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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Survey courses in United States history and European history have held central positions in the American secondary school curriculum since the publication of the reports by the American Historical Association's Committee of Seven\(^1\) and the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of the Social Studies.\(^2\) Likewise, most colleges and universities in the United States have followed this curricular trend by establishing a minimal number of credit hours in survey history courses as a part of their graduation requirements.\(^3\) The result of this academic


structuring is that a staggering number of high school and college students are involved annually in the study of introductory history. Based upon the curricular uniformity and widespread enrollment in introductory classes, it is imperative that history instructors understand the relationship between their teaching objectives and the role of survey courses in a student's general education. It is with this goal in mind that this study is presented.

Statement of the Problem

This thesis is designed to answer the question: "What is the most appropriate teaching objective for survey history courses in American high schools and colleges?" In order to approach this question from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective, this dissertation has been divided into two unequal parts. The first part, as developed in Chapters II, III, and IV, is designed to categorize the views of history teachers concerning the objectives of teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges. These views, as expressed in articles published in selected periodicals between 1939 and 1969, have been analyzed in accordance with their orientations toward six objective themes which have been arranged in three dichotomous sets. The thematic dichotomies are: (1) Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity, (2) Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method, and (3) Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge. These categories were established in order to assess the objective claims of various history teachers in relation to three historically defensible sets of polarized objective themes which could be connected by a continuum of emphasis and corresponding de-emphasis.
The second part of this thesis, as developed in Chapter V, is a critical evaluation of the six thematic categories which have been presented in the previous three Chapters and a defense of the Self-Knowledge theme as the most appropriate instructional objective for survey history courses.

Methodology

The research device of content analysis, an approach to investigating the nature of printed material which has been adopted by both historians and social scientists as a valuable analytical tool, has been employed in this study. Bernard Berelson has described content analysis as "...a research technique for the objective, systematic, and quantitative description of the manifest content of communication." Since this study is concerned with the objectives of teaching survey history courses as communicated in periodical literature, the method of content analysis was deemed an appropriate analytical technique for securing research data.


Selection of the Content to be Analyzed

The selection of the journals to be employed in this study was based upon three separate considerations: (1) the number of articles dealing with the teaching of history at the high school and/or college level included in a particular journal; (2) the scholarly reputation of each periodical; and (3) the availability of the periodical for analysis. The journals chosen for this study are listed below in alphabetical order. It should be noted that these periodicals represent a broad spectrum of academic interests and a generous variety of geographical, disciplinary, and philosophical standpoints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association of University Professors Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of American Colleges Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving College and University Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Journal of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of the Time Span

The period from 1939 to 1969 was chosen in order to assure an adequate sampling of opinion over more than a generation of time, yet also to enable this study to be of contemporary value in depicting current objective trends in the teaching of survey history courses. With the exception of those periodicals which were first published after 1939, all of the journals selected for this study were examined over the entire thirty-one year span.

Definition of Terms

In the process of thinking and writing about a topic, an author may form a subrosa definition for a specific term or a concept which defies a standard dictionary definition and thus hampers the comprehension of a reader. To avoid this situation and to clarify certain central terms employed in this study the following definitions are provided.

An American high school is an institution of learning, supported by either public funds (public schools) or private resources (private or parochial schools), which provides instruction for young people between the ages of fifteen and eighteen years in grades ten, eleven, and twelve.

An American college is an institution of higher learning, supported by either public funds (state or land grant colleges) or private resources, which provides instruction for individuals who have attained at least a high school diploma. This definition shall include all preparatory
schools, junior colleges, colleges, and universities which devote at least a portion of their academic programs to a liberal arts curriculum. This definition does not include technical or trade schools, business colleges, or post-high school apprentice programs.

A history teacher is an individual who spends any portion of his time during the normal school or academic year instructing students in the subject of history. This definition is intended to be broad enough to include all high school and college personnel who might teach history, regardless of their other duties as principals, football coaches, guidance counselors, band directors, academic deans, divisional or departmental chairmen, college presidents, personnel deans, admissions directors, ROTC officers, athletic directors, political science instructors, supervisors of student teachers, authors, geography teachers, politicians, or historians.

A survey history course is an introductory class generally designed to chronologically cover an unspecified series of historical characters and events occurring across a broad geographical base over a 300-4,000 year period of time. In American high schools these courses, variously labelled "World History," "European History," "The Western World," or "Western Civilization" and "American History" or "United States History," are available to students during their years in the tenth and eleventh grades. In American colleges similarly labelled courses are available to freshmen and sophomore students. The high school survey history course generally extends throughout the entire school year (36-40 weeks). The college survey history course is usually structured as a multi-quarter or multi-semester sequence of classes in accordance with
the decision of the history department at each college.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations inherent in a study of this kind may be attributed in varying degrees to four sources: (1) the nature of the problem under investigation, (2) the method of analysis being employed, (3) the nature of the material being analyzed, and (4) the research skill and objectivity of the analyst conducting the inquiry. The integral relationship among these four sources clearly compounds the problem of researching this topic. Despite these obstacles, however, the knowledge gained by critically analyzing a variety of stated objectives, by defining the meaning of teaching objectives in regard to attainable educational results, and by reflecting upon the potentially beneficial role of a history teacher's objectives for himself and his classes will hopefully make the difficult task of assembling this study worthwhile.

An initial problem which is encountered in attempting to analyze the objectives of teaching survey history courses in the United States stems from the pluralistic nature of American society as reflected in its educational institutions. This contention is not intended to imply that the membership of the teaching profession either directly parallels or even accurately reflects the social stratification which currently exists in the United States; in fact, despite the increasing heterogeneity in the social class origins of teachers during the past three decades, it is still rare to find an individual from an extremely wealthy or an

---

extremely poor socio-economic level serving as an instructor in an American high school or college. Nevertheless, in regard to specific social and political philosophies, secondary school and college classrooms seem to be manned by teachers of diversified ideological persuasions. These differing socio-political outlooks held by American educators only occasionally yield perceivable methodological innovations or deviations in the teaching process. They are frequently observable, however, in an instructor's stated educational objectives. Particularly in the area of social studies instruction, where classroom content lends itself to social, political and economic analysis and commentary, educational objectives cease to have the precise behavioral consistency of instructional goals in mathematics or physics and tend to be intensely subjective and value-laden. Therefore, in response to his teaching material, his personal commitments, and the demands of the various communities which he serves, a history teacher is likely to formulate objectives which are lengthy, complex, value-oriented and, not infrequently, contradictory.

Another problem related to the material being analyzed stems from the diversity of individuals who write articles dealing with the teaching of history and the corresponding diversity of periodicals which publish such essays. As previously indicated, many instructors divide their pro-

7The term "ideological persuasions" is to be loosely defined to imply a complex pattern of social, political, and economic beliefs and values which could be depicted on a dimensional construct of varying intensity. For examples of the nature of these contrasting systems of thought and how they operate in American schools see the following: George D. Spindler, "Education in a Transforming American Culture," Harvard Educational Review, XXV (Summer 1955), pp. 145-156; Harmon Zeigler, The Political Life of American Teachers (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967), pp. 1-7; 93-119.
professional talents between teaching history and teaching some other subject or serving in an administrative post. Consequently, the articles being analyzed come from a remarkable variety of sources. It is interesting to note, also, that in spite of the great amount of history courses currently being taught in American high schools and colleges, there is no single major periodical which devotes its central emphasis to historical teaching objectives, methods, content, evaluation, etc. With the exception of The History Teacher, a diminutive journal first published in 1968 by the History Teachers Association at the University of Notre Dame, no periodical exists which specifically "...provides a meeting ground for history teachers on the secondary and college levels." Thus, one is almost as likely to discover an essay dealing with the teaching of a survey history course in The American Journal of Sociology or the Journal of Philosophy as in The American Historical Review or Social Education.

Finally, a potential shortcoming in analyzing published articles exists in the possibility of editorial discrimination in relation to a particular educational methodology or opinion. Although one can never be certain that such censorship has not occurred, the variety of views represented in the journals which were analyzed suggests that editorial policies were neither rigid nor censorious.

In regard to understanding the limitations which exist in this study in the area of methodology, one must be aware of the theoretical basis which undergirds the research technique of content analysis. The three major assumptions of content analysis, as explained by Bernard Berelson, are cited below.

---

1. Content analysis assumes that inferences about the relationship between intent and content or between content and effect can validly be made, or the actual relationships established. We say "inferences" (i.e., "interpretations") because most studies utilizing content analysis have been limited to inferences; there have been extremely few studies which concretely demonstrate the nature or the extent of the relationship between communication content, on the one hand, and intentions or effects, on the other. This assumption that knowledge of content can legitimately support inferences about non-content events is basic to a central contribution of content analysis, namely, to illuminate certain non-content areas.

2. Content analysis assumes that the study of manifest content is meaningful. This assumption requires that the content be accepted as a "common meeting-ground" for the communicator, the audience, and the analyst. That is, the content analyst assumes that the "meanings" which he ascribes to the content, by assigning it to certain categories, correspond to the "meanings" intended by the communicator and/or understood by the audience. In other words, the assumption is that there is a common universe of discourse among the relevant parties, so that the manifest content can be taken as a valid unit of study.

3. Content analysis assumes that the quantitative description of communication content is meaningful. This assumption implies that the frequency of occurrence of various characteristics of the content is itself an important factor in the communication process, under specific conditions. Whenever one word or one phrase is as "important" as the rest of the content taken together, quantitative analysis would not apply. It does apply only when the content units have a more or less equal weight, for purposes of the analysis. To some extent, but not entirely, this is simply a matter of selecting the important categories for analysis. In any case, content analysis should be undertaken only when relative frequencies of the content categories are relevant to the problem at hand.9

Of these three assumptions, the second seems to depict the greatest potential problem for an analyst. The difficulty inherent in reading an essay

9Berelson, Content Analysis in Communication Research, pp. 18-20.
only at the level which Berelson labels as "manifest" is obvious; and the corresponding ease of allowing "latency," or suggested meaning, to creep into the analysis constantly challenges the analyst's commitment to research neutrality. Despite these methodological difficulties, though, careful screening and selection of materials and thorough study of the manifest characteristics of the written data can still produce research results which are both valid and reliable.

A final limitation or problematic area of this study exists in the analyst himself. His central role in screening and selecting materials for research, in establishing the categories of analysis, and in applying the analytical technique to the selected sources is obvious. Aside from the standard human shortcomings of personal and professional bias, the greatest problems confronted by the analyst in completing this study were limitations in the areas of research experience, time, and patience.

Plan of the Study

This dissertation is divided into five chapters. Chapter I includes brief outlines of the problem to be studied, the methodological approach to be applied, and the content to be employed for analysis. The introductory chapter also includes definitions for general terms used throughout the essay and an appraisal of the limitations of the study. Chapter II presents the categories for analysis to be employed in the study and the thematic indicators to be used to identify and categorize each article. Chapter III provides a tabulation of the data obtained from the analysis of the selected periodicals. Chapter IV consists of an
analysis of the data from the previous chapter. And the concluding section of the study, Chapter V, provides recommendations regarding the proper role of objectives in teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges.
CHAPTER II

THE CATEGORIES OF ANALYSIS

The research technique of content analysis requires the analyst to formulate a set of categories by which printed material may be analyzed. The nature of these categories is dictated by the purpose of the study. In this thesis two types of analytical categories have been developed and employed. The first category seeks to identify the point of emphasis which is manifest in an article in regard to a polarized continuum of history teaching objectives. The second category, organized as a thematic dichotomy, serves to depict a polarized spectrum of objectives which are available to teachers of survey history courses.

Categories of Emphasis

To evaluate the intensity of a viewpoint expressed in a particular article, it was necessary to identify more than merely a "pro" or "con" position. For this reason a system of ranking responses along a continuum was developed. This framework, as described and illustrated below, provided sufficient flexibility for the analyst's task of ranking responses.

Straight Positive (SP) - any viewpoint which supports without qualification the theme on the left side of the continuum.

Qualified Positive (QP) - any viewpoint which supports with qualification the theme on the left side of the continuum.
Neutral (N) - any viewpoint which is definitely related to the thematic dichotomy but which is balanced between the left and the right sides of the continuum.

Qualified Negative (QN) - any viewpoint which supports with qualification the theme on the right side of the continuum.

Straight Negative (SN) - any viewpoint which supports without qualification the theme on the right side of the continuum.

In terms of a pictorial illustration, the categories of emphasis should be viewed as below:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
+ \quad SP \quad QP \quad N \quad QN \quad SN
\end{array}
\]

It must be emphasized that this system of evaluation is dependent solely upon the judgment of the analyst concerning each article to be classified.

Categories of Thematic Dichotomies and Their Indicators

The thematic categories selected for this study have been polarized to afford a clearer image of conflict between selected teaching objectives. This method of polarization of values (i.e. "liberty-conformity," "spending-saving," "competition-brotherly love," "determinism-responsibility," etc.) has been successfully employed by social scientists in their search for an effective technique of studying pluralistic social systems. In regard to his sociological analysis of American civilization, Kaspar N. Naegele has commented,

Values, as constituent elements of a system, are related in several ways: they may enforce one another, limit each other, be segregated from one another, contrast with one another, contradict each other. In general, these various relations have not been elaborated for America's system of
values, yet there has been a marked tendency to "discover" in America a series of paradoxes and conflicts... [But] descriptions of a value system of as complex a society as that of the United States are bound to be rich in paradoxes since the general propositions in terms of which such descriptions must be made always have a logical extension that exceeds the facts.¹

The necessity of representing American society on a polarized construct is reiterated by Max Lerner's contention:

The problem of social analysis is only partly illumined by the search for causes. In much of our thinking causation is giving way to relation and interaction. "America is this," says one observer of American life, "America is that," says another. It is likely that America is both, because America is a highly polarized field of meaning, but that neither can be fully understood except in relation to the other and to the whole intricate civilization pattern. The study of American Civilization becomes thus the study of the polar pattern itself, not a search for a single key that will unlock causation.²

The polarized themes which were developed for this study function in two ways. First, they depict the complexity and/or conflict which exists in the selection of objectives for survey history courses; and second, they provide touchstones for analyzing the consistency of ideas, conditions, and practices which are currently employed in history classrooms in relation to the themes being studied.


Two additional points must be noted. The function of the categories of emphasis is a coefficient of the validity of the thematic dichotomies. That is, it is futile to attempt to identify a communicator's position along a polarized continuum if that continuum is not theoretically reliable. For this reason great care was taken in selecting indicators for each theme. Also, the thematic dichotomies developed for this study are initially intended to be descriptive rather than judgmental. They serve as quantitative-empirical resources, rather than qualitative-normative measurements. No position on the continuum bears any connotation of academic benefit or detriment, of educational success or failure. They are simply points of emphasis along a polarized thematic spectrum. However, in the concluding chapter of this study the data from this analysis will be analyzed qualitatively and subjected to questions of a normative, judgmental nature. At that point, though, the content analysis will have been completed and the analyst's critical commentary will be based upon contemporary educational theories and other research findings.

The thematic dichotomies to be employed in this study are: (1) Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity, (2) Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method, and (3) Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge. When combined with the categories of emphasis, these thematic dichotomies may be pictorially depicted as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizenship Training</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>QP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>QN</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Historical Objectivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of Facts</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>QP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>Historical Method</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following pages describe each of these themes in detail and provide a list of indicators employed to identify each theme. Examples of quotations which fall into each thematic category are also presented.

The Citizenship Training Theme

Citizenship training is a commonly accepted objective of historical instruction. This goal implies that each student should be indoctrinated to love, honor and accept without doubt the socio-political system under which he is being educated. The citizenship training theme posits that the history teacher best serves his students and his community by cultivating national pride (as well as the concommitant ethnocentric attitudes toward foreign countries) in his classes, by propagating popular myths through the presentation of carefully censored historical interpretations, and by demanding universal student acceptance of a single, homogeneous code of national belief and behavior. Operating within this frame of reference, the history teacher must exhibit strong convictions that the historic words and deeds of America's Founding Fathers should be etched into the conscience of each generation. This educational practice hopefully assures the preservation of the heritage of the past, as well as the

imposition of a rigid mold of traditionalism on the future. Patriotism, intolerance, and a sense of national mission — each of these concepts is a hallmark of the citizenship training theme.

The goal of citizenship training through formal schooling has long been associated with the Greek experience in political education. According to Werner Jaeger, the essence of Greek thought during the fourth century B.C. was not typified by the disinterested theoria which was practiced by the Ionian scientists; rather, Athenian thinkers like Plato and Herodotus, who believed that knowledge existed to direct man to a course of right action, dominated classical educational thought. In the Republic, for instance, Plato contended that the proper study of the past by all citizens would insure city-state unity. This concept of "proper study" clearly involved a high degree of indoctrination and myth propagation regarding the social origins of man and the nature of the state. Herodotus, though lacking Plato's philosophical insight and teleological perspective, also pursued the citizenship training goal by historicizing myths. Following the literary tradition established by Homer in his idealized depiction of the Trojan War, Herodotus drafted the history of the Persian Wars as an epic drama of moral justification for Athenian dominance in the Greek world. Although his history is certainly more

than the work of a "charmingly naive storyteller" or a blatant Athenian chauvinist, as one student of Greek historical scholarship has observed, Herodotus' didactic reliance upon Homeric tradition and his uncritical use of oral reports which were fragmentary, unreliable, self-serving, and often contradictory creates serious doubts about the objectivity of his work. The obvious link between Plato and Herodotus is their eagerness to perpetuate the ideals of their city-states through a carefully-planned study of the past.

During the early Christian period St. Paul linked citizenship obligations with religious belief. While seeking to "educate" his followers in Rome to their religious and civic responsibilities, Paul asserted,

*Every Christian ought to obey the civil authorities, for all legitimate authority is derived from God's authority, and the existing authority is appointed under God. To oppose authority then is to oppose God, and such opposition is bound to be punished.*

This policy was generally adopted by the Roman Catholic Church until the Reformation, when it was re-interpreted by several of Europe's national monarchs in an attempt to gain Scriptural justification for their "Divine Right" prerogatives. To this day, in fact, the Pauline Doctrine is cited as evidence of Christianity's support for the political status quo.

During the past five centuries many European political philosophers and historians have sought to justify the study of history by noting

---


its value as a means for creating social and political orthodoxy through
the transmission of national culture and tradition. The citizenship
training theme dominates the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas
Hobbes, and Jules Michelet. While Machiavelli⁹ and Hobbes¹⁰ employed the
study of history as a weapon against political heresy and dissent,
Michelet¹¹ articulated the organismic viewpoint of the all-encompassing
nation-state which superceded all individual needs and desires.¹²
Although the latter interpretation seems more positive in nature, it
clearly connotes the same end -- individual submission to state dictates
-- as the former viewpoints. In all three cases the role of national
history is the same. It is to illustrate the grandeur of the present age
by tracing the roots of the present in an unerring, glorious past.

The American experience in citizenship training is vividly evi­
denced in the efforts of John Winthrop, John Cotton and the other Puritan
leaders to secure rigid socio-political orthodoxy within their Massa­

⁹Niccolo Machiavelli, The Prince, translated by George Bull

¹⁰Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956),
pp. 9-157; Laurence Berns, "Thomas Hobbes," in History of Political
Philosophy, edited by Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey (Chicago: Rand

¹¹Jules Michelet, "From The Introduction To The People (1846),"
in The Varieties of History: From Voltaire To The Present, edited by
Also see Jules Michelet, History of France (2 Vols.). translated by
G. H. Smith (New York: Appleton, 1875).

¹²Arthur O. Lovejoy, "The Meaning of Romanticism for the Historian
of Ideas," in Intellectual Movements in Modern European History, edited
The fears of disorder and factionalism which had motivated Puritan political thought did not vanish from the North American continent even after 1776. In fact, the birth of a New Nation after the American Revolution seemed to foster a conservative demand for the consolidation and perpetuation of nominally republican principles, opinions, and manners. Leaders of various political persuasions -- ranging from Federalist Noah Webster to Republican Thomas Jefferson -- warned of the inherent dangers of anarchy and factionalism which could arise from "non-patriotic" educational practices. In his essay "On the Education of Youth in America," Webster observed that

"...our national character is not yet formed; and it is an object of vast magnitude that systems of Education should be adopted and pursued, which may not only diffuse a knowledge of the sciences, but may implant, in the minds of American youth, the principles of virtue and of liberty; and inspire them with just and liberal ideas of government, and with an inviolable attachment to their own country."


Throughout the nineteenth century and well into the twentieth, the theme of patriotic education dominated the thought and practice of history teachers and textbook writers. Horace Mann, more than any other single figure in the pre-Civil War period, crusaded to translate citizenship training goals into administrative policy in American schools. The early successes of the so-called "Common School Crusade," however, were directly challenged by an overwhelming influx of foreign immigrants -- 35 million people between 1815 and 1915. Thus American educational institutions faced a dual task. First, domestic patriotism had to be reinforced; and second, political socialization had to be provided for a burgeoning naturalized population. This challenge, combined with the effort to resolve the human problems posed by the emerging urban-industrial civilization, helped to spawn the Progressive Movement in American education.

During the two decades following World War I the forces favoring citizen-
ship training as the major objective of history instruction drew strength from numerous sources, including the "Red Scare" of the early 1920's, the Great Depression, and the rise of fascism in Europe. Even after the decline of the Progressive education movement in the late 1930's and its final organizational collapse in the mid-1950's, the emphasis upon citizenship training remained strong due to the effects of the McCarthy Era and the Cold War.

Citizenship Training Theme Indicators

1. The Citizenship Training theme emphasizes the repetition of nationistic rituals (e.g. flag salutes, Pledge of Allegiance) and songs (e.g. "The Star-Spangled Banner," "America the Beautiful," "You're a Grand Old Flag"), as well as the annual observance of patriotic holidays (Memorial Day, Flag Day, Washington's birthday, Lincoln's birthday).

2. The Citizenship Training theme encourages students to adopt an intellectual stance of uncritical acceptance of the American social system, of historical and contemporary governmental decisions, and of the free enterprise system.

