

AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
INNOVATIVE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM MATERIALS

Except where reference is made to the work of others, the work described in this dissertation is my own or was done in collaboration with my advisory committee. This dissertation does not include proprietary or classified information.

---

Charles E. Farmer

Certificate of Approval:

---

Jada Kohlmeier  
Assistant Professor  
Curriculum and Teaching

---

John W. Saye, Jr., Chair  
Professor  
Curriculum and Teaching

---

David C. Carter  
Associate Professor  
History

---

Joe F. Pittman  
Interim Dean  
Graduate School

AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
INNOVATIVE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM MATERIALS

Charles E. Farmer

A Dissertation

Submitted to

the Graduate Faculty of

Auburn University

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the

Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama

May 10, 2008

AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
INNOVATIVE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM MATERIALS

Charles E. Farmer

Permission is granted to Auburn University to make copies of this dissertation at its discretion, upon request of individuals or institutions and at their expense.  
The author reserves all publication rights.

---

Signature of Author

---

Date of Graduation

## VITA

Charles Edward Farmer, son of Dr. Larry Edward and Paula (Martin) Farmer, was born October 11, 1974, in Enterprise, Alabama. He graduated from Oakland High School in Murfreesboro, Tennessee, in 1992. He attended Auburn University in Auburn, Alabama, and graduated with a Bachelor of Science degree in Social Science Education in June, 1997. He entered Graduate School at the Florida State University in September, 1997 and graduated with a Master's degree in Educational Leadership in August, 2001. While working toward his Master's degree, he taught US and World History at Bay High School in Panama City, Florida. Upon completion of his Master's degree, he worked in administration for one year at A. Crawford Mosley High School in Lynn Haven, Florida. He then moved to Auburn, Alabama, to work full-time toward his Doctor of Philosophy degree. After a three-year stint as a full-time graduate student and part of Dr. John Saye's staff at the PIH Network, he re-entered the classroom teaching all levels of US History at Troup County High School in Lagrange, Georgia. He is currently Assistant Principal at Opelika High School in Opelika, Alabama, a position he has held since July 2006. He is married to the former Rachel Eden Henderson, and has a son, Harrison Edward.

DISSERTATION ABSTRACT

AN EXAMINATION OF FACTORS AFFECTING THE ACCEPTANCE OF  
INNOVATIVE SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM MATERIALS

Charles E. Farmer

Doctor of Philosophy, May 10, 2008  
(M.A., Florida State University, 2001)  
(B.S., Auburn University, 1997)

304 Typed Pages

Directed by John W. Saye, Jr.

Although many studies have been conducted that analyze social studies curricula, there is a need for further investigation into the dynamics of social studies curriculum reform projects. This should facilitate an enhanced understanding of how to engage in effective curriculum reform in the future. The principal focus of such research should be on curricula that were developed in eras which offer materials that provide alternative learning opportunities to that of most materials of the day.

In order for curriculum developers to understand how prior curriculum reformers made decisions regarding their rationale and purposes for creating materials in light of the social, political and economic influences of the time period, research data must be compiled and made accessible. If these influences are comprehended by future curriculum developers, it could afford better collaboration among all educational stakeholders in the production of curriculum materials.

This study examines what factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials. Additionally, the implications of the history of curriculum reform on contemporary curriculum development are addressed. The study was completed by analyzing, structurally and critically, four curricula as critical cases using a set of guiding questions and a heuristic created in conjunction with this research. The four data sets are: the Harold Rugg's Social Science Course, the Amherst Project, the Harvard Project, and the Teachers' Curriculum Institute's *History Alive!* series. Not only were the curriculum sets researched individually, but a comparative analysis of the structural and critical components of the four curricula was also completed.

While there were distinctions between each of the four critical cases, the final analysis suggests that the overarching themes of social studies highlighted in the heuristic are shared by three of the four critical cases.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank my advisor, Dr. John W. Saye, Jr., and my committee for their support throughout my project. Immeasurable gratitude is due to my wife, Rachel, my son, Harrison (even though he does not realize it!), and my entire family for their love, support, and patience during this process. I especially would like to thank my parents for positioning me throughout my life so that I might have the opportunity to embark on this venture. I would also like to show appreciation to my professional colleagues – Dr. Stan Cox, Dr. Shakela Johnson-Ford, and Mr. Jason Bryant – for their help and words of encouragement throughout the final stages of my project. Last but not least, I want to thank my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, for giving me the ability to complete such an endeavor.

Style manual used is *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association, 5<sup>th</sup> Edition*.

Computer software used is *Microsoft Word for Windows*.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....		x
I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	6
	Introduction.....	6
	Recurring Tendencies within the Social Studies Debate.....	7
	Mediated Action.....	10
	Levstik and Barton’s “Four Stances”.....	11
	The Heuristic.....	14
	The Critical Tendency.....	17
	The Amelioristic Tendency.....	20
	The Nationalistic Tendency.....	22
	History of Curriculum Reform in Social Studies.....	25
	Post-Reconstruction Educational Reform.....	25
	The “Classics” versus The “Moderns”.....	26
	NEA and AHA Committees of Ten and Seven.....	28
	Rise of Progressivism .....	31
	The 1916 Report.....	34
	Great Depression/New Deal Era.....	36
	Progressive Education and Social Reconstruction.....	37
	World War II and the Cold War.....	42
	The New Social Studies.....	44
	The Vietnam War and Societal Changes at Home.....	47
	A Conservative Critique of Education in American Schools.....	49
	The Controversy over the National History Standards....	50
	Historical Context of Classroom Practice Since 1900.....	52
	Review of Social Studies Curriculum Materials Analysis.....	55
	Content Analysis of Social Studies Materials.....	55
	Prominent Critiques of Social Studies Materials.....	57
	The Research Problem.....	61
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	64
	Introduction.....	64
	Data Collection.....	65
	Methods of Data Collection/Rationale for Strategies.....	67

Data Analysis.....	69
Content Analysis.....	69
Procedures.....	71
Preparation to analyze the data.....	74
Study Limitations.....	79
Attempts to mitigate limitations.....	81
Transitioning to the data analysis.....	82
IV.    THE RUGG SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSE.....	84
Historical Contextualization.....	84
Overview.....	84
Underlying principles.....	88
Description of curriculum materials.....	92
Content Analysis.....	94
Presentation of Materials.....	95
Content.....	102
In-depth Analysis of the treatment of the American Revolution...	107
V.    THE AMHERST PROJECT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY.....	121
Historical Contextualization.....	121
Overview.....	121
Underlying principles.....	125
Description of curriculum materials.....	127
Content Analysis.....	130
Presentation of Materials.....	131
Content.....	137
In-depth Analysis of the treatment of the American Revolution...	142
VI.   THE HARVARD SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT.....	153
Historical Contextualization.....	153
Overview.....	153
Underlying principles.....	154
Description of curriculum materials.....	156
Content Analysis.....	158
Presentation of Materials.....	159
Content.....	172
In-depth Analysis of the treatment of the American Revolution...	180

VII. TEACHERS' CURRICULUM INSTITUTE.....	190
Historical Contextualization.....	190
Overview.....	190
Underlying principles.....	193
Description of curriculum materials.....	199
Content Analysis.....	201
Presentation of Materials.....	202
Content.....	215
In-depth Analysis of the treatment of the American Revolution...	218
VIII. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS.....	231
Introduction.....	231
Ideological factors.....	233
Pragmatic factors.....	247
Study Implications.....	257
Suggestions for Further Study.....	258
Conclusion.....	259
REFERENCES.....	262
APPENDICES.....	280
Appendix A: Interview Questions and Dates Conducted.....	281
Appendix B: Rugg Social-Science Course Materials Surveyed.....	282
Appendix C: Amherst Project Materials Surveyed.....	284
Appendix D: Harvard Social Studies Project Materials Surveyed.....	287
Appendix E: Teachers' Curriculum Institute Materials Surveyed.....	291

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Comparative Analysis of how tendencies within the social studies debate answer this study's guiding questions.....	15
Table 2:	Comparative Analysis of how tendencies within the social studies debate answer this study's guiding questions.....	76
Table 3:	Data Sources from the Rugg Social Science Course.....	93
Table 4:	Data Sources from the Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History.....	128
Table 5:	Data Sources from the Harvard Social Studies Project.....	158
Table 6:	Data Sources from TCI's History Alive!.....	201

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

### **Introduction**

Tyack and Cuban posit, “Many educational problems have deep roots in the past, and many solutions have been tried before. If some ‘new’ ideas have already been tried, and many have, why not see how they fared in the past?” Moreover, the researchers argue that “all people use history (defined as an interpretation of past events) when they make choices about the present and future.” Additionally, they believe that when reforms target basic alterations within an institution it may take the passing of a generation or more before effective data can be gleaned regarding the success or failure of the changes within the system (Tyack and Cuban, 1995). With these observations in mind, this study strives to delve into the reforms of yesteryear to analyze a purposeful sample of curriculum materials that have resulted from various reform eras within the larger Social Studies Movement.

Since the late nineteenth century, numerous philosophies have surfaced regarding social studies in American public schools. Each school of thought has had its own opinions about what content should be taught and how. The differences between these groups have created a continuous curriculum debate over content selection, instructional methods, and how intended or unintended consequences of what is learned will impact students throughout their lives. In order to achieve a better understanding of this debate and its effects on social studies curriculum reform, it is helpful to examine how

influential groups, such as teachers, teacher-educators, historians, society-at-large and politicians, answer a series of questions about citizenship over a prolonged period:

- What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- What is a good, democratic citizen?
- How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

### **Purpose of the Study**

There are three key purposes to this study. One purpose of this study is to understand the content and underlying purposes of innovative curriculum materials in three significant historical periods. A second purpose of this study is to investigate the political, social, and economic context surrounding eras of curriculum reform and how it may have influenced the creation and reception of innovative curriculum materials. A third purpose of this study is to compare curricula and their fates to draw implications for contemporary curriculum development.

### **Significance of the Study**

Many studies have been conducted that analyze social studies curriculum materials. However, most analysis has focused solely on textbooks (Santoli, 1997; Gordy and Pritchard, 1995; Romanowski, 1994; Wade, 1993). Therefore, an analysis of social studies curriculum materials other than conventional textbooks is critical to the body of research. Additionally, there have been periods of growth and periods of retrenchment for those opposed to the status quo over the last one hundred years. Consequently, research should be performed that investigates how and why innovative social studies curriculum materials were created and received during certain time periods to gain a better understanding of how to employ successful curriculum reform (Tyack and Cuban,

1995). By accounting for those tendencies that have arisen from periods of advancement and reduction, curriculum developers should be better prepared to produce materials that prepare students to become productive American citizens.

### **Research Questions**

This study began with two broad questions: 1.) What factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials? and 2.) What implications does the history of curriculum reform have for contemporary curriculum development? While there are many avenues that a researcher might take to reflect on these questions, I decide to focus on the ebb and flow of the social studies curriculum reform movement over the last century and a quarter.

### **Methodology**

A sizeable portion of the review of the literature has been transformed into a historical narrative for the purpose of contextualizing the last one hundred and twenty-five years of the social studies curriculum reform movement. However, before a historical narrative is attempted, I explain the theoretical basis for a heuristic I developed. The framework for this study emerged as a heuristic for understanding how camps have answered the guiding questions that have steered the social studies debate. The heuristic aligns the purposes and practices for teaching into three broadly defined categories: Critical, Amelioristic, and Nationalistic. This heuristic will afford an instrument to assist in understanding the patterns which have occurred throughout the history of social studies curriculum reform.

Historical case studies of critical cases from three eras will be the benchmark for exploring why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative materials. A purposeful sample of the curriculum materials from three historical eras will be the focus of the critical cases and are as follows: Harold Rugg's curriculum series from the 1930s, the New Social Studies movement including the Amherst Project and the Harvard Project from the 1960s and 1970s, and the Teachers' Curriculum Institute's *History Alive!* series of present day. Content analysis guidelines and criteria were established to analyze each set of curriculum materials. Secondary source materials were used to provide contextual information on those curriculum materials. Interviews with developers were conducted as an additional resource to secondary source materials. Each critical case is reported in its own chapter. The beginning of each analysis chapter offers a descriptive narrative of each set of curriculum materials sets the historical context in which the curriculum materials were developed. A structural analysis of each curriculum set is then presented in each chapter. Each chapter concludes with an in-depth analysis of each curriculum set's treatment of the American Revolution. The final chapter of this study put forward a comparative analysis of the four critical cases to generate trends that have arisen over time that adversely or conversely affected the success of social studies curriculum materials.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The first limitation of my study was the use of the American Revolution as the centerpiece for the in-depth critical analysis portion of this study. Since Harold Rugg's curriculum was developed in the 1930s, I could not choose any historical phenomenon



beyond 1930. This is important because the most recent seventy-five years of American history that is taught in classrooms cannot be analyzed. The way in which curriculum reformers address more recent eras might aid in better understanding the purposes they had for creating the materials. A second limitation was that a small number of the resources were impossible to locate. Had those materials been available, they might have altered the overall analysis. A third limitation to my study involves interviews. Due to the far-reaching time period of those materials analyzed as part of my study, I was not able to interview participants who are deceased. While the authors' theoretical writings and other publications that addressed their curricula were helpful in contextualizing the materials, the data collected from interviews likely would have shed more light on the intentions the developers had while creating the materials. The inclusion of only four curricula is the fourth limitation. The use of another set of curricula might have provided different outcomes. Moreover, the periods I classified as "momentous" may not be universally accepted as such. The last major limitation is the development of an a priori framework. The a priori framework used in this study emerged from the study of a variety of prominent theorists from the last thirty years. Based on this study and a survey of curriculum reform over the past century, I was able to develop a heuristic that highlighted tendencies within the social studies debate. While the tendencies are based in theory, the analysis could cause me to maneuver my examination so that it fit satisfactorily into the tendency categories rather than emerging on its own.

## CHAPTER 2: THE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

### **Introduction**

The discussion over what should be taught to children in history and social studies has its roots in the early foundations of our country's education system. This discussion, however, took on a new and more heated phase with the development of specialized professional organizations for history and education after Reconstruction (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978; Cremin, 1964). The assessment of the National Education Association's Committee of Ten and the American Historical Association's Committees of Seven and Eight initiated the onslaught of debates that have deeply influenced the field up to present day. Since the last quarter of the nineteenth century, a variety of ideologies have emerged to state, defend, and promote their beliefs regarding what and how social studies should be taught in America's schools. The formation of new philosophies and the reinvigoration of ones already in existence prompted innovative curriculum materials in social studies education. Additionally, at points in American history a convergence of political, social, and economic phenomena has influenced schools and served as an impetus for curriculum reform. In this study I will examine the two following questions:

1. What factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials?

2. What implications does the history of curriculum reform have for contemporary curriculum development?

While from the periphery the ongoing discourse regarding curriculum reform may seem to be strictly a political debate, internally it is much more complex. There are fundamental differences among teachers, teacher-educators, historians, society-at-large and politicians regarding what should be taught to our youth, how it should be taught, and what effect the content taught ultimately has on an individual throughout the course of his or her life. Moreover, these groups feel strongly that the manner in which history and social studies are presented in America's classrooms directly influences the making of a "good citizen" and the understanding of an "ideal democracy." To gain a more meaningful understanding of the nature of this enduring debate and its effects on social studies curriculum reform, it is helpful to examine how influential groups, such as those mentioned previously, answer a series of questions about citizenship and citizenship education over an extended period of time:

- a. What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- b. What is a good, democratic citizen?
- c. How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- d. What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

### **Recurring Tendencies Within the Debate Over the Social Studies**

As is evident in the literature, the debate over Social Studies curriculum reform extends well beyond the academic realm of the high school or university. In fact, Americans possess a wide array of viewpoints on who we are, where we came from, and where we are headed. Many Americans feel the societal values and mores that are

ingrained in the American culture only promote a status quo that hampers opportunities for certain sectors of society (Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Apple, 2000; Cherryholmes, 1988). Conversely, other Americans feel that without following and respecting the principles that were established by our forefathers, America will meet her demise (Cheney, 1994; Finn, Ravitch, and Francher, 1984). Many Americans see it as their duty to question the actions of the government. On the other hand, countless Americans believe promoting patriotism and nationalism is their ultimate responsibility.

While the literature conveys that there is an active debate within American society on what and how social studies should be taught in America's schools, it also suggests that it is not resonating in the elementary and secondary sectors of education. It is not easy to pinpoint why theoretical approaches have difficulty translating into practice. However, many studies legitimize such a notion. Whether it is a division between teacher practices and educational theory or barriers that teachers face when preparing for the daily responsibilities of their profession, there is an apparent disconnect (Rossi, 1998; Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Oakes, J., Gamoran, A., and Page, R. N., 1992; Onosko, 1991; Thornton, 1991; Leming, 1989; McNeil, 1986; Lortie, 1975; Jackson, 1968). In fact, some theorists argue that there are two cultures of Social Studies Education (Nelson, 2006; Cuban, 1993; Leming, 1989).

One culture in Social Studies Education encompasses the majority of the academy who, in their profession, reflects about social studies and its purpose in education. The other culture includes most teachers who engage in social studies on a daily basis. The social studies theorists principally believe that we are a civilization in crisis. Social studies teachers, conversely, oftentimes seek to maintain traditional values. Furthermore,

many teachers seek to glorify the past and highlight what they deem to be patriotic. Many teachers believe students should experience a classroom that shows the good that America has imparted on the world. It is important to understand that neither teachers nor theorists are restricted to one culture or the other. In fact, there are conservative thinkers and theorists such as Lynne Cheney and Chester Finn. Moreover, there are critical teachers throughout the field of education (Nelson, 2006; Leming, 1989; Shaver, 1981).

This dichotomy provides an illustration of each end of the spectrum in regard to the on-going debate in social studies. However, the vast middle ground that exists between these two descriptions must be accounted for as well. Later in this study, I will address this “middle ground.” Nonetheless, the prior descriptions of polar opposites within the debate over curriculum reform in Social Studies Education illustrate why there is such disagreement on how to prepare America’s young people to be “good citizens”. Many within society argue that a focused approach to participatory action is the key. However, others largely believe that rote memorization of important events and concepts of America’s past will effectively prepare America’s youth to be “good citizens” (Leming, 1989; Shaver, 1981). Regardless of the method used to prepare young people to be good citizens, the purposes of those doing the preparing must be fully understood and examined. This notion is significant because the method alone is of no real consequence until it is coupled with an intended purpose. Therefore, variances in the outcome occur when the preparers’ purposes are joined with particular methods. In other words, individuals use whatever methods are necessary to convey what they believe to be important. Of course in this case, the outcome is “how are citizens to be in the end?”

## Mediated Action

Once Americans resolve their own personal beliefs about what makes a good citizen, they employ their civic-mindedness in countless ways. Some Americans visit state capitals or other historical monuments. Others attend protests. Still others simply go vote or help a political leader with their campaign. Nevertheless, Americans, whether knowingly or not, engage in activities that often offer a glimpse into their belief systems as Americans. Levstik and Barton (2004, 2001) identify this process as mediated action. Essentially mediated action is the idea that one gains knowledge while he or she is involved in a specific action or task aimed at accomplishing a particular purpose (Gredler, 2005; Levstik and Barton, 2001; Wertsch, 1998).

The socio-cultural analyses of James Wertsch and Kenneth Burke are influential to the theoretical basis of mediated action. Wertsch builds upon Burke's framework for understanding an individual's thoughts and purpose. These theorists argue that when studying humans, researchers must explain five interconnected components: act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. While the place (scene), person (agent), and method (agency) are important to mediated action, the act and purpose of the agent define the overall process. The act is a starting point from which the other four components flow. However, the crucial element of mediated action is the purpose because it motivates the initial act, action, or task in which an agent engages (Levstik and Barton, 2001; Wertsch, 1998).

## Levstik and Barton's Four "Stances" of Historical Learning

Levstik and Barton hypothesize that there are four stances – Identification Stance, Analytic Stance, Exhibition Stance, and Moral Response Stance – that may be taken toward history and that each may be used for multiple purposes. The Identification Stance largely sees the goal of history as helping students relate to the fundamentals of the American past that have shaped the nation into what it is today. The Analytic Stance chiefly perceives the objective of history as involving some form of historical analysis. The Exhibition Stance principally recognizes the aim of history as demonstrating that one has retained knowledge about history. The Moral Response Stance primarily distinguishes the intent of history as having students make judgments about the actions of those in the past. These brief descriptors of Levstik and Barton's four stances are only benchmarks for what people view as the basic rationales for studying history. Even though people may have very different views or see different outcomes to a particular event in history, they still can fall within the same stance. The reason it is possible for people with different views to fall within the same stance is because individuals make decision regarding what materials and methods to use in order to accomplish what they believe are important purposes and intended outcomes for using historical knowledge (Levstik and Barton, 2004, 2001).

Using the aims identified in Levstik and Barton's Moral Response Stance, these examples articulate a few key points that will be argued throughout this narrative. First, people with very different views of particular events in history can adopt the same stance or stances toward history. Secondly, the educator's purpose behind their action or method is what actually leads to their end goal which is "how are students to be in the

end?” Lastly and most important, the educator’s purpose stems from their own personal answer to the guiding question which was introduced earlier: What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving it? The answer to this question is the springboard from which many other beliefs that individuals hold dear about America flow, especially regarding how they answer the remaining guiding questions associated with this study. As will be addressed repeatedly in this study, each person preparing America’s youth to be “good citizens” has an answer to this guiding question about the ideal democracy. That answer guides their purpose for what should be taught to our youth, how it should be taught, and what affect it will ultimately have on young people throughout their lives.

A descriptive illustration of how educators with differing viewpoints might present the Great Depression will demonstrate the complexity involved in understanding purposes and methods as they fit within Levstik and Barton’s conceptualizations of the stances individuals take toward history. Those educators, who often lean to a more nationalistic view, might seek to use the Great Depression as a vehicle to convey mainstream American values such as hard work and self-governance. Therefore, the educator may exhibit how the Great Depression taught Americans to pull themselves up by their bootstraps collectively. Additionally, the instructor might seek to show the courage of Americans as they tried to survive the hard times of the Great Depression. Therefore, the educationalist might focus a lesson or lessons on groups, such as “Okies,” or individuals, such as Florence Owens Thompson, who struggled mightily during the Depression but in the end used their own internal fortitude and/or government assistance programs brought on by the New Deal to help them regain their footing. Moreover, the



traditionalist educator's unit may highlight leaders, such as Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Hugh Bennett, who they deem as "heroes" who worked for the common good.

Regardless of the methods or lessons, if the educator believes that America is close to an ideal democracy, their purpose is going to be centered on passing on those characteristics that strengthen such a position. In this instance those characteristics include, but are not limited to, self-governance, hard work, and courage.

Other educators, who have a critical view of society, might promote a curriculum that spotlights the idea that a small, elite group of Americans controls the decisions made for society. With this purpose in mind, these educators may push for a unit that is critical of decisions made by the influential elitists of the time. Therefore, the curriculum that educators seek to implement might focus on the ills of speculation, industry, and greed leading up to the Great Depression. Moreover, instructors likely would include lessons on leaders, such as Herbert Hoover and his volunteerism program, who did not directly address the demands of American society at large. Additionally, these educationalists would almost certainly press for the inclusion of lessons focused on those who were aggrieved, such as factory workers or those living in "Hooverilles," by the actions of political and industrial leaders. The motivation for such a curriculum would be to show that a hierarchical structure where power is in the hands of the chosen few is bad for American society. Many educators who are critical of American civilization believe that an ideal democracy is far from reach, but not completely unattainable. These same educators largely believe society should be restructured where all citizens have equal access. Such a restructuring could be influenced by incorporating a curriculum that teaches students to question what occurred before, during, and immediately following the

Great Depression. Furthermore, a curriculum that questions the leadership during, and ills which resulted from, the Great Depression might be the method for achieving such a purpose as restructuring society causing students to question issues of power and equity in society today.

In order to provide a better understanding of the various philosophies regarding what should be taught to America's youth and how each have emerged over the last century, it is imperative to place the curriculum reform movement into context. On a national scope, political, economic, and social themes have frequently arisen throughout the century-long debate. These themes have, on occasion, resulted in periods of advancement and attenuation in curriculum reform and led to recurring struggles between opposing camps within the Social Studies Movement. These struggles might be seen as tendencies, or patterns, over time. These tendencies have been the crux of the ongoing debate in social studies for over a century. When considered in conjunction with the guiding questions about citizenship, these tendencies provide a framework for understanding the history of curriculum reform in the social studies.

**A Heuristic for understanding how tendencies within the Social Studies debate answer this Study's Guiding Questions**

A variety of prominent theoretical works on social studies education from the last thirty years have influenced my creation of a heuristic to aid in understanding the tendencies that have been prevalent in the century-long debate over social studies curriculum reform. A heuristic is a device that serves as an aid to learning, discovery, or problem-solving (Merriam-Webster, 1990). It is important to understand that the heuristic used here is but one of many instruments that might be used to evaluate the

history of curriculum reform in social studies. Using attributes of commonality gleaned from the body of literature and associating them with the guiding questions introduced at the beginning of this literature review, the heuristic presented here aligns the purposes and practices for teaching into three broadly defined categories: Critical, Amelioristic, and Nationalistic. (Table 1)

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of How Tendencies within the Social Studies Debate answer this Study's Guiding Questions

	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Amelioristic</b>	<b>Nationalistic</b>
<b>What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving the ideal?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy:</b> All citizens have equal access and influence.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy:</b> A small elite group controls the decision-making process.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> Major, fundamental changes in societal structures are needed to achieve an ideal democracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy:</b> Applying mainstream American values to all of society so that each citizen has the opportunity and capabilities to engage themselves as functioning members of the general public should they choose to do so.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy:</b> There is an underlying structure of society that has the potential for the ideal democracy.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> Limited changes need to be made before an ideal democracy fully materializes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy:</b> Realized in societal values such as capitalism, hard work, and liberty that have been accepted over a 200 year period.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy:</b> The United States is as close to the ideal democracy as she can get.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> The current system provides opportunity for success based on merit.</li> </ul>

<p><b>What is a good, democratic citizen?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who actively participates in society by involving themselves in actions that challenge the status quo.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who attempts to make the world a better place by learning from society's past mistakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who promotes the mainstream values of America.</li> </ul>
<p><b>How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By exposing students to situations, inside and outside of the classroom, which require them to grapple with societal issues to prepare them to question issues of power and equity in society today.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By affording students opportunities to engage in analysis of historical materials to understand the relationship between events, problems, and people of the past and present so that they can help correct those mistakes and make the world a better place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By learning about figures and accomplishments in history that represent the values that make this nation good and prosperous.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most often history is more about overarching patterns than knowing specific dates and places because there are many versions of history that need to be accounted for.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History provides a basis point for why the present day world is as it is, but it also provides the tools of analysis that are needed to effectively participate in society. Therefore, if students are to engage in historical analysis they must be exposed to history.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History as foundational knowledge is vital if students are going to get a sense of who they are, where they come from, and where they are going.</li> </ul>

## The Critical Tendency

The Critical tendency believes an ideal democracy includes a societal structure where those who are considered more vulnerable or “without a voice” are afforded opportunities to advance in and ultimately participate in the leadership of society. Vulnerability oftentimes stems from one’s lack of economic autonomy. The Critic most often believes that the less fortunate are mired in mediocrity because those who hold the power have done little to nothing to help the less fortunate. This hegemonic socialization implicitly establishes where individuals in society should be placed. Therefore, one’s economic status is habitually unchanging because he or she generally has a pre-determined social status whether the individual realizes it or not. In other words, individuals will often be encouraged or discouraged to seek endeavors based who they are, who their family is, and what their family does as a vocation. Therefore, in order for opportunities to occur for those who historically have been placed at the bottom rung on society’s economic ladder, society must be reorganized. The restructuring of society begins with education which ultimately affects the economic and political foundations as well.

Many within the Critical tendency believe that hegemony begins with the education system. Many Critics would argue that most curriculums generally promote the importance of certain knowledge about particular groups or people. At the same time, those curriculums marginalize other sectors of society, usually those associated with minority groups. Apple (2000) believes that the mission of education is to keep active in the minds of citizens the shared remembrance of the struggle for equality and rights in all institutions of our society. Moreover, Apple argues that this requires new considerations

to important curricular questions such as: “Whose knowledge is taught? Why is it taught in this particular way to this particular group? How do we enable the histories and cultures of the majority of working people, of women, of people of color to be taught in responsible and responsive ways in schools?” In order for a reorganization to happen, the general public must more widely accept those views that run counter to the status quo. In the case of education, acceptance would include better identifying with, relating to, and understanding the perspectives of minority groups such as women or people of color.

Additionally, the Critical perspective takes issue with the status quo view of capitalist America as a properly functioning institution. The Critical perspective believes that capitalism is largely to blame for the inadequate and inappropriate societal structure of America. While capitalism may have succeeded in formulating means of mass production and profit, only those at the top of the economic hierarchy have reaped the financial and societal benefits. Those not as fortunate have seen their physical and emotional needs being relegated to the outer margins of society. Additionally, the spoils of capitalism have placed political, social, and economic limits on the vast majority of the population. For these reasons, most Critics would endorse and encourage a different economic structure all together. Socialism is a more suitable framework for many who identify with the Critical perspective. They claim that socialism offers a more realistic approach to meeting the basic needs of the citizenry. Nutrition, housing, education, healthcare, and other basic needs have been provided more equitably to more citizens who lived in nations who adhered to the principles of socialism. With this in mind, the construct of an ideal democracy is far from reach, but not unattainable. With a more egalitarian approach to governance and leadership, acceptable changes can occur that

empower those who oftentimes are voided from the equation (Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Apple, 2000; Gutmann, 2000; Cherryholmes, 1988).

The Critical tendency envisions a good, democratic citizen as one who actively participates in society by assessing it closely. Assessment of the general public chiefly includes raising questions and participating in activities that run counter to the status quo beliefs about functions within society. The Critic feels strongly that the individual is responsible for learning about issues within society, making reasoned judgments about those issues, and effectively arguing for a shift in the way that decisions that are made. In essence, the Critical tendency argues that society must be altered drastically if the underprivileged and underrepresented are truly going to have a voice in society.

It is the view of the Critical perspective that the purpose of social studies is to present a point of view that defends and seeks to alter the plight of the underrepresented and underprivileged. Therefore, the development of a good citizen is cultivated by exposing students to situations, inside and outside of the classroom, that require them to grapple with societal issues. However, exposure is not the only component. Students must be required to gain knowledge on their own accord, draw conclusions based on their knowledge, and make a personal commitment to continually engage in this civic process. Martorella's (1997) "informed social criticism" articulates the characteristics of the Critical tendency in relation to how a good citizen might develop. Informed social criticism provides chances for an assessment, critique, and alteration of traditional customs, current societal practices, and methods of analysis. In order for young people to be given the tools to complete such a process, the Critical tendency leans to the notion

that students should be challenged to tackle the issues and develop sound answers to them so they will be prepared to challenge the fundamental structure of society.

In order for students to tackle present-day issues, they must have some historical context. Therefore, most often history is more about overarching patterns than knowing specific dates and places. For example, if a minority group encounters repeated usurpations, the recurrent setbacks might be the focus of the history presented. The Critical tendency most often professes the mission of history and social studies as defending those within society who are seen as most vulnerable and oftentimes are. Additionally, the Critic uses history and social studies as a vehicle to analyze and alter society. Consequently, the Critic frequently questions why the less fortunate in society are habitually in the state of affairs they find themselves (Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Apple, 2000).

Those in the Critical camp might use Levstik and Barton's (2004, 2001) moral response stance to advocate that educators train students to defend human rights and, in turn, to improve the human circumstance. Regardless of the specific approach, theorists feel strongly that education's purpose is to defend, and ultimately alter, the plight of the underrepresented and underprivileged. This purpose is largely identifiable with the Critical tendency of the heuristic (Levstik and Barton, 2004, 2001; Martorella, 1991; Evans, 1989; and Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978).

#### The Amelioristic Tendency

The Amelioristic tendency deems that an ideal democracy encompasses a framework where people have options that can lead to success. This framework largely encompasses applying the mainstream values of American society to all citizens.



Currently, many feel that the societal values that are ever-present in America are not applied in a manner that promotes the common good of all its citizenry. There is an underlying structure of society that has the potential to obtain an ideal democracy, but there is still much progress to be made before it fully materializes. The framework offers the prospect of success for all individuals once the societal structure adequately addresses the needs of all (Parker, 2003; Patrick, 2002; Dewey, 1938).

The Ameliorist envisions a good, democratic citizen as one who makes the world a better place by learning from past mistakes. Evans's (1989) "Relativist/Reformer" typology stresses the importance of this type of "good citizen." The "Relativist/Reformer" typology believes once students understand the relationship between past and present historical issues, they will begin to recognize that history is the foundation of current events. In turn, students will visualize themselves as social reformers who can better the world by learning from past mistakes. The Ameliorist believes involvement in the community is the most productive way for reform. Active participation in this fashion is different from that of the Critic because the Amelioristic perspective believes that needed change can occur within the basic parameters of the current societal structure (Patrick, 2002; Newmann, 1975; Dewey, 1938).

From this perspective, the purpose of social studies is to aid student understanding of the relationships between past and present historical issues so that students can learn from society's past mistakes. In order for good citizens to be developed at a young age, the Amelioristic tendency suggests that students analyze materials to understand the relationship between events, problems, and people of the past and present. If this is done effectively, the Ameliorist argues the instructor must attempt to present a variety of

materials objectively. In turn, students research the competing views to gain knowledge to better understand current events. The end result is that students will gain insight into historical events to help make better the present and future. History is an important element of social studies to the Ameliorist. Not only does it provide a basis point for why the present day world is as it is, but it also provides the tools of analysis that good citizens need to participate in and improve society (Evans, 1989; Levstik and Barton, 2004, 2001; and Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978).

Much of these concluding aspects of the Amelioristic tendency are identifiable with Barr, Barth, and Shermis's tradition of Social Studies Taught as Social Science. The Social Science tradition seeks to develop "future citizens." To the social scientist, "good citizens...have learned a mode of thinking from social science disciplines; that this mode of thinking is generalizable; and that having learned it, he will understand properly, appreciate deeply, infer carefully, and conclude logically... 'liberating the mind'" (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978). The social science tradition believes that the greatest training for democratic citizenship is exposing students to issues in society and letting them analyze the issues as social scientists do (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978).

#### The Nationalistic Tendency

The Nationalistic tendency posits that an ideal democracy is realized in the mainstream values that have been accepted within American society over a 200 year period. Those values include but are not limited to: capitalism, self-governance, individual liberty, hard work resulting in achievement, and recognition of diversity. Accepting the notion that "nothing is perfect," the United States is as close to an ideal democracy as conceivably possible and its culture must be passed on from generation to

generation. A good, democratic citizen is one who promotes those mainstream values that have been prevalent throughout the history of the United States of America. They promote these values by conveying or emulating the accomplishments of historical figures who have exemplified the aforesaid values (Evans, 1989; Levstik and Barton, 2004, 2001; Finn, Ravitch, and Francher, 1984; and Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978).

The purpose of social studies is to expose students to past events and people who represent the national values to establish a sense of longevity in mainstream American values. Additionally, students are taught about present-day people and events to further bolster the fervor that society based on the mainstream values represents a good society that should be preserved. The development of a good citizen occurs by learning about figures and accomplishments in history that represent the values that make this nation good and prosperous. Moreover, the hope is that students will then want to emulate the values conveyed to them. If students are truly going to get a sense of who they are, where they come from, and where they are going, history as foundational knowledge is a vital component of the curriculum (Evans, 1989; Levstik and Barton, 2004, 2001; Finn, Ravitch, and Francher, 1984; and Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978).

Illustrative examples of the Nationalistic extreme are presented in the works of Barr, Barth, and Shermis, and Levstik and Barton. Barr, Barth, and Shermis's "citizenship transmission" ideology states "a citizen is one who conforms to certain accepted practices, holds particular beliefs, is loyal to certain values, participates in certain activities, and conforms to norms which are often local in character" (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978). Citizenship transmitters identify "good citizenship" as "right knowledge," "proper behavior," and "respect for authority." The transmitter has accepted

a belief. Actions reveal that belief. And, the ultimate goal is that the transmitter's students act in the same manner. Worth mentioning is that this tradition does not only relate to those who believe in mainstream values. In the end, citizenship transmitters' purpose is "to bring about belief in and allegiance to a set of values which he believes are essential to the preservation of society" (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978). This idea is important across all three tendencies within the heuristic because it shows that those from different perspectives can make use of similar methods to accomplish their purposes. For example, a neo-Nazi cult and the Veterans of Foreign Wars both believe in the purpose of Barr, Barth, and Shermis's cultural transmitter. However, their beliefs about the ideal society may be completely different.

Levstik and Barton's (2004, 2001) "identification stance" offers three key purposes that help individuals affix the past in the present: 1.) the celebration of early history as a way of understanding "who we are," 2.) the eulogizing of key figures of the past as a means to establish present-day examples, and 3.) the use of the past to justify current events. This stance often promotes the use of history to establish where "we" started as a nation, an aim of both the Amelioristic and Nationalistic tendencies in my heuristic. However, those who are aligned with the Critical tendency largely oppose the pretenses of the identification stance by arguing that it uses history as a vehicle that preserves a traditional view of social status, promotes the status quo, and ignores inequities. In essence, the identification stance often sees history as a narrative that positions individuals in time and place by telling "who we are, where we came from, and to what we belong." On the other hand, the Critical perspective of the heuristic argues

that society needs to broaden who “we” encompasses, especially if an ideal democracy is every going to be achieved.

Throughout the remainder of this study, the previously mentioned heuristic will provide a tool to help interpret the various patterns and themes which have occurred throughout the history of curriculum reform. Additionally, the heuristic will help to analyze curriculum materials in the latter portion of this study. The three viewpoints which are included in the heuristic are by no means fixed categories. Rather, they are tendencies that assist in the reflection of the debate over curriculum reform in social studies as it has distinguished itself throughout the last century.

### **History of Curriculum Reform in Social Studies**

#### **Post-Reconstruction Educational Reform**

As a Nation on the mend from an internal conflict, the United States saw rapid change in the decades immediately following the Civil War. Mass transit and industry coupled with an abundance of immigrants elicited a Nation with many new and altering ideas. Education was one such area that began to experience a variety of new ideologies. By 1890, a multiplicity of organizations began rousing to influence the school curriculum (Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964). Prior to the advent of professional organizations in history and education, a variety of individuals already began laying the foundation for alterations to the education system. Many influential citizens – Jacob Riis, Jane Addams, and Theodore Roosevelt to list a few – were troubled by the hardships placed upon urbanites by the burgeoning industrialism of the day. Consequently, these concerned citizens felt an “awakening of social conscience, a growing belief that this incredible suffering was neither the fault nor the inevitable lot of

the sufferers, that it could certainly be alleviated, and that the road to alleviation was neither charity nor revolution, but in the last analysis, education” (Cremin, 1964).

