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INTRODUCTION

Men fear thought as they fear nothing else on earth—more than ruin, more even than death. Thought is subversive and revolutionary, destructive and terrible; thought is merciless to privilege, established institutions, and comfortable habits; thought is anarchic and lawless, indifferent to authority, careless of the well-tried wisdom of the ages. Thought looks into the pit of hell and is not afraid. It sees man, a feeble speck, surrounded by unfathomable depths of silence; yet it bears itself proudly, as unmoved as it were lord of the universe. Thought is great and swift and free, the light of the world, and the chief glory of man.

Bertrand Russell

Successful curriculum innovation in social studies--fact or fiction? Whatever the answer, there is no question that many efforts have been made to improve the social studies curriculum. This study is a history of some of these endeavors. Additionally, it is a history of social studies education from 1787 to 1984. In this writer’s opinion, it would be difficult to understand the success or failure of past curriculum proposals without some knowledge of the time in which and for which they were written.

Undoubtedly, some curriculum proposals have been extremely successful. Several national committee reports
were crucially important in the formation of not only modern social studies education, but education in general. As such, though their reports are technically before the time frame of this dissertation, they are included in it. To exclude them would be to leave this work unfinished, and, unlike some famous composers, this writer has no desire to write an unfinished symphony.

Overview

For the convenience of the reader, the purpose of this introduction is to provide a brief chapter by chapter summary of the content of this dissertation. Hopefully, it will aid the reader in locating information he seeks and/or avoiding that which is not relevant to his particular endeavor.

Chapter One is an analysis of the complex nature of social studies education. It attempts to establish the difficulties inherent in any curriculum revision when, as is true of social studies, no substantial agreement exists upon aims, desired results, or the nature of the discipline.

Chapter Two establishes the nature of this study. The major question investigated, if what is alleged to be true is true, is why so little fundamental change in the social studies curriculum has occurred since the implementation of the 1916 NEA Report of the Committee on Social Studies.
Chapter Three is a survey of most available national and state surveys of social studies curriculum patterns. It is also a survey of dissertations and literature relevant to the topic being examined.

Chapter Four is a concise history of social studies education from 1787 to 1916. The roots of social studies education in the United States are examined, with a special emphasis upon the reports of the three most influential national committees of their era: The NEA Committee of Ten (1892), The AHA Committee of Seven (1898), and the NEA Committee on Social Studies (1916).

Chapter Five is an examination of the report of the first national committee from a prestigious organization to meet with failure, the AHA Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. The report itself and the reasons for its failure are analyzed in an attempt to determine the major impact this report had upon future endeavors.

Chapter Six continues with a review of the 1939 National Council for the Social Studies bulletin, The Future of the Social Studies. Though the actual impact of this document would be difficult to prove, the attitude which pervaded it remains infectious.

Chapter Seven is a discussion of historical roots of elementary social studies education.
Chapter Eight is an examination of the development of Paul R. Hanna's thinking and his "expanding environments" curriculum. This curriculum is generally recognized and accepted as the dominant K-3 sequence and cannot be ignored.

Chapter Nine investigated the thinking and curriculum design of Hilda Taba. The curriculum which resulted from her work has achieved national recognition though its impact in the nation's classrooms seems limited.

Chapter Ten analyzes one of the many projects which resulted from Project Social Studies, the University of Minnesota structure-of-the-disciplines model. It also reviews the era of the "new" social studies so that the approach used by Edith West and her associates is placed into a meaningful perspective.

Chapter Eleven critically reviews the latest NCSS curriculum report, In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies.

Chapter Twelve summarizes what this writer learned in relation to the success and durability of the 1916 NEA report on social studies. In the opinion of this writer, the success of this report was due far less to any intrinsic merit than it was a serendipitous set of circumstances. It was clearly not implemented in 1916 and was probably not dominant until after 1935, by which time it was clearly an anachronism.
Chapter Thirteen summarizes and applies the curriculum knowledge this writer learned in researching this document. In it this writer suggests that the outward appearance of the social studies scope and sequence has not changed significantly. Outward appearances, however, sometimes disguise reality, for a close investigation of the social studies curriculum seems to indicate gradual change.

The lesson to be learned from the many curriculum efforts heretofore labeled "failures," therefore, is not that one can do nothing, but that one cannot expect great sudden changes. To do so is to act in ignorance of the past. Such ignorance, precisely, is what this writer has striven to reduce.
Our task is not to say what is obviously true: that it would be far better if people could come to know more and more about everything. But our task is, rather, to figure out with more clarity than we ever have before how people come to know about anything, so that we can, with more efficiency and effectiveness than is now the case, give all of our young people the opportunity to acquire some degree of relevant knowledge.

Alan Griffin

This dissertation is a selective history of scope and sequence patterns in social studies education 1916 to 1984. It is written for social studies educators. By its very nature it cannot be comprehensive. Such a task would take many more volumes and much more time than is warranted by a dissertation. Nevertheless, this document is an attempt to impart to readers significant, long-range, and meaningful glimpses into the nature of social studies and, more specifically, selected scope and sequence endeavors. It is hoped that others will be stimulated to conduct research along similar lines and decrease the ahistoricism that seems to plague social studies education.1 Perhaps, members of
the social studies profession will finally heed George Santayana's advice to remember the past so that they are not condemned to repeat it.\textsuperscript{2}

Social Studies are difficult to describe

Social studies education is an enormously complex field. A national portrait seems impossible. Social studies education appears more like a mosaic molded from an infinite, unique, colorful, highly individualized group of pieces than a painting.\textsuperscript{3} The many new course offerings of the last two decades have led more than one social studies educator to label the social studies "a smorgasbord of disunity as well as diversity."\textsuperscript{4} The matter is further complicated by the fact that social studies education is composed of at least six separate and independent disciplines. History, geography, political science, anthropology, sociology, and economics are all taught and often considered "social studies". Each discipline has its advocates as well as its detractors. More than one critic has suggested that what goes on in the social studies classroom is no discipline at all.\textsuperscript{5}

There is no nationally imposed social studies curriculum to which all states adhere. Few, if any, states dictate a complete and binding social studies K-12 scope and sequence.\textsuperscript{6} No two states seem to have identical curriculum guidelines. Influential writers have questioned whether one curriculum model would even be appropriate. Paul Hanna, for example,
states "that few if any social studies theorists would advocate one and only one grand design for all schools. We have prospered nationally by diversity." H. Gorden Hullfish and Philip Smith recognized this position as well. "We (typical Americans) want no central office in Washington to hand down directives to schools all over the land."8

On the other hand--in spite of cries that such efforts are futile and will certainly fail--a significant group of influential social studies educators has been calling for a new scope and sequence model for some time.9 Richard E. Gross, for example, has written on numerous occasions that a "major effort must be made to develop an integrated social studies program, grades K-14."10 He is most certainly not alone in the desire. In 1982 the National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS) underwrote just such an effort which will hopefully be completed in time to be evaluated in this dissertation.

None of this controversy precludes the possibility that "a locally accepted nationwide curriculum" does exist which has been around since 1916 and has proven remarkably resilient to change.11 It is a curriculum which may not be appropriate to the needs of American society in the 1980's. Even if some set of national guidelines did exist, individual classroom teachers and local administrators have traditionally had much control over course content as long as they remain within the community's "zone of tolerance."12
Teachers are indeed "arbiters of what goes on in their classrooms. They can, therefore, effectively veto curricular changes of which they do not approve." This assumes, of course, that most teachers are aware of such guidelines and innovations in the social studies. This may not be true. Some studies have indicated that only a small minority of teachers belong to social studies organizations or use professional social studies journals.

It is quite clear from national surveys that many state departments of education do not know, in any definitive manner, the nature of social studies education course offerings within their boundaries. Some states do not routinely even collect such information. Where such information is collected—even if it is systematic and meaningful—the knowledge of what is actually taught in the classroom is difficult to ascertain.

The course title has not proven to be a reliable indicator of course content. There are, to use an overworked example, immense numbers of topics that can be taught under the generic title of American history. There are many methods by which each topic could be taught. One could teach it chronologically, thematically, problematically, or conceptually. In any case—and there are many other ways to teach American history—the teacher would have to select the fundamental knowledge, concepts, or skills that he/she wished to emphasize. Since there is an almost
unlimited supply of each, it is highly unlikely that two different social studies teachers would choose exactly the same topics and then teach them in exactly the same manner.

The only reliable indicator of course content, it seems, is the textbook. "The 'power' of the textbook to mold curriculum content, and to a lesser extent instructional practice, is a well documented educational phenomenon." "The dominant instructional tool continues to be the conventional textbook, and longtime bigsellers continue to dominate the market." It has been said that the textbook is "the central instrument of instruction used by most social studies teachers." This allegation is not new. In 1895 Dr. J. M. Rice addressed the National Educational Association convention with a speech titled "The Substitution of the Teacher for the Textbook." The basis for his talk was the belief that poorly prepared teachers were all too dependent upon textbooks and that "more was required than to lead the child to store in his mind a chaotic mass of cut-and-dried facts."

The task of describing the social studies field is further complicated by the lack of agreement upon how it should be taught, what should be taught, the relative importance of process and product, the specific results expected, and many other problems.

Social studies education has been bombarded for much of its existence by single focus attempts to mold the
Fads, however, have become the bane of social studies. This writer agrees that such single focus attempts as life adjustment, moral education, values clarification, back to the basics, reflective inquiry, peace education, international education, structure of the discipline, citizenship education, and others, all have some value. Some have very great value. The problem is that none has been accepted as the candidate upon which to base the entire social studies curriculum. The result has been an often schizophrenic behavior on the part of the social studies; unprofessional in all too many instances.

Nevertheless—though completely aware of the inherent difficulties and the potential conflict with what has just been said—this writer finds himself in agreement with those who would like to see an aim upon which the social studies could legitimately focus. He agrees with Dr. Robert Jewett that "we cannot continue to give allegiance to a multitude of different and often conflicting educational objectives. There is an important need of a single, central aim or direction in education."23 Perhaps it is not unreasonable to hope that one day such direction might be discovered.
No core of fundamental social studies knowledge

Many, though by no means all, social studies educators charge that the field is in chaos. One of the major reasons if not the major reason for this chaotic condition is that there does not yet exist a clearly articulated, well defined, tested, testable, and widely acknowledged core of social science knowledge. The question has long been asked "What knowledge is of most worth?" At the present time it seems that there is no answer for this question.

Alan Griffin discussed this problem in an article titled "Revising the Social Studies" which appeared in the October 1963 edition of Social Education. This writer believes that the logic which Griffin used then is just as valid now. Griffin believed that it was not unreasonable to hope that a core body of social studies knowledge might be developed ... in time. He emphasized that the way the natural sciences developed was worthy of consideration. The central point of his argument was that "physics, chemistry, and astronomy were not 'brought together' by the fiat of curriculum-makers; they came together when they had reached the level of abstraction at which 'explanations' in one field were seen to clear up and remove the contradictions, evasions, or inadequacies in the content of another field."26

This presents an interesting paradox. There is no accepted body of social science core knowledge. Curriculum
writers cannot mandate one into existence. In spite of this, a field exists called social studies. Something constructive is supposed to be occurring in its classrooms. Some type of curriculum, therefore, has to exist. Educators cannot agree on this curriculum because there is no core body of knowledge. Catch--22.

The effects upon social studies of no core knowledge

The absence of a core knowledge has had several major and enduring effects upon social studies. Without making any value judgement, the absence has encouraged a proliferation of definitions, designs for teaching, and added, consequently, to the confusion in the classroom. It is nearly impossible under such circumstances to prove that one educator's values are any better or worse than another's.

Of the many definitions of social studies which have subsequently developed, perhaps the best known and most widely used is that of Edgar B. Wesley. Wesley drew a clear distinction between the social studies and the social sciences. The social sciences "were concerned with the detailed, systematic, and logical study of human relationships" which "may or may not be suitable for instructional purposes at the college level" and "are less
likely to be useful at the high school or elementary level."

"The social studies," continued Wesley,

\[...\] are designed primarily for instructional purposes. They are those portions or aspects of the social sciences that have been selected and adapted for use in the school or other instructional situations. The term social studies indicates materials whose content as well as aim is predominantly social. The social studies are the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes.\[27\]

Many social studies educators have been in substantial agreement with Wesley. David Kellum, for example, believes the function of the social studies program "is to introduce the student to the objectives, the methods and applications of the social sciences, and to bring him, through such a consideration, to a greater understanding of himself and of his fellow man."\[28\] Clearly, Kellum's definition was influenced by Wesley's. There is a subtle difference, however. Kellum's definition gives the reader a rationale for teaching social studies as well as a definition of it.

Other social studies educators have sought to define the social studies in a more utilitarian manner. Richard E. Gross asks,

\[...\] are there not some unique insights about human beings and democratic society that should accrue through social education? Are there not key shared values of the culture that the socio-civic curriculum needs to help maintain and extend?\[29\]

John Jarolimek, writing in the Eightieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, concurs:

Social studies programs must emphasize the positive aspects of pluralism, stressing
especially the necessity of a society to achieve and maintain unity while at the same time enjoying the benefit that derives from a legacy of ethnic, religious, and racial diversity.30

Many believe that the idea of citizenship education is the banner around which social studies educators should rally. In 1979 the NCSS declared that the "basic goal of social studies education is to prepare young people to be humane, rational, participating citizens in a world that is becoming increasingly interdependent."31 Certainly James P. Shaver would agree. When discussing what he believed to be the shortcomings of Project SPAN (Social Studies/Social Science Education: Priorities, Practices and Needs), he remarked "I hope that it will not distract public school or university people from efforts to come to grips with the social studies as citizenship education."32 James Barth and S. Samuel Shermis would seem to substantially agree. They define the social studies "as a set of goals which describe how the content of citizenship education is to be selected, organized and taught."33 John Michaelis equates the role of the social studies with that of education in general. "The central function of the social studies is identical with the central purpose of education--the development of democratic citizenship."34 No one who defines the social studies in such a manner is likely to doubt the value of the social studies in the classroom or that it has a worthy place in the secondary school curriculum.
Howard Mehlinger defines the social studies by describing it in a state-of-the-art manner:

1. It is a sequence of courses established for the most part sixty-five years ago when American society and expectations for schools were quite different.
2. It is a servant to special interests that believe students should acquire knowledge, attitudes, and skills congenial to their own particular perspectives.
3. It is a platform for individuals to advocate their views about the nature of society and the purposes of schooling without regard for whether their ideas are instructionally feasible or acceptable to the majority of Americans.
4. It is a sector of the school curriculum—perhaps the only sector—for which teachers are knowingly miseducated.
5. It is a subculture in which concerned professionals struggle to overcome crippling discrepancies imposed by traditional practices and institutional lethargy.35

Further educators have emphasized the social studies as a process that must take into account the student's ability to think, emphasizing the social studies as process rather than product. Alan Griffin wrote,

...the teacher in the secondary school must be satisfied to stimulate and promote a much lower level of reflection than is described in the analysis of a complete act of thought. Indeed, he must be satisfied to inject any degree of reflection, at any level, into the experience of his students.36

Professors Hunt and Metcalf, in their famous textbook, Teaching High School Social Studies, are in substantial agreement with this position. In reality their position, as well as Griffin's, evolved from the many works of John Dewey, most specifically his works How We Think and Democracy and
According to them, "the foremost aim of instruction in high-school social studies is to help students reflectively examine issues in the problematic areas of American culture." 37

It should be apparent to the reader that there is more than one way to teach social studies, or, at the very least, more than one way educators advocate teaching it. Barth and Shermis have chosen to call these "traditions" or "modes of selecting and organizing content and teaching." 38 They have identified three of these traditions, though they do not go so far as to claim that there are only three. They label the three traditions "social studies as citizenship transmission, social studies as social science, and social studies as reflective inquiry." 39 Donald O. Schneider describes them as subject centered, learner centered, and society centered. 40 John D. Haas also finds three general modes of teaching social studies. He calls them Conservative Cultural Continuity, Process of Thinking Reflectively, and the Intellectual Aspects of History and or the Social Sciences. 41 In a discussion under "Approaches to Social Studies Education," Muessig discusses the subject-centered approach, the citizenship education approach, the emergent-needs approach, the reflective approach, and the structure-of-the-disciplines approach. 42

If one subscribes such positions, one could see in the definitions presented in this document examples of each
tradition. This writer is not concerned whether Barth and Shermis, Haas, Schneider, or Muessig are correct. There may be considerable validity in holding that there are at least three traditions.43 It would not matter if there were one hundred distinct traditions. The point is that there is more than one. The lack of agreement upon a core has left the door wide open for any number of competing traditions which only serves to discredit the social studies profession (if there really is one) in the eyes of the public.

Each "tradition" has problems. If one accepts that the role of the social studies ought to be that of citizenship transmission or society centered, as Barth, Barr, and Shermis and others do, a series of unanswered questions looms. What does one mean by a citizen? What, for that matter, is a "good" or "bad" citizen? How does one teach another to become a good citizen? What content is involved? How does one know when he has succeeded? What evidence exists to demonstrate that citizenship education is a reasonable goal?44 What happens when social studies educators agree upon the goal but disagree on the means?

If one accepts that teaching social studies as social sciences is a worthy goal, similar questions arise. What content of the social sciences is most worth knowing? For what purpose is this knowledge to be learned? Would this knowledge have utility in the present or mostly in the
future? What evidence is there that would support the teaching of the social sciences as a worthy goal?

The tradition to which this writer subscribes, that of reflective thinking, is not without problems. If one is to examine "problematic areas" of the American culture as Hunt and Metcalf advocate, how does one insure that such areas are real problems to his students? Is it possible or even desirable to have every student in the classroom investigating the same problem and have it really be meaningful to each one of them? How would one manage a traditional classroom full of students each of whom is working on a different problem? What if the student chooses not to be a reflective thinker? How could one ever conceive of a national scope and sequence model when it is almost certain that different geographic areas of the United States will have students with very different problems? Would parents accept their children questioning dearly held values? It seems to this writer that as far as scope and sequence is concerned, the reflective educator might be forced to agree with Earl Kelley that "any curriculum set up in advance is bound to fail, because education is an emerging process."

One could legitimately ask why social studies educators could not simply pick and choose among the traditions? Is it not conceivable that one day the class could reflectively examine an issue and the next be asked to memorize voting
procedures so that they could become more effective citizens? The answer is, of course, that teachers could teach in such a manner. They often do. The problem is that underlying each "tradition" of teaching is a corresponding theory of mind, often conflicting. "The history of education bears testimony to the fact that influential theories of the mind translate themselves at some point into educational practice." A teaching method which consists of underlying conflicting theories of mind may only serve to confuse the learner.

Knowledgeable social studies educators would also have to acknowledge that to a greater or lesser extent, any method, way, or tradition is a form of indoctrination. One end of the spectrum (citizenship education) would find students being taught the specific values, skills, and content (whatever those are defined to be) an American citizen should have (though we tend to ignore that these values might conflict from one geographic area within the United States to another and also with the values of a world citizen). The other end of the spectrum might find a student who is free to rationally come to any supportable conclusion about the American system of values.

Many citizens would never support the latter type of education. Hullfish and Smith recognized that "always, in a plural culture, we may anticipate that individuals and groups will conceive of the schools as instruments for the promoting of their special purposes, or failing this, will suspect them
of being tools of others."48 Griffin was also keenly aware of this problem. "Even in America, many agencies are eager to cause children to accept particular beliefs, without reflection; some even go so far as to want facts kept out of a student's experience if their essential tendency is toward some conclusion which is regarded as undesirable."49

Without question, the continuing failure by social studies educators to find common purpose or direction will hamper the acceptance of social studies education as a profession. It will also hamper the acceptance of any new scope and sequence pattern. Is this a problem for the social studies teacher? Howard Mehlinger believes it may not be. He believes that as far as the average classroom teacher is concerned the continuing debate over a definition of the social studies is a "nonproblem" that "college professors enjoy debating. . .through articles and speeches."50 For many, perhaps most, classroom teachers there is some convincing evidence that the definition of the social studies is whatever the textbook defines it to be.51

On the other hand, a nonproblem for teachers can translate itself into a severe problem for students. There seems little question that many students do not like social studies.52 It does not seem a question of difficulty. As Lawrence Metcalf observed, "Many of our students who dislike the social studies are hard at work on much more difficult content in their science and mathematics courses."53 Those
students who frequently transfer from state to state or
district to district seem especially penalized. Since there
is no universally accepted curriculum, it is theoretically
possible that the secondary student could spend four years
taking American history, or receive none. A similar problem
exists for the teacher who moves from state to state. The
teacher trained in one state may have problems in gaining
certification in another, or be ill prepared to teach a
unique subject.

Over thirty years ago Earl Kelley remarked, in a small
book titled Education for What Is Real, a "stimulating
experience for any teacher is to stop and ask himself why he
teaches his subject. What is it for? What difference does
he expect to result in his learners having acquired it? How
does it contribute to the growth of the learner?" 54 These
are precisely the questions that must be asked by social
studies educators seeking to develop new scope and sequence
models.

In spite of all the controversy surrounding it, the
social studies field exists. It may or may not be growing,
but it is not yet dead. It seems to be in search of focus
and identity. One aspect is certain. Since 1893, important,
and sometimes not so important, committees have attempted to
define the scope of the social studies as well as the
sequence. Their efforts have been significant as well as
Insignificant. This dissertation proposes to examine some of them.

2 This writer does not subscribe to a Hegelian or Marxist cyclical theory of history. The concept, however, seems to have some validity when applied to the social studies. See Robert E. Jewett and Robert B. Ribble, "Curriculum Improvement and Teacher Status," in Social Education 31 (Jan. 67), pp.20-22.


20 Ibid., p.151.


22 Ibid., p. 564.


30 Jarolimek, "Overview," p. 15.


35 Mehlinger, "Gulfs," pp. 244-245.


39 Ibid.


43 See also John D. Haas, "Social Studies."

44 The historical evidence seems mixed. An often cited example of success of indoctrination would be Nazi Germany. On the other hand all the indoctrination in the world does not seem to change the way the Poles feel about their government.

45 The answer is, of course, not very many of them would. As Hullfish and Smith pointed out, parents were often worried that such an education would fill their children's heads with all sorts of ideas. The problem is that children already have ideas, usually ideas which are not grounded in evidence, or as Hullfish and Smith termed them, bad ideas. Such ideas are clearly worth investigating.


52 See Gross, "Status," for example.


54 Kelley, Education for What is Real, p. 99.
CHAPTER TWO

THE STUDY

Hope, not fear, is the creative principle in human affairs. All that has made man great has sprung from the attempt to secure what is good, not from the struggle to avert what was thought evil. It is because modern education is so seldom inspired by a great hope that it so seldom achieves a great result.

Bertrand Russell

It is generally acknowledged by social studies educators that the 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association has proven amazingly durable. It was not the first national committee to greatly influence the development of the social studies. It most certainly was not the last committee to attempt to do so. It seems to have been the last, however, to have significantly influenced the scope and sequence patterns in many American school systems.

This lack of fundamental change seems odd in light of the fact that conditions have dramatically changed since the
1916 report was written. The reasons for which the report was written for the most part no longer exist, but the scope and sequence pattern remains.\(^4\) It seems to this writer that a selective history of the era following the 1916 Report, if only to examine why it has remained intact, is important and has merit. Why were alternative proposals not implemented?

**The Scope of the Study**

This dissertation is primarily an historical inquiry. In it this writer chronologically examines alternative scope and sequence patterns from 1916 to 1983. Approximately one alternative curriculum pattern per decade is examined. Each is carefully chosen and critically reviewed.

This writer attempted to establish the issues and dilemmas still unresolved and identify work that remains to be done. Perhaps there are irresolvable problems. If so, these need to be recognized. On the other hand, this writer is optimistic that solutions exist; that problems that seem to have no solution may be unravelled by patient, investigative histories.
The Need for the Study

Fundamental curriculum reform has been unsuccessful since 1916. Historical studies of a broad nature are necessary if social studies educators are to understand why. Too often all that is known is isolated bits and pieces of events. Past efforts of curriculum reformers are often forgotten as well as deliberately ignored. Past mistakes are often repeated.

Scope and sequence endeavors do not take place in a vacuum. They are reflections of,

... past and current educational theories and practices, philosophies of education, psychological theories, moral and religious beliefs, customs and traditions, social ideas and ideals, economic theories, political doctrines, extant textbooks, statutory requirements, standards of scholarship, national ideals, and the pronounced opinions of leaders....

To this writer's knowledge no selective or comprehensive history of social studies scope and sequence efforts has been written. No dissertations have been written which investigate this apparent curricular stagnation. Some studies, however, have been completed which deal with certain phases of this inquiry.

There has been an interest, recently, by the social studies profession in its own history. Concurrently there has been a renewed clamor by many leading social studies educators for a new national scope and sequence model.
Both have been perceived to be important. Journals have opened their doors to social studies histories; The NCSS initiated a research effort directed towards a new scope and sequence model. It is projected that this effort (now under the leadership of Dr. John Jarolimek of the University of Washington) should be completed in 1984. It will be included and critically evaluated in this dissertation if possible. It can be seen, therefore, that dissertation efforts directed towards scope and sequence patterns, as well as histories of them, are timely and important.

This dissertation has a very real potential to reduce gaps in knowledge about past scope and sequence efforts. Comparing efforts over a long period of time has advantages. Perhaps patterns will be seen in the way such efforts either failed or succeeded. This writer submits that if social studies educators can understand why past efforts have failed or what it was about the early efforts that made them successful, perhaps "reinventing the wheel" every twenty years or so can be avoided.

It seems important to this writer to understand the motivation behind each effort. In each case there are reasons why the 1916 effort was believed to be inadequate. It seems equally important to develop an understanding of how each curriculum writer or committee viewed the nature of social studies. It is very clear that the perceived nature of
social studies is directly related to the proposed scope and sequence.

Towards a Common Understanding of Terms

It is requisite in any work of this nature that each reader have a common understanding of certain critical terms. There are four such terms in this document: social studies education; nationally recognized; selective history; and scope and sequence.

Social Studies Education

It should be very apparent to the reader that much confusion exists over a common definition of social studies education. This should have been made very clear in Chapter One. As scope and sequence is so closely related to the definition of the social studies, it is extremely important to have a common understanding, at least within this dissertation. It is sometimes necessary to arbitrarily establish a working definition simply to proceed with the work. This is especially true in the case of the social studies where no consensus exists. This working definition, however, is not necessarily this writer's personal definition.

Obviously, the term social studies education can be subdivided into two more basic elements. Neither is easily
defined. This writer chooses to accept the spirit of Dr. Edgar B. Wesley's definition and define the social studies for the purpose of the dissertation as "the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes." Admittedly, this definition begs the issue of what the social studies ought to accomplish. It does not clearly define the social sciences. It does not explain the most efficient way of teaching. Nor does it, for that matter, give any guidance as to why the social studies ought to be taught in secondary school classrooms of the United States. Social studies, on the other hand are being taught regardless of whether there is an agreed upon definition of what they are, why they should be taught, or what can be reasonably expected from them. Therefore any course which is primarily concerned with and draws upon the social sciences of history, anthropology, sociology, political science, psychology, geography, or economics for the use in the secondary classroom is, for the purposes of this dissertation, social studies.

Unfortunately the lack of agreement is not limited to a definition of social studies. Just as no consensus exists about the nature of social studies, none exists concerning the term "education". Does being educated simply mean that one has been exposed to a certain content of which one can regurgitate a certain percentage upon demand? Or does it mean that one's behavior will be demonstrably changed as a result of being exposed to content? If one's behavior does
not demonstrably change does it mean that an education has therefore not occurred? Can one convincingly prove that just because a student fails a quiz or a test that no education or at the least an acceptable education has not occurred?

James Harvey Robinson believed that the aim of education was "to produce a more intelligently critical and open-minded generation" which would "be better prepared to understand the condition of human life and to avail themselves of its possibilities more fully and guard against its dangers more skillfully than previous generations."13

Bertrand Russell theorized:

If the children themselves were considered, education would not aim at making them belong to this party or that, but enabling them to choose intelligently between the parties; it would aim at making them able to think, not at making them think what their teachers think.14

Herbert Thelen, writing in Education and the Human Quest, defined education as,

... simply the name for that part or aspect of all community life which is responsive to the demands of human nature, social interdependence, and societal goals; which seeks to relate these meaningfully to a sense of larger purposes and thus find significance in the great adventure of man on Earth.15

Alfred North Whitehead defined education as, "the acquisition of the art of the utilization of knowledge,"16 for, he said, "a merely well-informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth."17
John Dewey declared:

It is evident that education is primarily concerned with thinking as it actually takes place in individual human beings. It is concerned to create attitudes favorable to effective thought, and it has to select and arrange subject matter so as to promote these attitudes.18

Dewey defined education as the "reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience."19

Boyd Bode wrote in a similar manner that the central task of education was,

...to impart a realizing sense that we stand at a fork in the road. This reconstruction of experience is something that the individual must do for himself. There must be no indoctrination in the sense that the outcome is to be prescribed. A democratic philosophy of education rests on the faith that if the oncoming generation is given an opportunity to see the basic issue, democracy will win. It must win on these terms or it cannot win at all.20

Hullfish and Smith defined education as "in fact, a remaking of individuals, and thus of the culture."21

If this writer were to continue in this vein, and there are many more educational philosophers and specialists that concur in this viewpoint, the reader would not have a realistic picture of the educational scene. Many educators do not view education as an interactive, two-way street between teacher and learner. They view the process of educating as a one-way street in which teachers impart to
their learners carefully selected and very specific content; selected according to some criteria which have been established. As Bode characterized this tendency, "There is a temptation to assume that the heart of the educational process consists, first, in determining by some kind of analysis what particular facts are most important." This view is very seductive, especially when people are searching for anchors on which to hold. Unfortunately, there is no consensus on which particular facts are most important.

Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary defines the term "education" as "the process of training and developing the knowledge, skill, mind, character, etc., especially by formal schooling; teaching; training." Though this definition does not give one any clues as to what ought to be taught and why, it does provide a working framework.

Social studies education, then, for the purpose of this dissertation is the process of training and developing the knowledge, skill, character of the student (via the medium of the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes) in a formal setting.

Nationally Recognized

The term "nationally recognized" is more easily defined. This writer wishes the reader to understand that there have been many curriculum patterns suggested by various
groups since 1916. Most of these have been underwritten by national organizations. This writer does not wish to necessarily limit himself to such efforts. If this writer finds an individual’s model which attained national recognition, it will have as much of a chance of being included as that of national organizations.

One point must be emphasized. National recognition is not necessarily synonymous with classroom implementation; this is more true now than it was in 1916. In actuality, little is known about classroom practices, perhaps less about how they are changed. As Muessig recognized, "the classroom teacher is the alpha and omega of curriculum improvement."25

History

The term "history" is another which defies simple definition. Henry Steele Commager rightly pointed out that the word itself is ambiguous. "It means the past and all that happened in the past. It means too, the record of the past--all that individuals have written or said about the past...."26 History also means "the branch of knowledge that deals systematically with the past; a recording, analyzing, coordinating, and explaining of past events."27

History may or may not accurately describe an event such as it actually occurred. "The truth" says one author writing about the first two weeks of the Korean War, "lies caught
somewhere within the web of lies and contradictions that make
up history."\textsuperscript{28} "History," said Harry Truman, "is always
written by the winners.... Read up on the War of the Roses.
It was the very same thing. It took hundreds of years before
the real truth came out."\textsuperscript{29} Honest scholarship demands the
most careful and balanced account the documents will support.
This writer intends this document to be such.

This dissertation is intended to be a selective history.
This writer suspects that many curriculum reform efforts have
been duplicative.\textsuperscript{30} In any case, there are far too many
curriculum endeavors extant to examine each appropriately.
This history, therefore will be a balanced account of a
select group of proposals which represent major "traditions"
of social studies education.

