Percentages
1.	Cooperative Learning Activities	86
2.	Study guides, reviews, and review games to help prepare for exams	86
3.	Using Graphic Organizers and Foldable	82
4.	Technology (Internet, Film, Video, etc...)	75
5.	Active Learning	70
6.	Field Trips	65
7.	Student Presentations	60
8.	Class Discussions	60

Sources: Field Study Report-2015

Table No. 2

Question 2: What do you dislike about social studies instruction ?

S. N.	Activities	Percentages
1.	Lecture	80
2.	Rote Memorization and Note-taking	76
3.	Worksheets	74
4.	Busy Work	67
5.	Assignments from the Textbook	64

Sources: Field Study-2015

VI. Result and Discussion

In response to the first question students expressed their view that they do like to learn social studies in multiple ways. This notion of learning social studies using an array of methods and techniques corresponds with the views of Bonwell & Eisen (1991) and Russell & Byford (2006). The results of the data conclude that primary school students want to go on field trips, work in cooperative learning groups and be actively engaged with content. Accordingly, the children of the present study active learning like critical thinking, group discussion, question and answer techniques, and presentations. This study clearly indicates that children accepted their teachers as guides but not as a authoritative body of knowledge.

Passive learning, such as lecture, note-taking, busy work, worksheets, and rote memorization is what students dislike about social studies as suggested by Leming, Ellington, and Schug (2006). The results of data clearly illustrate that students want to be actively involved in learning social studies. Smuth (1984) says that if children find teaching learning difficult, it could well be that there is something wrong with the way we are asking them to learn rather than that something is wrong with their innate capacity for learning. This notion indicates that teaching learning strategies and methods are major concern of the classroom delivery than the children. The present study indicates that teaching learning activities carried out at the primary education in Nepal unsatisfactory and should improved. Similarly, this study shed light on the fact that teaching learning activities conducted by the primary level social studies teachers have not been designed on the basis of need and interests of the learners. At the same time, infrastructure, classroom situation and social, physical and educational conditions of the primary schools in Nepal is also unsatisfactory.

According to APEID (1982) the learning experiences should be in line with the objectives, retain the students interest, have transferred and utility value, logically organized and psychologically sound by paying attention to the principles of instructional design and human development. This statement clearly suggests that there must be a close relationship between teaching learning activities and intended learning outcomes. Similarly, learning activities should be based on the need, interest and aspirations of the children. Primary school children cannot read and write as the matured students. Interesting activities are necessary for them. The same result is reflected in the present study. Most of the activities liked by the students are related to active learning.

Illich (1971), in his famous book *Deschooling Society* (1971) expressed a big dissatisfaction over the prevailing school system. He argued, the schooling does not teach cognitive development, rationality and intellectual autonomy. Rather they impart material values and technical knowhow, thereby making their students

permanently dependent on expert and bureaucrats (Smesler, 1993). Illich called for interesting institutions to teach Students what they want to learn rather than force ideas on them.

Piaget very carefully traces the growth of the mental development right from early childhood to late adolescence. According to Piaget, thinking process changes radically, slowly from birth to maturity in four stages: the sensory motor stage (first two years), when the child learns to control perception and motor responses in dealing with physical objects and language; Preoperational or representational stage (to about the age six or seven), in which the child learner to extract concepts from experience and later to make perceptual and intuitive judgment; the stages of concrete operations (between the ages seven and eleven), in which the child learns to solve physical problems by anticipating consequences perceptually; and the stages of formal operations (late childhood or early adolescence), in which the youngster learns to think hypothetically and to theorize and experiment. Piaget has described the intellectual development of children as a series of consecutive stages which, in turn, are dependent upon each other. Piaget insists that the sequence of these stages in intellectual development remains the same for all children.

The widely read and respected Faure commission Report Learning to be (1972) observed that the existing formal education systems everywhere growing increasingly obsolete and maladjusted in relation to their rapidly changing societies. Faure commission was not satisfied with the content of the prevailing education system because the content of education is irrelevant and is divorced from the contemporary problems. Similarly, Faure commission has criticized the methods of education on several grounds. The report (1972) of the commission Says:

The content of education is criticized because it is irrelevant to the individual needs, because it holds back scientific progress and social development or because it is divorced from contemporary problems. Methods are criticized because they overlook the complexity of educative process; fails to learn from research and are not sufficiently directed at training minds and attitude (p. 61).

Teaching learning plan should contained a variety of teaching learning activities including observation, class discussion, question answer, small group projects, field trips and community resources as pointed out by the Childress (1978). At the same time, relevant teaching aids are also not suggested in the teaching learning process. According to the necessity a teacher may use locally available teaching learning materials. Most of teachers did not use easily available, applicable and locally available teaching aids. On the other hand, chart, posters, models, real objects, pictures, photos, maps and other locally available materials were not used by the most of the teachers.