3. The Citizenship Training theme blends myth, religion, custom, and tradition with historical facts to form a sacrosanct, highly idealized image of the American past in the minds of all students.

---

4. The Citizenship Training theme establishes the teacher as the ultimate authority on all matters of social or political controversy which arise in the classroom.

5. The Citizenship Training theme places curricular emphasis upon the chapter-by-chapter progression through historical material, with the greater amount of classroom time to be devoted to the period of American history from 1776-1860.

6. The Citizenship Training theme encourages group activities to foster cooperative acceptance of patriotic practices and beliefs.

7. The Citizenship Training theme fosters socio-political orthodoxy by indicating that self-realization can only be achieved through the acceptance of national norms and traditions.

8. The Citizenship Training theme emphasizes instruction in citizenship skills (e.g. voting, reading a newspaper, serving as a "junior" councilman, observing a trial) which are practical and will be of immediate use to graduating students.

9. The Citizenship Training theme avoids discussions of serious international issues and genuinely controversial national problems in favor of studying local issues and community concerns.

10. The Citizenship Training theme employs historical events as illustrative sources of proper standards of American behavior and belief, always emphasizing middle class (white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) values and the role of "religion" and "Christian ideals" in the founding of the United States.

11. The Citizenship Training theme believes that the schools and colleges must assume the solemn responsibility of inculcating "the American way of life" in all youth.
The Historical Objectivity Theme

The theme of Historical Objectivity stresses the educational value of critically appraising the past without having special conclusions or pre-determined results in mind. This educational aim implies that teaching emphasis should be directed toward examining techniques of historical investigation, factors of multiple causation and socio-political pluralism, and methods of most accurately depicting past situations and events. It must be noted that by adopting a stance of historical objectivity the student of history does not abrogate the opportunity (and/or responsibility) of reaching a subjective, value-laden conclusion; it does prohibit, however, an individual from applying a patterned conclusion on a unique set of historical circumstances.

The nature of historical objectivity demands open-mindedness, perserverance, and scholarly neutrality in the examination of all historical material. Philosophically, the idea of historical objectivity is humanistic in nature, with all men being judged on the merits of their being, rather than according to their race, religion, or nationality. In many respects the role of the teacher and the student in this theme are synonymous. Both function in the areas of hypothesizing, gathering evidence, formulating and testing conclusions. The teacher, of course, is responsible for selecting a variety of historical problems, characters and events to be studied. This task must be carefully attended to in conjunction with the teacher's area of competence and his students' interests and abilities. The reliance upon the exercise of individual research skills and the development of rational processes as guides to action earmark the theme of historical objectivity.
The roots of the theme of historical objectivity, like the roots of the citizenship training objective, can be traced to classical Greece. In contrast to the citizenship training ideas articulated in The Republic and The Histories, however, the Athenian historian Thucydides rejected the use of myths, fables, or legends as "legitimate historical devices. "It may well be," Thucydides remarked in the opening chapter of his history of the Peloponnesian Wars,

that my history will seem less easy to read because of the absence in it of a romantic element. It will be enough for me, however, if these words of mine are judged useful by those who want to understand clearly the events which happened in the past and which (human nature being what it is) will, at some time or other and in much the same ways, be repeated in the future. My work is not a piece of writing designed to meet the taste of an immediate public, but was done to last forever.21

The study of the Peloponnesian Wars was not inaugurated as a paean to Athenian power and glory. Unlike the uncritical prose of his predecessor Herodotus, the writings of Thucydides reveal the labors of a keen analytical mind immersed in the process of collecting evidence, sifting, checking, evaluating, writing and revising, and all the time thinking hard about the war, the causes and issues related to the conflict, the leadership of Pericles, and the nature of the Athenian Empire.22 The true value of history, as Thucydides practiced it, "...was that it furnished political experience, not that it embodied any religious, ethical, or philosophical idea."23


22Finley, ed., The Portable Greek Historians, p. 7.

23Jaeger, Paideia, 1, p. 390.
The application of historical objectivity in American teaching owes much to the nineteenth century German historical tradition. Leopold von Ranke, who instructed two generations of seminar students at the University of Berlin in the critical study of primary sources, is most frequently associated with the goal of writing history "as it actually happened". Although this phrase has been denounced and its author labelled a pretentious positivist, the genuine meaning of Ranke's historical objectivity lies beyond the scope of any single phrase or term. The following statement, though manifestly cold and scientific in its detachment, adequately describes Ranke's commitment to historical objectivity.

...To history has been assigned the office of judging the past, of instructing the present for the benefit of future ages. To such high offices this work Histories of the Latin and Germanic Nations from 1494-1514 does not aspire: It wants only to show what actually happened (wie es eigentlich gewesen).

But whence the sources for such a new investigation? The basis of my present work, the sources of its material, are memoirs, diaries, letters, diplomatic reports, and original narratives of eyewitnesses; other writings were used only if they were immediately derived from the above mentioned or seemed to equal them because of some original information. These sources will be identified on every page....

Aim and subject mould the form of a book. The writing of history cannot be expected to possess the same free development of its subject which, in theory at least, is expected in a work of literature....

The strict presentation of facts, contingent and un-attractive though they may be, is undoubtedly the supreme law. After this, it seems to me, comes the exposition of the unity and progress of events....

Finally what will be said of my treatment of particulars, which is such an essential part of the writing of history? Will it not often seem harsh, disconnected, colorless, and tiring? There are, of course, noble models both ancient and -- be it remembered -- modern; I have not dared to emulate them: theirs is a different world. A sublime ideal does exist: the event in its human intelligibility, its unity, and its diversity; this should be within one's reach. I know to what extent I have fallen short of my aim. One tries, one strives, but in the end it is not attained. Let none be disheartened by this! The most important thing is always what we deal with, as Jakobi says, humanity as it is, explicable or inexplicable: the life of the individual, of generations, and of nations....

Many prominent American historians accepted Ranke's philologically grounded concepts. In 1880 Herbert Levi Osgood, a noted scholar in American colonial history, hailed Ranke for "the priceless lesson" he had taught all historians: "...to discover truth and to state it with absolute impartiality." Twenty-eight years later George Burton Adams reiterated Osgood's praise of Ranke's intellectual contributions, proclaiming that the battle cry of the historian should be "...the call of our first leader, proclaiming the chief duty of the historian to establish wie es eigentlich gewesen." At the turn of the century and through the post-World War I period Ranke's influence steadily declined as Progressive historians redefined their historiographical posture. Not unlike traditional Rankeans, Frederick Jackson Turner, James Harvey Robinson and Charles Beard rejected


27Ibid.
the abstract philosophers of history like Hegel due to their habit of substituting logic or even mysticism for historical experience.\textsuperscript{28} However, unlike German scholarship, American historians were influenced by the social pragmatism of John Dewey. This led to a distinctly non-Rankean conclusion concerning the goal of historical investigation -- if truth and meaning were to be discovered by examining the consequences of actions, then scientific objectivity could not be equated with social neutrality. If history was to be anything but antiquarianism, therefore, it must assist man in interpreting the experience of the present, as well as giving him some sense of direction for the future.\textsuperscript{29} As early as 1891 Frederick Jackson Turner had written, "Historical study has for its end to let the community see itself in the light of the past, to give it new thoughts and feelings, new aspirations and energies. Thoughts and feelings flow into deeds."\textsuperscript{30} In his 1911 address to the Philosophical Society in Philadelphia, James Harvey Robinson reinforced Turner's stance by asserting,

\ldots We must develop historical-mindedness upon a far more generous scale than hitherto, for this will add a still deficient element in our intellectual equipment and will promote rational progress as nothing else can do. The present has hitherto been the willing victim of the past; the time has now come when it should turn on the past and exploit it in the interests of advance.\textsuperscript{31}


\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., pp. v-vi.


In concluding a description of the historical objectivity theme, a word must be included about the fallacious idea of "objective history". Both Robinson and Charles Beard rejected the Rankean hypothesis that historians could reproduce the past "as it actually happened". Rejecting the assumption that an historian could ever be utterly detached from his work, Robinson wrote,

...Objective history is supposed to be a search for facts regardless of any preference or aims except the discovery of raw truth. It is history without an objective. I have come to think that no such thing is possible. One had always to make some kind of a selection in saying anything about the past.\textsuperscript{32}

Beard, in his critical essay "That Noble Dream," had already warned his fellow historians that they were obligated to indulge in critical self-examination before attempting to pursue historical truth. This implied that to achieve historical objectivity (and not "objective history"), an author must (1) explore the personal assumptions upon which the selection and organization of historical facts proceed, (2) broaden scholarly examination of the past beyond political boundaries to include interests hitherto neglected -- economic, racial, sexual, and cultural in the most general sense of the term, and (3) acknowledge the tentative-probabilistic nature of all historical conclusions.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Historical Objectivity Theme Indicators}

1. The Historical Objectivity theme stresses the unbiased,


\textsuperscript{33}Charles A. Beard, "That Noble Dream," \textit{American Historical Review}, XLI (October 1935), pp. 74-87.
critical examination of the roles of all individuals, nations, forces, and ideas involved in historical problems or conflicts.

2. The Historical Objectivity theme emphasizes the belief that all men must be judged on their merit rather than according to their race, religion, or nationality.

3. The Historical Objectivity theme demands the study of all major historical problems regardless of their social implications or controversial nature.

4. The Historical Objectivity theme relies upon individual research and examination of evidence as the most legitimate source of historical conclusions.

5. The Historical Objectivity theme emphasizes cultural relativity and multiple causation in analyzing decisions made in regard to historical problems.

6. The Historical Objectivity theme strives to avoid a nationalistic bias by stressing method over belief, factual evidence over legends, and individual decisions over authority.

7. The Historical Objectivity theme views the teacher as an open-minded investigator of historical problems who serves as a gadfly and a resource person to his students.

8. The Historical Objectivity theme employs a variety of historical problems, characters, and events in pursuing the educational process based upon the dual components of the teacher's knowledge and the students' interests and abilities.

9. The Historical Objectivity theme stresses the desirability of understanding social change as a means of improving the human condition,
rather than simply relying upon tradition and stability as sources of social cohesion.

Examples of The Citizenship Training-Historical Objectivity Dichotomy

The following examples are provided to give the reader a more specific understanding as to the types of ideas which were classified in the Citizenship Training-Historical Objectivity Dichotomy.

Citizenship Training:

In a democratic society, as in all others for that matter, the school should serve as a means of social stability, of maintaining political and social cohesion, of implementing the core values of society. If society is to have cohesion sufficient to prevent its disintegration, if it is to succeed in implementing its core values, if established mores and attitudes are not to lose their sanctions, if there is to be continuity of institutional development, youth must be socialized in terms of the prevailing cultural pattern. No society dares fail to develop in youth an emotional attachment to the prevailing ideology. Any other course may lead to social disintegration and to impotency in the face of crisis.  

Historical Objectivity:

To impose a pat interpretation which a student must accept in the same unquestioning spirit in which he accepts the objective facts is essentially an authoritarian, obscurantist, and insulting device. If he is told that fascism is the incarnation of evil and democracy is synonymous with the Kingdom of God, and if he believes this because he has been told to, he can later forget what he has been told, or someone else may tell him something different and then he will believe that instead.

Citizenship Training:

In these troubled times it is to be expected that patriotism and pride and devotion to our nation and way of life


be at the top of the list of the main ends of instruction. If ever a balanced sense of loyalty is needed, it is today -- not in the sense of nationalistic chauvinism, pointedly avoided by a number of teachers, but as an abiding faith in the values of democracy with a positive resolve to add to the realities of those values. Groups in the United States who fear that Americanism is a lost virtue of high school United States history instruction can quiet their apprehensions.

**Historical Objectivity:**

If history is to mean anything at all to the undergraduate -- in his life, his perspective, his critical processes, and his decision-making -- he must come to terms reluctant though he be, with harsh reality. He cannot do it within the confines of ideological frameworks taken at face value. The logic of human illogic, alas, must be introduced into the classroom if the student is not to be deceived into believing in a world that does not exist.

In our age, ideologies are consciously and rapidly created for purposes of social control and the long-term undermining of an enemy. The survival of the individual within society, and as a member of a free society confronting the world, depends in part upon the habit of regarding ideology-makers everywhere with suspicion and upon awareness of the potency of ideology as a device for establishing control in an increasingly interdependent world. Skepticism, doubt, and non-commitment are among the greatest safeguards of individual freedom and the open society.

**Citizenship Training:**

...[T]he social intelligence of the average voter will determine our national destiny and to a large extent our individual well-being. Teachers of history, treating as they do the origin of our social and political institutions, have a large responsibility in the education of future citizens.

Teachers of history should...arouse a warm enthusiasm for, and a devotion to, our national ideals.

---


Historical Objectivity:

Many ways of life have been supported by emotion and devotion amounting to fanaticism; we need understanding, based upon full knowledge. The objectivity of the history teacher is the only guarantee that the student is being led to seek that kind of understanding. Obviously teachers must select from the unlimited mass of historical data, but students will hardly trust evidence admittedly chosen to demonstrate a thesis.39

Citizenship Training:

The study of history has been required of school children from ancient times until today. Most of the states in our Union require the study of United States history by law. The reason lies in the widespread belief that the study of history, especially of national history, the study of the nation's heroes and of its heroic deeds, is useful as a creative and inspiring force in molding the minds of the younger generation. The study of the nation's past is considered by many, and with good reason, one of the best means of instilling love of country and patriotic devotion. There is little doubt that the dramatic, heroic story of the American Revolution, of the genius of the Founding Fathers, of the brilliance of Thomas Paine and of the patriotism of Patrick Henry makes generations of young Americans proud of their heritage.40

Historical Objectivity:

In a good department of history or political science a number of different political, social, philosophical, and religious viewpoints will be expressed by the professors.... Having professors with different viewpoints is closely related to the academic freedom of instructors. The professor's right to think is about the only guarantee of the student's right to think and the best guarantee that the student will be required to think. The student has a right to be sure that what his teacher says is what the teacher believes, not merely what he is allowed to say. From the viewpoint of the student academic freedom, it is the student's right to question, to doubt, and to differ with the professor. Incompetence or dishonesty should


debar a professor from his profession, but not unorthodox or unpopular opinions. A teacher is incompetent if he denies his students the right to question, to doubt, and to differ with him. The worst teacher is the one who expects his students to parrot his ideas. The worst students are the ones who do.41

Citizenship Training:

May we not admit that, with all its potentialities, there are times when youth needs and even welcomes adult leadership and that in wartime especially the teacher is under obligation to give that leadership and direction? Much has been said of the dangers of indoctrination, but if the teacher is at all worthy of his calling, he should be qualified to give positive guidance in times of crisis. To be specific, he should not hesitate to give his pupils clear-cut and reasonable teaching which will enable them to recognize the spirit of defeatism for what it is and to abhor it as they would abhor treason. He should not hesitate to teach positively, forcefully, and optimistically. The teacher who is not convinced of the justice of our cause or who fears for the outcome of the war has no place in the classroom. This does not mean that he must close his eyes to the fact that the war will be long and hard. Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill have warned us against false optimism and premature hopes. But they have also told us just as forcefully that there can be only one outcome, no matter how far distant the defeat of the Axis powers may be. Teachers must assume positive leadership in helping to sustain this confidence and determination.42

Historical Objectivity:

... [T]he best means of preserving democracy is to keep improving it by full criticism of it. To doubt that our values can be preserved if the people are told the truth is itself to question the very essence of democracy. It is only by keeping scholarship and teaching free that we can hope to serve the high function of passing on the wisdom of all men of all ages, whatever the effect on current institutions.43

The Accumulation of Facts Theme

The objective of teaching history to enable students to accumulate facts rests on two assumptions. First, by exercising mental "muscles" through the steady increase of factual information and by establishing fixed stimulus-response connections (e.g. Christopher Columbus - 1492; Declaration of Independence - July 4, 1776; "Give me liberty or give me death" - Patrick Henry) students will be able to learn new facts more readily and thus be socialized more effectively. The roots of this particular learning theory can be traced to a variety of individuals: Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, John Calvin, Jonathan Edwards, and Edward L. Thorndike. Second, by accumulating a random supply of facts, an individual may distinguish himself as an "educated" man in a quantitative sense. This conception of education does not imply that all facts are equally beneficial or relevant; however, it does stress the obligation of the history instructor, who is by definition able to make qualitative judgments in regard to the worth of specific facts, to communicate a maximum number of "important" historical facts to his students. These important facts would include such items as the Clay Compromises, Napoleon's seizure of power on 18 Brumaire, the reforms of Akbar, the War

of 1812, and the Teapot Dome Scandal. Whether the history teacher employs objective (e.g., True-False, Matching, Multiple Choice, etc.) tests or essay examinations, the student's quantitative knowledge is the central factor in determining his academic progress.

Addressing himself to the issue of the qualitative hierarchy of factual material, Robert V. Daniels has observed,

There are major facts -- the existence of key individuals, events, institutions, movements, and concepts -- that should be readily available in the student's mind so that he can bring them into an essay, or write a page of detail on each when called upon to do so. Who can talk of the history of Modern Europe if he cannot do this with such "facts" as the French Revolution, Robespierre, the Estates General, the Rights of Man? There are lesser, more concrete facts -- individuals, events, and geographical places -- that are nevertheless part of the vocabulary, the mental furniture of any educated person, and the student should be able to identify them if necessary.46

Although Daniel's viewpoint may seem academically myopic, one must assume that like Mark Krug47 he views the study of history as the hub of the liberal arts curriculum. Although Daniels provides several specific examples of important facts, Louis Gottschalk is perhaps more general in his qualification and definition of "historical facts". In his essay entitled Understanding History he explains,

A historical "fact"...may be defined as a particular derived directly or indirectly from historical documents and regarded as credible after careful testing in accordance with the canons of historical method. An infinity


47 Krug, History and the Social Sciences, p.
and a multiple variety of facts of this kind are accepted by all historians: e.g., that Socrates really existed; that Alexander invaded India; that the Romans built the Pantheon; that banks in the United States in 1933 were closed for four days by presidential proclamation; and that "the Yankees" won the "World Series" in 1949. Simple and fully tested "facts" of this kind are rarely disputed. They are easily observed, easily recorded (if not self-evident, like the Pantheon...), involve no judgments of value..., contradict no other knowledge available to us, seem otherwise logically acceptable, and, avoiding generalization, deal with single instances.48

A final definition is provided by Jacques Barzun and Henry Graff, who observe, "...[P]ure facts in historical reporting are those statements which express a conventional relationship in conventional terms: Thomas Jefferson was born on April 2, 1743; the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated on December 2, 1823; President Garfield was shot by Charles J. Guiteau."49

Numerous sources are available to assist a history instructor seeking to develop a breadth of factual knowledge in his students. In regard to classroom lectures, discussions, and examinations, the history textbook generally serves as the central factual resource. However, for term papers, class projects, and oral reports students may obtain historical facts from a seemingly endless variety of sources, including:

1. Encyclopedias (e.g., the Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences)

2. Biographical Dictionaries (e.g., the Dictionary of American Biography, Who's Who, Current Biography)


3. Indexes to Periodicals (e.g., the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, the New York Times Index)

4. Dictionaries of Quotations (e.g., Barlett's Familiar Quotations, H. L. Mencken's New Dictionary of Quotations on Historical Principles)


7. Handbooks and Sourcebooks (e.g., Henry Steele Commager's Documents of American History)

8. Bibliographies (e.g., Oscar Handlin et al. the Harvard Guide to American History, the American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature).\(^{50}\)

Obviously, no history student -- or history teacher -- need ever be concerned about a shortage of readily available factual material.

**Accumulation of Facts Theme Indicators**

1. The Accumulation of Facts theme emphasizes the educational value of a variety of techniques of information gathering (e.g., compiling, listing, etc.) and of memorizing large quantities of names, dates, terms, definitions and geographical locations.

2. The Accumulation of Facts theme favors the use of objective

---

examinations to evaluate in quantitative terms student retention of historical material.

3. The Accumulation of Facts theme operates upon the assumption that factual knowledge is required before a student can begin to think about historical problems.

4. The Accumulation of Facts theme is founded upon a learning theory which stresses "exercise" of the mind through the memorization of facts.

5. The Accumulation of Facts theme emphasizes teacher selection and organization of class content based upon the maximum availability of factual data.

6. The Accumulation of Facts theme operates on a dual system in regard to students; that is, although they are approached by the instructor as a group in regard to assignments, lectures and tests, individual competition is encouraged through the extrinsic realm of quantitative grading.

7. The Accumulation of Facts theme emphasizes reliance upon authority for knowledge -- teacher, textbook, encyclopedia, etc.

8. The Accumulation of Facts theme subscribes to the notion that the quantity of factual knowledge is an adequate indicator of the quality of a student's thinking ability.

The Historical Method Theme

The objective of teaching the Historical Method entails both procedural and attitudinal factors. Since the time of Thucydides, historians have generally followed an orderly technique of dealing with evidence in
attempting to establish the relevance, authenticity, and credibility of a particular item from the past.\textsuperscript{51} As Allan Nevins has observed, "Not only is the intention of history high, but the method is scientific." He continued,

\begin{quote}
The historian...collects his data fairly, observes it systematically, organizes it logically, and tests its parts thoroughly. Then by inductive logic and the use of hypothesis he reaches provisional generalizations, and only when he has carried out a final search for new data, and made fresh tests, does he commit final conclusions to paper. In all this he casts off, so far as possible, the prejudices of race, nationality, class, and faction. If his method falls short of the test-tube precision of the chemist, it is at any rate as scientific as he can make it. He will go to the primary sources for as many facts as possible, and restrict his reliance on secondary accounts. He will give each category of evidence its proper valuation: the official document, the letter, the memoir, the newspaper story, the pamphlet, the artifact. He will put every witness, every scrap of paper, under cross-examination.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

Echoing the documentary emphasis of nineteenth century German historiography, French historian N. D. Fustel de Coulanges emphasized the scientific nature of historical investigation in the "Introduction" to his six-volume History of the Political Institutions of Ancient France. His comments also add a note of scholarly insight to Nevins' description.