Scope and Sequence

Scope and sequence, the hub around which this
dissertation revolves, is, fortunately, rather easily
defined, at least for the purposes of this dissertation.
"\textit{Scope} refers to the extent of content covered in social
studies courses. . . \textit{Sequence} refers to the order in which
various aspects of content are to be taken up in the
progression through the grades."\textsuperscript{31} Reduced to simplest
terms: scope is what, sequence is when.
FOOTNOTES


2 The Committee of Ten (1893) and the Committee of Seven (1898) are both credited with substantially shaping the nature of the social studies in their time. They are both discussed in Chapter Four.

3 Take, for example the American Historical Association’s Report of the Commission on the Social Studies or the many new social studies projects of the 1960’s.


There are several dissertations of this type. An example is George A. Fincham, "A Social Studies Scope and Sequence Study for Tennessee Schools," (Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Tennessee, 1964). Refer to Chapter Three of this dissertation for a more thorough discussion and analysis of research in this area.


Richard E. Gross and Thomas L. Dynneson, "Regenerating the Social Studies: From Old Dirges to New Directions," Social Education 44 (May, 1980), pp. 370-74. This is a summary of a "White Paper" which is available from ERIC on microfiche under order number ED 180863. See also Howard D. Mehlinger, "Social Studies; Some Guls and Priorities," in Mehlinger and Davis eds., The Social Studies, p. 260.

Edgar B. Wesley, op. cit., pp. 3-4.


Ibid., p.1.


23 People are always free to believe what they want in America, but it creates havoc in education. Controversial issues are risky, for even when objectively investigated parents may not like the results.


27 *Webster's*, op. cit., p. 863.


30 The is precisely the point raised by Hertzberg. Even more of a concern to her is unnecessary duplication caused by ignorance of past curriculum reform efforts.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nothing has brought pedagogical theory into greater disrepute than the belief that it is identified with handing out to teachers recipes and models to be followed in teaching.

John Dewey

PURPOSE

Several questions were explicitly or implicitly raised in Chapters One and Two. One such question was why has so little fundamental change occurred in social studies education since 1916. If this is true, status literature should confirm it. It would make no sense to investigate the concept of little fundamental change if, in fact, great change had occurred. This document is a selected history of scope and sequence endeavors. A search of dissertations and histories of curriculum recommendations was necessary to confirm that the proposed document would be unique. A claim was made in Chapter One that the social studies has suffered from ahistoricism. This was confirmed by the same search that located documents on curriculum recommendations. Finally, this search reviewed some recent literature on
sequential learning and instructional sequencing. This
writer is of the opinion that scope and sequence
recommendations must be based on more than a "just because"
基础。They must be defensible, logically consistent,
sensitive to the needs of society, students, and subject
matter, and sensible. This seems a most basic type of
research for social studies researchers.

Limitations

This chapter does not review or summarize literature
which expresses dissatisfaction with the 1916 pattern of the
social studies curriculum but does not recommend a specific
alternative. It does not discuss literature which does,
since that is the major topic to be investigated. It does
not include state curriculum recommendations.

In the first instance, this writer desired to know what
was and is as far as social studies curriculum patterns were
concerned. This writer was not concerned with what should
be, at least at this point. In the latter case, though state
curriculum guides are indeed sometimes useful, they are often
difficult to obtain. This is more true of older guides than
newer.¹ Of much more importance is the fact that such guides
are relatively useless determinates of actual classroom
teaching.² Furthermore, some state curriculum guides are
little more than suggestions how to integrate specific
innovations into an existing curriculum. In any case, traditional American local autonomy in school matters often cancels out proposed changes which are not supported by the local constituency.

**ORGANIZATION**

This chapter is divided into four major subsections.

Section One. Summary observations of research in this chapter.

Section Two. National, state, and regional status surveys of the social studies curriculum 1915-1983.

Section Three. Related histories or compilations of national committees' curriculum recommendations for the social studies 1920-1982.

Section Four. Recent research literature on instructional sequencing as well as any social studies dissertations on the same subject.

**LITERATURE RESEARCH PROCEDURE**

The process of identifying relevant literature was not a simple one. It was a combination of two computer searches and a long search of library materials as well as a series of phone calls to various universities and Microfilms International for copies of various dissertations. Neither
computer search proved particularly valuable, though neither was a complete waste of time or money.

The first computer search was initiated in January, 1983, and the second in September. The first was an attempt to identify articles and dissertations on scope and sequence in the social studies curriculum. It was more thorough than the second in as much as all dissertation titles since 1861 and all Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) literature after 1966 were searched. 62 ERIC articles and 18 dissertations were identified. Of these, 5 articles and 4 dissertations proved useful. The second searched articles written on sequential learning since 1979. 154 articles were identified of which 23 were ultimately deemed useful. This writer's personal search was most productive of all. Over 300 potential articles and 50 dissertations were identified, many of which proved valuable.

SOURCES OF LITERATURE

It seems to this writer that it may be valuable that future readers of this document know the general sources of the literature used in this chapter.
Dissertations:  
\textbf{American Doctoral Dissertations}
\textit{Dissertations Abstracts International}

Dissertation Compilations:
\textbf{McPhie}
\textbf{Gross and De La Cruz}
\textbf{Chapin}
\textbf{Wruble and Ratliff}

Sources of journal citations:
\textbf{Education Index}
\textbf{School and Society}
\textbf{School Review}
\textbf{Research in Education}
\textbf{Current Index to Journals in Education}

Social Studies Journals:
\textbf{The History Teacher's Magazine*}
\textbf{The Historical Outlook*}
\textbf{The Social Studies}
\textbf{Social Education}
\textbf{History Teacher}

Reviews of Social Studies Research:
\textbf{Wilson and Atwood (1934)#}
\textbf{Murra, Wesley, and Zink (1941)#}
\textbf{Carr, Wesley, and Murra (1950)#}
\textbf{Gross and Badger (1960)#}
\textbf{Harrison and Solomon (1964)#}
\textbf{Metcalf (1963)#}
Summary Observations

Summary observations are established to emphasize the points that this writer believes are suggested by the literature reviewed in this chapter. They are not intended as substitutes for either the summaries presented or the research reports. Such observations are purely this writer's, and he does not claim that they are unique.

Observation One. The 1916 Report of the Committee on Social Studies has had very major impact. It remains clearly the most used curriculum model in practice. This has been true for nearly forty years. It was a model which was often not
followed precisely. This flexibility seems a great part of its strength. Though it has never been government mandated, many observers of the social studies have noted that in actual practice it was so common that it might as well have been.

Observation Two. There was no rush to adopt the suggestions contained in the 1916 Report. This was partly because of the intervention of World War One. The report was first published barely four months before the United States' entry. This event so dominated the discussion in The History Teacher's Magazine that it was not until 1921 that an article was to be found discussing the merits (or lack thereof) of the 1916 Report. It was also partly due to the fact, which remains true, that many preferred the traditional teaching of history and only history. The Report varied from this tradition but was in line with the more progressive thinking of the time. It therefore met with immediate acceptance by some educators and intense resistance by others.

The movement to adopt the suggestions gained momentum slowly. It never totally obliterated alternatives. This writer does not believe, on the basis of his reading of the national surveys, that the 1916 Report established clear dominance over the competing models (mainly the 1898 Committee of Seven Report) until the 1940's.

Observation Three. The most durable and widely adopted part of the 1916 Report seems to be the eighth grade American
history, tenth grade world history, and eleventh grade American history sequence. The three most popular courses from 1920 to 1980 appear to be American History, World History, and American Government.

Observation Four. Civics (the citizenship variety) never dominated the ninth grade in the manner that American history and world history have their respective grades. Civics has at times been very popular; the grade in which it is most commonly offered is and has been the ninth grade. It has never consistently dominated it, however.

Observation Five. The Problems of Democracy course and its variations (Principles of Democracy, modern problems, social problems, etc.) never overwhelmingly dominated the twelfth grade. American government (or civics as it has often been called) has consistently been a strong challenger, especially in the West and Midwest. Thus it seems incorrect to this writer for any researcher to conclude that the 1916 pattern has been destroyed because the POD course is disappearing.

Observation Six. The twelfth grade is an area of flexibility and electives. The social sciences of economics and sociology have persistently been offered in this grade by many schools during the whole period covered by this dissertation.

Observation Seven. There are periods in which status surveys are difficult to find. This writer was successful in finding national surveys from each decade 1920 to 1980. Locating
state surveys was an entirely different matter, however. Many were conducted in the twenties and again in the sixties, but the interim is barren. Those which can be tracked down from the thirties to the fifties (and there are not many of them) are often dissertations from universities. Many do not loan them or could not find them.

Observation Eight. Comparing surveys is risky, even though this writer has compiled tables which do so. It is like comparing apples, oranges, and pears. Two separate surveys rarely ask the same questions. Some summarize what social studies courses schools offer; others what schools require. Some compile courses in which students are enrolled. One survey tallied the number and type of sections that social studies teachers taught. The point is that percentages thus vary quite radically, even in the same year. The reader, therefore, must beware.

Observation Nine. Little to no research has been done by social studies educators in the areas of effectiveness of social studies scope and sequence. Much seems assumed. Such research, though clearly desirable, would be exceedingly difficult to conceptualize and implement, if it can be done at all.
Status of the Social Studies Literature

National Surveys

This writer found over twenty useful national surveys which adequately illustrate the state of the social studies 1915 to 1980. Though the dissertation is technically studying the era after 1916, this writer wanted to include at least one survey which illustrated the dominate curriculum pattern before that time. Clearly, the information sought was whether the Committee of Seven report carried the weight that many writers ascribed to it. The answer was readily apparent. Yes, it did. It was quite obviously the most dominant curriculum pattern in the report.

Johnson and Briggs (1915)

This survey was conducted in 1914. Of the surveys used in this chapter, it was by far the largest. It consisted of a questionnaire circulated by the Department of Education, compiled by Henry Johnson and Thomas H. Briggs, and published by the Department of the Interior. It was very brief, covering but two pages. Questionnaires were sent to 11,515 schools nationwide. 7,197 replied (62.5%). The researchers concluded that "the evident, though not overwhelming,
distribution of the so-called 'four blocks of history' manifests the influence of the report of the Committee of Seven." (p. 120) Even if one did not come to the same conclusion, and this writer does not know how one could not, it is equally to be noted that the curriculum is dominated by some form of history.

A glance at the figures (summarized in Table One) confirms that the most commonly offered course in the ninth grade was ancient history; medieval and modern European history the tenth; English history the eleventh; and American history the twelfth. It should be noted that civics (another name for American government) ran a very close second in the twelfth grade. This was not inconsistent at all with the suggested course offerings by the Committee of Seven. It does, however, illustrate the traditional strength that government has had and continues to maintain.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>9th grade</th>
<th>10th grade</th>
<th>11th grade</th>
<th>12th grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required/Elective</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>1,324</td>
<td>1,558</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1,818</td>
<td>1,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economica</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 Continued

Special Note: The first column of figures in each grade level is the number of schools which require the course; the second column of figures is the number of schools which offer the course.

Dawson (1924)

The next substantial study of the social studies was conducted in 1924 under the auspices of the American Historical Association. 2,404 questionnaires were received from 48 states and the District of Columbia. In addition to the tabulations of these surveys, the results from the 504 largest school districts were also compiled. A comparison of the two is interesting.

On the basis of the information presented, Tryon concluded that there was some order in the chaos. He believed that "about one-third of the schools are under the influence of the N.E.A. Committee on Social Studies; a second third under that of the Committee of Seven; and only a third are without chart or compass." (p. 254)

Dawson himself concluded that ancient history, medieval and modern history, and English history were weakening in popularity, tending to be compressed into a one-year survey of world history. Furthermore, he noted that American history seemed to be moving from the twelfth to the eleventh
grade, being replaced in the twelfth by a "problems" course of some type. Finally, he observed that there seemed a tendency to place one or more of the new civics courses in the ninth grade (p.268).

The nearly inescapable conclusion is that the 1916 Report, though not clearly dominant, was gaining momentum. The essential results of the survey are listed below as Tables Two and Three.

Table 2

Course offerings from 504 schools with 382,224 pupils (p.254)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th># students</th>
<th>#schools offering</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>59,208</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Civics</td>
<td>32,727</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern History</td>
<td>30,657</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/Medieval History</td>
<td>29,988</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History</td>
<td>21,823</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>12,692</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval/Modern History</td>
<td>11,155</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>10,458</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>7,891</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English History</td>
<td>5,575</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Results based upon course offerings in 2404 school; number of schools offering either full or half year courses in order of popularity.

**Ninth Grade:** Ancient History, 592; Community Civics, 498; Medieval and Modern History, 360; Civics, 66.

**Tenth Grade:** Medieval and Modern History, 427; Modern History, 407; Ancient History, 394; Ancient and Medieval, 367; World History, 180. *

**Eleventh Grade:** American History, 485; Modern History, 400; Medieval and Modern History, 218; Economics, 199; Civics, 198; American and Civics, 143.

**Twelfth Grade:** American History, 713; Economics, 576; Civics, 501; American History and Civics, 487; and Problems of Democracy, 268.

* the tenth grade world history course was only offered as a full year course

Tryon, Smith, and Rood (1927)

This national survey was conducted of 78 junior high school centers in 27 states to ascertain the nature of course offerings. Of these 78 centers (note that these are not individual schools): 34 offered American history and 55 offered geography in the seventh grade; 29 offered general history and 23 offered U.S. history in the eighth; and 19
offered civics and 8 offered community civics in the ninth grade. The tendency seemed to be that of the 1916 pattern.

Wilson and Erb (1931)

Unlike the Tryon (1927) survey, Wilson and Erb surveyed 301 separate junior high schools in 13 states. Four major geographical areas were included. They found that there was "little agreement as to what social studies should be taught ... or how the selected material shall be organized for teaching purposes...." (p. 507) Wilson and Erb found the most common course offerings to be as listed in Table Four. What consistency there was seems generally more like the 1916 model. This probably should be expected, as the junior high school was generally found in reorganized districts, districts that would also be likely to accept the N.E.A. curriculum recommendations.

Table 4

Grade Seven: Geography, (151 schools); and Early American History (121 schools).
Grade Eight: Later American History (100); Entire American History (91); Community Civics (49); Geography (46).
Grade Nine: Community Civics (73), usually a year long course; World History (44)\(^a\); and Ancient History (27)\(^b\).
Table 4 Continued

a 35 of these schools were in one school district, Los Angeles.
b especially strong in the schools of the eastern states.

Kimmel (1932)

This study is monograph number 21 of the National survey of Secondary Education. It surveyed junior high schools in 55 cities and senior high schools in 43 cities. This, obviously, is not a very large sampling; the author admits as much. Only three courses, grades seven through twelve, had markedly established grade placement. American history was most prevalent in grade eight, civics in grade nine, and world history in grade ten. American history was only slightly favored in the eleventh grade, with Modern European or modern world history running a very close second. Grades seven and twelve were too congested to make any generalizations.

Marks (1933)

Marks surveyed the social studies in reorganized and unreorganized secondary schools. 267 schools from 44 states and the District of Columbia were represented. She concluded that reorganized schools (those following the 6-3-3 plan)
were more likely to be following the 1916 plan than four year
(8-4) high schools. The most consistent course offerings were found in the tenth (world history) and the eleventh (American History) grades. The ninth and the twelfth grades had various offerings which followed no consistent pattern. Four year high schools offered a slightly higher number of required history units and a lower number of non-historical subjects.

Delong (1941)

Delong’s survey of the state of the social studies is the first part of a three part Ph.D. dissertation completed in 1945. It was a continuation of doctoral work by Earl U. Rugg (Delong’s dissertation advisor). This work was not a survey in itself, but a review of NCSS yearbooks, The National Survey of Secondary Education (cited as Kimmel 1932 in this dissertation), The Report of the Commission on the Social Studies of the NEA Dept. of Superintendence, and an analysis of authoritative programs. His conclusion was that the most frequently offered course in grade ten was world history, grade eleven American history, and grade twelve economics or social problems. He found the practice in grades seven to nine was not standardized. Even so, the most common course offerings were American history and geography in grade seven, American history and Civics in
grade eight, and Community Civics and Vocational Civics in grade nine. (pp. 188, 75-99). He confirmed the trend noted by Dawson (1924) that Ancient history, English history, and Medieval history were slowly disappearing (p.132).

Merideth (1945)

This study was conducted under the auspices of the Minnesota Council of the Social Studies. At the time of the study, Merideth was apparently a member of the teaching staff at the University of Minnesota High School. Questionnaires were sent to all 48 states (34 replied) and 49 cities (33 replied). The central tendencies are summarized in Table Five(p.345). The 1916 pattern is the dominant though not overwhelming curriculum model.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seventh Grade</td>
<td>United States History (14 states, 16 cities); Geography (13 states, 8 cities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth Grade</td>
<td>U.S. History (27 states, 23 cities); Geography (3 states, 6 cities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth Grade</td>
<td>Civics (26 states, 21 cities); Geography (9 states, 2 cities).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth Grade</td>
<td>World History (31 states, 24 cities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 Continued

Eleventh Grade: U.S. History (29 states, 18 cities).

Twelfth Grade: Modern Problems, Problems of Democracy (22 states, 18 cities); U.S. History (5 states, 10 cities).

Bradfield (1949)

This survey consisted of a letter of request to each of the 48 state departments of education for information on their respective social studies program. 34 states replied. Of these, 8 were western states, 10 north-central, 9 were southern states, and 7 northeastern. Four courses were mentioned most frequently. In order of frequency of mention; U.S. history, world history, world geography and culture, and problems of democracy. World Geography was most commonly found in grade nine, world history in grade ten, U.S. history in grade eleven, and problems of democracy in grade twelve (p.179).

Jones (1953)

Jones concluded, on the basis of 107 replies from 118 high schools in cities of over 100,000 in population, that the national pattern was still "World History--United States History--Problems..." (p.257). The four most required social
The information used in this summary is for the calendar year 1958 but actually comes from Anderson (1964). As was noted in the observational summaries, status surveys of the social studies in the fifties were very difficult to obtain. This writer found reference to only one other survey from the mid-fifties, and he has been unable to obtain this survey at the present (Sexton, 1956). Fortuitously, Anderson et al. published statistics from a previous survey. The ten most often offered courses were, in order of popularity: Senior High School American History; World History; Junior High American History; Civics; American Government; State History; World Geography; Economics; Problems of Democracy; and U.S. Geography (p. 12).

Barnes (1960)

One of two surveys conducted of sixty-two cities in forty-two states (the other was of science subjects), this survey was of social studies subjects K-12. The results for grades seven through twelve are summarized in Table Six. 
This survey sent questionnaires to 500 school systems nationwide. 281 responded (56%). Replies were received from all 50 states (p.73). Of the replies received, 154 schools were 7-12, 60 were 10-12, and 67 were 7-9. Moreland concluded, on the basis of the survey, that the "pattern of required courses in today's schools strongly reflects the influence of previous national commissions, particularly the Committee on the Social Studies in 1916" (p. 102).

Precisely because of this, Moreland believed, "a re-examination of the social studies sequence in the secondary schools is of the utmost importance" (p. 102).

The two most common offerings for each grade level are summarized in Table Seven.
The status of the social studies was often checked in the years just following the launching of Sputnik 1. This was, of course, a time a great reform and energy for all of America's educational system. Jones decided to recheck the status of the social studies after almost nine years. The organization of this survey was quite similar to that of the 1953 survey in that senior high schools in 130 school systems in cities of over 100,000 in population were surveyed. All
130 schools responded. The majority of schools surveyed were requiring more social studies courses. The only significant difference in the amount of sections required was that World History was a much more common requirement and the problems courses required had declined moderately. The four most commonly required social studies courses and the number of schools requiring them were: United States History, 130 schools; World History, 64 schools; Civics or government, 64 schools; and Problems of Democracy, 34 schools.

Anderson et al. (1964)

Some surveys prove to be a rich source of information in addition to that which is specifically desired. This is one such survey. Not only were the social studies offerings in 388 public schools nationwide reported, but the offerings in 248 Catholic schools and 233 independent schools by region were also reported (p. 3). Though this summary will basically be concerned with the public schools offerings, the independent schools showed an interesting trend in essentially offering the Committee of Seven four block history courses (p. 17). The ten most commonly offered courses and the percent of schools offering them are summarized in Table Eight. Table Nine breaks Table Eight into four geographic regions. It is interesting to note the relative weakness of American government and corresponding
strength of P.O.D. in the East as compared to the other regions.

Table 8a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>%Schools Offering</th>
<th>Most Frequent Grade Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Am. History</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Geography</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State History</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geography</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9b

Percent public schools teaching as separate course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Midwest</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Hist.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Hist.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JH Am. Hist.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Gov.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Geo.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Hist.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Geo.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) (p. 12)  (b) (p. 13)

Jennings (1967)

Jennings is one of two national surveys cited which surveyed students rather than states or schools. 1669 seniors from 97 schools were interviewed in the spring of
1965. The results are summarized by total percentage of students taking the course as well as percent students per geographic area. The percentages of American History per geographic region were not given. Presumably this occurred because it was almost universally offered nationwide. It is also interesting to note that Jennings statistics tend to confirm the geographic strength and weaknesses of certain social studies courses first noted in the Anderson et al survey (1964).

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Total%</th>
<th>NE</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>W</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. History</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Gov.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Probs.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized World</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kimball (1969)

Kimball's survey, the second of two national surveys which tallied students, was of 1,589 seniors and 1,123 juniors taking social studies courses in either 1965 (seniors) or 1966 (juniors). The students queried were those taking the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test. The survey results are summarized in Table Eleven (p. 1).
### Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Percent Seniors Taking Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>2 2 5 6 75 75 20 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local History</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>22 24 39 39 3 3 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/Medieval</td>
<td>9 9 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern European</td>
<td>1 5 6 1 1 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics/Citizenship</td>
<td>20 18 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>20 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>12 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>21 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>3 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Juniors Taking Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/Local History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient/Medieval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics/Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gross (1977)

This survey is unique in that it is the only national survey after the 1916 model had become clearly established to conclude that the curriculum pattern had been "shattered" (p. 197). Part of the Gross survey is summarized in Table Twelve. Given the rather traditional enrollment rankings, even if total social studies offerings have declined, this writer finds it odd that Gross came to the conclusion he did.
Perhaps this was due to the fact the survey really surveyed students from 1973 to 1975; a time when the social studies (as well as all education) was under fire.

The Gross Report utilized information from 36 state departments of education (p. 194.), replies from almost 100 knowledgeable social studies educators from 49 states (p. 195), and information from the National Center for Educational Statistics (p. 196). Gross admitted that given the limitations in resources and personnel that the survey was not fully comprehensive and that the results should be interpreted carefully.

Table 12a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>% Schools Offering</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3,464,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,541,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,306,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>736,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>796,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>592,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Am. History</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>590,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>449,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>298,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a (p. 196) b included as part of 3,464,000

Wiley (1977)

Wiley, like Delong (1941), conducted a literature search to determine the status of the social studies from 1955 to 1975. She concluded, on the basis of this research, that the
sequence at the secondary level has...remained basically stable. The most notable changes have been the disappearance of courses labeled geography and civics at the ninth grade level and the replacement of the twelfth grade problems course with a proliferation of electives focusing on social sciences and currently popular topics (p.36).

Weiss (1978)

This survey was commissioned by the National Science Foundation. It was a part of Project SPAN. 400 school districts thought to represent the curriculum nationwide were surveyed. Weiss found that the most commonly required courses were United States History (81%), American government (34%), and World History (17%) (p. 26). 93 percent of the schools with grades 10-12 offered American History (p. 57). "World History, American Government, and sociology are the only other social studies courses offered by a majority of schools with one or more of the grades 10-12" (p.57).

Fontana (1980)

Fontana's study is somewhat unique as a national survey in that it investigated the number of social studies sections taught by 552 secondary social studies teachers drawn from a national sample. The three leading courses are American
history, American government, and world history. It is no surprise to observe that the most common grade in which they seem to be offered are the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grades. The results also seem to indicate some tendency, visible also in compilations of state curriculum guides, for world history and American history to be offered as two year courses. Table Thirteen summarizes the results.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Number of Sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Hist.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Gov.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Hist/Cult</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc/Psych/Anthro</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One other survey might be worth investigation, though this writer has not yet been able to obtain a copy of it as it is not available through University Microfilms International. Allen Gregory Sexton (1956) surveyed the social studies curriculum in selected American cities for the State University of New York at Buffalo in a Ph.D. dissertation. It might be worth reading if it can be obtained.
This writer originally intended to summarize state surveys in much the same manner as national surveys. The mounting length of the chapter as well as the duplicative nature of state surveys has led to a revision of this intention. The dearth of available state surveys from 1930 to 1960 was also an important consideration, as was the rather consistently poor design of most state surveys, especially the earlier ones.

As was noted above, many surveys of the social studies in individual states from 1930 to 1960 are unavailable. This does not necessarily imply that they were not done. Delong (1941) noted in part one of his dissertation that a relatively large number of survey type master's theses existed. Several may also be found in Wilson and Atwood (1934). Such theses are difficult to obtain even when one can find title and author. Their design need not be as rigorous as that of a doctoral thesis. Thus, only surveys which appeared in journals or obtainable doctoral dissertations are included in the chart below. In spite of such limitations, this writer located almost twenty state surveys of the social studies. Each reference is cited at the end of this chapter should the reader desire to read it.

The last column is a rough gauge of what the curriculum pattern appeared to resemble. 1898 signifies that
it generally followed the Committee of Seven recommendations; 1916 signifies that it generally followed the Committee on the Social Studies of the N.E.A. The state surveys are summarized below in Table Fourteen.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Dominant Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnard b</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartwing</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bain</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordier b</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finchum</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olmo</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broyles</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>No Pattern 10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roach</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surveys written but not available at this time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The early adoption by the state of Pennsylvania of the 1916 course of study should come as no surprise, as Barnard was a member of the 1916 committee.

Regional Surveys

Two regional surveys were found among the many surveys reviewed by this writer. Both were of the social studies curriculum in selected North Central Association schools. Both were conducted in the early sixties; both came to the same conclusion.

Masia (1963)

The Masia survey sent questionnaires to 400 secondary schools, public and private; about 10 percent of the 3,587 member schools. 368 replied (about 92 percent, p. 205) from 18 of the 19 states which comprise the accrediting area (only Wyoming did not have a sample included in the survey). Masia concluded that "the typical pattern of course offerings in these schools, either as requirements or as electives, still mirrors the 1916 recommendations" (p. 207). A quick review
of Table Sixteen, which summarizes part of Masia's findings, confirms this conclusion.

Table 15a
Percent Schools Offering Course in Grades 9-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World History</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. History</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O.D.</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intnl. Rel.</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a from Table Three on p. 208.

Sjostrom (1964)

Sjostrom also surveyed a random sample of schools in the North Central Association. Only schools with enrollments of over 1,000 students were surveyed. 83% of these schools responded. Sjostrom concluded, as did Masia, that the pattern of social studies course offerings was similar to that recommended by the Committee on Social Studies in 1916. Furthermore, he noted that World History was becoming more of an elective than a requirement, more electives were being added to the curriculum, and that United States History was increasing in popularity.
Related Histories and Dissertations

A careful search of many dissertation abstracts confirms that there has not yet been a selective history of curriculum patterns in the social studies. This same search also reveals that there were several good dissertations and books directly or peripherally related to the work this writer proposes to do.

All dissertations titled "social studies" were checked by this writer. All social studies dissertation abstracts since 1934 have been read by this writer. This writer is convinced that no dissertation of the nature proposed here has been done. In fact, no social studies curriculum historical dissertation seems to exist before 1949. Since that time, only six or seven dissertations which touch upon the subject have been done, all of them before 1969. Each of these was read in total by this writer and is reviewed and summarized in this section.

Three published works are also cited in this review. Each touches upon aspects of the social studies curriculum which this writer hopes to investigate in a more thorough manner. Each provided insight to this writer.

Published Works

This writer makes no claim that the three works cited here are the only valuable histories of the social studies curriculum. They were the most valuable to this writer,
however. The first work is Rolla M. Tryon's venerable *The Social Sciences as School Subjects*. Originally written as part of the American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies, it is certainly not new. It remains, however, one of the single most important reference works on the social studies curriculum prior to 1935. This writer highly recommends it as a source of information on the major committees as well as a history of several of the social studies disciplines.

Tryon recognized at the time he wrote this work that the Committee of Seven report was losing ground to the 1916 NEA report, but that there were still a substantial number of schools that continued to teach the four blocks of history.

The second published work which this writer found useful was John D. Haas' *The Era of the New Social Studies*. This work traced the social studies developments from 1955 to 1975. Haas was, of course, most concerned with the impact and the origins of the new social studies movement. He suggests that the roots of the new social studies can be found in the mounting criticisms of the whole American educational system beginning in the early 50's. As far as the social studies were concerned, Arthur Bestor's two previously cited works were of great impact. Also of great importance to all educational reform of the 50's was the launching of Sputnik I in 1957. This was the catalyst needed to launch the great series of reforms which profoundly
affected the whole educational system and eventually the social studies. Haas suggests that the educational establishment was a "convenient scapegoat" (p. 7).

In the early sixties, as has been demonstrated in several national surveys, social studies educators were seeking a rationale for the revision of the social studies curriculum. These surveys often did demonstrate that the social studies scope and sequence had not changed significantly since 1916. This did help to initiate a movement within the social studies for curriculum revision. Unfortunately, however, this "just because it's been around nearly fifty years" approach was not enough. No examination was conducted to determine the reasons why it had endured. The suggested changes, therefore, did not have the impact that many thought they would.

From the standpoint of this dissertation, the important observation by Haas was that there was an overall failure by social studies educators to implement the new curriculum materials. The 1916 model, though battered and weather beaten, survived generally intact. Haas attributes the failure of the New Social Studies to: 1) its tendency towards being one dimensional and placing emphasis on the structure of the separate disciplines; 2) a tendency to focus on a single discipline, yearlong course, or unit, which would be integrated into an existing structure; 3) an over-reliance on rationality; 4) a failure to take into account individual
student differences, neglecting students other than the college bound and academically talented; 5) an arrogant, myopic and ahistoric attitude. The New Social Studies reformers did not use the lessons learned by past curriculum reformers, implicitly assuming that nothing of worth had been learned or pioneered in the past (pp. 79-83).

The end result of such mistakes, asserts Haas, was that by 1967 the New Social Studies had reached its zenith and by 1976 was largely dead. Some materials were successfully implemented, but the final effect was that the social studies seemed more than ever to be "wandering in search of focus" (p. 84).

The third work that this writer found useful is a relatively new work by Hazel Whitman Hertzberg, Social Studies Reform 1880-1980. Published as a part of Project SPAN, Hertzberg's work is a serious study of social studies reform efforts since the social studies became an important part of the secondary school curriculum. Hertzberg found that since 1916 social studies reformers have been reluctant to suggest a new integrated scope and sequence, in spite of expressing a dislike for the NEA model.

Professor Hertzberg suggests that this reluctance as well as the resilience of social studies teachers in general to change, deserves closer study. One solution, she seems to believe, is that perhaps one scope and sequence model is not
enough; several ought to be developed from which individual schools and states could choose.

Hertzberg heavily emphasizes studying the lessons of the past. Modern social studies educators and curriculum reformers would do well to review the reports of the Committees of Ten, Seven, and Social Studies, whose brief recommendations with tight reasoning had such tremendous impact. She rightly points out that each of these committees carefully studied current American practices as well as European practices and innovations. None of them suggested anything that was a sharp break with the past or that was not already being done in leading classrooms. Hertzberg warns that if modern scope and sequence recommendations "are to be genuinely useful to the schools, they cannot depart too far from current school practice" (p. 179).