As new philosophies emerged enrollment in high schools and universities increased quickly. Throughout much of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, American education was mostly a vehicle to expose students to classical literature and relics of the World’s past. Moreover, social studies in the school served as a means to cultivate citizenship. There were competing interests – “the classics” and “the moderns” – on how best to accomplish the overarching goals of education. In relation to the heuristic associated with this study, “the classics” were largely aligned with the Nationalistic perspective while “the moderns” were more identifiable with the Amelioristic range. Much of the discipline’s focus on history centered around the AHA and NEA committees. These committees offer a watershed moment in the debate over the social studies that is still present today. The reports of the aforementioned committees are integral parts to the post-Reconstruction educational reform era (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

The “Classics” versus The “Moderns”

Classicism encompassed knowledge gained by studying the products of the distant past – Latin, Greek, and mathematics – that have survived the test of time. Modernism, on the other hand, focused on history, science, and modern languages such as English. Historians were able to make in-roads into the field of education because many possessed a combination of the two. Historians considered themselves to be scientific, which in the 19<sup>th</sup> century meant using primary sources and weighing competing views. At the same time, they effectively maintained a connection with the

classicists. Historians argued that their content area provided a logical place for the ideas of antiquity; yet, also provided an outlet for the modern ideals essential for participation in a democracy. In the latter quarter of the 1800's, history dominated the social studies largely for this reason. However, division often arose between academicians who wanted to "Americanize" immigrants, a Nationalistic impulse, and those who sought cultural pluralism, a more Amelioristic perspective. Americanization was not a new phenomenon in the 1880's and 1890's. For decades, many Americans believed that those new to the country should be trained on the "American way of life." For some Americans that meant conversion to Judeo-Christian principles while others believed a full-fledged assimilation to American society was necessary. Conversely, cultural pluralists wanted immigrants to include a mixture of the old and new worlds. Immigrants were persuaded to promote and develop their own traditions as they contributed to American life. Americanization became an issue of national importance that often has gravitated to the forefront in times of war (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

American historians charted the course that advanced history as the chief discipline for the study of societal issues. Many historians took the initiative to argue that history offered a means for students to engage in social and civic opportunities. By studying the past through historical inquiry, students applied learned lessons to their everyday lives. Herbert Baxter Adams was the most renowned historian of this period. He has most closely been associated with the teaching of history at the secondary level. In fact, he is credited with compiling the first social studies methods text, *Methods of Teaching and Studying History* (1883). Moreover, Adams was the founder of the

American Historical Association (AHA). It was almost two decades after the formation of the AHA and the AEA, American Economic Association, before other professional association in social studies arose. Prior to these organizations, the National Education Association served as virtually the only forum for which the leadership of America's higher education community could meet and discuss common issues and concerns. There was no separation of K-12 and higher education. Rather, the leadership of each worked in concert. Nonetheless, during the twenty-year pause, the work of the National Education Association (NEA) and her Committees of Ten and Seven established a national curriculum agenda for the content area (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

#### National Education Association & American Historical Association Committees of Ten & Seven

In the 1890s, the Committee of Ten was formed to focus on secondary-level curriculum development and its congruency with the college curriculum. Those charged with evaluating the curricula of History, Civil Government, and Political Economy were referred to as the Madison Conference or the History Ten. Led by Charles Kendall Adams, president of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, the History Ten convened as a mixture of influential secondary and post-secondary educators. Personalities such as James Harvey Robinson and Woodrow Wilson were members of the History Ten. The Committee sought to give all secondary students a good education by developing a curriculum that established "one education for all." That is, there was no distinction between college-bound and non-college-bound curriculums. The Committee strongly favored history and compared it to science. Moreover, they pointed out that history



fostered an environment that trained the mind and prompted individuals to use the information they learned to engage in higher order tasks. The History Ten viewed history as a means to moral training. Moreover, the group believed “newer methods” would better serve students as they prepared in high school to participate in the affairs of the Nation in their adult years. “Newer methods” involved audiovisual aids, field trips, debates, and inquiry to name a few. Furthermore, the History Ten believed that textbooks and teachers needed to improve drastically if schools were going to improve in social studies instruction. The Madison Conference of the Committee of Ten’s final product was an eight year curriculum to “broaden and cultivate the mind” by focusing on history. The Committee of Ten’s recommendations have been most closely aligned to the influence of history on the school curriculum and, at least minimally, on the inclusion of future social studies courses as a vehicle for educating citizens on how to effectively to live and participate in a democratic society (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

In 1896, the National Education Association requested that the American Historical Association convene a second committee. The Committee of Seven was charged with developing college entrance requirements centered on history. However, they far exceeded this request by expounding upon the Committee of Ten’s analysis of history’s role in secondary education. The Seven firmly believed that history was a vital component of citizen development. Therefore, they felt history should be accessible to all people, not just those who specialized in the field of history. The Seven’s recommendations were similar to that of the History Ten’s. Like the History Ten, the

Seven sought to advance a general understanding of history in the schools (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

While the Committee of Seven's stated purpose was centered on college entrance requirements, their curriculum recommendations were limited in scope. Beyond placing more emphasis on history's role in citizenship education and more closely aligning the curriculum to secondary school teachers' practice methods, the Seven's report offered very little in terms of expanding social studies. In fact, the work of the Committee of Seven ensconced history in the vanguard of social studies in the American school. Additionally, the Committee strengthened the relationship between historians and teachers. Developmentally, the Committee of Seven shunned the emerging work of new social sciences. They argued that intellectual development was more beneficial to the growth of pupils than a sense of social consciousness. The Seven also researched more deeply teaching methods and resources ultimately proposing a textbook-centered curriculum (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

The Committees of Ten and Seven collectively accomplished a variety of notable achievements. First, they cultivated a positive relationship between the history and teaching professions. Secondly, they created arguably the most influential curriculum development project in the field to that point. Lastly, they cemented history as a centerpiece in the curriculum. Beyond the obvious, the committees also gave history and historians the upper hand in the debate from the outset with any and all opposing viewpoints virtually always on the defensive when presenting their curriculum ideas. During this time history was also the vehicle, much like Civics courses today, for educators to promote good citizenship and obedience to the patriotic mores of the

American past. Therefore, the work of the Committees in many respects is Nationalistic. Nationalistic tendencies are also evident in the Committees' views that intellectual development was an important component to the growth of young people. However, the Committees are largely identifiable with the Amelioristic tendency. Although they were seeking changes in the way students were taught, the Committees seemed to generally support the underlying foundations of the education system. Had they sought a more drastic alteration of the system, the Committees surely would be recognized as a Critical tendency (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1978; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

#### Rise of Progressivism

By the 1870s, enormous corporations began to control the economic order. This led to the industrialization and commercialization of America. Cities afforded people better paying jobs and previously unaccustomed conveniences. Times were turbulent as America moved from an agrarian to an urbanized society. City life, with all its conveniences and indulgences, offered many hazards as well. Congestion, disease, and fire are a few common problems with which those moving to the city constantly dealt. Prior to the turn of the century, many individuals felt that the ills prompted by industrialization had to be addressed. Historians have categorized these Americans as "progressives." Progressivism was wide in range and diversity. However, there were some commonly held beliefs by progressives. Progressives believed in progress, prosperity, and growth. Yet, they did not feel that the laws of Social Darwinism offered a legitimate means to obtain these goals. The works of progressives in government and

academics influenced the societal landscape for more than quarter century (Tindall and Shi, 1999; Brinkley, 1992).

Over a fifteen year period between the Committee of Seven's findings and the 1916 Report, the United States continued to address how she would adjust to industrialism and immigration. The array of courses under the guise of "history" became known as "the social studies." Moreover, generally speaking in social studies education two ideologies gained the upper hand. "Social efficiency" and the "New History" were the formal nomenclatures assigned to each camp. Of the two, social efficiency was much more fragmented in terms of how professionals interpreted its role in the advancement of education. Social efficiency was considered to be an educationally-focused reform movement. On one hand there was David Snedden and on the other there were the pragmatists who identified with John Dewey. There were many others scattered between the two opposing viewpoints. Nonetheless, each of these two opposing factions believed strongly that their line of thought was most appropriate if students were going to be prepared to participate in society. Snedden favored social efficiency as a means to socialize students on the virtues and morals of society, a Nationalistic tendency. He believed that children should be fit within society's structure. Additionally, Snedden believed that traditional history was an ineffective means to complete such a task. Therefore, he favored the incorporation of the social sciences into the curriculum. Conversely, John Dewey sought to neutralize societal barriers in an effort to develop a more democratic society, a more Amelioristic tendency. Dewey envisioned a curriculum centered on history, science, and art. He argued that a self-evident desire for motivation and service to others would develop within those individuals who were schooled in this

fashion. Such an educational experience would ultimately prepare young people to engage in correcting the ills of society (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1954; Dewey, 1938).

Like social efficiency in the field of education, historians began a reform movement commonly referred to as the “new history.” In 1912, James Harvey Robinson, a participant in the Madison Conference, composed a belief statement aptly named *The New History*. Those historians of like mind, and there were quite a few, thought history should focus on history that occurred within the last few hundred years rather than ancient history. In essence, “new historians” held that students should learn about both world leaders and folks who experienced the same struggles as everyday, ordinary families. Students, the “new” historians believed, should learn about the working and living conditions of people who engaged in everyday life similar to their own. The “new history” sought social progress through the social sciences and education. Therefore, “new history” is closely aligned with the Amelioristic tendency of the heuristic (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Dewey, 1938).

The latter two of the aforementioned approaches, Dewey’s social efficiency and the “new history,” served as a basis for the 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. While the efforts of those favoring the development of the “social studies” were not tightly coordinated to say the least, they did effectively weaken the foundation cemented by the Committees of Ten and Seven that favored a more traditional approach to history. Additionally, the reformists at the time deeply influenced the 1916 Report’s

findings and recommendations (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Dewey, 1938).

#### The 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education

By 1916 some within the academic community began to promote issues-centered Social Studies. The 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education extended its prior work and suggested there be more emphasis on current issues and social problems. The authors argued that good citizenship should be the objective of all high school social studies classrooms. The inclusion of content that encouraged the betterment of human society was seen as the most effective way to cultivate good citizenship. Students learned how to be good citizens by practicing making sound judgments. In order to practice, students had to weigh competing facts in a conflictive situation. Civics was highly important to the committee's recommendations. In fact, the 1916 Report suggested that a course entitled *The Teaching of Community Civics* be taught. The course was developed to inculcate appropriate social behavior of young people by embracing local, national, and international aspects of citizenship. Specifically, the course's main purpose was to aid children in knowing about their community – what the community does, how it does it, and what they should do for their community in return. In all actuality, the Report promoted focusing on the local community because of its close proximity to and influence on students. While this appears to be a more Nationalistic tendency, it really leans more towards the Amelioristic tendency because the civics course sought to involve students in learning how to make their community better through participatory action.

The aforementioned course was Dewey's version of social efficiency in its finest form. Additionally, John Dewey's belief in focusing on the interests of students was incorporated into the recommendations. Dewey sought to have students engaged in learning that would better prepare them to participate in society in the future, rather than indiscriminately study the past. However, Dewey felt strongly that ultimately students should follow the guidance of the teachers as they advanced through their studies.

The committee also recommended the formation of an advanced course named *Problems of Democracy* (POD). The committee suggested this course in an effort to arrange teaching around something different from traditional class offerings. Moreover, POD grew out of the social gospel movement of Protestant religions who felt society must be made better through logical planning and reform efforts. In essence, the course promoted education for social amelioration. *Problems of Democracy* incorporated all social studies courses, including history, by focusing on social issues. POD served as the benchmark for progressive education by tackling social problems straightforwardly in the curriculum. Additionally, reflective thinking and blending content from several disciplines within the social sciences became important elements of progressive education (Evans, 2004; Saye, 1994; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, & Shermis, 1977).

The 1916 Report of the Social Studies Committee of the National Education Association Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education formally combined the "new history" of Robinson and "social efficiency" pedagogy of Dewey to form the basis of their recommendations. Additionally, the committee integrated suggestions by a multiplicity of professional organizations, like the history teachers' association. It has often been argued that the 1916 report was influential only in

retrospect because shortly after the report was publicized in a variety of journals the United States entered the First World War. Ultimately, international matters superseded domestic and the 1916 report sat idle in the minds of society as a whole. Nonetheless, the 1916 Report's influence surely was aided by the United States' entry into the First World War because citizens became increasingly interested in European and modern history, citizenship education, and contemporary issues. The final report of CRSE was not completed until 1918 (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

#### Great Depression / New Deal Era

As the 1930s, the Great Depression, and the New Deal approached the fight for who would influence the Social Studies continued. Massive urbanization continued to raise great concerns for the survival of American democracy largely because citizens were unsure that such a political framework was prepared to tackle the rapidly growing issues of the nation. Moreover, the economic issues of the day were a source of enormous consternation. Nearly one-third of all Americans were unemployed. While a burgeoning economy coupled with its ups and downs exposed Americans to economic volatility, the Great Depression imposed fear in the majority of Americans. In essence, people began to question the legitimacy of American institutions such as the government, economic policies based on capitalism, and education. In education, this often meant budget cuts that prompted teacher shortages. The American public was sympathetic to the plight of educators, but offered little assistance. Social amelioration and socialization goals for teaching of social studies gained primacy during this era. The controversy over history's "new" place in the curriculum remained, but societal problems and controversial



issues became increasingly important to the public (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Cremin, 1964).

### Progressive Education and Social Reconstruction

The 1930s have often been identified as the period when “progressive education” flourished. However, there was and still is much debate on the proper definition of the aforementioned term. There have generally been four accepted camps within progressive education: mainstream progressives, social reconstructionists, administrative progressives, and child-centered progressives. The mainstream progressives, such as Dewey, felt strongly that student participation and growth should be the emphasis of education. The social reconstructionists advocated a complete restructuring of the social order. The administrative progressives, such as Snedden, sought to indoctrinate students about the proper morals of society through the teaching of social science courses. Finally, the Rousseauists, or child-centered progressives, supported the natural development of child. For this time period, the social reconstructionists offer a camp within the Social Studies Movement that is worthy of further analysis. The social reconstructionists are important because they carried the work of pragmatists such as Dewey towards a harsher critique of society. The social reconstructionists felt that if real change was going to occur to save American society the entire societal structure had to be revamped (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Cremin, 1964).

Two reformers, Harold Rugg and George Counts, provide examples of the kinds of approaches that were prevalent at the time. Rugg’s curriculum is one of four critical cases studied in greater detail later in this study. Therefore, much of the focus on the historical context of social reconstruction in relation to the Social Studies Movement will

highlight the work of Counts and his colleagues. Harold Rugg was widely considered the leading progressive educator in social studies throughout the 1920s when said theory was gaining wider acceptance. After a successful stint in civil engineering, Rugg focused his graduate studies on psychology, sociology, and education. To Rugg, both fields were related in that they, at least at the time, relied heavily on tabulations and measurements. During his post-graduate academic career, Rugg became absorbed with the need for society to address its problems. Honing in on restructuring the social studies curriculum, Rugg decided to write a series of textbooks. The social science texts were praised by some and jeered by others, but represented a substantial effort to unite history, geography, sociology, economics, and political science into an account which studied the modern-day industrial civilizations of the world. Harold Rugg's ultimate goal was to form a general social studies curriculum devoid of the individual disciplines which had been customary to that point. In so doing, Rugg argued, Americans must understand that education is the driving governmental force in a democracy. Moreover, he believed the most efficient manner to convey this principle was through learning that addressed trends throughout society that fashioned the society as it was and the education being taught in it at the time (Evans, 2004; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964; Rugg, 1936; Rugg, 1933a; Rugg, 1933b; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b).

Rugg's writings and the response to them exemplify the ebb and flow of the debate over the social studies in American schools. Seen as controversial by many, Rugg's materials were widely accepted from their inception. Rugg's curriculum placed higher value on human rights than on profits and private property. Additionally, he wanted students in schools to wrestle with the issues raised by the dilemmas of

capitalism. Rugg wanted schools to teach about the social world as if people mattered. He and his colleagues felt that if society rationally analyzed issues they would reach an agreement on how to address them. Rugg's curriculum sought to provide students an opportunity to wrestle with these potential issues and learn how to reflectively decipher what the goals of society should be. However, many Americans began to see Rugg's materials wrought with bias. The content selected to include in the texts and presentation of the materials were seen by critics as a means to foster a harsh critique of American society. As critics grew in many cases, Rugg's materials were not allowed to be incorporated into school curriculums. In the end, the reaction to Rugg's curriculum materials resulted in more of a retrenchment than progression away from the status quo from curriculum reform. However, in the beginning Rugg's curriculum extended the acceptance of social reconstructionists' viewpoints to a wider audience than before (Evans, 2006; Evan, 2004; Saye, 1994; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

George Counts has often been associated with the work of Thorstein Veblen. Veblen discounted any efforts at educational reform until the persuasion of businessmen was removed from the process. Moreover, Veblen felt that teachers should be placed in positions of power within the educational system if reform was ever going to be achieved. For much of his career, George Counts pressed for a continual social critique within the field of education. After conducting a series of influential studies, Counts posited that the key issue for educational reform in America was that it never tackled the effects industrialism had on society. Those effects included, but were not limited to, too much power in the hands of the industrial elite, the infusion of politics into the education system, and the overall class biasness that he believed was prevalent at the time.

Furthermore, he argued that until educational reformists did address industrialism, reform would continue to be a fragmented course of action that was shallow in its efforts because it would be nothing more than a facade. Counts was oftentimes not categorized as a “progressivist” like Dewey or Rugg because he was considered to be more radical. However, as the depression deepened, ideologies that were considered extremists by most became acceptable in American society. This was largely due to the notion that any change might aid in moving the nation out of the dire state it was in at the time. Therefore, with the help of his research group at Columbia University, Counts forged ahead in his continual attempt to critique the field of education. Ultimately, Counts and his legion cultivated a highly-successful collection of junior high materials focused on the problems of contemporary life. George Counts supported the notion of issues-centered education. However, Counts considered himself a social reconstructionist. Part of the progressive education camp, social reconstructionists felt strongly that people fomented change. In his most famous speech, “Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive,” Counts challenged teachers and schools to be at the forefront of social change. He did not want teachers to endorse reforms through education. Rather, Counts expected teachers and schools to provide the vehicle by which change could be driven. Such a position firmly entrenches George Counts in alignment with the Critical perspective of my heuristic (Guttek, 2006; Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Cremin, 1964).

The general belief system that George Counts employed as the basis for his attempts at educational reforms started well before his aforementioned speech in 1932. In fact, as early as 1915 while completing his dissertation, Counts discarded education for a career focused on social critique and analysis. Counts sought major alterations in the

character and the curriculum of public high schools. Counts wanted the high school to be a “people’s institution” that promoted the values of democracy. Throughout the remainder of the 1920s Counts continued to critique such aspects of the educational system as class bias and politics in education. However, it was his writing entitled *Secondary Education and Industrialism* in 1929 that would guide his professional career into the 1950s. This work highlighted the notion that the United States never fully addressed the effects of industrialism . If she had, people would develop plans to use the industrialized economy to help the common good instead of self interests, what Counts referred to as democratic collectivism (Gutek, 2006; Evans, 2004; Cremin, 1964).

Many schools of thought regarding what should be taught to America’s youth and how competed for acceptance during the Great Depression and New Deal Era. Social reconstruction was one such camp. Much like social efficiency a decade earlier, there was variation within specific camps. For social reconstruction, there was Rugg who was identified as a “progressivist” and Counts who was much more critical of society at large. Rugg produced a curriculum to promote change. While Counts’ junior high curriculum was influential, ultimately his fiery speeches and studies encouraged change.

Nonetheless, both reformers felt strongly that major alterations to American society had to occur if life were to get better. Social reconstruction offered a period of innovation in terms of educational reform. However, growth was short-lived largely because of how society perceived, or was led to perceive, the work of social reconstructionists coupled with the onset of a world war.

## World War II and the Cold War

Progressive education was most successful during the 1930s. However, the onset of World War II weakened the acceptance of this philosophy. Moreover, a sea of change occurred during the period surrounding the Second World War. The general consensus among those opposed to traditional methods of education from the 1910s through the 1930s had been to question American institutions. Many in America felt it was their responsibility to question the political, social, and economic institutions of American life to make better her society. Furthermore, scores of individuals sought to expose the weaknesses of American culture. During the early 1940s such an approach became the exception rather than the rule. In fact, many educators felt it was their duty to prepare students to fight until their death in the name of democracy. More importantly in relation to this project are the effects, immediate and long-lasting, that World War II had on American society, specifically education. The most notable direct effect was the demise of the Progressive Education Association which was the formal organizational arm of the issues-centered movement in social studies. Those associated with the progressive education movement were transformed from those who openly questioned the ills of education to those who were blamed for the ills of education. In other words, the traditionalist camps that opposed progressive education attacked them more publicly and vigorously. Arthur Bestor's published critique entitled *Educational Wasteland* was one of the most notorious. Like many other critics of modern education, Bestor argued that academic disciplines should be the focus of education with history being the focal point of social studies. Additionally, he blamed progressive educators for weakening the public's view of education and America's national security and democracy itself. These

attacks swayed public opinion from sympathy to blame. Also, many educational projects were developed to better prepare workers for the impending war. For example, greater emphasis was placed on geography and issues directly related to war (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964). Therefore, World War II and the Cold War prompted a period of reduction in curriculum reform. Moreover, as in most times of war, the Nationalistic perspective of the heuristic gained prominence.

As with World War I, education found its way to the forefront. The Commission on Wartime Policy of National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), charged with formulating recommendations about the social studies curriculum, published a report entitled *The Social Studies Mobilize for Victory*. The report stated that social studies programs should prepare citizens to cope with war and all its repercussions.

Additionally, the commission advocated the use of symbolic ceremonies as a way to persuade allegiance to the American way of life. Social criticism and an emphasis on social problems became secondary to the intensification of peoples' resolve regarding democracy (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

After the conclusion of the Second World War and the start of the Cold War, the nation became more deeply entrenched in the use of indoctrination to inculcate democracy in schools. Anti-communist sentiments were common aspects of educational life. Be it the textbook or supplemental materials, the objective was clear – marginalize communism. World War II weakened progressive education. The Cold War completely dismantled it. Progressive education was demonized by university professors and journalists who stated it was undemocratic. Red-baiting became commonplace.

Progressive educators were accused of propagandizing against American capitalism and democracy. Teachers were fired for suspicion of being communist. Academic freedom was diminished throughout the educational establishment. As the tenuous environment strengthened, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) was passed in 1958. Clearly based on the funding provided by NDEA, curriculum reforms started with science and math. By the early 1960s, however, funding and reforms became prevalent in the social studies. The government felt that throughout the 1950s technical trades were on the decline. From a Cold War perspective, this was a grave concern. Couple this with the launching of Sputnik by the Soviets and it equated to an all out effort to increase national educational standards and an amplified focus on the more academically talented in society. In an effort to align American schools with the realities of a cold war, the government assimilated its foreign policy into the academic curriculum. The funding gave millions of dollars in federal aid to science, mathematics, and foreign language education, but offered nothing to social studies. The legislators viewed science and mathematics as the most logical means to secure America rather than social studies (Evans, 2004; Oswald, 1993; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

### The New Social Studies

A curriculum reform movement was also crafted out of the Cold War. The “new social studies” as it is known was the government’s attempt to financially support education by focusing on individual disciplines and professional development. The curriculum materials produced at the time were extremely detailed and offered little leeway for modification by teachers. Some projects did attempt to promote citizenship education. However, citizenship education was assumed to be linked to political science.



Therefore, it was ignored or downplayed most of the time during the new social studies. Most historians and social scientists pressed for “the social studies” to move past simply social studies to a more intellectually rigorous curriculum based on the social sciences (Evans, 2004; Oswald, 1993; Massialas, 1992; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

Much of the work surrounding the “New Social Studies” originated from the work of Jerome Bruner. More specifically, Bruner’s prominent work entitled *The Process of Education* is at the heart of this “new social studies.” *The Process of Education* conveys the principles behind the curriculum reforms of mathematics and science and those who conducted and financed the endeavors. However, the volume is much more than just a condensation. In fact, the book is a report on the Woods Hole Conference of 1959. The Woods Hole Conference was comprised primarily of scientists employed at post-secondary institutions. A multitude of organizations, such as the National Science Foundation and the United States Air Force, offered funding to the conference. In the end, an informal alliance was forged between the government, private organizations such as the Rand Corporation, and the universities to critique the progress of the schools. Classroom teachers were initially left out of this growing curriculum reform movement of the 1960s (Evans, 2004; Goetz, 1994; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Bruner, 1966; Bruner, 1960).

Jerome Bruner’s influence was far-reaching during the “new social studies” era of curriculum reform. *The Process of Education* set forth a litany of principles that served as both the guidelines and rationale for curriculum decisions made throughout the United

States during this period of the arms race and Sputnik. A summation of those principles is as follows:

- a. Any subject can be taught at any level to any child.
- b. Learning by inquiry or discovery is the most effective means for students to be taught.
- c. Children can be taught how to learn.
- d. When taught effectively and efficiently, the disciplines offer a way for students to expand and maintain knowledge.

Bruner's approach to curriculum reform encouraged discovery learning sequentially with more focus on the evaluative component of learning. In essence, the objective of the majority of projects within the "new social studies" was to create junior historians and/or social scientists who could make objectively informed decisions about their academics and ultimately to better society. With this framework in mind, historians, educators, and social scientists once again made every effort to reform the social studies. Therefore, the reformers opted to focus specifically on curriculum development in their efforts to transform the social studies. Ultimately the "new social studies" brought together a variety of individuals concerned with education – educators, psychologists, and social scientists – in an effort to create new materials to aid in teaching. The genesis of new curriculum materials was based on research and theories of instruction. After being developed, the materials were field-tested, revised based on suggestions, and then oftentimes redistributed as supplements to already offered classes in American public schools. By the end of the 1960s and into the 1970s some fifty projects had been produced to develop materials for the social studies. Many of the New Social Studies

projects wanted to create junior historians who used the tools of analysis to solve societal problems. For this reason and others, the “new social studies” as a curriculum reform is more centrist, the Amelioristic perspective, than the time period immediately following the Second World War (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Bruner, 1966; Bruner, 1960).

The New Social Studies was not without controversy. *Man: A Course of Study* or MACOS was a battle over academic freedom that essentially ended the funding of the “New Social Studies” projects. MACOS was a 4<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum based on anthropology. It came under fire when a fundamentalist preacher claimed the curriculum to be too liberal. The course focused on the question: What is human about human beings? To those who sought to preserve the “American Way of Life,” the critical approach of MACOS was a danger. Therefore, an onslaught of criticism began. Many criticisms were centered on concerns of evolution, socialism, and humanism. Specifically, concerns were raised that the curriculum suggested that man and his social behaviors resulted from lesser animals. For example, it was alleged that the curriculum spent a semester addressing the subculture of Eskimos where a variety of societal practices were deemed to be of low moral value. Issues such as euthanasia, wife swapping, witchcraft, and cannibalism were supposedly central to the curriculum. The entire controversy brought into question the idea of academic freedom and what limits should be placed on what is presented and how it is presented in America’s schools (Evans, 2004; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

## The Vietnam War, Societal Changes at Home and The Newer Social Studies

The national turmoil of the 1960s virtually single-handedly derailed the projects of the “new social studies” because their purpose most often was to prepare the most intellectual students for academic advancement rather than prepare individuals to deal with everyday, real-world problems. Events such as the assassination of a President and national civil rights leader, the rioting in major cities throughout the United States, the growing militancy among minorities groups, and the massive anti-war protests, prompted social change. The focus on a need to prepare intellectuals to compete against communism was complicated by the need for all Americans to cope with the domestic upheaval. As the decade passed, a “newer movement” arose. The national events which adversely affected the success of the “new social studies” were the same events that provoked the “newer social studies.” Since the reforms of the “new social studies” were more centrally focused on preparing students to compete against Russian prominence, reformers were forced to rethink their efforts at shaping the curriculum. The war in Vietnam, the on-going civil rights movement, and the social unrest throughout the United States are all examples of the events that shaped the social studies in the years after the “new social studies.” The result was a focus on issues-centered, present-day controversies where students were social activists, rather than social scientists or historians. The “newer social studies” possesses many of the characteristics of both the Amelioristic and Critical perspectives of my heuristic. The movement promoted open learning environments and revived the social reconstruction movement of the 1920s and 1930s. The newer movement found its footing among many teachers because of its presentist approach on the divisive issues of the time. The movement was exemplified in

the publishing of the 1971 National Council for the Social Studies Curriculum Guidelines. Essentially, the guidelines put into writing the need for teachers to focus on student concerns and social problems by providing active learning experiences (Evans, 2004).

#### A Conservative Critique of Education in American Public Schools

By the 1980s, however, traditional history re-emerged to the forefront of the social studies movement. Much of the comeback is attributed to an influx of research on schooling in America. In 1983, *A Nation at Risk* was published by a commission appointed by President Ronald Reagan. The National Commission on Excellence in Education's thesis was that the United States of America was "at risk" of lagging behind her international counterparts. The report cited that America's schools were responsible for producing poorly-educated young people which in turn accounted for the nation's economic shortcomings.

Not only did the government involve itself in evaluating the American public schools, but so did those in higher education. In November 1985, Diane Ravitch's article "Decline and Fall of History Teaching" appeared in the *New York Times Magazine*. Ravitch argued that the social studies were to blame for history's decline in American schools. Arguing that history is a story that retells the past, Ravitch maintained that there should be a shift from history as a vehicle for investigation back to history as a narrative of the past. The most efficient manner to educate the youth of America is to focus on American history and other histories chronologically. The justification for this framework is that a student "emerge with a sense of how he and his society came to be what they are and where they are at the present time" (Finn, Ravitch, and Fancher, 1984).

This article is but one of many that were part of a larger movement of individuals throughout society who favored the restoration of a more conservative approach to social studies teaching, one focused more on history. The re-establishment of the traditional camp brought a push in the 1980s for instruction focused on use of the history textbook, in chronological order, and in a narrative format (Evans, 2004; Tyack and Cuban, 1995). These tendencies all fit within the Nationalistic perspective.

#### The Controversy over the National History Standards of 1994

The apparent need for standards arose out of the conservative critique that began brewing in the mid-1980's and the growing realization that consistency was needed if student learning was going to be successful. Many believed that America had lost its economic competitive edge among the international community. The national public, including many educators, agreed with this assessment. Therefore, individual groups, within and outside the field of education, began to push heavily for reform, in this case the creation of national standards.

In social studies, the National History Standards of 1994 provide a contemporary example of how complex the social studies movement has been over the last century. Historians felt it was their obligation to be involved in the decision-making process if the standards were to be required. Consequently, The National Endowment for the Humanities, headed by Lynne Cheney, awarded the National Center for History at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA) a sizeable grant. Under the direction of Professor Gary Nash, the Center was charged with the development of the National History Standards for both United States and world history. The standards were established as the framework for what students in grades 5-12 should know about the

aforementioned content areas. The authors had two points of emphasis as they constructed the standards, historical thinking and historical understanding. They also incorporated an inquiry-approach to learning for students. As the standards were published, opponents were concerned that, as they put it, a negative portrayal of American history had been presented. For example, Lynne Cheney felt that while it is necessary to “be honest about the failings of the U.S.,” (Cheney, 1994) teachers should also teach the youth of America about “the individual greatness that has flourished in our political system” (Cheney, 1994). As one might expect, a firestorm of controversy ensued. Similar to what happened to Rugg more than a half century prior, articles and editorials in the media intensified as the controversy began to take shape. The debate culminated in a motion by Senator Slade Gorton to reject the standards. The United States Senate did officially condemn the National Standards for United States History by a vote of 99 to 1 (Evans, 2004; Cheney, 1994; Stern, 1994).

The debate over the National History Standards of 1994 offers yet another vignette in the on-going struggle for curriculum reform in the social studies. Critics of the National History Standards claimed that the standards were a politically correct document opposed to Western ideals, too heavily entrenched with multiculturalism, and offered multiple perspectives of American History that could confuse one’s understanding of the nation’s past. For example, critics argue that certain historical figures such as George Washington were omitted intentionally. Additionally, conservatives declared that there was overt opposition towards American institutions. Moreover, critics felt special emphasis was placed on malcontent sects in American society. Conversely, proponents of the standards have always contented that the

standards were attacked by conservatives who had an agenda that they felt was being challenged by such a project. Furthermore, defenders of the standards argued that the standards are nothing more than a tool to help teachers develop engaging lessons. The standards are not mandatory. Rather they are simply guidelines a teacher might follow as they prepare to teach (Chapin, 1995; Bicuvaris, 1994; Stern, 1994).

As has been the case over more than a century, the struggle over what should be taught in schools and how it should be taught incites strong beliefs among society. This brief historical sketch of the history of curriculum reform lends credence to this notion. A large portion of this literature review has recounted the history of curriculum reform in social studies education in the United States. Much of the historical account illustrates that the debate over curriculum reform principally occurred outside the schoolhouses themselves. Therefore, it is essential that a brief historical context of classroom practice be recounted before the review of the literature forges onward.

### **Historical Context of Classroom Practice Since 1900**

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, teacher-centered instruction dominated the high school classroom. The root of such practice was centered squarely on the immediate needs of the time. Teachers were to impart the skills necessary for students to work in an increasingly industrialized world. At the same juncture, teachers wanted to assimilate or “Americanize” those immigrants that continued to pour into the country. The most successful fashion for teachers to accomplish such a goal was to create an environment that was very structured. This translated into teacher dominated discussions in a classroom that had desks neatly lined in rows facing the front of the classroom. Textbook assignments, or seatwork, were commonplace. Structure was also important because the



number of students attending high school doubled from 1890 to 1900. A variety of factors are attributed to such growth. Notably, the public high school was in essence a creation of American society. It was publicly-controlled and opened to all who wished to attend. Therefore, parents were encouraged to send their children to school past the early years. The enormous influx of students, most of whom still did not receive a secondary diploma, forced educators to consider whether or not the school curriculum was adequately preparing all students to become productive citizens. Most at the time, felt that a traditional approach to history was the most appropriate means to this end (Cuban, 1993; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Lortie, 1975).

By end of the Great Depression, there were at least some teachers implementing a more progressive education. The educators who attempted such new and innovative practices in their classroom were an overwhelming minority, especially in the secondary school. Opportunities to move outside the classroom physically and mentally were a key component of progressive education. Student-centered classrooms became common terminology for identifying classrooms which offered more facilitation, rather than domination, by teachers. Students discussed and debated the issues of the day in an effort to better understand how they might cope with an ever-changing and uncertain world. Even many of those who attempted to be “progressive” in their instructional practices did not do so fully. Some teachers were not entirely committed to an alternative method for fear of how it might affect not only their employment, but their authority. Anti-communism was an integral part of education in post-World War II America. Charges of subversive behavior were hard to contest and hurt or ruined careers, which hampered the efforts of many teachers to offer an alternative curricular approach to classroom practice

(Evans, 2004; Cuban, 1993; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Lortie, 1975).

By the 1960s, one might expect that methodologies had changed the manner in which teachers conducted their classrooms. However, this was not the case. While highly publicized innovations such as team teaching were supposedly exuding from public schools, the truth was practices still had not shifted much. A focus on participatory education did not fully materialize into an accepted instructional practice. Textbooks were the central tool of instruction. A steady exchange of questions and answers between teacher and students was routine. However, many classrooms were not implementing the curriculum and/or theoretical approaches that were developed as part of the increased focus on education by the government in the late 1950s (Evans, 2004; Cuban, 1993; Hertzberg, 1981; Shaver, Davis, & Helburn, 1979; Lortie, 1975).

As the twentieth century came to a close, it appears that beliefs about a variety of issues are what have sustained a more consistent approach to classroom practices. Personal views on the purpose of schooling, how the school should be structured, and the expectations of teachers all seem to have injected a certain amount of influence in favor of the more traditional approaches to classroom practices (Heilman, 2001; Merryfield, 1998; VanSledright, 1996; Makler, 1994). Couple these ideas with teachers' feeling about the amount of effort that must be expended to manage a more informal classroom and we begin to see, at least partly, why it has been so difficult for the school environment to change substantially (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991).

Classroom practice is a large component of the educational process. How an educator conveys material surely affects how it is received by learners. Likewise, how

learners engage in the classroom affects what they do or do not take from their educational experience. There is, however, another element of the learning process that is influential. Curriculum materials themselves play an important role on the educational growth of learners and teachers alike. Curricula have been influenced by the social events of this nation. Therefore, it is necessary to examine the ebb and flow of curriculum materials throughout the century-long social studies education debate.

### **A Critical Review of Social Studies Curriculum Materials Analysis**

#### **Content Analysis of Social Studies Materials**

A variety of methods have been used to analyze social studies curriculum materials in the preceding decades. Content analysis, both quantitative and qualitative, has been implemented repeatedly. Intellectual critiques have been elicited by professors of history, sociology, and education. Moreover, a combination of both of the aforementioned methods has been incorporated. This portion of the literature review will examine studies that have analyzed social studies curriculum materials. This will provide a benchmark for how this study proceeds. What alternatives need to be considered as texts are analyzed as part of this study? What research has already laid a foundation that can be built upon in this study?

Educationists have used a combination of content analysis strategies in studies that focused on social studies curriculum. Most of these studies have used textbooks as the focal point of their research. Whether it is textbooks used in America or abroad, researchers often gravitate to these texts because of their centrality to teachers' and students' lives in the classroom. In fact, studies show that at least seventy percent of classroom time is dedicated to textbook-related activities. Additionally, researchers

believe that a variety of factors – such as profiteering by textbook publishers and a lack of diversity in textbooks – indicate a need for textbook curriculum reform (Santoli, 1997; Gordy and Pritchard, 1995; Romanowski, 1994; Wade, 1993).

Gordy and Pritchard (1995) examined the extent to which social studies textbooks included diverse points of view about American History. They conducted research on the presentation of slavery by fifth grade social studies textbooks in Connecticut. The researchers conducted a content analysis on seventeen textbooks that were used by at least three school systems within the state of Connecticut. By conducting a pilot investigation of two textbooks, the researchers developed three broad categories for coding – triangular trade, life as a slave, and Emancipation and Reconstruction. A quantitative approach to content analysis was used to conduct this study in conjunction with Banks's four levels of integration of ethnic content. Banks's four levels of integration are contributions (Level 1), additive (Level 2), transformation (Level 3), and decision making/social action (Level 4). The contributions approach assessed to what extent "famous people, holidays, and cultural events of various race/ethnic groups are added to the curriculum without changing its basic structure" (Gordy and Pritchard, 1995). The additive approach included themes and concepts from various racial or ethnic groups, but maintained that the overall curriculum was not altered. The transformative approach was the first level to exact change in the curriculum. This approach "allows for an understanding of how U.S. history emerged from the interaction of diverse cultural groups by presenting concepts and themes from diverse perspectives" (Gordy and Pritchard, 1995). Level 4, the decision making and social participation approach, pressed students to make decisions based on the multiple perspectives concepts they learned in

their lessons. The authors deduced through their study that three areas were commonly presented in textbooks about slavery: triangle trade, life as a slave, and Emancipation and Reconstruction. The authors concluded that most texts only presented the terrible voyages of the triangle trade, but failed to assess critically the slave trade as a process. The researchers found three weaknesses for the presentation of life as a slave. First, the sexual exploitation of female slaves was disregarded. Secondly, there were no connections made between the living conditions of slaves and those of many African-Americans today. Lastly, most texts did not address how other ethnic groups participated or did not participate in slavery. The authors were dissatisfied with the overall presentation of Emancipation and Reconstruction. Specifically, they believed that the terms of freedom were not accurately presented, the roles of African Americans in the Union Army were not addressed, and the roles of African American women were marginalized. The researchers found that most of the texts surveyed as part of their study had reached level two or the additive approach. They felt this reinforced sexist and racist attitudes among students because there were a minimal number of perspectives presented. In the end, the researchers suggested that serious curriculum reform had to occur in order for students to obtain a better understanding of slavery in America.