History is not an easy science; its subject is infinitely complex; human society is like a body whose harmony and unity can be grasped only by examining successively and closely each of the organs which compose it and which are its life. Long and careful study of a particular is therefore the only way that can lead to some general outlook. One day of synthesis requires years of analysis. In a quest which demands so much

\textsuperscript{51}Gottschalk, Understanding History, p. 28.

patience and so much effort, so much prudence and so much boldness, the chances for error are countless and none can hope to escape them. If we have not been discouraged by the deep awareness of the difficulties of our task, it is because we believe that the honest search for truth is always rewarding. If we accomplish nothing else but to throw some light on hitherto neglected points or to call attention to some obscure problems, we shall not have labored in vain, and we should moreover feel justified in saying that we have contributed our share to the progress of historical science and to the knowledge of human nature.

Implicit within the methodological construct of the historian is an attitude of doubt or skepticism. For this reason the practitioner, of the historical method must always approach his subject from a critical stance, constantly acknowledging the problematic nature of his pursuit and the tentative nature of his conclusions. A realistic expectation of the results of applying the historical method to problems of the past is a terminal point somewhere between "possibility" and "certainty". A scientist might label such a conclusion as a high "probability". In his essay A Preface to History, Carl G. Gustavson has attempted to spell out several elements of the historical method. It is interesting to note that he maintains that the goals of teaching history is the development of "historical-mindedness," which he defines as "...a form of reasoning when dealing with historical materials and present-day problems." The vagueness of the descriptive term employed here does not detract from the useful-


54Barzun and Graff, The Modern Researcher, pp. 131-144.

ness of Gustavson's listing of the characteristics of the historical method.

1. The historical method requires a natural curiosity as to what underlies the surface appearances of any historical event.

2. The historical method encourages a student concerned with a present problem, idea, event, or institution to allow his mind to gravitate in the direction of the past, seeking origins, relationships, and comparisons.

3. The historical method encourages a student to discern the shapes and contours of the forces which are dynamic in society.

4. The historical method stresses the continuity of society in all its forms.

5. The historical method clarifies the perpetual nature of social change.

6. The historical method demands that a student approach a topic with an open mind, prepared to recognize tenacious reality rather than what he wishes to find.

7. The historical method rests on the knowledge that each situation and event is unique.56

The inevitable question facing any discussion of the historical method is: If your methodology is constant, then why are your conclusions variant? That is, why do historians so frequently disagree about such commonly studied topics as the causes of the American Revolution or the role of unrestricted submarine warfare by Germany in motivating American intervention in World War I? In an essay entitled "What Are Historians Trying to Do?", Henri Pirenne, a distinguished European historian, has tackled this challenging problem from the viewpoint of a social scientist. He writes,

56 Ibid.
Not to the historical method but to the subjects with which history is concerned must be imputed the historians' want of precision and the fact that their results seem uncertain and contradictory. The human actions which they study cannot appear the same to different historians. It needs only a moment of reflection to understand that two historians using the same material will not treat it in an identical fashion, primarily because the creative imagination which permits them to single the factors of movements out of chaos varies, but also because they do not have the same ideas as to relative importance of the motives which determine men's conduct. They will inevitably write accounts which will contrast as do their personalities, depending upon the relative value they place on individual action or on the influence of collective phenomena; and, among these, on the emphasis they place on the economic, the religious, the ethnic, or the political factor. To this first cause of divergence we must add others. Historians are not conditioned in various ways solely by inherited qualities; their milieu is also important. Their religion, nationality, and social class influence them more or less profoundly. And the same is true of the period in which they work. Each epoch has its needs and tendencies which demand the attention of students and lead them to concentrate on this or that problem.

Historical Method Theme Indicators

1. The Historical Method theme emphasizes the use of logic and critical evaluation of evidence in the study of historical problems.

2. The Historical Method theme encourages the introduction of open-ended discussions and unresolved problems in the classroom.

3. The Historical Method theme fosters student skills in detection, evaluation, and criticism of historical interpretations.

4. The Historical Method theme plays down the role of the teacher as an authority, while emphasizing reliance upon the individual application of an investigating procedure.

5. The Historical Method theme encourages the transferability of the critical learning process from historical situations to present-day issues.

6. The Historical Method theme stresses the notion that facts gain meaning and relevance only in the context of the historical problem being investigated.

7. The Historical Method theme establishes the teacher as a problem designer, research assistant, and fellow investigator in the history classroom.

8. The Historical Method theme stimulates individual students to demonstrate imagination and creativity in selecting a problem, adopting a suitable methodological approach, gathering evidence, forming hypotheses, and reaching a defensible conclusion.

9. The Historical Method theme demands that the teacher employ testing or evaluation procedures which require reasoning rather than memorization, analysis rather than recall.

10. The Historical Method theme is oriented toward the future, since it equips each student with a procedure for dealing with contemporary as well as historical problems.

Examples of The Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method Dichotomy

The following examples are provided to give the reader a more specific understanding as to the types of ideas which were classified in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy.
Accumulation of Facts:

First things come first, and every student should have at his command a body of historical data before he is permitted, let alone encouraged, to discuss, write, or even think about the meaning of history.\textsuperscript{58}

Historical Method:

History and science differ in important ways, but if historians conceived of history as a way of thinking, they would have an approach which makes use of but does not presume mastery of [an unfathomable number] of facts. The study of history would not be a hopeless effort to master an impossibly large mass of material. It would be learning to think in historical terms.\textsuperscript{59}

Accumulation of Facts:

...Not that I can tolerate any view which belittles the importance of facts, those hard, clean-cut, learnable and testable items in our intellectual life, including a due portion of the most precise of all, dates. History -- or any other kind of knowledge -- without facts is logically absurd and pedagogically vicious.\textsuperscript{60}

Historical Method:

A major and indispensable step in the arduous process of achieving intellectual maturity is the gaining of proficiency in historical method. In the broad sense, historical method is a method of treating complex human phenomena. This is an accomplishment as vital for the educated layman as for the professional scholar. It embraces three techniques -- analysis, interpretation, and criticism. Analysis is the process of isolating causes, significant moments or elements, and the consequences of an event. Interpretation logically follows analysis and is, essentially, a resynthesis of the elements resolved by analysis, but a resynthesis carried out in such a way as to show the inner meaning of the total circumstances. Criticism is the application of that kind of intellectual acuity which recognizes fraud and sophistry, distinguishes


\textsuperscript{60}Edward O. Sisson, "A Teacher Looks at History," Educational Forum, IX (March 1945), p. 300.
validity from error, differentiates viewpoint from fact, and, in general, evaluates the worth of what is given. 61

Accumulation of Facts:

Through the study of history [students] find examples of personal and social action, some of which they want to emulate and some of which bring shame. Even at the simplest level, knowledge of a common past is essential to lasting social organization. This principle is followed by all social organization. It is essential to a nation-state. To the question, why teach about Christopher Columbus, John Smith, William Bradford, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Robert E. Lee, George Washington Carver, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson, one good answer is that it would be impossible to conceive of our country without them or a good American who does not respond warmly to them. The same could be said for the Mayflower Compact, the Maryland Act of Toleration, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Gettysburg Address, and the Four Freedoms. 62

Historical Method:

The main objective has to be to make the student think as we think; not the same thoughts, of course, but the student must grasp the method of our thinking. It is not the subject matter that is strange to my class; they can learn the facts, they already have a fair store of historical facts. But they have great trouble in learning to use the facts, to analyze them, to separate the little ones from the big ones, to generalize from the facts. To us, history is not "just one damned thing after another". Our minds are trained to interpret, to single our cause and effect, principle and example, pro and con, rule and exception. Our minds are trained to put two and two together. Unless forced to do so, very many of our students will not put anything together except emotional experiences.

Unless they develop some ability at critical analysis, they will never be able to criticize a book or detect a fallacy, to understand the history of our country or to organize a classroom study unit in that history....63


Accumulation of Facts:

A certain body of historical knowledge to be imparted to the pupils must be the first concern of the history teacher. After this other objectives such as the ability to reason on these facts, to use them in discussion, to apply them to the problems of contemporary society.

Historical Method:

The use of the historical method in the classroom can provide a channel through which creative and critical thinking can take place even in the early years of formal education.

Accumulation of Facts:

...[W]e are teaching freshmen who need primarily the proper historical framework before they start upon philosophical speculations or tackle great and profound historical problems. Let us therefore not discard rashly all of the old survey in order to keep up with present-day fashions. Let the student by all means get a glimpse of great ideologies, let him read sources, let him grasp great social and economic movements of the times -- but let him also know the facts of history. The facts are there. They cannot be ignored, and history without them may be a course in humanities or in speculative philosophy, but it is no longer history. Let us still teach the humdrum data first before drawing inferences. Such information must be assimilated before the freshman plunges into the philosophic or the literary. Any synthesis must be based upon the scope of facts, and the teaching of freshman history must still be largely a matter of putting across a solid framework of historical data.

Historical Method:

...Why teach American history? There seem to be several basic reasons...A student needs to develop a perspective from which he can analyze present conditions. He needs to acquire a cognitive structure from which he can relate the present to the past. He needs to be able to engage in thought processes necessary for such analysis. He needs to recognize when such analysis is desirable.

---
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If the teacher is going to move toward meeting these goals, he must develop a course which will both motivate the student and afford him the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills outlined....

The Knowledge of the Discipline Theme

The goal of achieving Knowledge of a Discipline is based upon the conviction that there is inherent value in studying a particular academic subject. This assumption may be derived from any one of several factors: (1) the methodology of a particular subject may be either unique or transferable to other subjects, (2) the nature of the facts and/or interpretations characteristic to the discipline may deserve special consideration, or (3) the contemporary meaning and application of learning in a particular subject may be beneficial to society. Teachers of history, as defenders of the discipline, frequently claim that all three of the aforementioned factors are relevant to their subject.

In order to appreciate the depth of the American educational commitment to discipline-centered instruction, one must be acquainted with the historical background of this phenomenon. In secondary school curriculums, for example, the required study of history stems from the nineteenth century tradition of nationalistic indoctrination and runs through the twentieth century decisions of state and local school boards to foster patriotism through the study of the discipline of history.\(^6^7\) In American colleges, scholarly specialization has solidified disciplinary structures


\(^6^8\) Johnson, Teaching of History, pp. 25-85; Pierce, Civic Attitudes in American Textbooks; Elson, Guardians of Tradition.
in history as elsewhere, with professional organizations, journals,\textsuperscript{69} and honorary fraternities serving as academic boundaries inhibiting cross-curricular or inter-disciplinary communication.\textsuperscript{70}

The central role of history in contemporary American high school and college curriculums was largely determined at the turn of the century during the transformation of historical study from amateur to professional status. This action was fostered primarily through the persistence of the American Historical Association (AHA). In 1896, twelve years after its establishment, the AHA appointed Andrew C. McLaughlin, Herbert Baxter Adams, George L. Fox, Albert Bushnell Hart, Charles Homer Haskins, Lucy M. Salmon, and H. Morse Stephens to serve on the Committee of Seven. This committee was charged with the duty of studying nineteenth century educational practices and making recommendations regarding the proper role

\textsuperscript{69}It is interesting to note that the development of history as an academic discipline in the United States lagged behind Western Europe by almost half a century. As Fritz Stern has commented, "By the mid-nineteenth century history had ceased to be a branch of literature and had become an academic discipline. Impressed by the example of the natural sciences, historians, especially in Germany, asserted that their craft too had to become a science, and established an elaborate machinery of scholarship. Professional journals were founded in a format that has remained essentially unchanged to the present day, and the study of history in the Universities, a rarity at the end of the eighteenth century, became commonplace." Stern notes specifically that the development of historical journals in Europe -- Historische Zeitschrift (1859), Revue des Questions historiques (1870), Revue historiques (1876), and the English Historical Review (1886) -- preceded the establishment of the two major American journals of history, The American Historical Review (1895) and the Mississippi Valley Historical Review (1907), by several years. Stern, ed., The Varieties of History, p. 170.

of history in the twentieth century secondary school. The 1899 Report of the Committee of Seven, in addition to suggesting improvements in the areas of library holdings, textbooks and teacher-training, specifically delineated a four-year sequence of history courses which, the Committee contended, should be universally adopted by American schools. This sequence of courses included ancient history (Greek and Roman) in the 9th grade, medieval and modern European history in the 10th grade, English history in the 11th grade, and civil government in the 12th grade. This disciplinary sequence was reinforced by the 1900 decision of the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) to adopt the four course sequence of history blocks as the basis for its testing program. This action effectively froze the four-year history sequence into the curriculums of public schools for two decades.

Between 1900-1915 the dominance of the historical "block" curriculum was challenged by educators and curriculum specialists who had been influenced by the learning theories of William James, G. Stanley Hall, Francis Parker, and John Dewey. Several of the other social science disciplines, seeking to balance if not to eclipse the growing power of the AHA, also began to organize professionally -- the Association of American

---
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Geographers in 1895, the American Political Science Association in 1903, and the American Sociological Society in 1905. Each of these organizations formed special educational committees to lobby with state and local school boards for disciplinary representation in the high school curriculum. Despite these pressures for curriculum revision, however, the AHA remained committed to the four-year history sequence. In fact, in 1911 it even received a report from the Committee of Five, a group which had been appointed to evaluate the criticisms of the 1899 Report, which proposed only token changes in the prescribed history sequence and all but totally ignored the demands for increased attention to subjects such as economics, sociology, and community civics (political science).\textsuperscript{74}

In 1911 the National Education Association (NEA) established a Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education with Thomas Jesse Jones serving as chairman of the subcommittee to investigate the social studies area. The 1916 report of this Commission led to a diminution of history course offerings in American high schools. Although European history was to be taught in the 10th grade and American history in the 11th, grades 9 and 12 were reserved for interdisciplinary offerings labelled "Community Civics" and "Problems in American Democracy".\textsuperscript{75}

Nevertheless, from 1916 until the present, in practice if not in theory, 


the two survey history courses have remained the core of the social studies curriculum and the disciplinary emphasis in their instruction has set the intellectual trend for most college preparatory students.76

The disciplinary structure of historical study in American colleges has rarely been challenged during the past seven decades. The departmental organization of most college faculties, the academic trend toward specialization and strict disciplinary identity, and the professional accouterments of scholarly life -- organizations, journals, etc. -- have all dictated the continuing emphasis upon teaching history as a singular liberal arts subject. This is not to imply that variety in classroom activities ceases to exist merely because disciplinary emphasis is pursued. In fact, the contrary is generally true. In the same college survey history course, while one historian may casually present a rambling narrative of past characters and events, another historian may balance his presentation with three-or-four different scholarly interpretations, while yet another historian is examining the nature of specific historical documents with his class in an attempt to define a clear causal pattern based upon primary sources. Despite these varying approaches, however, the emphasis of all three teachers is still clearly discipline-oriented.

A variety of historians and educators have championed the continuation of the discipline approach to teaching history. Ray Allen Billington, noted American frontier history scholar, has declared,

The study of American history in our secondary schools will help train men and women capable of charting the nation's course, just as it will enrich their lives and add immeasurably to their enjoyment in later years. It will do so by developing in today's youths valuable thought habits that will endure throughout their lifetimes, and by equipping them with the special knowledge needed to function as knowledgeable citizens of the Republic. As a mental discipline the study of American history (1) trains students in analytical and objective thinking, (2) broadens their horizons by adding the time dimension, and (3) introduces them to a knowledge of a variety of academic subjects that expand their vistas and increase their social usefulness.

Billington continues by observing,

That the study of history serves as a medium for cultivating valuable intellectual attitudes is obvious. The historical method as a mental discipline is useful far beyond the field of history, even for secondary school students. Through the study of the past they learn that human affairs can never be simple -- that there are no pat heroes or villains, no "bads" or "goods," no simple cause and effect relationships, in human behavior. They realize that the social process is one of enormous complexity, and that man's conduct is often not only unpredictable but inexplicable. Once understood, this basic truth serves as a warning against precipitous conclusions on all subjects that defy superficial analysis. If a student emerges from his schooling with an awareness of history's underlying complexity, he will realize that large issues of all sorts seldom have a "right" or "wrong" answer, but must be appraised objectively in historical perspective. Such a lesson can be taught by the study of any subject dealing with society, but through none so effectively as American history.

After examining social studies curriculums in American public schools during the late 1950's, Charles R. Keller condemned teachers for emphasizing the creation of "good citizens" while neglecting the
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content and disciplines of the subjects they were teaching. He con­
tended, "What students should do in schools is to study subjects and
become acquainted with facts and ideas. Subjects as such have disciplines
that will help to develop students' minds." Bernard Berelson, writing
the "Introduction" to study published jointly by the American Council of
Learned Societies and the National Council for the Social Studies, seconded
Keller's disciplinary motion by arguing that the school's goal of producing
responsible citizens can best be achieved through the study of the best
available knowledge from the social science disciplines.

Knowledge of the Discipline Theme Indicators

1. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme emphasizes the value of
knowing a variety of scholarly interpretations for a specific historical
event.

2. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme encourages students to
examine problems which have been of long-standing historiographical
interest (e.g., Frederick Jackson Turner's "frontier thesis," Charles A.
Beard's "economic interpretation of the Constitution," the causes of the
American Civil War, etc.).

3. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme posits an intrinsic
value to the study of history and accepts the accumulation of historical
knowledge as a legitimate end of education.

---
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4. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme seeks educational validity in curricular breadth by prescribing a large number of specific facts, dates, characters, and events which must be studied by all students.

5. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme accepts the premise that knowledge can be compartmentalized (or departmentalized).

6. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme views a class as a passive, homogeneous body which can be inducted into the knowledge of history.

7. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme assumes a distinct hierarchy of knowledge, with the teacher as the central authority on the selection of subject-matter, methodology, evaluation, etc.

The Self-Knowledge Theme

The idea of teaching history to increase Self-Knowledge stems directly from the Socratic tradition. The line from the Apology which reads, "The unexamined life is not worth living for man," most adequately describes this classical position. The self-knowledge objective places the mental and physical growth of each student as the dominant educational factor and in turn subordinates such considerations as the transmission of cultural heritage, the accumulation of factual material, and the comprehension of disciplinary structure to this end. In describing the individualistic nature of historical study, Robert V. Daniels has noted,

As a subject of unlimited inquiry, history can be a powerful stimulant to the curiosity and the thirst for truth. The spirit of historical inquiry is enlivened by its legitimate subjective side in the play of individual opinion, values, and imagination. The student learns that his own opinion is worthwhile, provided only that he has based it on knowledge and is ready to revise it when new knowledge makes this
necessary. More like the humanities than the sciences, work in history is always a personal intellectual venture.\textsuperscript{82}

On a slightly higher philosophical level, R. G. Collingwood has also described the objective of historical study in individualistic terms.

...history is 'for' human self-knowledge. It is generally thought to be of importance to a man that he should know himself: where knowing himself means knowing not his merely personal peculiarities, the things that distinguish him from other men, but his nature as man. Knowing yourself means knowing, first, what it is to be a man; secondly, knowing what it is to be the kind of man you are; and thirdly, knowing what it is to be the man you are and nobody else is. Knowing yourself means knowing what you can do; and since nobody knows what he can do until he tries, the only clue to what man can do is what man has done. The value of history, then, is that it teaches us what man has done and thus what man is.\textsuperscript{83}

Even though Thucydides clearly described the intent of his historical writing to serve as an intellectual guide to future generations, few historians have openly acknowledged the interrelationship between self-knowledge and historical understanding. Thus for centuries history was perceived as a form of natural science which dealt only with observable phenomena (e.g., documents, paintings, relics, coins, etc.) from the past. One of the first nineteenth century historians to recognize the humanistic nexus of historical investigation was Wilhelm Dilthey. Intellectually stimulated by Immanuel Kant's noumena-phenomena distinction and G. W. F. Hegel's dichotomy of "Nature" and "Spirit," Dilthey rejected the "positivism" of the natural sciences and, anticipating the "idealism" of Benedetto Croce and R. G. Collingwood, formulated a

\textsuperscript{82}Daniels, Studying History, p. 7.

philosophical distinction between (1) learning by perceiving objects and (2) understanding the nature of life through the expanded vistas of historical study. The following quotation clearly depicts Dilthey's viewpoint. Note particularly his appeal to intrinsic motivation in historical study.

...Mankind, if apprehended only by perception and perceptual knowledge, would be for us a physical fact, and as such it would be accessible only to natural scientific knowledge. It becomes an object for human studies only in so far as human states are consciously lived, in so far as they find expression in living utterances, and in so far as these expressions are understood. Of course this relationship of life, expression and understanding embraces not only the gestures, looks and words in which men communicate, or the enduring mental creations in which the depths of the creator's mind open themselves to the spectator, or the permanent objectifications of mind in social structures, through which the common background of human nature shines and is permanently visible and certain to us. The mind-body unit of life is known to itself through the same double relationship of lived experience and understanding, it is aware of itself in the present, it rediscovers itself in memory as something that once was; but when it tries to hold fast and to apprehend its states, when it turns its attention upon itself, the narrow limits of such an introspective method of self-knowledge make themselves felt. 84

Dilthey continues by resolving the dilemma of obtaining self-knowledge through the process of studying mankind. He declares,

...Only from his actions, his fixed utterances, his effects upon others, can man learn about himself; thus he learns to know himself only by the roundabout way of understanding. What we once were, how we developed and became what we are, we learn from the way in which we acted, the plan which we once adopted, the way in which we made ourselves felt in our vocation, from old dead letters, from judgments on us which

were spoken long ago. In short, it is through the process of understanding that life in its depths is made clear to itself, and on the other hand, we understand ourselves and others only when we transfer our own lived experience into every kind of expression of our own and other people's life. Thus everywhere the relation between lived experience, expression, and understanding is the proper procedure by which mankind as an object in the human studies exists for us. The human studies i.e. history are thus founded on this relation between lived experience, expression, and understanding.