Dissertations

Alilunas (1949)

The Alilunas dissertation focuses upon the evolution of the movement which culminated in the Report of the Committee on Social Studies in 1916. Had it only discussed the many forces which impinged upon this movement it would have had relevance to this writer's work. Alilunas first described the dilemma of the social studies at the time he was
researching. Then, he related that situation to the origins of the social studies movement. He believed that by the late 1940's curriculum experimentation had been checked by conservative educators and lay people. Alilunas believed this could not last, however, because the trends which gave rise to the social studies subjects other than history continued to operate.

Since educators and lay people alike tended to act in ignorance of those important trends, Alilunas directed his dissertation towards a study of them. These forces coalesced in the 1916 social studies report. The main part of Alilunas' study therefore, was directed to the time before 1916. As he saw it, the key factor was that of functionality. The social studies, according to Alilunas' interpretation of leading social studies advocates, had to relate to contemporary American life. This was to be accomplished not by teaching more history, but less. This in turn led to conflict within the academic/lay community which Alilunas discussed at the beginning. In brief, this was a very helpful work in understanding the birth of the social studies movement.
Mehl (1954)

Mehl's often overlooked study may not properly belong in this review. It does not strictly examine the social studies. Rather, it discusses the high school at the turn of the century. It is an excellent work. Mehl relates the Committee of Ten's report to the forces at work within both education and society. Mehl found that although extreme diversity seemed to characterize the high school programs after the Committee of Ten's report, a "uniform pattern based upon the spirit of the Committee of Ten" existed (p.268). This seems a key understanding, since this report had large impact on the development of the social studies curriculum. Criticisms of whether or not surveys indicated the schools were implementing the social studies curriculum strictly according to the report or not are therefore seen in a whole new light.

Cruikshanks (1957)

This is an historical study which places emphasis upon curriculum content rather than organizational patterns. As such it only indirectly touches upon scope and sequence patterns. Cruikshanks work is helpful, on the other hand, in identifying the eras in which committees significantly influenced curriculum content and organization. It is also
helpful from the standpoint of his emphasis that content and objectives are a reflection of society, and should change as society changes.

Cruikshanks divided his study into four eras: 1) 1693-1915; 2) 1916-1930; 3) 1931-1940; and 4) 1941-1955. The first era was one of "unequaled stability" (p. 224). The second was, in sharp contrast to the first, a transition period from stability to "experimentation and expansion" (p. 225). The third marked the end of the period in which national committees exerted marked influence over the curriculum. The result was confusion and conflict over the curriculum. The fourth period was one in which the number of new courses and topics increased dramatically, continuing a trend begun during the third period. Most expansion occurred within established courses and marked disagreement over the nature of the social studies continued (p. 233).

Cruikshanks noted that from 1893 to 1955 "there was much evidence to suggest that textbooks were the major determinants of the curriculum".

Boozer (1960)

This is the first of two dissertations this writer obtained on The American Historical Association (AHA) and its complex relationship with the social studies. The AHA, as the reader should know by now, had several committees which
had a major impact upon the development of the modern scope and sequence. Boozer discussed eleven of them in detail, suggesting that their influence in school matters declined significantly from 1910-1920 (p. 362). Boozer attributed this to an increasing specialization in scholarship as well as the emergence of other social sciences (pp. 362-362). After 1920 the association, with one exception, the Committee on American History in Schools and Colleges, did not recommend particular courses of study. Perhaps the most significant of these failures was the Commission on the Social Studies of 1928. The AHA seems to have been embarrassed by the final report. It is possible that no recommendations would have proven acceptable or influential anyway.

One of the most important points raised by this long dissertation is the involvement of the AHA in its role as a learned society in the activities of the schools (p. 368). This seems the exception rather than the rule. In the case of the AHA it has been a most influential exception, indeed, since both the NCSS and Social Education owe their very existence to it.

Kinzie (1965)

The purpose of this study was to relate the curriculum recommendations of the American Historical Association to its
own philosophy. Though no later report was as influential as the Committee of Seven, "each of the studies...helped to clarify and enlarge the basic function of the social studies in American education" (p. 179). For years it was the only significant voice.

Kinzie determined, on the basis of his research, that dualism often existed between the philosophy which the association held and the curriculum recommendations it adopted. Not surprisingly, curriculum proposals from the AHA have been dominated by history. He found that it was not unusual for the AHA to advocate a return to more traditional methodology, often slighting the needs of the non-college bound students.

One of the more important findings by Kinzie was that the AHA saw the role of the social studies to be that of promoting effective citizenship.

Wells (1968)

This study summarized the curriculum recommendations of national committees 1893-1967. This dissertation, or a modification of it was published as The Foundations of the Social Studies Curriculum in America (1971). Wells survey found that there were at least fifty-five committees from twelve national organizations to make social studies curriculum recommendations within this time period. He also
found that these committees generally recommended few radical changes. This study is most helpful in quickly locating summaries of social studies curriculum recommendations as well as their source.

Nidds (1968)

Nidds' dissertation is an analysis of selected written recommendations of major committees, commissions, and projects. In some respects it is much like the Wells' study. Nidds major finding was that a causal relationship often existed between the curriculum recommendations of the selected groups and social, political, and economic forces (p. 188). Nidds concluded that these forces often led to errors in judgement in the choice of curriculum objectives. Many objectives became outdated and did not serve students in adulthood as intended (p. 188). This could have been avoided, he suggests, by an historical perspective which would counterbalance the prevailing social, economic, or political situation.
The final section of this chapter is devoted to a brief discussion of instructional sequencing. This problem is far too complex and the research too inconclusive to do much more than give it a cursory review. Though this seems a most basic and important issue, especially when discussing scope and sequence recommendations, almost no social studies educators have published research findings in this area.

Karen B. Wiley (1977) states: "There appears to be virtually no research comparing the merits of one type of content with another for achieving specified sets of social studies goals and objectives" (p. 168). In fact, this writer found only one secondary social studies dissertation (Sand 1949) which touched upon the many problems associated with scope, sequence, or continuity. No dissertations were found which investigated the effectiveness of social studies scope.

Instructional sequencing has long been widely identified as an urgent problem. Bellack (1948) stated that one "need not search long in the field of curriculum development to identify many urgent problems which call for solution....In this category must certainly be included problems relating to sequence and grade placement" (p. 610). Sand (1951) determined that "there is a desperate need for a theory of curriculum organization to bring order out of the present chaos" (p. 573). In spite of such calls research into
instructional sequencing has also been largely neglected, especially by social studies investigators.

There are many dimensions to this problem, several of which are relevant to this discussion. Unquestionably, the unprecedented American attempt to universally educate its public is part of the problem. Miel asked if it was necessary for all children to go through the same sequences. Furthermore, she pondered the issue of whether it was necessary that progress be steady. Is that "The Way" people learn? In addition to this she realized that any sequence, especially in the social studies, automatically means that one must order topics. One has to have (or should have at any rate) criteria for such ranking. For each topic included there are myriads of others left out. How does one defend his choices? Most importantly, she underscored the necessity of such sequences being defensible.

There seems little doubt that a uniform national scope and sequence would be convenient. It would be far easier to train teachers who would then be qualified to teach in any secondary school in the nation. Textbook publishers would have a field day. They would know precisely what textbooks school districts would need. A uniform scope and sequence would greatly reduce the trauma of student transfer and differing state/local requirements for graduation.

Though there seems to be many advantages to a uniform scope and sequence, unanswered questions persist. What
subjects should the social studies teach? This, of course, is dependent upon what the result is supposed to be. As has been seen, there is no consensus on this issue. Neither is there any research which confirms or denies the feasibility of specific alternative social studies scopes.

Even if the question of a "proper" social studies scope could be answered at this time, and this writer is not sure that it can, the serious problem arises as to what subject matter would best provide the desired results. Then, in what order ought that subject matter be presented? As there is little work on the concept of subject matter/desired results, this writer can only present speculations. It seems inevitable, for example, that when one discusses citizenship education, historians would suggest that history courses best fit the bill; sociologists would believe that sociology is the answer; economists would insist that students must understand the economy to be functioning citizens; and so on.

It would seem to make sense to teach from the simple to the complex; from the known to the unknown. This is especially true when teaching skills. As far as learning facts is concerned, however, such may or may not be the case.

In spite of the little that is known about instructional sequencing, it seems common for social studies educators to assume that learning best occurs if it is
sequential, building upon previous conceptual experience.

Stearns (1979) believes,

... it is obviously desirable in principle that teachers at one level have some grasp of the previous conceptual experience of their students, and insofar as we can construct patterns of conceptual development and actual models of linkage, we can clearly improve the educational experience and coherence in history. (p. 477)

What seems "obvious" in principle remains largely untested in practice. What research that has been done seems to be largely in the area of computer programmed instruction. The results seem to be very mixed. Natkin (1970) found that "the sequence effect...was dependent upon memory load. When the latter exceeded nine concepts, the linear sequence was not superior to the non-linear ones" (p. 20).

The problem of sequence extends not only to concepts, skills, knowledge, etc., between courses but also to within them as well. As far as this dissertation is concerned, the major concern is the relationship between courses. In this case, there is a prominent curriculum model in existence, even if everyone does seem to complain about it. There is also a "devilish" tendency, which Gross (1977) noted, for school districts to allow students to take any social studies course in any secondary grade. This would, of course, totally destroy the desired effect of a national scope and sequence model. The national model itself is no paradigm. Stearn claims it has "rather limited claims to careful sequentiality" (p. 471).
Perhaps this brief essay will be interpreted as an appeal to return to "square one." That is not the intention of this writer. He believes that defensible, flexible, practical, and progressive scope and sequence models are possible. There is a solid foundation to build upon. It is not necessary or desirable for students and teachers to be subjected (or subject themselves) to the types of curricula that characterize social studies in all too many instances. This situation must change.
FOOTNOTES

1 Many newer guides are available through ERIC on both microfiche and print. This writer counted over fifty such guides since 1970.

2 Compare the state guidelines to state surveys and arrive at your own conclusion. This writer would be surprised if your conclusion is different.

3 See, for example, ED 194 444, Walter D. Talbot, A Course of Study for Social Studies in Utah (1981).


9 The 19 member states are Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

10 See footnote #5 in Chapter One.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION 1787 TO 1916

Our fundamental purpose here is the creation of rich, many-sided personalities, equipped with practical knowledge and inspired by ideals so that they can make their way and fulfill their mission in a changing society which is part of a world complex.

Charles Beard

Social Studies 1787 to 1890

Rolla M. Tryon said that "in fact it was during the generation after 1830 that history actually entered the schools as an independent subject."1 This statement may or may not be entirely accurate. William H. Cartwright described it as "erroneous."2 Agnew O. Roorbach, in The Development of the Social Studies in American Secondary Education Before 1861, suggested that Tryon’s statement was, "not substantiated by either textbook or catalog evidence . . ."3 Perhaps, it would have been more accurate to have said that history as an independent subject was not
widely established by 1830, for it is true that its most phenomenal growth occurred well after that point. But established it was.

This writer has found it most helpful to divide the era of the entrance of the social studies into the curriculum before 1890 into three phases: 1. 1787 to 1830; 2. 1830 to 1860; and 3. 1860 to 1890. The year 1890 is chosen as a terminal point simply because it begins the era in which the Committee of Ten reported. As such it will be discussed in context with that committee report.

Social Studies 1787 to 1830

The exact point at which social studies entered the curriculum is difficult if not impossible to ascertain. As Wesley accurately observed, "Scanty and unsystematic reports furnish few reliable data concerning subject offerings and student enrollment for any considerable portion of the country." There is, on the other hand, considerable evidence that history was taught during this era.

Americans have consistently thought education had some value. As early as the 1732 the colony of New York passed a law which stated:

... good Learning is not only a very great Accomplishment but the properest Means to Attain Knowledge, Improve the Mind, Morality
and good Manners and to make Men better, wiser, and more useful to their Country as well as to themselves.5

New York was not the first state to do so. Massachusetts, for example, had enacted such legislation in the late 1600's. The importance of New York's law and similar laws was that it paved the way for later laws of greater importance. Such laws "laid the foundation of an education directed toward the development of civic efficiency."6 The teaching of history was one of the major ways in which early educators sought to make their pupils more useful to their country.

Several aspects of early social studies education warrant discussion at this point. When one talks of social studies education in the secondary schools of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century America, one must consider it in terms of teaching history or, more likely, history as segment of reading or geography and, very rarely, government. The term "social studies" was not officially sanctioned until 1916, after which it quickly gained widespread, though not universal, acceptance. The reader should also know that no social studies was taught in public high schools before 1821 for the simple reason that public high schools did not exist.

If public high schools did not exist, where were the social studies (or, more precisely, history, geography, or history in conjunction with reading and geography) taught?
What were the dominant forms of secondary education in the United States prior to the development of the public high school? The answer is twofold: 1. The Latin Grammar School, and 2. The academy.

The Latin Grammar School dominated the American secondary educational scene from approximately 1625 until 1785. Such schools primarily prepared a "select few" for entrance into colleges or in a general way for service in the state or church. Its curriculum was narrow and classical and probably did not include history.

It is not uncommon for social studies writers to assert that history, if taught in these schools, was done so in connection with Latin or the classics. Such was probably not the case. As Roorbach observed,

...The teachers were held accountable to parents and school officials for the ability of their students to pass the college entrance examinations. The requirements for admission did not provide for the power to interpret and to appreciate the content material of the Grecian and Roman authors. They demanded skill to read, write, construe, parse, and decline classical Greek and Latin. Thus we see that teachers and pupils could ill afford to divert their attention from these main objectives for any length of time.

It would have taken a very capable, dedicated teacher with and abounding interest in history to have attempted to teach it under such circumstances.

If, then, history was not taught in the Latin Grammar School, why would it be found in the academy? The answer is embedded in the purpose of the academies themselves. It was
a "new institution whose philosophic roots were embedded in the Age of Enlightenment." The scope of the academy was much broader and more general. "It received both boys and girls...and ministered to the masses as well as the classes. It prepared for life as well as for college. Its curriculum was about as broad as that of the Latin Grammar School was narrow." The academy was, in fact, more in line with the developing sense that citizens must be educated if they were to share in the responsible governance of the new republic.

It should be noted, however, that even if in a very real sense the public high school was an outgrowth of the spirit of the academy, the academy was not gradually transformed into a public institution. This certainly did occur, but it was the exception rather than the rule.

Noah Webster, in his educational survey of 1806, found science, geography, higher mathematics, modern languages, needlework, drawing, and even embroidery, but made no mention of history. In spite of this, there is evidence for its existence. The first American history textbook, *An Introduction to the History of America*, compiled by John McCulloch, appeared in 1787. Nearly thirty percent of Jedidiah Morse's *American Geography* (1789) was devoted to American history. From 1799 to 1814 seventeen history texts were published which had at least eighty-five editions. By 1815 a minimum of twenty-three editions of six different American history textbooks had been
published. If, as Wesly suggests, "the appearance in America of textbooks in history reflects with reasonable fidelity the growth of history in the curriculum" then history occupied a definite position in the curriculum by 1815.

Phillips Exeter Academy, in 1799, "gave Lewis Cass a certificate showing that he had pursued the following subjects during seven years in which he was a student: 'English, French, Latin, and Greek languages, geography, arithmetic, and practical geometry;...rhetoric, history, natural and moral philosophy, logic, astronomy, and natural law." History was introduced as a differentiated subject in the Boston Latin School in 1814.

The first American public high school, The English Classical High School, was founded in Boston in 1821. It was a response to needs which had arisen as a result of changes in the American way of life. Its curriculum included "The studies of the second class...Ancient and modern history and chronology...The studies of the third class...History, particularly that of the United States." By 1825 eleven out of thirty-three academies in New York reported work in "history".

The year 1827 "signaled the entrance of United States history into the school curriculum as a study required by law. At this time both Massachusetts and Vermont made the teaching of history compulsory." Additionally during this
decade thirteen new texts in American history were published. It is correct, therefore, for Tryon to have asserted that definitely by 1830 the social studies had an established place in the curriculum. There is considerable evidence that, at least in New England and New York, history was well established before 1820.

It must be noted, however, that history still was taught only to a very small percentage of the American student population. Only a small number continued their education past the common school and obviously only a minority of these attended institutions where history held a regular place in the curriculum.

The values ascribed to the teaching have been remarkably consistent. William F. Russell, writing in 1914, noted that there were several reasons history came into the curriculum: 1) for the purpose of moral training; 2) to provide for the leisure period; 3) to give religious training; 4) to inspire patriotism; 5) to obviate international prejudices; 6) to train for citizenship; and 7) to provide discipline of the mind. Furthermore, he noted, "With the exception of the religious aim, all are present today." Roobach confirms this, "all the values ascribed to history before 1861 were formulated by 1810."

As a formulative era the period to 1830 was crucial. The foundation for later spectacular growth of both the public high school and history in the curriculum was laid.
The decade of the 1820s was important in other ways as well. In 1823 President Monroe promulgated the Monroe Doctrine, which some historians have labeled the second Declaration of Independence. More importantly, in 1828 Andrew Jackson was elected. This event was to prove indispensable for American public education.

Social Studies 1830 to 1860

No one statement could characterize the era between the election of Andrew Jackson and the Civil War. Conditions were changing rapidly in these times; America was undergoing unprecedented industrialization. A slow movement towards urbanization was gaining momentum. Leadership was passing from the old elite to a more progressive and democratic middle-class. The founding of the Boston English Classical High School was one result of this movement. Its purpose was to "meet the needs of the new generation of merchants, artisans, and tradespeople."

As Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr. noted in The Age of Jackson, education was one of the most important planks of the common working man's credo. "Education would diffuse knowledge, and knowledge, the early labor leaders believed, was power." Labor's role in the rise of public education should not be underestimated. Its agitation for educational reform was very important. "Twenty-six towns in
Massachusetts, two in Maine (Portland and Bangor), and one in New Hampshire (Portsmouth) had established high schools before 1840. From 1825 to 1850 the percentage of New York's secondary students attending schools in which history was taught rose from 38.8 percent to 95 percent. Outside of New England and New York it was generally a different story. In 1837 only 5 percent of Pennsylvania's secondary students attended a school in which history was part of the regular work.

By 1860 six states had enacted legislation requiring the teaching of social studies. To the east lay Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island; to the south Virginia; and to the far west, California. In Massachusetts and New York, the leading states in educational matters, some form of history was taught in nearly every secondary school. According to the 1904 Report of the Commissioner of Education, 321 high schools were established in the United States by 1860. "One hundred and twenty one of these were in New England. More than one-half of the remainder were found in Ohio, New York, and Michigan." At approximately this same time (1850) there were, according to figures compiled by Alexander Inglis and E.G. Dexter, "6,085 academies with 12,260 teachers, and 263,096 pupils in the entire United States." They were strongest in the Middle and Southern states where the aristocratic
tradition was strongest and industrialization had the least impact.

Roerbach, studied 235 secondary school catalogs from twenty-three states issued between 1820 and 1860, and found American history offered in 175.40 The position of history in the classroom since 1830, though vastly improved, was still tenuous.41

One other factor was of increasing importance during the time before the Civil War and especially after it. That factor was the rise of state universities and colleges. After the Dartmouth decision (1819), many states established universities under public support and control. By 1860 ten states had passed legislation toward this end. This was of crucial importance to the development of the high school, for history was on the threshold of acceptance as a college subject. "The first chair in history was established at William and Mary in 1822. Harvard took similar action in 1839 and Yale in 1865."42 Such actions were destined to have far reaching effects. Few public high schools up to 1840 offered college preparatory curriculums. After that point, however, preparation for college increasingly became a recognized function of the high school.43 Since history was becoming an established subject on the collegiate level, its importance as a high school subject rose correspondingly.

By 1861 history held an important place in the curriculum of Massachusetts secondary schools.
Of sixty-three high schools reporting at that
date, fifty taught 'General History,' thirty-nine
'History of the United States,' sixteen 'Modern
History,' thirteen 'English History,' four
'Mediaeval History,' two 'French History,' one
'History of Massachusetts,' and one 'History
of Connecticut.'

Social Studies 1860 to 1890

From 1790 to 1890 the population of the United States
increased from four million to almost sixty-three million.
Its land holdings increased from a narrow strip along the
Atlantic Ocean until it spanned both the Atlantic and the
Pacific. The urban population of towns larger than 2,500
rose from six million in 1860 to twenty-two million in
1890. By 1890, America was on the verge of becoming a
recognized world power.

Twenty-three states passed laws in the forty years
following 1860 which required the teaching of history in the
public schools. This is in marked contrast to the
situation before the Civil War. History was commonly offered
in the curriculum, but had not found general acceptance as a
required study.

"The really marked development in public education,"
observed William A. Smith, "came after the Civil War. In
1869 the National Teachers' Association passed the following
resolution:

Resolved, That the National Teachers' Association
considers it a part of the duty of all
institutions of learning to inculcate the principles
of an intelligent citizenship, and to this end they earnestly recommend the more extensive introduction into our public schools the study of United States History....49

In 1876 the same organization, now called the National Educational Association, recommended United States history for the elementary and "universal History and the Constitution of the United States" for high schools.50

By 1890 the place of history in the high school curriculum was thoroughly established by law.51 At the same time there were at least 2,526 high schools, up from 321 in 1860. 202,963 pupils were enrolled in them.52 At least 82,909 of them were enrolled in history other than American history, so it is safe to assume that the actual number enrolled in all histories was higher.53

The Civil War had a major effect upon the development of education in the United States. The effect was more than twofold, but two are enough to make the point. The first was that the issue of states' rights was settled, at least for a very long time. Americans now fundamentally grasped the idea that America was a single nation.54 The second effect was, at least for the period of the reconstruction, that the South was exposed to Northern educational practices and culture.

Parallel events were of equal importance. The first was President Lincoln's signature on the Land Grant College Act (The Morrill Act) in 1862. Though states reacted with
varying degrees of wisdom, the overall effect was new activity by states in the area of higher education. The second event was the July 21, 1874 decision rendered by the Supreme Court of Michigan; Charles E. Stuart and Others v. School District No.1 of the Village of Kalamazoo and Others. This decision established the right of school districts in Michigan to tax in support of public high schools. Though the decision obviously could not be binding on other states, it seemed to have established a new climate of belief. At a minimum, it confirmed such a climate. Other states rapidly followed suit in the support of public education at the secondary level.

During this time colleges and universities had been steadily extending the range of history entrance requirements. By 1895, "out of a total of four hundred and seventy-five universities and colleges investigated by the United States Bureau of Education, three hundred and six required American history, one hundred and twenty-seven General history, fifty-seven English history, nine State and Local history, and one French and German history."

Though college entrance requirements were clearly a boon to the development of history in the elementary and secondary curriculum, they were a problem as well. Most colleges had different entrance requirements. It was difficult, therefore, for public high schools, which had a series of
non-academic problems with which to contend, to properly prepare their youth for college.

Harvard President Charles W. Eliot, who has been called, "in his day the most influential leader in the educational activities of the country," saw a "gap."56 Addressing the NEA in 1890, he said,

No state in the American Union possesses anything which can be properly called a system of secondary education . . . between the elementary schools and the colleges is a wide gap very imperfectly bridged by a few public high schools, endowed academies, college preparatory departments, and private schools, which conform to no common standards and are under no unifying control.57 Eliot believed that it was absolutely necessary to find a set of new and common standards if the colleges were to find "in the schools a firm, broad, and reasonably homogeneous foundation for their higher work."58 One result of such mounting criticism was that the NEA funded a Committee of Ten in 1892. This group was destined to become one of the most famous and influential in educational history.
By 1892, public high schools had gone through an era of rapid growth. Almost two-thirds of all secondary students were now enrolled in them, and they were on the brink of much greater growth. They were also in a state of great confusion, as the major divisions were poorly defined and badly articulated. Additionally, public high schools were saddled with two conflicting traditions. Americans saw value in both the classics (Latin, Greek, geometry, algebra) as taught in the Latin Grammar School and the modern subjects (English, history, science, modern languages) as taught in the academies. The classics still commanded great prestige. Booker T. Washington, in his autobiography *Up From Slavery*, appropriately illustrates this attitude. "There was a further feeling that a knowledge, however little, of the Greek and Latin languages would make one a very superior human being, something bordering on the supernatural."59 Though Americans clearly valued the classics, they were also a practical people, with a strong demand for the here and now.

The hybridization of the high school which resulted was unsatisfactory. Many schools attempted to fulfil both expectations:

...There were high schools which were exact copies of the academy. There were high schools which maintained the classical tradition of the Latin Grammar...
School. There were high schools which were for all intents and purposes free colleges. There were high schools which were normal schools. And lastly there were high schools which offered little more to their students than an advanced elementary school education.  

This chaos led many to believe that the time had come for a change. As Eliot had observed, there was indeed a very wide gap.

The very forces which combined to promote the rise of formal education also served to insure the success of the Committee of Ten. Two important forces were the growth of cities and a shift in the sources of intellectual authority. The concentration of people in the cities allowed a relative concentration of the wealth. Elaborate graded schools could be supported. Children of the city had time to spare. Unlike their counterparts in the rural areas where all hands were needed and which were poor in comparison, city children often had both access and means to a higher education.

A shift in traditional authority was equally revolutionary. Works of a new generation of scholars (exemplified by Herbert Spencer and Charles Darwin) helped to promote the development of experimental science. The scholar gained new respect:

The rise of the educated expert--most often a scholar at a college or a university--to a position of prominence in society explains a great deal about the movement of formal education closer to the center of American society in the late nineteenth and early
Theodore Sizer, in *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*, wrote,

American secondary schools were, at best doing an imperfect job. They enrolled few; they provided their students with instructors the majority of whom were barely competent. The schools' strength was sapped by politics and by the need for buildings and equipment. They provided no clear philosophy for education, as they were split by two relatively antithetical philosophies. They could only agree on a desire for mental power, whether it be gained from the grammar of the classics or from a study of contemporary political economy. Their pedagogy in the hands of inept teachers was one of rote memorization and recitation, hardly popular with the students.

This, in a nutshell, was the terrible predicament that social studies teachers found themselves a part of by 1890. This was the situation the Committee of Ten was to attempt to remedy.

The Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy of the Committee of Ten met in Madison, Wisconsin on December 28-30, 1892. Though the membership of this conference was also ten, it was an entirely different group. Both James Harvey Robinson and Woodrow Wilson were members. Apparently, Wilson was the dominant force within it. They were keenly interested in school children who would not go to college, or, for that matter even enter high school. They recognized that few continued their education past elementary school. "The instruction in history and related subjects ought to be precisely the same for pupils on
their way to college or the scientific school, as for those who expect to stop at the end of the grammar school, or at the end of the high school."64

Their report further stated,

...it is the mature conviction of the members...that the subjects in question, especially when taught by the newer methods herein advocated, serve to broaden and cultivate the mind; that they counteract a narrow and provincial spirit; that they prepare the pupil in an eminent degree for enlightened and intellectual enjoyment in after years; and that they assist him to exercise a salutary influence upon the affairs of his country.65

They further justified the study of history in the schools on the basis that it was "a subject unequaled for its opportunities of comparison...as a part of the education of a good citizen...(and as) moral training."66 They stated that the "present subjects are very unsatisfactory...because they are studied with a view only to the college examinations, and without reference to any preparation for life."67 The conference likewise condemned the rote memorization of facts. "In our judgement this is in itself the most difficult and least important outcome of historical study."68

Not unexpectedly, the conference recommended increased social studies (history) courses in the curriculum. They wished to insure that not only did the student who was going to high school and college get a sound history education, but that the elementary student would receive one as well. The
scope was rather simple: history. The sequence was chronological and logical. Accordingly, they recommended where possible an eight year consecutive history curriculum, thus hoping to insure that it penetrated the elementary as well as the secondary school. The sequence they recommended was as follows:

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First year</td>
<td>Biography and mythology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second year</td>
<td>Biography and mythology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third year</td>
<td>American History; and elements of civil government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth year</td>
<td>Greek and Roman history, with their oriental connections. (At this point the pupil would naturally enter the high school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth year</td>
<td>French History. (To be taught as to elucidate the general movement of mediaeval and modern history)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth year</td>
<td>English History. (To be taught as to elucidate the general movement of mediaeval and modern history)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh year</td>
<td>American History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth year</td>
<td>A special period, studied in an intensive manner; and civil government.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The members of the conference recognized that not all schools would be able to institute the eight-year program and accordingly offered a six-year alternative. The alternative program moved Greek and Roman history from the elementary segment to the senior high sequence and eliminated French history and the special period. They further acknowledged the importance of good teachers. It "is desirable that in all schools history should be taught by teachers who not only have a fondness for historical study but who also have paid
special attention to effective methods of imparting instruction." Finally, they were "unanimously of the opinion that (the Conference) would suggest nothing that was not already being done by some good schools..."

The report was published in late 1893. It was widely reviewed and discussed in educational and popular journals and papers. The reaction was varied. The important point was that there was reaction and widespread reading of it. Furthermore, it was important because it was the first of its kind. "It is clear that the Committee of Ten opened the floodgates for groups studying every nook and cranny of the curriculum." It is difficult to determine the influence the Committee of Ten report had in determining the nature of the history curriculum. It must not be forgotten that the Report concerned the entire secondary curriculum and not merely the social studies. The success of the Report as a whole did not, therefore, guarantee that the history recommendations would be implemented.

The report as a whole seems to have been successful. E. O. Sisson, in the Atlantic Monthly, wrote in 1910 that "It may be safely said that there is not a high school in the United States today that is not affected by the Report of this great committee, its total influence is beyond estimate."
There is some disagreement as to how successfully the history recommendations were implemented. In 1906 E. G. Dexter's wrote an article titled "Ten Years' Influence of the Report of the Committee of Ten". It is one of the very few pieces of contemporary research on the effects of the Committee of Ten report. His study disclosed "the fact that neither at the time of the appearance of the report nor ten years later were these history recommendations even approximated by the actual conditions." As far as the report itself was concerned "The Report of the Committee of Ten seems not to have influenced directly to a marked degree the curriculum of public high schools." 

On the basis of this same evidence, Tryon concluded that the "proposals of the Conference were favorably received." Sizer concluded that "history itself remained largely neglected." Bernard Mehl, in an unpublished doctoral dissertation, determined:

One fact presents itself with impressive weight and that is that the Committee of Ten had relatively little effect toward the creation of a uniform program of studies for all the high schools in the United States. Dexter's study was bound to record this fact for all the evidence is inescapable. But again even with almost extreme diversity in high school programs as to actual subjects offered and the type and amount of parallel courses listed there could be seen a uniform pattern based upon the spirit of the report of the Committee of Ten.

The report could not have come at a more auspicious time. Sizer declares that "an authoritative document was
badly needed." In addition to this, he postulates that the Report was successful because it:

1. Provided much needed direction.
2. Had authoritative membership.
3. Had a carefully planned distribution.
4. Accurately reflected the scholarly mood of the day.
5. Had a moderate tone.
6. Avoided placing blame.
7. Was timely.

Any report, no matter how influential, which included history only as a subdivision, was unacceptable to many historians. The result was the famous Committee of Seven commissioned by the American Historical Association. It too was destined to have great impact upon the position of history in the secondary curriculum. In a very real sense, however, it owed its success to the ground breaking work of the Committee of Ten.
The Committee of Seven - 1899

In early winter of 1896, work was commissioned by the American Historical Association on a new report. Though acknowledging the importance of the Committee of Ten subcommittee, the committee members declared that before their work had been undertaken,

...there had not been any systematic attempt of this kind; nor had there been any prolonged effort by any national association to present the claims of history, or to set before the schoolmen a statement of what might be considered the value of historical study and the place it should occupy in the school programme.81

They did, however, call attention to the "fact that there seems to be some agreement among teachers of history concerning the methods of teaching; and we have attributed this agreement in some measure to the recommendation of the Madison Conference...."82

It should come as no surprise that the Committee placed history in a *sine qua non* position in the curriculum. "We believe that the pupil should study history, and not something under the name of history - neither philosophy on the one hand, nor the art of historical investigation on the other."83 According to them, history's manifold values were:

1. Cultivating judgement.
2. Training in the acquiring, arranging, and systematizing of facts.
3. Training in the putting forth of individual product.
4. Developing the scientific habit of mind and thought.
5. Training in the handling of books as well as library skills.
6. Quickening, strengthening, and disciplining the imagination.
7. Training in the use of "well chosen words".
8. Providing good books.
9. Training to become intelligent citizens.