Romanowski (1994) studied five popular secondary-level American History textbooks and the impact they have on students in relation to democratic ideals of equality and justice. He did so with the Japanese internment as his content focus and qualitative content analysis as his method. Romanowski claimed that “most textbooks trivialize the conditions of internment camps, downplay the personal property losses suffered by the victims, and fail to raise the many possible motives for the internment”

(Romanowski, 1994). Romanowski argued that textbooks present materials in a manner that supports particular interests and ideologies, namely ones that are neither critical nor diverse. Ultimately, the researcher charges that schools must do a better job of producing citizens who can and will uphold democratic ideals that promote justice and equality. However, he states that in order for such a goal to occur schools must move away from the current textbooks. In his research, Romanowski deduced that most American History textbooks presented a version of America that only focused in on a Eurocentric interpretation. Consequently, textbooks were stonewalling the progress of schools to produce productive citizens.

Santoli (1997) extended the research of Allen Ketchum when she analyzed how six countries involved in World War II presented the war in their textbooks. Additionally, Santoli provided a descriptive analysis that led to a comparison of the information taught to students in the various countries about World War II. Santoli concluded that general patterns of bias were prevalent in each country's version. Additionally, she posited that unless supplemental materials were included, students would receive an inadequate and largely flawed interpretation of World War II. In this case, "largely flawed interpretation" equates to an account of World War II that portrays each respective country in the best possible fashion.

#### Prominent Critiques of Curriculum Materials

The academic and journalistic communities have weighed in on the effectiveness, or ineffectiveness, of texts in relation to educating young people. Two prominent works, *America Revised* and *Lies My Teacher Told Me: Everything Your American History*

*Textbook Got Wrong*, are central to the narrative-based literature produced by the professorship regarding social studies texts.

*America Revised* by Frances Fitzgerald was published in 1979. This analysis of American History textbooks from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century to the 1970s examines how and why textbooks have changed during certain decades. This book is structured into three distinct chapters. Chapter one, entitled *Past Masters*, discusses in detail the political aspects of textbook publishing. Additionally, the power adoption has on the selection of textbooks that are used is addressed. Chapter two, *Continuity and Change*, spotlights how American History textbooks have presented such issues as reconstruction, immigration, nativism, US foreign policy, and communism. Chapter three – *Progressives, Fundamentalists, and Mandarins* – studies the lack of scholarly history in textbooks. In many respects the three categories proffered by Fitzgerald in her final chapter coincide with Barr, Barth, and Shermis’s work cited earlier in this study.

Fitzgerald argues that textbook companies place such limits on the authors of textbooks that they can not construct a text in a meaningful way. In essence, the public’s view is what drives textbook production and not the historians who are actually writing the text. Fitzgerald praises the work of David Saville Muzzey whose textbook of the early twentieth century was widely influential on the young people of America. In her view Muzzey’s text, *American History*, brought America alive to its readership. She admires the textbooks of this time period for their focus on character and moral earnestness. Conversely, Fitzgerald attributes the monotone textbooks that arose during the Eisenhower Era to the successful attacks on what she concluded was a slightly reformist public school text written by Harold Rugg.

Fitzgerald found it difficult that a country with the political and economic clout of the United States could not better educate young people to understand the importance of monetary and political affairs in society. Additionally, Fitzgerald was deeply concerned that so many sectors of American society view a different picture of America. She believed there were common threads that should be accentuated. To Fitzgerald, the central question of American History – who are we as a nation? – is left unanswered in most textbooks of the 1950s and beyond. In essence, Fitzgerald argues, if multiple perspectives mean that there is no common American culture then American history is undoubtedly too complicated to fathom. *America Revised* points society to perhaps the most important problem it faces. What should be made of the American past? Is there one account? Is there such a thing as American culture?

*Lies My Teacher Told Me*, by James Loewen, examines a dozen textbooks published between 1974 and 1991. Loewen starts from the assertion that high school textbooks are the source of general dislike for history among high school students. Additionally, Loewen conjectures that students enter college less knowledgeable about their own history than any other subject. In fact, he argues that history has to be unlearned in college because high schools present erroneous information to young people. Loewen believes that teachers, textbooks, and textbooks publishers are all culpable in this process of misinformation. Ultimately, the onus is on the textbooks in his view. He argues this is due in large part to the restrictions placed upon authors. Loewen posits that the stakeholders within education – publishers, teachers, administrators, etc. – have allowed American history textbooks to become a sequence of insipid tidbits of information that should be memorized then discarded.



Most textbooks, Loewen argues, present a positive view of American history. In his mind, that is a central problem. Of the textbooks Loewen examined, all twelve minimized most all conflicts in American history down to the notion that while America has its problems, they have all been fixed by the white elite. In order to illustrate his point, Loewen chronologically addressed major events and people in American history that he perceived to be inaccurately portrayed. Loewen believes that those who make decisions – publishers and school boards – about textbooks strictly want to please the majority. To solidify this point, Loewen questions why more recent history does not address more controversial or, in his mind, truthful events in American history. He argues that by leaving recent history out of textbooks young people not only are separated from truth, but they lose interest in the generations that preceded them.

The works of Fitzgerald and Loewen provide but two examples that address the concerns society has about textbooks that are used in the schools. Fitzgerald's *America Revised* seems as though it is mostly identifiable with the characteristic prevalent in the Amelioristic perspective of my heuristic. On the other hand, Loewen's *Lies My Teacher Told Me* critique exhibits many characteristics similar to the Critical perspective. While their overall perspective might differ, these two critiques seem to agree that the issues surrounding textbooks have influenced the premise that American history is the least liked and worst remembered subject in the American curricula. Additionally, these two authors would likely agree that the compilation of so many facts have resulted in an intellectually diluted version of American history.

## **The Research Problem**

Few studies have been conducted that analyze social studies texts and curriculum. Therefore, it is imperative that the body of literature address the political, social, and economic influences that have served as a force for curriculum debate and reform in social studies education throughout the last one hundred years. Additionally, critiques of traditional curricula have shown that they minimize multiple perspectives and offer a view of history to which many subcultures do not identify (Gordy and Pritchard, 1995; Loewen, 1995; Romanowski, 1994). Conversely, throughout the decades a sundry of influences have worked against innovative curricula gaining wider acceptance and use. War, questions of patriotism, lack of funding, and many other influences have adversely affected innovative curricula (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977). Therefore, research should be conducted that probes how and why innovative social studies curriculum materials were created during particular times in America over the last century. In short, we are in need of studies that explore the internal and external dynamics of social studies curriculum reform projects over a comprehensive period of time that will enable us to better understand how we might engage in effective curriculum reform in the future. The principal focus of such research should be on innovative curricula that offered materials that provided alternative learning opportunities to that of most materials of the day. Heretofore, most curriculum material analysis has centered on textbooks. Some of the previous studies on social studies curriculum materials argue that in order for textbooks to be even remotely effective, supplemental materials should be available for use. Therefore, an analysis of social studies curriculum materials other than mainstream textbooks is vital to the body of research.

I will examine the two following questions as I study purposeful samples of curriculum materials from the last century:

1. What factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials?
2. What implications does the history of curriculum reform have for contemporary curriculum development?

As a contribution to understanding the nature of innovative curriculum development, it seems imperative to explore those materials from pivotal moments in this nation's history. An essential goal of this literature review has been to document the ebb and flow of the debate over what should be taught to children in social studies and the instructional practices used to do so. There have been times of progress and times of retrenchment for those opposed to the status quo in the last century since this debate began. By accounting for those patterns and themes that have resulted in alternating periods of progress and retrenchment, curriculum developers may be better equipped to create materials that prepare all students to become productive citizens within American society.

In the end, this study will offer a comparative analysis of the similarities and differences of the selected curriculum sets. The results of this analysis may be useful when new social studies curricula are developed. By understanding the factors that determined the fate of past innovative curricula, the chances that future innovative curricula will meet wider acceptance might increase.

## CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

### **Introduction**

The Methods chapter of my study is organized into three parts: Data Collection, Data Analysis, and Study Limitations. The discussion on Data Collection describes the criteria for selecting curricula, the curriculum materials and the time period in which they were created, and the methods of data collection and the rationale for these strategies. The Data Analysis section delves more deeply into the roles of content analysis in my study. Moreover, the overall process of how I conducted the analysis portion of the study is elucidated. The final element of the Methods chapter, Study Limitations, accounts for those issues that arose throughout the study that were beyond my control and potentially impacted the outcomes of this study directly.

In this study I examined two questions:

1. What factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials?
2. What implications does the history of curriculum reform have for contemporary curriculum development?

## **Data Collection**

### Selection Criteria for Curricula

A purposive sample of curriculum materials was examined throughout the analysis portion of this study. I selected curricula using the criteria that follow in an effort to ensure meaningful content, historical, and comparative analyses throughout the study (Rudestam and Newton, 2001). As is evident by my review of the literature, there have been periods of advancement and retrenchment in the area of social studies curriculum reform over the last century. Therefore, I chose curriculum materials that exemplified products which were created at points of significant debate over the direction of society and democracy and the role of education especially as it relates to the social studies curriculum reform movement. The four curricula that were studied, first as individual cases then comparatively, were chosen purposefully in an effort to inform the questions central to my study. Each of the four curricula was addressed as an individual critical case before all four are analyzed comparatively.

Cases develop from a variety of sources. They may encompass a variety of topics such as people, communities, or as is the situation in my research, critical events. Case data contain all the facts and records that a researcher has about a case. Therefore, any available data become part of the analysis. Whether it is prior studies, primary source materials, or interviews, any accessible information becomes the raw data (Patton, 1987).

The criteria used as a benchmark for selection of curriculum material sets are:

1. Did the curriculum projects have a national scope?
2. Did the materials differ from typically-adopted classroom curriculum materials of their day?

3. Was there a significant adoption rate of the materials nationally?
4. Did the materials collectively account for the wide range of time (the entire 20<sup>th</sup> century) that the debate encompasses?
5. Were the materials created at points of significant debate over the direction of American society?

The four critical cases associated with my study are: Harold Rugg's curriculum series, The Amherst Project, The Harvard Social Studies Project, and *History Alive!*. The selection of four critical cases provides examples throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century debate over social studies curriculum reform. In relation to the criteria for selection of curricula, the four projects associated with my study appropriately met the standards I set to for the selection process. All four projects were or are recognized nationally by many social studies educators. In many respects the materials were accepted by classroom teachers and other educators, but not necessarily by those who actually were engaged in the adoption process. Each of the four curriculum development projects arose in a time of change and debate. Specifically, three momentous time periods in the 20<sup>th</sup> century provided the historical context for the selection of the four curriculum sets included in this study: 1.) the industrialization and urbanization of America and how progressive reformers and the Great Depression affected society, 2.) New Deal reform, World War II, the Cold War, and how each simultaneously influenced society and 3.) the liberal reforms of the 1960s and the ascendancy of conservatism in response to them. I chose the American Revolution as the content-related topic for comparatively analyzing all four curricula. However, additional topics from each curriculum set were included to ensure that the American Revolution content materials were representative of each curriculum's

goals. I chose the American Revolution for two reasons. First, in order to comparatively analyze the four curricula, I needed to examine a uniform content topic across all sets of materials. The Rugg curriculum series was created in the 1920s and 1930s which ruled out any content that was post World War I. Secondly, the curricula incorporated a variety of disciplines which required the selection of content that was applicable to more than one content focus. The American Revolution offered this alternative because not only does it address American History, it also encompasses World History, Civics, American Government, Geography, and Law.

#### Methods of Data Collection/Rationale for Strategies

I collected primary data from three sources: curriculum materials, interviews, and period accounts. Secondary data sources included curriculum histories, biographies, and other existing analyses and critiques.

The primary sources for data are the curricula themselves. Interlibrary loan afforded me the opportunity to obtain most all the curriculum materials that I needed from three of the four sets. My major professor, Dr. John Saye, and a second committee member, Dr. Andrew Weaver, were instrumental in providing me with other primary curricula resources.

Interviews with individuals associated with the curricula offered additional insight into the decisions that were made at the time of creation and implementation. Dr. Bert Bower, CEO and President of History Alive!, allowed me to conduct a forty-five minute interview in which he spoke of the broad rationale for why he created the curriculum materials. Dr. Bower and I corresponded extensively through email as well. While Dr. Bower's initial interview was more informal, he did allow me to formally interview him

as part of my data collection. Drs. Richard Brown and Fred Newmann, who were involved in developing the Amherst and the Harvard projects respectively, granted me permission for an interview. Formal interview questions were used to conduct the interviews of Drs. Bower, Brown, and Newmann (Appendix A). All three professors graciously provided curriculum materials for me to use for the analysis portion of my study. Dr. Bower provided me with an entire *History Alive!* unit set. Dr. Brown supplied me with *A Guide to the Amherst Approach to Inquiry Learning*. This work was an unpublished article detailing the theoretical framework of the Amherst Project. Dr. Newmann furnished me eighteen teachers' guides that I had been unsuccessful in obtaining. All these materials were critical components in my analysis of each of the curriculum materials to which they were associated.

A dissertation by William Kline entitled "The 'Amherst Project': A case study of a federally sponsored curriculum development project" was also a source of secondary interview data. Kline, who worked on the Amherst Project, had extensive interviews as part of his study. The theoretical works of the curricula developers were also used as foundational pieces throughout the study. For example, Oliver and Shaver's *Teaching Public Issues in the High School* and Teachers' Curriculum Institute's *Bring Learning Alive!* and *Social Studies Alive!* aided in my understanding of their respective curriculum projects. Countless writings from Harold Rugg provided a context for how his reading course came to fruition. These writings aided in understanding the rationales for why each of the developers felt it necessary to create their materials.

Secondary resources were essential in my research. Curriculum histories such as the works of Cremin (1964), Hertzberg (1981), and Evans (2004) provided valuable



knowledge of the century-long debate over social studies curriculum reform.

Additionally, prior research such as journal articles and edited books, supported my comprehension of the research I conducted.

### **Data Analysis**

Content analysis was the primary method used in my study. A heuristic and the guiding questions presented at the beginning of the review of the literature served as organizational tools that provided a benchmark for the analysis. The heuristic and guiding questions each had its specified place within my study. Content analysis was used to comparatively analyze each curriculum.

### **Content Analysis**

There has long been a debate among researchers over how content analysis should be implemented as a research strategy. Many argue that it is only possible to incorporate content analysis quantitatively. Those researchers who favor content analysis as a quantitative method believe it to be largely objective, methodical, and scientific (Stemler, 2001; Holsti, 1968; Berelson, 1952). Researchers who oppose such a viewpoint and favor content analysis as a qualitative methodology argue that a focus strictly on quantitative measures is what minimizes it as research strategy (Ryan and Bernard, 2003; Selltitz et al., 1959). Still other researchers believe a blend of qualitative and quantitative content analysis is useful to the body of research. The basis for this argument is that quantitative content analysis offers a means to address frequency and longevity. Conversely, qualitative content analysis provides a way to study patterns that form in particular fields of study. Proponents argue that when adjoined, the two differing strategies only strengthen the validity and reliability of the research (Berg, 1995; Patton,

1987; Smith, 1975). Even with the complexity of the approaches to content analysis, the construct is generally defined as a procedure that aids in drawing conclusions by methodically classifying unique patterns in data (Ryan and Bernard, 2003; Stemler, 2001; Berg, 1995; Patton, 1987; Smith, 1975; Holsti, 1968; Selltiz et al., 1959; Berelson, 1952).

Within the broader argument over content analysis rests a trepidation regarding the use of this methodology. The concern among researchers centers on whether underlying meanings within content should be justifiably included in research or research should be based solely on what can be physically tallied. Latent content analysis involves the inferences communicated by a text or speech. Conversely, manifest content analysis includes the calculable components of a speech or text. The research community fundamentally agrees that latent content analysis is valid as long as specific attention is paid to detail. Suggestions by the research community on how to provide adequate detail are as follows: provide multiple selections from the content that illustrates the researchers' analysis, validate content analysis procedures with other researchers, and blend content analysis strategies that focus on physical (manifest) and symbolic (latent) content for reliability. This study abides by all three suggestions. Multiple selections from the content and the blending of content analysis that focuses on both physical and symbolic content are key elements of my study. Additionally, I sought validation from committee members regarding the content analysis procedures I developed as part of my study (Stemler, 2001; Berg, 1995; Wade, 1993; Holsti, 1969; Berelson, 1952).

My analysis of secondary source materials while creating the historical context for each of the four critical cases was a combination of latent and manifest content analyses. Likewise, I used a blend of manifest and latent content analyses as part of the

individual and comparative analyses of the four sets of curriculum materials. The content analysis guidelines for the individual and comparative analyses revolved around what emerged from the contents' message. The heuristic and the guiding questions introduced at the beginning of the literature review served as a benchmark for how the curriculum developers might view social studies and its role in educating young people. Those questions are as follows:

- a. What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- b. What is a good, democratic citizen?
- c. How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- d. What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

#### Procedures

A historical curriculum study requires a descriptive analysis of the curricula being reviewed. The four following sets of curriculum materials were analyzed: Harold Rugg's curriculum series from the 1930's, the Amherst Project and Harvard Project from the New Social Studies Movement of 1960's, and *History Alive!* from the 1990's. Therefore, the historical context of each curriculum set was established first. In an effort to better understand the characteristics that may assist in explaining how the curricula were received in schools, each case was analyzed individually next. Then all four cases were analyzed comparatively to establish similarities and differences between their content, rationales, and purposes for creating the curriculum materials.

The historical narrative that materialized from the review of the literature guided many components of my study. Not only did the literature review provide a historical context for the debate over social studies curriculum reform, it also afforded the opportunity for the emergence of a heuristic and guiding questions that are integral to my

study. In order to set each curriculum within its historical context, I began my analysis by researching primary and secondary sources in order to create a historical foundation for each of the four critical cases. This historical contextualization established the rationale and purpose of each curriculum. To a lesser extent, contextualizing helped determine the general state of American society and its influence on the curriculum sets. Much of American society's influence on curriculum reform was addressed in my literature review and earlier in this chapter. In order to better understand the rationale for the materials and to bridge the historical analysis with the content and comparative analyses, next I examined the supporting materials and other writings by the authors that were available. After the investigation of supplementary materials was complete, I pored over the curriculum materials themselves. This three-step process allowed me to begin the process of analyzing the specific characteristics of each critical case.

The most logical way to approach the data was to examine each curriculum set individually. As I examined the materials, an assortment of themes began to emerge. Similar themes surfaced in each of the four curricula. However, before the themes really came to light, broader categories became obvious in all four sets of curriculum materials as well. The two broad categories that emerged were Presentation and Content. Those characteristics associated with the Presentation category focused on all parts of the curriculum sets that were associated with how the materials were organized and presented. The Presentation aspects of the materials were largely realized by way of manifest content analysis. The Content characteristics were more extensive and required a combination of manifest and latent content analyses.

The Presentation components took into account how the materials were organized. I asked such questions as why do all the materials have some sort of introductory commentary? Why does each piece created by the same projects have the introductory piece? Does that signify the curriculum's intent for each unit or book to be a stand-alone lesson? What was the basic objective of how the materials were organized? The themes that grew out of this analysis were largely focused on the uses of introductions for student materials, the organization of the body of materials, instructional activities, and the organization of teacher's guides.

The Content components took into account why and how the materials included certain content, how the content was presented, and why certain content was chosen. The themes that materialized from this analysis were chiefly centered up intended purposes, critical thinking strategies, and experiences. These themes became visible as I asked a variety of questions about the data. What is the depth of the material? How broad is the material? What content do the developers place the most emphasis upon? Is there evidence of multiple perspectives? Is emotive loading prevalent? Are students given the opportunity to weigh evidence? Are students faced with dilemmas that force them to make decisions? Are the decisions persistent, public issues type decisions? Do the decisions require students to make moral judgments or are the decisions superficial? What influence do the experiences of students have on the way the students interact with the content? Does the content require students to have had certain experiences in order to adequately understand the materials?

The analyses of each individual curriculum set's treatment of the American Revolution offered me the opportunity to understand the broad purposes the curriculum

developers had for their respective projects. Additionally, by analyzing each set individually I was able to gain a sense of the typicality of the materials purposes, organization, and content. Once I looked at each curriculum set individually and documented what the data showed, I comparatively analyzed all four critical cases to see the similarities and differences in the approaches each employed to teach about the American Revolution.

#### Preparations to analyze the data

A variety of prominent theoretical works on social studies education from the last thirty years have influenced my creation of a heuristic to aid in understanding the tendencies that have been prevalent in the century-long debate over social studies curriculum reform. The process of finalizing the heuristic for interpreting the social studies curriculum reform debate was a long and arduous one. Moreover, the formulation of the guiding questions was a lengthy struggle.

What in its final form has emerged as a heuristic began as a continuum. As I wrestled with the viewpoints of more than twenty educational theorists, similarities and differences about how students should learn social studies began to arise. Additionally, I began to understand that the seminal works of theorists such as Evans; Levstik and Barton; Barr, Barth, and Shermis; and Martorella; represented efforts to organize the bevy of theoretical frameworks that have arisen over time into broader categories about social studies education. In many respects, this realization was helpful to the advancement of my study. These works prompted my thinking about the depth and breadth of this research topic. Undeniably, the variety of ideas about social studies education makes it possible to tackle my research from many angles. The seminal works

helped to clarify broad themes. However, I did not find them adequate enough to address the struggles within the social studies reform movement that my analysis identified. In some cases, the categories were too defined. In other cases, they were not broad enough. Therefore, my development of a continuum on which to place the theories of individuals began to emerge as a heuristic that would help explain the tendencies within the century-long debate.

All the while I was struggling with the development of a continuum, I was also wrestling with how to incorporate a set of guiding questions into my study. What started out as a basic list of seven questions that drive the debate has evolved into four questions that have been integral in the establishment of a heuristic rather than a continuum. I understood very early in my research that a set of guiding questions needed to be formulated. However, once I created the questions based on recurrent themes within the social studies reform movement and education itself, I still was not fully aware of how they were to be integrated. Nonetheless, as the review of the literature continued to grow so did the process of creating a continuum. The continuum seemed to be developing as a logical tool to help social studies educators better understand the prominent theoretical frameworks in the field of social studies education. At this point, the guiding questions still had very little influence on how I understood the social studies curriculum reform debate. In fact, the seminal works were largely influencing the ranges I developed on my continuum.

What I failed to see as I was attempting to create a continuum was that the questions I originally developed were being answered all along by the theorists that I was studying. Therefore, I continually revisited the guiding questions as I wrote my literature

review. Although the works of seminal theorists greatly influenced my original thinking about a continuum, I came to realize that each theorist has his or her own caveats to how and why social studies should be taught. However, I also began to recognize that what have become the four guiding questions associated with my study offered a broader understanding of the competing viewpoints of the social studies curriculum reform movement.

With this realization, the significance of a continuum began to wane and the idea of a heuristic quickly surfaced. A heuristic is a device that serves as an aid to learning, discovery, or problem-solving (Merriam-Webster, 1990). Moreover, it is an organizational tool that allows one to gain a better grasp of a particular idea or thought. It is important to understand that this heuristic is but one of many possible instruments for analyzing the history of curriculum reform in social studies. I began to focus my attention to how those involved with the century-long debate would answer my guiding questions. I began to see themes develop. In every case it seemed that the theme was in the context of opposing positions. For example, the initial themes were socialization v. countersocialization, History v. Social Studies, and social amelioration v. upholding traditional American values. I promptly recognized that this attempt was too focused and did not allow for a broader vantage point of the debate. Therefore, I reverted back to the ranges on the continuum. The tendencies I had struggled so mightily with for such a long period of time were right before me. I studied how the ranges answered my guiding questions and discovered that the same ranges on the continuum were the tendencies that would comprise my heuristic. Of course, it was imperative that I continually revisit the guiding questions to ensure that I was broadly addressing each tendency's viewpoint.



The heuristic bonds the purposes and practices for teaching into three broadly defined categories: Critical, Amelioristic, and Nationalistic.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of How Tendencies within the Social Studies Debate answer this Study's Guiding Questions

	<b>Critical</b>	<b>Amelioristic</b>	<b>Nationalistic</b>
<b>What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving the ideal?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy:</b> All citizens have equal access and influence.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy:</b> A small elite group controls the decision-making process.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> Major, fundamental changes in societal structures are needed to achieve an ideal democracy.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy:</b> Applying mainstream American values to all of society so that each citizen has the opportunity and capabilities to engage themselves as functioning members of the general public should they choose to do so.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy:</b> There is an underlying structure of society that has the potential for the ideal democracy.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> Limited changes need to be made before an ideal democracy fully materializes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ideal democracy</b> : Realized in societal values such as capitalism, hard work, and liberty that have been accepted over a 200 year period.</li> <li>• <b>Current democracy</b> : The United States is as close to the ideal democracy as she can get.</li> <li>• <b>Necessary changes:</b> System provides opportunity for success based on merit.</li> </ul>

<p><b>What is a good, democratic citizen?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who actively participates in society by involving themselves in actions that challenge the status quo.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who attempts to make the world a better place by learning from society's past mistakes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One who promotes the mainstream values of America.</li> </ul>
<p><b>How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By exposing students to situations, inside and outside of the classroom, which require them to grapple with societal issues to prepare them to question issues of power and equity in society today.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By affording students opportunities to engage in analysis of historical materials to understand the relationship between events, problems, and people of the past and present so that they can help correct those mistakes and make the world a better place.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By learning about figures and accomplishments in history that represent the values that make this nation good and prosperous.</li> </ul>
<p><b>What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most often history is more about overarching patterns than knowing specific dates and places because there are many versions of history that need to be accounted for.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History provides a basis point for why the present day world is as it is, but it also provides the tools of analysis that are needed to effectively participate in society. Therefore, if students are to engage in historical analysis they must be exposed to history.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History as foundational knowledge is vital if students are going to get a sense of who they are, where they come from, and where they are going.</li> </ul>

The emergence of a heuristic was so vital to my study because of its role in how I look at the data. In order to logically categorize the variety of ideas about what should be taught in social studies, I had to create a tool that would help me better understand the landscape of this hotly-contested debate over content. The identification of general tendencies in the social studies debate allowed me to have a benchmark for the ideas held by theorists and curriculum developers alike. Once the general tendencies were established and understood, I was able to immerse myself into the data and not be setting myself up to fit the data nicely within the categories of my heuristic.

### **Study Limitations**

There were limitations to this study. First, the effect of the date in which the Rugg reading series was created. As was addressed in the procedures portion of this chapter, the American Revolution is the centerpiece for the in-depth analysis of this study. Since Harold Rugg's curriculum was developed in the 1930s, I could not choose any historical phenomenon beyond 1930. This is important because the most recent seventy-five years of American history that is taught in classrooms cannot be analyzed. The way in which curriculum reformers address more recent conservative or liberal eras might add credence to the purposes they have for creating the materials in the first place.

Second, a small number of the resources were impossible to locate. Although I had meetings with the Interlibrary Loan staff at Auburn University, I was not able to obtain copies of a small number of resources through that process. I also attempted to purchase personal copies of the texts, but due to publication date, they were no longer available. Nonetheless, I believe I have incorporated enough representative examples to

ensure typicality. However, because some were not available, I cannot state with certainty that those materials would not alter my analysis.

A third limitation to my study involves interviews. Due to the time period of some of the curricula, I was not able to interview participants who are now deceased or otherwise incapacitated. While the theoretical framework writings and other research pieces were informative, I believe the inclusion of more interviews could have had a significant impact on the outcomes of my research.

The number of curriculum materials created for classroom use over the last one hundred and twenty-five years is extensive. Therefore, the inclusion of only four curricula is a limitation, too. While I have chosen to focus on momentous periods of American history to counter this limitation, other curricula might have yielded different results. Moreover, the momentous periods I selected may not be considered momentous to others.

The last major limitation of my study is the development of an a priori framework. My a priori framework was based on logical assumptions about social studies curriculum reform. However, those assumptions that were accepted to create the heuristic associated with this study might have caused me to regard the categories that emerged as concrete rather than fluid. In effect, this could cause me to steer my analysis of data in ways that fit nicely into the categories. That would obviously skew the data in a way that weakened my findings.

Attempts to mitigate study limitations

Since I understood the importance of analyzing a broad range of content materials rather than limit my study to American Revolution content, I used a range of content

examples for each curriculum set. The incorporation of analysis that focused on each individual curriculum set allowed me to include a wider array of materials that were published by each project. If I limited my analysis to the American Revolution only, I would have minimized the importance of investigating a more complete body of materials. While inferences can be made by evaluating one content area, the opportunity to include multiple content areas aids in confirming the reliability of the rationale and purpose of each curriculum set.

The value of interviewing participants as part of a qualitative study can be vital to the overall analysis in a study. However, some individuals associated with the projects which are part of my study were not available for conversation. Therefore, I was able to find a variety of secondary source interviews. The information gleaned from those interviews proved invaluable to this study. Had I not opted to use such an opportunity, I would have undoubtedly denied my study an important data source.

In an effort to ensure that I did not attempt to fit the data within my heuristic, I decided early on that the heuristic would only be an organizational tool for my thinking. That is why it is established, discussed, and highlighted in chapter two. By reviewing the vast number of theorists that I studied from the outset of my study, I saw some tendencies in the century-long debate that those theorists discussed generally. However, the work of theorists left some doubts for me on how to effectively analyze and organize the ever-present debate. Therefore, I refocused my work from a continuum to a heuristic. The heuristic simply gives me a benchmark for understanding what each curriculum developer might have been trying to accomplish with their materials. The heuristic will

not be the source of the analysis. Rather, the heuristic will be a tool to aid me in my understanding of the debate and those involved in it.

The debate over social studies curriculum reform has been a tumultuous one over the last century. Many theorists have developed valid rationales for why they believe their purpose for a particular social studies curriculum is most useful in preparing students to be productive citizens. The reason I exhausted so much time and effort in my review of the literature to contextualize the social studies reform movement was to give the reader a sense of just how contentious the issue of curriculum reform was and is. The effort to provide a broad account of social studies curriculum reform was also important as a way of establishing the milieu in which “innovative” curriculum materials were created. Once the context was established, the inclusion of materials that offered a wide range of social studies content was selected.

#### Transitioning to the Data Analysis

The analysis reporting portion of my study is not detailed in the traditional sense. Whereas most dissertations present the data analysis in Chapter Four, my dissertation’s data analysis is divided into four chapters. For clarity and understanding, I have chosen to present each critical case in its own distinct chapter. Therefore, chapters four through seven of my dissertation comprise the data analysis. The critical cases are aligned in chronological order starting with Rugg’s Social-Science Course (chapter four). The remaining three chapters are presented as follows: the Amherst Project (chapter five), the Harvard Social Studies Project (chapter six), and Teachers’ Curriculum Institute (chapter seven).

Each critical case chapter begins with a brief synopsis of the materials under investigation. A general overview, statement of the underlying principles, and a brief description of the curriculum materials are identified in order to contextualize the curriculum materials. Additionally, a table of the materials under review as part of my investigation is presented in each chapter. Once the historical contextualization has been established, I delve directly into the content analysis of each critical case. As was stated previously, the focus of the content analysis portion of the presentation on the categories of Presentation and Content. Each category has its own themes that emerged from the data analysis. Those themes are discussed individually in each of the four chapters. Moreover, the themes are addressed comparatively in Chapter Eight. Chapter Eight consists of my findings and recommendations

## CHAPTER 4: THE RUGG SOCIAL-SCIENCE COURSE<sup>1</sup>

### **Historical Contextualization**

#### Overview

As the 1930s and the Great Depression arrived, urbanization continued to raise concerns for the survival of American democracy. For example, people began to question the legitimacy of American institutions such as the government, the economic system, and education. These issues coupled with the possibility of another world war left many Americans concerned about the future of the United States. Progressive education flourished well into the 1930s as a response to traditional education. Harold Rugg has often been identified as the leading progressive educator during its formative years of the 1920s. Rugg argued that Americans had to understand that education is the driving governmental force in a democracy. Rugg and other educational theorists felt strongly that society needed to address its problems especially those initiated from capitalism and industrialization. Although Rugg did not support all its views, he was profoundly influenced by the idea of technocracy in the 1930s. Rugg saw a need for social engineers who would devise and manage the economy in the best interest of the American public. He believed that a system of production and distribution had to be created which would produce the greatest sum of goods needed by Americans. This

---

<sup>1</sup> While a minimal number of the sources can be found in the References section, many of the citations for the Rugg Social-Science Course curriculum materials can be found in Appendix B.



differs from the current free market because Rugg held that the goods produced should be distributed so that everyone would have the opportunity to live above their existing standard of living. Rugg decided one way to prepare young people to rally around this goal was by restructuring the social studies curriculum. Rugg created a six-volume series whose purpose was to teach students the history of civilizations and comprehend the realities of modern life such as the growth of cities and the working conditions in factories. By understanding the realities of modern life, Rugg felt students would see that people mattered, thus provoking a change from within every individual to want to re-create society from a top-down structure to one with justice for all citizens (Rugg, 1933; Rugg, 1931b).

The Rugg Social-Science Course was cultivated in four developmental phases. The first edition was produced in 1921-1922 using a mimeograph. While the number of school systems that used it were likely minimal in comparison to subsequent editions, this version of materials was influential in the process of dissemination because it served as the foundation for teachers who used Rugg's materials. The second experimentation occurred in over 100 school systems in 1922-1923 and included printed books. Between 1923 and 1929, over 300 school systems used the Social Science Pamphlets in their schools. While the Social Science Pamphlets were also printed books, they consisted of an entirely reorganized version of the second phase of Rugg's curriculum development project. In excess of 600,000 students in over 40 states experienced these pamphlets over this six-plus year period. These three editions culminated in the creation of the Rugg Social-Science Course. The Rugg Social-Science Course curriculum materials are the focal point of this portion of the data analysis (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

As Harold Rugg began to vocalize his belief that American society should move toward some version of collectivism, scrutiny arose around him. Moreover, Rugg's speeches, articles, and comments against patriotic organizations such as the American Legion made him and his curriculum materials an even larger target for attacks. Specifically, Rugg voiced his distaste publicly for the American Legion because of their efforts to censor a school magazine. Rugg increased his public criticisms of the American Legion and other organizations thereafter which made him a primary target for attacks. Such public comments meshed with Rugg's efforts to address in his curriculum materials the threats of censorship and propaganda to American democratic society (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg was not alone in his views or the attacks levied by patriotic organizations. These organizations overtly pursued any individuals or groups who they believed to be un-American whether they were or not. To these organizations, un-American might be defined as anyone who questioned the basic tenets of American society and her capitalistic, economic system. Many of his progressive education colleagues and "new historians" such as Charles Beard were criticized publicly. They were mocked in newspaper editorials and cartoons as communists. State legislatures passed laws requiring the incorporation of traditional patriotic lessons and practices in schools. Advertising even began to focus more on improving the society's view of capitalism rather than simply selling a product (Evans, 2004).

The attacks against Rugg and his social science course were protracted. The initial phase of assaults accused Rugg of being a Communist who supported socialism. Additionally, he was said to be against private enterprise. The second wave of attacks blamed Rugg for the increase of radical youth organizations. The textbooks and practices

associated with the Rugg Social-Science Course were cited as the chief causes for the promotion of a collectivist society to the youth of America. The final episode of attacks on Rugg was likely the most damning. A report published by the National Association of Manufacturers alleged that a large portion of the 600 social science textbooks used in American public schools were critical of democracy and free enterprise. Moreover, the books purportedly tended to convey the weaknesses of American democracy rather than what the nation had achieved. The findings of the NAM report heightened the attacks on Rugg's curriculum again in the early 1940s (Evans, 2006; Riley, 2006; Evans, 2004).

The popular press undoubtedly affected the viewpoint of several school systems that had adopted the Rugg Social-Science Course as part of their school or system-wide curriculum. Although the outcome of the controversy varied from place to place, there were documented cases of systems that banned Rugg's materials because of their "subversive" nature. In fact, there were published reports that in some locations around the nation the books were publicly burned. On the other hand, if success is measured by quantity of sales, Rugg's curriculum series has to be considered largely triumphant for at least a period of time. In the decade of the 1930s, over 1.3 million reading books were sold. In the same time span, over 2.6 million pupil workbooks were sold. Furthermore, organizations came to the defense of the Rugg social science materials. Committees such as the Academic Freedom Committee of NCSS and the Council of the American Historical Association drafted materials and statements that supported the use of questions and controversy in the teaching of social studies (Evan, 2006; Riley, 2006; Evans, 2004).

## Underlying principles

Much of Harold Rugg's work was influenced by the work of "frontier thinkers," such as Thorstein Veblen, John Dewey, Charles Beard and his "new historian" counterparts. These were American and European researchers who studied the psychological foundations of industrialism. Rugg was most heavily influenced by those of American descent. So much so, in fact, that he requested for these experts to provide him with the most prominent books from their respective fields. Rugg's curriculum development team siphoned through the suggested materials and developed fifteen factors for social studies curriculum. One example of the fifteen factors is as follows: "unregulated power over communication, government, and wealth by a minority unwilling to make changes in the social system to create more equity" (Stern, 2006). To Rugg, the methodology his team used for curriculum development was scientific in nature, thus objective. However, the inclusion of only those texts that were important to the frontier thinkers as a basis for his curriculum might refute that claim and show bias on Rugg's part. Nevertheless, the theoretical underpinnings were influential to Rugg's Social Science Course. Taking the theoretical work of Beard as an example, Beard believed that political, social, and particularly economic forces of a historical era manipulated and controlled history. For Beard, history was written and understood in terms of current problems and potential for the future. In essence, what was taught (and learned) was an expression of a given culture and society existing at a specific point in history in a precise location. Additionally, Beard held that political institutions were fundamentally formed by the economic interests of those who instituted and had power

over them (Evans, 2006; Gutek, 2006; Stern, 2006; Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977; Cremin, 1964).