In the same respect, in 'How Children Fail', Holt (1964) called for schools and classroom in which each child in his own way could satisfy his curiosity, develop his abilities and talents, pursue his interest and from the adults and older children around him get a glimpse of great variety and richness of life. Holt also laid more emphasis on the child centered teaching learning process. He further says that teaching learning process must be based on the need and interest of the children.

Vygotsky conceptualized a zone of proximal development as way of viewing what children are coming to know. He recognized that children were able to solve problem beyond their actual development level if they were given a guidance in the form of prompts or leading questions form someone more advanced.

This person, the more capable peer, could be another student, a parent and/ or a teacher. It is also noted that the only good instruction received in childhood is the one that precedes and guides development. Here teachers' role is to direct action within school context and appropriate to the child's present level of development, the culture and social context.

In sum, it is clear that primary school students want to be taught social studies using a variety of teaching methods and techniques. Primary school students dislike the passive learning environments they have often grown accustomed to and want to be actively engaged in social studies. This data clearly suggested that teachers should become more reflective about their instructional approach and they should adapt their teaching style to meet the interest and needs of the students.

It should be noted that the survey was anonymous and open-ended, which enabled students to tell inappropriate and unusable responses. Roughly 12% of the survey responses were deemed unusable. It must be stated that the discussion of the findings raises many questions based upon a small study, but the outcomes are interesting and complex, highlighting new and different realms of inquiry and variability. However, it is necessary to remember that the results of this study help researchers understand a student's response in a specific situation and contribute to scholarship on primary school students' attitudes toward social studies instruction and learning, allowing researchers to make comparisons with research that has been previously conducted. These findings do not provide a comprehensive understanding that can be generalized to the population, but do provide insight into the importance of dynamic social studies instruction.

VII. Findings

- Most of the teachers of the present study have not used activity based, child centered and innovative teaching learning strategies in the primary level Social Studies classroom.
- Effective teaching aids are not used in the classroom and indigenous and locally developed materials are also nonexistent.
- Most of the teachers do not use appropriate teaching aids because they have not sufficient knowledge about it and curriculum has also not made sufficient provision about it.
- It was also observed that teaching learning process has been affected by the lack of sufficient physical facilities.
- Most of the teachers are untrained so they are not able to use curriculum, teachers' guides and teaching learning materials effectively.
- Most of the teachers have heavy load of the classes along with other school responsibility. It has also hampered the teaching learning activities of the school.
- There is no close relationship between teaching learning activities and intended learning outcomes. Similarly, learning activities are not based on the need, interest and aspirations of the children.
- Relevant teaching aids are not included in the teaching learning process.
- Most of the teachers are not familiar with modern teaching technology.

VIII. Suggestions

- Activity based, child centered and innovative teaching learning strategies should be included in the curriculum.
- It is important for the curriculum developers and teachers

educators to keep themselves updated with the pedagogical researches and adopt and try out best practices in the system.

- There should be more emphasis on locally developed and indigenous materials.
- Most of the teachers do not use appropriate teaching aids because they have not sufficient knowledge about it and curriculum has also not made sufficient provision about it. So regular training on the teaching methodologies and teaching aids should be provided to all teachers.
- It was also observed that teaching learning process has been affected by the lack of sufficient physical facilities. So government should take responsibility of the physical facilities.
- Most of the teachers are untrained so they are not able to use curriculum, teachers' guides and teaching learning materials effectively. Therefore training on curriculum, textbooks, teachers' guides and learning materials should be provided to all teachers.
- Most of the teachers have heavy load of the classes along with other school responsibility. It has also hampered the teaching learning activities of the school. Teachers teaching loads should be reduced to minimum loads.
- Teachers should be skillful in planning and using available space in sensible and purposeful manner in the best possible way.
- In order to cater to needs of children/students to maximize their learning, several factors play roles. It is important to identify them and prioritize actions from what is possible now and what should be achieved and how they could be achieved in time bound strategy manner.
- Teacher preparation course should provide room for variety of teaching learning strategies. Varieties of teaching learning methods such as reflective teaching (Pollard, 2006), discovery and experiential learning; topic and project work (Cohen, 1996), cooperative learning, writing and inquiry, critical listening (Crawford, 2005), integrated strategies instruction, instructional enrichment, bright start, planning assessment simulation and successive model (Ashman and Conway, 1997), task setting and differentiation (Kerry, 2002), concept attainment, advanced organizers, inductive thinking (Joyce and Weil, 1980) and problem based instruction (Arends, 2001)