The Committee recommended a four year sequence of history studies for the high school. The scope was once again history and the sequence chronological.

Table 17

1. Ancient History, with special reference to Greek and Roman history, but including also a short introductory study of the more ancient nations. This period should also embrace the early Middle Ages, and should close with the establishment of the Holy Roman Empire (800), or with the death of Charlemagne (814), or with the Treaty of Verdun (823).
2. Mediaeval and Modern European History, from the close of the first period to the present time.
3. English History.

Several aspects of this curriculum are noteworthy. To begin with, the curriculum was consecutive. In this respect it was similar to the model proposed by the Madison Conference. The courses proposed were not significantly different. The major exception was that the Committee of Seven eliminated the "intensive period of study." This was not done out of any aversion to that type of study, however.
Indeed they believed "that the careful examination of a very limited period is highly beneficial." Their point was that they did not see "how in many schools sufficient time can be given to such work, and not because we advise against the adoption of that plan of work if there is time and opportunity in the school course." Finally, recommendations were made that American history should be offered in the elementary school no later than the eighth grade. This was common practice in many schools, as many students dropped out well before high school. They justified offering it again in the eleventh grade on the basis that the pupil could "work along new lines and attack new problems; ... new and more difficult books can be read, and more advanced methods used." According to Tryon, this report "almost 100 percent" dictated high school course offerings in history for two decades after its publication, losing influence only after the 1916 Report on the Social Studies was published. Little hard evidence seems to exist to explain in detail why the report was such a success. Perhaps it flourished because it was a history report by history authorities for history teachers (this writer is not sure that this theory holds water; quite a few later committee reports met the same criteria and were miserable failures). Possibly it was because it confirmed, in most respects, the recommendations of the equally authoritative Committee of Ten. Its scope and
sequence was simple and clear: teach history and do so chronologically. Do nothing that was not already being done in some good schools.

Edith M. Clark, writing about the curriculum in 1920, offered no explanation. She did confirm “the reports of the various committees appointed to investigate the history question have in large measure shaped the course since 1898...” Edith M. Clark, writing about the curriculum in 1920, offered no explanation. She did confirm “the reports of the various committees appointed to investigate the history question have in large measure shaped the course since 1898...” Edith M. Clark, writing about the curriculum in 1920, offered no explanation. She did confirm “the reports of the various committees appointed to investigate the history question have in large measure shaped the course since 1898...”89 1898 obviously refers to the Committee of Seven. Wesley attributed its immediate acceptance to its “timeliness, its specificity, and its completeness within the area treated...”90 Tryon writes,

Evidence of the committee’s tremendous influence on history in the high schools may be found in syllabi and textbooks published to conform to its recommendations, and the number of schools offering and requiring the courses proposed.91

Textbook publishers almost immediately began offering texts conforming to the Committee of Seven’s report. “A textbook intended for high school use in history published between 1900 and 1915 had hard ‘sledding’ if it failed to claim it conformed....”92 As was noted in the introduction, the power of the textbook to mold the curriculum was (and remains) very great. It is very powerful evidence in favor of the influence of the Committee that publishers so rapidly followed its lead.

Two contemporary surveys confirm such impressions. A survey of 7,197 high schools by the Department of Education
in 1914-1915 revealed that the four block history course was strongly entrenched.93

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Reg.</th>
<th>Elec.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ancient History</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3794</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>6141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern History</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>2662</td>
<td>5745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English History</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>2666</td>
<td>4625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American History</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4341</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>6201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A survey of social science subjects in 344 high schools of Wisconsin (1914-1915) reveals much the same trend. Of a student population of over 42,000: 10,500 were taking ancient history; about 5,100 medieval and modern history; about 2,500 English history; and about 6,500 American history. The dominant offering by far was the four blocks of history or some variation of it.94

Times, however, were changing. Educational philosophies were rapidly changing, too. Assumptions that educators took for granted during most of the nineteenth century were beginning to be seriously challenged at its close. Psychologists, typified by Henry James, conducted experiments that, however primitively, discredited the doctrine of formal discipline. Training in one field or subject matter was shown not to give increased power in unrelated fields.
Experimental schools (such as The Laboratory School established in 1896 at the University of Chicago) were inaugurated and had an immediate, profound, and sustained influence. They promulgated the idea that an education must be related to the student’s interest and experience. Griffin said:

It is fair to say that the twentieth century brought revolutionary changes in the outlook of teachers. The recognition that many and perhaps most of the activities were being carried on as a matter of sheer habit... that examination of what we were doing in light of what we thought we were trying to do was urgently needed swept across the educational world, carrying all before it.95
Public secondary education experienced a period of spectacular growth from 1890 to 1920. The number of high schools rose from 2,526 to 14,326, a 467% increase. The number of students attending school rose from 202,963 to 1,857,155, an 815% increase. The number of teachers rose from 9,120 to 97,654, a 971% increase. From 1920 to 1928 the numbers were destined to go higher yet. Numbers, however, have a convenient way of disguising problems as well as illustrating them. On the one hand, it could be said that universal public education and all that it implied was coming into its own during this period. On the other hand, educators were forced to ask themselves what an education was all about and how secondary public education was to coordinate itself with higher education as well as elementary education. As has been noted, this was not a new issue.

There was a startlingly high dropout rate at this time. According to the figures of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education,

... only about one third of the pupils who enter the first year of the elementary school reach the four-year high school, and only about one in nine is graduated. Of those who enter the seventh school year, only one-half to two-thirds reach the first year of the four-year high school. Of those who enter the four-year high school about one-third leave before the beginning of the second year, about one-half are gone before the beginning of the third year, and fewer than one-third are graduated.
This was absolutely unacceptable to the Commission which viewed an education as essential to the well being of the nation. Their solution was to recommend "the enactment of legislation whereby all young persons up to the age of 18, whether employed or not, shall be required to attend the secondary school not less than eight hours on each week that the schools are in session."\(^99\)

The Committee of Seven's recommendations, though very influential, had not met with unreserved acceptance. Writing in 1911, James Sullivan of New York, a member of the American Historical Association's Committee of Five (1908), asserted that to "many, even ten years ago, it seemed absurd that a pupil should have to know who Cleon was in order to be graduated from high school, but that he might be densely ignorant of Bismark."\(^100\) Though confirming that the Committee of Seven's recommendations had been widely adopted, he said that in most parts of the country the course of the four fields recommended by the Committee of Seven caused greater trouble than in New York City, and it caused great problems there.\(^101\)

The year 1910 saw the tentative beginnings of a committee which was destined to have a major impact upon secondary education, the Committee on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. At the July 6, 1910 meeting of the Department of Secondary Education of the National Education Association two resolutions were passed:
Resolved, That it is the sense of the Secondary Department of the National Education Association that the interests of high-school students would be advanced by the reduction of the requirements in foreign languages to one such language and the recognition as electives of all subjects well taught in the high school; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of this department that until such modification is made by the colleges, the high schools will be greatly hampered in their attempts to serve the best interests of boys and girls in the public high school.102

There is no mention in the minutes of that meeting that give any indication that a committee had been formed based upon the spirit of the resolutions. Such was the case, apparently, since the July 12, 1911 minutes declare that a resolution had been passed at the 1910 meeting which established a committee on the articulation of high school and college. Clarence D. Kingsley was appointed its chairman.103

The first report of the Committee of Nine on the Articulation of High School and College was presented at the Dept. of Secondary Education's meeting on July 11, 1911. The problems contemplated by the committee were at least threefold in nature. They recommended the actual credit requirements for graduation, advocated reduced college admission requirements, and discussed the function of the high school. The committee felt that college admissions "should be based solely upon the completion of a well-planned high-school course."104 Furthermore, they asserted that "the idea that the student should, early in his high-school
course, decide whether he is going to college ignores one of the chief functions of the high school; namely, that of inspiring capable students with the desire for further education." ¹⁰⁵ A college which had very specific requirements discouraged this possibility, hence the committee's recommendation.

The committee believed that it was the duty of the high school to "give every student instruction designed to return to society intelligent, able-bodied, and progressive citizens." ¹⁰⁶ The high school time was "the testing time, the time for trying out different powers, the time for forming life purposes. A final choice of a chosen vocation should not be forced upon him at the beginning of that career." ¹⁰⁷

Additionally, they were of the opinion that fifteen units should be the minimum graduation requirement. The fifteen units were to be divided as follows:

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nine specified units.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 units of English.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units of one foreign language.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 units of mathematics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 unit of social science including history.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 unit of natural science.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two additional academic units.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One or both of these units must be advanced work to meet the requirement of a second major of three units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By 1912 the committee acknowledged that the colleges had recognized the broader function of the high school. This in turn created the need to carefully select and organize the curriculum. To accomplish this purpose the committee recommended that twelve subcommittees be formed, one of which was on social science. By 1913 this committee had been appointed. Thomas Jesse Jones was named chairman. Sometime between 1912 and 1913 the committee renamed itself. From this time forward it was the Committee on Social Studies. This writer assumes that the chairman proposed this change, for it did not occur until the committee had been formed. Michael B. Lybarger concurs. He suggests that "the social studies, as these were understood by the social studies committee in 1916, were exemplified in the curriculum of the Hampton Institute..., Jones only teaching experience...."

The 1913 minutes of the Dept. of Secondary Education also reveal that the Committee on the Articulation of High Schools requested that the NEA "create a Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education." The name change was suggested because the old title "suggests that these committees are to be influenced by the traditional conception
of a preparation for college." Such was not to be the case. Once again, Clarence Kingsley was named chairman.

A major reorientation in emphasis occurred. Each of the committees was given the charge to "devote much attention to the organization of courses each of which will meet the needs of many pupils." Subject matter was a means to an end rather than an end in itself. The individual committees also had to take into consideration that two types of school plans existed: the traditional eight year elementary plan with a four year high school; and the newer six year elementary with a three year junior high and a three year high school.

The traditional plan of devoting eight years to elementary education is rapidly becoming obsolete. On the one hand, if the committees fail to take this fact into consideration their reports will be defective where the elementary school course has been shortened; on the other hand, if the committee assume the shortened school course, their reports will be defective where eighth-grade system persists.

Consequently each committee was charged with the task of addressing each system. Its plan had to clearly show how it could be adapted to both the 8-4 and the 6-3-3 system.

This writer acknowledges that this introduction to the 1916 Report may seem unnecessarily long. This writer is of the opinion, however, that it is very important that the reader understand that the 1916 Report was an integral part of a larger effort significant in a progressive era. Unlike many of the earlier committees (as well as later ones for that matter) which were independent in nature and were
dealing more or less specifically with history or the social studies, the 1916 Committee was operating in an environment of a total reorganization of the secondary education. Proposed changes to the social studies, therefore, occurred in an environment of reorganization and change, not independent of it. This may help explain the eventual widespread acceptance of the social studies proposals. Schools were looking for guidance in nearly all curriculum matters at this time. They were also in a relatively fluid stage; not yet established but growing rapidly. Essentially they had not had the time to become conservative and protective of tradition, for they had not yet established such traditions.

The 1916 Report (officially titled The Social Studies in Secondary Education) is a single document. It is Department of Education Bulletin, 1916, No. 28. One must, however, read two, perhaps four, more Department of Education complementary bulletins to completely understand the intent of the committee. The committee itself acknowledges as much. The reader is informed by the committee that its preliminary statements could be found in Bulletin, 1913, No. 41 and that it considered Bulletin, 1915, No. 23 (The Teaching of Community Civics) an integral part the 1916 Report. This writer suggests two additions: (1) Bulletin, 1915, No. 17, Civic Education in Elementary Schools as Illustrated in

The 1916 report was issued in late November of 1916. It was printed in total in the January, 1917 issue of The History Teachers' Magazine, which requested readers to evaluate it and send their comments to the magazine. Surprisingly, none appeared until the December/January 1922 issue, America's entrance into World War One having almost totally dominated discussion in the interim.

The Report immediately defined social studies. They were "understood to be those whose subject matter relates directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man as a member of social groups." The "conscious and constant purpose" of the social studies was to be "the cultivation of good citizenship." The good citizen was defined in Bulletin, 1915, No. 23 as,

...a person who habitually conducts himself with proper regard for the welfare of the communities of which he is a member, and who is active and intelligent in his cooperation with his fellow members to that end.

The committee furthermore declared that "unless the subject matter and the methods of instruction are adapted to the pupil's immediate needs of social growth, such attempts avail little." They were very concerned that the social studies course of the past had been too concerned by supposed future needs and too little by those of the
present.121 They did not believe that the student needed to acquire a comprehensive knowledge of any or all of the social sciences.122 "Subject values and teaching methods must be tested in terms of ... the application of knowledge to the activities of life, rather than primarily in terms of the demands of any subject as a logically organized science."123 On this basis, the four block unit of teaching history, which had "been largely fixed in character by the traditions of the historian and the requirements of the college" was declared to be "more or less discredited" and "ill adapted to the requirements of secondary education."124 No history was to be taught as though "it had meaning or value in itself...." Instead, history should be taught "to show its relation or contribution to the present."125 They firmly believed, on the other hand, "that there should be a social study in each year of the pupil's course."126

The committee suggested that the following sequence, which could be adapted by both the 8-4 and the 6-3-3, be used:
It is apparent that the committee intentionally designed the courses to be cyclical. In fact, if the elementary courses followed the suggestions made in Bulletin, 1915, No. 23, the student would have completed three such cycles by the end of his high school career. This plan was based "chiefly upon the practical consideration that large numbers of children complete their schooling with the sixth grade and another large contingent with the eighth and ninth grades." The committee wanted to insure that such students would have acquired some experience with all of the social studies no matter when they left.

A very great emphasis was also placed upon the teaching of civics. This was not the civics course of the past, however. Instead of stressing the operation of government machinery, the new civics aimed primarily to lead the pupil:

1. To see the importance and significance of community welfare... in their relations to
himself and to the communities of which he is a member;

2. To know the social agencies, governmental and voluntary, that exist to secure these elements of community welfare;

3. To recognize his civic obligation, present and future, and to respond to them by appropriate action.  

The chief stated purpose of teaching civics was simple. The committee believed that these courses would "provide the pupil with a motive for the continuation of his education." There was obviously a concern on the behalf of the committee that students should complete as much education as possible. There were unstated concerns as well. The United States had had a large influx of immigrants. Given the unstable world situation at the time of the report, there was concern as to how to best assimilate (or whether to assimilate) them into the American culture. The committee only obliquely indicated that such was a concern. "It is a fallacy, for example, to imagine that the children of native-born Americans need civic education any less than the children of immigrants...." The point is that this was precisely their concern. Recommend civic education to all children, however, and the problem is solved.

One final point seems appropriate. As has been suggested, the committee on social studies was an integral part of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. This commission presented, in 1918, seven cardinal principles which they believed should guide the
reorganization and development of secondary education. The following were regarded as the main objectives of education: "1. Health. 2. Command of fundamental processes. 3. Worthy home-membership. 4. Vocation. 5. Citizenship. 6. Worthy use of leisure. 7. Ethical character." In addition to these principles, the Commission expressed the opinion that,

...the secondary school must be equally zealous to develop those common ideas, common ideals, and common modes of thought, feeling, and action, whereby America, through a rich unified, common life, may render her truest service to a world seeking for democracy among men and nations.

The Committee on Social Studies clearly understood their role to be a part of that effort.

**The results of the 1916 Report**

Weasley and Tryon suggest that there were nine effects of the Report:

1. Many states began to offer the Problems of Democracy course in their senior year.
2. The sanctioning of the term "social studies".
3. The restoration of the National Education Association to a position of leadership in the social studies.
4. The adoption of a full year of American history in high school.
5. The popularization of the needs of youth.
6. A reduced emphasis on the value of facts.
7. The adoption by many schools of a full year of European history.

8. The demonstration that national committees could recommend new and relatively untried courses.

9. A reduction in the notion that the social studies had to totally reflect the social sciences.134

Neither could have foreseen that the scope and sequence model suggested by the committee would have endured substantially intact for over seventy years. It has endured in spite of many efforts to change it. It is hoped that this selective review of alternative proposals will help determine why. If the unresolved issues addressed by the various scope and sequence endeavors can be pinpointed, perhaps they can be successfully redressed.
Table 21
Summary of Curriculum Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Ten</th>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>Social Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>American and Civil Gov.</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Geography/European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight</td>
<td>Greek and Roman</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>Civics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Medieval Modern European</td>
<td>European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleven</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve</td>
<td>A special period</td>
<td>American/Civil Gov.</td>
<td>Problems of Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Scientific analysis can indeed show that our social order requires a certain degree of literacy and that it needs farmers and plumbers, but this would be a demonstration of the obvious. We all approve of these objectives. The point at which we need help is where there is no agreement.

Boyd Bode

A Brief Overview

The World War One and post-World War One era was a watershed period in American history. No longer was America a mere spectator in international affairs; it had become an active, influential participant. This is not to say that Americans were unanimously of the opinion that they should be involved in international politics. Just below the surface, opinion was deeply divided, and many had not yet made up their minds. The ultimate rejection of American membership in the League of Nations was a clear sign of this division.¹

A significant number were, however, caught up in the flush of victory and the fervor of Woodrow Wilson's
idealistic crusade, including many social studies educators. Consequently, a major attempt to revise the social studies curriculum was begun in late 1918. No committee could have had a more auspicious beginning. It was a blend of the old and new, and was sponsored by the AHA at the request of the NEA. Great accomplishments were expected. In retrospect, it is obvious that neither group expected serious resistance to a new report by a committee of national stature, targeted at remedying problems raised by the war.

The new report, titled "The Report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship," was published informally in 1921, their request for formal publication having been denied by the executive council of the AHA. As if this was not enough, it was not supported by the rank and file of the NEA either. Henry L. Selmeier, in an unpublished doctoral dissertation, suggests that the report, "did not satisfy anyone."

In spite of the fact that the report was neither revolutionary nor particularly conservative, it was controversial almost from the beginning. Edgar Dawson considered it, "an entirely worthy effort [that] had very little opportunity to secure a fair hearing." Edgar B. Wesley suggested, "It was apparently too 'historical' for the followers of the Social Studies Committee and too 'social' for the rank and file of the historians." Rolla
M. Tryon added, "One cannot prove by means of objective evidence that this Committee wielded any significant influence." In spite of this, the evolution of both the committee and its report are well worth investigation, for many lessons are to be learned from this, the first great failure of national committee from an organization which had been so influential in the formation of the social studies.

Chapter Five will examine how and why the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship developed, what it saw as its charge, the scope and sequence proposed, how its report was received by contemporary writers, how the report was evaluated subsequently, and why the report was rejected.

Evolution of a Committee

A Committee on History in Schools was appointed in October, 1918 by the National Board for Historical Service, a group "organized in April, 1917, to do whatever service historians as such could perform for government and public in war time...." In February 1919, the executive council of the AHA assumed responsibility for this committee:

The committee on history in schools was confirmed after a discussion in which it was explained that the national board for historical service, upon request by the National Education association, had appointed Messrs. Harding, Bagely, Bogardus, Chandler, and Knowlton a committee to prepare a report in the study of history in all schools of less than collegiate grade, and that the board had requested the association to cooperate with it in this activity by appointing a similar committee. The council thereupon voted to substitute for its
standing committee on history in schools a special committee consisting of the five members already appointed by the national board, together with Messrs. Ford, McLaughlin, and Schafer, and to prepare as soon as possible a report on the change and readjustments which should be made in the study and teaching of history in all schools, elementary, secondary, rural, vocational, etc., below the grade of college.12

Initially, Samuel B. Harding was appointed chairman, but he resigned the chairmanship (though not committee membership) in early 1919. Joseph Schafer was thereupon chosen chairman.13 At a meeting in Chicago on February 28, 1919, the committee immediately decided to plan a twelve year course of study directed towards both the 8-4 and the 6-3-3 school curriculums.14 In this respect it was different from many committees which had preceded it. No previous AHA committee had attempted to revise the whole history curriculum.

The committee believed that the most urgent problem was that of the history courses in the high school.15 In a preliminary article published in April, 1919, Schafer added, "[The] fresh study of the problem of history in the schools is one of the direct results of the war."16 "[The] American experience in that war," he continued, "brought home forcibly to many minds the need of better adjustment of the school work in these lines to the changed conditions of the nation and the world."17 Many educators and historians (especially the new historians) apparently agreed, feeling the need for history courses which were not exclusively
American in nature and which had a much greater emphasis upon contemporary matters. The American citizen of the post-war period, they believed, "must have some definite knowledge of world affairs as well as of strictly national affairs." 

This writer does not find such attitudes unusual or necessarily unreasonable. In light of President Wilson’s public statements, such reflections of perceived national interests were not uncommon. It should be remembered that at almost precisely the same time the committee began its deliberations Wilson was in Europe negotiating the Treaty of Versailles and formulating the League of Nations. Though American membership in the League was to be rejected, no one knew this at the time, hence the felt importance of European history.

Edgar Dawson suggests that there were other factors which should be recognized that led to the committee’s formation. "The first of these...was the growing self-consciousness of the social science guilds."

Dawson believed that, "A second influence...was the movement to reorganize the school system in the direction of the 6-3-3 plan." Since this would create a new school (the junior high), it was believed that, "some revision of all of the subject-matter curricula ought to be undertaken." This in turn led to the movement of which the 1916 Report on Social
Studies was a result. Curricular confusion reigned as the 1916 report competed with the older Committee of Seven report. Furthermore, added Dawson, "the war had left a heritage of almost hysterical demand for quick education in citizenship...." According to Dawson, the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship was, "[a] serious effort...made by historians to salvage the situation." At the committee's preliminary session on March 1, 1919, it informally adopted the following statement of aims:

1. The supreme aim in the teaching of history and social science is to give positive direction to the growth of those mental and moral qualities of children which, rightly developed, constitute the basis of the highest type of citizenship.

2. We gladly acknowledge that all sound training, through whatever feature of the school curriculum, contributes helpfully to this desired end, but we are nevertheless convinced that the historical training affects the result most directly.

3. Historical training (a) frees the mind...(b) tends to produce open-mindedness...(c) induces patient inquiry...(d) gives some grasp upon the methods of investigation...(e) develops... judgment...[and] (f) yields—or should yield—the high moral and ethical concepts of loyalty to principles and to institutions....

A preliminary report and a report of progress appeared in the May and June, 1919 issues of The Historical Outlook respectively. The preliminary report established that the committee desired, as much as was possible, to take the history teachers of the nation into its confidence. The preliminary report also established a tentative curriculum guide to which teachers could react.
Grades One and Two: In these earliest school years it seems wisest not to attempt to differentiate history from other matter of literary instruction.

Grade Three: The first systematic history work...includes, as reading matter to be pursued regularly in class, stories of early man and also stories of the pre-Greek world, especially Egypt and Palestine.

Grade Four: (1) Stories of Greece and how the Greeks lived; and (2) stories of Rome and how the Romans lived. Supplementary material in the nature of hero tales of both Greece and Rome can be found in desirable forms, frequently in the best literature of the ancient world.

Grade Five: Stories of the Middle Ages and how man lived in the Middle Ages; stories of inventions and stories of maritime discoveries; also the dramatic stories connected with Spanish conquests and settlements in North and South America.

Grade Six: English history as a background to American colonial beginnings, and for the story of American development economically, socially, and politically to the point where the Revolution resulted, setting up the new republic.

Grade Seven: American history from the middle of the eighteenth century, or thereabouts, to the present time by children of thirteen of fourteen years of age.

Grade Eight: Problems in American Democracy.

Grades Nine to Twelve: No definite proposal.
The June report of progress established two additional points. The first was that the committee desired to, "carry forward the work of the investigation and the program of conferences to a point where there shall be very little doubt either of the soundness of its conclusions or of their wide acceptability." The second was that the tentative curriculum guide had come under some intense criticism. There were three main criticisms:

It was said that the proposed course contemplated the inclusion of too much European matters; that it failed to provide a well-rounded course in American history and civics to be completed by the end of the sixth grade, when so many pupils are obliged to drop out of school; that it made no adequate provision for a definite scheme of social studies in the junior high school.

Accordingly, the committee revised its original proposal in an attempt to satisfy these criticisms. This resulted in a major overhaul of the proposed elementary curriculum. Grades 1-6, especially grades 1-4, saw a significant change in emphasis from the European (Greek and Roman) to the American. The later report on progress also gave a more definitive high school curriculum. The revised preliminary committee recommendations are summarized in Table 23.
Table 23
Revised Curriculum Recommendations

The Elementary School

Grade 1: The making of the community.
Grade 2: The making of the community.

The Making of the United States

Grade 3: How Europeans found our continent and what they did with it.
Grade 4: How Englishmen became Americans, 1607-1783.
Grade 5: The United States, 1783-1877.
Grade 6: The United States since 1877 and How we are governed today.

American History in its World Setting

The Junior High School

Grade 7: The world before 1607 and the beginnings of American history.
Grade 8: The world since 1607 viewed in relation to the evolution and expanding world influence of the United States.
Grade 9: Community and national activities.

The Modern World

The Senior High School

Grade 10: Progress towards world democracy, 1650 to the present.
Grade 11: United States history during the national period.
Grade 12: Social, economic, and political principles and problems.

Even this amended version was almost immediately criticized. Professor Wayland J. Chase of the University of Wisconsin wrote,
The most essential history subject for American boys and girls is, of course, American history, and probably the strongest popular defense of the study of the history of European peoples in American high schools is that American history and American social, political and economic institutions and conditions cannot be understood without a knowledge of it.31

"The best of all agencies for the Americanization of our citizens," Chase continued, "is the study of American history, and it should have the maximum time and the most favored place."32 Chase's criticisms are probably typical of the "historical" wing of history teachers. He further suggested that the high school program be a slight modification of the Committee of Seven and that the junior high program be heavily sprinkled with American history.

In "An Open Letter from the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship", dated Sept. 20. 1919 and published in the November issue of The Historical Outlook, Schafer explained the most recent actions of the committee. He related how he had spent the month of July, "presenting the results of our several conferences to gatherings of teachers at university summer schools."33 "Interest everywhere," he reported, "was keen, showing that teachers are concerned about the problem which our committee has under consideration."34 "I am convinced," he concluded, "that the committee's project is destined to meet with a large measure of favor."35

Unfortunately, Schafer's optimism was misplaced. It
was not shared by a majority of the membership at the December meeting of the AHA in Cleveland, Ohio in 1919. As was usual, several conferences were held. Of these, "that which excited the widest interest was the one called for consideration of the report of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools." The minutes of that meeting report:

To an external observer not versed in the problems of the schools it seemed much like other educational discussions he had heard, wherein A and B and C urge that in the framing of a new curriculum more emphasis should have been laid on this or that or the other element, while on the other hand all agree that the new scheme already contains too much, that it will be difficult to introduce, and that it should be worked out in greater detail. Such an observer was inclined to think that the new program, so carefully planned by the committee and so ably and open-mindedly defended on the floor by Prof. Schafer, was a good one, well adapted to its purpose of meeting the exigencies of a rapidly altered world, and that if it did not include all desiderata it was not for want of having taken them into account.

The minutes do not reveal the result of these deliberations. Charles A. Coulomb, reporting on the Cleveland meeting in the February issue of The Historical Outlook, does. After, "a lively discussion in which but one speaker seemed to favor the report as presented, it was tacitly agreed," that the report needed further study and revision. On this basis it was agreed that it should be re-presented at the 1920 Annual Meeting.

The minutes of the 1920 meeting are almost equally
In view of the transfer of the chairman of this committee, Professor Schafer, from Oregon to a new occupation in Wisconsin, and of other changes of occupation by other members, the committee asked to be discharged and to have its work reviewed and concluded by a fresh committee. The council acceded to this request and appointed a new committee to be called the committee on history teaching in schools, of which the chairman is Professor Johnson.

A reading of a summary of the minutes of the executive council reveals the same information plus one additional fact. The council voted to, "[discharge] the committee at its own request [and] record its high appreciation of the committee's laborious service."40

On the basis of these two brief reports one would get the impression that the discharge of this committee was a "matter of fact," normal occurrence. Such was not the case. A careful reading of the daily minutes of the executive council leaves quite a different impression. Schafer had submitted a report to the executive council in which the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship had requested:

Resolved, That the committee ask the council for permission to publish its final report to embody: (1) A fairly definite outline of the reorganized program for the 12 years as embodied in the June, 1919, issue of The Historical Outlook; (2) a straight-forward statement justifying the program; (3) syllabi of certain selected topics and courses embodied in the program which will be put forth not as final recommendations but merely as suggestive of the detailed treatment that might be accorded to the various part of the program.
This resolution was presented at the December 27, 1920 meeting of the executive council. After a discussion it was voted to defer action until December 29. At this meeting the executive council reconsidered the above request and voted to adopt the following statement:

In discharging the committee at its own request, the council desires to record its high appreciation of its laborious services. In view of the incomplete nature of the report and of the fact that a considerable difference of opinion seems to exist among the members of the association respecting the recommendations of the committee on history and education for citizenship in the schools, the council is apprehensive that formal publication of the report by the committee would appear to commit the association prematurely, and therefore the council thinks it wise to refer the whole subject to the new standing committee on history teaching in the school.

The executive council did grant, "leave to print informally such reports as the members might see fit to prepare for the press." "[The] McKinley Publishing Company...generously offered to devote the March and April issues of The Historical Outlook if so much space [was] necessary, to the production of the report.

Such space proved inadequate and the report was printed in the March (Parts 1 and 2), April (Part 3), May (Part 4), and June (Part 5) issues in 1921. Only the first two parts remain valuable, parts 3-5 being specific syllabi for the ninth through the eleventh grades which have, as Tryon rightly observed in 1935, "long outlived their value."

The curriculum guide which was printed in those pages
in no way differed from that which was suggested in the revised preliminary report (summarized in Table 23).

Schafer was by this time under no delusions as to how the committee report would be received.

We [the committee] know that not all who are interested in the reform of the social studies will be satisfied with its recommendations. In fact, we would be surprised if more than a good working minority shall favor all of them.  

Schafer added one thought which this writer finds significant and insightful.

One may be permitted to doubt if, in the advanced state which city school organizations have attained—with their varied aims and multitudinous courses—any one single report, however meritorious, can again acquire the influence exerted by the report of the Committee of Seven on Secondary School History, or that of the Committee of Eight on History in the Elementary Grades.

"We will be gratified if," concluded Schafer, "at the end of a decade, our work shall be appraised as helpful by way of suggestion and stimulation." Such was not to be the case.

**Intense Controversy**

The report as informally printed came under nearly immediate and intense criticism, some of it from the committee members themselves, others from individual curriculum specialists, most notably Harold O. Rugg.

Samuel B. Harding dissented from the recommendations
for grades 1-6. He especially believed that the sixth grade recommendation was inadequate. "I think it highly desirable," he argued, "that this year of European history should be strengthened." Furthermore, he doubted the wisdom of tying the committee recommendations exclusively to the 6-3-3 plan at the expense of the many schools which still operated under the 8-4 plan.

A.C. McLaughlin, a committee member who had also chaired the famous Committee of Seven, defended the report. Though admitting that he was not a specialist on the elementary grades, he supported the high school plan.

On the general scheme of study for the high school I think that I am more entitled to have a decided opinion and I feel fairly confident that the plan presented by the Committee meets the desires of the thoughtful and progressive high school teachers of the country.

Committee member Knowlton criticised the ninth grade syllabus as, "too comprehensive in character, with a tendency to over-emphasize the purely informational side."