Rugg argued that three specific principles arose from the work of frontier thinkers such as Beard. The three principles were as follows: a focus on the expansion of modern culture, the thinking behind decision making, and the fusion of knowledge through social studies. Rugg believed the incorporation of these principles into a curriculum framework would help students clarify the present and how it came to be. Moreover, he thought the principles would better prepare students to participate in social progress. For example, the frontier thinkers pressed for an investigation of everyday life; the history of industry and work; the influences social, economic, and political changes have on society; and a study of the “common man.” The frontier thinkers argued that by understanding how recent history has changed, students will better understand the progression of modern culture. Additionally, the frontier thinkers wanted students to grasp the importance of decision-making in society. Therefore, they sought opportunities for students to engage in the history of thought as a means for promoting intellectual liberty to foster progress. Lastly, the frontier thinkers believed that students should gain knowledge from what Rugg identified as “separate school subjects” (Rugg, 1931c). However, the frontier thinkers and Rugg advocated “the necessity of combining them [all subjects] into one course” because they “must be tied closely together in their natural relationships...to understand any institution or condition of life today [because] the mind must utilize facts, meanings, generalizations, and historical movements” (Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b, Rugg, 1931c). In order for Rugg to successfully implement these principles into a curriculum, he believed that he had to create a more innovative course which encompassed

dramatized episodes, revisiting of concepts, learning to generalize and learning by doing. Subsequent sections of this analysis will offer examples of how Rugg incorporated these principles into content selection will addressed (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Rugg, 1936; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b).

Four elements made Rugg's social science course innovative compared to others of its time. First, it promoted the notion of a unified course in social science. The course's main objective was to help students understand modern life and how it was developed. In order to accomplish this goal, Rugg believed that history, geography, civics, economics, and the like had to be integrated into one course. Rugg argued that "all these factors must be tied closely together in their natural relationship. Hence the necessity of combining them into one general course instead of teaching them as separate subjects" (Rugg, 1931). Oftentimes these subjects had been taught separately. Rugg's social science course sought to prepare students to understand the modern world and required combining all components of the social sciences into one cohesive curriculum (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

The second characteristic was the use of "dramatic episodes." Rugg's episodic approach to history was incorporated to replace the repetitious, regurgitation of facts that he felt was included in most other school texts. The "dramatic episode" embellished the historical accounts of the past in an effort to make the exhaustive amount of reading more appealing to secondary students. For example, in *Changing Civilizations in the Modern World*, an explanation of the formation of trading companies is couched within the context of what British merchants might experience rather than just giving factual information about trading companies. The text included information about attacks by

pirates, loss of merchants' lives, and other information typically appealing to young people. Rugg himself noted that the readings included in his course were voluminous as compared to the traditional textbook of the time. Additionally, the episodes were accompanied by a multitude of maps, graphs, and pictures (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

“Learning by doing” was the atypical novel feature of the Rugg Social-Science Course. The inclusion of problem-solving activities that were stimulating for students was considered one of the innovative components of this curriculum. Rugg’s incorporation of the Pupil’s Workbook of Directed Study sought to provide students with such an opportunity. The workbook presented students with a sequence of problems. Each unit required students to answer multiple questions associated with problems of the modern world. This goal attempted to bring Rugg’s main purpose – “active and intelligent participation in American civilization and tolerant understanding of other civilizations” (Rugg, 1931) – full circle. Rugg believed that students grew as learners by actively engaging in the study of societal issues. Student recitation of facts was not enough to prepare them to participate in bettering the societies of the modern, industrialized world (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

The fourth and final component of the Rugg Social-Science Course was “planned repetition.” The planned repetition was centered on significant ideas, overviews, and subject matter. As was previously referenced, these concepts and generalizations were established through Rugg’s examination of the texts of specified disciplines as suggested by the “frontier thinkers.” Rugg’s use of graphs, maps, narratives, and pictures, offered the opportunity for repetitious exposure to those principles that he incorporated into his

curriculum. The key for the curriculum developers was that the reoccurrence be in a variety of learning situations (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

In the literature review and the methods chapter, I described a heuristic for viewing the long-running debate over the social studies curriculum. The heuristic proposed three general tendencies based upon how one answers four essential questions:

- What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- What is a good, democratic citizen?
- How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

The critical tendency principally identifies an ideal democracy as one that allows all citizens to have equal access and influence. To attain this would require major fundamental changes in current societal structures. The critical tendency largely views the good, democratic citizen as one who actively participates in society by involving themselves in actions that challenge the status quo. The best way to develop this type of citizen would be to expose students to situations which require them to grapple with societal problems that prepare them to question issues of power and equity in society today. The critical tendency's vision of history's role within the mission of social studies is that history is more about overarching patterns than knowing specific dates and places because there are many versions of history. Rugg's public statements suggest views typical of the critical tendency. Does an analysis of his curriculum materials reflect critical sentiments?

#### Description of the Rugg Social-Science Course Materials

This course included a series of six "Reading Books" and supplementary "Workbooks of Directed Study." Additionally, each reading book was accompanied by a



“Teacher’s Guide.” The major objective of Rugg’s materials was to “introduce the pupil to world civilizations and their history so that students might enact a social transformation of America” (Rugg, 1937; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930a; Rugg, 1930b; Rugg, 1929). For example, Rugg spent a considerable amount of time in the later volumes promoting a carefully planned American society: A society in which the people, rather than a chosen few, controlled virtually every aspect of society from advertising up to a national income for all.

A list of all those materials that were surveyed as part of this study follows. All the reading books from Rugg’s curriculum were secured. However, the same can not be said for the pupil’s workbooks and teacher’s guides. I included a “y” in the columns of those materials that were examined.

Table 3

Data Sources from the Rugg Social Science Course

Reading Book	Teacher’s Guide	Pupil’s Workbook	Copyright Year
Changing Governments and Changing Cultures: The World’s March toward Democracy			1931
A History of American Government and Culture: America’s March toward Democracy	Y	Y	1931
An Introduction to Problems of American Culture	Y	Y	1931
Changing Civilizations in the Modern World: A Textbook in World Geography with Historical Backgrounds	Y	Y	1930
A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social	Y	Y	1930
An Introduction to American Civilization: A Study of Economic Life in the United States			1929

*An Introduction to American Civilization*, the first reading book in the series, focused on the influences the economy had on society at the time the curriculum was written. The second book, *Changing Civilizations in the Modern World*, broadened the scope by surveying societal and economic factors of other nations. *A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social* is the third volume in the Rugg Social Science series. It focused on the effects commercialization, agriculture, and industrialization had on America. *A History of American Government and Culture*, which is the fourth text, addressed the trial and error processes of American democracy. The fifth volume, *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*, studied how individual persons functioned in their respective communities before, during, and after American society became more industrialized. The sixth and final volume, *Changing Governments and Changing Cultures*, presented many of the social, political, and economic problems faced by other important countries throughout the world (Rugg, 1937; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930a; Rugg, 1930b; Rugg, 1929).

### **Content Analysis**

The content analysis portion of this study encompasses structural and critical analyses. This segment of the analysis is divided into three sections: Presentation of Materials, Content, and An In-depth Analysis of Rugg's Treatment of the American Revolution. The structural analysis initially provides the reader with an overview of how the materials were organized. Next, how students' experiences influence learning according to Rugg is addressed. Lastly in the structural analysis, Rugg's emphasis on the importance of structure in relation to content is addressed. Within each section are sub-sections that encompass the overarching themes associated with the Rugg Social-Science

Course curriculum materials. These themes provide a broad representation of the overall Rugg Series and offer a glimpse of the likely anticipated functions of the Series and its developers. A critical analysis of Rugg's materials was completed by conducting an in-depth analysis of his treatment of the American Revolution. Using the guiding questions mentioned throughout my study, I will show how Rugg might answer each of the four questions.

#### Presentation of Materials

The Rugg Social-Science Course upheld a stable methodology in the presentation of the six reading books, pupil's workbooks, and teacher's guides that structured the materials. As I surveyed these curriculum materials, four themes continually arose that related to the presentation of materials. In the sections that follow, I will present those themes and the evidence that supports their reappearance throughout the curriculum. The four themes are: units of work; themes, cue concepts, and basic generalizations; the program of pupil activities; and central problems, questions and/or issues. Each is discussed in greater detail in the sub-sections that follow.

#### Units of Work

The authors established units of work as a key organizational element of the course when they noted, "this new course in the social studies is organized in a series of definite units of work" (Rugg, 1929a). The units of work are divided into two kinds of information: historical and contemporary. The number of "units" varies from volume to volume in the Rugg Social-Science Course. Nonetheless, the units of work offered an excellent structural technique for teachers and students to grasp the content under study. The unit of work approach was beneficial from a categorization standpoint in all three

major components of the course – the Reading Book, the Workbook, and the Teacher’s Guide. By dividing the information in this manner, the materials were easier to follow and likely more manageable for those who taught with these curriculum materials. For example, the *Teacher’s Guide for An Introduction to Problems of American Culture* highlighted the seven units associated with the reading book, *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*, and its accompanying pupil workbook.

The Teacher’s Guide provided a rationale for the inclusion of content. For instance, it stated that “Unit III deals with the American and his work by discussing the role of the job in the life of the average man, the increase in unemployment and the lack of planning which caused it, and scientific planning in industry” (Rugg, 1932). Later on in the Teacher’s Guide, chapter nine discussed in-depth how the teacher should attack the unit of work. The theme for this unit focused specifically on how work groups influence Americans. The teacher’s guide also provided a list of fifteen important concepts that should be developed in this unit of work. An illustration of the concepts associated with this unit of work was “the central role of the job in the life of every person” (Rugg, 1932). The Teacher’s Guide, Reading Book, and Workbook offered students the opportunity to learn, read, and discuss why jobs are so crucial to people. For example, teachers were encouraged to have students conduct surveys in their local communities to better understand the relationship between occupations and unemployment. In fact, the Teacher’s Guide offered suggestions for questions to be asked in the survey. Then the developers transitioned into their purpose(s) for this particular unit of work. First, the notion that increased unemployment was related to the amplified use of machinery to complete jobs was conveyed through readings and discussion. Then, the developers

included what they called in the Teacher's Guide, "the central problem: how to plan the distribution of labor and income among the people" (Rugg, 1932). In essence, the author was focused on what he saw as a major problem at the time – planning. Planning was the focus of the next unit of work in this particular semester long course. The unit on planning will be addressed in greater detail in the final section of this chapter because it provided a typical example of Rugg's vision for social studies' development of a good, democratic citizen.

#### Themes, Cue Concepts, and Basic Generalizations

In the rationale for the development of the Social-Science Course curriculum materials, Rugg stated, "Mastery of the material in the course...should concentrate upon *understanding* the chief themes, concepts, and generalizations, and understanding will be indicated only when a pupil can *illustrate* clearly each of these" (Rugg, 1932). Chapter Two of the Teacher's Guides highlighted the themes, concepts, and generalizations associated with each semester's set of materials. In fact, the authors clearly stated that "the teacher should understand, therefore, that themes, concepts, and generalizations are the basic *intellectual* skeleton of this course" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). While each volume had its own focal points, the Teacher's Guide attempted to bring to light for the teacher the central themes of a particular semester's work. To convey the importance of themes, concepts, and generalizations upon the Rugg Social-Science Course curriculum materials, I will use chapter two of the *Teacher's Guide for A History of American Civilization Economic and Social*.

Chapter Two of each Teacher's Guide neatly presented the ideals of the volume under review. Rugg believed that students had to repetitively be acquainted with content.

At the beginning of the chapter that discussed themes, Rugg declared, “Throughout his study the pupil should be constantly oriented with respect to American civilization and the factors which produced it. To guarantee that, this course has been definitely organized about the chief trends or historical movements and the chief themes of contemporary life in American civilization” (Rugg, 1931b). Moreover, Rugg acknowledged the influence themes had on his selection of content included in his volumes of work. He stated in the Teacher’s Guides, “It is of the utmost importance that the teacher understand clearly the manner in which these themes have controlled the choice of content and the organization of material” (Rugg, 1931b). These often repeated statements exemplified just how important this portion of the materials was to the overall presentation of materials. Rugg included fifteen statements in the Teacher’s Guide that were the basic economic themes of modern civilization by which that course, *A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social*, were organized around. One example of the themes included is “the rapid rise in the economic standard of living produced by the Industrial Revolution” (Rugg, 1931b).

The chapters in the Teacher’s Guides that focused on themes also addressed the significance of cue concepts on the curriculum. The section stated, “both teachers and pupils need to have ‘cue meanings,’ catch phrases, which sum up succinctly many meanings; for example, ‘standard of living,’ ‘changing civilization,’ ‘industrial country,’ and ‘agricultural civilization.’ To each of these cue meanings of broad scope we give the convenient name concept. Each of these is a summarizing term – an abbreviated symbol – which stands for a great wealth of meaning and with which we do our thinking” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). The curriculum developers

highlighted the important concepts in each Unit of Work chapter throughout the teacher's guides. An example of these concepts was presented in the previous section.

Basic generalizations were a "third means of organizing the course" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). To the curriculum developers, "a generalization is merely a statement of relationship between two or more concepts" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). Four of the five Teacher's Guides surveyed as part of my research used the same example of city life to convey what the purpose of generalizations were. Generalizations were important to Rugg's curriculum because students had to successfully understand how certain concepts might relate across subject areas to better know how they were interrelated in society. In this instance the example presented facts that seemed to strongly influence the growth of cities. The curriculum creators prompted teachers to use the outline of activities to foster growth in understanding the generalizations of each unit.

#### The Program of Pupil Activities

Early on in the course's theoretical framework the point was made that "learning is an active, assimilative process" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1929). A major tenet of the Rugg Social-Science Course was that "the social studies is essentially a stream of pupil activities" (Rugg, 1932). Therefore, the author dedicated an entire chapter in the teacher's guides and pupil workbook for each reading book to incorporate a massive amount of activities into the course. By and large the chapter was a theoretical justification for why and how activities should be incorporated into a classroom that used the Rugg Social-Science Course for its curriculum. One of the primary factors in this

curriculum was that the onus was on the student in terms of growth personally and intellectually.

Largely this chapter tied the Teacher's Guide and Pupil Workbook together in conjunction with the Reading Book. For instance, there is a chart in the Teacher's Guide which was intended to help teachers know and understand how individual and group activities related to the units of work and the problems upon which those units were focusing. Additionally, the chapter sought to provide detailed organization for teachers who used the curriculum. This arrangement set the foundation for the use of the Pupil's Workbook. The curriculum developers cautioned against following the materials systematically. In fact, the authors pressed for adaptability among classes and activities. So much so that they stated, "the teacher should regard the Reading Book, the Workbook, and the Teacher's Guide merely as a wealth of optional suggestions, as a comprehensive list of activities from which to develop a vital and stimulating semester's work" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

The last major duty of the chapter on pupil activities was to offer a justification for the use of various instructional techniques. Rugg argued that a variety of methods would help students in their quest to master the content in the Rugg curriculum series. Without repetition and variation, Rugg believed that students might be ill-prepared to express the knowledge they gained while studying his curriculum. In the *Teacher's Guide for Changing Civilizations in the Modern World* five methods were discussed extensively: objective tests, time lines, map exercises, open forums, and reading of reference books and other texts (Rugg, 1930).



## Central Problems, Questions, and/or Issues

The curriculum developers of the Rugg Social-Science Course asked themselves the following question from the outset, “What is necessary in order to organize activities and materials in the social studies in such a way that they shall stimulate thinking?” (Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). Their response was to create a course that required thought and organize it “around issues, problems, and unanswered questions” (Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1929). All three focus areas seemed to be used interchangeably by the curriculum developers. The “problem” was ultimately the overarching issue being studied. The questions helped “to guide the study of each of these problems, two or three central questions are asked” (Rugg, 1931a).

The materials related to *A History of American Government and Culture* will be used as a model for how problems, questions, and issues were incorporated into the curriculum (Rugg, 1931a). There were thirty problems recommended by the curriculum developers. The Units of Work in the *Teacher’s Guide* specifically laid out the problems related to each unit. For example, Problem II was “How were the Early Colonies governed?” (Rugg, 1931a). In the *Reading Book*, Chapter Two was entitled “How the Early Colonies were governed” (Rugg, 1931a). It provided students with pertinent information to address the problems that students were learning about. The *Teacher’s Guide* suggested that students first read the chapter hastily. Then it encouraged students to read quickly and search for themes, concepts, and generalizations. The *Pupil’s Workbook* offered students the opportunity to engage in fact-based questions, multiple choice questions, the development of a term time line, and questions for an open forum discussion.

## Content

The Content associated with the Rugg Social-Science Course was standard across units. There were two broader sections that emerged from the Rugg Series: experiences and structure. Experiential learning was important to the curriculum developers. They stated in the Teacher's Guides that "the work of the social studies must be shot through with as much first-hand experience as possible...only by much first-hand experience – excursion, observation, vivid discussion – will he achieve a true understanding of the social world" (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). There were three recurring themes associated with experiences: learning by doing, series of experiences, and an "intensive study of a few matters". The curriculum creators viewed organization to be just as important as experiences. Although they noted that "it will be difficult to organize the course clearly," (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929) the detail of the curriculum designers expressed the magnitude of structure as it related to the content. There were three frequently noticed topics related to structure: vivid, dramatically-interesting materials; "every agency of expression"; and understanding units. In the following sub-sections, these six recurring themes are addressed.

## Experiences

"Learning by doing" was a hallmark of the Rugg Social-Science Course. It is the first of three "experiences" in which the developers wanted students to engage.

"Learning by doing" was discussed in the *Preface* of all of the *Reading Books*. It was addressed in the *Psychological Basis of the Course* in all of the *Teacher's Guides*. And in the judgment of the curriculum developers, it was enacted through the creation of the

*Pupil's Workbooks.* The manner in which the curriculum conveyed this goal was “essentially [as] a stream of activities, a succession of things for the pupil to do. There is widespread reading from books, magazines, and newspapers; the vigorous interplay of minds in open forum and debate; the original preparation of briefs, outlines, summaries, and criticisms; the invention of new graphic methods of portraying the important facts and principles of how people live together” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). The developers viewed this methodology conversely to that of the “older” courses where students simply had to memorize facts without carrying the process one step further and engaging in any activities. By engaging in these activities, Rugg believed that students would gain a better understand of the modern world, the problems that are associated with it, and that they would have the opportunity to practice the decision-making process to find solutions to those problems. While the Workbooks were presented in the Presentation of Materials portion of this analysis, they served as more than just an organizational tool.

The notion that “the course must consist of a carefully graduated series of experiences” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929) is the second experiential component of engaging in the content of the Rugg Social-Science Course. This ideal is closely allied with that of “learning by doing.” However, in my analysis of the materials I viewed the “graduated series of experiences” from a broader perspective. In essence, the “learning by doing” approach was focused on engaging students, through activities in the Pupil’s Workbook, with the material in the Reading Books. On the other hand, a “series of experiences” was similar to scaffolding students in content from the foundational level of knowledge up to the level where students can

synthesize using the knowledge they gained. My estimation is that the “series of experiences” were created and/or made available by the teacher for students to practice while working through a unit of the Rugg Social Science Course. Moreover, the units of work built upon each other. For example, *Changing Governments and Changing Cultures: The World’s March toward Democracy* began with a unit introducing the “storm centers of the world” (Rugg, 1932). This unit talked about dictatorships, problems between Asia and Europe, and the issues that arose in industrial nations. The chapter concluded with a section of “important topics and questions which will guide our study” (Rugg, 1932). The second unit provided a background on western democracy. The third and fourth units focused specifically on England, France, and Germany and the movement toward democracy. The later units focus on how the earth was “Europeanized” and a World War was started by the industrialized countries of the world (Rugg, 1932). It could be argued that the Rugg Social Science Course curriculum associated many of the world’s problems with the rapid industrialization throughout the world. This brief narrative on *Changing Governments and Changing Cultures* also shows how a series of experiences with the content helped students as they “encounter new situations, new personalities, or new problems...each new experience with them modifies the attitudes which we had previously assumed toward them, infuses new shades of meaning, or elaborates or reconstructs concepts which we had of them. Steadily the stream of experiences which make up the educative process shapes and reshapes understanding” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). The Rugg curriculum suggested that this shaping and reshaping was intended to alter students’ perceptions and views away from the status quo and towards a

transformation of America as a nation that placed more control into the hands of all of her citizenry.

The last area related to experiences that was repeatedly cited throughout the curriculum materials was the need for “intensive study of a few matters” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). These “few matters” are what make up the six volume course known as the Rugg Social Science Course. The curriculum designers declared this in their writings when they stated, “The examples which constitute the nucleus of this new course have been chosen on the basis of careful analyses of adult needs, of scientific studies of learning, and of the judgment of authorities in history, geography, government, economics, etc.” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). The best way to explain how the course accomplished selecting what content to include is by providing a typical example. Many courses at the time required students to memorize and regurgitate a multitude of locations on a map. The Rugg Course minimized the geographic locations to include only those that specifically related to the content being learned. Likewise, the content selection for the overall material was condensed to those topics that were most important to the overall understanding of the development and growth of the United States. At the time the Rugg curriculum materials were being developed industrialization, growth of cities, and other issues related to those topics were of great significance. Therefore, much of the Rugg Social Studies Course was centered on having students engage in content materials associated to those current events of the time period so that students might be better prepared to tackle the issues of the day. Rugg’s speeches and curriculum suggest his

answer to societal problems was a complete overhaul that placed more control in the hands of the masses and provided a better standard of living for all Americans.

### Structure

Dramatic episodes that offered vivid examples of the country and world were a feature of the Rugg materials. Materials that provided a vivid, dramatically interesting illustration of the issues being studied were common of the Rugg Social Science Course curriculum. The rationale behind such materials was founded on the belief that few people were able to venture outside their own communities. Therefore, it was hard for students to fully accept or understand when they learned about another region of the country or world. Consequently, the curriculum developers of the Rugg materials thought if they structured units and chapters around pictures and dramatic writings that they would have a better chance at enticing students to engage themselves in the materials.

The second area of content that offered structure to the materials was the inclusion of “every agency of expression” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). This rationale was the cornerstone of the Rugg Social Science Course’s focus on a variety of activities for students. This approach to content is different from content in the traditional sense. The curriculum designers argued that “the use of moving pictures and other pictorial illustration will contribute concrete imagery to the development of understanding. Paralleling the vivid word portrayals of social and economic life there will be a wealth of problem material evoked by the conditions met in the study” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). The sort of alternative approaches that the developers sought to use more of were research

statistics and individual research by students. Specifically, the Course encouraged students to grapple with quantitative statistics that show how the modern world was ever-changing (Rugg, 1931c).

The last recurring structural topic of the Rugg Social Science Course curriculum materials was the use of “understanding units”. The basis for organizing understanding units centered on one question: “What facts, generalizations, and historical materials do young people need to know to understand the topic under consideration?” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929). For instance, the Reading Book entitled *A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social* was developed to aid students in learning about each civilization. Therefore, each unit focused on economic or social aspects of civilization. Unit VII honed in on economic concerns by discussing industry in the North and the Cotton Kingdom in the South. Conversely, Unit II touched on the social aspect of European settlement of the New World. Each unit and chapters within the units had their own purposes in helping students better understand the concepts of economic and social civilizations. Whether it was conveying facts about how European settlements were established or how geography affected economic growth, each unit demonstrated important information about America that would ultimately help the student as they learned about the issues related to the chapters (Rugg, 1930b).

#### An In-depth Analysis of the Rugg Course’s Treatment of the American Revolution

A focus on one curriculum topic provides the opportunity for a critical analysis of the text and subtext of the Rugg curriculum materials. Three of the six Reading Book volumes included content on the American Revolution. Due to the set up of the Rugg Social Science course – volumes that are divided incrementally by semester – the

inclusion of content on the American Revolution was confined to those books in which the broader topics related to the American Revolution and the issues surrounding the war. Volumes III, IV, and V were the Reading Books that included content on the American Revolution. Consistently throughout the analysis of Rugg's Social Science Course curriculum, the Reading Books demonstrated historical narratives that infused Rugg critical tendencies. Oftentimes the Reading Books conveyed critical tendencies more subtly. However, the accompanying Teacher's Guides more overtly prompted teachers to address the broader topics and problems through a more critical lens.

*An Introduction to the Problems of American Culture*, volume V, used the American Revolution to express how "in times of war constitutional guaranties of civil liberty are declared of no effect" (Rugg, 1931b). *A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social* provided more content about the war, especially the Battle of Lexington and Concord. Likewise, the Pupil's Workbook offered the students opportunities to engage in activities to better understand the American Revolution. For instance, students were required to answer through reading and discussion the following questions: "What main events led to the American Revolution? What classes of people in England and in America were responsible for the Revolution? What were the important outcomes of the Revolutionary War?" (Rugg and Mendenhall, 1930b). Some additional activities included writing a play about the American Revolution, drawing a cartoon, and the chronological ordering of events related to the war. The Unit of Work in which this content was included was entitled "America's First Steps Toward Democracy." The Problem was "What Were America's First Steps Toward Democracy?" (Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1930b; Rugg and Mendenhall, 1930b).



The volume in the Rugg Social Science Course with the most emphasis on the American Revolution was *A History of American Government and Culture: America's March toward Democracy*. This provided an entire unit of work related to the American Revolution and the events that fomented it. This unit of work revolved around the theme of conflict, in this case between the colonists and British Parliament. The second sub-section was entitled "Wealth and available money" (Rugg, 1931a). This section compared wealth in England with wealth in the colonies. Additionally, Rugg highlighted how machinery in England allowed faster production and more growth of wealth among the middle class. Rugg's discussion of the colonies was centered on the potential for wealth in America. Rugg also focused on how the lack of a national currency complicated the colonies' problems. Poor leadership by the Continental Congress and its financial appointees were also of grave concern to Rugg. Ultimately Rugg's intent was to show, "that in wealth and available money, as well as in other respects, the thirteen colonies were weak compared with Great Britain" (Rugg, 1931). In the third sub-section Rugg noted that Great Britain was able to hire 30,000 German Hessians because "although Great Britain had difficulty in finding among her own people those who were willing to fight the colonies, because of her wealth she could hire soldiers when her own people would not enlist" (Rugg, 1931a). In comparing the strengths of Great Britain with the colonies, Rugg often turned to the issues that most troubled the colonies instead. The concerns were largely centered on money and sustenance (Rugg, 1931a).

The section, "A Brief History of the War Itself" was chiefly factual in nature and presentation. This portion of the content talked briefly about three campaigns of the American Revolution. Each campaign was addressed regionally and chronologically.

Rugg placed great emphasis on “the terrible suffering at Valley Forge” in the interim. Rugg offered an eye-opening depiction of the Continental Army at Valley Forge, even including an excerpt from Washington’s and another officer’s diaries. Then Rugg heavily critiqued the Continental Congress stating it “was often inefficient and sometimes unable to enforce its decisions” (Rugg, 1931a).

The Teacher’s Guide that accompanied this Reading Book exhibited much more of the agenda Rugg had for teachers and students. For example, the Teacher’s Guide suggested that teachers “treat the War for Independence essentially as an economic struggle between the ruling classes of England and of the colonies. Emphasize the resources of the two sides. Make much of important facts concerning the economic and social groups which supported the war. Correspondingly, devote little time to the battles themselves. If the pupils wish, let them read accounts of these in other books for the dramatic interest” (Rugg, 1931a). Another example of the Teacher’s Guides’ forthright approach was identified in the Teacher’s Guide for *Unit II: The Struggle for Self-Government: 1660-1783* which stated that the unit “revolves around another conflict, that between the colonists and the British Parliament” (Rugg, 1931a). This conflict followed the focus of Unit I which was centered on property owners and the masses. Rugg encouraged teachers to highlight “that for more than a hundred years the men of wealth – the merchants, the leading planters, and the shipowners of the colonies – were in conflict with the leaders of the British Parliament” (Rugg, 1931a). The premise of this conflict as expressed by Rugg was that throughout time the common man had virtually nothing to do with this conflict. Rather, the elite were those that were heavily opposed to Parliament and her legislation. Therefore, Rugg wanted “the economic basis of the political fight”

understood (Rugg, 1931a). Additionally, Rugg wanted emphasis placed on the notion that in England “leaders practically controlled the entire government in the interest of the merchant class” (Rugg, 1931a).

This Teacher’s Guide introduced ten concepts that were focused on one topic – that there was a struggle between the “rising middle class of private capitalists [who] controlled the government in England” and “a corresponding class of private capitalists [who] controlled the government in each of the colonies in America” (Rugg, 1931a). Rugg expressed his desire to critique the conflict again when he stated in the Teacher’s Guide, “We must try to discover the actual facts of the war behind the conventional treatment which merely emphasizes the heroism of the colonial troops” (Rugg, 1931a). The manner in which Rugg suggested teachers tackle this feat was three-fold. First, Rugg believed the resources of each side should be contrasted. Second, Rugg felt that the number of people who were apathetic about the war was important because it showed that those in conflict originally consisted of the small group of elites in America and England. Lastly, Rugg held that France’s influences had to be fully addressed in order for students to fully grasp the entire war effort. This instructional example offered implications relating to Rugg’s critique of society and his goals for transformation. Specifically, Rugg expressed his belief that the good citizen is one who challenges the status quo. By encouraging teachers to have students tackle the American Revolution through discovering the “actual facts,” it suggested that Rugg was skeptical of the manner in which the story had been told. Moreover, it implied that he was pushing for a more critical study of the American Revolution. It could be argued that his conception of society as one ruled by the privileged was expressed when he highlighted to teachers that

the American Revolution started as a conflict between a small group of elites in America and England. This example provides a broader view of the manner in which Rugg often conveyed his curriculum to teachers and students. It is closely aligned to how adherents of the critical tendency would answer the four guiding questions related to this study.

While Rugg's unit in *A History of American Government and Culture* that focused largely on the battles of the American Revolution expressed some level of a critical tendency toward American society, it was not typical of the Teacher's Guide that accompanied the Reading Book or most other materials associated with the Rugg Social Science Course. Whether or not the time period covered by this particular unit was a factor is uncertain. Based on my analysis of the Rugg materials, however, it appears the Rugg Social Science Course materials were chiefly aligned with the critical tendency discussed earlier in this chapter. The section of the Reading Book that preceded Rugg's treatment of the war itself focused on the root causes of the American Revolution. Rugg established the context for why America even sought independence. As one might expect of Rugg, he couched the conflict in terms of economic issues and concerns. For example, he noted that the colonists were "merely employees making them [people in England] a profit" and "the colonies were important so long as they benefited English trade and England's power in Europe" (Rugg, 1931a). However, he went on to identify that the changing needs of the colonists forced them to become Americans, rather than Englishmen, and ultimately they had to "think more and more for themselves" (Rugg, 1931a). Rugg stated that this mentality eventually caused a divisiveness between business leaders of both sides, too. For example, British Parliament passed laws such as the Navigation Acts and trade laws that helped British merchants but hindered American

shippers, planters, and craftsmen. Rugg pointed out that this prompted colonial resistance of the colonies in as much as it was acceptable to the elite colonists. The series of events, such as the Stamp Act, that focused on England trying to force the colonies to pay for her debts fomented more change according to Rugg's Reading Book. This approach to framing the historical events in Rugg course are similar to what Charles Beard advocated at the time. Essentially, Beard believed that students should acquire information and positions that led to liberty in decision-making and the preservation of free will. Rugg's materials exemplified a Beardian view that promoted freedom and independence through knowledge. Additionally, Rugg's curriculum conveyed Beard's belief that political institutions were formed by the economic interests of those in power. For example, the Reading Book stated "when the Townshend duties were repealed most of the well-to-do people were satisfied. Their business was safe. After all, they had no idea of breaking away from the mother country...But a movement had started which they could not stop...from that time on, the rebellion proceeded largely against the wishes of the upper classes" (Rugg, 1931a). The Reading Book, *A History of American Civilization: Economic and Social*, identified many of the same concerns and issues of this time period as Volume IV.

In *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*, Rugg used America's struggle for independence to broaden his view of liberty especially as it related to democratic society of his time. Reading Book Volume V offered a fairly straightforward account of how Rugg might have answered the four guiding questions established early on in this study. Additionally, Rugg's use of American history in this context

exemplified his belief that “whenever history is needed to understand the present, history is presented” (Rugg, 1932; Rugg, 1931a; Rugg, 1931b; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

*An Introduction to Problems of American Culture* suggested the emphasis that Rugg placed on political and civil liberties in a democracy. According to Rugg, civil liberty incorporated two components: personal security and personal liberty. Personal security was established by “governments to protect him [Americans] so that he may live in safety, in good health, and in comfort so far as the American standard of living permits” (Rugg, 1931b). Personal liberty encompassed rights such as freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly. Rugg simply identified political liberty as “the right to share in the government – to vote and to hold office” (Rugg, 1931b). In the Reading book Rugg cited that only a “favored few” have ever really enjoyed the rewards of liberty, Rugg recounted throughout history how only “those who had the good fortune to be born the children of the ruling class, had civil and political liberty” (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg then established in the Reading Book how the New World did not change the fortunes of the common man. Specifically, he noted that “in every section [of America], from south to north, a few well-to-do merchants and landowners controlled the government” and “often the well-to-do owners of property who had civil liberty did not allow others to have that right” (Rugg, 1931b). Additionally, Rugg emphasized that the Constitution was “drawn up by a small group of well-to-do and intelligent landowners, merchants, and bankers” (Rugg, 1931b). Throughout this narrative, Rugg stressed the shifting tide from the influences of the elite to the masses. For example, “After the Civil War came 50 years of conflict over other civil and political liberties. You know the story of the energetic and brilliant industrial leaders who built up great business enterprises and

secured a dominant position in government. You have studied many examples of the way in which the politicians protected Big Business by maintaining a high tariff, by attempting to control the Supreme Court, and by securing the passage of laws favorable to their own interests. You also know the story of the political revolt of farmers and city workers against this control...the common people made gains in their attempt to make their civil and political liberties more secure. They passed laws controlling the corporations. They broke down the spoils system of filling government offices, and they developed more direct means of electing candidates to office” (Rugg, 1931b).

Curriculum excerpts such as this resemble the principles of Beard and other frontier thinkers discussed earlier in this chapter. Rugg’s inclusion of content such as this suggests a similar purpose to that of Beard about what and how history is taught.

Specifically, the purpose seems to be an economic analysis of history. There are secondary purposes such as the notion that what is taught is an example of society at certain times and places. Additionally, Beard’s idea that those who hold the economic power are the ones who influence political institutions seemed to be prevalent.

While noting gains had been made in political liberty, Rugg suggested there was still a long way to go. He expressed this in Reading Book V where it was stated, “It is clear that in a vast, complicated democracy like the United States the problem of getting the facts to the people is a difficult one...in order to make government democratic and to guarantee civil and political liberty, the people as a whole must have access to all the necessary facts upon which the public questions are decided; second, to bring the essential facts before the people impartially and completely is a task beset by great difficulties. These difficulties are caused in part by the vastness of our land, by the

impersonal conditions of city life, and by the increasing interest of the private citizen in his own personal affairs. They are also caused by the very complexity of the machinery through which the facts are spread throughout the nation – the mails, newspapers, magazines, and books, the radio, the public platform, the ‘movies,’ the theater, schools and colleges...” (Rugg, 1931b). As for civil liberties, the Reading Book suggested that Rugg believed that civil liberties were not fully guaranteed. Rugg stated that the only way to ensure that civil liberties were protected was for “the officials elected by the people to live up to their pledges to govern in accordance with the constitutions and the laws” (Rugg, 1931b). *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture* then provided examples throughout history where officials did not protect the constitutional rights of individuals.

It could be argued that *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture* provided a detailed interpretation of Rugg’s view of a democracy. Civil and political liberty seemed to be the cornerstones of Rugg’s ideal democracy. While Rugg conceded that strides had been made, his writings suggest he was still skeptical that the liberties of all were not being placed at the forefront of those in leadership. The writings also implied if individuals were not afforded the opportunity to exercise their liberties then the democracy itself has not yet been fully realized. For instance, Rugg offered five groups of questions that he felt “must be answered carefully if America is to march steadily on toward a more perfect democracy, if the mass of Americans are really to become more and more free, if civil and political liberty is to be adequately protected” (Rugg, 1931b). Those questions encompassed such issues as: How can civil rights as guaranteed in state constitutions be protected by officials? Should there be information available to all



Americans through a variety of media outlets? Should people be permitted to criticize or defend existing forms of government publicly? Should public places be open to all Americans for discussion on societal issues? Should all citizens have equal access to speak over the radio regardless of their beliefs? What methods should be enacted so that all people have access to information that will help them make intelligent decisions about societal issues? (Rugg, 1931b).

In *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*, Rugg challenged students to gather as much information as possible when preparing to cast a ballot for a public decision. Rugg wrote, “in a true democracy all the grown-up people help to carry on the government either directly or through the representatives whom they elect.” Rugg also endorsed the idea that a national income be equally distributed between the American people “so that every person will have the best standard of living in respect to comfort that the great wealth of the nation now makes possible” (Rugg, 1931b). To accomplish these aims each person must know certain important facts and must use them intelligently. Thus he has a *right* to all the necessary facts but also the *obligation* to think clearly about them in deciding public questions” (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg clearly instructed individuals to guard against two factors during the information gathering process: censorship and propaganda. Rugg’s purpose was to inform readers that those individuals or groups who control sources of information might suppress facts or give misleading statements in an effort to sway the citizen toward a favored outcome. He was forthright in his views on this subject in the Reading Book as he stated, “Persons in control of information may, for reasons of their own, give the citizen false or misleading statements as if they were true facts” (Rugg, 1931b). Therefore, Rugg believed that “American

citizens must study and try to solve the problem of getting the facts to the people” (Rugg, 1931b). For example, Reading Book V included a detailed chapter on how public opinion was formed. While he wrote extensively about the influences of family, neighborhoods, and social organizations on public opinion, Rugg clearly felt newspapers intentionally predisposed the opinions of average Americans to favor the interests of media elites. Additionally, he highlighted that the concerns of those who owned newspapers was to sell them, not provided readers with facts. As Rugg put it, “Today the average newspaper-reader receives very little information, indeed, of the truth of controversies in industry, agriculture, business, international affairs, and the like. Instead he receives emotional, and sometimes imaginary accounts of scandal, crime, and controversies of various kinds. These form his attitudes, *without proved and measured facts*” (Rugg, 1931b). Moreover, Rugg suggested that citizens have a responsibility to prepare themselves to participate in the decision-making process of their community. According to Rugg’s curriculum, citizens might better prepare themselves to participate in community decisions by gathering information from multiple sources such as friends, neighbors, movies, radio broadcasts, town meetings, and any other source of information. Additionally, Rugg noted that the development of a citizen is influenced by the public opinions of those they are most likely to be in contact with such as their family, their community, and social organization.

Rugg’s curriculum suggested that a good, democratic citizen was one who understands his or her “*obligation* of securing and weighing the necessary facts in order to vote intelligently. That is, he has the obligation of using his vote for the good of the great mass of the people” (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg’s curriculum also seemed to advocate

that *all* people should be given equal access in society (and seize the opportunity to do so) so that they might be better prepared to participate in it. For example, individuals should have the opportunity to review any and all newspapers and magazines to help them sift through information. Individuals should be allowed to gather at meeting places where open discussion could be conducted and criticisms of government voiced. Persons should also be given equal access to speak over the radio airwaves regardless of their beliefs (Rugg, 1931b).