The American tradition of studying the past to gain self-knowledge may be seen in the historical writings of James Harvey Robinson and Carl L. Becker. In describing Robinson's major educational objectives for the teaching of history, intellectual historian Harvey Wish has listed four points. The first of these points summarizes all of Robinson's historiographical and educational thought: "The purpose of history is to enable us to understand ourselves and therefore solve our present problems and perhaps direct the future." Robinson himself, in an essay entitled "The New History", explained the value of historical understanding to the decision-making man of the present.

"History...may be regarded as an artificial extension and broadening of our memories and may be used to overcome the natural bewilderment of all unfamiliar situations. Could we suddenly be endowed with a God-like and exhaustive knowledge of the whole history of mankind, far more complete than the combined knowledge of all the histories ever written, we should gain forthwith a God-like appreciation of the world in which we live, and a God-like insight into the evils which mankind now suffers, as well as into the most promising methods for alleviating them, not because the past would furnish precedents of conduct, but because our conduct would be based upon a perfect

85 ibid., pp. 28-29.
comprehension of existing conditions founded upon a perfect knowledge of the past.\textsuperscript{87}

The essence of Dilthey's philosophical judgments and Robinson's educational ideas concerning the nature of historical study seem to culminate in the thought and writings of Carl Becker. In his Presidential Address before the American Historical Association on December 29, 1931, Becker proclaimed the necessity of historical inquiry for legitimate, meaningful self-actuation. In describing "Everyman" as his own historian, Becker concludes that the past and the present are united in each human being.

...Of all the creatures, man alone has a specious present that may be deliberately and purposefully enlarged and diversified and enriched.

The extent to which the specious present may thus be enlarged and enriched will depend upon the knowledge, the artificial extension of memory, the memory of things said and done in the past and distant places. But not upon knowledge alone; rather than upon knowledge directed by purpose. The specious present is an unstable pattern of thought, incessantly changing in response to our immediate perceptions and the purposes that arise therefrom. At any given moment each one of us (professional historian no less than Mr. Everyman) weaves into this unstable pattern such actual or artificial memories as may be necessary to orient us in our little world of endeavor.\textsuperscript{88}

Thus Becker views self-knowledge as the highest goal or priority in man's quest for understanding of himself, his community and the chaotic world around him.


Self-Knowledge Theme Indicators

1. The Self-Knowledge theme emphasizes the study of historical problems which will assist each student in future decision-making activities.

2. The Self-Knowledge theme is founded upon the humanistic view of man as the measure of all things and as the end of all educational pursuits.

3. The Self-Knowledge theme accepts the value of individual autonomy in making historical judgments and in formulating conclusions to social problems.

4. The Self-Knowledge theme utilizes historical knowledge as a means to the greater end of individual understanding.

5. The Self-Knowledge theme encourages an elective curricular principle based upon student selection of problems for classroom investigation. That is, there is no prescribed list of characters or events to be covered in a class.

6. The Self-Knowledge theme establishes the role of the teacher as an evaluator of the evidence assembled and the logic employed by each student during the pursuit of historical inquiry.

7. The Self-Knowledge theme stresses the interrelationship of all disciplines and branches of learning in facilitating man's search for knowledge.

8. The Self-Knowledge theme establishes the teacher as a resource person in terms of stimulating thought, assisting in the unearthing of evidence, testing hypotheses, and evaluating conclusions.
9. The Self-Knowledge theme posits the value of student heterogeneity.

10. The Self-Knowledge theme encourages each student to be creative and imaginative, to accept responsibility for furthering his own education, to examine an endless spectrum of personal, social, and historical problems, and to provide a measure of intrinsic motivation for learning.

Examples of The Knowledge of The Discipline-Self-Knowledge Dichotomy

The following examples are provided to give the reader a more specific understanding as to the types of ideas which were classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge Dichotomy.

Knowledge of the Discipline:

The classrooms of the nation are filled with teachers of history but practically empty of historians who teach history... Any person who knows how to read can study a history chapter the night before and go into a class the following morning to spew forth a few memorized facts and act enormously brilliant before a group of students who know nothing. The historian does much more. He understands the scholarship of the period under consideration, the relationship of that period to other periods in history, the fields of controversy that revolve around the men and issues concerned, and the values to be derived from study -- values to be retained as part of the moral armor with which each citizen of a democracy must be clothed if that democracy is to survive.®

Self-Knowledge:

An important tactic in seeking a new basis for the teaching of American history is to begin with the students. What are they interested in? What do they care about? There are obviously many different answers to these

questions -- the student population is not homogeneous -- but I strongly suspect that in any systematic survey some concerns would appear over and over again. Students in my classes tend to worry about the following questions:

Who am I and what do I want to be?

Am I successful in my inter-personal, particularly my inter-sexual relationships?

Can I satisfy both the demands of my own spirit and the demands of my parents?

Will I achieve what I desire in my career, in my family life and in the physical and social environment in which I choose to live?90

Knowledge of the Discipline:

...History is the only discipline in a broad sense which is peculiarly devoted to reminding us of choices, convictions, and conditions. Unless we are prepared to deny this past and ignore man's life as a whole, we must consult this source of knowledge. History weighs what others have weighted. There is a hidden "give and take" from which the humanities can develop many "exchanges of thought". History and the humanities are compatible only when history remains the ground upon which to survey the human situation. History should not shrink from this service; the humanities cannot survive if they discard history.91

Self-Knowledge:

Primarily, the teen-ager wants to know who he is, what he is. What can he succeed at? Just how good (or bad) is he intellectually, socially? What is the true nature of his abilities? Any person who begins by learning about the world before he knows much about himself always ends up confused and ill at ease because he sees the world through a psychological filter that he does not understand or may not even be aware of. He has not recognized how he reacts to the world (to say nothing of why) and so events and personalities are viewed with a distortion that may be


due to a psychological predisposition. Yes, I am arguing that history teachers...need to sharpen their psychological insights.

...Before a teen-ager has a nagging concern about the Mayflower Compact he will be aware of other things gnawing away at him. And these things, the safe resolution of conflict, should be the teacher's first concern. And more. To Socrates -- the best teacher was not one who crams the minds of students with the greatest number of facts in the shortest possible time, but the one who is able to kindle a fire of spiritual and intellectual enthusiasm; who strengthens high moral, spiritual, and cultural aspirations; who develops within the student a knowledge of what he can become.92

Knowledge of the Discipline:

History can be regarded as the fundamental science ...of men and society; of their growth and development. Nowhere can a young man or a young woman learn to understand what man is but in history.93

Self-Knowledge:

...The primary goal of effective social studies teaching ought to be to involve students in the process of reflective thought on issues facing contemporary society. The disorientation of our society is all about us, and the citizenry, products of our schools, are woefully unprepared to deal with the complexities of a confused and complex world. They not only lack the factual background to understand social problems but too often arrive at illogical conclusions based on mere preferences, prejudices, and ignorance. With the very real possibility that we may all be cremated equally, irrational discussion goes on, if any discussion takes place, in regard to the war in Vietnam. Lake Erie, we are told, is one-third dead, incapable of supporting any form of life....Many more such examples come to mind, but these will suffice to dramatize the concerns to which the social studies should address themselves.

We have not been very successful to date. Every study that has ever been made has shown that students enter high


school and emerge four years later virtually unscathed in regard to their basic attitudes. Their beliefs remain conditioned by their prejudices and their affiliations. They have not learned to examine their values, nor have they learned to think critically and independently.\(^{94}\)

**Knowledge of the Discipline:**

... [H]istory acts as an essential corrective to the generalizations of the other social sciences and helps to ward off the dangers of oversimplification and provincialism; ...it provides a very effective intellectual weapon, the developmental method, for the study of things in time and in process of change; and...it can serve to synthesize, bring together and orient in relation to each other different branches of thought, in this respect supplementing and even replacing the philosophical approach.\(^{95}\)

**Self-Knowledge:**

... [T]he world history course should attempt to provide a student with a set of opinions that would permit him to estimate the course of future events in his private affairs and in the larger scene of the society in which he lives. Such a course would continuously put before the student this question: Does this or that event or series of events from the past supply you with any key to what the future might be like? Seldom would the student be asked the question that is now the central point in the course in world history: Does this or that event explain why the present world is as it is? There is a vast difference in these two questions. When a teacher asks the latter with reference to the few isolated events from the past that he can touch on in a year's course, he is asking the student to do the impossible. He is demanding that the student make the transition through thousands of single events lying between an event in the past and some fact about today's world. If he asks the former question he is asking the student to formulate an opinion as to what the future might be. He is encouraging the plastic mind to perform what has always seemed to be one of its natural and necessary functions, namely, to become conscious of the existence of some kind of order in the world. He is encouraging wisdom instead of insisting on knowledge.\(^{96}\)


Knowledge of the Discipline:

History, then, interprets the past in a humanizing way; i.e., it discloses to us both the deeds and the motives of our forebears. In doing so it illuminates the present. Only the study of history can tell us how it came about that we speak English, live under British legal institutions, and worship in the many different ways we do. History alone explains why one-tenth of our citizens have black skins, how we became involved in the cold war, and how it comes about that North America is composed of three countries and other large continents have many. Moreover, history views events in a chronological order which helps establish comprehensible relationships. And the continuity of events are seen not only in chronological but in causal sequence.

Mention should also be made of traditional products of the study of history — historical synthesis; awareness of continuity, progress, and change; critical thinking involved in historical criticism; and concept formation (nationalism, imperialism, democracy).97

Self-Knowledge:

... [T]o the individual who approaches the study of the past with an open mind and without a predetermined pattern which he attempts to superimpose on the events he studies, history can suggest alternatives. A clue to what man can do, said Collingwood, is what man has done. The notion that history repeats itself is naive, but the history of man does represent the accumulated experiences of the species. While no individual relives any moment of his life, it would be even more naive to argue from this that experience counts for nothing in guiding our daily activities. The study of history, then, can present us with possible courses of action, can suggest alternatives, and can inform us of man's potentialities. While the present is conditioned by the past, man is not a prisoner of the past. While events are often predictable, they are seldom inevitable; man shares a responsibility for his own future.98


CHAPTER III

THE PRESENTATION OF DATA

The statistics presented in this chapter are derived from the content analysis of 413 articles published in nineteen journals between 1939 and 1969. It should be noted that since the thematic categories being employed in this study were polarized into three sets of objectives -- Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity, Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method, and Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge -- each article analyzed could contain as many as six thematic references. Conversely, an article could deal with the topic of teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges without stating any classifiable objectives and thus fail to qualify under any of the prescribed thematic references. In addition to these extreme situations, the analyst found several articles which presented viewpoints that fit directly into one of the three thematic categories, but which included both polar objectives (i.e., Citizenship Training and Historical Objectivity). In such cases the article containing the contradictory objectives was classified as Neutral (N). Regardless of the number of different themes included or the contradictory nature of the objectives stated in a particular article, the reader should note that the entire sample of articles was used to calculate the percentage of responses adhering to each thematic dichotomy.
This study is designed to analyze the teaching objectives stated by individuals who have written articles during the past three decades concerning the nature of history instruction at the survey level in American high schools and colleges. To accomplish this purpose the data presented in this chapter is organized into statistical tables which depict (1) the number of articles analyzed from each of nineteen journals, (2) the per cent and number of articles which adhered to each thematic pole of the dichotomy of objectives, and (3) the per cent and number of articles classified within the entire thematic category.

This chapter is used to present the bulk of the pertinent data obtained through the content analysis. Statistics related to the three thematic dichotomies described in Chapter II are presented in the following tables. The next section of this dissertation, Chapter IV, will be used to interpret the findings presented below.

The Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity Theme, 1939-1969

The Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity Theme as it appeared in articles between 1939 and 1969 is shown in Table 1 (see pp. 70-72).

The American Association of University Professors Bulletin contained eleven articles on history teaching of which four (36.36%) were coded into the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. One article (9.09%) was in the Citizenship Training category, three (27.27%) were in the Historical Objectivity category, and none were in the Neutral category.

The American Historical Review included four articles on history instruction, with two (50.00%) of those articles being classifiable in
the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity complex. One article (25.00%) adhered to the Citizenship Training pole of the continuum, one (25.00%) adhered to the Historical Objectivity pole, and none were classified in the Neutral category.

The Association of American Colleges Bulletin published three articles dealing with history teaching. The Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy was represented in all three (100.00%) of these articles. One (33.33%) was in the Citizenship Training category, two (66.66%) were in the Historical Objectivity category, and none were in the Neutral category.

The Educational Forum presented nine articles concerning the teaching of history and eight (88.88%) were placed in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. One (11.11%) was found to adhere to the Citizenship Training theme, six (66.66%) adhered to the Historical Objectivity theme, and one (11.11%) was classified in the Neutral area.

The Harvard Educational Review had six articles dealing with historical pedagogy at the survey level. Three (50.00%) of those articles were classified in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. Two (33.33%) followed the Citizenship Training orientation, one (16.66%) followed the Historical Objectivity orientation, and none were placed in the Neutral realm.

Improving College and University Teaching printed seven articles dealing with history teaching and two (28.56%) of those articles were classified in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity complex. The Citizenship Training articles numbered one (14.28%), the Historical
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Total number of articles, 1939-1969</th>
<th>Citizenship Training</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Historical Objectivity</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Assoc. of Univ. Prof. Bulletin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>36.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of American Colleges Bulletin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Forum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>88.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving College and University Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>28.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>35.28</td>
<td>52.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical</td>
<td>Total number of articles, 1939-1969</td>
<td>Per Cent and Number of Articles</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Higher Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Citizenship Training</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley Historical Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Historical Objectivity</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Journal of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Review</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical</td>
<td>Total number of articles, 1939-1969</td>
<td>Citizenship Training</td>
<td>Historical Objectivity</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.43</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Bulletin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectivity articles numbered one (14.28%), and no articles were placed in the Neutral category.

The Journal of American History had one article on history instruction and it fell into the Citizenship Training – Historical Objectivity category. The single article (100.00%) adhered to the Historical Objectivity pole of the continuum.

The Journal of General Education had seventeen articles dealing with the teaching of history of which nine (52.92%) were found to be analyzable under the Citizenship Training – Historical Objectivity theme. Three (17.64%) were listed in the Citizenship Training category, six (35.28%) were listed in the Historical Objectivity category, and none were listed as Neutral.

The Journal of Higher Education had nine articles (69.21%) out of thirteen dealing with history instruction which were classified in the Citizenship Training – Historical Objectivity dichotomy. One article (7.69%) was coded under the Citizenship Training theme, seven (53.83%) were coded under the Historical Objectivity theme, and one (7.69%) was coded under the Neutral category.

Liberal Education offered six articles on the teaching of history, and four (66.66%) were deemed appropriate for the Citizenship Training – Historical Objectivity theme. None were applicable to the Citizenship Training theme, four (66.66%) were placed in the Historical Objectivity theme, and none were judged to be Neutral.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review issued twelve articles dealing with the teaching of history. Five (41.65%) of these articles were coded into the Citizenship Training – Historical Objectivity
dichotomy. Three articles (24.99%) were classified under Citizenship Training, two (16.66%) were classified under Historical Objectivity, and none were placed in the Neutral category.

The *Pacific Historical Review* presented four articles concerning history instruction, of which two (50.00%) were placed in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. None of the articles qualified under the Citizenship Training theme, two (50.00%) were judged to be in the Historical Objectivity area, and none were listed in the Neutral area.

The *Peabody Journal of Education* published nine articles which dealt with the teaching of history at the high school and college levels. Two (22.22%) of these articles were ranked in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. None of the articles was classified under the Citizenship Training category, one (11.11%) was classified under the Historical Objectivity category, and one (11.11%) was listed in the Neutral category.

The *Phi Delta Kappan* printed eleven articles on history teaching, with six (54.54%) being classified in the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. One article (9.09%) was ranked in the Citizenship Training area, five (45.45%) were ranked in the Historical Objectivity area, and none were listed in the Neutral category.

The *School Review* included seventeen articles on instruction in history, of which twelve (70.56%) were analyzable under the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. Four articles (23.52%) were placed in the Citizenship Training category, seven (41.16%) were placed in the Historical Objectivity category, and one (5.88%) was listed in the Neutral category.
School and Society published fifteen articles dealing with the teaching of history. Eight (53.28%) of those articles were classified under the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity theme. Four articles (26.64%) fit into the Citizenship Training category, three (19.98%) qualified under the Historical Objectivity category, and one (6.66%) was ranked as Neutral.

Social Education presented 153 articles concerning history teaching. Seventy-eight (51.02%) of those articles fit into the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. Thirty-five articles (22.89%) were classified under the Citizenship Training theme, forty-one (26.82%) were classified under the Historical Objectivity theme, and two (1.31%) were listed as Neutral.

Social Studies offered 108 articles on history instruction, and thirty-nine (36.08%) were deemed appropriate for the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. Twenty-one articles (19.43%) were coded under the Citizenship Training theme, sixteen (14.80%) were coded under the Historical Objectivity theme, and two (1.85%) were coded under the Neutral category.

The Teachers College Record printed seven articles dealing with history teaching. Four (57.12%) of these articles were classified under the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy. None were listed under the Citizenship Training theme, three (42.84%) were judged applicable to the Historical Objectivity theme, and one (14.28%) was placed in the Neutral category.
The Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method Theme, 1939-1969

The Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method Theme as it appeared in articles between 1939 and 1969 is shown in Table 2 (pp. 77-79).

The American Association of University Professors Bulletin contained eleven articles on teaching history of which seven (63.63%) were coded into the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. One article (9.09%) was in the Accumulation of Facts category, five (45.45%) were in the Historical Method category, and one (9.09%) was in the Neutral category.

The American Historical Review included four articles on history instruction, with three (75.00%) of those articles being classifiable in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method complex. None of the articles adhered to the Accumulation of Facts pole of the continuum, three (75.00%) adhered to the Historical Method pole, and none was classified in the Neutral category.

The Association of American Colleges Bulletin published three articles dealing with history teaching. The Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy was represented in two (66.66%) of the articles. One (33.33%) was in the Accumulation of Facts category, one (33.33%) was in the Historical Method category, and none were listed in the Neutral category.

The Educational Forum published nine articles concerning the teaching of history and seven (77.77%) were placed in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. One article (11.11%) was found to adhere to the Accumulation of Facts theme, six (66.66%) adhered to the Historical Method theme, and none were classified in the Neutral area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Total number of articles, 1939-1969</th>
<th>Per Cent and Number of Articles</th>
<th>Accumulation of Facts</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Historical Method</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Assoc. of Univ. Prof. Bulletin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>63.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of American Colleges Bulletin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Forum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>77.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>16.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving College and University Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42.84</td>
<td>57.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2 (continued)

ACCUMULATION OF FACTS - HISTORICAL METHOD

THEMES IN SELECTED PERIODICALS, 1939-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Total number of articles 1939-1969</th>
<th>Accumulation of Facts</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Historical Method</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64.68</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>76.44</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Higher Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30.76</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley Historical Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodical</td>
<td>Total number of articles 1939-1969</td>
<td>Per Cent and Number of Articles</td>
<td>Per Cent and Number of Articles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accumulation of Facts Neutral</td>
<td>Historical Method Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent No.</td>
<td>Per Cent No.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Journal of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11 1</td>
<td>55.55 5</td>
<td>66.66 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.09 1</td>
<td>63.63 7</td>
<td>72.72 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Review</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.64 3</td>
<td>58.80 10</td>
<td>82.32 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.64 4</td>
<td>13.32 2</td>
<td>39.96 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>17.00 26</td>
<td>52.32 80</td>
<td>75.21 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>19.43 21</td>
<td>49.96 54</td>
<td>72.17 78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Bulletin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.28 1</td>
<td>71.40 5</td>
<td>85.68 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Harvard Educational Review had six articles dealing with historical pedagogy at the survey level. One (16.66%) of these articles fell into the Accumulation of Facts – Historical Method category. The single article (16.66%) adhered to the Historical Method pole of the continuum.

Improving College and University Teaching printed seven articles dealing with history teaching and four (57.12%) were classified in the Accumulation of Facts – Historical Method complex. The Accumulation of Facts articles numbered one (14.28%), the Historical Method articles numbered three (42.84%), and no articles were placed in the Neutral category.

The Journal of American History, which printed one article dealing with history instruction, received no classification under the Accumulation of Facts – Historical Method dichotomy.

The Journal of General Education had seventeen articles dealing with the teaching of history of which thirteen (76.44%) were found to be analyzable under the Accumulation of Facts – Historical Method theme. Two articles (11.76%) were listed under the Accumulation of Facts category, eleven (64.68%) were listed under the Historical Method category, and none were listed as Neutral.

The Journal of Higher Education had nine (69.21%) out of thirteen articles dealing with history instruction classified in the Accumulation of Facts – Historical Method dichotomy. No articles were coded under the Accumulation of Facts theme, five (38.45%) were coded under the Historical Method theme, and four (30.76%) were coded under the Neutral theme.
Liberal Education offered six articles on the teaching of history, and four (66.66%) were deemed appropriate for the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method theme. None were applicable to the Accumulation of Facts theme, four (66.66%) were placed in the Historical Method theme, and none were judged to be Neutral.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review issued twelve articles dealing with the teaching of history. Five (41.65%) of these articles were coded into the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. Two articles (16.66%) were classified under the Accumulation of Facts theme, three (24.99%) were classified under Historical Method, and none were placed in the Neutral category.

The Pacific Historical Review presented four articles concerning history instruction, of which two (50.00%) were placed in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. None of the articles qualified under the Accumulation of Facts theme, two (50.00%) were judged to be in the Historical Method area, and none were listed in the Neutral area.

The Peabody Journal of Education published nine articles which dealt with the teaching of history at the high school and college levels. Six (66.66%) of those articles were ranked in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. None of the articles were classified under the Accumulation of Facts category, five (55.55%) were classified under the Historical Method theme, and one (11.11%) was listed in the Neutral category.

The Phi Delta Kappan printed eleven articles on history teaching, with eight (72.72%) being classified in the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. One article (9.09%) was ranked in the
Accumulation of Facts area, seven (63.63%) were ranked in the Historical Method area, and none were listed in the Neutral area.