Edmund S. Noyes, from Central High School in Washington, D.C., wrote, "We should continue to teach history as history, to try to recreate some appreciation of the past, including its points of view as well as its problems."

Irving H. Hart, from Iowa State Teacher's College, felt, "The proposed course of study in history for the first six grades marks a distinct retrogression from the standards established by the Report of the Committee of Eight."
These challenges to the committee report were mild compared to those unleashed by Rugg. In his "first significant foray into curriculum making," Rugg theorized that there were two schools of thinking when it came to reorganization of the curriculum in the social studies.56 The first group, according to Rugg, "is contributed to largely by college professors ..."57 "[The] second by students of the school curriculum and a miscellaneous group of progressive school people, administrators and teachers."58 He believed that the first group had largely controlled reorganization of courses for over thirty years, but that the committees representing this group, "have distinctly failed to bring about scientific and relatively permanent reconstruction of the school curriculum."59 Rugg characterized the Committee's work as "Armchair Opinion."60 As an investigational body he gave the committee further bad grades. "[It] appears that the Committee of Eight has failed completely."61

Rugg complained that the report was a "set of hypothetical programs by individuals."62 He concluded that his "own procedure would be to ignore the fact that we have today a curriculum in history, geography and civics; start afresh and define clearly the scope, functions and objectives of the course by this criterion of 'social worth'."63
Not surprisingly, Schafer took exception to such criticism. He questioned how, "the work as you [Rugg] outline is 'scientific'." Schafer believed that the committee report merited more than being "ignored."

The Committee all along has been animated by a spirit the reverse of arrogant. All of its members were honestly desirous of accomplishing some good....Under these circumstances, it is not to be wondered at if sensitive members of the Committee shall feel a little hurt when they find a talented teacher like yourself setting up the 'opinion' that the public should 'refuse a hearing' to us.

This writer is not surprised that Schafer reacted in the manner that he did. He is relatively certain that Rugg honestly, intensely believed what he wrote; his purpose was not offend but to instigate honest, complete curriculum reorganization. In this respect Rugg was correct, the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship did not propose anything that was significantly different, and perhaps one can understand Rugg's disappointment with the results. On the other hand, Rugg expected Schafer to understand what he meant by "scientific," and this was too much to ask.

Murry R. Nelson, a Rugg biographer, has suggested that many of those who criticised Rugg's use of the term "scientific" were, "critics who frankly did not understand Rugg's views or, if they did, were jealous of his notoriety." Nelson included the above mentioned exchange of open letters between Rugg and Schafer in this
classification. In doing so, this writer is of the opinion that Nelson was guilty of oversimplification. Schafer could indeed have been jealous of Rugg's notoriety, but it is much more likely that he was hurt, not jealous. Perhaps Nelson, after an extended study of Rugg's works, understood what Rugg meant. This writer, like Schafer, did not, (and he is not jealous of Rugg's notoriety and does understand what Rugg only later clarified). He shares Schafer's sense of outrage at Rugg's off-handed condemnation of over two years of hard work. Schafer was right. The letters to which Nelson referred did not clearly define what Rugg meant by "scientific." Such ambiguity only served to cloud an already murky situation.

In Retrospect

Did the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship deserve the ignominious end to which it was consigned? This writer thinks not. For the most part he finds that Rugg's criticisms were unjustified and perhaps naive. On the other hand, even though the committee did attempt to take the history teachers into its confidence, Rugg was correct in labeling the syllabi presented as those of individuals. Wesley believed that Rugg's criticisms may have hastened objectivity in curriculum revision. It may
have signaled the end of the era in which national committees wielded significant influence as well as the rise of the independent curriculum specialist.

Tryon suggested the committee had very little influence; Wesley agreed. Both, however, think that it is plausible that,

...the world-emphasis that came into the history courses of junior and senior high schools during the nineteen twenties could have had its beginning in the suggestions of the Committee, for no previous committee used the word 'world' in connection with a course in history.68

This writer suggests that there is one further and very major effect that this committee may have had. The Commission on Social Studies of the AHA, when it finally presented its long and prestigious report, did not outline a specific scope and sequence. It has come under much criticism for not doing so. This writer is of the opinion that this may have been a direct result of the failure of the 1921 Committee. The lesson that the members of the later commission took from the earlier was not that national committee influence was waning, but that they should not outline a specific curriculum. This, in retrospect, was a mistake.

Why did the committee fail? Many reasons have already been suggested, and these do not need repeating. This writer suggests that two other possibilities bear examination. The first is, as Dawson recognized in 1929,
that the committee bore too close a resemblance to the 1916 report without the impressive and forceful backing that the 1916 report had. Arthur Dunn, James Harvey Robinson, and J. L. Barnard "[gave] real force to the [1916] movement, because of the fact that these, and other similar members of the committee, were not mere educational faddists."69 The second possibility is that because the 1921 report bore such close resemblance to the 1916 report, it may have served to confirm it rather than compete with it.70 Dawson concludes, "Failing any kind of powerful backing, and lacking adequate funds to press its case, an entirely worthy effort had very little opportunity to secure a fair hearing."71
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CHAPTER SIX

THE FUTURE OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES (1939)

Where individual and social values are plural, schools cannot serve representatives of a single point of view. They have to represent, rather, the condition that makes plurality possible: the protection of freedom of thinking against the beguiling certainties of visions so clear to adherents as to blind them to the claims of other visions.

H. Gordon Hullfish and Philip G. Smith

The period from 1921 to 1939 is a study in contrasts. The 1921 Report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship was written in a time of optimism, a seemingly healthy economy, and peace. The atmosphere in which The Future of the Social Studies was written was that of severe, continuing depression, uncertainty, and war.

In spite of such contrasts, the era did not lack national committees or interest in the social studies and social trends. Part II of the 1923 yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE), edited by Harold Rugg, was devoted to the social studies. President Herbert Hoover commissioned a national survey of U.S. social trends in 1929 that was published in 1932 just prior to the
presidential election. This endeavor was a clear demonstration of Hoover's lifelong concern for and commitment to education in the United States. The Commission on the Social Studies of the AHA reported officially in 1934, having labored since 1928. The NCSS devoted two Yearbooks, the Fourth (1934) and the Sixth (1936), to the social studies curriculum. Such organizations as the Progressive Education Association, the NEA, and the American Political Science Association all published committee reports or bulletins on social studies.

Unfortunately, most of these seem to have had very little real impact. Tryon called the 1923 NSSE document, "The climax of the Society's efforts in behalf of the social sciences... [Its effect] was somewhat local and temporary rather than substantially permanent and general. [It] hardly belongs in the same class with the...Committee of Seven..."6

The prestigious AHA Commission on the Social Studies, of which Tryon was a member and his work a part, also had relatively little impact. Though it published a massive, multi-volume report with many valuable suggestions and great insights for social studies educators, it did not recommend a specific scope and sequence. Howard Rai Boozer, in an unpublished doctoral dissertation, suggests the commission's final report embarrassed the AHA.8
The Fourth and Sixth NCSS Yearbooks likewise avoided specific scope and sequence recommendations, choosing, rather, to publish what some leading schools were doing in the hope that educators would find edification in such programs.

A growing number of teachers were not satisfied with such recommendations. They desired more specific curriculum advice and professional guidance. Inasmuch as social studies teachers had their own organization, the NCSS, and their own publication, *Social Education*, pressure commenced for practical, specific curriculum suggestions.

Edgar B. Wesley, one of four requested by the NCSS to suggest what should be taught in American junior and senior high history courses, offered several specific suggestions. He then added,

The time has arrived, I think, when the National Council for the Social Studies and the American Historical Association could well afford to take some specific action to clarify the status of history in the schools. A committee might well be appointed to prepare an experimental program for the schools....It should set itself the humble task of preparing a program for the schools, one that would at least furnish a point of departure. The broad outlines of contents and sequence for the social studies should be laid down grade by grade. Such a program should allow for local adaptation and for some alternate units, but it should be a program which teachers could recognize and try.9

Ruth West, President of the NCSS, essentially agreed.

In answer to these demands the National Council last winter [1939] appointed a Committee on curriculum, headed by Mr. Edgar B. Wesley of the
University of Minnesota, whose function it is to survey the field and recommend to the Council practicable next steps to be taken in attacking the problem of the social-studies curriculum. In the meantime the Publications Committee was authorized by the Board of Directors to send to some twenty leaders in social-studies education requests for statements of what, in the opinion of each, the best curriculum in the social studies might be.10

Such actions apparently had wide support among NCSS members. The Future of the Social Studies, edited by James A. Michener, was one result. Formally presented to the NCSS in November, 1939, the bulletin retains considerable "freshness" even though the pages themselves are now yellowed, torn, and musty.

The spirit of this document is best illustrated by those who contributed to it, especially their curriculum recommendations. All scope and sequence models found in this bulletin are summarized in this chapter.

Ruth West wrote in the "Foreword":

Most social-studies teachers have found the reports of the Commission on the Social Studies of the American Historical Association their most helpful guide in this period of change. The Commission went far toward clarifying problems and giving insight as to the methods best adapted to their solution. The scholars and teachers who drew up those reports, however, felt that the time was not ripe for recommending a 'course of study' to be followed by schools throughout the country. Possibly that time will never come. Perhaps flexibility is the quality we most need in our curricula today. But for several years the [NCSS] has been urged to give the question serious consideration, with the result, perhaps, of developing a program adapted to the needs of school children at every stage of their growth, flexible enough to meet the regional demands of
the various sections of the country, comprehensive enough to meet the regional demands of the various sections of the country, comprehensive enough to cover the areas and concepts essential to an understanding of our dynamic society, and well enough defined to furnish a design into which our more or less chaotic thinking and practice might be fitted in a semblance of unity and order.11

Fifteen leading social studies educators responded to the NCSS request. Their suggested curricula were a mix of the tested and the untested, the practical and the impractical, the idealistic and the realistic, the concrete and the abstract. Michener cautioned readers: "The purpose of this book would be misunderstood if its provisional nature were not kept constantly in mind."12 He reiterated that it was not to be, "interpreted as a formal statement of what the social-studies curriculum should be."13 Neither did Michener wish teachers to determine an "ideal" course of study by seeking a consensus among the suggestions for each grade.14 He understood that such use of the bulletin could conceivably result in terribly flawed and incoherent curricula, instead of the carefully integrated experiences envisioned. Each scope and sequence proposal was to be taken as an organic whole and understood as such.

Michener believed that no national committee or commission was likely to become another "Committee of Seven." He found it, "interesting to note that even this most influential of committee reports was not able to command unanimous support."15
Michener ascertained, "nothing inherently faulty in varied courses of study; on the contrary, variety is to be desired in democratic education." On the other hand, professional guidance was needed. He suggested that individual curriculum construction often led to "schools...saddled with monstrosities.... usually repetitious, frequently lacking in integration, and oftentimes purely capricious in choice of subject matter." On this basis well constructed curriculum suggestions, even when not followed precisely, would be far more useful than none at all.

Michener hoped that the bulletin would be the first step of a sustained effort bring order out of confusion. He wished that, "these statements will form the basis of much serious discussion, and that from such discussion plans can be made for a commission which will consider the future of the social studies in the curriculum in American schools." In light of Michener's perception of the problems which previous national commissions had confronted, and the influence which they did not have and were unlikely to have, this writer finds it most curious that he saw another national commission as a solution. On the other hand, Michener, even now, is not alone. There remain influential social studies educators, who, in spite of much evidence to the contrary, desire a national committee for the social studies curriculum.
There were important problems Michener believed had to be addressed. It was important to determine if the social studies should be an integrated course of a collection of classes. Was it possible to have only one course of study? Did social studies merit a place in the curriculum? What skills should be taught? What place did citizenship education merit? Should social studies teachers indoctrinate? Finally, what content should be included?²⁰ Michener did not attempt to answer such questions.

As has been noted, fifteen social studies educators responded to the request for curriculum guidance. Some suggestions are dated. Even so, each merits summary. Tables 24 to 38 are such summaries. This writer has tried to summarize the most important features of each proposal; much will be left out while the essence remains. In several cases, specific scope and sequence suggestions were not given. These were, of course, more difficult to summarize accurately, and the reader should, if interested, take the time to read thoroughly those which interest him or her.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Content Suggested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Home and Neighborhood life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Community Life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Community life in other times and in other lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Making a living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Everyday life through the ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Progress through the ages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| VII.   | A) The background of American democracy.  
B) Democracy is established in the New World. |
| VIII.  | The struggle for political and social democracy in the United States. |
| IX.    | A) Democracy is tested in the United States.  
B) United State's neighbors experiment with democracy. |
| X.     | Human progress: problems in world history. |
| XI.    | Contrasts in Social Organization: The Local Community. |
| XII.   | Expanding Social Organization. |

---

Table 24

Harold R. Anderson
K-III. Enlarging their understandings and experiences with the things students already know and which vitally concern them.

IV. Different ways of living in the past.

V. Different ways of living today.

VI. Ways of living in Europe, yesterday and today.

VII. Ways of living in America, yesterday and today: Survey of American history in a geographic setting from discovery to 1840.

VIII. Ways of living in America, yesterday and today: Continuation of American history in a geographic setting from 1840 to the present.

IX. World Economic Geography.

X. The Evolution of Our Civilization.

XI. Modern Institutions, Social Trends, and Problems.

XII. Modern Institutions, Social Trends, and Problems.
Table 26

Roy Hatch

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Curriculum Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-I.</td>
<td>The School and the Home:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>The Schools and the Neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>The School and the Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Other Peoples in Other Lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>The United States and its North American setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>The United States since the Civil War. Alternate: European Backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>The Cradle of Civilization. Alternate: European Expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>The Development of Western Europe and its expansions into the New World. Alternate: The United States in its World Relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Pan-America Alternate: Our Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Modern European History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>United States History and Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Problems of American Democracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 27**

R.O. Hughes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-III.</td>
<td>Enlarge children's knowledge of what home, school, and community do for them, and develop further an understanding of independence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Regions and countries studied with special reference to the effect of natural conditions on the life and work of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Attention centered upon the United States, largely historical: to the Civil War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>The United States as a unified nation to the present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>The Old World and its achievements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>The New World and its progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Individual citizen and his place in society, government, and industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>The world as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>United States history and government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Sociology and economics.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Mary G. Kelty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-III.</td>
<td>Home, School, Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>American History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>American History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Development of World Culture. (Three year sequence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Development of World Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Development of World Culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Intensive study of their own community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Needs not formerly considered (Human Relations, Consumer Education, Home Making, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>American History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Modern Problems, Problems of Democracy. 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 29

A.C. Krey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-III.</td>
<td>Recognition of simple social experience in symbols—pictoral and verbal. Extension of knowledge of time and space by illustrations of experiences in other times and other lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Simple descriptive geography of world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Simple narrative history of development of our society from early beginnings in Europe to present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Extension of Grade V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Development of civilization: prehistory to present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Development of civilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Development of civilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Chief geographic patterns of world and social characteristics of patterns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI-XII.</td>
<td>Chief problems of American society considered in their economic, social, and political aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Chief factors in interrelationship of contemporary world society.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 30

Henry Kronenberg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Home and School life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Neighborhood experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>The Community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>How people live and work in my state and in other parts of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>How people live in other parts of the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>How our country came to be what it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>American history and citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>American history and citizenship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>World geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>The development of our civilization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>The development of the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Modern Problems and Issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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No specific K-12 curriculum was suggested. McCutchen would offer a problems approach in all six years of secondary education with the problems confined to an agreed-on scope but with no sequence pre-determined. In the eleventh or twelfth grade, where students usually experience a need for organization or classification of that which they have studied, survey courses in world history, American history, and contemporary society would be offered as electives.28

Table 31

S.P. McCutchen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No specific K-12 curriculum was suggested. McCutchen would offer a problems approach in all six years of secondary education with the problems confined to an agreed-on scope but with no sequence pre-determined. In the eleventh or twelfth grade, where students usually experience a need for organization or classification of that which they have studied, survey courses in world history, American history, and contemporary society would be offered as electives.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| VIII.  | A) United States history, 1865 to present.  
|        | B) Civics. |
| IX.    | Ancient and medieval history (excluding American) through the invention of printing. |
| X.     | Modern Old World history, including some account of the Far East, 1450 to present date. |
| XI.    | New World History. |
| XII.   | A) Economics.  
|        | B) Political Science. |
Table 34

I. James Quillen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-I.</td>
<td>Meeting the problems of young children in the home and school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Community living as experienced by the child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>A comparison of living in the local community with that carried on in other communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>The historical development of contemporary community life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>The use of science and invention in the modern world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>The effects of science and invention on intercommunity relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Social relations and problems in community and state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Region and nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>Social relations in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Major social problems of the world today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>Major social problems of the world today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>Transition from the public school to the life beyond.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35
Earle U. Rugg

Principles of Grade Placement:

a. Difficulty of learning will be the chief criterion of grade placement.

b. While rather hypothetical, the writer ventures these suggestions:
   1) In the primary grades the emphasis should be placed on the more direct and simpler lessons of socialization under teacher guidance with, in the main, an informal treatment of lessons from the race experience presented orally.
   2) In the intermediate grades where some measure of skill in reading and some ability to manage civic situations and problems had been attained, the emphasis can be shifted more to vicarious study of civic life and to simple student participation and civic activity.
   3) In the upper or junior high school grades the more formal study of reading materials along problematic lines can be attempted in practice in managing somewhat independently more complicated social-civic-moral situations in and out of school.
   4) In the senior high school grades, assuming this level to be the last formal aspect of America's universal instrument of guidance, both the activities and reading materials must be organized on rather mature, interpretive levels with much emphasis upon responsible self-direction.
## Table 36

Harold Rugg

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Curriculum Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| III.  | A. First study of earth and universe.  
|       | B. Nature peoples.         |
| IV.   | A. Communities of men.    
|       | B. People and countries.  |
| V.    | A. The building of America. 
|       | B. Man-at-work: A year's study.  |
| VI.   | A. Man-at-work: His arts and crafts.  
|       | B. Mankind developing civilization throughout the ages. |
| VII.  | A. Introduction to study of American civilization.  
|       | B. Europe builds industrial civilization and Europeanizes the Earth. |
| VIII. | A. The history back of the American problem: Land conquest and development.  
|       | B. The history back of the American problem: The beginning of a unique democracy. |
| IX.   | A. Community and national life: Citizenship and civic affairs.  
|       | B. Community and national life: Rebuilding America. |
| X.    | World problems and world history.  |
| XI.   | The American problem and its historical background.  |
| XII.  | The American problem and its historical background. |
Table 37

Donnal V. Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Curriculum Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-II.</td>
<td>Wide background of child experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III-IV.</td>
<td>Neighborhood, village, city, state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>The nation, how it came to be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>The world beyond national frontiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Secondary Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Themes:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Social organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>The evolution of social organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>The issues of living in a modern culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>Suggested Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Living together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Living in our neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Ways of living in other lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Where our ways of living come from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Living in the age of machines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Richer ways of living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>The world we live in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Our nation’s story.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>American communities today.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| X.     | a. Our cultural background.  
       | b. America’s basic industries. |
| XI.    | a. Critical forces of modern life.  
       | b. Facing America’s future.  
       | a. For high ability students; b. For low ability students. |
Reaction to the Bulletin

The Future of the Social Studies was received with interest at the 1939 NCSS convention; the second largest convention to be held up until that time. Over 700 people crowded the Friday (Nov. 24) afternoon session at which the...bulletin...was discussed.

Mary G. Kelty, a contributor to the bulletin, found, substantial agreement on study of the immediate environment for the first and second grades, but difference as to whether the immediate or a wider scene be considered in the third grade. The proposals for the fourth grade spread very widely, with ten proposals from thirteen contributors. The fifth grade recommendations have considerable spread with, however, some central tendency toward American civilization, while the sixth grade central tendency is toward the development of European civilization.

Erling M. Hunt from Columbia University and editor of Social Education, "found considerable agreement in the Bulletin's recommendations on American history for the eleventh grade and even more for modern problems in the twelfth." Furthermore, he believed that the proposals had in common "much interest in democratic citizenship, community study, development pupil responsibility, and the meeting of personal and guidance needs."

Harold Rugg noted, "The need is to put youth in touch with life as it is lived in America today." He thought the grade placement of history was not important. What was
important was the fact the history was taught. Rugg was most concerned about, "the 'witch-hunt' that [was] now threatening to stifle democracy in the country and attempting to bar some problems from consideration in the schools."42

Discussion continued Saturday morning. At this point Wesley presented five possible "next steps":

(1) encouraging the trial of perhaps twenty "experimental programs" following accepted curricula but so organized that choices would have to be made and that no school could adopt any program ready-made; (2) the collection and publication in a second bulletin of reports on extant programs; (3) reexamination by the National council of the whole field of objectives and principles, with attention to the effect of teaching on conduct and to procedures; (4) individual and comparative evaluation of programs now in operation; and (5) doing nothing.43

Very little of the heated discussion that characterized the AHA 1921 report seemed to exist. What existed was an intense interest in curriculum construction, a concern for the present chaotic situation, and a general satisfaction with the bulletin itself as a starting point for future work. Unfortunately such work as both Wesley and Michener suggested did not occur, probably a casualty of the gathering clouds of World War Two.

In Retrospect

It cannot be said that The Future of the Social Studies
transformed the social studies profession. Its impact is exceedingly difficult to gauge. The expected outcomes failed to materialize. Even *Social Education*'s sister magazine, *The Social Studies*, only mentioned the bulletin in passing and did not review it.44

Though not generally reviewed (favorably or unfavorably), it did not suffer the fate of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship. The bulletin was not rejected by its parent organization. Neither was it forgotten. It is still referred to in social studies articles and books. It did stimulate meaningful discussion among social studies educators. In this respect the bulletin continues to provide insight and influence, even now.

The bulletin is not unique in the sense that it provided multiple curriculum proposals. The 1923 NSSE Yearbook as well as the 1934 and 1936 NCSS Yearbooks each did so.

If then, the bulletin failed to produce immediate results, and was not unique in the sense that it was not the first to offer multiple scope and sequence proposals, exactly what was its significance? The real importance of *The Future of the Social Studies*, in the opinion of this writer, is that it signaled a significant change in attitude by an influential social studies organization. No longer
were vague recommendations sufficient. No longer was it necessary for social studies scholars and professionals to believe "the time was not ripe" for recommending a course of study. Specific scope and sequence proposals were recognized to have value, even if they could not be adopted precisely. Additionally, credence was lent to the idea that though the nation's teachers might not accept one curriculum designed for all (if that is really possible), multiple proposals which aided teachers in designing integrated curriculums had distinct value.

Such then is the legacy of this unique bulletin. The *Future of the Social Studies* supported change without tying teachers to one specific model, offered enlightened alternatives to chaos, and, conceivably, reinforced certain aspects of the 1916 report (junior high American history, world history, eleventh grade American history, and twelfth grade American problems). Furthermore, it strongly reinforced an "expanding environments" scope and sequence in the elementary grades.

Contributor S.P. McCutchen added,

*There was a time when an Aristotle could legitimately claim to be acquainted with all existing knowledge, when a King of Portugal could publish a compendium of human knowledge in one volume. There was a time when school teachers could with some accuracy predict the knowledge and skills which their adolescent pupils would need when they became adults.*

*This time had passed, as had the time when one*
curriculum model could fit the needs of all social studies teachers in the United States.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES

The school is expected to go beyond conditioning to understanding.

Herbert Thelen

The purpose of Chapter Seven is to establish an historical foundation for Chapters Eight and Nine, which primarily investigate two curriculum models for elementary social studies. To accomplish this, Chapter Seven is a description of the present elementary curriculum pattern, an historical examination of selected major committee reports on the elementary social studies curriculum from 1892 to 1940, and a discussion of some unique problems of social studies in the elementary grades.

The situation in 1984

Recent status surveys of elementary social studies confirm the existence of a dominant elementary curriculum pattern. Just as the 1916 Report on the Social Studies has
evolved into the predominate model for the secondary social studies curriculum, the "expanding environments" theme has become the most influential model for elementary social studies. This model is not unquestionably accepted. It has undergone a number of changes in the past twenty years.1 A more thorough discussion of these changes, as well as the growing reservations with expanding environments, will be found in Chapter Eight.

Karen B. Wiley (1977) determined: "The 20-year period from 1955-1975 witnessed a continuation of the expanding-environments theme in the elementary social studies."2 This sequence of courses is sometimes also referred to as expanding communities, expanding horizons, or concentric circles, though the underlying assumptions are identical. The major premise of expanding environments is that the student should begin with that which is familiar and close at hand (home, school, friends, self) and move in gradual steps to that which is unfamiliar and far away (community, state, nation, world).3

The Report of Project SPAN (1982) supported Wiley's conclusions, as have all other recent national surveys of the social studies. It stated that "the overwhelming majority" of elementary social studies programs are based on the following sequence of courses as listed in Table 39.
Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>K-6 Dominant Curriculum Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Self, School, Community, Home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State History, Geographic Regions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. U.S. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. World Cultures, Western or Eastern Hemispheres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent efforts to change this sequence have not been successful. One such effort proposed to introduce the social science disciplines into the elementary grades. Another proposed the introduction of critical thinking skills. Such efforts have been rather sporadic, however. John Jarolimek questioned the introduction of social science disciplines in the elementary, believing, "[The] segregation of content into various disciplines may be entirely appropriate for the adult student, but such arrangement is not recommended as a program of study for young children."

Project SPAN and other recent surveys have also indicated considerable instability in the lower (K-3) elementary grades. Part of this may be temporary, a result
of the "back to the basics" fad. The social studies seem firmly established and well accepted in grades 4 and higher, even if they are not growing.8

What remains unclear is precisely how the expanding environments theme came to be so firmly established at the elementary level. Clearly the theory, if not the practice, was well established by 1939, as was noted in Chapter Six. In The Future of the Social Studies, Mary G. Kelty stated that such a curriculum was, "approved almost universally in the literature of education...."9 This seems an accurate statement. Even if one were to judge her comment solely on the basis of the NCSS bulletin, her conclusions would be confirmed, for eleven of the fifteen contributors suggested the expanding environments theme or some variation of it.

Historical Developments

The origins of national committee interest in elementary social studies, like those of the secondary school, are found in the NEA Report of the Committee of Ten. The Madison Conference did not, however, specifically address the needs of the elementary grades. On the other hand, it did not wish them to be ignored. The committee believed, "No part of our recommendations seems to us more important than this, that something in addition to American history be
taught in the grammar schools."10 They felt that such work, which should begin in the elementary school with biography, mythology, and good historical reading, needed no argument.11 Accordingly, their suggestion was that biography and mythology should be taught in grades five and six. The conference made no suggestions for grades one through four.

The Madison conference was cognizant of the fact that their proposed curriculum did not adopt either of the then common arrangements. It was not chronological; neither was it organized along the "German" model. The German arrangement alluded to seems to be some variation of the expanding environments theme.

It [has not] seemed desirable to recommend a method not uncommon in Germany, by which the student begins with the history of his own city and widens out to his nation, to Europe, and perhaps eventually to the rest of the world. ...[If] this process is at any point interrupted the child is left with the feeling that the world stops where his study has ceased.12

The NEA Committee of Fifteen, which reported in 1895 was directed specifically toward the elementary grades. This committee ranked history fourth in importance in the elementary school (language, arithmetic, and geography were ranked first, second, and third). Furthermore, they believed that the major importance of history was citizenship training.13 Oral history lessons to the extent of sixty minutes per week for the entire eight elementary
years were prescribed. Additionally, five lessons per week of U.S. history in the seventh and first half of the eighth grade and the same number for U.S. Constitution in the second half of the eighth grade were suggested. Their specific curriculum suggestions are summarized in Table 40.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEA Committee of Fifteen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Epoch of Discoveries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Epoch of Colonization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Intensive study of U.S. history (Grade 7 and 8). Intensive study of Constitution (Grade 8).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AHA Committee of Seven, like the NEA Committee of Ten, did not officially suggest an elementary curriculum. Their report did, however, contain an appendix with elementary suggestions by committee member Lucy M. Salmon. Her suggestions were found not only in the AHA report but also formed the basis for the curriculum recommendations of The First Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education (later the NSSE). Table 41 summarizes her suggestions as found in both reports.
Table 41

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lucy M. Salmon's Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AHA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade: III. Stories from the <em>Iliad, Odyssey</em>, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Biographies of prominent historical characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Greek and Roman History to 800 A.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Medieval and Modern European History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. English History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. American History.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grade: IV. | Stories from the *Iliad, Odyssey*, etc. |
| Grade: III. | Same. |
| Grade: IV. | Biographies of prominent historical characters. |
| Grade: II. | Same. |
| Grade: V. | Ancient History to 800 A.D. |
| Grade: VI. | Medieval History. |
| Grade: VII. | Modern History to the present time. |
| Grade: VIII. | American History. |

Salmon visited 32 German gymnasiums over a three month period as a part of her work for the Committee of Seven. She noted that their historical instruction was organized into three "concentric circles." The point of view of each was: "...the first circle, heroes, in the second, states--particularly the German state, in the third circle, the world...."

The overwhelming acceptance of the Committee of Seven's report stimulated the AHA to initiate a committee on history in the elementary schools. This "Committee of Eight" completed its work and reported in early 1909. Tryon said: "[On] the whole, it was exceedingly well received."
thought that most of its curriculum suggestions were only mildly progressive, but that its sixth grade course, "Old World background to American History," was revolutionary.\textsuperscript{21} Common practice, as had been noted, was to offer American history in this grade. The Committee of Eight's curriculum recommendations are summarized in Table 42.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Indian life, Thanksgiving, Washington's birthday, local events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Indian life, Thanksgiving, Washington's birthday, local events, Memorial day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Pictures of historical scenes and persons in different ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Historical scenes and persons in American history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Historical scenes and persons in American history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>World from which our ancestors came.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Exploration and settlement of North America and the growth of the colonies until the close of the French and Indian War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>American history.\textsuperscript{22}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1916 Committee on Social Studies, like the Committee of Seven, was primarily directed towards secondary schools. Like the Committees of Seven and Ten, it considered the needs of elementary schools. Readers of this bulletin are referred to another, \textit{Civic Education in Elementary School as Illustrated in Indianapolis}, for elementary curriculum guidance. The emphasis, as the title
suggests, was upon civic education. The ubiquitous Arthur W. Dunn, the compiler of both bulletins and strong advocate of civic education, characterized the Indianapolis curriculum as, "not a process of instruction in variety of subjects, but a process of living, of growth, during which the various relations of life are unfolded." Table 43 summarizes the civic curriculum of grades 1 to 4. It should be noted that the curriculum was actually an eight year course. However, the curriculum suggested for grades 5 to 8 has no value in this discussion.

**Table 43**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic Education in Indianapolis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Year:</strong> The family. What parents do for children. How children show their gratitude... Attention is fixed upon the family because it is the social group of the child's first experience...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Year:</strong> The Home in contact with activities of the community... The civic study still centers in the home, but it is the home as affected by the outside community through agencies with which the child is already familiar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Year:</strong> First Half: The home and the school. Second Half: The home-and-school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fourth Year:</strong> First Half: Indianapolis. Second Half: Indianapolis as an industrial center in touch with other parts of the country, showing interdependence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1921 AHA Committee on History and Education for Citizenship also suggested a community emphasis for grades one and two. In this respect it confirmed a trend that the
curriculum should begin with experiences most students shared. Beyond this point, however, its elementary curriculum was more traditional, mainly historical. Once again American history was proposed for grades five and six. European history was moved to the seventh grade (see Table 23, Chapter Five). The effect of this report was probably minimal, especially in the elementary grades, so it is not discussed further in this chapter.