Although Rugg's vision of the development of a good, democratic citizen might be implicit in his curriculum, there were several overt suggestions interwoven throughout the materials. For example, the idea of scientific planning was introduced to the students. Rugg was critical of how manufacturers were producing goods without planning their distribution and subsequent sale throughout the country. By exposing students to such information, Rugg was arguably attempting to influence students' view of society and government. He charged that the people needed a more collective society that provided more economic and social equality for all Americans. Rugg presented his view that the "basis of a secure and comfortable living for the American people lies in a *carefully planned economic life*" (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg presented a platform in the Reading Book, *An Introduction to Problems of American Culture*, for nation-wide planning for the use of natural resources to provide a better source of income and supplies for people through job opportunities and usage. He also promoted "cooperative control of the production of wheat, corn, meat, fruit, and other products in order to guarantee the American people sufficient food and to assure the farmer a decent standard of living" (Rugg, 1931b). Rugg's implementation of this chapter on scientific planning provides an example of how

Rugg believed his curriculum could produce good, democratic citizens. It could be argued that by promoting the ideas that he did in his chapter on scientific planning that Rugg was attempting to sway the views of those students who studied his curriculum. As the quotes suggest, his position was reflected in the materials. He was advocating a position rather than offering a balanced presentation of facts, which is interesting in light of his views on propaganda and censorship. Based on the analysis of the materials, Rugg clearly struggled with how exactly to completely and fairly present the facts. As was noted in this chapter, Rugg often offered positions rather than facts about issues. Therefore, at times his desire to provide all the facts to readers was outweighed by his efforts to editorialize on issues of which he believed to be of utmost importance.

In conclusion, Rugg's Social Science Course materials suggested that Harold Rugg sought a democracy based on economic equity and equal access. He believed that as long as a "chosen few" have control of the economic, media, educational, and political institutions of America, an ideal democracy will not be attainable. Moreover, Rugg's materials repeatedly implied that those individuals who make up the masses of common people have the "obligation" to prepare themselves to participate in society. The best manner for the average person to engage in societal change was to study all the facts available to them plus seek information through other channels such as family and social organizations. Many of the examples highlighted as part of Rugg's curriculum seemed to advocate that as more common people participate in society eventually they might overtake the small group of elites who were making decisions. Once the masses overtake the political and economic control of the few, the opportunity for an ideal democracy might be more readily attainable.

## CHAPTER 5: THE AMHERST PROJECT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF HISTORY<sup>2</sup>

### **Historical Contextualization**

#### Overview

After the Great Depression, the American government assumed a larger role in securing the wellbeing of individuals than had been the case in decades past. New Deal policies and the Second World War stabilized America in the post-Depression era. America emerged from World War II the unsurpassed military and economic authority in the world. However, many cultures accepted the principles of communism. The Cold War proved to be a worldwide ideological struggle between American capitalism and democracy and Soviet Union communism (Tindall and Shi, 1999; Brinkley, 1992).

In an effort to align American schools with what the government perceived as necessary preparations to win the Cold War, the government assimilated its foreign policy into the academic curriculum. Specifically, nationalism and patriotism were recurring foci of schools. Additionally, national funding was used to reinvigorate trade schools. This began an all out effort to increase national educational standards and an amplified focus on the more academically talented in society. These sorts of decisions were in response to the launching of Sputnik by the Soviets. The “new social studies” as

---

<sup>2</sup> While a minimal number of the sources can be found in the References section, many of the citations for the Amherst Project curriculum materials can be found in Appendix C.

it is known was the government's attempt to financially support social studies education by focusing on individual disciplines and professional development. Based on the funding provided by National Defense Education Act of 1958, the movement started with science and math. By the early 1960s, however, funding for curriculum reforms became prevalent in the social studies as well (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis, 1977).

The Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History was a research project originally sponsored by Amherst College. Curriculum development was not new to Amherst College. Prior works by George Taylor opened the door for Van R. Halsey and Richard Brown, co-editors of the project, to obtain funding in the amount of \$2000 from the school in 1959. Additionally, publishing support was offered by D.C. Heath and Company who was publishing Taylor's Problems in American Civilization series. Early on, the project was strictly a local effort. Materials were written at Amherst College and distributed and field tested in the New England area. Shortly thereafter, however, the Amherst Project was largely funded by the United States Office of Education. As early as 1964, the Amherst Project began preparing curriculum materials focused on American history content. The Committee on the Study of History developed into a national committee comprised of educators and historians. The Project was best exemplified by conformity to the theories of Jerome Bruner, especially the idea of discovery learning. The materials expanded to standardized units of American history, consisting of primary and secondary sources, ordered in sequence that concentrated on a universal question. For example, the unit entitled *Communism in America: Liberty and Security in Conflict* included over fifty primary source documents ranging from political satires, to Supreme

Court opinions, to survey data, and more. The overarching question for this unit revolved around how to protect liberty for the individual while maintaining national security.

While teachers wrote the materials as part of summer writing camps, the Amherst Project was one of many social studies projects around the country that were chiefly aligned with post-secondary philosophies that were similar to that of the project directors. In this case, the Committee on the Study of History shared a common ideal of history as a discipline rather than focusing on the broader social studies. Likewise, those public school teachers who were part of the project staff agreed with the role of history within the project. The ultimate goal of the Amherst Project was to provide history curriculum materials that expanded the intelligence and development of high school students because “it [history] is being killed in the schools...if we could just get some lively, really gutty materials into the hands of kids, that kids would end up with something really worthwhile” (Kline, 1974) (Brown, 1996; Kline, 1974; Haley, 1972; Sanders and Tanck, 1970).

Project director George Brown’s own view of the Amherst materials was that “what we were really doing was turning the world of education on its head. From a world that saw itself as operating from the top, down. There were people at each level of the educational process that saw themselves as answer givers, dispensers of information, and we were turning the world of education around and suggesting that education properly begins with the student, with a question that the student asked. What the student was learning was a product of what the student was seeing and hearing and ultimately learning. It was a major shift in the way classrooms were seen” (Interview conducted on January 26, 2007).

As of 1973, the Amherst Project had sold more than 86,000 of its published units (Kline, 1974). The units did not sale tremendously, but two of the units are still in print. Brown's view of dissemination was bleak at best. He stated, "They (the unit books) certainly did not have the effect of producing massive change in classrooms. (laugh) That's an understatement. But they did help to generate a discussion of education and history that is still to some extent being fulfilled. We still have some people who are using literally those units. But I also think it influenced education in other ways, like the Chicago Metro History Fair which involves about 15,000 students each year. Students are going out into their communities and gathering primary materials and answering questions and drawing conclusions about another historical time. I think the project had latent influences that are still being reflected in a number of ways, but it didn't transform the American high school classrooms." Brown goes on to assert that "the project became well-known, but I'm not sure that there was enough time for it to become expansive across the nation in classrooms. It certainly was not a universal acceptance and I don't think it was because of opposition as much as it was that the time was relatively brief before we were all wiped out and the new wave of educational thinking came" (Interview conducted January 26, 2007). Most of those teachers who chose to use the materials were advocates and supporters of the Amherst Project's mission. The Project directors openly geared their target market towards those individuals who sought innovative materials rather than attempting to gain acceptance through large publishing companies (Brown, 1996; Kline, 1974).



## Underlying principles

Jerome Bruner's influence on the Amherst Project can not be overstated. Like so many other curriculum development endeavors of the 1960's, this project was greatly influenced by the notion that students learn best when they are actively engaged in their studies. Moreover, incorporating John Dewey's ideals of student involvement in the learning process prompted the use of a universal question in each unit and also served as a cornerstone to the development of the Amherst materials. The curriculum developers believed that developing each unit around a question related to human behavior would create a lesson that was more intriguing to students. In addition, the reformers believed studying the past by focusing on questions that students could relate to their own experiences, and questions to which students had to grapple with the answer, would strengthen students' understanding of themselves and the world around them (Brown, 1996; Kline, 1974; Haley, 1972; Bruner, 1960; Dewey, 1938).

When discussing the project's desire for students, Brown stated, "We wanted them (students) to develop skills of inquiry. We wanted to re-orient their thinking about learning. We wanted them to become curious. We wanted students to begin to make connections that they have about things going on in their lives and the academic world. We wanted students to ask questions, open-ended questions that had no answers. We wanted them to pursue things at greater depth to become wiser people. We wanted kids to grasp a greater understanding of complexity, greater tolerance if you will, greater ambiguity, all these things" (Interview conducted January 26, 2007).

As for teachers' responsibilities and purposes, Brown acknowledged, "The teachers as we saw it needed to be leaders in inquiry, not answer givers, who could work

with their students in the pursuit of questions. We wanted teachers to have the skills not to turn off inquiry, but to encourage it. They needed to get students to sharpen the questions they were asking, to listen to each other better, to read primary materials more effectively, and we saw teachers as being the key to that as leaders. They had to be models as leaders which required a change in the typical teacher from answer givers to leaders of inquiry” (Interview conducted January 26, 2007).

As the “only project devoted exclusively to the study of history, and even more narrowly to American history” (Brown, 1996), the Amherst Project surely viewed history as an integral underlying principle of their materials. Furthermore, their *Guide to the Amherst Approach to Inquiry Learning* stated, “The Project takes the position that history as such has value as a tool for learning: that it is more than mere names and dates, and that properly used, it represents a significant and important way of carving into reality and enhancing and fostering human growth” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished).

The Amelioristic tendency associated with the heuristic presented in the review of the literature and methods chapters of this study offers its own unique vantage point to how one might answer the four guiding questions included in this study:

- What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- What is a good, democratic citizen?
- How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

The amelioristic tendency primarily identifies an ideal democracy as one that applies mainstream American values to all of society so that each citizen has the opportunity and capabilities to engage themselves as functioning members of the general public should

they choose to do so. To accomplish this would require limited, rather than drastic, changes in current societal structures. The amelioristic tendency chiefly views the good, democratic citizen as one who attempts to make the world a better place by learning from past mistakes. The greatest way to develop this type of citizen would be to afford students opportunities to engage in analysis of historical and current materials to understand the relationship between events, problems, and people of the past and present so that they can help correct those mistakes and make the world a better place. The amelioristic tendency's vision of history's role within the mission of social studies is that history provides a basis point for why the present day world is as it is, but it also provides the tools of analysis that are needed to effectively participate in society. Therefore, if students are to engage in historical analysis they must be exposed to history. The theoretical writings of the Amherst Project and interview answers of Dr. Richard Brown suggest views largely typical of the amelioristic tendency. Does an analysis of the Amherst Project's curriculum materials reflect amelioristic responses as well?

#### Description of the Amherst Project Materials

The Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History created units which were anticipated for use in 11<sup>th</sup> grade history courses. While the Amherst Project willfully focused their materials development on American history courses, units were promoted for inclusion in other social studies courses where appropriate. The materials were formulated as two to four week units. Unit sets included a student text and Teacher's manual. Primary source materials were made accessible to students to use as evidence. Students, in turn, were required to ask questions about the primary source materials and draw their own conclusions. Teaching strategies were largely omitted from

the teacher’s manuals. Instead, the manuals mainly offered the teacher a brief overview of the documents included in the student unit books and questions for discussion of those documents. Nonetheless, due to the focus on American history, teacher knowledge and understanding of content was a virtual requirement for those teachers who chose to incorporate Amherst materials into their classroom (Brown, 1996; Kline, 1974, Haley, 1972; Sanders and Tanck, 1970).

The Amherst Project provided thirteen lesson units as data sources for my study. A short, explanatory illustration of these thirteen units will be presented since each presents a diverse issue and contains differing documents. In the table the students’ texts, teacher’s manuals, and copyright years are included. The “Y” in the teacher’s manual column simply signifies that the text was surveyed as part of my study. I was fortunate to procure all the accompanying teacher’s manuals for the Amherst Project.

Table 4

Data Sources from the Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History

	Students’ Text	Teacher’s Manual	Copyright Year
1	What Happened on Lexington Green? An Inquiry into the Nature and Methods of History	Y	1970
2	Hiroshima: A Study of Science, Politics, and the Ethics of War	Y	1970
3	Communism in America: Liberty and Security in Conflict	Y	1970
4	Korea and the Limits of Limited War	Y	1970
5	Collective Security in the 1930’s: The Failure of Men or the Failure of a Principle?	Y	1970
6	Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England	Y	1970
7	The Rights of Americans: The Changing Balance of Liberty, Law, and Order	Y	1972
8	God and Government: The Uneasy Separation of Church and State	Y	1972
9	Thomas Jefferson, the Embargo, and the Decision for Peace	Y	1972

10	Lincoln and Slavery: Ideals and the Politics of Change	Y	1972
11	Conscience and the Law: The Uses and Limits of Civil Disobedience	Y	1973
12	The Western Hero: A Study in Myth and American Values	Y	1973
13	Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power	Y	1975

The first publication by the Amherst Project on the national platform was *What Happened on Lexington Green: An Inquiry into the Nature and Methods of History*. The Revolutionary War battle at Lexington Green was used to demonstrate the struggles associated with studying history. Moreover, the case of Lexington Green served as an outlet for the curriculum developers from Amherst College to offer students and teachers a better understanding of how historians attempt to formulate and defend their beliefs regarding what is and is not reality in history. *Hiroshima: A Study in Science, Politics, and the Ethics of War* was a thorough examination of the American rationale to drop the first atomic bomb. *Communism in America: Liberty and Security in Conflict* focused on the conflicted issue of safeguarding the nation's security while at the same time promoting individual liberties of American citizens. *Korea and the Limits of Limited War* addressed the topic of American foreign policy. Specifically, this unit questioned the ability of democratic nations to maintain a protracted foreign policy effort. The feasibility of global alliances and organizations was assessed by students in the unit entitled *Collective Security in the 1930's: The Failure of Men or the Failure of a Principle?* Students were asked to compare the struggle between autonomy and society in *Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England*. Similarly in *The Rights of Americans: The Changing Balance of Liberty, Law, and Order*, learners were asked to

make a values judgment on the issue of individual rights v. societal order. Delving into the topic of church and state relations, *God and Government: The Uneasy Separation of Church and State* focused its lessons on how these entities might co-exist. Policy issues confronted by leaders of a democratic society were concentrated on in *Thomas Jefferson, the Embargo, and the Decision for Peace*. How President Lincoln managed slavery, both politically and personally, was the central theme of *Lincoln and Slavery: Ideals and the Politics of Change*. The complexity of altering or abolishing a law by civil or legal means in a democratic society was the focus of *Conscience and the Law: The Uses and Limits of Civil Disobedience*. *The Western Hero: A Study in Myth and American Values* used the American icon as a vehicle for students to inspect their own personal ideals as well as those of American culture in general. *Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power* forced students to tackle the problems initiated by the sheer ideal of power especially in terms of decision-making for a country with the capacity to execute incomparable devastation on its foes.

The Amherst units included in my study offer a holistic representation of the resources that were created as part of the project. Additionally, the data sources described above provide a realistic expression of what types of materials the Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History attempted to provide the educational community.

### **Content Analysis**

The content analysis portion of this study includes structural and critical analyses. This portion of the analysis is divided into three sections: Presentation of Materials, Content, and An In-depth Analysis of the Amherst Project's Treatment of the American

Revolution. The structural analysis initially provides the reader with an overview of how the materials were organized. Next, some intended purposes by the Amherst Project curriculum developers is presented. Lastly, the structural analysis emphasizes how students' experiences influence learning according to the Amherst Project. Within each section are sub-sections that encompass the overarching themes associated with the Amherst Project curriculum materials. These themes provide a broad representation of the overall Amherst Project and offer a glimpse of the likely intended purposes of the Project and its developers. A critical analysis of the Amherst Project's materials was completed by conducting an in-depth analysis of their treatment of the American Revolution. Using the guiding questions mentioned throughout my study, I will show how the Amherst Project materials might answer each of the four questions.

#### Presentation of Materials

The Amherst Project maintained a fairly consistent approach to each of the thirteen units that frame their materials. As I surveyed the unit books and teacher's manuals, five themes continually arose that related to the presentation of materials. In the sections that follow, I will present those themes and the evidence that supports their recurrence throughout the curriculum. The five themes are: adaptability, central questions, original evidence, teacher's manuals, and instructional practices. They are discussed in greater detail in the sub-sections that follow.

#### Adaptability

The flexibility of the materials was undeniably a key component of the Amherst materials. In fact, in *A Guide to the Amherst Approach to Inquiry Learning*, Richard Brown and Edmund Traverso went to great lengths to convey just how adaptable the

units were intended to be by dedicating a few sections of their theoretical framework piece to the variety of uses that may be incorporated. According to the developers, the units may or may not comprise an entire history course because “each unit is an independent module, and the units are all designed so that they may either be used together for an entire course, or independently by teachers developing their own courses out of a variety of materials” and that “groups of units may be used together, in whole or in part, with or without other materials” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). Moreover, the developers defended their position that the Amherst materials are modifiable beyond the standard history course. They insisted that “the units are readily usable in a wide variety of social studies and humanities offerings” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). Lastly, the curriculum developers addressed the individual units themselves. Since the “materials are designed as laboratory materials, [they] are to be used as circumstances warrant and questions dictate” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). Additionally, the materials were mass produced in two forms, loose-leaf and bound. The developers argued that this too aided in open-endedness and adaptability because extra materials could be inserted or Amherst materials could be deleted from the unit (Brown, 1996).

The teacher’s manuals that accompanied each unit book were informative in many ways. They will be addressed more intimately in a following section. However, the teacher’s manuals continually addressed the importance of adaptability as well. Most every teacher’s manual offered some disclaimer reminding teachers that whether a unit is used in its entirety depended on a variety of factors such as age, experience, and ability level of the students. Teachers were urged to be perceptive of these concerns in planning



the use of units and to adjust as situations arose (Moulton, 1975; Wilbur, 1973; Beebe, 1972; Bennett, 1972; Casey, 1972; Guttman, 1972; Guttman, 1970; Minear, 1972).

### Central Questions

The notion of a central or universal question was paramount to the Amherst curriculum units. In fact, “the universal question operates as a spine for the rest of the unit” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). The *Guide to the Amherst Approach to Inquiry Learning* noted that central questions accomplished two important goals: to give “meaning and relevance to the student on a subjective and personal level” and to pose a “human problem, dilemma, or value conflict that is identified by the question” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished) (Brown, 1996). In essence, the universal question was a “hook” to gain students’ interest.

Since the universal question’s purpose was to engage students, the unit books included them in the Introduction and/or Section One of each unit. For example, *God and Government: The Uneasy Separation of Church and State* used a variety of sources to address the question, “how can we decide where political authority infringes upon religious liberty, and where religious authority threatens political liberty?” (Guttman, 1972). The unit objective was to have students adequately address the proper relationship between church and state. In an effort to entice student interest, the developers incorporated school prayer in the initial sections. The “Regents’ Prayer,” both the majority and dissenting opinions for *Engel v. Vitale* (1962), and a *Chicago Tribune* editorial were employed for student analysis.

Repeatedly in the teacher’s manuals, the text categorized the episodes presented in the Introduction and/or Section One as dramatic events. For example, *Thomas*

*Jefferson, The Embargo, and The Decision for Peace, God and Government, and Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England* emphasized the importance of dramatic events as a way to encourage students to contemplate more deeply the case under study. For example, the crisis Jefferson faced required him to respond quickly and decisively. Students, in turn, are introduced to the basics of the situation facing Jefferson and asked to consider how he should respond. Then students are bread-crumbed through more evidence to help them modify or solidify their initial conjecture. Nonetheless, the dramatic events are situated along with the central questions to provide a springboard for hooking students into each unit.

#### Original Evidence

While this theme arguably could be integrated into the discussion on content, I believe its place is more suitable in the presentation of materials. The Amherst Project curriculum developers placed great emphasis on “evidence” in their theoretical writings and teacher’s manuals. To the developers, the documents included in the unit books were not merely documents. Rather, they were “collections of evidence...selected and carefully structured with a view to the use students will be making of them rather than on the basis of some presumed historical importance that has no relationship to the questions, needs, and interests of the students who will be using them” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). The documents that the developers chose were a wide array of newspapers, cartoons, letters, tables, maps, court papers, magazines, and many other documents of importance. Each unit contained approximately fifty pieces of documentary evidence. However, beyond the printed pages and structure of units, the writers also wanted students to grapple with historical evidence as part of their unit work.

In *Hiroshima: A Study in Science, Politics, and the Ethics of War*, the developers noted that “the material in this section (Section One) has been selected to...offer opportunities for an inquiry into the nature and validity of historical evidence” (Harris, 1970).

The Amherst Project curriculum developers identified the inclusion of original historical evidence as supreme for building a trustworthy teacher/student relationship. They stated, “The Project believes that the successful use of history requires the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect between teachers and students, and that this is best accomplished by giving students genuine historical evidence rather than evidence that has been invented and written for them. Amherst Project materials do not talk down to students. They are in fact designed to suggest to students that they are mature persons capable of dealing with real issues on the basis of actual historical evidence” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). The collection of materials surveyed seemed to be balanced, offering a fair representation of all parties involved in the conflicts under review.

#### Teacher’s Manual

The Teacher’s Manual was a vital component of the Amherst Project. In retrospect, Dr. Brown believed the manuals to be a weakness for the project. He wrote, “The manuals...offered help with classroom implementation that was uneven at best and often virtually nonexistent. Pitched thus to inquiry-oriented teachers who could figure out for themselves how to do it, the manual were, as a result, far less helpful to other teachers than they might have been” (Brown, 1996). I personally found them helpful in understanding the purposes of each unit. In fact, without the teacher’s manuals I believe it would be hard to navigate the materials. The manuals were by and large concise. While each varied in length, Dr. Brown wrote in his valedictory article that “because we

thought it inconsistent with our message to have unduly prescriptive teacher's manuals, we made them brief, leaving pedagogical strategy largely to each teacher. The manuals told teachers what we had in mind in preparing the unit" (Brown, 1996). Each teacher's manual mirrored the unit book it accompanied. In essence, it had identical sections to that of the unit book to which it was associated. The teacher's manuals mainly offered a synopsis of the major readings included in the unit books. Additionally, the teacher's manuals provided instructional practice suggestions and questions for teachers to use in their classrooms.

#### Instructional Practices

Again, the teacher's manuals offered suggestions for instructional practices that might aid in preparing students to participate in inquiry learning. The curriculum developers of the Amherst Project offered a variety of practice techniques, but relied heavily on two: essays and discussion. To the developers of the Amherst materials, essays were beneficial because they "can be evaluated on their own merit, or essays written at the start of an academic year can be compared with those written at the end of the year so that a student can be evaluated in terms of his own growth, rather than on the basis of comparison with other students" (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). Many of the teacher's manuals suggested that students hypothesize their initial thoughts to the universal questions of units so that they can rethink and revise their views as they encountered more evidence (Bennett, 1972; Guttman, 1972; Guttman, 1970; Minear, 1972; Baker, 1970; Cohen, 1970). Discussions were integral for fostering dialogue of the universal questions in virtually every unit created by the Amherst Project. The curriculum developers offered other potential techniques for teachers to use as they

implemented the materials. For example, *Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power* recommended that teacher incorporate role-playing and debates into the unit. These two strategies were suggested at various other points in units. However, those four strategies were major one presented by the creators of the Amherst materials.

## Content

The Content associated with the Amherst Project was largely consistent across units. In the following sub-sections, those recurring themes associated with the content of the project are addressed. The sub-sections are divided between intended purposes, critical thinking, and experiences.

## Intended Purposes

The Amherst Project curriculum developers certainly had intended purposes for the outcome(s) of using their materials. Through surveying the curriculum materials and theoretical writings, a number of those intended purposes were ever-present. In particular, three purposes were persistent throughout: students' understanding of the nature of human beings, the role of historians, and what it means to "do history." The curriculum developers acknowledged "the study of history as having goals that are primarily humanistic, and have to do with fostering the growth of human beings not only in knowledge but in their awareness and appreciation of complexity in their sensitivity and ability to make perceptive and informed judgments, and in wisdom" (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). *Thomas Jefferson, The Embargo, and The Decision for Peace* listed "the hope that they [students] will grow in empathy and understanding of the human dimensions of a problem with which all in a free society must live" (Beebe, 1972) as a primary aim of the overall unit. According to its developers, *Hiroshima: A Study in*

*Science, Politics, and the Ethics of War* was developed with humanization in mind. In the teacher's manual the author posited that studying such a difficult dilemma as whether or not to annihilate a city would "shake them [students] up a little" (Harris, 1970) because oftentimes kids lived in the fantasy world of television violence and not the reality of a world at war.

The role of historians or historian's craft was also an important purpose of the Amherst Project materials. While the curriculum developers denied that the goal of the project was to guide students to be historians or to discover the historian's craft, they did not fully remove either's importance from the learning of history. In fact, they argued that one of the goals of their materials was for students to gain knowledge of and to mature from the use of history. Although they did not see the final outcome as training junior historians, the developers did admit that in order for students to effectively know how to usefully apply history to their lives, they would have to employ similar techniques to those of historians. Therefore, the Amherst Project sought the end goal of learning and growing from history rather than actually developing historians (Buffinton, 1975; Wilbur, 1973; Minear, 1972; Bennett, 1970; Brown and Traverso, unpublished; Guttman, 1970; Harris, 1970).

The Amherst Project identified three key assumptions about learning. All three are directly related to the idea of "doing history" (Beebe, 1972). First, all learners have certain experiences that have shaped them and what they bring to the learning environment. Second, the learner has to have the desire to learn if they are really going to learn. Third, learning is the product of active participation, not compliance to a traditional set of norms. To the Amherst Project, active participation equated to the

student as the scholar-inquirer. A scholar-inquirer was responsible for “asking questions and pursuing hypotheses into original evidence...with the challenge to come up with conclusions of his own, and to build his own body of knowledge and his own qualities of understanding, perception, and sensitivity” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished).

*Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England* offered an excellent example of the unit books and teacher’s manuals promoting active participation and doing history. In the teacher’s manual Guttman suggested that the study of history “involves the complicated question of interpretation, which is likely to have more to do with the eye of the beholder than it does with the event being interpreted. It is hoped that students might see this in using this unit, and they might be encouraged to move on from there to an open-ended consideration of the nature and purpose of the study of history, and the question of whether it may not indeed tell us more about ourselves than it does about the past” (Guttman, 1970).

### Critical Thinking

The theme of Critical Thinking was surmised from a combination of frequently presented curriculum issues that deeply shaped the materials. The curriculum developers repeatedly addressed the notion of inferences and generalizations. Additionally, discovery learning and multiple perspectives were critical components of the Amherst materials.

While inferences and generalizations were not specifically implicated as key components of the Amherst Project materials in the theoretical writings, they were repeatedly discussed and alluded to in the teacher’s manuals associated with each unit (Beebe, 1972; Bennett, 1970; Cohan, 1970; Guttman, 1972b). For example, *Collective*

*Security in the 1930's: The Failure of Men or the Failure of a Principle?* stated that one of its purposes for the unit was “to give students an opportunity to develop critical skills in the pursuit of historical understanding, leading to an appreciation of the limits and tentative nature of generalizations, as well as the difficulty the historian encounters in ascertaining the ‘facts’ of any situation” (Cohan, 1970). The importance of using inferences and understanding generalizations is implicit to the study of history. That might explain why the curriculum developers included these expectations as part of the teacher’s manuals, but not in their theoretical framing.

Conversely, discovery learning was a centerpiece around which the Amherst Project was built. The curriculum developers of the unit entitled *Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power* identified the importance of discovery learning in its teacher’s manual. The teacher’s manual stated that “the general approach in this study, as in all units in this series, is to encourage students to learn by discovering for themselves the key issues, the tentative answers, or the final judgments in a debate over some point in American history” (Buffinton, 1975). Additionally, Dr. Brown noted that the Amherst Project “hitched our star to the concept of ‘discovery’ learning” (Brown, 1996). He made this comment in reference to the notion that everything the Project did flowed from the principle of discovery learning.

Multiple perspectives and contrasting views, especially in relation to the evidence presented in the unit books, was a key element of the Amherst materials. The teacher’s manuals highlighted this notion repeatedly. In the Preface of *Communism in America: Liberty and Security in Conflict*, the developers noted, “the author has tried to provide evidence supporting all major points of view on the problem” (Baker, 1970). Likewise,



in *The Rights of Americans: The Changing Balance of Liberty, Law, and Order*, the author pointed out that the “documents may create a real problem for him [the student] because of the fact that the contradict each other” (Casey, 1972). *Freedom and Authority in Puritan New England* also provided an example that solidified this curriculum’s stance on the inclusion of multiple perspectives. In the teacher’s manual, it stated, “Section 1 offers two dramatically contrasted views of the same incident” (Guttmann, 1970). A simple survey of the unit books also provided broad proof that the documents included were geared to a multiple perspective approach.

### Experience

The theme of experience was prevalent in two distinct areas throughout the curriculum: personal experience and personal bias. The sub-category of personal experience is much less convoluted than that of personal bias as the subsequent analysis will show.

In their foundational writings, the creators of the Amherst Project identified four elements that must be present for learning to occur. Curiosity, motivation, and focus were the first three. Experience was the fourth element which in the minds of the authors was directly related to the first three elements. Experience “is the sum of all that has happened to him up to the moment of the encounter, including what he knows and feels, what his concerns are, what he is aware of and sensitive to, and how he communicates...it governs what he will hear, see, or sense in the encounter, and how he will feel about it: in short, it governs what he will learn” (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). The Project oftentimes acknowledged the importance of recognizing experiences throughout the thirteen units. Whether it was relating content to their

personal lives or the basis for instructional practices, virtually every Amherst unit relied on experiences in some form or fashion (Moulton, 1975; Minear, 1972; Cohan, 1970).

Understanding bias was pivotal in the Amherst Project materials. Interestingly enough, students had to understand the bias of evidence as well as the bias they bring to the learning experience. The latter is directly correlated to the four elements discussed in the previous section. The former, however, was something many of the teacher's manuals tackled head on in an effort to strengthen students' historical interpretations and understanding. For example, the *Imperialism and the Dilemma of Power* teacher's manual in Section Two encouraged teachers to address "the racial and national bias that afflicted all these Western peoples...this will enable the students to discover how a person's belief both justifies and stimulates his actions. Hopefully, the student will then examine his own values" (Buffinton, 1975). Additionally, the editors of the Amherst Project addressed bias as it related to the inclusion of content. *In God and Government: The Uneasy Separation of Church and State* they stated "if there is a bias on the question of state and federal aid, the editors are not aware of it" (Guttman, 1972).

#### An In-depth Analysis of the Amherst Project's Treatment of the American Revolution

The Amherst Project dedicated an entire unit book to the American Revolution. Entitled *What Happened on Lexington Green? An Inquiry Into the Nature and Methods of History*, this unit book used "the famous incident at Lexington of April 19, 1775, as a case in point, this unit asks the student to deal with three basic questions: what is history, what is reality, and what do historians do with – or to – history and reality?" (Bennett, 1970). After a brief overview of how the unit was structured, I will utilize the unit on the American Revolution to offer a critical analysis of the Amherst materials. This will be

accomplished by combining the content from the unit with their theoretical writings to show how the Amherst Project curriculum developers might have answered the four guiding questions associated with this study.

The Presentation of Materials and Content largely identified the themes associated with the general curricula. While the central questions were already named in the introductory paragraph, other components of the presentation of materials need to be more vividly acknowledged. From the outset, the author addressed the importance of adaptability. After a detailed discussion on the manner in which the unit can be tailored, the author stated, “The unit has been designed with the hope that it will prove adaptable to the particular needs of a wide range of students and teachers. What these particular needs are, teachers and students will have to judge for themselves” (Bennett, 1970).

The unit used each section as a building block for the next. The building blocks aligned rather nicely with the themes identified as key to the overall curricula. Section One provided “original evidence” and asked students to “function in the role of historian” to reconstruct what might have occurred at the Battle of Lexington. The eyewitness accounts were affected by personal bias and how the participants saw the event. For example, Documents 9 and 10 were accounts from the rival commanders of the battle. While they were at the same locale, each certainly saw the battle and how it began differently.

Once students were hooked by “doing history” in Section One, they were asked to “work toward some generalizations about what historians do and what history is” (Bennett, 1970). The goal of Section Two was to have students grapple with why historians “differ so greatly in writing about a single point in the past” (Bennett, 1970).

This section attempted to do this by accounting for bias and personal experiences that might have influenced the work of historians. Documents were included that addressed national and political bias and the effects they might have on historians. Additionally, the evidence accounted for how the personal experiences of those historical figures and historians might have skewed their views. Section Three offered students the opportunity to delve even deeper into the philosophical questions that might have arisen as part of such a case study. For example, the introductory paragraph stated, “The selections in this section do not deal with one special even in history, such as the Lexington episode, but are intended to raise broader questions. How much can one know about anything, whether it occurred today or a hundred years ago? How do we find truth? What is truth? What is reality?” (Bennett, 1970).

Throughout the teacher’s manual and unit book other themes were prevalent. The instructional practices offered as part of the unit on the American Revolution were much the same: essay and discussion. Additionally, while it was concise, the teacher’s manual was beneficial to the greater understanding of the unit. Discovery learning as defined earlier was implicit in the unit because students were asked to study the evidence, make some judgments, and draw conclusions throughout.

The importance of history and its analysis have been highlighted throughout the theoretical works of the Amherst Project. These writings suggested that history, historical data, and historical analysis were the wellspring from which the entire Amherst Project flowed. What the curriculum developers expected students, and teachers, to “do” with history highlighted how they likely interpreted what the ideal democracy was, what

characteristics identified a good citizen, and what the responsibility of social studies was in the development of good, democratic citizens.

The relationship between history and the present was paramount to the developers of the Amherst Project curriculum materials. In fact, a prologue was placed at the beginning of each unit which stated the authors' views regarding the relationship between the two. The Amherst curriculum development team members believed that "the meaning that adheres to the experience or situation comes from us, from the curiosity or questions we bring to the experience, from our own past experience as it sensitizes us and enables us to *hear* or *see* or *feel* certain things in the situation....Each of us will feel and react differently in the face of a common experience. Learning is an act that each individual does for himself, even when he is learning from and with others....each man's learning is his own, ultimately a personal matter" (Bennett, 1970). Essentially, the Amherst Project saw history as a way of "learning how to learn, in order that they (students) might continue learning through life...thus we viewed history not as something to be 'learned' as an end in itself but as a body of experience to be delved into by students...(and) we expected students to come to have a deeper and richer sense of their own past and what could be learned from it" (Brown, 1996). Members of the project agreed that history as a body of knowledge was also significant, albeit secondarily. Knowledge of history was significant to Amherst staffers from the standpoint that the more an individual knows and understands about history the better equipped they will be to ask important questions about society that will hopefully make it better (Brown, 1996; Kline, 1974, Haley, 1972; Sanders and Tanck, 1970; Bennett, 1970).

The Amherst Project's views of history and knowledge suggested much about what they believed a good, democratic citizen was and how one might be developed. In their theoretical writings the developers stated, "The Project takes the position that history is a way of confronting and learning from reality. The central purpose in studying history is held to be the personal and moral development of human beings, not the memorizing of irrelevant 'knowledge.' The subjects of the units are chosen not for their own sake, but with a view to their usability to pose universal questions of human relationships, pertinent as such to the lives of students. Within this framework, the materials over and over again invite the student to discover for himself paradox and irony, to confront dilemma, to see that not all problems are solvable, and to appreciate the nature and uses of value judgments, while practicing making them. The hope is that the student, in trying to explain for himself why particular human beings acted as they did in particular situations, will deepen his own understanding of what it is to be human, that he will come to appreciate man's necessity to act in the midst of uncertainty, to grapple with the moral dimensions of man's behavior, and to comprehend more fully the nobility and frailty of the human condition (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). Additionally, they wrote, "A primary goal of every unit is that students should constantly be able to recognize and define themselves in regard to [a particular] conflict, and that through it they should be constantly reflecting on their own values" (Brown and Traverso, unpublished).

The American Revolution student materials offered some descriptive examples of how the curriculum developers attempted to provide students with opportunities to become better citizens as they themselves defined citizenship. For instance, the

Introduction to *What Happened on Lexington Green?* presented an account that ignited the Watts Riots. The situation began after Marquette Frye was arrested for speeding through the Watts District of Los Angeles. The curriculum designers afforded the readers the chance to see just how complicated it can be to recreate any event. The developers used excerpts from a book that was published about the riots to help contextualize the situation. Additionally, they provided students with the police's version of the incident as well as an interview with the Frye family that was published in *Ebony* magazine.

After the accounts were offered, students were prompted to answer a series of questions. These questions exemplify how the Amherst Project curriculum developers attempted to develop good, democratic citizens as explained in their theoretical writings which were acknowledged in the preceding paragraph. First, students were simply asked, "What did happen?" Next, students were posed two more questions, "Why is it that human beings see things differently when they happen? And if this is a fact of life, how do we ever know what is real, and how do we identify ourselves in regard to time or the immediate past of our own lives?" In conclusion the student materials stated, "These are the questions that this unit is about. By delving into history and asking what it means, it invites a consideration of questions that are very personal and immediate, and to which there are no easy answers" (Bennett, 1970). The teacher's manual stated that the incorporation of such a line of questioning was to encourage students to deliberate about "the implications of the answers we give these questions – or the difficulty we may have answering them – for the larger questions of how we identify and understand ourselves" (Bennett, 1970).

Another example of how the Amherst Project's American Revolution unit typified their view of the good citizen was presented in Section Two. After students examined a plethora of diverse accounts about Lexington in Section One, they were then challenged to analyze how historians reconstruct historical events. The opening paragraph of Section Two explicitly confirmed the purpose of that portion of the unit. Its purpose closely resembled the developers' views of the good, democratic citizen and how they are developed. The paragraph stated, "If it is difficult to be sure of the facts of the past, what is it that historians do when they write the history of a subject? What, indeed, is it that we call history? These are the central questions raised in this section. Since you have worked at reconstructing what happened at Lexington, what historians have said about the episode is here used as a case in point, but the subject of the section is history and historians, not Lexington" (Bennett, 1970). The subsequent paragraph further detailed how the Amherst developers impelled students to "deepen his own understanding of what it is to be human" (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). It declared, "The following excerpts are drawn from the works of British and American historians. They are the products of men and women who have had time to research and consider the matters about which they write. They would, supposedly, be able to exercise greater insight and impartiality than those less well trained in the discipline of writing history. It is obvious, however, that controversies still exist. In reading the documents in this section, keep in mind that it is more important to try to decide why each author writes as he does than to worry about who might be right. After examining and comparing the excerpts, what conclusions might one reach about what history is, and how historians write it? Is the



task of writing history merely one of sifting through the evidence? Do we get closer to the truth about a past period as time passes?” (Bennett, 1970).