The School Review included seventeen articles on instruction in history, of which fourteen (82.32%) were analyzable under the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. Three articles (17.64%) were placed in the Accumulation of Facts category, ten (58.80%) were placed in the Historical Method category, and one (5.88%) was classified as Neutral.

School and Society published fifteen articles dealing with the teaching of history. Six (39.96%) of those articles were classified under the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method theme. Four articles (26.64%) fit into the Accumulation of Facts category, two fit into the Historical Method category, and none were ranked as Neutral.

Social Education presented 153 articles concerning history teaching. One hundred and fifteen (75.21%) of those articles fit into the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. Twenty-six articles (17.00%) were classified under the Accumulation of Facts theme, eighty (52.32%) were classified under the Historical Method theme, and nine (5.89%) were listed in the Neutral area.

Social Studies offered 108 articles on history instruction, and seventy-eight (72.17%) were deemed appropriate for the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. Twenty-one articles (19.43%) were coded under the Accumulation of Facts theme, fifty-four (49.96%) were listed under the Historical Method theme, and three (2.78%) were coded under the Neutral category.

The Teachers College Record printed seven articles dealing with history teaching. Six (85.68%) of those articles were classified under
the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. One article (14.28%) was listed under the Accumulation of Facts theme, five (71.40%) were listed in the Historical Method category, and none were placed in the Neutral category.

The Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge Theme, 1939-1969

The Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge Theme as it appeared in articles between 1939 and 1969 is shown in Table 3 (pp. 84-86).

The American Association of University Professors Bulletin contained eleven articles on the topic of history instruction in American high schools and colleges. Five (45.45%) of these articles were placed in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Three articles (27.27%) fell into the Knowledge of the Discipline category, two (18.18%) were placed in the Self-Knowledge category, and none were ranked in the Neutral category.

The American Historical Review included four articles on history instruction, with all four (100.00%) being classifiable in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Two articles (50.00%) adhered to the Knowledge of the Discipline pole of the continuum, two (50.00%) adhered to the Self-Knowledge pole, and none were classified in the Neutral category.

The Association of American Colleges Bulletin published three articles dealing with history teaching. The Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy was represented in two (66.66%) of those articles. One (33.33%) was in the Knowledge of the Discipline category, one (33.33%) in the Self-Knowledge category, and none were in the Neutral category.
### TABLE 3

KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE - SELF-KNOWLEDGE

THEMES IN SELECTED PERIODICALS, 1939-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Assoc. of Univ. Prof. Bulletin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of American Colleges Bulletin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Forum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>77.77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving College and University Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29.40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41.16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Higher Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley Historical Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Journal of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55.55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3 (continued)

**KNOWLEDGE OF THE DISCIPLINE - SELF-KNOWLEDGE**

**THEMES IN SELECTED PERIODICALS, 1939-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>Total number of articles, 1939-1969</th>
<th>Knowledge of the Discipline</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Self-Knowledge</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.27 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27.27 3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Review</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.16 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23.52 4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.62 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.32 2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>43.82 67</td>
<td>3.92 6</td>
<td>22.89 35</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>47.17 51</td>
<td>2.78 3</td>
<td>21.28 23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Bulletin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-- 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.56 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Educational Forum presented nine articles concerning the teaching of history and seven (77.77%) were placed in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Two articles (22.22%) were found to adhere to the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, five (55.55%) adhered to the Self-Knowledge theme, and none were classified in the Neutral category.

The Harvard Educational Review had six articles dealing with historical pedagogy at the survey level. Two (33.33%) of those articles were classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Both articles (33.33%) adhered to the Self-Knowledge category.

Improving College and University Teaching printed seven articles dealing with history teaching and all (100.00%) of them were classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge complex. The Knowledge of the Discipline articles numbered one (14.28%), the Self-Knowledge articles numbered five (71.40%), and one article (14.28%) was placed in the Neutral category.

The Journal of American History had one article on history instruction and it did not qualify under the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy.

The Journal of General Education had seventeen articles dealing with the teaching of history of which twelve (70.56%) were found analyzable under the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge theme. Five articles (29.40%) were listed in the Knowledge of the Discipline category, seven (41.16%) were listed in the Self-Knowledge category, and none were listed in the Neutral category.
The Journal of Higher Education had ten (76.90%) articles out of thirteen dealing with history instruction which were classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. One article (7.79%) was coded under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, nine (69.21%) were coded under the Self-Knowledge theme, and none were coded under the Neutral category.

Liberal Education offered six articles on the teaching of history, and five (83.33%) were deemed appropriate for the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge theme. No articles were listed under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, three (50.00%) were placed in the Self-Knowledge category, and two (33.33%) were judged to be Neutral.

The Mississippi Valley Historical Review issued twelve articles dealing with the teaching of history. Four (33.33%) of these articles were coded into the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Two articles (16.66%) were classified under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, one (8.33%) was classified under the Self-Knowledge theme, and one (8.33%) was classified as Neutral.

The Pacific Historical Review presented four articles concerning history instruction. One (25.00%) was placed in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. It (25.00%) was coded under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme.

The Peabody Journal of Education published nine articles which dealt with the teaching of history. Five (55.55%) of those articles were ranked in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Two articles (22.22%) were classified under the Knowledge of the Discipline category, two (22.22%) were classified under the Self-Knowledge category,
and one (11.11%) was placed in the Neutral category.

The Phi Delta Kappan printed eleven articles on history teaching, with six (54.54%) being classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Three articles (27.27%) were ranked in the Knowledge of the Discipline category, three (27.27%) were ranked in the Self-Knowledge category, and none were listed as Neutral.

The School Review included seventeen articles on instruction in history, of which eleven (64.68%) were analyzable under the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Seven articles (41.16%) were placed in the Knowledge of the Discipline category, four (23.52%) were placed in the Self-Knowledge category, and none were ranked as Neutral.

School and Society published fifteen articles dealing with the teaching of history. Nine (59.94%) of those articles were classified in the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Seven articles (46.62%) were coded to the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, two (13.32%) were coded to the Self-Knowledge theme, and none were ranked as Neutral.

Social Education presented 153 articles concerning history teaching. One hundred and eight (70.63%) of those articles fit into the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Sixty-seven articles (43.82%) were classified under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, thirty-five (22.89%) were classified under the Self-Knowledge theme, and six (3.92%) were listed in the Neutral category.

Social Studies offered 108 articles on history instruction, and seventy-seven (71.23%) were deemed appropriate for the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy. Fifty-one articles (47.17%) were
coded under the Knowledge of the Discipline theme, twenty-three (21.28%) were coded under the Self-Knowledge theme, and three (2.78%) were coded as Neutral.

The Teachers College Record printed seven articles dealing with history teaching. Two (28.56%) of these articles were ranked under the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy, and both (28.56%) were ranked under the Self-Knowledge theme.

Summary of Thematic Distribution

Table 4 (p. 92) presents a summary of the thematic distribution obtained from the content analysis of 413 articles in nineteen journals. The statistics listed below are drawn from the total sample and are presented to clarify the range of responses in respect to the three polarized continuums developed for this study.

The Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy was listed as an objective in 199 articles. Seventy-nine articles (39.30%) favored the Citizenship Training theme, one hundred and twelve (55.72%) supported the Historical Objectivity theme, and ten (4.98%) were classified as Neutral.

The Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy was favored as an objective in 290 articles. Sixty-four articles (22.07%) verbalized the Accumulation of Facts theme, two hundred and seven (71.38%) supported the Historical Method theme, and nineteen (6.55%) were classified as Neutral.

The Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge dichotomy was coded to 277 articles. The Knowledge of the Discipline theme was pre-
sented in one hundred and fifty-five articles (55.96%), the Self-Knowledge theme appeared in one hundred and eight articles (38.99%), and fourteen articles (5.05%) were classified as Neutral.

**Distribution of Objectives**

The final statistics presented in this chapter are included in Table 5 (pp. 93-94) and Table 6 (p. 95). These tables are provided to depict the overall distribution of objective claims presented in the 413 articles analyzed. Table 5 presents a periodical-by-periodical breakdown of the statistics, while Table 6 summarizes the distribution of objectives for the entire sample of 413 articles.
### TABLE 4

**THE TOTAL DISTRIBUTION OF THEMES IN SELECTED PERIODICALS, 1939-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Articles Analyzed</th>
<th>Polarized Themes: Per Cent and Number of Articles Classified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citizenship Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>39.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>22.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>55.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

THE DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVES CLAIMED BY AUTHORS OF ARTICLES ON TEACHING SURVEY HISTORY COURSES IN AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1939-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>No. of Articles Analyzed</th>
<th>Number of Objectives Claimed Per Article*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Assoc. of Univ. Prof. Bulletin</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. of American Colleges Bulletin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Forum</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Educational Review</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving College and University Teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of American History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of General Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Higher Education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi Valley Historical Review</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Historical Review</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5 (continued)

THE DISTRIBUTION OF OBJECTIVES CLAIMED BY AUTHORS OF ARTICLES ON TEACHING SURVEY HISTORY COURSES IN AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES, 1939-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodical</th>
<th>No. of Articles Analyzed</th>
<th>Number of Objectives Claimed Per Article*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Journal of Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Review</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School and Society</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Education</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers College Bulletin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based upon the inclusive nature of the thematic categories developed for this study, no more than six objective alternatives are possible.
### TABLE 6

**The Total Distribution of Objectives Claimed in Articles Analyzed, 1939-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number and Per Cent of Objectives Claimed</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percentage)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following section of this study is designed to interpret the statistics assembled in Chapter III. The observations presented in the following pages are derived from three sources: (1) the statistical data provided in Tables 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 in the previous chapter, (2) the notes compiled by the analyst from the articles being studied during the process of content analysis, and (3) the speculative judgment of the analyst concerning the nature of history instruction at the survey level. In order to preserve the unity of the interpretative frame of reference within this chapter, a general discussion of the nature of the American social order between 1939 and 1969 will be postponed until the concluding chapter. At that time the author will also assess the general status of history teaching objectives and make specific recommendations in regard to this subject.

Based upon the broad distribution of objective claims depicted by the statistics in Chapter III, one must conclude that pluralism typifies the teaching aims of survey history courses in American high schools and colleges. Table 4 (p. 92) reveals the emphasis placed upon the themes of Historical Method (71.38%), Knowledge of the Discipline (55.96%), and Historical Objectivity (55.72%). It should also be noted that two of the remaining themes -- Citizenship Training (39.30%) and Self-Knowledge
were mentioned by nearly two-fifths of the authors responding within each dichotomy. Only the Accumulation of Facts theme (22.07%), which was acknowledged as an objective by sixty-four authors, seemed to be held in general disfavor by the writers sampled. The preponderance of the Historical Method theme over its polar objective is demonstrated by the fact that it equalled or surpassed the Accumulation of Facts theme in all periodicals examined except School and Society (see Table 2, pp. 77-79). The Historical Objectivity theme, although clearly not as overwhelmingly dominant as the Historical Method, equalled or surpassed the Citizenship Training theme in all journals except the Harvard Educational Review, the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, School and Society, and Social Studies (see Table 1, pp. 70-72). Finally, the Knowledge of the Discipline theme was barely able to maintain equality, let alone dominance, over its polar objective. In fact, seven periodicals — Educational Forum, the Harvard Educational Review, Improving College and University Teaching, the Journal of General Education, the Journal of Higher Education, Liberal Education, and the Teachers College Record — out of the nineteen analyzed favored the Self-Knowledge theme (see Table 3, pp. 84-86).

Despite these instances of dominant-subordinant ranking, it is clear that the 413 articles surveyed provided a total spectrum of purposes or aims in regard to history instruction. Table 7 illustrates the number of responses attributed to each of the six themes employed.
### TABLE 7
THE TOTAL NUMBER OF AUTHORS FAVORING EACH THEMATIC CATEGORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Theme</th>
<th>No. of Authors Selecting Each Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Method</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Discipline</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Objectivity</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Training</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of Facts</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting sidelight related to the distribution of objective claims is the fact that the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity dichotomy was mentioned as a thematic goal in only 201 cases. This figure, although representing 48.68% of the entire sample analyzed, is six less than the number of authors who selected the Historical Method theme alone as a goal, seventy-six less than the Knowledge of the Discipline - Self-Knowledge category, and eighty-nine less than the Accumulation of Facts - Historical Method dichotomy. One can only speculate about the reasons for this apparent deficiency. Perhaps the Citizenship Training - Historical Objectivity theme is viewed as educationally unimportant, or even as a very low priority teaching objective among history teachers; perhaps the authors analyzed considered the polarized issues of "patriotism" and "internationalism" was too controversial to consider; or perhaps the authors studied preferred to state procedural-methodological objectives.
(Historical Method, Knowledge of the Discipline, and Accumulation of Facts) rather than attitudinal goals (Citizenship Training, Historical Objectivity).

Another factor which reinforces the theme of pluralism in objectives is the tendency of the authors analyzed to list objectives which fall into more than one of the thematic dichotomies. Table 5 (pp. 93-94) illustrates this tendency in relation to each periodical grouping, while Table 6 (p. 95) provides statistics in relation to the entire sample. To support the idea of objective pluralism, two figures are particularly worth noting: 280 (67.70%) of the articles analyzed stated two or more classifiable objectives, and 121 articles (29.20%) claimed three or more classifiable objectives.

Due to the fact that so many of the periodicals analyzed contained fewer than ten articles dealing with the topic of teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges, there is little value in attempting to compare and contrast trends in editorial policy or objective distributions in specific journals. Nevertheless, one must note the numerical dominance of Social Education (153) and Social Studies (108) upon the total sample of 413 articles. Since it is not relevant to this study, no correlation figures were developed in Chapter III to compare the views of the authors in these two journals with those of the authors writing in the other seventeen periodicals analyzed. In respect to the weight of evidence provided by these two journals, however, Table 8 (p. 101) is provided to illustrate the varying degrees of continuity between (1) the objectives claimed by authors writing for Social Education and Social Studies, (2) the objectives claimed by the entire sample (N = 413) of
articles analyzed, and (3) the objectives claimed by authors in the 151 articles remaining in seventeen journals.

The final areas of statistical data which must be noted are those articles which listed no classifiable objectives and those articles which claimed contradictory purposes. As depicted in Table 6 (p. 95), thirty-five articles (8.50%) either provided no objective claims or stated purposes which were not classifiable within the realm of the thematic dichotomies developed for this study. The research technique of content analysis is for the most part responsible for this "null set" situation, since it demands a prescribed set of categories and denies the analyst the opportunity to speculate about "unstated assumptions", "unverbalized purposes", or other forms of latent content. Thus, thirty-five articles defied classification.

In cases where an author claimed contradictory objectives, the article was classified in the Neutral (N) category. One must be extremely critical of the practice of formulating over-zealous objective claims for the teaching of any subject. It is reassuring to note that, as shown in Table 4 (p. 92), only 43 responses (5.59%) were coded as Neutral. Nevertheless, it is a serious shortcoming for an author (or a politician) to offer "all things to all people". In terms of teaching survey history courses, this type of objective construction can only foster unrealistic expectations about educational results and will predictably fail to provide meaningful guidance in regard to potential methods which could be employed to attain the stated goals. It is somewhat alarming to note that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Dichotomies</th>
<th>No. and Per Cent of Responses from Social Education and Social Studies</th>
<th>No. and Per Cent of Responses from the Entire Sample (N = 413)</th>
<th>No. and Per Cent of Responses from the Total less Social Education and Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship Training</td>
<td>56 (47.87%)</td>
<td>79 (39.30%)</td>
<td>23 (28.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Objectivity</td>
<td>4 (3.42%)</td>
<td>10 (4.98%)</td>
<td>6 (7.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>117 (100.00%)</td>
<td>201 (100.00%)</td>
<td>84 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of Facts</td>
<td>47 (24.35%)</td>
<td>64 (22.07%)</td>
<td>17 (17.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12 (6.22%)</td>
<td>19 (6.55%)</td>
<td>7 (7.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Method</td>
<td>134 (69.43%)</td>
<td>207 (71.38%)</td>
<td>73 (75.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193 (100.00%)</td>
<td>290 (100.00%)</td>
<td>97 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Discipline</td>
<td>118 (63.78%)</td>
<td>155 (55.96%)</td>
<td>37 (40.22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>9 (4.87%)</td>
<td>14 (5.05%)</td>
<td>5 (5.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>58 (31.35%)</td>
<td>108 (38.99%)</td>
<td>50 (54.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185 (100.00%)</td>
<td>277 (100.00%)</td>
<td>92 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
such well-known and respected educators as Ray Allen Billington$^{1}$ and Richard E. Gross$^{2}$ have been guilty of formulating contradictory objective claims.

There are also a number of lingering questions which remain unanswered -- and probably unanswerable -- in the wake of this study. For instance, if Knowledge of the Discipline is such a highly valued objective (55.96%), why do so few discipline-oriented historical journals publish articles dealing with the nature and objectives of historical instruction? Among the historical periodicals analyzed (the American Historical Review, the Journal of American History, the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, and the Pacific Historical Review), only twenty-one articles dealing with the issue of survey history courses were published between 1939 and 1969. Other noted historical periodicals, namely the William and Mary Quarterly, the Journal of Southern History, and the Journal of Modern History, offer even fewer articles dealing with history teaching.

$^{1}$First Billington claims, "By familiarizing us with past instances of heroism and past examples of wise leadership, history ennobles us, and quickens our faith in our heritage." Only four pages later he declares, "Through the study of the past they [secondary school students] learn that human affairs can never be simple -- that there are no pat heroes and villains, no "bads" and "goods", no simple cause and effect relationships in human behavior...." Ray Allen Billington, "The Case for American History," in The Case for Basic Education: A Program of Aims for Public Schools, edited by James D. Koerner (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1959), pp. 29, 33.

$^{2}$Initially Gross contends that teachers, "as partisans for democracy..., are expected by society to be more than detached scholars." In a contradictory fashion he observes in the following sentence, "Remaining open-minded and objective, American history instructors must serve as a positive force in promoting social progress and in further extension of democracy." Richard E. Gross, "Current Affairs and American History," Social Education, XX (April 1956), p. 173.
Another issue which lies beyond the scope of this study is the relationship between objectives and methodology, or between theory and practice in survey history course instruction. Do the dominant objective values stated by the authors in the articles analyzed typify the goals and methods employed in the actual teaching of history in high school and college classrooms? That is, is "objectivity" encouraged in examining all historical material? Are historical problems actually submitted to rigorous examination in the classroom? Are students urged to adopt tentative, hypothetical, problematical attitudes toward historical evidence? Are numerous historical interpretations employed to explain the events of the past and to encourage students to discover contrasting points of causal emphasis? Particularly in regard to the marked dominance of the Historical Method theme over the Accumulation of Facts category, is method stressed over subject matter? Is classroom controversy prompted by noting the inconsistencies in historical actions or interpretations? Is the text-book fact-crammed or problem-loaded? Is the teacher concerned with depth of understanding or with coverage of material? These questions, along with dozens of others, require examination in the light of the objective claims noted in this study.

In conclusion, one must acknowledge the remarkable span of objectives established by the authors of the articles analyzed. If all of these objectives could be achieved in a survey history course (whether in high school or in college), the class would not only be the core of the curriculum -- it would undoubtedly be the curriculum. The term "pluralism" has been frequently employed in this chapter to describe the
findings of this study. Another term which might have been aptly applied is "confusion". The thematic dichotomies developed for the content analysis of the 413 articles studied were extremely valuable in sorting through and classifying the seemingly endless number of specific objective claims made in regard to skills, knowledges, attitudes, and values made by the authors analyzed. The following chapter, entitled "Conclusions and Recommendations", will demonstrate that a plethora of objectives is a sign of weakness in survey history courses. In fact, for purposes of achieving the general education goals attributed to survey history course offerings by historians and educators alike, the only objective that is genuinely applicable to introductory history teaching is the Self-Knowledge theme.
To the operation of thinking about and formulating objectives with the aid of contemporary knowledge, thought, and method, the social sciences also bring one conclusion of fundamental and inescapable significance which must preface the beginning of the operation: Every human being brought up in a society inevitably has in mind a frame of social knowledge, ideas, and ideals -- a more or less definite pattern of things deemed necessary, things deemed possible, and things deemed desirable; and to this frame or pattern, his thought and action will be more or less consciously referred. This frame may be large or small; it may embrace an immense store of knowledge or little knowledge; it may be well organized with respect to categories of social thought or confused and blurred in organization; and the ideal element in it may represent the highest or lowest aspirations of mankind. But frame there is in every human mind. This is known, if anything is known. If the fact be denied, if a large, clarified, and informed frame of purposes is rejected, is deliberately and ostentatiously put out at the front door of the mind, then small, provincial, local, class, group, or personal prejudices will come in at the rear door, occupy the background of the mind, and constitute the frame. This conclusion of contemporary social thought applies to those who formulate objectives and curricula for the schools, to teachers who expound them, and to the writers of treatises on the social sciences.\(^1\)

\[\ldots\text{instruction in social studies in the schools is conditioned by the spirit and letter of scholarship, by the realities and ideas of the society in which it is carried on, and by the nature and limitations of the teaching and learning process}\ldots\]\(^2\)

\[^1\text{Charles A. Beard, The Nature of the Social Sciences in Relation to the Objectives of Instruction (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934), pp. 181-182.}\]

\[^2\text{Charles A. Beard, A Charter for the Social Sciences (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. 2.}\]
Much of the structure for the final chapter of this study is based upon the preceding observations by Charles A. Beard concerning the nature of teaching objectives in the social sciences. In order to adhere to Beard's analytical approach to evaluating objectives, it must be acknowledged that before one can begin to critically evaluate the findings revealed in Chapters III and IV, one must (1) review the objectives traditionally assigned to history instruction in the United States and (2) outline the nature of American society between 1939 and 1969. The first section of this chapter, therefore, will be devoted to these descriptive tasks. After this is completed, the writer will attempt to justify the rejection of five of the objective themes studied — Citizenship Training, Accumulation of Facts, Knowledge of the Discipline, Historical Objectivity, and Historical Method — as impractical, unrealistic, or potentially harmful to the academic and personal growth of students. The final pages of the dissertation are reserved for a defense of the Self-Knowledge theme as the most appropriate educational objective for teaching introductory history classes in American high schools and colleges today.