The Future of the Social Studies, when compared to the reports which preceded it, seems a radical shift in emphasis at the elementary level. Perhaps, in retrospect, this is its true strength. On the other hand, if one adopts the historical viewpoint the writer is attempting to establish, the bulletin seems a rather logical "next step." The expanding environments curriculum pattern was known to both the Committees of Ten and Seven and rejected by both. Nor was it adopted by the Committees of Fifteen or Eight. By 1916, coinciding with the rise of the "New History" and progressive education movements, it had gained a measure of support which seemed to build until it was the dominant elementary theory of 1940.

Perhaps the Depression assisted this process by forcing educators to look for new solutions to resilient problems. Perhaps the continuing growth of progressive education also aided its growth. Equally important was the increasing
acceptance of John Dewey's educational philosophy, which stressed the need for educational activities to be related to the child's experience. This writer is sure that Dewey did not approve of a great many of the educational practices to which his theory was harnessed. Though Dewey's philosophy could be, and was, used to support the expanding environments theory, the reflective thinker would be hard pressed to believe that one scope and sequence could fit the needs and experiences of all students. Furthermore, there is no way that such emerging and changing needs could be known in advance.

It should be emphasized, as Mary G. Kelty noted, that the expanding environments curriculum was not nearly as accepted in practice as it was in theory. For this to occur it needed to be championed by tireless and influential educators. Paul R. Hanna was such an educator, eventually becoming the educator best identified with the "expanding environments" and, conceivably, most responsible for its success. Hanna's curriculum proposals are the subject of Chapter Eight, while the alternative curriculum proposals of Hilda Taba are the subject of Chapter Nine.

Problems Unique to Elementary Social Studies

James G. Lengel and Douglas P. Superka investigated the problems of elementary social studies for Project SPAN. This writer finds their analysis both helpful and
enlightening. Lengel and Superka suggest that many major problems of elementary and secondary social studies can be traced directly to poor articulation. The articulation problem is complex, with multiple causes and no simple solutions.

Sources of poor articulation:

1. Elementary and secondary social studies usually occur in separate buildings. Teachers cannot share or interact with each other. Radically different teaching environments result, with each group acting independently of the other.

2. Social studies are often not considered an important part of the elementary curriculum. Articulation, by inference, is not important either.

3. Elementary and secondary social studies are based upon different organizational schemes; the elementary being a series of expanding environments and the secondary a series of contracting cycles.

4. A qualitative difference in the training of elementary and secondary social studies teachers. The elementary teacher, for many valid reasons, is not usually as well founded in social studies content or methods.

5. Elementary and secondary social studies textbooks reinforce disarticulation, and textbooks, as was noted in
Chapter One, have a significant influence on course organization and content. Elementary texts are often part of a K-6, K-7, or K-8 series. K-12 text series are rare. Rarer still are school districts which adopt them. Secondary texts, on the other hand, are generally developed separately for individual disciplines; coordination and integration not generally being significant design factors. The end result, of course, is a poor K-12 articulation.

Such problems are unlikely to disappear with the wave of a magic wand. Long-term, careful analysis of possible courses of action and their consequences is needed. Clearly, students are ill served by poor elementary and secondary social studies articulation; almost anything which enhances K-12 integration will be of benefit to them. Paul Hanna and Hilda Taba attempted solve some of these problems, and it is to their work that this dissertation now turns.
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CHAPTER EIGHT

SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE ELEMENTARY GRADES: HANNA

For it is said that humans are never satisfied, that you give them one thing and they want something more. And this is said in disparagement, whereas it is one of the greatest talents the species has and one that has made it superior to animals that are satisfied with what they have.

John Steinbeck

Roots

Paul Robert Hanna, the educator most identified with the "expanding communities" elementary social studies scope and sequence, was born in Sioux City, Iowa on June 21, 1902. He was graduated with an A.B. from Hamline University in St. Paul, Minnesota in 1924. He earned an A.M. and a Ph.D. from Columbia University in 1925 and 1929 respectively. Hanna was a research associate at Lincoln School, Columbia University from 1928 to 1935 and an assistant professor at Columbia Teacher’s College from 1930 to 1935. From 1935 to 1937 he was an associate professor at Stanford University, and a professor of education at the same institution from 1937 to 1954. Hanna became the Lee J. Jacks professor of child education in 1954 and remained in this position at
Stanford until he retired in 1967.¹

It is difficult, if not impossible, for one not to be molded to some extent by one’s environment, and the Columbia University Graduate School undoubtedly influenced Hanna. Columbia was a hotbed of educational activity during these years, having such well known and forceful faculty members as John Dewey, George S. Counts, Charles Beard, William H. Kilpatrick, and Harold Rugg, just to name a few.

Dewey took an active interest in education at Columbia. George Dykhuisen, a Dewey biographer, said, “[Dewey’s] impact on the [Columbia Teacher’s] college grew till eventually his name and that of the college were inextricably linked in the minds of professional educators everywhere.”² He was especially involved in the laboratory schools associated with the Teacher’s College.³ The Lincoln School was one of these, having been taken over by the Teacher’s College in 1917. The Lincoln School’s purpose was, “scientific experimentation and constructive work in the reorganization of elementary and secondary education . . .”⁴ It should not be forgotten, furthermore, that the Lincoln School was the springboard from which Harold Rugg had launched his criticism of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in 1921. Nor should it be forgotten that much work that Hanna was later to continue was pioneered under Rugg’s leadership.

Kilpatrick’s role at Columbia was also important.
Kilpatrick, wrote Dykhuisen, "brought Dewey's philosophy of education to a whole generation of students during his long and distinguished career at the [Teacher's] college..." His teaching clearly had a profound influence upon many students, and his 200 F (Foundations of Education) course was nationally renowned.

Hanna came to Columbia with the intention of studying philosophy under Dewey, who still taught actively at that time. Dewey, however, had not returned from China that year, so Hanna enrolled in Teacher's College. Between 1925 and 1929, when he received his Ph.D., Hanna took courses from both Kilpatrick and Rugg, who, in 1930, asked him to become a faculty member of the 200 F course. It was as a young faculty member that Hanna finally had "numerous opportunities to associate with Dewey in seminars and in faculty meetings," though his association was "much more frequent and intense with Rugg and Kilpatrick . . ."

Evolution of a Curriculum Design

Initially, it was not clear to this writer precisely how Hanna became involved with social studies education while at Columbia. His dissertation was titled "Arithmetic Problem Solving: A Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Three Methods of Problem Solving." Depending upon how one pronounced "arithmetic" the indication was that it was
either a mathematics education or a philosophy of education thesis. The fact that an article by Hanna titled "Methods of Arithmetic Problem Solving appeared in the November, 1930 issue of *Math Teacher*, tended to confirm the former assumption. Furthermore, Hanna chaired a committee which reported in 1935 on aspects of the math activity program. In this report, which this writer believes demonstrates a crucial aspect of Hanna's curriculum thinking (as well as a strong interest in curriculum design in general), the group reported that the incidental math skills gained in an activity program were insufficient. Certainly, they found, math skill learning did take place. Children, however, needed to develop more basic skills than were incidentally learned in such a curriculum.

This writer corresponded with Hanna to solve this apparent dilemma. Hanna replied that his dissertation was indeed in mathematics education, the topic having been suggested by a Lincoln School colleague. Mathematics education, however, never became a vital interest. In retrospect, Hanna believes his interest in social studies began while he was associate director of the Lincoln School. In this capacity, he had the opportunity to lead the faculty in elementary curriculum experimentation. Certainly, social studies education was a newer and more exciting area of the curriculum than mathematics (at least at the time), and it is also true that social studies was an area most
amenable to the application of Dewey’s philosophy.

By 1934 Hanna was the State Consultant on Social Studies for Virginia’s curriculum committee. In conjunction with them, a new scope and sequence had been developed. The new curriculum was published in the January/February, 1934 issue of Progressive Education, an issue devoted to social studies. The editors of Progressive Education termed this curriculum “an unusually fine course of study.”

Hanna suggested the social studies curriculum had two paramount objectives: "(1) To direct children in experiencing a realistic understanding and appreciation of human relations; (2) To permit children to participate in improving human relations.” Human relations, he added, ranged all the way from personal to international. Furthermore, he suggested that human relations included twelve major social functions:

1. Procure raw materials from the crust of the earth (soil, mines, rivers, oceans, and so on) by a variety of processes and to change these raw materials into things useful to man and to maintain those services essential to individual and group living. (Production)

2. Distribute a continuous, uninterrupted flow of these goods and services to the ultimate consumer. (Distribution)

3. Consume these goods and services with profit to individual and social “health,” --mental, physical, and spiritual. (Consumption)
4. Conserve and protect in the best interests of all human life, natural resources, and the positive good of racial heritage. (Conservation)

5. Transport themselves, their goods and services, and to communicate with each other. (Transportation and Communication)

6. Explore and develop new spatial, intellectual, social, aesthetic, or moral realms. (Exploration and Settlement)

7. Enjoy the privileges of and benefit from recreation. (Recreation)

8. Prepare for better human relations through education. (Education)

9. Extend freedom into areas now closed by bondage of ignorance or selfishness. (Extension of Freedom)

10. Create and enjoy the creations in esthetics. (Esthetic Expression)

11. Find a fuller expression of the spiritual impulses. (Religious Expression)

12. Obtain and secure among a whirl of disintegrating tendencies and integration of the individual. (Individual Integration)

Hanna did not condone an elementary or early secondary social studies program which was the, "approach of the specialist in each of [the] separate fields." Nor, did he wish it to be a fusion of related content from the disciplines. He did not believe that exact content or experiences could be prescribed which would build understanding in the student’s mind. On the other hand, this did not prevent the suggestion of a concrete scope and sequence (summarized in Table 44).
The Virginie Curriculum (1934)

The Individual and His Immediate Environment

Grade 1. Home and school life.
Grade 2. Community life.

Geographical Pioneering

Grade 3. Adaptations of life to environmental forces of nature.
Grade 4. Adaptations of life to advancing physical frontiers.

Technological Pioneering

Grade 5. Effects of discovery upon our living.
Grade 6. Effects of the machine upon our living.

Social Pioneering

Grade 7. Extension of provisions for cooperative living.

The Social World

Grade 8. A critical study of the human relations basic to the social processes in the more immediate environment of the natural and social world.

The American Scene

Grade 9. Orientation in terms of American culture and civilization.

The Western World

Grade 10. Orientation in terms of the culture and civilization of the western world.

The World as a Whole

Grade 11. A world survey and critical evaluation of problems of contemporary world cultures and civilizations.15
Hanna suggested that to insure a sound psychological base the approach to social studies should be through student interests. He felt that the twelve major social functions could serve as suggestions for student experiences. Each could be applied in every grade, but in a different and increasingly sophisticated manner. Hanna was, furthermore, concerned about the widespread overdependence upon textbooks, desiring their removal as the sole source of activities and reading.\textsuperscript{16}

"In summary," said Hanna, "the viewpoint of the social studies in the schools of Virginia should strive for a fuller understanding and appreciation of human relations, and a deepening desire to improve continuously all collective endeavors of mankind."\textsuperscript{17}

During 1935 Hanna moved to Stanford. Almost immediately, if not sooner, he began work with the California State Committee on Scope and Sequence. By October 1935 Hanna had published an article with scope and sequence recommendations in the \textit{California Journal of Secondary Education}. The twelve major social functions had been compressed into ten, and the proposed curriculum covered grades 1-12. The new plan was a modification of the Virginia Plan. Grades 1 to 4 were nearly identical and are not repeated in Table 45 which summarizes the California proposal.
Table 45

California Scope and Sequence: Grades 5-11

Technological Pioneering

Grade V. The personalities responsible for and the romance involved in the discovery of our scientific principles and technological equipment which gives us control over natural forces in fulfilling the major social functions.

Grade VI. The effect of science and its practical application in power and machinery to our living conditions—mass production, interdependence, universal education, etc.

Social Pioneering

Grade VII.
Grade VIII. The contrasting social purposes and controls (mores and institutions) characteristic of societies which live (a) by adjusting to nature and (b) by controlling nature.

Grade IX. The democratic theory of the state—a political, economic, and social means and end as contrasted to other theories, and the place America had in furthering universal understanding of this theory.

A Systematic Survey of Man

Grade X. The story of man’s slow and tedious development from the beginnings of language and tools to the end of the agricultural era.

Grade XI. The story of man’s more rapid development from the beginning of the industrial revolution to the present, the opening of the power age.

Grade XII. The problems and promises of our contemporary world focusing attention on the shaping of the future in terms of those values held most desirable for the common welfare.  

This same curriculum (minus grades 10-12) was published in the same journal in October of 1936. Hanna at this
time reemphasized that the first two years needed to be directly connected with the child's everyday experiences. The first six years, he continued, essentially involved leading the student to understand the contrasts between cultures which lived simply by adjustment and those which lived more adequately by control of nature and social arrangements.

Hanna was very busy as an educational consultant and specialist for the government during World War Two and afterwards. These experiences significantly shaped Hanna's outlook. "[S]chools," he wrote, "have a mighty obligation in helping to establish the conditions out of which...a world community may emerge."20 "The schools must provide us and our youth with the experiences and the data which will aid in developing behavior consistent with the demands of our new membership and leadership in the world community."21 He continued to emphasize the importance of a well designed and realistic curriculum.

The idea of a world community was not, of course, unique to Hanna. Visions of a world community have existed for many years, but they took on new meaning with the creation on the United Nations. By 1953 Hanna had begun to write about a concentric-circle pattern of community relationships. He suggested that this pattern of relationships was one that could not be ignored by educators. He took the position that, "a particular school
must recognize itself as holding membership simultaneously in all of the communities which lie beyond the immediate locality." Figure 1 represents the community relationship which Hanna sought to establish.23

Figure 1

Hanna was simultaneously refining the major social functions first proposed in 1934. There were now nine and they were termed "basic human activities".

1. Protecting and conserving health, resources, and property.
2. Producing, distributing, and consuming food, clothing, shelter, and other consumer goods and services.
3. Creating and producing tools and technics.
4. Transporting people and goods.
5. communicating ideas and feelings.
6. Providing education.
7. Providing recreation.
8. Organizing and governing.
9. Expressing esthetic and spiritual impulses.

Eleven doctoral candidates at Stanford were recruited to research and identify social science generalizations in which content could be rooted. These generalizations were researched within the framework of Hanna’s nine basic human activities. Hanna theorized that,

[The] development of understanding and behavior of the good citizen cannot be left to chance; the stakes of cultural survival and progress are too high to permit anything less than a careful and comprehensive selection of those generalizations and values which are thought to give the greatest assurance of sound social arrangements and progress.

The dissertations were completed between 1954 and 1959 and were reported in the 32nd Yearbook of the NCSS (1962). This work, it should be noted, was a continuation of that initiated under the guidance of Rugg at Columbia during the 1920’s, most specifically that of Neal Billings and John Hockett. Hanna intended this work to continue, applying the generalizations to the expanding community’s concentric rings, but this writer has found no evidence that this ever occurred.

In the January, 1956 issue of the NEA Journal, in an
article titled "Social Studies for Today," Hanna coupled the expanding community theme to the nine basic human activities. Eleven emphases were suggested within that larger framework, and the following scope and sequence was proposed.

Table 46

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
<th>1956 K-8 Scope and Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-1. Home; School.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Local Community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State; Region.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nation; The USA and the Inter-American Community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The USA and the Atlantic Community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The USA and the Pacific Community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. United States History.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By 1963 the social studies field was in a stage of excitement and ferment as the general curriculum revision spread from science and mathematics to social studies. Hanna discussed his ideas on curriculum revision in the April, 1963 issue of Social Education. He was elated by what he termed a growing national awareness, "of the central place social science content and processes deserve in our schools." Hanna attached great importance to over-all curriculum design structures. He was concerned that curriculum revisionists would too easily give up on the difficult task of developing such structures, concentrating instead on
individual courses which though useful had no clear overall design and led nowhere. Hanna was correct in labeling existing K-12 curriculum accomplishments as "meager." He did not endorse one grand design for all schools, suggesting instead that the development of competing models was healthy; that development of models without such structure was not.

Hanna proposed his design as one possible K-12 curriculum. He believed that it was important for youth to first see the over-all structure. In one sense, this was a logical extension of Bruner's work. By doing so, however, he did not advocate a structure of the disciplines approach in the strictest sense. He felt this would be more appropriate at the secondary or the college level. Not surprisingly, Hanna proposed, "a unified, coordinated, wholistic study of man-to-man relations" at the elementary level. The sequence suggested (see Figure 2) was that of the expanding communities. He justified this choice on the basis that: (a) it provided the overall structure; and (2) it tapped previous experience. The sequence, emphasized Hanna, not the grade level assignment was most important. Furthermore, he did not advocate that students jump aimlessly from culture to culture or community to community. In effect this meant that when students were studying families they were not to study families from other
Hanna believed that a profitable manner in which to enhance this curriculum was to overlay it with the nine basic human activities which, "universally, men in groups have in the past, do now, and no doubt will continue to carry on... (see Figure 3)."
A careful examination of these clusters and names, suggested Hanna, would reveal a similarity to the names used to designate social studies disciplines. Geography and history were not a part of the nine activities, however. They were not offered as separate courses (at least in the first five grades) but were to be learned incidentally, an interesting feature in light of Hanna's previous math committee experience.

The curriculum proposal was completed by overlaying the model illustrated in Figure 3 with an emphasis on developing communities of nations (see Figure 4).

Figure 4

This model, therefore, served as the basis for an integrated K-12 curriculum, though the illustration itself only extends to perhaps the seventh grade. Hanna suggested that once the wholistic communities of man curriculum had been completed (by the sixth through the ninth grade at the
school's discretion), he would offer the courses listed in Table 47.

Table 47

Hanna K-12 Curriculum

Grade:
1. The child's family community.
   The child's school.
2. The child's neighborhood community.
3. The child's local communities: country, city, county, metropolis.
4. The child's state community.
   The child's region-of-states community.
5. The U.S. national community.
6-7. U.S. and Inter-American community.
   U.S. and Atlantic community.
   U.S. and Pacific community.
   U.S. and World community.
8. World geography.
9. World history.
10. 1/2 year Economics.
    1/2 year Political Institutions and Processes.
11. United States History.
12. Problems of Society.40

To Expand Or Not To Expand...

The expanding horizons elementary social studies curriculum, as was described in Chapter Seven, remains the dominant curriculum model in 1984.41 It has had at least as much and probably more influence upon elementary social studies than the 1916 model has had upon secondary social studies. It is a more defensible model in almost all respects.42 It has, however, had little to no carryover
into the secondary grades.

The Hanna model is based upon Dewey’s assertion that,

It is a cardinal precept of the newer school of education that the beginning of instruction shall be made with the experience learners already have; that this experience and the capacities that have developed during its course provide the starting point for all further learning....

Dewey went on to suggest that such an education had to have orderly development, with new experiences intellectually related to earlier ones.

The Hanna model accomplishes this from a content orientation. Furthermore, it is a logical sequence; this intrinsic logic has probably aided its acceptance.

Though still defended, the expanding communities curriculum is besieged with increasing criticism. It can be criticized for not being integrated in spite of Hanna’s contention that it is. The different scheme of coursework in the elementary and the secondary reinforces disarticulation. Additionally, most school districts do not adopt a pure K-6 Hanna model. More likely than not, it is a K-3 variance, following in a general sense Hanna’s sequence though losing the wholistic aspect. History and geography teachers are a group likely to be unhappy with the Hanna proposals, finding it unpalatable for those subjects to be learned incidentally. Though this may be less true now than in 1921, the preliminary curriculum of the 1921 AHA committee was intensely criticized for a lack of specific
elementary history courses.

Hanna's model is oriented around nine basic human activities, utilizing universal generalizations from each. This seems like an effort likely to bear little fruit. If there are generalizations that students must learn, then let them arrive at them. Neal Billings, whose work Hanna later expanded, discovered 880 such generalizations.46 Who would choose which, if not all, students should learn? For what purpose?

The expanding environments model has received much criticism from developmental psychologists like Piaget and Kohlberg.47 Such work is generally recognized to have some value, and it certainly has had educational influence. If Piaget and Kohlberg are right, their findings have momentous implications for elementary social studies. Piaget, for example, believed that all children cognitively developed in an invariant sequence; the age at which they attained particular levels varying with intelligence and environment.48 On this basis curricula would have to be designed in keeping with the child's cognitive ability. Attempted teaching which did not do so would risk being inappropriate and ineffective.49 The same would be true of Kohlberg's case, where values taught at inappropriate stages and levels of moral development could, conceivably, be useless.50
Egan (1979) attacked the expanding environments from a different angle. He suggested that Dewey had not intended the linking of experiences be restricted to content. Egan suggested that there was a viable alternative that was much more meaningful: "[The] fundamental categories [children] use to make sense of experience, the structural forms they use to give order to experience." Children, on this basis, understand the polar opposites of love and hate or good and bad much more readily than the content and adult oriented expanding communities curriculum. Such content orientation necessarily limits the child to a structure which gradually moves away from the family. A curriculum along emotional or moral categories, theorized Egan, grants immediate access to almost anything capable of being expressed in such terms. Perhaps the old "heroes" or "stories of the past" curriculum so popular in the late 19th century was not so ludicrous after all.

A further criticism in this age of televisions and computers, is that a child's vicarious experiences are not limited to the family, if they ever were. Even at a very young age children are exposed to national and world issues and events, whether or not they can understand all their implications. Such impressions as children receive are not impersonal nor objective, but individualized and meaningful.

On the other hand, and in its favor, the expanding environments curriculum is relatively easy to understand and
implement; a decided plus factor considering the present elementary social studies environment. A curriculum based upon the developmental psychology of Kohlberg or Piaget could be a nightmare. To be most effective it would be individualized, something that would prove cost prohibitive in a time teachers are lucky if they have only thirty children per classroom. Additionally, the samples upon which Piaget and Kohlberg based their observations leave great, even huge, margins for error. This alone, however, does not in and of itself prohibit either from being correct.

There are other alternatives. Different interpretations of Dewey have been proposed. One of these is the Taba Curriculum, the all too early culmination of Hilda Taba's life work. It is to an examination of this curriculum that the dissertation now turns.
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Let the main ideas which are introduced into a child's education be few and important, and let them be thrown into every combination possible.

Alfred North Whitehead

Roots

Hilda Taba was born on December 7, 1902 in southeastern Estonia. She received an A.B. from the University of Tartu, Estonia in 1926, an A.M. in education and psychology from Bryn Mawr in 1927, and her Ph.D. from Teacher's College, Columbia University in 1933.

Taba accepted the position of Curriculum Director of the Dalton School in New York City upon graduation. In 1933 the Dalton School began to participate in the Progressive Education Association's Eight-Year Study. The high quality of Taba's work in this study resulted in assistant professorships at The Ohio State University (1936-1938) and the University of Chicago (1938-1945). Taba was the director of The Project in Intergroup Education in Cooperating Schools from 1945 to 1948 and the director of the Center for the Study of Intergroup Relations at the
University of Chicago from 1948 to 1951. She became a full professor of education at San Francisco State College in 1951, holding various positions at this college until her untimely death in 1967.2

Nearly everything that can be said about Hanna's educational experiences at Columbia applies to Taba...and more. Whereas Hanna desired to take courses from Dewey and probably was influenced by Kilpatrick (it would be hard not to be), Taba did take courses from Dewey and definitely was influenced by Kilpatrick.3 Kilpatrick, in fact, was her major advisor and oversaw work on her doctoral studies and dissertation, which was subsequently published.4 Taba also acknowledged the influence of Boyd Bode, with whose forceful writings she clearly sympathized.5 The imprint of these three leaders in the progressive educational movement upon her thinking was unmistakable.

It is with the Columbia experience that the similarity between Taba and Hanna ends, for Dewey's philosophy could be interpreted in many ways. Whereas Hanna took one branch of the road (content emphasis), Taba clearly took another (process emphasis). Unlike Hanna's doctoral work, there is no question that Taba's doctoral studies prepared her for curriculum work.6 Her eventual involvement in social studies curriculum innovation, therefore, comes as no surprise. Furthermore, Taba's work is conceptually more
sophisticated. Ironically, however, it was to become coupled to Hanna's expanding environments in its final incarnation.7

Curriculum Thinking 1932 to 1964

Hilda Taba was a prolific writer. Though her work is difficult to summarize briefly, it would be nearly impossible to understand her apart from it. Curriculum problems, rationales, and designs were consistently a primary concern. Taba constantly refined her theories, and understood curriculum problems as many educators never did (and never will). She firmly believed that education should be a constantly evolving and living process, never a static one.

The Dynamics of Education

The best way to understand Taba is to begin with her first major work, The Dynamics of Education: A Methodology of Progressive Educational Thought.8 This is a brilliant work. It remains fresh and stimulating over fifty years after its initial publication. It is also her dissertation.

The title is illuminating. As Taba suggested and Kilpatrick affirmed, education was meant to be a dynamic affair, not an act of being but an act of becoming. The idea of reconstruction, of course, was standard progressive
education credo, not accepted by all followers of Dewey and certainly not original to Taba. Taba cogently argued for this "dynamic education." Education as it was commonly found, she insisted, promoted learning which was inappropriate and static. Dynamic learning, on the other hand, inspired further learning; it was alive and effective in the learner’s conduct.

Taba offered sophisticated arguments in favor of dynamic education. She recognized that American education at that time, as now, was, "confronted by a great variety of conflicting positions, ill digested ideas, and contradictory practices." Taba felt that since society was vigorous, education should reflect that vigor.

Learning, as Taba understood it, was an interrelational process. Its three most important elements were:

... (1) what in this connection may be called learning materials (that is, environment, stimulation, teaching, books—in fact, everything with which the learner comes in contact and to which he reacts); (2) the nature, abilities, and interests of the agent of learning; and (3) the structural form and sequences of the process of learning itself together with its results.

Taba maintained that traditional theories of education did not take this interrelatedness into account. She asserted that they were one-sided, emphasizing one aspect, usually content, to the exclusion of all the others. Taba considered the opposite extreme, a totally "child centered" school, to be equally ill conceived. Taba believed that
progressive education, whatever its flaws, had attempted to remedy these imperfections, stressing the dynamic aspects of learning in preference to fixed content oriented patterns.\textsuperscript{14} The educative experience was genuine, in her opinion, only to the extent in which the learner consciously participated and applied resulting directives.\textsuperscript{15}

Curricula which primarily emphasized content were "doubly narrow" in Taba's mind.\textsuperscript{16} Not only did they select only content matter from a the many factors which influenced experience, they then made such content the exclusive objective of conscious curriculum planning.\textsuperscript{17} The subject matter most often chosen was that which was thought to preserve values, logic, knowledge, and accepted moral and social institutions.\textsuperscript{18}

Many curriculum planners feared that chaos would result if logical, subject-centered curricula were abandoned. Taba was cognizant of their concerns. She felt, however, that it was a mistake to assume that the logic of researchers or discipline specialists was the same as that derived from experience or applicable to it. Moreover, wrote Taba, mastery of logically-oriented subject matter did not guarantee scientific and logical reasoning.\textsuperscript{19} Neither did subject matter taught apart from the continuity of experience and significance have any motivational power or educative value.\textsuperscript{20}
Taba saw little to no merit in ready-made truths or generalizations merely handed down to students. She did not know with any certainty which "truths" would be of significance to the learner. Additionally, she thought that it was entirely possible to teach many such generalizations and yet not have one be significant. Such materials only had worth as food for thought or use in creative thinking, never as, "ready-made products to be mastered and digested." Ideally, Taba thought, the period of formal learning was only an introduction to an informal period of much greater importance...life itself. What was learned in school was therefore to be rethought and reevaluated continuously in light of life's experiences and not chiseled in stone.

From a curriculum perspective, the worst effect of an exclusive emphasis upon subject matter was that it segregated the functions of planning and practice. When this unhealthy separation of functions occurred, curriculum planning occurred with sequences, tasks, subject matter, and outcomes, "decided prior to and apart from the process of learning itself." Taba realized, as many reflective educators have, that living, experiential curriculum cannot be perfectly envisioned in advance. This writer agrees. If learning is an interactive process, where learners and their needs, experiences, hopes, beliefs, fears, and opinions are
significant factors, there is no certain way to determine outcomes apart from the learning process and, there is no guarantee of results. Many find this unsettling. "The sequences," advised Taba, "are at least partly determined by the process itself." Preordained results, exact charts, and rigid curricula, warned Taba, had no place in curriculum planning.

Evolution of Curriculum Thinking, 1933 to 1953

Taba, as mentioned previously, worked for several years in the Eight Year Study. As a result of this experience she became a major contributor to both the NSSE and NCSS Yearbooks in 1945. Taba discussed curriculum problems in both, however, the NSSE contribution provides more insight into the refinement of her thinking. Too many courses, she suggested, had been expanded to the point where only superficial knowledge was possible, with no time for reflection and generalization. The Taba of 1945 was more willing to think in terms of a planned, practical, organized curriculum, and offered six practical suggestions for curriculum organization:

a. Curriculum Experiences Should Have Valid and Significant Content.
b. Learning Experiences Should Provide the Opportunity for Attaining a Wide Range of General Objectives of Growth.
c. Learning Experiences Should Be Appropriate to the Interests and Needs of Children.
d. Learning Experiences Must Provide for Continuity and Sequential Development.
e. Learning Experiences Should Have the Maximum Relationship to Life and Living.

f. Learning Experiences Should Permit a Sufficient Variety of Learning Activities.30

Taba reemphasized that sound curriculum planning was necessary for effective learning.31 Extreme curriculum positions were again held to be unsound. Ideas were important, she insisted, but they needed to be revisited in, "different and increasingly mature contexts" to be effective.32

Taba singled out the concentric circles approach, as commonly conceptualized, for criticism.

The experiments tried in this direction, such as the concentric curriculum proceeding from home, community, and immediate environment to the nation and the world, have been either too formal or naive even to stimulate an adequate exploration of what is abstract or remote for different maturity levels.33

Critical thinking, and how to best promote it, never seemed far from her thoughts (It is through this vehicle, the promotion of critical thinking, that Taba became involved with the Contra Costa County Schools). Shortly before moving to San Francisco State College in 1951, Taba discussed, "The Problems in Developing Critical Thinking" in the November 1950 issue of Progressive Education. She reiterated thoughts expressed in the 1945 NSSE yearbook: "Critical thinking is not a simple gadget that can be taught and acquired on the spot in one lesson, unit, or even single subject."34
If, as Taba believed evidence indicated, critical thinking was a developmental process, then it logically followed that it was possible to teach it. There were, conceivably, developmental sequences which could be discovered and utilized. In believing that thinking was learned behavior, Taba had long been far ahead of many curriculum theoreticians. She had read and agreed with Piaget long before it became popular to do so.35

There was, however, a fundamental problem that Taba had encountered with the intergroup education project; successful curriculum implementation depended upon teachers. Teaching practices, however, could not be changed overnight; summer sessions and weekend training programs were not enough. A long term commitment was required from both teachers and school systems if change was to occur. The teaching of critical thinking, moreover, required that teachers be able to think. Too many, she suggested, had never had the training or opportunity to do so.36 Those who did, "by and large stumbled on it on their own."37 Large groups of them were not able, in her opinion, to, "state ideas or concepts nor recognize them when they were stated."38

If one is willing to grant that critical thinking is necessary prerequisite of the proper functioning of democracy, then it can be understood why Taba modified her thinking and considered specific curriculum proposals. It is
interesting to note this change in thinking. Effectively, Taba was now suggesting that there might be values, concepts, truths, or ideas whose transmission was vital.

That existing curricula were organized for purposes other than that of teaching critical thinking was apparent. Taba, however, saw no real conflict in teaching both content and critical thinking. In her opinion, any content which did not contribute to critical thinking or the development of concepts which led to it had no place in the curriculum.39

It was about the same time that Taba moved to San Francisco State that she became involved with the Contra Costa County Schools. Evelyn Jegi, the curriculum coordinator for the county schools, had heard Taba speak and was impressed. Soon after, she invited Taba to become a curriculum consultant for the county’s elementary social studies teachers, who were revising their curriculum completely.40 Taba accepted this position only after insureing that the school system and its resources would be committed for a period of years.41 This relationship was to prove enduring and mutually beneficial, lasting until Taba’s death in 1967.