These two examples express how the Amherst Project materials pressed to train students to use history to learn more about human nature. Specifically, the developers sought to encourage students to analyze their inner-person and how they see the world. By accounting for one’s own views and beliefs, the Amherst Project designers believed that students would be better prepared to understand where others’, especially those with opposing viewpoints, judgments were being cultivated. In the end, the Amherst Project felt this enhanced understanding of the human condition would help students better appreciate the situations that societies must grapple with as well as each individual’s role in the process.

The Amherst Project of the Committee on the Study of History would likely decline to answer if asked their view of the ideal democracy. Rather, they would call attention to how they went to great lengths to offer multiple perspectives and provide internal development of individuals through the study of history. This suggests that they largely wanted students to be interested enough in conflicts and dilemmas that they themselves could cultivate their own vision of the ideal democracy instead of it being imparted unto them. In Section One alone, the Amherst Project offered 23 different accounts related to “The Lexington Affair” (Bennett, 1970). The developers noted the importance of multiple perspectives on many occasions in that section of the student materials. First they wrote, “The statements in this section come from a wide variety of historical sources” (Bennett, 1970). Later in Section Two they clarify again that “the following accounts of the Lexington incident come from a number of diverse sources:

reminiscences of actual participants given many years after the fact, newspaper stories, 'official' reports, personal diaries, and a version given by an interested citizen who did not happen to be there on that April morning in '75" (Bennett, 1970).

It could be argued that their emphasis on multiple perspectives suggested the Amherst Project authors valued pluralism in society. Additionally, the incorporation of diverse sources suggested a value judgment that directed student thinking to a certain way of thinking about the past and about evidence. The authors might not tell students what position to take, but they seemed to be encouraging them to consider the broadest possible range of evidence before arriving at a position. This suggested a breach in what they see citizens do in their own time and what they wish citizens would do. It could also be argued that the authors were trying to instill in students a sense of skepticism about those in positions of authority.

The accompanying teacher's manual offered additional insight into the curriculum developers' desire that students gain their own interpretation of historical events and their views of society. Teachers were encouraged to prompt students to focus "on the methods used for arriving at whatever position is finally taken," rather than a right answer (Bennett, 1970). The developers' explanation of this further solidified their view that the learner understands what is driving their decision, rather than the curriculum doing it for them. Specifically, the teacher's manual offered certain caveats to the historical analysis that students might take. For example, the developers alerted teachers that students might want to consider the physical locations of those who provided accounts of what occurred. Additionally, the designers prepared teachers to remind students that the battle participants' "personal bias might color their views. So also might the fact that each is

engaged in making what amounts to a quasi-official report of the battle, with the consequent temptation to justify his own command” (Bennett, 1970). However, it still could be argued the decisions about curriculum content steered students toward habits of mind that are valued by the authors.

It is obvious from the student and teacher materials that the Amherst Project creators were attempting to foster an environment where students could use a variety of resources and methods to draw their own conclusions about a particular episode in history, in this case the American Revolution. The final statement in the teacher’s manual that accompanied the American Revolution unit also suggested that the Amherst Project did not necessarily want to impart a certain vision of democracy onto those who encountered their materials. Rather, they wanted the reader to formulate their own views about society and its issues. The final comment by the developers in the teacher’s manual avowed, “From the problems of evidence in Section 1 to the final question as to what is reality, the student and the teacher are invited to work hand in hand in a search for answers to questions that have lacked definitive answers for hundreds of years. Is this not, however, in the final analysis, what education strives for – to help human beings to use, as best they can, their particular powers to pursue the elusive goals of happiness, beauty, and truth? The study of history, or of any honest intellectual discipline, should constantly provide new insights into both the present limitations and the future potentialities afforded by the human condition. Such insights may better enable man in William Faulkner’s terms, ‘to endure...and prevail” (Bennett, 1970).

The Amherst Project materials suggested that the study of history was the lynch pin by which all other aspects of cultivating good, democratic citizens were held in place.

The study of history afforded students the opportunity to analyze historical data and learn about the internal conflicts that human beings encounter when they are thrust into difficult situations. By studying history, students gained better insights about themselves and how they relate to the larger picture of civilization – their community, their society, their world. As students improved their own understanding of themselves and the world in which they live, they should be prepared to participate in bettering society's current condition. While the authors seemed to have obvious ideas about what a good citizen is, their definition of the ideal democracy was more ambiguous. After studying the Amherst materials, the ideal democracy was something that each individual should be able to define for themselves instead of the developers offering their own interpretations of what the ideal democracy might consist. In the end, the Amherst Project's propensity to favor historical data and analyses aligned their materials most closely to the Amelioristic tendency. Additionally, their probable vision of a good, citizen and how it is developed were associated with this tendency.

## CHAPTER 6: THE HARVARD SOCIAL STUDIES PROJECT<sup>3</sup>

### **Historical Contextualization**

#### Overview

Drs. Donald Oliver and James Shaver initiated the Harvard Social Studies Project in 1956. Ultimately, Drs. Fred Newmann and Donald Oliver produced 28 unit books. What began through funding from a private grant provided by Mr. Monroe Gutman grew to a project supported by the United States Office of Education and Harvard University's own research and development program. The project was founded on the belief that the study of public controversy should be the principal component of the social studies curriculum in secondary public schools. The project directors sought to prepare learners to evaluate social issues through dialogue and debate. The Harvard Social Studies Project members believed they were putting forth a curriculum that was innovative compared to their predecessors or competitors. By studying an array of situations from divergent cultures and across time, the project directors felt strongly that students would be better equipped to analyze value conflicts that are a fundamental part of society (Haley, 1972; Sanders and Tanck, 1970; Oliver and Shaver, 1966; Oliver, 1965).

#### Underlying principles

The Harvard Social Studies Project was intended to train secondary students of regular academic ability how to state and defend their viewpoints on societal

---

<sup>3</sup> While a minimal number of the sources can be found in the References section, many of the citations for the Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum materials can be found in Appendix D.

questions. The curriculum was centered on the idea that if students were engaged in studying public issues that have endured throughout history then they would be better prepared to deliberately discuss their own view of the problem as it related to the present day. With “public issues” as the centerpiece, the Harvard Social Studies Project created a curriculum focused on examination and analysis. The Harvard Project placed particular importance on three distinct areas that are crucial to the learning process associated with analyzing public issues: identifying issues, learning strategies of clarification and justification, and the use of discussion to debate issues (Oliver and Newmann, 1967; Oliver and Shaver, 1966; Oliver, 1965).

The curriculum architects began laying the foundation for their materials in their theoretical writings. First, they argued that “a plurality of active groups – i.e., pluralism – is a necessary ingredient of a free society, because it is the only natural mechanism which can insure some freedom of choice” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). The developers believed even with diversity among groups based on economics, ethnicities, and race, society should still openly encourage the values of personal freedom and human dignity. They argued that as individuals some of our most intimate decisions are affected by others in society whose standards are dissimilar to ours. This idea might be the lynchpin to the entire Harvard Social Studies Project because the curriculum developers held that “this is a source of constant conflict and controversy” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). Moreover, when conflict developed into an issue that was significant to a larger sector of society, the issue became public. Whether directly or indirectly, at the point a decision became public everyone in society was involved in the conflict. The developers believed that if issues were to be debated publicly there had to be a set of “common standards, common

principles of ethical and political conduct, and a common vocabulary of norms. The maintained that Western civilization in general, and America in particular, has developed such standards to serve as a basic vocabulary for the debate of public issues. They included concepts, or values, such as “*property rights, free speech, freedom of religion, freedom of personal association and privacy, rejection of violence and faith in reason as a method of dealing with conflict, the general welfare of all, equal opportunity, equal protection under the law, rule of law or constitutional limits on government, rule by consent of the governed, due process of law, separation of powers, and local control of local problems*” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). By providing a set of concepts, often referred to as the American Creed, that are generally acceptable to mainstream society, it could be argued that the Harvard Social Studies Project agreed there were underlying principles that offered a structure of society that has the potential for the ideal democracy. The authors believed citizens needed to have knowledge of these principles and how they relate to democracy. As the students engaged with these principles, the developers held students should begin to see how much conflict arises from them. Based on the influences they encounter in society, students would begin to formulate beliefs about the principles. In the end, the curriculum designers anticipated students would develop arguments that supported or refuted certain stances citizens take on the principles.

Dr. Fred Newmann stated that “the essential purpose of public education and particularly social studies education are [sic] really the preparation for citizenship in a democracy and the major problem we identified was that conventional curriculums did not prepare students adequately because they did not deal with the fundamental challenge of citizenship which is to rationally look at positions on the conflicts that citizens face in

our democracy. We took the issues that people face in our democracy, and we felt that we needed to equip students to handle those dilemmas and particular conflicts through discussion. We believed that discussion was a key feature, or ought to be a key feature, of democracy – rational discussion” (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007).

The theoretical writings of the Harvard Social Studies Project and interview responses of Dr. Fred Newmann suggest views mostly representative of the amelioristic tendency in my analytical heuristic. Does an analysis of the Harvard Project’s curriculum materials reflect a similar amelioristic tendency? How the Harvard Project might answer the four guiding questions integrated into this study will help to identify whether or not their materials fall within the amelioristic tendency.

#### Description of the Harvard Social Studies Project Curriculum Materials

Dissemination and adoption of the Harvard Project materials has been hard to gauge. Newmann maintained that the curriculum developers “didn’t keep track of how many schools adopted them [the materials] or to what extent they adopted them or to what extent there were district adoptions or how many of the books for courses that were adopted. I know that a lot of teachers used them. First of all, specific figures in terms of sales, of course they were published commercially – we sold over 8 million copies of the units themselves. However, how they were distributed and how they were used, we just really don’t know. Although we do know that from experience and from going to conferences that a lot of teachers would come up to us and say ‘I’ve been using your materials’ and so we knew that we had a following that used them. We do know that in some communities there were issues that we were too controversial.” In fact, Newmann attributed the lack of success by the Harvard Project to the controversial aspect of the



materials. He declared, “The nature of this intellectual work is very complex and very disturbing because once you really start to argue about public issues you are going to get in conflicts with people whether it is your peers or teachers or whoever. So being centered on value conflicts and asking students to engage in conflict and arguing, that automatically creates a psychological issue. How do you deal with that? It is uncomfortable. For most people it can be threatening. People’s positions are threatened either by students or teachers because they don’t argue gently and constructively. So I would say the nature of the argumentative part of it is hard for people” (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007).

The Harvard Social Studies Project consisted of 28 unit books. Unit books included a variety of case studies about one public issue that was the focus of the overall book. Depending upon the relevancy of the unit to the class, each book required up to three weeks of use for implementation. While only general knowledge in social studies education is needed for teachers who incorporated the Harvard Social Studies Project materials into their classroom, effective use of Socratic seminars and other discussion techniques were strongly suggested. Teachers were also encouraged to involve school administrators in the process due to the possibility of conflicts that may arise from the incorporation of the Harvard Project materials into the public school classroom. Table 5 offers a listing of those materials from the Harvard Social Studies Project that were examined as part of my study. The teacher’s guides were integral to the curriculum materials because they provided teachers with an overview of the materials and how they might be used in the classroom.

Table 5

## Data Sources from the Harvard Social Studies Project

	Unit Title	Copyright Year	Teacher's Guide
1	Science and public policy: uses and control of knowledge	1993 (1967)	Y
2	The railroad era: business competition and the public interest	1991 (1967)	Y
3	Moral reasoning: the value of life	1972	Y
4	Social action: dilemmas and strategies	1972	Y
5	Revolution and world politics: the search for national independence	1970	Y
6	The civil war: crisis in federalism	1969	Y
7	Race and education: integration and community control	1969	Y
8	Status: achievement and social values	1969	Y
9	Colonial Kenya: cultures of conflict	1968	Y
10	Community change: law, politics and social attitude	1968	Y
11	The lawsuit: legal reasoning and civil procedure	1968	Y
12	Nazi Germany: social forces and personal responsibility	1968	Y
13	Rights of the accused: criminal procedure and public safety	1968	Y
14	The American Revolution: crisis of law and change	1967	Y
15	Cases and controversy: guide to teaching	1967	
16	The immigrant's experience: cultural variety and the "melting pot"	1967	Y
17	Municipal politics: interest groups and the government	1967	Y
18	Negro views of America: the legacy of oppression	1967	Y
19	Religious freedom: minority faiths and majority rule	1967	Y
20	Taking a stand: a guide to clear discussion of public issues	1967	

**Content Analysis**

The content analysis portion of this study encompasses structural and critical analyses. This segment of the analysis is divided into three sections: Presentation of

Materials, Content, and An In-depth Analysis of the Harvard Social Studies Project's Treatment of the American Revolution. The structural analysis initially provides the reader with an overview of how the materials were organized. Additionally, the structural analysis addresses the Harvard Project's emphasis on the importance of structure in relation to content. Within each section are sub-sections that encompass the overarching themes associated with the Harvard Project curriculum materials. These themes provide a broad representation of the overall project and offer a glimpse of the likely anticipated functions of the materials and its developers. A critical analysis of the Harvard materials was completed by conducting an in-depth analysis of their treatment of the American Revolution. Using the guiding questions mentioned throughout my study, I will show how the Harvard Social Studies Project materials might answer each of the four questions that underlie my analytical heuristic.

#### Presentation of Materials

The materials produced by the Public Issues Series/Harvard Social Studies Project by and large were consistent in terms of their presentation. In the initial section of the content analysis, I will present those themes that seemed to be an integral part of the presentation of the Harvard materials. The areas that provided that consistency are: use of case studies, use of questions/issues, use of dialogue/discussion, teacher's guides, and instructional practices.

#### Use of Case Studies

The Harvard Social Studies Project believed strongly that their materials should be used as part of a case study approach to learning. In fact, the unit books in the Public Issues Series were commonly referred to as "case materials" (Oliver and Newmann,

1967b). When asked about how the Harvard curriculum materials differed from other materials of the time, Dr. Newmann referenced the case study approach specifically. At the same time, he alluded to the Harvard Project's view regarding the purpose of teaching history: "We had a project that adopted a case study approach, but the point was still to teach history. The other projects of that era were aligned with the social sciences. We felt the discipline would be very useful to citizenship to the extent that materials from the discipline could help students clarify public controversy. So we selected materials from history and the social sciences and included them in the unit books to help kids with the task of clarifying their position on public issues. I would say that was the main difference. Of course, the other difference was the way our materials were presented as short, paperback case materials that could be adapted and used in different ways. Instead of following a strict chronology or a strict structure, with the unit books you could use the materials in a variety of courses" (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007).

The curriculum developers of this project argued that case studies focused thoroughly on a particular situation that would provide conclusions that had been addressed across time to provide a more general understanding of the controversy under review (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b; Oliver and Shaver, 1966). For example, *Religious Freedom: Minority Faiths and Majority Rule* asked the question: "Which tends to produce a stronger society: many different religions or common agreement on one major religious view?" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967f). While the unit starts with a discussion on Article One of the Constitution of the United States of America, it carried over to current day issues such as tax exemptions for religious groups and prayer in public schools.

## Questions / Issues

The Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum developers saw interconnectedness between issues and questions. In fact, on occasion they used the two interchangeably. Nonetheless, the developers devoted a section of *Taking A Stand: A Guide to Clear Discussion of Public Issues* strictly to stating the issue. Additionally, every teacher's guide reviewed issues and/or questions associated with the unit book. To carry the importance of questions one step further, the developers used a variety of questioning techniques at the end of the case studies. "Persisting Question of History" was used as the springboard by which rational discussion ensued. While I will discuss the latter more in-depth in subsequent sections, this section is devoted to a more detailed examination of the first two highlighted areas of questions and issues.

The Harvard Social Studies Project acknowledged prescriptive, descriptive, and analytic issues. Prescriptive issues occupied those concerns focused on the right and wrong of issues. Descriptive issues focused on problems of fact. Analytic issues honed in on the meaning of a particular problem or controversy (Oliver and Newmann, 1967; Oliver and Shaver, 1966; Oliver, 1965).

The strategies of justification and clarification were aligned with the identification of issues. The project developers reasoned that using analogous examples was the most effective way to counter prescriptive issues because analogies showed that there were multiple ways that an issue might be resolved depending upon the situation. Additionally, they argued that how evidence is evaluated influenced the reliability and validity of descriptive issues. Lastly, clarifying terms and making distinctions between possible meanings of difficult terminology would help students better understand the

controversy in which they were studying especially as it related to definitional issues (Oliver and Newmann, 1967; Oliver and Shaver, 1966; Oliver, 1965).

The curriculum developers of the Public Issues Series of the Harvard Social Studies Project maintained in the unit book *Taking a Stand: A Guide to Clear Discussion of Public Issues* that “to state issues clearly, it is useful to translate the main positions, or opinions that people have into questions. Stating the issue in question form focuses the discussion on a specific topic that requires reasoning and justification” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g). Additionally, every unit book associated with the Harvard Social Studies Project began with an introductory page entitled “The Necessary Questions.” In that introductory page, the curriculum developers gave some insight into how valuable they viewed the notion of questioning, as well as their view of history, when they stated, “Does today’s education in social studies cover too many answers and too few questions? ...When we leave the questions out, we create a rather unusual picture. It begins to appear that history had to happen just the way it did. And we are then inclined to suppose the way it happened was always the ‘right’ way or the only way possible” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g).

These two examples signify the extreme importance that the Harvard Project curriculum developers placed on the use of questions. Moreover, the examples suggest much about their views on the purpose and uses of history and citizenship. First, there is not one version of history. History should encompass multiple viewpoints. Studying history in this manner should offer students the opportunity to engage in the tools of analysis, in this case questioning, to effectively participate in society. In order that students might see the correlation between historical phenomena, the Harvard Project

chose to incorporate an analogous case study approach into their curriculum. As students learn the similarities and differences of historical events with comparable circumstances, they will be better prepared to make decisions in their own time and place that better society.

The centrality of issues and questions was evident in every teacher's guide associated with the Harvard Project that I surveyed. In fact, all teacher's guides had a section devoted to "Issues, Themes, and Analogies." In this section, the essential issues and/or questions related to the unit book were magnified. Some teacher's guides highlighted broader themes. For example, *Guide to Teaching/Municipal Politics: Interest Groups and the Government* had a wide reaching series of issues that the authors felt needed to be addressed. Initially, the guide pressed teachers to have student think about such questions as: *How are political decisions actually made? And what methods and tactics in politics are right?* It was from these two questions that the entire unit book spiraled (Oliver and Newmann, 1967c). Other teacher's guides such as *Guide to Teaching/Race and Education: Desegregation and Community Control* largely focused on legal issues alone. Although the unit book encouraged students to investigate a wider array of questions other than those with legal ramifications, the teacher's guide emphasized the importance of *Plessy v. Ferguson* and the Little Rock Nine and what effects those cases had on public school education. These examples demonstrate just how important the establishment of key issues and questioning was to each individual unit of the Harvard Social Studies Project. The theoretical writings of the Harvard Project specifically addressed the importance of identifying persistent key issues. The developers believed persistent issues allowed students to see that decisions affecting the

community had to be made by the citizenry or the officials whom they elected into office. Additionally, students were afforded opportunities to learn that issues recur at broadly divergent times and in various settings. The curriculum developers also saw the use of persistent, public issues as a means to learning that focused students' thoughts on case studies dealing with specific situations instead of a comprehensive set of episodes. The Harvard Project only included cases that, upon examination, would provide conclusions that could be applied to a set of events that had similar historical implications (Oliver, Newmann, and Singleton, 1992; Oliver and Newmann, 1969b; Oliver and Shaver, 1966).

#### Use of Dialogue/ Discussion

The Public Issues series stated that its major goal was “to help students analyze and discuss persisting human dilemmas related to public issues” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b). This statement alone stresses just how integral persistent issues and discussion were to the Harvard Social Studies Project. Couple that with the fact that the curriculum developers dedicated an entire unit book to teaching students (and teachers) how to go about carrying on dialogue concerning public issues and one sees how important discussion was to the overall project.

The Harvard Social Studies Project posited that there are three reasons why people carry on discussions: “persuasion and ‘winning’, ‘unloading’ feelings, and problem solving and clarification of opposing points of view” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g). Although these purposes may be self-evident, a brief explanation of the Harvard curriculum developers' rationale for their importance is warranted. Persuasion was (and is) suited for those persons who want to sway others that their position is the most proper. If a person is successful in this venture, they inherently believe more strongly in the



validity of their stance. However, if the discussion becomes more argumentative, the discussants might begin to focus more on winning. If that were the case, the participants will likely restate their strongest positions repeatedly so as not to weaken their argument. Therefore, these types of discussions tend to be repetitive and redundant. Unloading feelings was identified as a second purpose for engaging in discussion. These discussions generally are one-sided. The person most involved in the dialogue is largely talking to those who will listen compassionately. The limitation of such a discussion is that there are rarely any opportunities for clarification or influence. The last major reason people engage in discussion as identified by the Harvard Social Studies Project was for solving problems and clarifying opposing viewpoints. The rationale for this type of dialogue was that if more than one person is involved in the process of resolving a difficult problem the likelihood of a better solution increases. In fact, the inclusion of this type of dialogue likely was related to the curriculum developers' views of pluralism as it related to an ideal democracy. They defined pluralism as "the existence not only of different political or partisan groups within the society but of various subcultures which claim the mutual respect of one another, at least to the extent that there is free communication among them" (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). Therefore, if the ideal democracy as the Harvard Project developers truly saw it encompassed making subtle modifications to its existing structure so that all in society have the opportunity and capabilities to engage themselves as functioning members, it seems as though one of those alterations would be ensuring free communication, or discussion, by advocating a pluralistic society. Consequently, discussion contributors enter the dialogue trying to develop their own belief system regarding a persistent issue rather than having a pre-established viewpoint of the

situation. Oftentimes these sorts of discussions offer no resolution. However, they do afford participants the chance to better understand why they agree or disagree with another individual on certain important topics (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g).

In the rationale of the Harvard Project developers, the success of discussions largely focused on the skills of the teacher. The two parts of discussion that teachers needed to pay specific attention to were the teacher's role in discussion and how they evaluated the progress of discussion. The teacher must be seen by students as more than a giver of truths. Teachers had to be willing to change their own view of issues based on discussion. Additionally, the logistical requirements of discussion were seen as key by the project developers. Teachers had to have procedural guidelines for the flow of the discussion in order to maintain an effective learning environment. For example, the teacher must ask themselves: how long should an issue be discussed? When is an issue resolved? At what point, do you know if something has been completed in the discussion? In order to have a sense of whether or not these questions were attained, the teacher had to decipher if a consensus was reached or not. The teacher had to evaluate if the discussion has reached a point where no progress is being made. Lastly, the teacher must consider whether a time limit should be placed on the discussion. If so, he or she must stop the discussion when the allotted time ran out. Consistency and structure were key components to maintaining a rational, meaningful discussion (Oliver and Newmann, 1967).

The Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum developers continued in Part Three through Six of *Taking A Stand* to strengthen their argument for the inclusion of disciplined discussion in their curriculum. They classified five components of disciplined

discussion: sensitivity, stating the issue, pursuing issues with continuity, clear transitions, and relevance.

### Teacher's Guides

The Public Issues Series Guide to Teaching leaflets provided structure and continuity to the overall Harvard Social Studies Project. Each of the four page documents spotlighted five focus areas central to the Project: *Issues, Themes, and Analogies; Dialogue Analysis; Alternative Approaches to the Unit; Potential Problems of Teaching the Unit; and Other Activities*. Additionally, two objective tests and answer keys were included in the teacher's guides. The headings held true in all teacher's guides except for those published after 1969. The last three guides ventured away from practice and were more theoretical in nature.

The Issues, Themes, and Analogies section was largely focused on giving the teacher a broad brush view of the issue(s) central to each unit and how the cases included in each particular unit conveyed the issue at hand. The authors presented this section in a variety of ways. In some teacher's guides, they began with a discussion of the broader issues. For instance, *Guide to Teaching/Status: Achievement and Social Values* started with this statement, "This unit book deals with a complex of interrelated issues, which should be analytically sifted out: To what extent is our (or any) society stratified into social classes? If we assume that stratification exists, on what basis do we assign higher or lower social status? Do the underlying values that determine social status apply on the same basis to the different social contexts in which people live (home, school, work, recreation)? Considerable attention should be paid to the use of key terms: 'social class,' 'social status,' and 'values'" (Oliver and Newmann, 1969c). In other guides, the

curriculum developers began with a more specific issue or question and expanded the introduction from there. For example, *Guide to Teaching/Nazi Germany: Social Forces and Personal Responsibility* pointed out from the outset that those individuals associated with a group in the minority are far more controlled by social influences than those of the majority. The authors then connected the issue with the Vietnam War (Oliver and Newmann, 1968d). As has been highlighted throughout this chapter, the interconnectedness between similar, analogous historical events and issues was a key component of the Harvard Social Studies Project. Persistent issues offered students the opportunity to see how events were addressed within their historical context and how they might approach dealing with similar issues that arise in their lives. Still other guides began with an introductory paragraph that laid out the historical context for the issue or issues addressed in particular unit books. For example, *Guide to Teaching/Community Change: Law, Politics, and Social Attitudes* began by discussing the post-World War II population shift from city dwellers to suburbanites. Then a brief description of the first case study was presented. It was not until the third paragraph that the persistent issues at hand were formally introduced (Oliver and Newmann, 1968b). Once the issues and themes were established, the authors provided a brief synopsis of the analogies they used to convey the issue across time. While the unit books themselves were more detailed in terms of content related to the analogies, the teacher's guides offered the instructor a general overview of the analogous cases and how they related to the unit to which they were associated. The topics and central questions advocated learning centered on controversial issues that American society oftentimes faces, but students seldom are given the chance. Therefore, the topics selected and questions asked

suggest that the Harvard Project curriculum designers sought to offer students an opportunity to engage in materials that they might not otherwise encounter until adulthood. By that time, it would likely be too late to adequately prepare them to participate effectively. Therefore, the Harvard Project developers believed that if students were to become productive citizens, they needed exposure to and experience with dilemmas they might encounter as participants in American society.

The Dialogue Analysis sections of the teacher's guides were helpful for teachers in that they provided teachers with a transcription of how a discussion might flow as students attempt to hash out persistent issues in history. In essence, teachers had the ability to view the Harvard Social Studies Project as it was transformed from theory into practice. One potential pitfall though was that there was only one dialogue excerpt per teacher's guide. Therefore, if a teacher had particular issues arise within a discussion they may or may not have easily accessible information on how to troubleshoot the roadblock in the discussion. Nonetheless, some illustrations of the types of dialogues that the teacher's guides demonstrated follow. In the *Guide to Teaching/Race and Education: Desegregation and Community Control*, the authors provided an exchange of ideas on when it is morally and legally defensible to have educational segregation (Oliver and Newmann, 1969b). In the *Guide to Teaching/Negro Views of America: The Legacy of Oppression*, the writers focused more on the logistical aspect of organizing a discussion. Specifically, a vignette of how the teacher should establish a discussion agenda when many issues are raised at once was included (Oliver and Newmann, 1967d). In the *Guide to Teaching/Municipal Politics: Interest Groups and the Government*, the curriculum creators provided teachers with a vignette that offered two instructional clarifications.

First, the discourse analysis showed the drawbacks of following one question at a time. Second, the illustration demonstrated how to manage definitional issues that occur during disciplined discussions (Oliver and Newmann, 1967c).

The Alternative Approaches to the Unit section of each teacher's guide seemed to provide some insight to the greater goals of the Harvard Social Studies Project. It appears that the curriculum developers were modeling their belief in multiple perspectives and drawing one's own conclusions by including this section in the teacher's guides. The authors provided an overall framework for the Public Issues Series of the Harvard Social Studies Project, but they also offered flexible suggestions for teachers to follow when they integrated the Harvard Project materials into their classroom. Not only did the teacher's guide offer alternative approaches, they also suggested potential instructional practices to use if one chose to focus on an issue or issues different from those highlighted in the teacher's guide. For instance, the *Guide to Teaching/The Immigrant's Experience: Cultural Variety and the 'Melting Pot'* suggested that the unit be taught questioning discrimination, inculcation, and xenophobia in American society. However, the curriculum creators provided three alternatives to this approach. They suggested that a focus could also be placed on ethnic identity, stereotypes, or cultural pluralism, and still used the case study material provided as part of the unit book (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b). Again, each teacher's guide has its own unique suggestions relating to alternative approaches.

The Potential Problems of Teaching the Unit section is much like the Alternative Approaches section in that the amount of potential problems that are highlighted is so great that they are almost cumbersome. In an effort to illustrate the kinds of potential

problems that the developers foresaw, I will highlight a few of the topics associated with this section: Lack of Empathy, Lack of Personal Experience in Litigation, Position of Cultural Relativism Taken by the Students, and Remoteness of History (Oliver and Newmann, 1969a; Oliver and Newmann, 1968a; Oliver and Newmann, 1968c; Oliver and Newmann, 1968e). Again, the potential problems are undoubtedly focused on the particular unit at hand. Nonetheless, the prospect for roadblocks was obviously there or the developers would not have provided a section to prepare the teacher.

#### Instructional Practices

This analysis has attempted to document the importance that the Harvard Project authors placed on rational discussion. However, the Harvard Social Studies Project suggested a few additional instructional practices that students may involve themselves with during the analysis of issues in the unit books. The Project identified five activities: student position papers, role-playing, analysis of tapes, grouping for discussion, and deliberate discussion.

It was recommended that student position papers be written before and/or after discussion ensued. The key point for the authors was that the papers justify students' positions with bulleted points to make their case. Additionally, the use of opposing viewpoints from student papers was suggested to spark discussion and debate. If students were so inclined, they could also re-write their papers making alterations based on what changes in thought they developed throughout the learning process. Many of the unit books provided students opportunities to role-play. For example, *Religious Freedom* afforded students the chance to be members of religious minorities who were in conflict with those in society who had differing religious beliefs. To better educate and prepare

students for discussion, the developers believed that specified classes associated with a particular unit, especially the discussion portion of the unit, should be tape recorded and analyzed. The major reason for this activity was to improve listening skills among students. Grouping for discussion offered the most diverse ideas for additional instructional activities. The authors suggested three specific types of group discussions:

1. Debating teams of two to four students state their views on an issue to the class.
2. Five to eight students discuss an issue while the rest of the class listens and evaluates.
3. Pair Dialogues about a particular issue is ongoing throughout the classroom.

Deliberate discussion was suggested as a precursor to more intense discussions. Students had to “deliberate, discuss, and decide ‘what to say next’ to a previous statement created by another team or group” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b). Their end goal was that students should be better prepared to think more carefully about the issue at hand rather than proceed in a speedy discourse without time for thought (Oliver and Newmann 1967b; Oliver and Newmann, 1967g).

## Content

The Content associated with the Harvard Social Studies Project varied in many ways from unit to unit. Chiefly, I am referring to content in the traditional sense. Therefore, a wide array of historical topics was used to prepare twenty-eight unit books and teacher’s guides. However, the framework used to prepare students to grapple with persistent issues in history was principally similar across units. The similarities across units afforded students continuity as they learned how to better prepare themselves to actively participate in a democratic society. In the following sub-sections, those



recurring themes associated with how the content of the project was categorized are addressed. The sub-sections are divided between textual accounts, “facts of the case,” “persisting questions of history,” “facts of the overview,” and “review, reflection, and research.”

### Textual Accounts

The Harvard Social Studies Project used six different types of textual accounts as part of the case materials in their unit books: story and vignette, journalistic historical narratives, research data, documents, text, and interpretive essay. The situations used as illustrations of value conflicts were historical, fictional, and contemporary in nature. A story was intended to be viewed as a novel that depicted the emotions of the characters involved. The stories used in the Harvard Project materials were both fictitious and historically accurate. The vignette was a small piece of a story absent of a plot. For example, “Sammy’s Revenge” in *Colonial Kenya: Cultures in Conflict* was an authentic story about settlers who witnessed first hand the influence of the magic beliefs of the native peoples (Oliver and Newmann, 1968a). “The Case of Joseph Revesz” from *The Immigrant’s Experience: Cultural Variety and the “Melting Pot”* was a bona fide vignette that detailed how the Emergency Quota Act of 1921 affected an immigrant family (Oliver and Newmann, 1967c). The journalistic historical narratives were presented as news accounts. The news accounts were either eyewitness accounts or a detailed representation of a series of events. *The Civil War: Crisis in Federalism* offered several historical journalistic narratives. “The Draft Riots” was one of those narratives. It dealt with the manner in which New Yorkers disregarded law and order in objection of the draft (Oliver and Newmann, 1969a). Research data was used as evidence for testing

factual claims and consisted of statistical data from survey and experimental studies. For instance, *Status: Achievement and Social Values* included the “Incident at Elmtown.” This research data expressed how school policies were more strictly enforced on certain students (Oliver and Newmann, 1969c). Documents primarily consisted of public records such as speeches, court opinions, transcription of court proceedings, laws, diaries, and the like. *Nazi Germany: Social Forces and Personal Responsibility* contained an autobiography of young German soldiers at the beginning of World War I entitled “Ernst Toller’s Experience” (Oliver and Newmann, 1968d). Texts were those writings such as introductions and overviews in the unit books. Texts were often seen as objective in nature. In essence, texts were used to provide a general statement about history and the context around certain events. Texts offered definitions and theories for why certain phenomena transpired. “1864-90—A Pattern Emerges” was part of *Race and Education: Desegregation and Community Control*. It presented how racially segregated schools were started well before the turn of the twentieth century (Oliver and Newmann, 1969b). Interpretive essays were included in the Harvard Social Studies Project materials to express how to develop and support a position. *Negro Views of America: The Legacy of Oppression* offered one essay that was entitled “Explaining the Statistics.” This essay conveyed three different theories that attempted to explain racial diversity (Oliver and Newmann, 1967e) (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b).

The Harvard Project developers intentionally established a hierarchical approach to how they presented the case materials. The stories and journalistic narratives were used first as dramatic stories about people. Next, more objective materials were provided to help students understand facts and generalities about the phenomena under review.

Last, more philosophical approaches were included to spiral the information learned beyond the confines of the social studies classroom. The curriculum developers of the Public Issues Series explicitly stated that they created the materials in this manner because it “increasingly provides its own construction of a problem, rather than laying out the raw experience and challenging the student and teacher to construe the problem” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967b). This approach to curriculum development strongly suggests the influence Bruner’s spiral curriculum concept had on the Harvard Project materials. If the preceding questions and content emphases are reviewed as a set, they provide a better understanding of what the Harvard Project curriculum developers’ vision of the status of democracy might be. As Dr. Newmann alluded to in an interview, the materials associated with their project were highly controversial. So much so that some school systems would not adopt them for fear of adverse perceptions from the community. Newmann also stated, “At the time, anywhere from the 50’s through the 60’s when we did our work, there were a number of important controversial public issues that were not being adequately addressed that we could see – civil rights, war, abortion – these are just kind of current public issues although what we focused on was not on current events. It is really important to realize that. We were thinking about persistent, public issues such as majority rule v. minority rights. We focused on national security v. privacy” (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007). Therefore, the content that was included in these materials might be interpreted as material that was not popular or often addressed in schools. The integration of persistent, public issues that “were not being adequately addressed” with the understanding that their materials were highly controversial suggests that the Harvard Project was at least on some level trying to

provide a platform for individuals, groups, and/or issues that might hold views opposite the mainstream.

#### “Persisting Questions of History”

The “Persisting Questions of History” section is really the crux of the entire Harvard Social Studies Project because it is the part of the case study from which discussion flows. The importance of discussion to the Harvard Social Studies Project was well-documented throughout the examination of theoretical pieces, interviews, and the Public Issues Series. Additionally, the questions from which discussions are cultivated were essential to the project. In *Taking A Stand*, the curriculum developers exhausted many pages and much effort to clarify types of issues and how to address the issues successfully. The theoretical basis presented in *Taking A Stand* appears to be directly related to the “Persisting Questions in History” section of each case in the unit books. Therefore, I will briefly discuss the theoretical underpinnings highlighted in *Taking A Stand*. Then I will provide illustrations that were identified throughout the unit books which support the hypothesis that these two areas, the theoretical writings in *Taking A Stand* and the “Persisting Questions of History” section in the unit books, are related. There are five different types of issues that the Project acknowledged: moral or value issues, definitional issues, issues of fact and explanation, legal issues, and disagreements over frame of reference.

Moral or value issues were labeled as those issues that raise questions related to “goodness” and badness”. Some illustrative examples from the “Persisting Questions of History” sections in the unit books highlight moral or value issues. *Religious Freedom: Minority Faiths and Majority Rule* asked students to evaluate whether or no it was “right”

for Romans to require Christians to swear faith in Roman Gods (Oliver and Newmann, 1967f). *Municipal Politics: Interest Groups and the Government* encouraged discussants to evaluate whether or not political favors were “right” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967d). *The Civil War: Crisis in Federalism* solicited students’ view on whether or not leaders of slave revolts were morally justified in their use of violence (Oliver and Newmann, 1969a).

Definitional issues were related to the manner in which significant words or phrases were used in the discussion. Two people might describe the same word, event, or phenomena very differently. Therefore, the authors of the Harvard Project believed it was imperative that discussion participants agree to use certain terms consistently or at list reference a dictionary or other authoritative source for clarification if common ground could not be reached (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g). There were cases in the Public Issues Series that required students to define certain terminology as part of the discussion. *Negro Views of America: The Legacy of Oppression* invited students to “arrive at a general definition of slavery and test it with other situations; for example, the roles of soldiers and housewives” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967e). *Status: Achievement and Social Values* challenged students to define a high school student’s status among teachers, other adults, and students (Oliver and Newmann, 1969c).

Factual issues were also an integral part of the HSSP framework. These sorts of issues arose in situations where there were discrepancies about the details of events. Issues of fact can be clarified in four distinct ways according to the Harvard Project: common knowledge, personal observation, reference to authoritative source, and showing that an assertion is reliable in relation to similar claims (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g).

Legal Issues and Disagreements over Frame of Reference were two more expansive issues that the Harvard Social Studies Project highlighted as part of their public policy issue framework. Legal issues were largely a combination of the prior three types of issues: value, definitional, and factual. Disagreements over Frame of Reference centered on how to structure the most important issues associated with controversial topics. Specifically, the curriculum creators defined frame of reference as “the most important values and beliefs that influence how they look at the world” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967g). Instructive paradigms of these sorts of issues were prevalent throughout the unit books. *The Civil War: Crisis in Federalism* challenged students to decide whether or not they support the Draft Act of 1863 passed by the United States Congress (Oliver and Newmann, 1969a). *Revolution and World Politics: The Search for National Independence* prompted students to ponder issues of international law such as “to what extent do you consider that agreements such as those reached at Geneva should be regarded as law?” (Oliver and Newmann, 1970). The curriculum designers viewed frame of reference as an important component to account for when developing a curriculum and learning from one. They stated in their theoretical writings that “every teacher or other builder of social studies curricula has a frame of reference that, consciously or unconsciously, shapes the way he deals with ethical and political conflict – even if it is to ignore such controversy as too upsetting or as irrelevant to the more ‘pressing tasks’ of the social studies classroom” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). Likewise, students have a frame of reference they bring to the educational experience that must be accounted for when learning is taking place.