**Historical Survey of Teaching Objectives for History**

There has never been a shortage of objectives for history instruction. In his 1932 Report to the Commission on the Social Studies, Henry L. Johnson traced the divergent goals of history teaching from the Jewish prophet Joshua, who employed historical tales "to inculcate fear of Jehovah",\(^2\) through various teachers including the Spanish humanist Juan

---

Luis Vives,⁴ French chemist Joseph Priestly,⁵ and Prussian ruler Frederick the Great.⁶ Johnson's essay concludes with the twentieth century educational dictates of contemporary special interest groups such as the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and the National Association of Manufacturers, who seek "...to turn history into propaganda for predetermined ideals of life and conduct."⁷ In the 1940 revision of his classic text The Teaching of History, Johnson argued, "In the teaching of history we were not lacking aims. Our trouble was that we had too many aims to steer any specific course with complete conviction."⁸ He illustrates his contention with research data developed by a team of graduate students in 1909-1910 concerning the objectives of history instruction. After surveying their list of more than two hundred different purposes gathered from educational and historical literature, Johnson categorized them as follows:

Among the aims most frequently mentioned were: discipline of the memory, the imagination, the judgment; the setting up of ideals of patriotism, of conduct, of social service;

⁴Ibid., p. 21. Vives observed, "Without History no one would know anything about his father or ancestors; no one could know his own rights or those of another or how to retain them; no one would know how his ancestors came to the country he inhabits...."

⁵Ibid., p. 63. Priestly commented that the study of history must be applied to "...forming the able statesman and intelligent citizens."

⁶Ibid., pp. 90-91. Frederick the Great contended that history should provide "...examples of heroism to inspire pupils. The teacher must strive to bring out the moral lesson."

⁷Ibid., pp. 119-121.

the illumination of other studies, especially geography and literature; and the establishment of intimate relations with current events. Below these in frequency of mention, but often strongly emphasized, were: training in historical evidence; training to develop habits of accuracy in dealing with facts, skill in putting facts together, and insight into causal relations; training in the use of books; and the cultivation of a discriminating taste for historical reading. Often enough to carry weight, it was urged that school instruction in history should aim at the expansion of the vocabulary of pupils and at correctness and facility in oral and written expression, and should furnish appealing substance for debating societies and for school compositions. Within or beyond all other aims, we should, it appeared, seek to enrich the humanity of the pupil, enlarge his vision, incline him to charitable views of his neighbors, give him a love for truth, and, in general, make him a better citizen of the United States by making him a citizen of the ages.9

"All of these aims and all of the other aims suggested in the literature were conclusively and eminently desirable," concluded Johnson. He continued, however, to warn —

All of them could not doubt to some extent be promoted by history. But so many of them could be equally, or even more effectively, promoted by other subjects that their force was weakened and, in the absence of specific controlling aims, history could be pronounced an essentially aimless subject.10

Henry L. Johnson's conclusions about the divergent nature of history teaching objectives were generally reinforced by research during the first four decades of the twentieth century. Earl Miller, for example, after analyzing the objectives for history teaching stated in textbooks, committee reports, association proceedings, and articles in professional journals between 1888 and 1927, reported finding more than 1,400 different aims articulated. He did note, however, that there were ten general ob-

9 Ibid., p. 108.
10 Ibid.
jectives which were frequently found in all the areas surveyed. These objectives were:

1. To discipline the mind
2. To promote social efficiency
3. To explain the present in light of the past
4. To understand the development concept in history
5. To give ethical training
6. To give training in simple historical research
7. To inculcate ideas of patriotism
8. To train for citizenship
9. To give cultural training
10. To promote tolerance.  

In his 1937 study entitled *Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies*, Ernest Horn reported that three years earlier W. G. Kimmel had discovered a single social studies course which listed 135 different objectives, 85 in the introduction to one unit alone. Kimmel's research findings also noted that 47 mimeographed pages of objectives were provided for one junior high school course of study. Jonathan C. McLendon, in a pamphlet entitled *Teaching the Social Studies* (1960), summarized the twentieth century trends in developing objectives by writing,

Research has revealed several clear but not always favorable characteristics of objectives in social studies: (a) an excessive number of objectives stated; (b) marked uniformity among various localities, grades, and subjects; (c) frequently nebulous statements; (d) a time lag in reflecting social trends; (e) increasing emphasis on social

---


(as distinguished from individual) values; (f) apparent lack of rating according to importance; and (g) little evidence of application of research that has attempted to formulate more specific statements of objectives (for example, by answering the question, "What is a good citizen?" through detailed analysis of adult activities). Although agreeing with most of McLendon's conclusions, Lawrence Metcalf does note two unresolved problems in his analysis of objectives. First, Metcalf maintains that more attention must be given to the tendency of teachers to list inconsistent or contradictory objectives. Second, Metcalf contends that McLendon apparently fails to comprehend the distinct difference between "good citizenship" as a behavioral, quantitative factor and as a valuational, qualitative goal.

Finally, one is awed by the number of formal commissions which have codified endless lists of objectives without examining their relationship to the ongoing educational task of history instruction. The Committee of Seven, the Commission of 1916, and the 1956 Commission of the National Council for the Social Studies, to mention only three, provide clear examples of commissions which have attempted to establish educational goals without grounding their prescriptions on clearly defined social, psychological, factual, or ethical bases. In fact, of the major committees which have undertaken the responsibility of examining the nature and meaning of history teaching in American society, only the Commission on the Social Studies, which published its findings in the area of objectives in

---


1934, attempted to establish an intellectual foundation or rationale for its conclusions and recommendations. As Charles Beard noted in the section of that Report entitled "The Intellectual Problem of Determining Objectives", each teacher must ask himself, "What is a set of objectives?"

Responding to his own question, Beard observed,

> It is a scheme of purposes or ends to be attained by instruction. These purposes are individual and social, of necessity. They are individual because all instruction, even when carried on in the form of mass education, is directed to individuals, and the immediate results, whatever they may be, are to be found in the mind, spirit, and conduct of individuals. These purposes are also social, for the individual must live his life in society and certain social arrangements are indispensable to individual life....

Unlike the members of other commissions, Beard and his colleagues recognized the distinction between affective and cognitive goals of history instruction. Although he does frame several objectives under the headings of "Attitudes", "Allegiances", and "Esthetic Appreciations", Beard cannot be accused of indiscriminately mixing moral dicta with social science directives.

In formulating teaching objectives, an individual must acknowledge various segments of the educational process. These elements may be classified in four general categories: (1) normative conceptions of the social world, (2) empirical conceptions of the social world, (3) the nature of

---


historical knowledge, and (4) the nature of thinking. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to assess each of these elements in the 413 articles which were subjected to content analysis, it is nonetheless imperative to note that the objectives stated by the authors analyzed were based, either explicitly or implicitly, upon assumptions in each of these four areas. Based upon the broad spectrum of objective claims forwarded in the articles studied, one might initially be tempted to praise the various authors for their creativity, diversity, variety, and general eclecticism in formulating instructional aims. However, more critical scrutiny reveals that overstated objectives tend to suffer from vagueness, irrelevancy, inconsistency, and lack of coherence. And considering the variety of course materials, teaching strategies, and evaluational techniques which are inevitably linked to the formulation of objectives, one must agree with the educator who wrote, "The trouble with many of our eclectics is that they have not included consistency as one of their philosophical criteria. A careful reading of their stated purposes leaves one with the feeling that they are not really for anything at all, since their lists of impeccable purposes are shot through with contradictory and incompatible destinations."
American Society and Its Educational Institutions, 1939-1969

One can readily note from the previous pages that the traditional approach to producing history objectives for history instruction has come under severe criticism during the past decade. This tendency, it seems, strengthens Beard's contention that teaching objectives must be clearly formulated. The following pages will briefly survey "...the realities and ideas of American society" during the past three decades. As Beard clearly understood, both the society and its educational institutions play key roles in determining the nature, meaning, and goals of history teaching.

International war and revolution coupled with domestic tension and unrest have typified the American social and political experience during the three decades following the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe. Although some Americans forecast the dawn of a new era of international peace, prosperity, and domestic tranquility after the Axis powers were defeated in 1945, the ruins of the European balance of power and the apprehensions of the Atomic Age clouded such bright visions. Instead of finding lasting peace after the Allied victory, the American people discovered only international turmoil during the next quarter of a century. The major sources of friction included: a tension-filled "Cold War" between the United States and the Soviet Union; the dilemma of a divided Germany; the Korean War; the apparently insoluble conflict between the Arabs and Israelis in the Middle East; the rise of the Third World of underdeveloped countries; the hemispheric problems of Cuba and Santo
Domingo; and the prolonged military involvement in Southeast Asia. And as if an unstable international situation were not enough to cope with, domestic problems also emerged, sometimes with violent overtones and results, to challenge American society. Economic concentration, technological development, automation, unemployment, union and management disputes over wage-price scales, and the twin threats of inflation and recession were the major dilemmas which complicated the American economic scene during the past thirty years. Politically, the reactionary extremes of McCarthyism, Birchism, and the Radical Right faced the revolutionary challenge posed by anarchists, communists, and the "New Left". Toward the center of the political spectrum, the New Deal liberalism of the Democratic Party was becalmed in the 1950's by the Eisenhower ascendency; however, it was revived and rejuvenated under the banners of the "New Frontier" and the "Great Society" during the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. The central social problem of the past three decades, highlighted perhaps by the Supreme Court's 1954 decision condemning the practice of "separate, but equal" schooling for blacks, was the attempted integration of minorities, including Negroes as well as Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Indians and others, into the American social order. Other significant social problems emerged from a variety of issues frequently related to the material success of the American economy; these

problems included: unchecked population growth, particularly in urban
areas; popular demands for increased horizontal and vertical mobility;
the necessity of checking pollution of air and water resources; public
demands for better urban housing, transportation facilities, and police
protection; and the desire to maintain social security, to provide medical
aid to the elderly, and to end poverty in America. These are only a few
examples of the complex, inter-related, anxiety-producing situations which
faced the American public during the past thirty years.23

It is obvious that the educational institutions in the United
States had to respond to the effects of the tremendous changes and
challenges brought about during the mid-twentieth century. No segment of
education -- elementary, secondary, or college -- was immune from what
Stanley Ballinger has aptly described as "...the pervasive clash of values
[which] manifested itself in almost every phase of American public life
today." He continues to define the problem by observing,

By this is meant the deep-seated cleavages among
Americans on such vital matters as religion and public
education, sex morals and sex education, equality of
opportunity for individuals of all groups, censorship
and freedom of inquiry, loyalty and national security,
America's role in world affairs, and the basic character
and direction of public education itself. These and
other deep-seated differences manifest themselves daily
across the nation, sometimes inconspicuous to the casual
eye, sometimes erupting with great violence, revealing
the chasms of different perspective and value that
divide a given community.

This pluralistic culture of our multigroup society is
the stuff from which our children must fashion their

23Gunnar Myrdal, An American Dilemma: The Negro Problem in
America (2 Vols.; New York: Harper and Row, 1944); Daniel Bell, The End
of Ideology (New York: Collier Books, 1960); Maurice Boyd and Donald
Worcester, eds., Contemporary America: Issues and Problems (Boston:
Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1968).
lives, their sense of values, their life-goals, their notions of morality, their personal integrity, their sense of personal identity. How does the school... mediate between the growing child and this kind of fragmented, changing culture?  

To Ballinger and many other concerned educators, it seems that the problems confronting the schools are part of a much larger, and even more dangerous, social dilemma. During the 1939-1969 period a great deal of evidence was presented by social science scholars and other students of American life that American society was confronted by a cultural crisis of increasing dimensions.  

John Lunstrum has classified some of the most frequently cited symptoms noted by these social analysts; they include:

1. confusion and contradiction in values
2. decline in communication
3. personal disorganization
4. discontent of the intellectuals
5. an irrationality expressed in the cultivation of myths, absolutes, and a "two-valued" semantic orientation based upon simple "good" and "bad" distinctions.

If these findings are accurate, then the task of contemporary educational institutions in American society becomes obvious: to clarify values and


increase personal skills, knowledge, and understanding of society through the critical examination of persistent social problems.

The history of American education during the past three decades, however, reveals only a halting response to the increasing demands of the changing social order. Educational historian Lawrence A. Cremin has noted that the dawn of the fourth decade of the twentieth century marked the eclipse of the Progressive Education Movement in the United States. In fact, even before the outbreak of World War II, John Dewey and Boyd Bode had published rigorous critiques of the extremism and irrelevancies that had diverted the liberal goals of Progressive thought. As Frank G. Jennings noted in his article "It Didn't Start With Sputnik," critics who have asserted that the American educational system was only jarred from a century of mindless slumber by the Russian space achieve in 1957 were wrong. Historically, the entire structure of the American educational establishment had been under fire for almost two decades prior to the


launching of Sputnik. Nevertheless, a series of fortuitous circumstances did contribute to the educational renaissance (if not "revolution") of the 1960's. These circumstances included: the emotional response of the American public to the Soviet Sputnik in particular and to Russian technological advancement in general; the availability of Federal funds to schools and colleges during the Kennedy and Johnson years; the increased educational activities of private philanthropic foundations (Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller); and the rise of an entire spectrum of educational commentators and innovators, ranging from Harvard psychologist Jerome Bruner, to Carnegie-Mellon historian Edwin Fenton, to romantic educational critics Paul Goodman and Edgar Friedenberg.

Regardless of the financial or intellectual sources, however, the educational ferment of the 1960's was felt throughout the entire academic

---


community. Public school teachers, unwilling to fulfill passive roles as "meek public servants", employed union-type pressure through the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers to bargain for higher salaries, reduced teaching loads, and public recognition of their professional status in the academic world. Students also took a much more active part in the educational scene, but for divergent reasons. Black youths sought to foster racial pride and to secure cultural identity through the institution of "black history courses" in high schools and colleges. Meanwhile, white hippies "dropped out"; middle class youths got "up tight" about drugs, the draft, and the unyielding educational bureaucracy; and a small number of extremist students joined their "soul brothers" to violently protest "exploitation", "imperialism", and "The Establishment". American parents, recoiling in horror at the so-called "generation gap" over the issues of sexual freedom, marijuana, and student uprisings and protests, denounced individuals such as pacifist Benjamin


Spock for leading their children from the cradle to "The Revolution". The dilemmas confronting education at the college level were complicated by a penumbra of issues ranging from "Free Speech", "open housing" for blacks, draft counseling and resistance clinics for war protestors, ROTC recruitment and military training on campus, love-ins, sit-ins and rock festivals, administrative paternalism, and protests over American military involvement in Southeast Asia. No level of the educational ladder escaped notice. The Black Panther Party even served "liberty breakfasts" to black kindergarteners while preaching the political dogma of "All power to the people". And last, but certainly far from least in importance, the Federal government seemed unable to bring about the rule of integration in Southern public schools. Acknowledging the seriousness of the social situation, scholars such as Jacques Barzun, Henry Steele Commager, Charles Frankel, and George F. Kennan advanced theories concerning the potential breakdown of the democratic social order in the United States if educational institutions failed to reassert their roles of rationality and responsibility.

It is against this background of social and educational ferment that the objectives stated by the authors analyzed in this study must be evaluated. In regard to the task of history teaching in contemporary society, one educator has observed,

Before World War II, the historian -- and even the layman was able to explain particular events by locating

---

them in a progressive developmental pattern of grand
design. American history was interpreted as national
history with epic national themes: Constitutional
development, frontier expansion, sectionalism, the
growth of national unity and industrialism. According
according to Bernard Weisberger, these large national themes "are
no longer master topics which control the choice of
subjects for study. Our own generation is more con­
cerned with problems of the present, arising out of urban­
isms, concentration in industry, mass communications, our
emergence as a world power." 40

These words only echo the thoughts of British historian Geoffrey
Barraclough, who recently wrote, "The rising generation will inevitably
look back over the twentieth century with different priorities from
ours...The study of contemporary history [therefore] requires new per­
spectives and a new set of values." 41

The Evaluation of the Thematic Objectives

Based upon the statistics presented in Chapter III and the
interpretations provided in Chapter IV, it seems clear that the authors
of the articles analyzed in this study favored a variety of history
teaching objectives. Depending upon the exact method which one selects
to determine the value hierarchy within the sample of objective themes,
the purposes favored may be arranged in the following orders:

1. Historical Method (207) 42
1. Historical Method (71.36%) 43

40Stanley Seaberg, "American History: Comparative and Cosmo­
Also see Bernard A. Weisberger, "United States History," in High School
Social Studies Perspectives, edited by Erling M. Hunt (Boston: Houghton

41Geoffrey Barraclough, An Introduction to Contemporary History

42See Table 7, p. 98.

43See Table 4, p. 92.
2. Knowledge of the Discipline (155)  
3. Historical Objectivity (112)  
4. Self-Knowledge (108)  
5. Citizenship Training (79)  
6. Accumulation of Facts (64)

The high degree of correlation between these two methods of ranking is indicative of the substantial agreement among the authors analyzed concerning the hierarchy of purposes in teaching introductory history courses.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to presenting the writer's recommendation that the hierarchy of objective themes be arranged in the following order:

1. Self-Knowledge  
2. Historical Method  
3. Historical Objectivity  
4. Knowledge of the Discipline  
5. Accumulation of Facts  
6. Citizenship Training

Although it cannot be denied that each of the six thematic categories contains at least one beneficial aspect, the goal of the following pages is to justify the Self-Knowledge theme as the most appropriate objective for teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges. In this process, the five other themes will be critically evaluated and the reasons for rejecting each of them will be explained in detail. Finally,
the justifications for adopting the Self-Knowledge theme will be examined and defended.

Reasons for Rejecting the Citizenship Training Theme

The objective of achieving citizenship training through the study of history, although admittedly popular among large numbers of American teachers, legislators, and parents, is unacceptable for several reasons. Such an educational goal is: (1) anti-democratic, (2) socially and culturally unachievable in a genuinely pluralistic society, (3) anti-historical, (4) anti-individualistic, (5) conducive to the alienation of minority groups as well as minority opinion, (6) unimaginative and repetitious as a guide to educational practice, and (7) demeaning to the notion of free, rational inquiry.

The most frequently advanced defense of the citizenship training goal is usually phrased in the form of a self-answering, rhetorical question -- "Where will our children learn to be good American citizens if not in their history classes?" This type of rationale for "teaching patriotism" through history is clearly challenged by recent research findings in the field of political socialization. After more than a decade of intensive examination, testing, follow-up studies and comparative analyses, every major study in the area of political awareness has revealed that social norms and political values which students hold are not the products of their classroom experiences. Instead, these norms and values are the result of random socialization through contacts with parents, relatives,

---

44 Edgar Bruce Wesley, "Let's Abolish History Courses," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (September 1967), pp. 3-8.
peers, primary authority figures (i.e., ministers, Boy Scout leaders, etc.), and the mass media of communication. The bases for these accumulated normative structures are generally found in a combination of common sense, bias, sentiment, convention, prejudice, and ignorance. Roberta Sigel has been one of the most outspoken opponents of the contention that formal civic education must be responsible for shaping a student's social perspective and values. She labels this point of view "naive and narrow" and goes on to observe that such a stand

...ignores what we know about the way in which people go about learning society's norms. For instance, it ignores the fact that much of this norm internalization goes on casually and imperceptibly — most of the time in fact without our ever being aware that it is going on. It proceeds so smoothly precisely because we are unaware of it.46

In addition to the informal socialization forces outlined above, it cannot be overlooked that various special interest groups in the United States — the National Association of Manufacturers, the John Birch Society, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the American Legion, and even the Pentagon — spend millions of dollars annually to "sell" their particular citizenship attitudes and values to American youngsters.47 In such instances students, as potential citizens, are bombarded by opinions which are uncritically and universally deemed to be "American", "democratic", "free", "good", and "right". If we are to assume, therefore, that a good citizen in American society is an individual who blindly accepts the dictates of any authority, whether it is a special interest group, a local political leader, or a Vice President of the United States, then it is of very little importance what high school and college history teachers emphasize in the process of retelling the nation's history. Any myths, legends, and fables will suffice under the general rubric of citizenship training, since it has been demonstrated through research that genuine political socialization is for the most part achieved outside of the classroom.


In addition to the surveys conducted to ascertain the sources of political values, other studies have been initiated to measure the commitment of American adolescents to the democratic rights and processes outlined and guaranteed in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The findings of one study described by H. H. Remmers revealed that the freedoms of speech and press upheld in the Bill of Rights received only partial support among high school students.48

After polling a large segment of students and adults in regard to their attitudes toward specific issues relating to Constitutionally guaranteed rights, James W. Prothro and Charles M. Grigg reported a continuous tendency among all ages questioned toward disagreement with the fundamental principles of American democracy.49 The inference that must be drawn from these studies is that random socialization, although undeniably effective, is of dubious value in regard to creating genuinely "democratic" value structures. Alexander Rippa has counseled that

...it seems unwise to consider the goal of building emotionally-toned attitudes toward America and its ideals as the major objective in a school program of civic education. Many other forces are at work in American culture to help develop such attitudes....