Taba continued to struggle with the notion of how to design a curriculum which promoted critical thinking. She
wrote in an article published in *Social Education* in 1953 that, "the intelligence of children [was] grossly underestimated."42 Furthermore, she asserted that children did not come to school with blank slates for minds, upon which social studies education could write whatever it pleased. A program could not be effective which did not utilize children's existing social experiences.

Taba had suggested in *The Dynamics of Education* that subject matter content was nearly infinite, with only limited, temporary application. She believed that major organizing principles, however, were few, and had many specific applications.43 She built upon this principle in the 1953 article, suggesting that there were two levels of subject matter, "basic or focusing ideas to be taught universally, and a set of details selected to illuminate the ideas which can be treated as replaceable auto parts."44

This writer suggests that this change in thinking was a concession to reality; a tacit recognition that most teachers lacked the ability to isolate significant organizing principles.

Thinking in Elementary School Children

Until Taba began her work with the Contra Costa County teachers, she had been unable to test and refine thoroughly the ideas which she had been thinking about since she was a doctoral student. Thinking in Elementary School Children
was one result of her ability to now do so. The chief purpose of this study was to, "examine the effect of training upon thinking." If thinking was indeed learned behavior, Taba now had the time and resources to test this hypothesis.

The development of thinking, stated Taba, had long been an important objective of education, but its implementation had, "been sporadic and ineffective." She continued, "[Concern] for the development of critical thinking was at the heart of much of the work of the Eight Year Study.... The evaluation staff...spent years in identifying certain aspects of thought...." Taba's lifelong work was an attempt to build upon this foundation.

Taba found that the training used in the study resulted in an earlier beginning of formal thought than had been suggested by studies which did not attempt to do so. Her study confirmed Piaget's developmental sequence though not its age placement. Also substantiated was the hypothesis that, "an adequate emphasis on concrete operations of thought is a necessary prerequisite for the emergence of formal thought." Perhaps the discovery which surprised Taba the most was the generally low correspondence between the levels of thinking observed and the factors traditionally thought of as significant to critical thought (intelligence as
suggested by I.Q.'s, reading ability, social status, etc.). Though surprising in and of itself, Taba believed that this confirmed another basic hypothesis of the study, that,

slow learners would be capable of abstract thinking under a program of instruction which paced assimilation according to their needs and provided sufficient opportunity for concrete operations before making a transition to abstract operations and symbolic content.51

Finally, the study confirmed yet another Taba belief. Teachers and their strategies, attitudes, actions, and abilities were found to be the single most important influence in the development of critical thinking in students.

The Taba Curriculum Project

The Taba Curriculum was the climax of her educational career and thought. It is what most educators remember her for, if they remember her at all. It was the fruit of 16 years of curriculum refinement with elementary teachers. Published after Taba's death, in October 1969, the curriculum was the result of four years of intense work.

The Taba curriculum, as published, was the result of a continuous interaction among three groups: teachers, consultants, and curriculum writers. The project staff stated: "The task of instruction is to provide systematic training in [autonomous and productive] thinking..."52
Seven assumptions (all reflecting Taba's influence) were basic to this curriculum:

1. Thinking skills can be taught.

2. Thinking involves an active transaction between an individual and the data with which he is working. Data become meaningful to an individual only when he performs certain cognitive operations upon them.

3. The ability to think cannot be "given" by teachers to students. But teachers can assist in developing thinking skills in students by providing appropriate learning activities. How well an individual thinks depends on the richness and significance of the content with which he works, as well as the processes which he uses.

4. Any and all subjects offer an appropriate context for thinking.

5. All school children are capable of thinking on abstract levels, though the quality of individual thinking differs markedly.

6. Precise teaching strategies can be developed which will encourage and improve student thinking.

7. Since thinking takes many forms, the specific thinking processes to which one is referring should be made clear.

The Taba Curriculum was an attempt to assist students in developing cognitive skills by carefully developed sequential learning activities. Three levels of cognitive skills were emphasized in all years:

1. Developing concepts, in which students list, group and regroup a number of items and then label the groups.

2. Inferring and generalizing, in which students make inferences and generalize about the relationships they observe among various kinds of data.
3. Applying generalizations, in which students are asked to apply previously learned generalizations and facts to predict what might logically occur in a new situation.55

Eleven key concepts were offered in each grade in increasingly abstract, complex, and general manner. They were: causality, conflict, cooperation, cultural change, differences, interdependence, modification, power, societal control, tradition, and values.56 These were selected, "for their power to organize and synthesize large amounts of information."57

Knowledge is presented in each year of the Taba curriculum in four categories: main ideas, organizing ideas, contributing ideas, and content.58 Main ideas were selected on the basis of validity, significance, appropriateness, durability, balance, and scope.59 The sequence of main ideas, grades 1-8 is summarized in Table 48.

Table 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taba Curriculum Sequence of Main Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit I.</strong> The socialization of children takes place primarily within family, peer, educational, and religious institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit II.</strong> Families differ in life style and role expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit III.</strong> The institutions of a society are economically sustained through a variety of means.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Grade 2

Unit I. Community needs are met by groups of people engaged in many related activities.
Unit II. The nature of a particular community will influence the kinds of service it needs.
Unit III. The people of a community organize in different ways in order to attain their goals.

Grade 3

Unit I. Differences in economies are associated with differences in the ways people use their environment and skills.
Unit II. Contact between cultures often brings changes in the social institutions within them.
Unit III. Interaction between a people and their physical environment influences the way in which they meet their needs.
Unit IV. Tradition influences the ways in which a group of people modify their behavior.
Unit V. The basic economy of a society has a major influence on the life style of its people.
Unit VI. Tradition and innovation interact to determine the modifications that will occur in a people’s way of life.
Unit VII. Interaction between a people and their physical environment influences the way in which they meet their needs.
Unit VIII. People may develop new ways within their tradition to achieve their goals.

Grade 4

Unit I. The cultures of different peoples influence the manner in which they use the same environment.
Unit II. Man’s way of living is affected by the physical and social environment in which he lives.
Unit III. As societies grow, both their requirements and their problems change.

Grade 5

Unit I. New discoveries result from the application of previously learned knowledge to the solution of current problems.
Unit II. The life style of a culture is shaped by the contributions of groups which make up that culture.
Table 48 Continued

Unit III. Conflict may develop among groups when goals and expectations differ.
Unit IV. A mobile people tend to develop a way of life that differs from that in established communities.
Unit V. Technological development contributes to the nature and extent of cultural change.
Unit VI. The physical and cultural resources of an area encourage specialization in the use of land.

Grade 6

Unit I. Cultures change in varying degrees when they come in contact with another culture.
Unit II. Though all cultures possess certain unique features, they are also similar in a number of ways.
Unit III. The human and natural resources and geographical features of an area influence the material prosperity of the people within that area.
Unit IV. Different cultures deal with certain basic problems in a variety of ways.
Unit V. Changes that occur in one part of a society often produce changes in other parts of the society.

Grade 7

Unit I. Man's ways of living affect and are affected by the physical and social environment in which he lives.
Unit II. The actions of a people are influenced by the values they hold.
Unit III. Ideas and societies change as they come in contact with the ideas and achievements of other societies.
Unit IV. How quickly any change comes about depends not only on the nature of the change itself, but also on the pressures for and against that change.
Unit V. The beliefs, activities, and values of people are influenced by the times in which they live.

Grade 8

Unit I. Institutions tend to undergo continuous change.
Unit II. Political change results from dissatisfaction with the status quo; changes reflect attempts to deal with the causes of dissatisfaction.
Unit III. Divergent ways of life tend to compete for available resources and political control.
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Unit IV. As the nature of a society changes, new institutions arise to deal with those changes.

Unit V. Men continually seek to improve their condition through obtaining those rights they consider essential to their welfare.

Unit VI. A nation affects and is affected by the other nations with which it interacts.60

Evaluation

The Taba Curriculum seems far more sophisticated than the Hanna model. It attempted to strike a balance between subject matter, student needs, and society. It is, in the opinion of this writer, a step in the right direction. In some respects, it is a generic model, and was intended to be so.61 Taba had long understood that the development of critical thinking was of necessity a multi-disciplinary effort.

Overall, the Taba curriculum is a very worthy effort. The Taba Curriculum has, in fact, been noticed by teachers in other disciplines.62 It is considered to be a significant curriculum.63 It was published as a curriculum series.64

This writer, however, believes there are several serious weaknesses:

1. It is based upon the a priori assumption that critical thinking is necessary and vital for the proper functioning of the American democracy. In a sense this is
correct. A democracy does function best in which all citizens knowledgeably participate. On the other hand, though critical thinking is an admirable goal, there is no consensus among educators that it ought to be the primary emphasis of the curriculum. Some would argue that even if critical thinking were to become the accepted emphasis, it would be unwise to predetermine outcomes (see this writer's discussion in Chapter One).

2. The Taba curriculum is heavily dependent, perhaps too much so, upon Piaget's theories. While his hypotheses may be correct, for the most part they remain just that, hypotheses. Furthermore, it is one thing to understand that thinking is learned behavior (if that is true), and quite another to implement a rich, complex, experiential curriculum which achieves such goals. Even if agreement could be found on the need for critical thinking, then consensus would have to be reached on a definition of the nature of critical thinking itself.

3. As with many curriculum proposals, the Taba Curriculum absolutely depends upon the skill, interest, commitment, and ability of teachers. Teacher's abilities, however, range from horrible to outstanding. Conclusion? Many teachers are incapable of ever teaching critical thinking, even if they wanted to. Additionally, the training necessary for this curriculum to be successful
would be expensive, requiring a substantial commitment of
time and resources by school districts. Taba knew this.
She had been very fortunate that the Contra Costa schools
had been willing and able to do so. Most school districts
probably would not.

4: The curriculum change Taba envisioned required that
teachers perceive the need for it. Many, unfortunately,
ever do. If successful curriculum innovation begins with
the teacher, as Muessig suggested, then effective curriculum
innovation is a bottom-up process, beginning with and best
accomplished by individual teachers. Failing this, the
Taba effort would become merely another rejected top-down
model, worthy but not used.

The Taba curriculum, furthermore, mandates that
teachers change their teaching styles, and this is very
difficult, even when the desire exists. One study of the
Taba curriculum found that teachers did not feel good about
themselves even after one year of participation. This
would not, of course, particularly aid in the implementation
of this curriculum.

5. To be implemented as planned, the Taba materials
needed to be enhanced with rich and varied content
materials. Upon publication, however, any curriculum,
Taba's included, risks merely becoming another series of
textbooks in which the total amount of content used by
teachers is that contained in the texts.
6. The Taba curriculum is still an adult oriented and adult imposed scheme, though less so than Hanna's design.67

The Taba Curriculum Project was part of Project Social Studies. Many important studies in addition to Taba's were part of this effort. Some dealt with concepts, others with specific grades, issues, units, or social studies disciplines. Few attempted integrated K-12 curriculums. Several did. The University of Minnesota "structure of the disciplines" effort under the guidance of Edith West has been recognized as one of the best. It is the subject of Chapter Ten.
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CHAPTER TEN

PROJECT SOCIAL STUDIES: UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA (1968)

We begin with the hypothesis that any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development.

Jerome Bruner

All curriculum proposals are, in a sense, products of their time. Some are more dated than others. Often, what is progressive, enlightened, and educationally sound in one era is thought repressive, regressive, or impractical in another. Few, however, reflect the preeminent educational thought of their period more accurately than the University of Minnesota curriculum published in 1968.¹

No discussion of the Minnesota proposal would be meaningful without an examination of the era within which it was an integral part, the era of "new" social studies. In this case, the epoch is particularly significant, for the decade of the 1960’s was a time of serious and widespread attempted social studies reform. The University of Minnesota structure-of-the-disciplines curriculum was part of this effort and as such is very worthy of consideration.
It is difficult to paint briefly an accurate portrait of social studies curriculum change from 1940 through 1970. Yet, it is important to do so, for each decade had significance in what was to become a most critical period in the history of social studies.

No one would say that the years from 1940 to 1950 were characterized by intense curricular reform. Such efforts as occurred seemed to be of consolidation. What emphasis there was focused upon individual needs. I. James Quillen, member of the AHA Commission of Social Studies and contributor to the 1939 NCSS bulletin, The Future of the Social Studies, analyzed the post-war period as one of, "few basic changes in course offerings in high-school social studies."²

Much of what was said about the 1940's remained true in the 1950's. This is especially true from a curriculum reform perspective. On the other hand, there were significant trends in both decades many failed to recognize. Close educational parallels existed between the Truman/Eisenhower era and that of the Committee of Ten. Many aspects were nearly identical. Both periods were noted for dramatic increases in student population, inadequate facilities, staggering financial responsibilities, a short supply of teachers, concerns about adequate teacher training, and inadequate educational theory.³
curriculum, though important, took a back seat to such concerns.

Standard educational ideology was found lacking. Progressive education ideology, which had been revolutionary in the 1920's, and liberal in the 1930's, was deemed old-fashioned in the 1950's.4

The social studies curriculum and that of education in general came under intense criticism after 1950, mainly from critics outside the educational establishment. Many such critics were highly regarded, more than a few were from colleges and universities.5 A good number of their criticisms were valid. Little real change occurred, however, since such critics usually worked outside of school power structures.6

Embryonic Developments

The Progressive Education Association folded in 1955, leaving a great void of leadership in the educational field into which no group or special interest immediately stepped. This further complicated an already dismal curriculum scene. Roy A. Price summarized this in 1958: "While research findings in the social sciences have less validity than finding in the physical and natural sciences, there is a significant and regrettable lag between what we now know concerning human behavior and the social studies curriculum."7 Charles Keller wrote in Saturday Review that,
"The social studies are in the educational doldrums... A revolution is needed, and soon." It is not as if the social studies professionals had ignored the curriculum, for the 1955 NCSS yearbook, edited by Ole P. Sand and Ruth Ellsworth, was devoted to its improvement.

General neglect of the social studies curriculum was soon to end, though it took several catalytic and galvanizing events before serious reform efforts commenced.

One such event was the Russian launch of Sputnik in 1957. This occurrence, more than any other, roused middle-America into action. Calls, both positive and negative, were made for radical educational reform. Such demands were positive as a demonstration of continued faith in the educational system and its ability to resolve serious social problems. They were negative because simultaneously many made education an all too convenient scapegoat for any and all problems.

Other events were equally important, paving the way for social studies curriculum redesign in general and the University of Minnesota effort in particular.

The first of these events was the 1959 publication of James B. Conant's report, *The American High School Today*. The authority of the author, the credence given to his work, and the immediate acceptance of this report closely parallel the 1892 report of Charles Eliot. Both men had been or were
Harvard presidents; both reports were timely.

Conant made many recommendations, most of which were readily, even eagerly, accepted. His report became a model for a great many school districts. Conant did not ignore the social studies, recommending three or four years for all students in grades 9-12, "including two years of history (one of which should be American history) and a senior course in American problems or American government." His was an important confirmation that social studies merited a position in the fundamental American school curriculum.

A second significant catalytic event, a conference at Wood's Hole, Massachusetts, occurred in September of the same year. This conference was immortalized in Jerome Bruner's book, The Process of Education. This conference was significant, especially for the University of Minnesota effort. First, it was composed of some thirty-five nationally recognized scientists, scholars, and educators. This was important in and of itself, for here was a group of new leaders to fill the empty shoes created by the PEA's demise. This confirmed, "the decisive power of the academic community in matters of elementary and secondary school curricula...."

Second and nearly equally important, was the consensus of this group that, "any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage
of development."14 The implications of this theory were tremendous and further confirmed the crucial role of the academicians. Who else would better know the significant material and how to simplify it?

Third, the importance of structure was emphasized. The conference believed that the heart of the educational process consisted, "of learning initially not a skill but a general idea, which [could] then be used as a basis for recognizing subsequent problems as special cases of the idea originally mastered."15 Understanding fundamentals, they believed, made subjects more comprehensible.16 The central task of education, therefore, was, "how to construct curricula that can be taught by ordinary teachers to ordinary students and...at the same time reflect clearly the basic or underlying principles of various fields of inquiry."17 They believed this could be accomplished only through the use of the best minds in each discipline.18

Though the conference was specifically called to examine how science teaching could be improved, its implications for education in general and social studies in particular were obvious.

A fourth major catalyst of social studies reform was the financial involvement of the federal government and significant private foundations. The Supreme Court, in its famous 1954 decision, Brown vs. Board of Education, had
served notice to the nation's public schools of a new and larger role they were to serve.19 Through Project Social Studies the government became an active participant. Though curriculum revision for social studies started later than efforts in many other content areas, efforts were no less intense.

Potential applicants to Project Social Studies were notified in the November issue of Social Education that three types of activities would be granted funding: (1) basic and applied research projects; (2) curriculum study centers; and (3) research development activities.20

Gerald R. Smith reported six months later that grants had been approved for 7 curriculum centers, 11 research projects, and 2 developmental activities. These numbers were destined to grow much larger.21 The University of Minnesota was one of the original seven curriculum centers, its charge being to "use an interdisciplinary team of experts to identify the structure of each...social science discipline [and]...prepare and evaluate guides and material to be used in Kindergarten through grade 14."22 A four year contract was awarded. This effort will be evaluated shortly.

National reform activity (as opposed to actual national reform or efforts with one national aim) was well under way by 1963. Activity was not limited to nationally funded efforts. Many local school districts developed and
published new curriculum guides. Though such efforts will not be examined in this dissertation, they were significant in number, indicating a consensus for change. While a consensus existed for social studies change, there was no agreement on the aims such changes should have. Many educators had serious misgivings about both the potential and the direction of such diverse activity.

NCSS President Samuel McCutchen was concerned that the "structure of the disciplines" effort had great potential for fragmentation. In his presidential address, recorded in the February 1963 issue of Social Education, he said,

Each [discipline], independent of the others, has proposed (or hopes to propose) a curriculum comprehensively covering grades K through 12. Without machinery for coordinating these drives and without plan for selecting content functional to a higher purpose, the end result of these independent efforts can only be a struggle of power politics in which the scholarly discipline with the loudest voice and longest purse will capture the coveted later years of the senior high school, pushing the weaker fields into the elementary grades.23

McCutchen's advice was to search for and define a discipline of social studies. Only this could avoid the destructive struggle he envisioned; only it had the potential to "weld the separate elements of subject matter into a single field with its own integrity."24 He believed social studies had proud tasks of patriotism, Western culture, the contemporary world, and rational inquiry to fulfill for the American society.25
Donald W. Robinson questioned the need for a national revolution, stating that gradual change had occurred. The curriculum of 1960, he wrote, was not the curriculum of 1916. Robinson thought the pressing national need was for, "a series of gradual local revolutions." He believed what was most important, and lacking, was a, "concern for long-term plans for education, not emergency training. [Any] immediate sense of urgency should be reflected in adult education rather than in schools for the young."

Two conferences were funded in 1963 as a part of Project Social Studies, one at Stanford and the other at Syracuse. For the purposes of this work, the Stanford conference was the more important. Paul Hanna, Arno Bellack, Ralph Tyler, I. James Quillen, and Peter Odegard were all major contributors to it. All five discussed aspects of the history of social studies. Hanna, not surprisingly, suggested his expanding communities curriculum as one possible solution. It was Bellack, however, whose discussion was most relevant to this chapter.

Bellack recognized that what would eventually come to be known as the "structure of the disciplines" approach was widely accepted. He suggested three major characteristics of this approach: a hierarchy of ideas, conceptual schemes that changed with new evidence, and procedures and methods unique to each discipline. "Probably the most significant
aspect of a discipline's methodology," Bellack added, "[was] the logical process employed in evaluating the outcomes of inquiry...." 28

Bellack articulated two versions of the structural approach:

The first approach organizes the program around broad conceptions and generalizations representing a synthesis of ideas from the various social sciences; the second approach organizes the program around the conceptual schemes of the individual social disciplines. 29

Bellack warned, however, "Man's social life as it is actually lived is, therefore, far more complex that the limited image of it reflected in the generalizations of any one of the social disciplines." 30

Much of the rest of the discussion over the direction that social studies should follow is found in Chapter One and need not be repeated here.

The University of Minnesota Curriculum Project

Such, then, was the atmosphere in which Edith West and her fellow curriculum workers began their efforts. Their approach was an interdisciplinary one, unlike either model Bellack identified. They chose to weave individual social science disciplines into an integrated curriculum which did not sacrifice each discipline's identity, independence, or integrity. Neither did the Minnesota curriculum unduly emphasize one discipline at the expense of the others.
The principle educators involved were Edith West, William E. Gardner, Fred A. Johnson, and Vincent R. Rogers. Many other recognized social scientists contributed to the work.\textsuperscript{31}

The University of Minnesota project group worked nearly a year refining a curriculum framework. They worked with nine specific objectives, though only four are relevant to this discussion:

(1) Identification of major concepts and generalizations which comprise possible structures for the various social science disciplines and identification of the methodology and important techniques used to advance knowledge in each field.
(2) An attempt to assess the possibilities of developing and integrating framework or structure for the social sciences as a whole. This attempt would involve a study of the points of divergence and convergence among the social sciences.
(3) Identification of those concepts, skills, and attitudes most appropriate for inclusion in the social studies curriculum.
(4) Establishment of a curricular framework for grades K-12, with a few suggestions for grades 13-14.\textsuperscript{32}

Most courses were tested between 1965 and 1967, primarily by Minneapolis area teachers trained in summer workshops. Not all units were fully tested by the time the final report was published.\textsuperscript{33} Extremely important in this curriculum was the sequential development of concepts, generalizations, skills, and attitudinal behaviors organized around the anthropological concept of culture.\textsuperscript{34}

The West group operated under four assumptions:

(1) ...the social sciences have much to offer the
individual in terms of helping him understand the world around him and cope with problems of the modern day world.

(2) ...the social studies curriculum needed improvement and that this improvement could be achieved best by the cooperative efforts of social studies specialists, social scientists representing the different disciplines, and classroom teachers.

(3) ...a social studies curriculum should be designed to help achieve the broad goal of citizenship education.

(4) ...a curriculum needs to be developed as a coordinated program from grades K-12...rather than piecemeal at either each school level or within one social science discipline.35

The curriculum suggested by the Minnesota group is summarized in Table 49.

Table 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The University of Minnesota K-12 Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. THE EARTH AS THE HOME OF MAN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1. The Earth as the Home of Man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A World of Many Peoples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Our Global Earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Man Changes the Earth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. FAMILIES AROUND THE WORLD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1. The Hopi Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Chippewa Family (for Minnesota students).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Quechua Family of Peru.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Japanese Family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. FAMILIES AROUND THE WORLD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1. The Colonial Family of Boston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Soviet Family in Moscow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Hausa Family in Northern Nigeria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The Kibbutz Family of Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1. Rural and Urban Communities in the United States.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An American Frontier Community: Early</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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California Gold Mining Camp.
3. The Manus Community in the Admiralty Islands.
4. The Paris Community.

IV. COMMUNITIES AROUND THE WORLD: THEIR ECONOMIC SYSTEMS.
   Unit 1. Our Own Community—An Economic Emphasis.
   3. The Trobriand Islanders.
   4. A Village in India.

V. REGIONAL STUDIES.
   Part One--The United States.
   Unit 1. The United States: An Overview.
   2. The Midwest.
   3. The Northeast.
   4. The South.
   5. The West.
   Part Two—Canada.
   Part Three—Latin America.

VI. UNITED STATES HISTORY: FROM COMMUNITY TO SOCIETY.
   Unit 1. Indian America Before the White Men.
   4. Revolutionary America.
   6. The Civil War and Reconstruction.
   7. The Completion of National Expansion.

VII. MAN AND SOCIETY.
   2. Socialization.
   3. The Family.
   4. Our Behavior in Groups and Crowds.
   5. Intergroup Relations.

VIII. OUR POLITICAL SYSTEM.
   Unit 1. Overview of Our Political System.
   2. Political Parties and Elections.
   3. The Executive Process.
   4. The Legislative Process.
   5. The Judicial Process.
   6. Decision-making at the Local Level.
   7. The Middle East (in non-national election years only).
IX.  OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

   Unit 1. The United States: An Affluent Society?
   3. Farm Problems.
   4. The Auto Industry.
   5. Poverty in the United States.

   6. Units Which Alternate in Election and Non-election Years:
      a. Political Campaigns and Elections.
      b. The Middle East: An Area Study.

X.  AMERICAN HISTORY.


   Unit 1. Colonial Age, 1630-1820's.
   2. The Republican Age, 1760's-1820's.
   3. The Democratic Age, 1820's-1840's.
   4. Civil War and Reconstruction, 1840's-1870's.

   Part Two: Modern America--1870's to Present.
   Unit 5. Industrialization of America, 1840's-1914.
   6. The Consumption Economy, 1920's to Present.

XI. AREA STUDIES.

   Unit 1. Western Europe.
   2. The USSR.
   3. China.
   4. India.
   5. Culminating Section of Comparison and Contrast.

XII. VALUE CONFLICTS AND POLICY DECISIONS.

   Unit 1. How Can We Preserve Our Security Without Sacrificing Essential Freedoms?
   2. Economic Growth in the United States: How Can We Promote Growth?
   3. Problems of Underdeveloped Countries.
   4. Africa South of the Sahara.
   5. Racial Conflict in the United States: What Should Be Done?
   6. War and Peace.
   7. What is the Good Life?36
Each year of the Minnesota curriculum primarily emphasized one social science discipline. Even so, other disciplines were not ignored and were utilized in other, though less significant ways. The sequence of social science emphasis is summarized in Table 50.

Table 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K. Geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Anthropology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anthropology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Anthropology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sociology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Political Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Economics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. All Disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All Disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation and Critique

The Minnesota Curriculum is a good example of state-of-the-art structure-of-the-disciplines curriculum thinking. It is the most sophisticated K-12 curriculum model presented thusfar. In some respects it is confirmation that curriculum thinking has, in many respects, gradually improved in the period investigated by this dissertation.
The Minnesota curriculum staff emphasized that an inquiry strategy was at the core of their model. The staff did not wish to, "take the position that all teaching should proceed though inquiry," however. A variety of approaches was suggested. There were times, they believed, when informal lectures, map reading, expository teaching, and other methods were preferable.

A major goal, suggested West, was, "a scepticism of the finality of knowledge, an openness to new ideas, and a willingness to modify old ideas in the light of new evidence."  

As a structure of the disciplines design, certain strengths and weaknesses are inherent. Muessig wrote, "Advocates of the discipline-based approach contend that no other system is as well organized, ordered, and articulated as this one can be." In comparison with the other efforts thus far presented, this most certainly seems true. Muessig further suggested advocates of the disciplines approach believe it, "interests, motivates, challenges, and provides success experiences for learners."  

Bruner, who was involved in a structure of the disciplines effort himself, argues that, "the best introduction to a subject in the subject itself." This, however, could only be done in continuous consultation with leading experts in each discipline.

Central (though not unique) to the disciplines
approach is the concept of spiraling or revisitation, a principle drawn from developmental psychology. Important concepts, generalizations, attitudes, skills, and essential ideas, accordingly, should be taught repeatedly and with increasing complexity at various grade levels. Spiraling, incidentally, was also an important feature of the Taba curriculum. Some might claim this leads to boredom, since skills, concepts, attitudes, and so forth, are predetermined apart from genuine student needs and the learning process itself.

Problems with disciplines-based curriculums

The efficacy of subject matter in a disciplines based curriculum is dependent upon its timeliness, sequentiality, availability, and ability to be implemented. Curriculums, unfortunately, have a great tendency to stagnate once published. Publishers like to make a profit, and revisions cost money. Discipline based efforts, however, almost mandate some type of on-going curriculum evolution.

Teachers would have to be continually reeducated. Many would be unwilling, perhaps unable, to do so. Furthermore, such reeducation is not free. Who would pay for it?

Through what system would one be insured that the best talent in the disciplines was being recruited? Who is to say that such people would be interested in curriculum work?
Structure of the disciplines theory assumes that each of the social science disciplines has one discernable pattern of logic, methodology, or ideology. This writer is not knowledgeable about all social science disciplines, but he does understand history well enough to be fluent in its methodologies and concepts. Based upon this experience, this writer understands that there is no one accepted history discipline, methodology, or ideology, but a series of competing methodologies, ideologies, and logic. Therefore it is difficult, if not impossible, to incorporate the method of history into the schools. If it is safe to deduce from this experience that the same is true of other social science disciplines, then the situation becomes complicated indeed.

Discipline based curricula mandate carefully chosen and readily available materials. Additionally, each year of a discipline-based curriculum depends upon the previous year's generalizations, attitudes, concepts, skills, and so on. It would therefore be difficult to implement a K-12 curriculum in one year without sacrificing much of the curriculum's avowed purpose. Such skills, attitudes, generalizations, attitudes, moreover, risk simply becoming the "new" old facts to be memorized.

Furthermore, the structure of the disciplines approach has been justifiably criticized for being oriented toward the college bound, ambitious student. It does not take the
interests of all students into account, certainly not those of slow learners.45

Bruner's claim that any subject can be taught to any student in some manner does not consider the range of student abilities found in one classroom. Nor does Bruner account for the teacher who might feel like some sort of simpleton as a result of supposedly smarter and brighter "experts" determining his curriculum. Finally, the fact that something can be taught to a given student at a given age does not necessarily mean that such knowledge would be useful.

How would one train teachers? How does one insure that such training will bring the desired results? What does one do about the many teachers already teaching who have clearly demonstrated an affinity to the teaching style of their teachers (and an aversion of social studies curriculum research)? Is it realistic to expect teachers to become "pseudo-experts" in each social science discipline? Can many teachers even comprehend the importance of basic principles (whatever those might be)? What damage might be done by misteaching under such circumstances? Is it realistic to essentially expect the same interests and behavior from all teachers? How does one evaluate student success or even insure that they have learned prerequisite skills, attitudes, generalizations, or concepts?
It seems to this writer that such would be expecting more of the teacher than the "expert," who simply has to be accountable for one discipline.

What conclusions can be drawn from the Minnesota curriculum project? It has not been objectively evaluated.\(^{46}\) Neither was it widely reviewed.\(^{47}\) How then does one evaluate it? Much depends upon the nuances of the word "success." If, for example, success is gauged by national recognition and acceptance, it was a failure. On the other hand, if it is dependent upon publication, it was a success.\(^{48}\)

Success, however, cannot and should not be measured by national acceptance, rejection, or publication. The University of Minnesota model was a clear demonstration that integrated, intelligent, interdisciplinary, creative, sound, thoughtful K-12 curriculums were possible.

The Minnesota project and most efforts associated with Project Social Studies were a confirmation that federal funding could make a difference. Such support must be sustained if it to make a lasting difference, however. If the Minnesota project did not effect change, at least it helped identify problematic areas which others in time might rectify.

One final lesson should be drawn from this and all curriculum efforts associated with Project Social Studies. It is unrealistic to expect government or private funding,
thrown willy-nilly here and there, to effect dramatic and permanent change. As perceptive social studies historians have noted, the end result of the frantic activity of the 1960's was a minimal alteration of the basic social studies curriculum. Once again the 1916 curriculum reigned supreme.
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CHAPTER ELEVEN

IN SEARCH OF A SCOPE AND SEQUENCE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES (1984)

But please observe, now, that when as empiricists we give up the doctrine of objective certitude we do not thereby give up the quest or hope of truth itself.