References

- [1]. APEID (1982). *Towards a Better Science Education. Report of a Study Group Meeting: on Science Curriculum and Instructional Materials Development (10-18 Nov. 1981)*, Bangkok : UNESCO.
- [2]. Bonwell, C. & Eison, J. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classrooms*, Washington D.C. Eric Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED340272).
- [3]. Byford, J. & Russell, W. (2006). *Analyzing Public Issues-Clarification through Discussion: A Case Study of Social Studies Teachers*. *Social Studies Review*, 46(1), 70-72.
- [4]. CDC, (2005). *Primary Education Curriculum 2005*, Curriculum Development Center, Bhaktapur, Nepal.
- [5]. CERID, (2005). *Meeting Learning Needs of Children of Indigenous Peoples and Linguistic Minorities*. Kathmandu, Nepal : CERID, TU.
- [6]. Childress, R. B. (1978). *Public School Environmental Education Curricula. A National Profile*. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 9 (3).
- [7]. Chiodo, J. and Byford, J. (2006). *Do They Really Dislike Social Studies? A study of Middle School and High School Students*. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 28(1), 16-26.
- [8]. Creswell, J. (2005) *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [9]. Dewey, John (1916). *Democracy and Education*. New York, the Macmillan Co.
- [10]. Dewey, (1954). *My Pedagogic Creed*. In Ulich, Rebert (Ed.), *Three Thousands Year of Educational Wisdom Selection from Great Documents (2nd)* Cambridge, M. A. Harvard University Press.
- [11]. Driscoll, M.P. (2005). *Psychology of Learning for Instruction (3rd ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- [12]. Dow, P. (1979). *MACOS: Social Studies in Crisis*. *Educational Leadership*, 43,1, 35-39.
- [13]. Ellis, A., Fouts, J. & Glenn, A. (1992). *Teaching and Learning Social Studies*. New York: Harper-Collins Press.
- [14]. Harwood, A.M. & Hahn, C.L. (1990). *Controversial Issues in the Classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 327453)
- [15]. HLNEC, (1998). *Report of the High level National Education Commission. (in Nepali)*. Kesharmahal, Kathmandu, Nepal : Higher level National Education Commission.
- [16]. Hoagland, M. (2000). *Utilizing Constructivism in the History Classroom*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies / Social Science Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 482436).
- [17]. Holt, John (2005). *The Under Achieving School*. India, An Eklavya Publication.
- [18]. Holt, J. (1964). *How Children Fail*. In W. V. Til (ed.) *Curriculum: Quest for Relevance (1971)*. Houghton Miffling Company, Boston.
- [19]. Illich, I. (1971). *Deschooling Society*. New York : Harper.
- [20]. Kerlinger, F.N. (1978). *Foundation of Behavioural Research (Second Edition)*. Delhi : Surjeet Publication.
- [21]. Koul, Lokesh (2002). *Research Methodology*. New Delhi : Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- [22]. Leming, J.S., Ellington, L., & Schug, M. (2006). *The State of Social Studies: National Random Survey of Elementary and Middle School Social Studies Teachers*. *Social Education*, 70(5), 322- 327.
- [23]. Mills, C.J. & Durden, W.G. (1992). *Cooperative Learning and Ability Grouping: An Issue of Choice*. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 36 (1), 11-16.
- [24]. MOES, (2002). *Concept Paper for Further Support on Basic and Primary Education in Nepal*. Kathmandu, Nepal : Ministry of Education and Sports.
- [25]. NEC, (1992). *Report of the National Education Commission*. Kathmandu, Nepal : National Education Commission.
- [26]. Paris, M. (1997). *ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/ Social Science Education*. Bloomington, Indiana. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. EDOS09714).
- [27]. Russell, W. (2007). *Using Film in the Social Studies*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

- [28]. Russell, W. (2008). *Civil War Films for Teachers and Historians*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- [29]. Schug, M.C., Todd, R.J. & Beery, R. (1982). *Why Kids Don't Like Social Studies*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies. Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED224765).
- [30]. Shah, Rajendra Kumar (2013). *Designing a Progressive Curriculum of Social Studies for Primary Education in Nepal*. An Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Lucknow, Lucknow India.
- [31]. Shaughnessy, J.M. & Haladyna, T.M. (1985). *Research on Student Attitude toward Social Studies*. *Social Education*, 49, 692-695.
- [32]. Siler, C.R. (1998). *Spatial Dynamic: An Alternative Teaching Tool in the Social Studies*. Bloomington, IN. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies / Social Science Education. (ERIC Reproduction No. ED 415179).
- [33]. Singh, G. B. (2008). *Provision and Condition for Better Classroom Pedagogical Practices*. An Unpublished Research Report, Kathmandu :EFA/CERID.
- [34]. Smesler, N. J. (1993). *Sociology*. New Delhi : Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- [35]. Smuth, J. C. (1982). *The Place of the Environmental Education*. The UNESCO-ENEP Program. *Journal of Environmental Education* 8 (2).
- [36]. Stahl, R. (Ed.). (1994). *Cooperative Learning in Social Studies: A Handbook for Teachers*. New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- [37]. Sukhia, S. P., Malhotra, P. V. and Malhotra, R. N. (1971). *Elements of Educational Research*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Limited. Sukhia et. al. (1971).
- [38]. Van Sledright, B. (2004). *What Does it Mean to Think Historically and How Do You Teach It?* *Social Education*, 68(3), 230-233.