The school can make a distinctive contribution toward effective citizenship by cultivating in the students habits of inquiry, analysis, and judgment in place of bias, sentiment, or convention....50

---


This notion of "contributing toward effective citizenship" differs sharply from the Citizenship Training theme described in Chapter II. Using the classroom as a center for propaganda and indoctrination is a patently anti-democratic endeavor. When teachers attempt to inculcate right answers, right attitudes, and right beliefs through a process which combines suppression, omission, distortion, manipulation, prescription, and persuasion, they are not being "patriotic" — they are being totalitarian.\(^5\)

As one critic of citizenship indoctrination has observed,

> The impulse to seek desirable social or patriotic ends by compulsion is a natural one, but it should be resisted. When followed the effort is usually futile and the results often disastrous. We are familiar with the debasement of education in totalitarian countries through regimentation.\(^5\)

In addition to being anti-democratic, the goal of Citizenship Training is obviously impossible to realize in a dynamic, pluralistic, multigroup social order. Any school in the United States which attempts to transmit the cultural heritage of American society in an uncritical fashion inevitably finds itself in a paradoxical position. There is no single heritage in the United States; there are many heritages. "The competing traditions that to some extent have always characterized our history and culture have had their conflicts accentuated by an accelerated rate of change during the past century," note Maurice Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf. "Uncritical transmission of all of them," they continue, "can do


little but compound confusion and intensify conflict."53 James P. Shaver reinforces this argument by observing, "To see questions of public policy as having absolute right versus wrong answers vis-a-vis general American values is to ignore the fundamental operational basis of our democratic, pluralistic society."54 Shaver's viewpoint, which is founded upon the interrelationship of various specific value commitments held by individuals rather than the broader implications of a total cultural heritage, leads him to conclude that socio-political conflict is evitable -- and beneficial -- in a genuinely democratic social order.55 To Hunt and Metcalf, however, the recognition of value conflict is an integral aspect of achieving instructional goals since they consider the chief role of education in a democracy to be "...the intelligent or critical transmission of cultural heritages, during the course of which disagreements among individuals and incompatibilities in personal outlook are exposed and creatively resolved."56

The Citizenship Training theme is anti-historical since it must invariably distort knowledge, facts and ideas in order to arrive at predetermined solutions and values. One author has labelled the association of the study of history and citizenship building as a "fallacy" based upon the unfounded assumptions that


55 Ibid.

56 Hunt and Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies, p. 35.
...a civilization may be understood, appreciated, and propagated by means of the study of its history, that cultural values are implicit in history and are therefore susceptible of being taught via the vehicle of history, and finally, that functional participation in a culture is readily achieved through the study of its history.57

Another author, pointing directly to the inconsistency of pursuing Citizenship Training through history instruction, has declared,

...[i]f we are to use history as a means of building allegiance to our cultural value system and simultaneously to employ it to teach critical judgment and to enable our children to deal objectively with contemporary problems, we face a [logical] difficulty which must be reconciled.58

The Citizenship Training objective is both anti-individualistic and conducive to furthering the cultural alienation of minorities within the American social order. These two criticisms are indelibly linked. As Jerome Bruner has noted, "Our era has...witnessed the rise of ideologies that subordinate the individual to the defined aims of society, a form of subordination that is without compassion for idiosyncrasy and respects only the instrumental contribution of a man to the progress of the society."59 This type of subordination is nowhere more dangerous or ruthless than in an educational institution. The Citizenship Training theme denies individual freedom most frequently through the process of omission. That is, alternative forms of behavior, ideology, thought, attitude, and


value are simply not mentioned in the classroom. All educational time is devoted to authoritarian prescription of "the American way of life". Philosophically and psychologically, this denial of freedom is absolute; as one political scientist has commented, "To act...according to the truth, or to the good, or to the right morality, or to the will of God, may afford great comfort or pleasure, but only if the person committing the required action does so as a result of a choice freely made can he be said also to be free." And as students become passive receptacles into which a standard body of Truth is poured, the entire educational process becomes a mockery of "academic freedom" for the teacher and the learner.

The alienation of individuals invariably precedes the alienations of minorities. The painfully logical questions posed by a black child after completing a year of 8th grade American history might provide a key to perceiving the nature of subculture alienation in education. "Do the Indians always lose?" "Are all Mexicans as evil as those we studied at the Alamo?" "Were there any Negroes who weren't slaves before the Civil War?" "Were there any famous black leaders before Martin Luther King?" "What was it like to be poor during George Washington's time?" These questions point to what some critics have labelled the "null curriculum" in history instruction. That is, topics which are never discussed or even considered under the traditional Citizenship Training theme. Is it

---
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any wonder that black youths clammer for a racially biased history of their own; after all, why should they continue to be plagued by WASP history, under the guise of Citizenship Training?

Finally, the Citizenship Training goal is rejected because it is boring, repetitious, and an insult to the notion of free, rational inquiry. The idea of critical inquiry does not dismiss the necessity of social cohesion through the informal process of socialization. It rests, rather, upon the idea expressed by Alfred North Whitehead in Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect:

The art of a free society consists first in the maintenance of the symbolic code; and secondly in the fearlessness of revision, to secure that the code serve those purposes which satisfy an enlightened reason. Those societies which cannot combine reverence to their symbols with freedom of revision, must ultimately decay either from anarchy, or from the slow atrophy of a life stifled by useless shadows.63

One is more than tempted to conclude that the Platonic imagery of "useless shadows" in Whitehead's description is a key to the philosophic commitment to the "examined life" on the part of the British thinker. In less graphic terms, political philosopher Sidney Hook has specifically defined his conception of the role of the schools in regard to fostering democratic ideals and cultural traditions. "The initial loyalty to democracy," says Hook,

like the initial loyalty to anything else, arises from social atmosphere and practice. Rational loyalty results from a critical consideration of the claims, achievements, and shortcomings of democracy compared to those of its rivals. The practice of democracy comes first in order of time; the justification of democracy

comes first in order of logic. By training its students to think critically, a democracy gives them the power and the right to evaluate democracy, confident that its claims will withstand the analysis — that initial loyalties will become transformed into rational loyalties. No other form of society dares to chance this.  

Charles Frankel has declared that American educators should view the presentation of alternative value structures as an intellectual rather than civic duty. In that way, historical topics such as Henry David Thoreau's concept of "civil disobedience" can be viewed both historically (i.e., as one man's response to what he considered the inhumanity and injustice of the Mexican War) and contemporarily (i.e., as a group technique of protesting segregated dining facilities) as legitimate topics of social concern and relevance, without the onus of labelling the practice of civil disobedience as either "patriotic" or "traitorous". In terms of democratic educational practices and the concern with rational inquiry into the consequences of alternative actions, the specific question of civil disobedience becomes only one aspect of the greater issue of political obligation. Here the goals of the Citizenship Training theme once again emerge as anti-democratic, anti-historical, anti-individualistic, and anti-rational. As James L. Barth observes,

> If in the public schools the question of political obligation is not entertained, if the assumption of absolute obedience to the state is made, then the public schools become an agency of the state for indoctrinating pupils in the belief of unquestioning

---


acceptance of all governmental actions. If this state of affairs exists, then John Stuart Mill's apprehension would be realized. Mill holds that: "A general state education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mold in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in government...in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body."66

Reasons for Rejecting the Accumulation of Facts Theme

The Accumulation of Facts theme is untenable as a purpose for teaching survey history courses. The chief reasons for rejecting this theme are: (1) it fails to acknowledge the imprecise definition and selective nature of "facts" employed by historians and teachers of history; (2) it ignores the intimate relationship between the nature of knowledge and the nature of the knower by rejecting contemporary research findings in the realm of learning theory; (3) it champions retention of irrelevant data on the questionable assumption that it might become relevant at some unspecified future date; and (4) it omits reference to the development of causal relationships between facts and to the methods of structuring facts through problem-solving experiences.

Since history courses so often consist of monotonous, factual lectures they have frequently been described by critics as "...the university's most perfect type of fact-loaded, idea-absent, academic

Rationalizations for supporting the Accumulation of Facts theme as an objective generally fall into two categories: first, some history instructors argue that a student's mind must be filled with facts before any kind of thought can occur; second, other history teachers contend that in order to cover all of the material in a survey history course they must lecture in a rapidly-paced, factual manner. The fallacies underlying these two justifications seem too obvious to expose. The notion that there exists a definable series of factual "nuggets of knowledge" in history has been challenged by many educators, historians, and historiographers. E. H. Carr, for example, has written,

> It used to be said that the facts speak for themselves. This, of course, is untrue. The facts speak only when the historian calls on them: it is he who decides which facts to give the floor, and in what order and context....The historian is necessarily selective. The belief in a hard core of historical facts existing objectively and independently of interpretation of the historian is a preposterous fallacy, but one which is hard to eradicate.

Thus, any attempt to teach history as content (or "facts") is bound to be just as confusing, frustrating, futile, and illogical to American students as attempting to teach them the World Almanac, Webster's dictionary, or the Encyclopedia Americana. The content of history should be utilized by both the teacher and the student in regard to the educational purposes

---


desired; it should not be studied, learned, or memorized as an end in itself.\(^6\)

The statements presented in the previous paragraph are not intended to infer that facts are totally unnecessary to historical study. On the contrary, what is asserted is that the dynamic relationship between the historian and his facts -- what Carr has called "...the unending dialogue between the past and the present"\(^7\) -- must be openly acknowledged in the classroom if students are to understand the true nature of historical investigation. History teachers must be ready to acknowledge that

...a civilized man is one who knows the difference between raw data and knowledge, and who enjoys transforming the former into the latter. The need for accurate and complete data is not debatable, but the invention of printing solved the problem of making information available to those who know where to look for it. Some bits of data will lodge in the mind, inevitably, but it is irrational to make the accumulation of undigested information the main business of schools. The outcome of this emphasis is the accumulation of a teacher's repertory of tags, such as "Erasmus - humanist", and "Bruno - astronomer - burned for heresy", which camouflage the absence of either information or understanding and give the student only the illusion of learning.\(^71\)

The nature of contemporary civilization dictates an end to the practice of defining education as the mere transmission of a predetermined body of facts. The revolutionary speed of social, political, and economic change,


along with the recent discoveries of sociologists, psychologists, and learning theorists demand that emphasis in all educational endeavors be placed upon the capacity to learn and to inquire. As Shirley Engle has concluded,

The ground-covering fetish is based on the false notion that remembering is all there is to knowing or the equally false notion that one must be well drilled in the facts before he can begin to think. M. I. Finley, noted British historian, says about ground covering that "a mere telling of individual events in sequence, no matter how accurately done, is just that and nothing else. Such knowledge is meaningless, its mere accumulation a waste of time. Instead, knowledge must lead to understanding. In the field of history this means trying to grasp general ideas about human events. The problem is to move from particular events to the universal; from concrete events to the underlying patterns and generalities."

A concluding comment must be added in regard to recent findings in the area of learning theory. The Accumulation of Facts theme totally ignores the issue of student values, which are a key to instructional motivation, the nature of knowledge, which is constructed internally rather than absorbed externally, and the critical role of the educational experience as an evaluation of numerous factual constructions, which may be labelled "interpretations", "ideologies", "ways of life", "philosophies", etc. Although the notions of cognitive theories of Gestalt-field psychology may be historically traced to the thinking of William James
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and John Dewey, several contemporary educators and psychologists have articulated — and documented through research — positions in regard to teaching and learning which directly contradict the assumptions of the Accumulation of Facts theme. The following statements are provided as examples of contemporary objections to the view that education must be synonymous with memorization.

...a theory of instruction seeks to take account of the fact that a curriculum reflects not only the nature of knowledge itself but also the nature of the knower and of the knowledge-getting process... To instruct someone in a discipline is not a matter of getting him to commit the results to mind. Rather, it is to teach him to participate in the process which makes possible the establishment of knowledge. We teach a subject not to produce little living libraries on that subject, but rather to get a student to think...for himself, to consider matters as an historian does, to take part in the process of knowledge-getting. Knowing is a process, not a product.77

To believe that the acquisition of facts precedes thinking is a perversion because it completely mis-
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takes the relationship between facts and thought. One does not collect facts he does not need, hang on to them, and then stumble across a propitious moment to use them. One is first perplexed by a problem and then makes use of facts to achieve a solution. The entire process of problem sensing, problem formulating, data gathering and analysis, and confirming is called thinking.  

...the very attitudes and activities that characterize figuring out or discovering things for oneself also seem to have the effect of conserving memory.

In summation, one must ultimately reject the Accumulation of Facts theme on the grounds noted by philosopher-Mathematician Alfred North Whitehead. In the Aims of Education he wrote,

> Your learning is useless to you until you have lost your textbooks, burnt your lecture notes, and forgotten the minutiae which you learnt by heart for the examination. What, in the way of detail, you continually require will stick in your memory as obvious facts like the sun and the moon; and what you casually require can be looked up in any work of reference....

Reasons for Rejecting the Knowledge of the Discipline Theme

The objective of teaching survey history courses to achieve a Knowledge of the Discipline is an unacceptable goal for the following reasons: (1) it is a perversion of the general education emphasis of survey or introductory classes to seek specialized disciplinary knowledge as an ultimate goal; (2) survey history classes should be viewed either as service studies or as syntheses of humanistic studies, rather than as

---
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unique, compartmentalized, scientific areas of defined knowledge; and
(3) disciplinary emphasis in survey courses invariably leads to tedious,
irrelevant recitations of facts and interpretations which leave pupils
indoctrinated or conditioned rather than educated.

In an apocalyptic fashion, Paul Ward has challenged the wisdom
of maintaining academic emphasis on the study of history in contemporary
society by noting,

The part of mankind that has most exhaustively cultri­
vated history, Western Europe, has turned out to be
the source of imperialism and world wars, of communism,
fascism, and mazism. All these seemed to draw their
strength from the accumulation of historical loyalties
and indoctrination, the sort of history that was con­
cerned with nation-building, with government and its
relation to popular support in peace and war. Now
developing countries in other parts of the world are
looking to us for means of social betterment. Should
we visit on them our accumulation of self-admiring
history? Shall we visit this accumulation of cherished
facts about past politics upon our own next generation?81

Although Ward’s comments are not intended to augur the doom of the study
and teaching of history in the twentieth century, the point he is trying
to make is clear: if historical study is to have meaning for modern man,
it must be more than a mixture of fact-myth-legend employed to socialize,
nationalize, or dehumanize individuals. History, particularly at the
survey course level, must provide a relevant background of intellectual
methods, data, and ideas for a student’s general education. This notion
may be defined in either a negative or positive manner. General education
is not concerned with the technical or professional training of historians;
it is not concerned with the training of an intellectual elite in an

81Paul L. Ward, “Should History Be Cherished? Some Doubts and
Affirmations,” Social Education, XXXI (March 1967), p. 188.
occult science; it is not concerned with transmitting a specialized unit of historical facts and interpretations to a heterogeneous student body. Conversely, there are several requirements which, in a positive tone, should be met in survey history courses offered to non-specialists. Fremont Wirth, writing for the Mississippi Valley Historical Review, outlined the general education requirements of history instruction as follows:

1. The history offered for the general student should be as accurate and as scholarly as that offered to the historian.

2. The general student takes fewer courses than the person whose field of specialization is history. The courses should, therefore, be broader in range and with greater emphasis on the events which have social significance.

3. The courses for the non-specialist, whatever the amount suggested, should present a general overview.

4. The courses for the general student should be terminal in nature rather than designed as prerequisite for other courses to follow.

5. While the courses present a background of the past, the emphasis should be on the understanding of the present with its many social, economic, and political problems.

6. Emphasis should be on generalization, on understanding trends and movements, rather than details.

7. Since the amount of time which can be devoted by the general student to history is limited, it is imperative that the content be carefully selected. Many courses in history...are cluttered up with worthless materials and details which are soon forgotten.

---

8. The general student, as well as the historian, should have training in the historical method.

9. Finally, the general student must be introduced to well-written history and interesting historical biographies in order that his interest will be carried beyond the classroom.  

A central problem related to the conflict between general education goals and the Knowledge of the Discipline theme is the tendency of history teachers to compartmentalize knowledge. Since the aims of general education carry with them no explicit mandate concerning necessary or sufficient levels of subject matter, it is the responsibility of the history teacher to establish a rational criteria for the selection of material which he considers desirable for students to study and understand. Seymour Mandelbaum has highlighted the problem arising from this situation by observing,

The choice of subjects in every history course reflects the experiences, perceptions, expectations, and moral judgments of the teachers. What events, we ask, are worth describing and explaining? What does the future hold for mankind, and for these students, and what knowledge of the past will help to make the future better? How better and for whom? Every course taught in schools and colleges is rooted in attempts to answer these questions. We have arrived, however, at a point where the choice of subject in the standard American history course has become so conventionalized that the expectations and values which are inherent in the choice are not readily discerned. The standard course is no longer one way of examining and aligning the past. It has become history itself. The intellectual concerns -- the facts and the explanations -- which flow from
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different expectations and different values appear to be esoteric or peripheral. 85

Unfortunately, teaching history as a settled or final thing warps and destroys the vital spark of imagination in young students. It also ignores the academic responsibility of separating the method of historical inquiry from the products of that inquiry. 86

The contention that Knowledge of the Discipline is too narrow a goal for history teaching has long had currency and influential support throughout the first six decades of the twentieth century. At the turn of the century James Harvey Robinson argued for an expansion of historical vistas to include the other social science disciplines. His idea of a "New History" involved an escape from the narrow political and military myopia which had limited historical vision for centuries. Robinson called for a history that would "meet our daily needs" and "...avail itself of all those discoveries that are being made about mankind by anthropologists, economists, psychologists, and sociologists -- discoveries which...have served to revolutionize our ideas of the origins, progress, and prospects of our race...."87 The heritage of Robinson's interdisciplinary ideas has been brilliantly translated into historical practice by such noted historians as William Langer, Lee Benson, Samuel P. Hays, Martin Duberman, O C


David M. Potter, Russel B. Nye, and Thomas C. Cochran.

Numberous proposals have been forwarded by critics of the Knowledge of the Discipline syndrome in historical instruction in an attempt to resolve the dilemma of discipline-centered thinking among teachers and students. Core courses of study, such as "American Studies" or "Contemporary Issues", have been suggested by some scholars. Other interested teachers, such as George Rogers Taylor, have argued in favor of a renewed emphasis on methodology in historical instruction. "The problem approach provides one of the most effective devices for breaking down the barriers which separate the various disciplines," says Taylor.

Here is no forced effort to distinguish the sociological from the political aspects of an issue, no formal integration course where students listen to lecturers, each of whom presents the general approach and subject matter of his discipline. Rather the problem approach leads to that natural integration of knowledge which grows out of the problem itself.

The most extreme proposal for breaking the disciplinary grip of historical study on the general education curriculum was recently for-


warded by Edgar B. Wesley. His suggestion: the total integration of history into the curriculum. In his own words,

"It may be that history will disappear from the curriculum altogether. All its values can easily be infused into, or drawn out of, other studies. Only the historian thinks that pure, undiluted, unmixed, uncontaminated history exists and requires rigorous teaching and study. This tantrum-like demand is, of course, unrealistic, unenlightened, and unpsychological. History needs no separate existence for teaching or learning; it is a service study, not a self-sustaining discipline. In fact, it functions most usefully when suffused with other elements and subjects. So it is probable that the demand for its continued separate existence will actually work toward its diminution." 91

Reasons for Rejecting the Historical Objectivity Theme

The Historical Objectivity theme, although clearly more favorable as a purpose for teaching survey history courses than any of the three objectives already rejected, is unacceptable for the following reasons: (1) it presumes an impossible, and ultimately irresponsible attitude on the part of students toward the historical subject matter being investigated; (2) it is deemed a meaningless purpose by many students; (3) it ignores the intense commitment of most historians and teachers to deep-seated personal and professional values which effect their literary and instructional perspectives; and (4) it fails to account for the psychological reality that personal commitments and value judgments often serve as catalysts for initiating and directing historical investigations.

Based upon the scientific roots of nineteenth century German historiography, many history teachers have argued that the only way to pursue historical truth is to separate facts from values, thus clearing

the way for unbiased examination of all facts. However, recent research findings in psychology have tended to support the views of several educators and historians who have challenged the validity of the alleged fact-value dichotomy. In fact, all facets of the historian's task -- his initial assumptions in approaching a problem, the nature of reconstructing the past, and the historian's vested interests in his conclusions -- have been re-evaluated in light of the renewed interest in the problems of valuation. Historical objectivity has been replaced, at least theoretically, by an effort to acknowledge subjectivity, to identify specific biases and commitments, and then to proceed to demonstrate the meaning of a problem in the past through an acknowledged prism of understanding.

During the 1930's students of historical instruction voiced their concern over the failure of scholars to recognize the mutual intrusion of value judgments into historical interpretations as well as history teaching.

In 1934 Charles Beard acknowledged that

...historians recognize formally the obvious, long known informally, namely, that any written history inevitably reflects the thought of the author in his time and cultural setting...It is almost a confession of inexpiable sin to admit in academic circles that one is not a man of science working in a scientific manner with things open to deterministic and inexorable treatment, to admit that one is more or less a guesser in this vale of tears.\(^92\)

Ernest Horn added a conclusion to Beard's observation three years later. He noted that subjectivity (or "relativism", as it was frequently labelled at that time) was not only present in all interpretations, but such commitments by historians were beneficial to the study of the past. Horn ob-

\(^92\)Charles A. Beard, "Written History as an Act of Faith," American Historical Review, XXXIX (January 1934), pp. 221-222.
served, "Openmindedness, tolerance, and the presentation of all sides of an issue are means of arriving at conclusions, not a substitute for them. The extreme form of tolerance and openmindedness that is often advocated in theory is neither possible nor desirable of attainment. It neglects the role of ideals and emotions in human decisions and actions." 93

Where are value judgments most likely to creep into the historian's task? And if he is prone to subjectivity, how much more so will his students be subject to his — or their own — value judgments about the past? One student of philosophy and history has noted that "...values held by different individuals and groups affect greatly what most people believe to be facts." 94 For example, a Southern historian's interpretation of the Reconstruction Era of American history is based upon a different social milieu than a study of the same period by a Northern scholar. Likewise, Robert E. Brown's challenge to Charles Beard's interpretation of the Constitutional Convention was probably as much a response to different socio-economic conditions of the times as to the scholarly inconsistency of the previous work. 95 These observations are not intended to stereotype historians nor to imply that pre-investigatory value allegiances are unwholesome or unscholarly. As Sydney Spiegel has noted,

Value-judgments about both the past and the present can be an aid to further investigation of history, and

93Horn, Methods of Instruction in the Social Studies, p. 95.


history's utility. The value-judgment can be both a spur to investigation and a deductive basis for forming conclusions based on investigation....Morris Cohen pointed out that it was an error to suppose that scientific investigation proceeded purely by a Baconian inductive method. The facts alone cannot suggest an explanation of the facts. Pure induction, he said, "would reduce [the historian] to the role of a dictaphone," Bert James Loewenberg writes, "It is only when we have a hypothesis that we have something to look for. Without ideas, nature is one big blooming confusion."