The five types of issues associated with the Harvard Social Studies Project are a central theme in the content studied in the unit books. Moreover, the questions that evoke interest in controversial issues are interconnected to the issues themselves. Therefore, the curriculum developers spent an exorbitant amount of time developing the theoretical importance of their public policy issues approach. Once the approach was well-established, the developers used the “Persisting Questions of History” section to attract interest and ultimately discussion among students.

#### “Review, Reflection, Research”

Each unit book concluded with an all-encompassing section to bring everything included in the case study together, but also carry the learning process one step further. The main purpose of this section of the unit books was to remind students and teachers that they had not reached the conclusion of the learning regard a particular persisting public issue. In essence, the “Review, Reflection, Research” section offered supplementary activities designed for additional examination and discourse. Depending upon the controversial topic studied as part of the unit, each closing section related to the overall issue studied throughout the unit book. So whatever the main issue entailed, the “Review, Reflection, Research” portion of the unit book provided other instructional practices that students could tackle to increase their aptitude on the issue and how to attend to it (Oliver and Newmann, 1970; Oliver and Newmann, 1968b; Oliver and Newmann, 1967c).

## An In-depth Analysis of the Harvard Social Studies Project's Treatment of the American Revolution

The Harvard Social Studies Project dedicated an entire unit book to the American Revolution. The student unit book entitled *The American Revolution: Crisis of Law and Change* illustrated that “the questions of the American Revolution remain far larger than who won or who lost. It becomes increasingly crucial, despite the range of time, to ask these questions: What were the basic issues? How could these issues have been discussed? How might the resolution of these issues have been different and better? ...The issues of 1775 [that] are still contagious. They have spread through time and space across much of the modern world – translated or twisted in thousands of ways into legislation, into restless demonstrations, or into ‘wars of national liberation.’ These are the very issues which determine whether young men today are to live in peaceful comfort or to go forth into just or unjust battle. They are the very questions which young people today must be called on to know and discuss” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). In this portion of the analysis, I will use the unit on the American Revolution to convey the themes constructed in the analysis of the overall Public Issues Series of the Harvard Social Studies Project.

The American Revolution unit used seven different cases as part of the study. The first case was a simple text document entitled *Seeds of Revolution – 1650-1775*. This text outlined those social, economic, and political events leading up to the American Revolution. The second case was a fictional vignette, *Case of George Watkins (1773)*. This was an account about a man who had to decide whether to obey or dissent with the authorities of the time. The third case was an authentic historical journalistic narrative –



*Stamp Act*. This was an article that discussed attempts to enforce the Stamp Act which were met with resistance. Additionally, demands for repeal of the Stamp Act were addressed. Cases four, five, and six combined to create a *The Crisis Bursts: Three Points of View*. Case four, *Case of Adam Cooper*, was a fictional story. It depicted one man's view of what occurred at the Battle of Lexington. The fifth case, *Account of Lt. Col. Smith*, was an authentic document. It presented a British officers view of what happened at Lexington and Concord. The sixth case, *Case of Oliver Wiswell*, was a fictional story about the experiences of a family that were Loyalists. The seventh case, *Incident at Pettus Bridge*, was authentic contemporary journalistic narrative. It provided a modern analogy of the civil rights movement (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a).

The contents of the American Revolution unit demonstrated the efforts of the authors to incorporate the key elements they believed were necessary for developing effective citizens. From the outset, students engaged in materials that helped them identify the values most important to themselves. Additionally, students were required to recognize the values of others. Later students were challenged to define such terms as "patriotism" and "legality." Moreover, the students had to judge the validity of certain forms of protest. Students also had to weigh the factual claims made in personal accounts such as those established by Lt. Col. Smith. Legal issues were also present in the American Revolution unit. Students explicitly had to judge whether or not one of three historical figures whom they studied held firmer values regarding freedom and law than the other two (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a).

The teacher's guide for *The American Revolution* was similar to all other teacher's guides. It had the same sub-headings and features that were discussed at length

in the general analysis portion of this study. Additionally, the unit book offered a similar conclusion to that of the other units with “Review, Reflection, Research” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a).

As was stated in the general survey of the Harvard materials, questions and/or issues were an integral part of the project. Every unit book offered broad issues and/or questions as part of an introductory piece. *The American Revolution* was no different. “A Crisis in Youth” provided the introduction to the unit book. Not only did it set the context for the divisiveness associated with this event in history, this section also introduced the issues at hand. The questions or issues that were central to this unit were as follows (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a):

1. What is a proper government, and where does its power originate?
2. In what ways should people – as groups or individuals – be able to express themselves to constituted authority? And what responsibility do rulers have to listen?
3. When and how is authority to be challenged? Are there rules which tell us the exact point at which control becomes tyranny? Is there a precise measurement for the point at which dissent may turn to revolt? Is violence ever the “right” course?

These questions suggest much about how the Harvard Project might answer the four guiding questions linked to this study. The curriculum developers offered two types of content. One type of content revolved around which data students should be exposed to in school. The second type of content focused on what students will be taught to do with the data. It could be argued that the wording of the questions themselves seemed to be

directed to those in society who might be disillusioned with those in authority. At the same time, the questions stop short of unequivocal disapproval of society as it is. The questions suggest that the developers' believed American democracy needed to be altered to allow *all* citizens the opportunity to function within society. Additionally, the questions challenged students to think about what is required of them as citizens. For example, the questions asked students to think about when to challenge authority (Oliver and Shaver, 1966).

While a brief snapshot of how the Harvard Social Studies Project structured their unit on the American Revolution is beneficial, it only offered part of the explanation for their overall rationale and purposes. The content itself also speaks to a curriculum project's rationale and purposes. The Harvard Project authors believed if students are to develop into good, democratic citizens, they "should be exposed to public problems within our society...and the students should be taught to analyze these public problems within some useful political and social framework" (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). "It is necessary to have *some* framework from which to approach political conflict in order to feel any sense of adequacy or competence in handling it...without a framework the student is likely to view social controversy as a maze of facts, opinions, and conflicting claims. When his own opinions are challenged, he approaches the controversy by simply embracing unreflected judgments...without such a framework he is a creature of impulse, wasting his energies by rationalizing his failures rather than focusing his reason upon the challenges to his existence" (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). The remainder of this analysis will focus on the *framework* the Harvard Social Studies Project created to teach students how to become productive citizens. By analyzing the guiding questions associated with

my analytical heuristic in conjunction with the Harvard Project's American Revolution unit, I will identify the tendency to which the Harvard Project seemed to be most closely aligned. Throughout the analysis, I will provide examples that were typical representations of the overall Harvard Social Studies Project.

Early in the American Revolution unit, the curriculum developers suggested that there are certain values that are important to society. In the activity on page 14 entitled "Who Should Govern?", "a value" was defined and there was a subsequent activity for students to grapple with values. The first component of the activity required students to read a series of ten statements and place a check by "those statements which represent the values *you* hold about 'good' government" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). One example of the statements was "A country belongs to those men who own property in it, and they should govern" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). The second step in the activity involved students classifying ten values in relation to the statements. A few examples of the values are property ownership, majority rule, efficiency, and competence.

As was indicated in the underlying principles section, an important element of the Harvard Project was the inclusion of multiple perspectives so that students might understand all situations are wrought with diverse perceptions of the event. The Watkins vignette included four very different views of who was "right" in colonial America, the English or the colonists. Not only did the case show four sides to the situation, it also expressed the internal conflict of George Watkins himself. As Americans, we are often challenged to evaluate society and voice our praises or concerns for how it is or should be progressing. George Watkins' internal struggle offered an example how an individual might participate in the democratic process. The individual, in this case George Watkins,

must decide whether or not the internal issue with which he or she is struggling must be made public. If so, the curriculum developers would argue that is the place of government in a conflictual society. Specifically they stated, “A national government is called for that can deal with the problems of the larger society and yet allow the broadest and deepest conception of personal freedom and human dignity to exist among the subgroups...the commitment of the government, then, to the concept of human dignity has two components: protecting autonomy of individual sub-societies or groups and developing a common standard which can be applied to conflicts within the national community. A national society is possible only if there is some conception of national ethical standards on which antagonists can find common ground to debate differences” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). Using the Watkins case as an example, the curriculum developers seem to provide students with an opportunity to experience the internal struggle of those who participate in a democracy. They effectively presented fair hearings for all sides of the issue. As the theoretical work implied, the authors might have had two purposes with the Watkins example. First, they could have been expressing that there are many segments of society who want their views heard and acknowledged. Also, they could have been offering students the opportunity to confront diverse views so that they could gain skills in considering and sorting through the divergent claims made in public deliberation. The authors would argue that differences of opinion are healthy to democracy as long as those in power foster an environment supportive of personal freedoms and human dignity. As a citizen, however, it is our responsibility to gather the facts and be prepared to defend our views. In fact, the curriculum materials stated, “when a person values something for himself – where he has a personal preference – he isn’t

usually pressed very hard to defend it...a person's values for society or the community, however, may be a different matter than personal preference. Many different values can be expressed about government. The person expressing values about government – what is good for himself and others – will usually find himself obliged to justify them if he can” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a) (Oliver and Shaver, 1966).

Answers to the remaining three guiding questions were ever-present throughout the unit and overall curriculum. However, the last case study in the unit – “Incident at Pettus Bridge” – was really where possible answers to those questions by the Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum developers emerged. Moreover, “The Necessary Questions” at the beginning of every unit book highlighted the Harvard Project's view of the role of history within the mission of social studies and American citizens in society. The materials stated, “Our past and our present both are matters for Americans to think about and use, not merely to observe and memorize. This book grows out of a vigorous belief that each student is a part of our national past and present. It is intended to take you into a living dimension of history...to involve you as something more than a spectator, as more of a thinking, acting participant in history” (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a).

The analogous case at the conclusion of the American Revolution served many purposes. The curriculum developers even stated their view at the outset of the case proclaiming, “Here is a modern case from Selma, Alabama. It does not suggest that ‘history repeats’ exactly in its course or its outcomes. Civil rights demonstrators of 1965 are not identical with the Colonial patriots of 1775. Their cases square at many points, differ at others. Yet the larger question remains, still undecided in our own time: How far

can men rightfully go in challenging established authority to gain what they think is right?" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). This introductory statement suggested that HSSP wanted those who experienced their materials to see the connection between past and present events. Additionally, the juxtaposition of the colonists and demonstrators seemed to indicate that the developers saw some validity in comparing historical events to aid students in better understanding those events, people, and/or problems of the past and present so that they can help make the world a better place.

The "Persisting Questions of History" section at the end of the case study focused on analyzing parallels. Seven questions were posed that compared and contrasted "the questions of authority and dissent in Selma, Alabama, in 1965 and in the American colonies in 1765-1773" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). Each of the seven questions forced students to justify their position on the questions by having them provide specific reasons for their opinion. An example of one of the questions was "Did either the Stamp Act or the Selma voter registration practices involve issues that would remain even if these particular conflicts had been peacefully resolved? Give specific reasons for your opinion" (Oliver and Newmann, 1967a). Using the historical events – in this case those centered on the American Revolution and the Selma Voters Registration Campaign – the Harvard Project likely sought to provide students with the opportunity to engage in historical analysis to help understand the problems of the past and present by studying analogous historical cases. Once students began to understand the relationships of past and present events, the curriculum developers pressed them to begin making decisions and taking positions on issues of the day. In this case, the issue that paralleled historical

and current events was based on how far men can go when challenging authority in order to gain what they believe is right.

While the Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum materials offered a distinctive framework for teaching and learning, the overall project was more amelioristic than critical. The developers suggested that there was a foundational underpinning for the ideal democracy when they wrote “he [the student] must be committed to the basic ideals of American society emerging from the democratic traditions of Western civilization” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). The Harvard Project placed “at the heart of the liberal democratic society: human dignity and rational consent...respect for human dignity is the basic social value in the American community. When two people disagree over public policy, each should appeal to this basic value when he defends and rationalizes his position...our own society has developed an elaborate set of procedures for handling public disputes which are, hopefully, consistent with the fundamental value, human dignity. The principle behind the procedures developed for settling disputes with peace and dignity we shall call *rational consent*” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). The incorporation of human dignity and rational consent into their framework not only related to the Harvard Project’s vision of an ideal democracy. It was also interrelated to how they interpreted what a good, democratic citizen was. The Harvard Project developers maintained that pluralism of a variety of subgroups was the “necessary ingredient of a free society, because it is the only natural mechanism which can insure some freedom of choice” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). Having established this point, the developers also held that there were certain qualities that were required of good, democratic citizens. Specifically, they stated, “despite an inevitable degree of isolation among groups within



the society, there must be recognition that many problems have to be handled by the community as a whole. The members of all the subgroups must to some extent share value commitments and a normative vocabulary as a framework within which to deal with these common problems. This normative framework must include procedures for the mediation of interpersonal and intergroup conflict, especially as necessary to solve the societal problems” (Oliver and Shaver, 1966). The framework of the Harvard Social Studies Project was closely analyzed in the structural analysis portion of this chapter. The Harvard Project viewed history’s place within the mission of social studies as “very useful to citizenship to the extent that materials from the discipline could help students clarify public controversy” (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007). Additionally, the developers saw history not as a realized truth. Instead, history was to be questioned so that a variety of interpretations of an event might be offered. These quotes directly from the theoretical framework of the Harvard Project curriculum developers and the curriculum examples throughout this chapter strongly suggest an amelioristic tendency toward how and what social studies content should be emphasized and how it should be taught.

## CHAPTER 7: TEACHERS' CURRICULUM INSTITUTE<sup>4</sup>

### **Historical Contextualization**

#### Overview

As the 1980s approached, the rise of conservatism that had been over a decade in the making seemingly came to fruition with the election of Ronald Reagan. Reagan's campaign was centered up American pride and success. In essence, Reagan believed that leading the nation away from the welfare state established by the New Deal was of prime importance. Additionally, he felt that capitalism and gaining international respect were vital components of a successful America (Tindall and Shi, 1999; Brinkley, 1992).

The educational system was directly affected and influenced by the revival of conservatism established by the Reagan presidency. The national government and academic community published reports and articles that stated American public schools were not adequately preparing students to compete with her international counterparts. Additionally, many claimed the United States had lost its economic competitive edge among the international community. Therefore, individual groups, within and outside the field of education, began to push heavily for reform, in this case the creation of national standards. One of the disciplines within social studies that created standards was history. The National History Standards of 1994 were created. The standards were established as

---

<sup>4</sup> While a minimal number of the sources can be found in the References section, many of the citations for the Teachers' Curriculum Institute curriculum materials can be found in Appendix E.

the framework for what students in grades 5-12 should know about social studies (Evans, 2004; Stern, 1994).

There were two distinctly divergent views regarding what social studies content should be accentuated and how it should be presented. Those who agreed with the National Commission on Excellence's assessment that we were a nation "at risk" believed that the decline in students' performance was directly related to how history was taught. Specifically, they believed there should be a shift away from an investigative approach to teaching and learning history back to history as a narrative that retells *the* story of the past. Conversely, many curriculum reformers sought to create materials that would challenge students' thinking about and understanding of history. These same reformers felt strongly that students must do more with history than regurgitate facts they learned by being told a story. Numerous developers believed that the National History Standards of 1994 offered students the opportunity to achieve academic goals based on student thinking and understanding. Therefore, curricula such as *History Alive!* were produced. *History Alive!* was created by Teachers' Curriculum Institute (TCI) to give students opportunities to engage in history on a level that is most often different from traditional history instruction. Teachers' Curriculum Institute and *History Alive!* are the focus of the fourth and final critical case of my analysis.

Teachers' Curriculum Institute was founded in 1989. The curriculum development company began when a group of social studies teachers decided to alter the manner in which history was being taught. The creators of TCI wanted to develop materials that promoted a learning environment full of "creativity, engagement, and fun" (Bower Interview conducted on February 6, 2007). The group spent much of the decade

of the 1980's developing and tweaking ideas within the confines of their own classrooms. The lessons created by this group had a common thread. All the participants sought to find ways to interest an academically-diverse group of learners. This ideal became the mission of TCI – “to engage all learners in the diverse classroom so that social studies becomes one of their favorite subjects” (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). Additionally, TCI declared, “We have created a teaching approach that is mindful of the challenges of standards-based instruction, yet also promotes innovative, effective instruction that excites students about social studies” (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005).

Dr. Bert Bower, President and CEO of Teachers' Curriculum Institute, believes many see TCI's materials as successful because “It's the strategy. It's the vision of a better classroom. It's that people finally have an alternative to the boring textbook. The comment we get most often is ‘this is the way I want to teach’ or ‘this is the way I used to teach’ or ‘this is the way I try to teach, but I can only create two or three of these lessons a year.’ I think people are hungry for a model that's not just drill and kill because everybody across the nation knows that there is a lot of silent violence. By silent violence I mean they tell the kids to shut up, sit down, listen, fill out a worksheet, and the kids are becoming very passive. The whole nation is eager for meaningful engagement and that's what we offer. We have a technological aspect to it and that's fine. We have standards and that's fine. We have a textbook that's more readable and engaging than any other textbook and that's fine. But that's not what it's all about. It's about wanting to learn, coming together and getting excited about looking and analyzing and interpreting” (Interview conducted on February 6, 2007).

## Underlying Principles

The TCI approach to teaching and learning encompasses a collection of educational materials that offers learners of varying skills the opportunity to gain knowledge about important elements of social studies education. The materials respond to state-adopted content standards from all over the United States. TCI states that their intent is to present materials in a non-biased manner. Moreover, they use their materials to develop an enhanced understanding of history among young people. Teachers' Curriculum Institute bases their materials on theories set forth by the prior works of educational theorists. Howard Gardner's seven intelligences, Elizabeth Cohen's cooperative learning, and Jerome Bruner's spiral curriculum are entrenched in the lessons and activities developed by TCI.

Howard Gardner theorized that all students are intelligent. He defined intelligences as "the ability to solve problems, or to create products, that are valued within one or more cultural settings" (Gardner, 1993). Therefore, he deduced that instructional activities that include multiple intelligences offer better opportunities for more students to hone their abilities. Gardner's initial seven intelligences are as follows: verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, visual-spatial, musical-rhythmic, body-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Swenson, 1994; Gardner, 1993).

Elizabeth Cohen's work posited that cooperative interaction among students leads to increased student achievement. Moreover, Cohen's research suggested that students gain a wide range of abilities by working in groups. Most importantly, working within groups prompts students to accept more responsibility in carrying the work load assigned.

According to Cohen, when students undertake a more active role in their work, they learn and remember more of the concepts incorporated into the lesson (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Swenson, 1994; Cohen, 1986).

Jerome Bruner hypothesized that students learn more complex ideas through a gradual process of discovery. Bruner labeled this the spiral curriculum. Essentially, the idea was that students should be led through a continual progression of discovery. First, students should investigate a topic or event using more basic skills of cognition such as identification and recall. As students gain more understanding and knowledge of what they are studying, they should then be challenged to use more sophisticated cognitive skills such as interpretation. Bruner believed that the spiral curriculum made it possible for students of all learning levels to efficiently gain knowledge in groups. Moreover, this curriculum provided everyone the cognitive skills they needed to reach a high level of thinking regardless of their academic ability (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Swenson, 1994; Bruner, 1960).

While these theorists were vital to TCI's program, Dr. Bower admits there was also a more practical underlying principle – "In reality, while our teaching methods, our strategies, and our materials certainly reflect those three theorists, that is not really where we began. We began quite frankly by looking at social studies classrooms that were dominated by a national curriculum that was established by four or five textbook companies. The teachers got to pick from one of those four or five and everything was set for teachers – read the chapter, lecture, and answer the questions. That's what I experienced when I was in the high school for eight years. I thought the main thing

missing from education was creativity, (pause) engagement, and fun. Jim Lodbell and I founded TCI with the main idea of let's construct materials for teachers that create a truly fun, interactive, engaging, memorable classroom. Certainly we followed the three theorists, but more important than that, we went into classrooms and tried things out. It had to work for the crucible of the classroom" (Interview conducted on February 6, 2007).

The preface to *History Alive!: Engaging All Learners in the Diverse Classroom* was presented by Professor Joseph Onosko. He asserted, "*History Alive!* does not discuss fundamental curricular issues. It does not address the knotty philosophical problems of what the crucial goals of social education should be or what content should accompany these goals. Modifying Marshall McLuhan's famous line: The instructional medium is as important as the content message in teaching and learning. I know of no better book on the medium of instruction" (Bower, Lodbell, and Swenson, 1994). This position typifies much of what TCI attempts to accomplish in their curriculum. They offer some civic purposes in their theoretical writings. However, much of their rationale centers on pragmatic approaches to instruction for teachers. In essence, the authors have created their materials in such a way that all the teachers have to do is implement the lessons. It is not necessary for teachers to deviate from the Lesson Guides because everything they need to successfully execute a lesson is provided for them as part of their *History Alive!* materials. When civic purposes are not explicit, the pragmatism that is evident throughout the TCI theoretical and lesson guidebooks does suggest fundamental philosophies that the developers have for their curriculum.

Multiculturalism and history's purpose within the mission of social studies are two areas where the *History Alive!* authors clearly acknowledged their civic purposes. They state, "Teaching from a multi-cultural perspective, and stressing that the differences among races, nations, and ethnic cultures are at least as profound and as durable as the similarities, helps students learn to appreciate and navigate those differences in their increasingly globalized world" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower and Lobdell, 2005). In addition, the developers highlight their views of history within the mission of social studies in their theoretical writings. They affirm, "Students forget much of what they learn in social studies classes because they have no way to apply that knowledge. Teacher need to educate young people that social studies concepts affect not only the past, but students' lives today – ideas like the use and abuse of power, discrimination, democratic involvement, immigration, and human settlement of land...An important goal is to help students become lifelong learners by constantly challenging them to apply their social studies knowledge to the world around them" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower and Lobdell, 2005).

There are goals set forth by Teachers' Curriculum Institute that are grounded in pragmatism, rather than civic objectives. However, these practical purposes suggest that civic-mindedness is a major focal point of the creation of the materials. For example, pluralism is never clearly defined by TCI. However, it is referenced repeatedly in their rationale with comments such as "a crucial goal of social studies education is to prepare students for effective participation in a pluralistic society" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens; 2005). *Bring History Alive!* presents a section on how teachers can go about "creating a cooperative, tolerant classroom" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005) that alludes to the



significance of pluralism on the curriculum materials. The authors identify the issues with which students. Specifically, they note that students are eager to learn, but oftentimes hesitant to let their peers know how they feel for fear of how they might be perceived. The developers make teachers aware that the “TCI Approach cannot take place until students feel comfortable with sharing ideas, taking risks, working cooperatively, tolerating differences, and disagreeing honestly with the teacher and their classmates” (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). Therefore, the authors offer teachers a methodical course of action to help build a “safe” classroom. At least two of the components of the process offer possible insight into the beliefs of the authors of *History Alive!* regarding pluralism. They state, “Students learn to tolerate differences, respect ideas, and appreciate diversity” when working collaboratively (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). Additionally, the authors affirm, “Ethnic and cultural diversity is perceived as an opportunity, not a problem” in the learning process (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). This is one example of how TCI might use pragmatic approaches to teaching as a means to accomplishing a more latent civic purpose. Whether or not the covertness is part of a hidden curriculum is uncertain. However, TCI appears to be embedding some specific ideas about teaching and learning within their broader theoretical framework.

While not always explicitly highlighted in their theoretical works, civic purposes can also be inferred from the activities the authors include in the curriculum. A few of the *Objectives* sections from the *Lesson Guides* offer explicatory patterns of what TCI might have been trying to accomplish throughout their curriculum. *Lesson 1: The Native Americans* expects students to “be able to identify environmental factors that promoted

cultural diversity among Native American groups” (Hart, 2002b). *Lesson 2: European Exploration and Settlement* requires students to “be able to explain how European exploration and settlement of the Americas affected indigenous peoples and West Africans” (Hart, 2002b). *Lesson 17: Mexicano Contributions to the Southwest* seeks to have students “describe nine important Mexicano contributions to the culture and economy of the Southwest” (Hart, 2002c). *Lesson 19: African Americans at Mid-Century* intends for students to “be able to understand that the African American experience in pre-Civil War America was varied” (Hart, 2002c). *Lesson 25: The Great Wave of Immigration* expects that “students will be able to describe the life in the United States for Italian, Jewish, Chinese and Mexican immigrants” (Hart 2002d).

All of these examples address a multi-cultural approach to instruction by offering opportunities for students to learn about a variety of ethnic groups. However, the authors suggest additional objectives through the creation of their step-by-step instructional materials. Specifically, these objectives imply that the authors are attempting to provide students with opportunities to empathize with people who might be different from them. Additionally, the inclusion of a variety of subgroups infers the importance of multiple perspectives to gain a wide understanding of the world in which we live. The civic and pragmatic purposes of TCI’s *History Alive!* curriculum provide many opportunities for analysis which will be further addressed in subsequent sections of this chapter.

The theoretical writings of Teachers’ Curriculum Institute and interview responses of Dr. Bert Bower advocate views that are most suggestive of the amelioristic tendency. Does an analysis of the Teachers’ Curriculum Institute curriculum materials reflect an amelioristic tendency? TCI’s answers to the four guiding questions included in

this study will help to know whether or not their materials fall within the amelioristic tendency. The four guiding questions are:

- What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- What is a good, democratic citizen?
- How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

### Description of the History Alive! Curriculum Materials

The Teachers' Curriculum Institute materials have grown in scope, aesthetics, and levels over the years. What began as a binder with lesson plans, slides, audiotapes, and placards for students ranging from grades 5-12 has grown to a fully developed program of materials in US History, World History, and Geography for K-8. Additionally, there is a complete program of materials in Geography for 9-12. TCI offers general units in US and world history as supplemental materials to the 9-12 curricula. A comprehensive high school US history curriculum is near completion as well. TCI products consist of a variety of materials that culminate in an entire curriculum. Included in a set of materials are: lesson guides, student edition text, interactive student notebook, overhead transparencies, placards, DVD, and a user's guide.

Bower discussed at length TCI's adoption rates and usage nationwide. He stated, "We are a national program. We are correlated to all the states. We were in 120 districts in CA last year. We are virtually in every other state. Our major adoptions include Philadelphia, Boston, and New York, and Dade County, FL. We are a fast growing company and have adoptions all over the country." Bower used TCI's production in its home state of California to give a better sense of how quickly their materials are being

accepted. “We set goal of 5% adoption rate in the state of California. In our presentation, we talked about learning and teaching rather than selling textbooks and got over 25% adoption within the state of California...TCI was started with \$40,000 that I borrowed from my parents. We paid them back after two or three years. That’s the only money we ever borrowed since 1989. Everything else was what we call bootstrapping. We’d sell the product and when we made enough money we expanded. That was our goal – not to create something that needed outside funds or investors, but something that was so good that it would generate its own profit. It did and we are growing at an average of 15% a year. Last year we grew 96%. We are turning into a strong mid-sized publisher. At this rate we’ll be larger than the social studies divisions of the largest companies. I believe that is because we didn’t take a lot of money from anyone else other than my parents” (Interview conducted on February 6, 2007).

According to Bower what makes the materials different is that the TCI curriculum developers “start the classroom with an essential question certainly mindful of standards. We create really great activities to go with it. We create a graphic element that could be a map and/or a relic that all the pieces relate to. Then the teachers who developed it in the classroom tell the writers what to write, the production people what photos to get, and so the entire book is at the service of the dynamic classroom activity. So you are doing an activity and reading a book and the two relate beautifully to each other” (Interview conducted on February 6, 2007). The TCI criteria for developing essential questions is based on six important questions: *Does it move students to a deeper understanding of the standards addressed in the unit? Is it provocative? Is the question stated simply and clearly? Is it arguable from different points of view? Does the question prompt students*

*to synthesize and evaluate information? Is it easily broken down into teachable sections?*  
 (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens; 2005).

The materials that were surveyed as part of this study are listed in Table 6. The materials with the copyright year of 2005 are from materials that TCI produced as one complete set.

Table 6

Data Sources from Teachers' Curriculum Institute

	Unit Title	Copyright Year
1	Bring Learning Alive! The TCI Approach for Middle and High School Social Studies	2005
2	Social Studies Alive! Engaging Diverse Learners in the Elementary Classroom	2005
3	History Alive! The United States	2002
4	History Alive! The United States: Lesson Guide 1	2002
5	History Alive! The United States: Lesson Guide 2	2002
6	History Alive! The United States: Lesson Guide 3	2002
7	History Alive! The United States: Transparencies 1	2002
8	History Alive! The United States: Transparencies 2	2002
9	History Alive! The United States: User's Guide	2002
10	History Alive! The United States: Interactive Student Notebook 1	2002
11	History Alive! The United States: Interactive Student Notebook 2	2002
12	History Alive! The United States: CD	2002
13	History Alive! The United States: Placards 1	2002
14	History Alive! The United States: Placards 2	2002
15	History Alive! Supplemental: Colonial Life and The American Revolution	1997

### **Content Analysis**

The content analysis portion of this study encompasses structural and critical analyses. This portion of the study is divided into three sections: Presentation of Materials, Content, and In-depth Analysis of TCI's treatment of the American

Revolution. The structural analysis initially provides the reader with an overview of how the materials were organized. Additionally, the structural analysis addresses TCI's emphasis on the importance of students' participation and final work products in the learning process. Finally, the content section highlights how TCI's materials are affected by standards. Within each section are sub-sections that encompass the overarching themes associated with the Teachers' Curriculum Institute curriculum materials. These themes provide a broad representation of the overall Institute and offer a glimpse of the likely planned principles of the materials and its developers. A critical analysis of TCI's materials was completed by conducting an in-depth analysis of their treatment of the American Revolution. Using the guiding questions described in earlier chapters, I will show how the Teachers' Curriculum Institute materials might answer each of the four questions.

#### Presentation of Materials

The materials produced by Teachers' Curriculum Institute are consistent in terms of their presentation. In the initial section of the content analysis, I will present those themes that seemed to be an integral part of the presentation of the *History Alive!* materials. The areas that were persistent throughout the materials are: creation of lesson guides, use of student notebooks, use of a variety of teaching strategies, use of a textbook and use of other instructional materials. The *History Alive!* materials are designed for grades 6-8. This is a variation from the other three curricula. Whether or not it affects the overall analysis is uncertain especially since TCI combines the theoretical framing of the middle and high school approach to their curriculum into one edition. This suggests that their overall purposes for each grade grouping are similar.

The TCI Approach has been distinguished by eight elements since its inception: Theory-Based Active Instruction, Standards-Based Content, Preview Assignments, Multiple Intelligence Teaching Strategies, Considerate Text, Graphically Organized Reading Notes, Processing Assignments, and Multiple Intelligence Assessments. Theory-Based Active Instruction will be discussed more in-depth in the underlying principles section that follows. Standards-Based Content simply implies that the lessons created by TCI account for state and national social studies standards. Preview Assignments are those activities at the beginning of the lesson that preview what ideas will be learned and challenges students' prior knowledge and understanding. Multiple Intelligence Teaching Strategies encompass six types of activities that are integral to the TCI Approach: Visual Discovery, Social Studies Skill Builders, Experiential Exercises, Writing for Understanding, Response Groups, and Problem Solving Groupwork. Considerate Text involves the creation of materials that allow learners with varying degrees of ability to have opportunities to master what they have read. Graphically Organized Reading Notes offer one way to help with reading comprehension. Graphic Organizers help students make connections between key concepts as they read and learn. Additionally, Processing Assignments help students synthesize what they learned in a mixture of imaginative activities. Lastly, Multiple Intelligence Assessments enhance students' uses of their strongest "intelligences" through assessments that help them understand important material and prepare them to be successful on standardized tests (Bower and Lobdell, 2005; Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005).

## Lesson Guides

Each lesson in the lesson guides was congruent with the interactive student notebooks and textbook. Obviously, these “guides” were geared for teacher use to better prepare them to successfully teach each lesson in this *History Alive!* series. Therefore, there were 32 lessons created as part of *History Alive! The United States* and there were 32 chapters in the corresponding textbook (Hart, 2002a). There were generally 11 recurring sections in each of the lessons in the lesson guides: overview, objectives, materials, preview, graphic organizer, classroom activities, processing, internet connections, assessment, guide to reading notes, and student handouts.

The *Overview* simply supplied a broad brush view of the lesson. For example, Lesson 19 was entitled “African Americans at Mid-Century” (Hart, 2002c). The Overview for this lesson forthrightly stated the content students would learn and the activity that would assist in the learning process. Specifically, students were expected to “learn about the conditions that characterized African Americans’ lives in the period before the Civil War” (Hart, 2002c). The students participated in a *Writing for Understanding* activity which required them to analyze primary and secondary source documents related to the lives of slaves. Then students created a story quilt and wrote a journal as if they were slaves themselves (Hart, 2002c).

The *Objectives* section gave clearly defined expectations of student learning for each lesson. Lesson 28, “The Roaring Twenties and the Great Depression,” provided a sufficient example of the three to four objectives characteristic of all *History Alive!* lessons. The curriculum developers had three goals for student learning for this lesson: 1.) explain key events of the Roaring Twenties, the Great Depression, and the New Deal;



2.) complete three sensory figures using information about the Roaring Twenties, the Great Depression, and the New Deal; 3.) create artwork highlighting key events from the 1920s and 1930s, based on one song from each period (Hart, 2002d).

The *Materials* section listed all materials, content-oriented and creative, that were required to successfully teach and learn each lesson. For example, if student handouts need to be duplicated for a lesson, this section listed the handouts related to a lesson and how many of each should be included. “Creating the Constitution,” which is Lesson 8 in the materials, offered a representative illustration of the materials integrated into a *History Alive!* lesson. The list included the following objects: “Graphic Organizer Placard 8, Transparency 8, Student Handouts 8A-8D (1 copy each), portable radio, candles, ‘quill’ pens (made by affixing artificial feathers to ballpoint pens), string” (Hart, 2002b).

Interactive student handbooks are an important part of the *History Alive!* curriculum. They serve as resource where students can record virtually all important components of the content and knowledge they learned about throughout any particular unit. Scaffolds and other materials that were created as part of the curriculum are already compiled in the interactive student handbooks. For example, the *Preview* was largely associated with the interactive student handbooks. Each of these activities afforded opportunities for students to relate what they will learn in a unit to their own lives. The 12<sup>th</sup> lesson in the curriculum, “Foreign Affairs in the Young Nation,” used the *Preview* to introduce the lesson. While this was not always an objective of the *Preview*, it embodied the purpose of this section of the Lesson Guide. In order to “preview” this lesson, the teacher was instructed to educate students on the importance of geographic location in

protecting the overall well-being of the United States. Additionally, the teacher was advised to relate presidential foreign policy initiatives to geographic location. The activity portion of the preview required students to analyze a map from 1796 to see what countries might be a threat to the United States. In addition, students were asked to identify the geographical advantages and disadvantages of the United States in 1796. It was suggested that students work in pairs for the activity. After a discussion on student answers, the teacher was prompted to tell the class that “in this lesson they will study the steps that the first five U.S. presidents took to protect the country” (Hart, 2002c).

*Graphic Organizers* were a key component of each *History Alive!* lesson. The Lesson Guide explained to the teacher how to incorporate the graphic organizer specific to each lesson into the learning process. The actual graphic organizers themselves were found throughout the textbook. Lesson 26, “The Progressive Era,” was like most units, it had a graphic organizer incorporated into the content. After reading the introductory section to the unit in the textbook, it was suggested that the teacher inform students of what the Progressive Era was. Students were then to view the graphic organizer on page 371 in the textbook. The caption under the graphic organizer read as follows: “Graphic Organizer: Panel of Historical Figures – You will use this panel to help you understand the views and work of social leaders during this time” (Hart, 2002a). The Lesson Guide provided a series of questions to promote discussion of the picture used as the graphic organizer for this lesson. A couple of examples of the questions were: “What do you see? Which person might argue that there are serious problems in America?” (Hart, 2002d). The last purpose of the graphic organizer for this lesson as identified by the curriculum developers was to help students understand that they would be engaging in

contrasting viewpoints from the Progressive Era to help answer the broader question, “Is something wrong in America?” (Hart, 2002d).

The *Classroom Activities* section highlighted the interactive classroom activity that was suggested for each lesson. Teachers’ Curriculum Institute has incorporated six different classroom activities into their curriculum: Visual Discovery, Social Studies Skill Builders, Experiential Exercises, Writing for Understanding, Response Groups, and Problem Solving Groupwork. The Lesson Guides aided teachers procedurally and instructionally on how to implement activities into the classroom. One of the six different activities was integrated into each lesson.

Each lesson within the Lesson Guides concluded with five sections: Processing, Internet Connection, Assessment, Guide to Reading Notes, and Student Handouts. Some lessons also built in a Geography Challenge. *Processing* section helped teachers offer students an opportunity to synthesize the content they learned. *Internet Connections* afforded teachers and students chances to further the learning process by providing online research and project ideas correlated to the content learned in each lesson. The *Assessment* section made available a standards-based multiple-choice question test. Additionally, the test offered a constructed-response task that allowed students to use their multiple intelligences. The *Guide to Reading Notes* was simply an annotated version of the Reading Notes that students were required to complete in their Interactive Student Notebooks. The *Student Handouts* section was basically an organized section of all handouts associated with a particular lesson. Ten of the thirty-two lesson integrated the *Geography Challenge*. The main goal of this learning strategy was to strengthen students’ map skills.

## Use of a Variety of Teaching Strategies<sup>5</sup>

The *History Alive! The United States User's Guide* highlighted seven teaching strategies that Teachers' Curriculum Institute crafted "to stimulate each kind of learner" (Hart, 2002g). The approaches consist of Interactive Slide Lectures, Experiential Exercises, Social Studies Skill Builders, Response Groups, Problem Solving Groupwork, Writing for Understanding, and Interactive Student Notebook. This sub-section will delve more deeply into each of these teaching methods.

*Interactive Slide Lectures* afford students the chance to participate in the lecture by role-play, analysis, and/or interaction with/of historical images. Additionally, students are expected to "take notes," but in a non-traditional way. The Visual Discovery activities seemed to coincide with Interactive Slide Lectures. Lesson 31, "The Civil Rights Movement," used six "events" to teach the Movement broadly. After pre-arranging pairs of students and completing other logistically-related tasks, the teacher introduced the activity. Students had to analyze six transparencies and read from the textbook to complete the assignment. The assignment consisted of answering a series of questions associated with each transparency which was provided as part of the curriculum. Then students were required to write a slogan that summed up the main points of the image. Lastly, students had to create a symbol that was representative of the slogan (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002d; Hart, 2002f; Hart, 2002g).