William James

The sheer number and diversity of social studies projects during the 1960's practically guaranteed disunity and failure of reform efforts. As the collapse of "new" social studies became evident, pressure mounted for a new scope and sequence. By 1980, many social studies educators had joined in this clamor.¹

The NCSS responded to this pressure. In October 1981 Jan L. Tucker, Chairman of the NCSS Subcommittee on Scope and Sequence, mailed a survey to a number of social studies educators.² Four questions were asked:

(1) Would an NCSS scope and sequence in social studies be helpful?
(2) What would be the relationship between an NCSS scope and sequence and one used by your own state or district?
(3) To what extent should the NCSS be involved in a scope and sequence project?
(4) If the NCSS should undertake a scope and sequence project, what format would you recommend?³
There was some consensus in the responses. Most believed a scope and sequence was badly needed. A significant portion suggested that the NCSS should have a role in the design of such a document, though there was no consensus on the extent of that role. A few, however, strongly opposed NCSS involvement, believing the NCSS to be the "bland leading the bland." Many desired the inclusion of laypeople and professionals from other fields as a means of providing wide support and consensus. Most proposed an open-ended document with alternative sequences. A vocal minority suggested that a national commission would prove useful and was needed.4

At its June 1982 meeting, the NCSS Board of Directors directed then President James Banks to appoint a "Task Force" to develop a scope and sequence statement for adoption, publication, and distribution. Financial constraints prohibited the allocation of funds for this effort. Banks decided, with the advice and consent of the Executive Committee, to establish a regionally based task force. The Seattle area was selected as the regional base and John Jarolimek accepted Banks' invitation to be chairman. A number of educators were asked to serve on a National Advisory Committee to review and comment upon materials at appropriate points.5

A draft of the new scope and sequence document was circulated for such review and comment in June 1983. A
preliminary document dated November 1, 1983 evolved from it and is summarized and evaluated in this chapter. It will be published for critical review in the April 1984 edition of Social Education. This document may not be adopted precisely as written. If accepted, however, the final document probably will not differ significantly from that which is reviewed here.

Rationale

The Seattle Task Force defined social studies as,

...a basic subject of the K-12 curriculum that (1) derives its goals from the nature of citizenship in a democratic society that is closely linked to other nations and peoples of the world; (2) draws its content primarily from history, the social sciences, and, in some respects, from the humanities and science; and (3) is taught in ways that reflect an awareness of the personal, social, and cultural experiences and developmental levels of learners.6

This definition reflects what some believe to be state-of-the-art curriculum thinking. It links social studies clearly to citizenship education, emphasizes a global perspective, couples the curriculum to developmental stages, recognizes differences in student experiences and learning capabilities, and reflects the importance of content.

The social studies, according to the Task Force, "have a responsibility to prepare young people to identify, understand, and work to solve the problems that face our
increasingly diverse nation and interdependent world."\textsuperscript{7}

The Task Force suggests three goals for social studies:
"...educating citizens to become informed, [developing] skills necessary for citizen participation in social, civic, and political processes, and [embracing] the values and beliefs that characterize citizens in a democratic society."\textsuperscript{8}

The document states that social studies should not indoctrinate students to accept democratic beliefs and values. As a corollary to this, it assumes that critical thinking should be a major expected result. Knowledge, therefore, is used to help students better comprehend events and conditions. Teachers, they believe, have to be sensitive to the often contradictory thrusts of social studies education.\textsuperscript{9}

The Seattle group terms their curriculum design approach holistic-interactive. It is, "interactive because everything relates to everything else...holistic because it casts events in their broadest social context.\textsuperscript{10}

A sole reliance upon expanding environments or content complexity is not recommended in this document. It recognizes that children interact with the entire world at an early age. Their experiences, therefore, do not expand smoothly outward. Skills are to be taught systematically, sequentially, and practiced. Spiraling, or revisitation, is also advised.\textsuperscript{11}
The Task Force suggests that the preliminary scope and sequence, summarized in Tables 51-54, is, "presented for illustrative purposes and should not be construed as a model or ideal program. Rather, it is intended to extend the outer boundaries of existing practice, without moving so far out as to make the document unusable."\textsuperscript{12}

Table 51

1984 Preliminary NCSS Scope and Sequence

Grade:

K. Awareness of Self in a Social Setting.
I. The Individual in Primary Social Groups: Understanding School and Family Life.
II. Sharing Basic Needs in Nearby Social Groups: The Neighborhood.
III. Sharing Earth-Space with Others: The Community.
IV. Human Life in Varied Environments: The Region.
V. People of the Americas: The United States and Its Close Neighbors.
VI. People and Cultures: The Eastern Hemisphere.
VIII. Building a Strong and Free Nation: The United States.
IX. Systems that Make a Democratic Society Work: Law, Justice, and Economics.
XI. The Maturing of America: United States History.
XII. One Year Course or Courses Selected From:
   a) Issues and Problems of Modern Society.
   b) Introduction to the Social Sciences.
   c) The Arts in Human Societies.
   d) International Area Studies.
   e) Social Science Elective Courses.
   f) Supervised Experience in Community Affairs.
   g) Local Options.\textsuperscript{13}
The Seattle group believes that presenting only one scope and sequence model does not appropriately reflect the diverse nature and needs of American school systems. Accordingly, they suggested three additional options.

Table 52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCSS Option 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grade:**

6. European cultures with their extension into the Western Hemisphere.
8. Economics and law-related studies (one semester each).
9. Cultures of the non-Western world.
10. The Western heritage.
11. U.S. History (chronological, political, social, economic).
12. Government (one semester); Issues and problems of modern society (one semester).14

Table 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NCSS Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Grade:**

7. People and cultures of the Eastern Hemisphere.
8. Interdisciplinary study of the local region (geographic, social, economic, historical) with an environmental emphasis.
9. World history and cultures.
10. World history and cultures.
11. U.S. History (chronological, political, social, economic).
12. Economics and law-related studies (one semester each).15
Evaluation and Critique

In Search of a Scope and Sequence for Social Studies evokes both positive and negative sentiments and is not an easy document to evaluate objectively.

Positive Aspects

The NCSS Task Force tacitly recognizes that a central aim for social studies is desirable. Finding an emphasis upon which the social studies could focus would indeed be a major accomplishment. Further, the Task Force understands that there are practical constraints upon curriculum change. There are forces that exert control over social studies over
which social studies has almost no control.

Eighth grade American history, for example, is one result of such forces. Though it may have been meaningful to offer American history in the eighth grade in the late nineteenth or early twentieth century as a last chance to instruct students before they left school, most students now complete high school. The need for which the course was designed, therefore, has ended. Tradition and state laws, however, have not reflected this change, so the course remains. The same is basically true of eleventh grade American history. Tradition, likewise, supports the expanding environments elementary school curriculum. The NCSS Task Force is to be complimented for their recognition of such problems.

The historically diverse nature of social studies courses in the twelfth grade is likewise acknowledged. A flexible selection of courses is offered for this grade. This flexibility is a distinct advantage.

The 1984 preliminary document has additional strengths. In this writer's opinion, the association of knowledge, skills, and values with learner capabilities is good, common-sense curriculum thinking. Also to be commended is the recognition that the involvement of people from outside social studies (teachers, social scientists, historians, etc.) is desirable in curriculum revision. The goals of
citizenship and global education are, furthermore, praiseworthy. Both are goals that few would be willing to dispute.

Negative Aspects

This writer, however, is compelled to disagree with citizenship education as central focus of this curriculum. Such narrow focus is an Achilles’ heel, creating a proposal that is at cross purposes with itself.

1) Historically, it is true that history and social studies have traditionally been identified with citizenship and patriotism. Russell and Roorbach found that such values had been in place at least since 1810.17 It is equally true, however, that the school’s ability to teach citizenship effectively has never been proven.

2) A primary emphasis on citizenship education ignores the fact that it has strong competition from other thrusts and emphases with equally valid claims. Why should teachers who believe otherwise accept it? Would, for example, citizenship education as a primary goal be compatible with a structure-of-the-disciplines, emergent needs, subject centered, or reflective approach? This writer suggests it might not.

3) An adherent of the reflective approach, this writer would suggest that citizenship education, as an a priori goal, is contrary to the idea of reflection itself.
Certainly a "good citizen," whatever that is defined to be, could be one possible result. Equally possible, however, is the student who reflectively, rationally, logically, thoughtfully, and justifiably arrives at the decision to renounce his/her citizenship, who decides to go fishing instead of voting, or who mows his/her lawn on July 4th.

4) Whose society is the student being prepared to function within? Yesterday's, today's or tomorrow's? The whole idea of preparation for life ignores life as an on-going process. It also ignores the struggle which occurred early in this century between new and old historians. Dewey, for example, believed that schools could not be preparation for life, they had to be a reflection of life itself.

If the citizen is to be educated for today's society, is there consensus upon whose society and values this citizen should have?\textsuperscript{18} If one purports to educate for the future, can it be seen clearly enough to predict accurately what skills, attitudes, values, and so on, will be needed? How many, for example, predicted the rise of the computer age even twenty years ago? Who would have predicted that computers would be such a pervasive aspect of contemporary society ten years ago? If the need for computer literacy and skills could not be seen, how does one expect to inculcate skills whose need has not yet been envisioned?
5) Implicit in the NCSS rationale is the belief that there is an identifiable set of values, generalizations, ideals, attitudes, skills, ideas, understandings, and beliefs that distinguishes all Americans. This is simply not true. One of the strong points of the American democracy is its diversity. Such diversity is not easily distilled into any one set of testable objectives appropriate for the classroom.

6) Citizenship education, furthermore, is not the exclusive domain of social studies. It can be and is taught equally well in many other subject areas. Who is to choose what part, if any, belongs specifically to social studies? Is thirteen years of citizenship education practical? Is it enough? Is it too much?

7) The Seattle group proposes not to indoctrinate. Considering, however, that a very basic assumption of this document is that democracy is a valuable form of government and that the U.S. effort, in particular, ought to be preserved, there seems to be little likelihood that indoctrination will not occur. In reality, however, almost all education is some form of indoctrination, and all indoctrination may not be bad.

Summary Thoughts

This writer would be hesitant to recommend the adoption of this document. Its focus lacks breadth, historical
perspective, and balance. The choice of citizenship education as a central aim seems most unfortunate, opening schools to a Pandora's box of overzealous citizens, superpatriots, ultranationalists, and the like. Citizenship education is not a goal upon which consensus exists within social studies, let alone society at large. 20

This curriculum has the potential to suffer the fate of the AHA Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, which was rejected by its parent organization.

The end result of this curriculum is much like a patchwork quilt. From a distance, it seems beautiful. Closely inspected, however, it loses much of its glamor.
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CHAPTER TWELVE

THE 1916 REPORT IN RETROSPECT

Education, like invention, is primarily concerned, not with is, but with what may be.

Boyd Bode

Social Studies: What Kind of Future?

George Orwell presented his readers with a pessimistic vision of the future in his famous novel 1984. What otherwise would have been an ordinary calendar year was given new and unique significance. Undoubtedly, Orwell was perceptive of the darker side of human nature. Many in fact are alarmed by the parallels they see between modern American life and Orwell's negative utopia. Certainly, his version of the future is not appealing to most Americans. Nevertheless, it is a warning which once read cannot be forgotten.

Edward Bellamy also had a vision of the future. Though immensely popular at the turn of the century his "quaint" utopia, Looking Backward, is now seldom remembered. Unlike Orwell, however, Bellamy believed in a positive future, a future not to be feared but anticipated.
Both *1984* and *Looking Backward* have implications for social studies. Social studies in 1984 is in fact at a crossroads. Some consider the situation "quite desperate," a state of "curriculum anarchy." Other equally perceptive educators do not. Is social studies predestined to an Orwellian end? Should educators despair? This writer thinks not. As did Bellamy, he thinks there is substantial reason for hope. The quest is to build upon this hope, utilize inherent social studies strengths, and cut the Gordian knot of unsuccessful curriculum reform.

Retrospect

A major purpose of this study was to examine selected social studies scope and sequence patterns from 1916 to 1984. One conclusion is that none of the curricula reviewed in this dissertation was carelessly constructed. All were serious attempts to correct perceived problems. Each was superior to the 1916 Report on Social Studies in many and sometimes all respects.

It must be reemphasized that the 1916 report was primarily designed to redress specific problems which no longer exist. Furthermore, it was an anachronism by the time it was implemented. In spite of repeated attempts to replace it, the 1916 report has, for the most part, survived intact. Paradoxically, it is the "superior" alternatives
which have become memories.

A second major purpose was to answer a question many social studies curriculum reformers have asked: Why has there been no significant social studies curriculum change since 1916? This may be the wrong question. Hadley Cantril has suggested in The "Why" of Man's Experience that,

> The way in which a scientist poses his problem determines where he will come out ... A scientist is called "great" not so much because he has solved a problem as because he has posed a problem the solution of which, either by himself or his successors, will make for real progress.5

Perhaps social studies educators should reconsider their questions. Asking why such little curriculum reform has occurred since 1916 implies that the 1916 report was implemented rapidly and overwhelmingly in 1916. This was simply not true. The data presented in this document indicate a very gradual acceptance by many, though by no means all, school districts. The NEA proposal did not predominate until well after 1935, nearly twenty years after it was first published.

This writer suggests three, more appropriate questions:

1. Why was the 1916 NEA report accepted?
2. Why, once accepted, has it endured?
3. Who perceives the need for curriculum reform?
There is no single explanation for the acceptance of the 1916 NEA report. If one were compelled to provide one, serendipity appears to be as sound as any other. The NEA report "happened" to be published at the very same time favorable circumstances "happened" to coalesce. Its timing, "social" framework, limited competition, progressive ideals, recognition of contemporary concerns, and continuity with the past were all significant factors.

The report appeared at almost precisely the right instant to have maximum influence. A "window in time" appears to have existed between 1910 and 1920. The social reform movement had not gathered enough momentum to provide meaningful assistance before 1910. After 1917 America's entrance into World War I effectively diverted educators' attention. 1916, however, was a different story.

The greatest growth in public high schools occurred simultaneously (between 1900 and 1920). As a result of such growth, public high schools were in great turmoil. This growth created a need for reorganization, as schools sought to establish a sense of articulation, direction, purpose, and standardization for their curricula.

This search for purpose paralleled dramatic changes in American society, as it too redefined goals and purposes. The 1916 report was very much in harmony with such changes.
and with the leading educational theories of its time. Furthermore, it was the only major alternative to the Report of the Committee of Seven.

Synchronized with the basic principles of progressive education and reflecting the ideals of the Age of Reform, the 1916 report emphasized the importance of student needs and interests and recommended other social science disciplines in addition to history. In a time when the word "social" had important connotations, this synchronization and reflection significantly enhanced its acceptability.  

Why Has the 1916 Report Endured?

Again, there is no simple answer. Very complex circumstances bolster it. Most, if not all, supporting factors have absolutely nothing to do with the merit of the report itself.

The report is buttressed by individual teachers and ingrained habits, textbooks and textbook publishers, America's decentralized system of education with state and local control of curricula, state mandated courses, wide varieties of schools and school systems, little consensus among social studies educators on the purpose, process, or product of social studies, a lack of public consensus on the school's role in society, financial constraints, hidden curricula (factors other than those normally considered: teacher actions, attitudes, and expectations;
local traditions; and so forth),15 and tradition.16 Each of these factors has been discussed in this study and need not be repeated here. Their combined impact, however, dare not be underestimated.

Who Perceives the Need for Curriculum Reform?

Much of the present pressure for curriculum reform seems to have originated with professional social studies educators.17 It is this writer’s opinion that this group may be one of the most visible yet least effective agents for change in the curriculum revision process.

Many, perhaps most, social studies teachers do not read professional publications. Only a minority belong to specialized professional organizations such as the National Council for the Social Studies. Successful curriculum reform, however, seems to hinge upon them. If classroom teachers do not perceive the need for change, it will not occur.

Curriculum change, however, is not an impossible dream. The fact that alternative models have not displaced the NEA proposal is food for thought, not despair. Chapter Thirteen offers this writer’s analysis of possible “next steps.”
FOOTNOTES
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The quest for certainty is a quest for a peace which is assured, an object which is unqualified by risk and the shadow of fear which action casts.

John Dewey

Meaningful curriculum innovation is a very complex phenomenon. Lasting reform does not occur in an hour, a day, a weekend workshop, a summer, or a year. It seems to begin with and best be accomplished by individual classroom teachers. As Muessig, Taba, West, and others have recognized, curriculum improvement is an expensive proposition which requires a substantial and sustained commitment and has "few bargain prices."¹

In the past, as now, many social studies educators have advocated revision solely because significant change has not occurred since the 1916 NEA report was implemented. This cannot continue. Rationales for reform must be more sophisticated than "just because."

While much is known about the products of the curriculum reform process (structures, courses of study, curriculum guidelines, scope and sequence proposals), the
process itself is only imperfectly understood. This, too, must change.

Many believe social studies education is in a state of disorder, disunity, and disintegration. In spite of this, it still survives. Neither situation is likely to change in the immediate future. There is substantial agreement, however, that what is occurring is a disservice to students and something must be done.

In many respects, unfortunately, contemporary social studies education is much like an out-of-control juggernaut. Meaningful reform, therefore, requires a massive effort. If social studies education is to enter the 21st century as a viable component of the American K-12 curriculum, the problem of successful curriculum revision must be confronted directly and quickly.

Since superior curriculum proposals have failed to displace the 1916 report, one might conclude that nothing can be done. This is simply not true. A "raison d'être" of this dissertation has been to demonstrate that much of what was suggested by Hanna, West, Taba and the NCSS worked. A substantial portion has been incorporated gradually into the existing framework. Lack of national implementation therefore, cannot be equated to failure or lack of viability. There is a solid foundation upon which to build.
One National Scope and Sequence?

Many critical decisions confront contemporary social studies curriculum reformers. Few are simple and most have many variables. One such decision is whether or not a single guideline should be proposed. Numerous issues, elements, dilemmas, problems, proposals, and solutions of curriculum revision hinge upon this question.

The alternative of suggesting nothing at all, though not recommended, is always available. Doing nothing in this instance, however, would simply confirm a locally accepted "defacto national curriculum," based in part upon the 1916 report. This "defacto standard," as determined by Project SPAN, is summarized in Table 55. Few students, it should be noted, experience this pattern precisely as shown. In this respect, the 1916 NEA report, upon which this consensus is built, has had much the same effect Mehl noted for the Committee of Ten. That is, if one looks closely at individual school districts as Edwin Dexter did in 1906, one would find a similar, marked diversity. When, however, one looks at the nation as a whole, the following pattern emerges:
Table 55

Dominant K-12 Social Studies Scope and Sequence Pattern

Grade:

K. Self, school, community, home.
1. Families.
3. Communities.
4. State history, Geographic regions.
5. United States history.
6. World cultures, Western Hemisphere.
7. World geography or history.
8. American history.
9. Civics or World cultures.
10. World history.
11. American history.

Advantages of a National Scope and Sequence

A single, national scope and sequence could have several distinct advantages. In an era of relatively high student mobility, one model would significantly increase the likelihood that pupils would receive an integrated social studies education. It might decrease the possibility that students who transfer frequently from state to state or district to district would be taught the same course repeatedly or receive a fragmented scope and sequence.

A predominant model would be popular with textbook publishers. They would be able to predict with significantly increased accuracy what textbooks were needed.
in a given grade (i.e., state history in the 4th and 7th grades, American history in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades, and so forth). A "basic" curriculum would be popular with many teachers who depend upon textbooks and consider them "the cement" which holds the curriculum together.  

A national scope and sequence might introduce more uniform standards into teacher education and make it easier for teachers to move from one state to another. It could conceivably be more logical, integrated, and developmentally sound, a confirmation that social studies educators agree that certain content, skills, disciplines, attitudes, ideas, values, beliefs, or appreciations are important and ought to be taught.

Disadvantages

One scope and sequence pattern is most appropriate for nations with centralized systems of education and homogeneous populations. America, however, has neither, being characterized by decentralized schools and an heterogeneous people.

Each state has an independent school system. In addition to this, state legislatures frequently mandate courses. United States history is required by law in 41 states (37 in the elementary grades and 35 in the secondary grades); state history is required in 38 states; American government is required in 29 states; civics is required in
26 states; and so forth. This list, it should be added, is not all-inclusive. Economics, consumerism, careers, the free enterprise system, or an understanding of communism are examples of other frequently mandated courses.

It would be difficult for a single national curriculum proposal to incorporate the many different traditions, thrusts, and emphases which characterize social studies. Such movements vary from state to state, district to district, building to building, and from one day to the next in the same classroom. It is unlikely this will change in the foreseeable future. One national model might, therefore, emphasize one kind of social studies at the expense of the others. Any model which chooses to do so risks being discredited as merely another "fad." As many perceptive educators have recognized, social studies teachers are sick of one crusade after another and would refuse to march again.

**New or Old?**

If contemporary social studies curriculum reformers should decide that one scope and sequence is a legitimate aim, still another question must be answered. Should this scope and sequence be a totally new K-12 pattern or a modification of the old one? There are advantages and disadvantages either way.
A new K-12 curriculum could be a significant improvement upon the present curriculum structure. It would not be limited by tradition to offering American history in the 5th, 8th, and 11th grades, world history in the 10th, civics in the 9th, or American government in the 12th, for no other reason than it may have served some purpose in the past. A totally new K-12 curriculum could reflect the best contemporary educational thought. It would be organized as no revision of the 1916 report could ever hope to be.

New patterns, however, have been exceptionally difficult to implement. No recent effort has been successful. Courses mandated by state law are not easily displaced. Also, enough is not known about the reform process to guarantee success.

Modifications of the 1916 pattern might prove more successful. They would build upon a foundation which is a proven winner. Such proposals would, unfortunately, share the same limitations of the original: American history in two or three grades; world history in the 10th; civics in the 9th; and so forth. It could not be as integrated, exciting, logical, developmentally sound, nor sequential as a new proposal.

Multiple Patterns?

An additional alternative to a single national scope and sequence exists and should be examined. Instead of one
national model, perhaps twenty or thirty different curricula reflecting the major trends of social studies should be developed. There could be, for example, curricula which emphasize reflective thinking, values clarification, citizenship education, global education, multiethnic/multicultural education, social science disciplines, social roles, emergent needs, subject matter, and so forth. Each would need a sound rationale. Each should be carefully crafted by social studies professionals, teachers, students, social scientists, parents, as well as others interested in curriculum reform. These could then be published by the NCSS as suggested guidelines upon which teachers, school districts, and states could draw.

On the other hand, multiple proposals would probably lead to even more confusion. Such curricula might provoke a series of "curriculum wars" as each developer championed his/her model as the solution. Publishers would also find this alternative completely unpalatable, an impossible dream.

A National Scope and Sequence Commission?

Richard E. Gross has long campaigned for a national scope and sequence committee or commission. In some respects this idea is historically sound. Some national committees were outstanding successes and have influenced
social studies education significantly. The Committees of Ten, Seven, and Social Studies examined in this study are three such committees.

It is often forgotten that all three "successful" committees met with varying degrees of dissatisfaction and disapproval. Even in 1921, Joseph Schafer, chairman of the unsuccessful Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, thought that the time when one report could wield the influence of a "Committee of Seven" had passed. No report solved all problems, as no committee could be omniscient.

In this writer's opinion, the value of a national commission is greatly dependent upon its assigned role. If that role is to develop a new scope and sequence pattern, it will probably not have much impact or value. This writer would be greatly surprised if such a committee could reach agreement upon anything other than a watered down version of a compromise.

If, however, the committee's role is to serve as a clearinghouse for the development of alternative schemes within a larger framework, as Gross now envisions, it might have tremendous value. In this capacity, no other group would be likely to have the "larger perspective" necessary to review and refine such proposals.
What Should be the Role of the NCSS?

Though some doubt the ability of the NCSS to lead, this writer can imagine no other professional organization with the requisite experience, eclectic membership, and potential. Additionally, the NCSS has an advantage in its widely-read publication, Social Education.

Undoubtedly, the NCSS is incapable of funding an effort the size of which is envisioned here. It could not fund even one regional task force. A voluntary effort, however, will not suffice, for curriculum revision is a full-time, lengthy responsibility. Some type of substantial federal and/or state involvement, therefore, will be absolutely necessary if significant curriculum improvement is ever to become a reality.
Conclusions and Recommendations

1. Continuing fragmentation of the social studies curriculum is self-destructive. A "basic" scope and sequence recommendation is one possible way of remedying this situation.

A necessary "first step" in the development of such a model would be to agree upon a more generic definition of the social studies. One possibility might be as follows:

Social studies education is a fundamental element of the K-12 American curriculum. It consists of, but is not limited to, appreciations, skills, values, understandings, and attitudes drawn from the social science disciplines.

This definition acknowledges the essential role the social sciences have in the social studies. It intentionally avoids tying social studies education to one specific aim. This is a calculated risk, a disappointment to those who believe social studies must do so. On the other hand, this proposal does not alienate those who might believe that one emphasis for social studies is inappropriate or who would disagree with the specific one chosen. Finally, the above suggestion recognizes that social studies have a fundamental and traditional place in the American educational system confirmed by state law.

This writer, though aware of the inherent value of a new K-12 proposal, the limitations of a recommendation based
upon the existing framework, and the problems associated with national curriculum models in general, believes that the best chance social studies educators have to effect a national framework is to suggest a modification of the present pattern. A possible K-12 curriculum is suggested below:

Table 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Social Studies K-12 Curriculum Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Self, school, community, home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. State history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. United States history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. World cultures or history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. State history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. World geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. World history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. American history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A) Senior problems (1 year).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Introduction to the social sciences (1 sem).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One social science in depth (1 sem).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This curriculum proposal is predicated upon several assumptions:

A) There are aspects of the traditional 1916 report that cannot reasonably be changed. These include elementary and secondary American history, civics, American government, and elementary and secondary state history. So many states now mandate these courses that it seems senseless to try and
eliminate them.

B) Some realistic improvement in K-12 curriculum integration is better than none at all.

C) A balanced introduction to the understandings, skills, values, and attitudes from the social sciences seems appropriate if social studies education is to reflect the disciplines from which it is drawn. The sequence implicit in this writer's K-12 proposal is summarized in Table 57.

Table 57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence of Social Science Disciplines K-12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-3. Varies according to program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sociology/anthropology or history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Geography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Political science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. History.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. All social science disciplines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D) The expanding environments elementary curriculum--though not without its inherent problems and limitations--is firmly entrenched in the elementary grades. It is a sturdy foundation and is retained in the above suggestion. Nothing, on the other hand, would prevent individual districts from proposing their own K-3 alternative if they so desired.
E) Either the grade 5 or grade 8 American history course must be eliminated. This writer believes that both, in fact, are difficult to justify logically. Since state law mandates American history in the elementary curriculum of so many states, one or the other probably has to remain. This writer chose to place American history in the fifth grade, justifying this decision on the basis that it fits more logically into the expanding environments here than it would at the eighth grade level. Eighth grade American history is eliminated.

Brief Description of the Proposal

Grades K-3. The expanding environments sequence is suggested.

Grade 4. State history is recommended. There are solid reasons for suggesting it at this level: it logically extends the K-3 sequence; many states mandate state history in the elementary grades; a large number of elementary teachers tend to identify social studies with history, few having specialized in other social sciences.

Grade 5. American history.

Grade 6. World Cultures or world history is advised. Either course logically extends the sequence developed in K-5. A course in world cultures could serve as an introduction to significant understandings from anthropology and/or sociology, and is preferred. If, on the other hand,
world history is chosen, this writer recommends that it be coordinated with the course at the secondary level to reduce the high content load which seems to characterize this course.

Grade 7. State history is again recommended. Surveys establish that the seventh grade has generally been a year in which no course has established a lengthy predominance. On this basis, considering that many states require state history at the secondary level, it is placed in this year.

Grade 8. World geography is suggested as a replacement for American history. The senseless redundancy of American history in the elementary grades is thereby eliminated while students benefit from the introduction of an additional social science discipline.

Grade 9. A full-year course in government replaces 9th grade civics and 12th grade American government. Either could be offered as a full year course or both could be offered as semester courses.

Grade 10. World history.

Grade 11. American history.

Grade 12. The twelfth grade has historically been a year of flexibility. Courses such as Problems of Democracy, single social science disciplines (especially economics and sociology), or American government seem popular. Since government has been moved to the ninth grade, the following
options, which take into account tradition and changing student needs, are offered:

Option A) Senior problems (1 year). This course would be recommended for non-college bound youth (optional for college-bound students) as a way of tying together basic understandings from all social science disciplines in personal, local, state, national, and world problems.

Option B) Introduction to the Social Sciences (1st semester) and a Study of One Social Science In-depth (2nd semester). Option B is suggested but not required for college bound youth (optional for non-college bound students) as an introduction on a more sophisticated level to the fundamental understandings from the social science disciplines that will be encountered in college.

2. The many emphases, thrusts, or traditions of social studies cannot be ignored. This writer recommends that curriculum proposals emphasizing reflection, social roles, citizenship, values clarification, content, and so forth, be developed using the above framework as a parameter. These could then be published as a demonstration of the flexibility and applicability of one framework. The possibility exists, of course, that curriculum competition could still be sparked, but this writer believes that it would be blunted by the fact that everyone would be working within an identical framework.
3. Within the K-12 parameters established above, a federally funded, national commission could be convened by the NCSS to oversee, refine, and widely distribute illustrative models.
Final Thoughts

The quest for a scope and sequence for social studies has been difficult, plagued with false starts and missteps. Since the implementation of the 1916 NEA Report on Social Studies, marginal success has attended the effort. Why then, it might reasonably be asked, a history of such attempts? What meaning can be found in such failures?

Part of the answer for this question is found in the purpose of histories. Some say that they are written to provide guidance, however defective, for the future. Others suggest that their value lies in the light histories may shed upon contemporary problems. A third group writes for the satisfaction of finding possible solutions to knotty problems, such as a detective in a mystery novel. A few thrive simply upon the discipline necessary for such an effort and claim no further motive. Threads of each are found in this document.

Another part of the answer is found in the nature of histories. Much as each person is bound to see a different image reflected in a mirror, each historian perceives history differently. Where one might see hope, another could despair; where one would see strength, another only weakness; where one could see order, another might find chaos; where one may see change, another merely stagnation. No one view is absolutely right, few are totally wrong.
Each perception, analysis, or conclusion adds to the common pool of knowledge from which increasingly accurate, often pragmatic, sometimes hasty, American educational decisions may be made.

Americans, Franklin D. Roosevelt believed, were hesitant to entrust their general welfare to one group or class, though he acknowledged that one may temporarily gain supremacy. The net effect of this "Jacksonian heritage," suggested Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., has been the preservation of liberty.

American education, too, has a Jacksonian heritage. Though there have been times when curriculum reform was controlled by academicians, national committees, or specialists, none has dominated for long. Social studies teachers, it seems, desire to be masters of their own destinies. This may have served to preserve flexibility.

The 1916 NEA report seems to represent a conservative tradition in social studies, a "tried and true" sequence. Though their names will ring in the social studies "hall of fame" as long as social study is remembered, not even Dewey, Bode, Hullfish, Kilpatrick, Griffin, or Taba, were able to effect change in the whole curriculum structure at once. As a matter of fact, neither did the 1916 report, which itself was meant for secondary grades and had strong ties to contemporary tradition.
Many can and will disagree with the scope and sequence solution proposed by this writer. There is no question that defensible alternatives exist. On the other hand, it is the best effort that this writer believes feasible in light of a careful examination of past proposals and events.

The ultimate contribution of this study, therefore, is not the fatalistic conclusion that curriculum change does not occur or is impossible, but that its true nature is not yet understood. This writer suggests that in a society characterized by a "compulsive competition for easy solutions," there are none. Meaningful curriculum improvement is exasperating, is expensive, is incremental, is difficult, and, most importantly, is achievable.


6 Donald 0. Schneider and Ronald L. Van Sickle, "The Status of the Social Studies: The Publisher’s Perspective," *Social Education* 43 (October 1979), p. 461.
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