Supporting Spiegel's basic idea, another historian-educator has challenged history instructors to acknowledge their personal commitments in regard to subject matter being studied in the classroom. Mark Krug argues, "Social studies teachers cannot and should not be value-free. They ought to state their views and judgments on controversial and other issues...." And when the time comes to state conclusions in regard to the persons and events studied, or the generalizations and hypotheses under investigation, Michael Scriven has warned, "...[T]he tendency of the value-allergic social scientist to withhold a value judgment which is clearly indicated by the evidence in his possession, because of his frequently voiced worry, "Who can be sure what is right or wrong?", is an overblown skepticism."

For teaching purposes, therefore, an aim such as Historical Objectivity is of extremely questionable currency. Since it has been
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demonstrated that neither students nor instructors approach historical material in a Lockean tabula rasa fashion, then the admission of subjectivity might be a more realistic objective. And when an historical idea such as the abolitionist appeal to "a law above the law" is translated by students into the contemporary issue of draft resistance, is the notion of historical objectivity either applicable or relevant? Likewise, students often seem to be more interested in pondering what the world ought to be like, rather than in describing either what it was or is like. How does historical objectivity apply to such a situation? Undeniably, value commitments must be a central concern of historical study. Supporting this contention, Donald Oliver and James Shaver caution that

...inability to provide a final proof for values should not lead one to consider the search for values a casual or trivial concern. Ultimate scientific truth is not available either, but we do not discontinue the search for deeper and more penetrating interpretation of the natural world. We also test our beliefs against our perceptions of reality and base our actions on them, even though at best they have a high level of probability, not certainty. An ultimate definition of "man" and the range of social conditions necessary to man's fulfillment may be more difficult to approach than scientific truth... But this should not prevent us from making judgments about priorities of values, or from living by tentative conclusions about ultimate moral meaning.99

Ultimately, students need to view the historian as an active rather than a passive agent. His commitment to the goal of Historical Objectivity in the classroom tends to sterilize his material, to drain the life's blood from his contemporary analogies, and to make his entire task seem meaningless and irrelevant to everyday life. The history

teacher's commitment to judging the consistency of men's words and deeds and to evaluating the actions of men in relation to their social consequences makes his task, it would seem, inevitably value-charged. Students must recognize this fact. They need not become "junior historians" in order to note the vitality of historical study. But they do need to recognize the historian's function, which has been described by Carl Wittke as follows:

The historian must select and interpret his findings, for facts, in themselves, have little meaning. The historian has his laboratory manual -- the techniques of text criticism, the evaluation of sources, and the footnoting of his findings -- and presumably he has developed skills in sifting evidence which the untrained do not have. But in the end, he must say what the evidence means to him and make his conclusions understandable to his readers and his students. The image of truth, as Trevelyan said, is always reflected through the prism of a finite mind. To be completely objective, one either would have to be dead, for then it wouldn't matter anymore, or as cold and inanimate as an iceberg.  

Reasons for Rejecting the Historical Method Theme

Not unlike the theme of Historical Objectivity, the goal of instructing students in the use of the Historical Method is a far more defensible objective than the themes of Citizenship Training, Accumulation of Facts, and Knowledge of the Discipline. However, there are several reasons why the Historical Method theme is not acceptable as a goal for teaching survey history courses: (1) the Historical Method theme remains both undefined and, according to several philosophers and historiographers, undefinable in terms of curricular practice; (2) it is too often limited

in its scope and perspective only to ideas and events in the past, with
no effort made to carry the technique over into the study of contemporary
problems; and (3) it is doubtful that current teaching practice in history
genuinely imparts the Historical Method since the textbooks employed in
survey classes are universally devoid of problematical situations.

Since the idea of Historical Method is related to the notion of
the scientific investigation of the past, one might expect it to be clearly
articulated as a set of principles to guide all historical studies. Such
is not the case. In fact, there seems to be as much disagreement over the
nature and meaning of the concept "historical method" as there is over the
most classical issues of historiographical literature. And among
historians who traditionally prefer to avoid such metaphysical or method­
ological questions, the historical method has been accepted in an un­
critical, axiomatic fashion. But regardless of the position which the
instructor adopts toward the debate, students are seldom confronted with
the problematic nature of historical procedure. As John Palmer has
correctly observed,

Historians generally have shown little concern for
the manner in which their explanations are formulated.
History teachers typically give little direct attention
to the explanation process in their teaching even though
it is central to their writing, teaching, and understand­
ing of history. The matter borders on a philosophy

101 Lincoln Reis and Paul Oskar Kristeller, "Some Remarks on the
Method of History," Journal of Philosophy, XL (April 29, 1943), pp. 225-
245; Morton G. White, "The Attack on the Historical Method," Journal of
Philosophy, XLIII (June 7, 1945), pp. 314-331; Edward W. Strong, "How is
The Practice of History Tied to Theory?" Journal of Philosophy, XLVI
(September 29, 1949), pp. 637-644.
of history, a subject which has hardly been emphasized in the preparation and scholarly endeavors of American historians.\textsuperscript{102}

Even though the goal of initiating students into problem-solving techniques (under the rubric of the "historical method") may be stressed in most history course syllabi, "...the [history] teacher does the problem solving and the student is encouraged to observe the process."\textsuperscript{103} As Bernard Feder notes,

In almost every list of objectives for the teaching of the social studies is the declaration, variously expressed, that the study of history will, somehow, serve the present; that it will provide insights that will be of some use to the citizen in dealing with the contemporary world. It is completely unrealistic, however, to assume that the study of the past will result in the application of such understandings unless we focus consciously on these applications in our teaching. The relations between the past and present must be made explicit. The student must develop the habit of looking for parallels, connections and analogies; he will do this only if it is done systematically in the classroom.\textsuperscript{104}

This element of transfer training, which is so often overlooked in the application of the historical method by history instructors, leads many students to doubt the validity of "weighing and analyzing evidence" for any issues other than those dusty questions of a century ago.\textsuperscript{105} The

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
failure of history teachers to establish direct and obvious correlations between human problems of the past and the present, thereby establishing the universality of their pursuit, has led at least one scholar to question whether the study of the past is really a beneficial prerequisite to the investigation of contemporary problems. The argument for historical utility originally advanced by historians, demands conscientious classroom attention to analogies and parallels to continuing human dilemmas. "The technique of using history in a problem-solving approach," notes Sydney Spiegel,

is not a self-evident technique. There is no automatic transfer of the lessons of the past to current problems; and a study of the past for the past's own sake will certainly not have any automatic, self-evident bearing on current affairs, since transfer of learning depends upon the relevance of the thing learned to the new situation.

Finally, a word must be added about the nature of the survey textbook, which remains the core source of evidence in most history courses, and its position in relation to achieving the Historical Method objective. Numerous articles have been published criticizing history textbooks for their lack of emphasis on genuine problematic (as opposed to historiographic) issues, for their over-abundance of unrelated facts and their lack of documentation, and for their overall uselessness in providing
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motivation to students. Unless a large number of history instructors are following the advice of the social studies educator who suggested that even poor textbooks could be employed to encourage reflective thought by pointing out to students internal contradictions, erroneous generalizations, and biases of the authors toward specific topics, the history textbook is presently the largest stumbling block to initiating the Historical Method objective. At this point it seems that the historical method falters just as completely in the area of methodology as it does in the area of theory.

Reasons for Accepting the Self-Knowledge Theme

The Self-Knowledge theme, because it contains more of the positive attributes and less of the negative elements found in the other five themes examined, is clearly the most acceptable aim for teaching survey history courses in American high schools and colleges. The reasons for favoring universal adoption of the Self-Knowledge theme include: (1) it is inherently democratic and stresses individual decision-making; (2) it seeks


to motivate students through the examination of relevant personal and social problems; (3) it emphasizes the use of logical inquiry and the value of suspended judgment toward problematical situations; (4) it draws ideas, examples, and problems from all disciplines, using historical, scientific, literary, and philosophical materials to investigate issues; (5) it stresses the normative realm of individual viewpoints and acknowledges the diversity of conclusions to social problems within a pluralistic social order; (6) it emphasizes the transferability of method from topic to topic, discipline to discipline, and from the classroom to the outside world; and (7) it culminates, ideally, in the achievement of self-knowledge and self-direction.

In the first decade of this century British historian J. W. Allen declared, "We want to make it easy and even habitual to suspend judgment." He continued,

We want to make it absolutely impossible to hold opinions based upon grossly insufficient knowledge of the facts. We want a habit of thinking of conclusions as more or less probable rather than as true or untrue. We want to develop a realistic imagination of the number of different views that may be held on almost every really complex question.¹¹⁰

These goals, stated by Allen in The Place of History in Education, undergird the Self-Knowledge theme. Another student of the purposes of historical study noted in 1932 that "A knowledge of how to acquire knowledge is a permanent possession which can be used throughout life."¹¹¹ One might even speculate that the events of the two decades between Allen’s


comments and Charles Beard's observation had given the latter historian a much greater appreciation of the transitory nature of human knowledge, as well as the function of education. Following the logic expressed in Beard's statement, Jerome Bruner has affirmed in the 1960's that "Informed powers of mind and a sense of potency in action are the only instruments we can give the child that will be invariable across the transformations of time and circumstance." The dynamic nature of the American social order clearly demands an educational commitment to the development of autonomous individuals. These self-directing persons must be able to use their individual talents to satisfy personal objectives and goals and to engage in community activities which will progressively ameliorate the problems of an ever more complex society. John Dewey, in his 1916 essay Democracy and Education, defined the role of the educational process as preparing an individual to function autonomously in an unknown and unknowable future. He wrote:

> While all thinking results in knowledge, ultimately the value of knowledge is subordinate to its use in thinking. For we live not in a settled and finished world, but in one which is going on, and where our main task is prospective, and where retrospect — and all knowledge as distinct from thought is retrospect — is of value in the solidarity, security, and fertility it affords our dealings with the future.\(^\text{113}\)

Since so many history teachers express strong commitments toward helping students become good citizens, they should heed the reasoning behind Shirley Engle's rejection of the traditional stereotype of the flag-waving zealot. He contends, "The mark of a good citizen is the quality

\(^{112}\)Bruner, On Knowing, p. 122.

\(^{113}\)Dewey, Democracy and Education, p. 151.
of the decisions which he reaches on public and private matters of social concern.\textsuperscript{114} This position disregards the fallacious contention that democracy is a set of correct beliefs and standardized behavioral responses; rather, it rests upon the conviction advanced by liberal thinkers such as Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert MacIver, and David Fallman that democracy is simply a methodological approach to reaching essentially tentative social and political conclusions in a workaday world. Too often the concept of "majority rule" is equated with "right" and "truth" under the guise of democratic procedures. This assumption is potentially dangerous, as social critics John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville have noted, because it tends to downplay, or even crush, the vital role played by individual freedom and responsibility in a genuinely democratic social order. Historian David Shannon has clearly articulated the relationship between individual intellectual power, educational responsibilities, and social progress in a democracy. He says,

> Now it is very important that youngsters learn to think critically, and it seems to me that it is one of the major functions of the school (perhaps a unique one) and one of the functions of social studies instruction in particular to develop the power to think well. Clear, rigorous, precise thinking is vital in our personal, private lives. And in a democratic state the public must think rigorously about public issues if it is to maintain and extend democratic and free institutions.\textsuperscript{115}

In addition to stressing the idea of individual decision-making, the Self-Knowledge theme provides both methodological and curricular

\textsuperscript{114}Engle, "Decision Making: The Heart of Social Studies Instruction," p. 301.

imperatives for survey history instruction. In this regard it is interesting to compare the similarities of an observation made at the turn of the century with a statement made in the last decade. In 1908, in an article published in the American Historical Review, David J. Hill explained that "...history is nothing more or less than the record of man's efforts to solve the problems with which he is confronted by his nature and his environment." Echoing Hill's comment, and adding instructional imperatives, Minderella Schultz wrote in 1968:

> History is the study of men confronting problems, men choosing to approach their problems in one way or another, men paying for their choice by not having the benefits attached to the alternatives they rejected. While this approach to problem-solving is commonly thought of as an economist's approach, lively case material that can be used to introduce the approach is historical. Man facing problems can serve as a model for students confronting similar problems. One gets the impression that many of the students deeply involved in the problems of the day have no concept of man's having faced these problems before and survived.

The strengths of the problem-solving approach to learning are founded both in the nature of contemporary society and in the nature of modern learning theory. These two points are, it should be recalled, central considerations for judging the validity of teaching objectives according to Beard. In regard to these issues, Jay Williams has noted,

> One of the legacies left to teachers by John Dewey is the idea that a student who is being successfully educated is solving problems. The strengths of this

---


view are patent to most teachers. It rests on realistic grounds both in respect to the kind of life the student will live in our society and in respect to the nature of learning. Our society is undeniably not one where choices can be made and policies decided simply upon the basis of habit and tradition. Habit and tradition exist and will continue, but the educated man today must be more than their servant: he must understand them, be able to evaluate them and in some instances modify them. He must, in short, be able to think intelligently about social problems. As to the nature of learning, it is plain that people learn when they are challenged. They can be challenged by many things...but the most productive challenge is a problem. Problems appeal to one's curiosity, and facts and ideas discovered under their impetus do not terminate learning, but are a step in a continuing process.\footnote{118}

Just imagine how much better it would be for students (as well as for teachers) if they could cease considering survey history courses as noxious mixtures of "foreordained conclusions, set up by law, patriotism, national security, and civic virtue" that "do violence to logic, truth, and common sense"\footnote{119} and begin to view historical investigation in a more tentative, problematical perspective. As Richard H. Brown has observed, the greatest merit of a problem-solving approach

\begin{quote}
...is that it does not put teachers in a position of pretending to the student what we all know not to be true, but what the textbook and the traditional curriculum frequently do pretend -- that truth is a fixed and easy thing to be mastered in successive steps as one grows to adulthood or to scholarly eminence. With it the teacher can level with the student that the pursuit of truth is tough, that the process of education is life-long, that at best we who are teachers can only invite him to join us. With it we discover over and over again, despite ourselves, what we all know intellectually to be true but forget too often as educators: That all of us alike are students, all of us alike asking the same
\end{quote}

\footnote{118}{Jay Williams, "Problems and American History," \textit{Social Education}, XVII (October 1953), p. 266.}

\footnote{119}{Wesley, "Let's Abolish History Courses," p. 6.}
question — who and what are we, what the world around us is and how it works, how we relate to it.\textsuperscript{120}

At this point the reader may be asking himself, "Isn't this last paragraph a plea for the historical method as a teaching objective?" The reply to this question is negative, for several reasons: first, as noted earlier, the historical method tends to be too discipline-oriented to assist in genuine problem-solving; second, the "problems" for the problem-solving approach are essentially student-centered, socially relevant and contemporary, and interdisciplinary in nature; and third, the essential method of investigation which is to be employed, whether labelled "reflective", "problem-solving", "discovery", or "intuitive", is based upon John Dewey's imperative stated in his essay "Teaching Ethics in High School" -- the question to be resolved is not what to do, but how to decide what to do.\textsuperscript{121} The key to identifying the methodology employed in achieving the Self-Knowledge theme is that it is neither strictly scientific nor strictly empirical. It willingly combines normative aspects of judgment and valuation with analytical elements of evidence. Charles Frankel has noted that the "...activity which is involved [in the problem-solving pursuit] is not an empirical inquiry, but self-interrogation, a disciplined dialogue with oneself and others, an effort to find out, by following an argument, just what the principles are to which we are willing to commit ourselves.\textsuperscript{122} This position demands value-


\textsuperscript{122}Frankel, "Needed Research on Social Attitudes...," p. 28.
consciousness. One social studies expert, apparently speaking to those who argue for objectivity in problem analysis, has declared, "To duck the question of values is to cut the heart out of decision making." In a rhetorical fashion, Bernice Goldmark has supported the Self-Knowledge theme by asking,

Is it not enough that we teach a method of judgment making, expose judgments to public scrutiny, demand responsibility in defending judgments and hold our values as tentative, open to democratic process in a pluralistic society? If we cannot predict what the future will being in terms of new knowledge, technological advances, or social patterns, we can reasonably predict that decisions will always have to be made. Could we do better in education than to prepare students with a reconstructable method and to equip them to cope with rapid change? Could we do better than to commit the students to ongoing inquiry and reconstruction?

The essence of the Self-Knowledge theme as a teaching objective is its emphasis upon self-perception. Reinhold Niebuhr's contention that "The end of an individual life is, for him, the end of history...." is a clue to man's universal historic being. The Self-Knowledge theme proposes that an individual discover himself in history through the study of problems which perplex his life. Those who would attack this educational theory as too subjective an approach to legitimate historical inquiry should consult Morris Cohen's argument concerning the nature of the historian's valuational task. Cohen notes,


History...does not cease to be scientific when it shifts its focus from a phonographic recording of events that actually happened and assumes the critical task of appraising and evaluating their significance or importance. Indeed, we may say that no historian conscious of his task can avoid the problem of evaluation. The historian must have a point of view that determines what is important and what is unimportant in the confusing maze of human events. The category of importance is one of valuation. The safeguard against bias in the [study and] writing of history...is not to indulge in useless resolutions to be free of bias but rather to expose one's preconceptions, to make them explicit, to consider their alternatives, and thus to multiply the number of hypotheses available for the apprehension of historical significance.

Perhaps the greatest contribution that a teacher of a survey history course can make to an individual's growth is to institutionalize a set of mind which includes: (1) a recognition that human affairs are endlessly problematic, (2) a realization that humans must, nevertheless, take stands and move forward on policy decisions, (3) a provisionality and caution in the defense of stands taken on the basis of imperfect information, (4) a continuing support for the always-needed research into always present and emerging problems, and (5) a constant vigilance over our assumptions and the so-called "facts" we accept.

Final Statement

The conclusion of this study is two-fold. The findings of the content analysis indicate that eclecticism in teaching themes and objectives is the dominant characteristic among the authors of articles written between 1939 and 1969 dealing with the teaching of survey history.


courses in American high schools and colleges. The recommendations presented in this chapter, however, urge an immediate re-evaluation of the aims and purposes of such courses in accordance with Beard's three imperatives: the nature of scholarship, the nature of society, and the nature of learning theory. The defense of the Self-Knowledge theme has been hearty, but not flawless. There will surely be large numbers of critics to challenge such a proposal. It is most likely, in fact, that the harshest criticisms will be generated from the following groups: (1) discipline-oriented college professors and high school teachers who will dread the Self-Knowledge theme as a reactionary reincarnation of "life adjustment" courses and an attempt to subvert the liberal arts tradition; (2) patriotic community leaders who will view the Self-Knowledge theme as a sneaky method for introducing courses in "sex education" and "communism" into the classroom where students should be spending more time learning about the Great Men of the American Past; (3) well-meaning but insecure parents who will dislike the idea of the school challenging all sorts of cherished social attitudes and beliefs and of their children questioning their logic on political issues such as the draft, the war in Vietnam, and the legalization of marijuana; (4) tradition-bound high school and college teachers (probably the tenured variety) who are committed to their tried-and-true lecture notes and evaluation procedures; (5) students who love "the system" because it rewards strong memories and doesn't demand rigorous thought; (6) textbook peddlers and salesmen for nationally programmed curriculum materials in neat, well-organized, foolproof (if not teacher-proof and student-proof) packages.

A final critical group, which defies either occupational or
sociological classification, are those who would agree with Aristotle that there are some things which are better not to know than to know. In this case, like the man from whom this Athenian analogy is borrowed, one must prefer Plato, who said, "It is better and more manly to think that we ought to investigate what we do not know than idly to assume that we cannot, or ought not to, investigate." Yet it is difficult to ignore the ominous speculation of James P. Shaver, who noted,

Education for rational citizenship seems foredoomed to continue as a stepsister to history and social science instruction. Perhaps this is just as well. For contrary to our assumptions, the intense involvement of a citizenry effectively schooled and interested in the analysis of public issues might be too disruptive to our society.  
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>70.56%</td>
<td>76.90%</td>
<td>83.32%</td>
<td>33.32%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### APPENDIX B (continued)

**DATA WORK SHEET FOR ARTICLES, 1939-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Peabody J. of Education</th>
<th>Phi Delta Kappan</th>
<th>School Review</th>
<th>School and Society</th>
<th>Social Education</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Articles Analyzed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>23.52%</td>
<td>26.64%</td>
<td>15.04%</td>
<td>12.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training -</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>23.52%</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
<td>9.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>54.54%</td>
<td>70.56%</td>
<td>53.28%</td>
<td>51.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of Facts</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>17.64%</td>
<td>26.64%</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
<td>12.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td>28.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>29.40%</td>
<td>24.85%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>66.66%</td>
<td>72.72%</td>
<td>82.32%</td>
<td>75.21%</td>
<td>72.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Discipline -</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>41.16%</td>
<td>39.96%</td>
<td>30.74%</td>
<td>32.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>QP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>QN</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>13.32%</td>
<td>14.39%</td>
<td>14.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>8.50%</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>55.55%</td>
<td>54.54%</td>
<td>64.68%</td>
<td>59.94%</td>
<td>70.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Record</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Articles Analyzed</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>SP ------</td>
<td>QP ------</td>
<td>N 14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>QN 14.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectivity</td>
<td>SN 28.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accumulation of Facts -</td>
<td>SP ------</td>
<td>QP 14.28</td>
<td>N ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical</td>
<td>QN 14.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>SN 57.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Discipline -</td>
<td>SP ------</td>
<td>QP ------</td>
<td>N ------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Knowledge</td>
<td>QN ------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN 28.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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