*Event 1: The Supreme Court Ends School desegregation* was an image of parents protesting segregated schools. After previewing the slide, students were asked a series of

---

<sup>5</sup> The Interactive Student Notebook Teaching Strategy will not be discussed as part of this section because it is the focus of the Content portion of this analysis. Through examination of the *History Alive!* curriculum materials, the research deduced that the content of the course largely revolved around the Interactive Student Notebooks.

questions, such as “What are the people doing?”, by the teacher (Hart, 2002i). Students then had to read an excerpt from their textbook and complete Reading Notes in their Interactive Student Notebooks. Next, students contributed their answers during a class discussion. Before moving on to Event 2, students revisited the transparency, but were asked more difficult questions like “Why do you think the Supreme Court decided that ‘separate educational facilities are inherently unequal’?” (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002f; Hart, 2002i).

*Experiential Exercises* allow teachers to reconstruct historical episodes so that students can be a part of the past and comprehend history better. Lesson 11, “Political Developments in the Early Republic,” integrated an Experiential Exercise into the lesson. For this particular activity there were three phases: *Preparing for the Conference*, *Attending the Conference*, and *Voting in the Election of 1800*. Phase One was procedural in nature. The activity was introduced. Students were divided into groups and given roles. Materials were distributed. The process of preparing for the conference was reviewed with the class. Students worked in the groups to prepare for the conference. The purpose of this activity was to have students “debate which political party is best suited to lead the United States into the 19<sup>th</sup> century” (Hart, 2002c). The students actually participated in the conference during Phase Two of the activity. There was also a logistical element to this phase. The class had to be re-arranged to conduct the conference. Political banners had to be hung. Political buttons had to be given out to other students. Once the conference began, the teacher served as the moderator. It was suggested that the teacher be overly dramatic during their portion of the presentation. Political songs were played. Keynote speeches were delivered. The finale of the

conference was a debate between Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson. After the debate, a debriefing of the conference was suggested. The final phase of this Experiential Exercise was the actual voting in the election of 1800. After students voted and the ballots were counted, the teacher tells the class there is an impasse between Burr and Jefferson. Students are instructed to devise a plan for breaking the tie. Then they read from their textbook again. A discussion about the 12<sup>th</sup> amendment was suggested before debriefing the activity (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c).

*Social Studies Skills Builder* activities provide students the opportunity to engage in assignments that are skill-based. “The Constitution: A More Perfect Union,” which is Lesson 9, used a Skills Builder activity. This particular activity was a game in which students of varying abilities used the Constitution and their chapter Reading Notes to identify governmental checks and balances. Students were given Student Information Sheet 9 which provided situations that the branches of government were involved with. Students are given 30 seconds to decide which branch of government has the power to check the action identified in the situation. The process is repeated through each of the ten situations. The game is debriefed by the teacher asking questions to the students. Then the idea of federalism was introduced to the class (Hart, 2002b; Hart, 2002h).

*Response Groups* allow small groups to decipher information prior to reporting to the class-at-large. Typically, the class is shown a slide of an episode in history. Additionally, they are given questions to answer in small groups related to the image. Once small groups have been given a reasonable amount of time to discuss the issue at hand, each group discuss their answers with the class as a whole. An example of a Response Group activity can be found in Lesson 15, “Manifest Destiny and the Growing

Nation” (Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002g). After dividing students into groups of three, the teacher situated students on the floor around the edge of the map. The teacher then had to display Student *Information Sheet 15A: Situation 1: The Louisiana Purchase* on the overhead projector. This transparency explained the six-step process of “Situation 1.” Student groups have to decide which action the United States should take. They are presented three choices: offer to buy the city of New Orleans from France, threaten to go to war if France does not give New Orleans to the US, or offer to buy the Louisiana Territory to remove France as a threat to the US. Groups have to explain and defend their choice to the larger class. This process was repeated through five situations including Florida, Texas, Oregon Country, and War with Mexico (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002e, Hart, 2002h). Each situation afforded students an opportunity to encounter different solutions to the dilemmas. The goal of the lesson and activity was to express to students how territorial decisions affect population. Moreover, a key concept in US History, Manifest Destiny, was learned by the students (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002e, Hart, 2002h).

*Problem Solving Groupwork* encompasses activities which endeavor to include all students regardless of learning style or ability. This type of groupwork usually requires students to engage in a detailed project. “World War II” gave students the opportunity to create radio broadcasts about World War II from eight different groups of Americans. The students were charged with creating a promotional poster, introduction, lead story, human-interest story, advertisement, and conclusion. Moreover, students had to incorporate appropriate sound effects throughout the broadcast. The teacher played an example from the *History Alive! CD* to give students an auditory example of what is

expected of them. After radio broadcasts were completed, students presented them to the class. In order to include all students, a “call-in” show was suggested after each group finishes their broadcast (Hart, 2002d; Hart, 2002g; Hart, 2002j).

*Writing for Understanding* is a method that maintains a student-centered focus by requiring students to compose an essay about experiences they engaged in while in history class. For example, Lesson 25 focused its instructional activity on Writing for Understanding. “The Great Wave of Immigration” lesson had students create a scrapbook from an immigrant. Scaffolding was provided for students by giving them an instruction sheet on how to complete the annotated scrapbook. After students read the assigned section of the textbook, they had a brief discussion on terminology. As students became experts in pairs on a particular immigrant group, they had met all guidelines offered in their instructions. The final product was presented to the class (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002g; Hart, 2002h).

#### Use of the Textbook

Dr. Bower admitted that TCI has turned traditional curriculum development upside down by using the textbook as a supplemental resource instead of the main ingredient in a social studies classroom. This is the key difference between traditional textbook publishers and TCI. *History Alive! The United States* might look, feel, and even read like any other textbook. However, it truly is not like any other history textbook. The appearance of the *History Alive!* textbook offers one of several indications that TCI seems to have chosen a more pragmatic approach to curriculum development. Specifically, the eye appeal of their textbook might solely be created in the manner it was to simply seize the attention of those who influence the adoption of textbooks. It offers



TCI the opportunity to “get their foot in the door” and gain name recognition. If TCI had highlighted the activities that drive their curriculum from the outset, they may have been less likely to be noticed by the generally traditionally-focused textbook adoption committees. While much of the text reads like a historical narrative, there are places where questions are infused to push students to think about the circumstances of the time period in which they are studying.

The TCI curriculum developers stressed “the importance of using textbooks that adhere to the principles of ‘considerate text’ – expository text that is structured to maximize comprehension by its target audience” (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a). There were a few structural points that TCI highlighted that made the textbook seem to be more traditional in nature. They believe that the text should have a clear structure.

Consistency in the format, prose, and visual aids was important. Topics were minimized to a single page or two facing pages to aid student understanding. A realistic length was placed on each chapter to maintain a focus on key concepts and main ideas. Vocabulary development played a central role in the writing of the text. Key terms were grade level appropriate. If there were terms that were questionable, they were placed in bold print with a definition that followed. There was also a glossary in the rear of the textbook.

The final component of the presentation of the textbooks was centered on the use of images and graphic organizers. The graphic organizers were incorporated to help spotlight content for readers. The images were supplementary and helped to provide a deeper meaning of the reading (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a; Hart, 2002a).

The historical content itself was rather straightforward for the most part. To the reader, the prose was unassuming and basically told a story. However, students are

challenged to think more deeply at certain points within the text because students are asked to consider questions about the historical topics they are studying. A brief excerpt of the textbook is provided to express how the content is conveyed to the students. Specifically, it is noticeable how the content is presented as a fairly standard account of history. However, the questions posed to students shows how the curriculum deviates from a more traditional, “this is how it happened,” approach.

“A century and a half ago, the words ‘Manifest Destiny’ inspired vast hopes and dreams among Americans. They led to a war with Mexico. And they changed the map of the United States. The phrase *manifest destiny* means ‘obvious fate.’ It was coined in 1845 by John O’Sullivan, a New York newspaperman. O’Sullivan wrote that it was America’s ‘manifest destiny to overspread and to possess the whole of the continent.’ Looking at the land beyond the Rocky Mountains, he argued that ‘the God of nature and nations has marked it for our own.’...When Americans began their ‘great experiment’ in 1776, the idea that the United States might one day spread across the continent seemed an impossible dream. By 1848, however, the dream was a reality. In this chapter, you will learn how the United States tripled its size in a little more than a single lifetime...Manifest Destiny took many forms. America grew through treaties, through settlement, and through war. As you read this chapter, think about the way each new territory was acquired. Was O’Sullivan right that this expansion was a matter of destiny? Or was it a matter of diplomacy and sometimes dishonorable dealings? Could Americans have made different decisions along the way?” (Hart, 2002a).

#### Transparencies, Placards, and Other Interactive Components

The *History Alive!* curriculum materials surveyed as part of this study offered a variety of supplementary materials, some of which have already been mentioned throughout this analysis. While this section may not be as detailed as the previous two, it is no less important in terms of presentation of materials. The Lesson Guides and Teaching Strategies are the core of how the TCI materials are presented to the teacher and student. However, the supplemental materials associated with the materials only serve to enhance the final product. The materials include two transparency books, two

sets of placards, a CD with historical audio clips, maps, and timelines. As has been conveyed throughout this analysis, the detail that has been put into the creation of these materials makes implementation simpler than one might think. Therefore, when a teacher, administrator, or other stakeholder previews the *History Alive!* curriculum materials, they must look closely at the precise manner in which the materials have been compiled for presentation. When I first began surveying the materials, they seemed to be a hodgepodge of texts. After further review, each transparency, student handout, reading assignment, or placard held an explicit role in the overall curriculum materials (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002j; Hart, 2002k; Hart, 2002l).

## Content

The Content associated with Teachers' Curriculum Institute's *History Alive!* was conveyed using very specific strategies located in the Interactive Student Notebooks and discussed at length in the Lesson Guides. In the following sub-sections, those strategies associated with the content of the program are addressed. The sub-sections are divided between the use of the interactive student notebook and standards-based content. Particularly, the preview section and reading notes from the interactive student notebooks will be discussed at length.

## Interactive Student Notebook

The Interactive Student Notebook certainly could have been placed in the Presentation of Materials section of this analysis. It offered students an organized format to "hold" much of the content and experiences they encountered throughout each lesson. However, through surveying the materials, I believe that the curriculum developers saw the importance of this tool in the content itself. In fact, the *History Alive! User's Guide*

included two statements that bolster this suggestion. First, the curriculum designers stated in the User's Guide, "The Preview provides a clear connection between the student's own experience and the content of the lesson" (Hart, 2002g). In addition, the developers declared, "Reading Notes are the central organizing tool for content of every chapter in *History Alive! The United States*" (Hart, 2002g). Therefore, the *Preview* and *Reading Notes* sections of the Interactive Student Notebook are presented in this analysis to give a better sense of their relationships to the content.

The *Preview* was intended to provide students with a frame of reference for a historical event. Moreover, the *Preview* facilitated a deeper comprehension of the influence the event has had on the United States and the world. Every lesson, with the exception of those that have an Experiential Exercise included, commenced with a *Preview* task. The purpose of the assignment is to "spark interest, activate prior knowledge, tap a wide range of intelligences, and prepare students to tackle new concepts" (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a)(Hart, 2002g). The curriculum developers identified eight different preview assignments that are used in the *History Alive!* curriculum: Analogies, Reviewing for Previewing, Comparing Personal Experience with Key Concepts, Creating Simple Prototypes, Predicting, Responding to Visual Images, "What If" Sketch, and "You are There" Scenarios (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a).

A few illustrative examples of *Preview* assignments are included to provide a better sense of what these activities entail. Lesson 2, "European Exploration and Settlement," offered an Analogous case in point. In this activity, students were exposed to the competition that arose between European nations as they claimed land in the Americas. Students were given the opportunity to claim furniture in the classroom. The

teacher gave groups sticky notes to place on the claimed pieces. The first group was similar to Spain and was allowed to claim 30 pieces of furniture. The other groups were representative of France, England, and other countries. They were given the chance to claim furniture until all of it was taken. After the exercise was completed, students were debriefed about the activity through discussion. Finally, students were required to complete a two-column chart entitled “Labeling Classroom Furniture: Like Claiming Land in the Americas” (Hart, 2002b; Hart, 2002h).

An example of a *Preview* that related to the “Comparing Personal Experience with Key Concepts” and “Responding to Visual Images” was found in Lesson 23 titled “Tensions in the West” (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c). This Preview provided students with a prompt that instructed them to “Write about a time when someone made a promise to you and then broke it. Tell what the promise was. Why did the person break the promise? How did you feel when the promise was broken?” (Hart, 2002i). After students were given ample time to write, they were shown a transparency of the Battle of Little Big Horn. After expressing to the students that this was a way Native Americans reacted to broken promises, a discussion of the image occurred (Hart, 2002a; Hart, 2002c; Hart, 2002i).

#### Standards-Based Approach to Content

The TCI curriculum development team went to great lengths to account for content standards that are being created and implemented around the country. They have correlated each of their instructional programs with state standards on their website, [www.teachtci.com](http://www.teachtci.com). Teachers’ Curriculum Institute has accepted the premise that “any instructional approach must revolve around the content standards and curriculum

frameworks that are being formulated at the district, state, and national levels” (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a). However, the curriculum developers believe that standards guide the content taught, not the instructional techniques used to teach it. Therefore, TCI has adhered to the principles that have been conveyed throughout this analysis. In their theoretical writings, TCI acknowledged the importance of standards to their curriculum. They stated, “Educators need to find an approach that is mindful of standards, but still supports hands-on, active learning, to keep students excited about social studies. This is the goal of the TCI Approach” (Bower and Lobdell, 2005a). Therefore, standards certainly play an integral role in the overall framework of Teachers’ Curriculum Institute’s curriculum materials.

An In-depth Analysis of TCI’s History Alive!’s Treatment of the American Revolution

*History Alive! The United States* has a chapter and lesson devoted to the American Revolution. Chapter 7 and its accompanying lesson tackle the characteristics of the British and American military forces. Additionally, the major reasons why the Americans were able to defeat a superior British foe are addressed. Lastly, this chapter requires students to understand the conditions of the Treaty of Paris. In addition, Chapters 5 and 6 and their accompanying lessons focus on the events that led up to the battles of the American Revolution. While Chapter 5 focuses on independence and the historical episodes that sparked it, chapter 6 takes a comprehensive look at the Declaration of Independence. Lesson Five and the reading chapter associated with it are the focus of the in-depth analysis. The manner in which *History Alive!* addresses the broader causes that led to the American Revolution in Lesson 5 offers a more typical example of their materials than do their lessons on the battles themselves or the thorough

study of the Declaration of Independence. This in-depth analysis of TCI's treatment of the American Revolution and those actions that led to it will suggest how TCI might answer the guiding questions that were highlighted in earlier chapters.

The lessons from *History Alive! The United States* are aligned similarly to the manner in which my overall analysis was recorded. For example, there are detailed lesson plans for teachers to follow in Lesson Guide 1. The Lesson Guide addresses all areas that are essential for the teacher to successfully implement this class. A few of the objectives for Lesson 5 include, "empathize with how colonists felt when they were taxed without representation," "assume the roles of historical figures during a colonial town meeting and participate in a debate on independence," and "write a dialogue between a Loyalist and a Patriot that includes the key arguments on colonial independence" (Hart, 2002b). Lesson 5 materials are listed and/or provided for teachers in the guidebook.

There are six activities included in Lesson 5. A capsule summary of these activities follows. This portion of the analysis is included to provide a broad overview of all components of Lesson Five and the authors' purposes for including the activities. Due to the practical nature of TCI's curriculum materials, it is especially important to examine the content included in the Lesson Guide more closely. In other words, since TCI is extremely explicit in how they want teachers to present their materials, it is necessary to inspect the content that was presented in the activities of Lesson 5 in the Lesson Guide.

According to the Lesson Guide, the *Preview* activity was included to offer students the chance to experience the inequalities of "taxation without representation." The activity centers on a memo from the principal that informs students that they will have to pay for photocopied materials provided by the school. The exercise is supposed

to give students a modern example of how the colonists might have felt. The *Graphic Organizer* allows students to “learn more about the relationship between Britain and the American colonies in the 1700s” (Hart, 2002b). After students have read section 5.1 to contextualize the time period, they are asked to use the stressed relationship they might have with the principal as a metaphor for the relationship the colonies had with the British. The Reading Notes are aimed at challenging “students to compare the building tensions between the colonists and Britain to a strained relationship between students and a school principal” (Hart, 2002b). For example, the Reading Notes for 5.3 show a student reading the new gym rules posted by the principal. After reading the textbook, students should infer that the rules equate to the new laws imposed on the colonies after the French and Indian War. For instance, they should correlate the half-court only rule to the Proclamation of 1763. After students have completed the reading notes for all eight sections, they progress onward to the *Experiential Exercise*. This exercise is designed to have students “assume the roles of historical figures and re-create a 1776 colonial town meeting at which they will debate whether to declare independence from Britain” (Hart, 2002b). After the town hall meeting concludes, students engage in a *Processing* activity in which they “write a dialogue between a Loyalist and a Patriot on whether the colonies should declare independence from Britain” (Hart, 2002h). Lastly, the Lesson Guide offers an *Assessment* that includes 20 multiple choice questions. Additionally, the test contains a question where students are to “carefully examine the image projected by your teacher. In the space below, draw a head with a facial expression and a thought bubble for each of three colonists – a Patriot, a Loyalist, and a Neutralist” (Hart, 2002b). The image shows a large group of people toppling a statue of King George (Hart, 2002e).



Students are expected to complete three tasks as part of this question: “reflect how that colonist might have felt about what is happening in the image,” “reflect what that colonist was likely to have thought about what is happening,” and have “each thought bubble clearly explain why that colonist was likely to have reacted in this way” (Hart, 2002b).

The activities that comprised Lesson 5 were largely balanced. A more meticulous examination of the Experiential Exercise will express this later in the analysis. However, there were instances where the authors appeared to be encouraging teachers to guide the students toward a particular perspective by the nature of the activities they include in their materials. For example, the Preview activity was “designed to allow students to experience the *injustice* of ‘taxation without representation’ that the colonists felt” (Hart, 2002b). The session consists of a fictitious activity that allows “students to experience the injustice of ‘taxation without representation’” (Hart, 2002b). The activity begins with the teacher informing the students that he or she received a memo from the principal informing students that they would have to pay \$.10 for any photocopied materials. Any students who do not pay the fee were expected to receive a zero on the assignment. The teacher informs students that the principal admits that the fee may be burdensome, but by working together the school can solve the financial problems they have encountered. After the scenario is established, the teacher encourages students to ask questions. Additionally, the developers prepare the teacher to have students with varying views of the situation. For example, some students may see the principal’s request as no big deal while others may become highly agitated. After a discussion about the new policy, the teacher gives students a quiz. Students are required to give money, borrow money, write an IOU, or receive a zero. A volunteer is asked to collect the money and told their fee

would be waived. After the teacher passes out quizzes to those who paid the fee, he or she should wait a few minutes before notifying the class that the scenario was fictitious. Once students' money is returned, a class discussion about the situation is held. The Lesson Guide encouraged the following questions to be used to focus the discussion, "How did you feel when the principal's 'memorandum' was read? What seemed unfair about it? Did you understand the principal's reasoning? What were your feelings toward the volunteer fee collector? Why did this activity provoke such strong reactions?" (Hart, 2002b). The final part of the activity requires the teacher to relate this experience to that of the colonists during the time period leading up to the Revolutionary War. Students complete the Preview activity by correlating their classroom experience with "taxation without representation." The questions the curriculum developers suggest for the discussion especially seemed to provoke students' emotions. One the emotions are engaged, the authors ask the students to think about larger societal issues such as: the use of organized boycotts and protests to demonstrate their frustrations, the understanding that some in society obey laws because they want to avoid retribution, and the government imposes taxes to help pay off debts owed (Hart, 2002b).

The metaphorical approach to reading notes also seemed to be wrought with emotive loading. Take Section 5.5 *The Boston Massacre* as an example. After students read about the Boston Massacre, they analyze the picture in their reading notes to correlate the historical content with the image. The illustration shows students protesting the new rules of the gym. It has a caption above the assistant principal that reads, "You will all get suspended if you keep this up!" (Hart, 2002b). There are two columns for the students' notes. One column is entitled "In Metaphor" and the second "In History." The

“In Metaphor” column provides answers for the students. The students are to infer the correct answer for the “In History” column by comparing what they read to the image and relating it to the comment in the “In Metaphor” column. For example, the students should be able to associate the metaphor of the vice principal to the British troops located in Boston. Additionally, they should see that the vice principal’s threat to suspend is related to the firing upon the colonists by the British troops.

The pictures in the Reading Notes likely incite the greatest amount of emotion for the students because they offer students a real life example to which they can relate – an adversarial relationship between the principal and students. While some students may see this relationship prior to this lesson, others may not see it at all. Some might suggest that partaking in such an activity might create a skeptical mindset towards authority by students. Is that the goal of TCI’s example? Although these questions may never be answered, one might conclude that the early activities of Lesson 5 are encouraging students to examine the justifications for actions by authorities by relating historical events to situations that might be more relevant to them. These two examples offer additional insight into what is included in the content of the activities associated with Lesson Five of *History Alive! The United States*. In an effort to understand how TCI might answer the guiding questions associated with this research, it is imperative to relate content from their curriculum to the questions themselves. The remaining portions of this in-depth analysis will attempt to accomplish this endeavor.

The theoretical works of TCI provide some insight into how they would likely answer some of the guiding questions of this study. However, the authors of *History Alive!* are less explicit in their rationale about the analytical questions that guide this

study than were the other projects. Therefore, particular questions cannot be addressed with the same level of confidence that was done in the other curricula.

The curriculum developers' incorporation of Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences into the materials infers how they were liable to categorize the ideal democracy. In *Bring Learning Alive!* the designers stated, "A crucial goal of social studies education is to prepare students for effective participation in a pluralistic society, yet policies that separate students from one another according to academic ability also tend to separate them by social class, race, and language" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). This quote suggests that the Teachers' Curriculum Institute members believe that society is based on pluralism. However, the quotation alludes to the belief that there are changes that have to be made in schooling and society for the overall pluralistic society to work. This quotation points to TCI's views of society and the ideal democracy. From the outset, the developers held that our society is and should be one based on pluralism. Additionally, they challenge that effective theories have been developed, specifically Gardner's multiple intelligences theory, so that all are encouraged and required to participate in the educational process. The TCI materials incorporate their suggested beliefs regarding the ideal democracy by developing materials that hone the intelligences of all students so that everyone has a role in the learning process. In the end, the Teachers' Curriculum Institute *History Alive!* designers want students to "become lifelong learners" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). Assuming students attain TCI's goal of a lifelong commitment to learning by honing their best multiple intelligences and experiencing multiple perspectives, they should "effective(ly) participat(e) in a pluralistic society" (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005). This idea is similar to Dewey's conception

of education for democracy. Specifically, TCI's expectation of participation by all students in lifelong learning appears similar to Dewey's idea of "associated living" (Dewey, 1916). Dewey stated, "The extension in space of the number of individuals who participate in an interest so that each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own, is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity...A society which is mobile, which is full of channels for the distribution of a change occurring anywhere, must see to it that its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability" (Dewey, 1916). Like Dewey's views of education as they relate to democracy, TCI could have had a greater purpose for incorporating educational strategies such as cooperative learning and multiple intelligences.

The Experiential Exercise associated with Lesson 5 provides an example of how the theory of multiple intelligences exposes students to multiple perspectives and requires them to articulate their own intelligence as part of the overall work effort. The activity requires students to "assume the roles of historical figures and re-create a 1776 colonial town meeting at which they will debate whether to declare independence from Britain. Loyalists and Patriots will try to persuade Neutralists to join their cause" (Hart, 2002b). By engaging in such an activity, students not only learn how a pluralistic society functions, but how to participate in one as well. Two students groups are divided evenly into Loyalists and Patriots and charged with convincing a smaller number of students representing Neutralists to "join their cause" (Hart, 2002b). The authors specified that the figures chosen for this activity were done so "to represent multiple perspectives on

independence” (Hart, 2002b). The activity offers 36 differing viewpoints of historical figures – 14 Loyalists, 14 Patriots, and 8 Neutralists. After being assigned a character, students are to become familiar with their views on independence.

Arguments ranged in scope even within the subgroups of Loyalists and Patriots. For example, Loyalist #3, King George III, was “angered by the colonists’ reaction to the taxes and other laws passed by Parliament” (Hart, 2002b). On the other hand, Loyalist #10, Rebecca Franks, believes that the colonists “should remain under British rule,” but “that the colonies should be given some say in how they are governed” (Hart, 2002b).

The Patriots also had diversity in their arguments. Patriot #4, Patrick Henry, was “constantly telling Americans that they will never be free unless the colonies become independent” and “responsible for forming the Virginia militia” (Hart, 2002b).

Alternatively, Patriot # 13, Mercy Otis Warren, was an author who wrote “articles for the *Boston Gazette* that criticized Loyalists, calling them traitors” (Hart, 2002b). While these are only four examples of the perspectives among Loyalists and Patriots, they provide a fair representation of the kinds of compelling arguments with which students had to wrestle.

After student have been given ample time to familiarize themselves with their historical figure, the introductory portion of the town hall meeting commences. First, students introduce their historical figure to the class. In order that students express their multiple intelligences, they are required to create nameplates, propaganda, and key ideas associated with their cause. Instead of propaganda, the Neutralists create a two-sided sign so when they make their decision regarding which they will support they will be able to hold it up for the class. Additionally, Neutralists generate key questions rather than

key ideas. During the development portion of the activity, students are encouraged to align themselves with individuals who hold similar views as they create their propaganda materials and key ideas. After the materials have been displayed and introduction completed, the town meeting begins. This portion of the activity provides further opportunities for students to use certain intelligences. The teacher is expected to set the tone for the town meeting by dramatically opening the event as the moderator. Moreover, the teacher should maintain order so that each side, the Loyalists and Patriots, can present an argument and the opposing group may rebut. The Neutralists are allotted time to ask questions as well. The hope is that students will “become impassioned, argumentative, and loud, not unlike participants in actual colonial town meetings” (Hart, 2002b). The students conclude the activity by having the Neutralists choose sides based on who had the most compelling arguments.

This Experiential Exercise offers students the opportunity to engage in a societal debate. Moreover, students are afforded the chance to express their intellectual prowess by maintaining a key role in the process based on the Gardner’s characteristics with which they are mostly closely identified. That role can be creating a propaganda poster or speaking during the debate. Regardless, students are positioned so that they will have a vital part in learning. Additionally, the experience itself provides students with opportunities to view perspectives that are different from their own. In the end, this type of educational engagement likely will foster more empathy among students as they listen to and learn from the views of others.

The Teachers’ Curriculum Institute curriculum creators overtly address how students should learn social studies. In their writings they acknowledge, “Students

should learn social studies by involvement: leading, facilitating, acting, singing, discussing, drawing, making decisions, presenting, and critiquing. Active tasks require students to apply new knowledge as they solve a problem, analyze a situation, understand a perspective, or evaluate alternatives. This type of thinking involves higher-order intellectual skills” (Bower, Lobdell, and Owens, 2005; Bower and Lobdell, 2005). These points about learning and teaching seem to articulate how TCI might believe a good, democratic citizen should be developed. Specifically, students should be actively engaged in the process and teachers should provide them the opportunities to experience a wide variety of viewpoints and instructional techniques. While their theoretical writings allude to the importance of learning social studies and multi-cultural perspectives, they do not fully connect these ideals to the making of a good, democratic citizen in their curriculum.

The materials surveyed as part of this research are US History content. Since TCI believes that standards are necessary to gauge learning, one can infer that they emphasize history because it is central to the standards of the social studies curriculum. Based on their views about pluralism, having students use history to better understand the impact active participation has on society seems to be their ultimate purpose. Although the end goal of the use of history appears to be reflected repeatedly in the activities of *History Alive!*, it is not clearly addressed in their theoretical works. While the textbook is more of a historical narrative, it provides much of the historical information required for students to successfully engage in the activities associated with each chapter. It is by combining these two resources, the pre-developed lesson plans and the textbook, that TCI’s *History Alive!* curriculum highlights the importance history has on their materials.



It could be construed that the textbook offers a somewhat nationalistic viewpoint of historical events. However, when the supplemental textbook is used in conjunction with the lesson plans and activities it is apparent that is not the case. For example, an excerpt from Chapter 5 of how the textbook presents the events that led to the American Revolution is as follows: “Indeed, since the French and Indian War, the British had been mistaken about Americans again and again. Their biggest mistake, however, was in thinking that ordinary people – farmers, merchants, workers, and housewives – would not fight for rights that they held dear. At Lexington and Concord, Americans proved they were not only willing to fight for their rights. They were willing to die for them” (Hart, 2002a). While this excerpt gives a more positive account of the American peoples’ fortitude, Lesson 5 and its accompanying activities offer students the chance to engage in multiple perspectives, multiple intelligences, discussion, debate, and the opportunity to choose sides for some. After debriefing the chapter and lessons, the Processing activity replicates further the curriculum developers’ attempt to make sure that multiple perspectives, higher order thinking, and a personal commitment to learning were being considered by students. The students are required to justify the positions of Loyalists and Patriots in a written dialogue between the two parties. They are expected to do this by listing key reasons why each group supported or opposed independence. Additionally, students had to “use language that reflects the passionate feelings held by Loyalists and Patriots on the topic of independence” (Hart, 2002b; Hart, 2002h).

A great deal of the TCI developers’ theoretical writings was focused towards the pragmatic components of teaching and learning. However, much can be learned from their views on education as has been evidenced in this analysis. Teachers’

Curriculum Institute favors a society based on pluralism. While it can be argued that the textbook is a more patriotic historical narrative primarily used as a supplemental resource, the *History Alive!* activities encourage students to become more active in their learning. The activities potentially offer students opportunities to better prepare themselves to live, participate, and prosper in a globalized world because they allow students to experience situations that they might not otherwise encounter. Oftentimes *History Alive!* activities such as those in *Lesson 1: The Native Americans* or *Lesson 17: Mexicano Contributions to the Southwest* are heavily-laden with multicultural emphases. By experiencing these activities, students learn from the past in order to participate in changing shortcomings and advancing democracy in the present and future. Since the TCI developers are less specific about a civic rationale, a great deal must be inferred from the materials themselves. For example, while the materials offer very specific activities that provide diverse viewpoints, they do not ask students to exact change to the level that society must be overturned. Moreover, the very detailed lesson plans expect teachers to teach in a way that is oftentimes different to what they or their students are used to engaging. While these lessons approach topics that are frequently unlike those from more traditional curricula, they are seemingly only preparing young people to function in a globalized world. That is, they are not asking them to change the world. Rather, they are preparing them to function in it. When these concluding observations are tied to Teachers' Curriculum Institute's theoretical writings and the lessons and activities associated with their *History Alive!* curriculum, they suggest an amelioristic tendency toward how and what should be taught in social studies.

## CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

### **Introduction**

I embarked on this research endeavor by posing two questions: “What factors might explain why some innovative curriculum materials gained wider acceptance in social studies classrooms than other innovative curriculum materials?” and “What implications does the history of curriculum reform have for contemporary curriculum development?” I began by attempting to answer my research questions with a historical narrative that consumed a large portion of my review of the literature. The historical narrative provided a foundation for understanding the influences the history of curriculum reform might have on present-day curriculum development. Upon examination of a broad representation of social studies curriculum reform, I found it necessary to delve more deeply into specific innovative curricula to gain a better sense of the intellectual, moral, and cultural climates of the eras surrounding them. By studying curricula from three distinct time periods, I also sought to comprehend how, or if, these factors influenced how developers attempted to design materials and/or how citizens received them. The findings that emerged from researching four curriculum sets from three momentous periods of American history were informative as stand alone chapters.

The four curricula surveyed for this study were all innovative in comparison to the materials that have been traditionally used in social studies classrooms. However, they met with different levels of success. The Rugg curriculum was originally quite

successful and then fell into disfavor. The New Social Studies Projects at Amherst and Harvard were never widely adopted, although their developers cited evidence that they were accepted and used by teachers who sought to teach using inquiry-based approaches. However, studies of classroom instruction consistently suggest that inquiry teachers have always been few in number. The Teachers' Curriculum Institute curriculum, on the other hand has proven fairly successful in the 18 years since its inception. What might account for such different outcomes? A comparison across these curricula suggests that a number of ideological and pragmatic factors may play a role in the acceptance of innovative curricula.

As I examined the curricula, I found common themes that were present in all of them. There were organizational components which arose that seemed to influence the acceptance of the materials. Moreover, there were philosophic beliefs that were highlighted by how each curriculum might answer the guiding questions associated with my study that appeared to affect acceptance. I will organize the discussion in this chapter around two types of factors that were recurrent throughout the curricula: Ideological factors and Pragmatic factors. While the ideological and pragmatic factors will be discussed separately, it is important to note that there is a distinct interplay between them that influences the acceptance or rejection of materials. The ideological factors largely rest upon concerns related to the four guiding questions underlying my study. Conversely, the pragmatic factors mainly center on concerns connected to the organizational and instructional issues that arose from my investigation.

## **Ideological factors**

The critical analysis of each curriculum case provided important parallels and variations among the curricula. Whether it was the intended outcomes of each set of materials or how public perceptions influenced the acceptance of curricula, ideological factors seemed to heavily influence the success or failure of innovative curriculum materials. My heuristic played a crucial role in identifying the ideological factors associated with the four curricula I examined. My review of the literature on social studies curriculum development suggested three broad tendencies or stances on important questions about the role of social studies and its implementation in the schools: Critical, Amelioristic, and Nationalistic. An individual's tendency might be estimated based upon the way that person answered four guiding questions:

- a. What is an ideal democracy and how close is the United States to achieving that ideal?
- b. What is a good, democratic citizen?
- c. How should social studies develop good, democratic citizens?
- d. What is the place of history within the mission of social studies?

Americans have a wide assortment of beliefs about these questions. Many Americans think the societal values that are entrenched in the American culture uphold the status quo in ways that impede opportunities for particular groups within society (Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Apple, 2000; Cherryholmes, 1988). Other Americans believe that without upholding the values that were instituted by this Nation's founders, America will fall (Cheney, 1994; Finn, Ravitch, and Francher, 1984). Some theorists argue that there is a similar dichotomy within the field of social studies education (Nelson, 2006; Cuban, 1993; Leming, 1989). One camp largely consists of those in the academy who

theorize about social studies and its purpose in education. The other group includes most teachers who engage in social studies on a daily basis. Observers of the curriculum trends argue that social studies theorists predominantly believed that American civilization is in crisis. On the other hand, they argue that social studies teachers oftentimes seek to preserve traditional ideals. Furthermore, many teachers venerate the past and emphasize what they believe to be patriotic. Many teachers think students should experience a classroom that shows the positive impact that America has had on the larger world. These groups illustrate why there is such a disparity on how to prepare America's youth to be "good citizens". Many within society argue that active participation and involvement in societal issues is the solution. However, others mainly believe that imparting knowledge of important events and concepts of America's past will effectively prepare young people to contribute to society (Nelson, 2006; Leming, 1989; Shaver, 1981).

As my narrative on the history of curriculum reform suggested, the national reception of these two camps within the debate over social studies education can be influenced by events of the time. Oftentimes domestic crises, such as the Great Depression, have encouraged more open criticism of national policies. However, threats to America from international adversaries, such as the Soviet Union, may minimize the abilities of those who held critical viewpoints of American policies to openly voice their concerns. The influence of particular time periods and the events surrounding them has likely affected the ideological assumptions of the creators of curriculum materials and how those materials were received by the public.

## Views on Society and the Role of the Social Studies

Each of the four curricula contained messages, latent or manifest, that suggested views about the status of democracy in the United States. Given the dominant views among teachers and the general public, the level and explicitness of criticism that a curriculum offers towards the status quo might be expected to affect its reception. The Rugg's Social Science Course, suggested views distinctive of what I have termed the Critical Tendency. My findings suggested that the three other curricula surveyed held views that were largely typical of the Amelioristic Tendency. However, each of the Amelioristic curricula differed in the level of criticism it offered towards US society.

Harold Rugg offered an explicit critique of society. Rugg's Social Science Course materials suggested that Harold Rugg sought a democracy based on economic equity and equal access. He believed that as long as a small elite group had control of the institutions of America, an ideal democracy would not be realistic. The Rugg Social Science Course Reading Books offered a litany of changes that Rugg thought would benefit American society. Rugg specifically pressed for students to endorse scientific planning of society. He felt that the economic and political institutions should benefit all citizens equally. Moreover, he felt that all citizens should have more say in the decisions that affect society as a whole (Rugg, 1931b).

The Harvard Project was the most critical of the curricula that were emblematic of the Amelioristic Tendency. The Harvard Project placed great emphasis on American ideals such as human dignity and personal freedom as components of their theoretical framework for studying social studies. However, some of the topics they included in their materials were cause for controversy. They challenged traditional content and

instructional methodology. The Harvard Project developers maintained that they wanted students to confront controversial public issues so they would be better equipped to address similar issues throughout their lives. They acknowledged that incorporating often ignored, controversial issues such as abortion and civil rights in the curriculum, and the expectation that deep-seated disagreements might arise from discussions about those issues, made the Harvard Project materials more difficult for many to accept. The inclusion of some of the questions and topics suggested that the Harvard Project developers believed that society was still in need of substantial reform. For example, the way they related the patriots of the American Revolution to civil rights activists at the Pettus Bridge in their unit on the American Revolution questions how successful American has been in moving towards greater democracy.

Teachers' Curriculum Institute was less critical of society than Rugg or the Harvard Project. TCI's reluctance to overtly state their ideological purposes made it more difficult to fully gauge their assessment of society. TCI seemed to be subtler in its message than the other curricula I surveyed. While a more conventional understanding of history as a universally agreed upon narrative story was generally portrayed in the contents of the TCI textbook, I found TCI's message different in the actual lessons and activities. The *History Alive!* activities encourage students to participate more in their learning. A number of activities carried a strong suggestion that democracy's ideals have not been fully realized for all and that citizens should take a role in altering societal inadequacies to better meet those ideals. For example, the *History Alive!* lesson on the Progressive Era lets students engage in a panel debate on the question, "Is something wrong with America?" After the panel discussion concludes, the class debriefs the



activity by addressing a set of questions like “Whose ideas do you believe have had an influence on modern American society?”

The least critical of the curricula surveyed as part of my study was the Amherst Project. My findings suggested that the Amherst Project placed great importance on history as content and as a tool for fostering human growth. The Amherst Project authors expected students to engage in “collections of evidence” that incorporated historical and current events. Students used the study of history as a base point for understanding themselves and the world around them so that they might learn to make decisions by taking into account the multitude of information available to them. This information may include a variety of resources ranging from interviews to newspaper articles to official documents. Nonetheless, the primary goal of students for the Amherst developers was to use history as a means to have students analyze historical data about conflictual circumstances. Consequently, if students found themselves in similar situations they would have better insights about their own views and how they relate to society. Although they raised some questions about societal improvement, the Amherst Project was less overt in criticizing the status quo than the Rugg and Harvard materials. While they did offer universal questions to hold the units together, the students chiefly gained knowledge so they could draw their own conclusions about particular historical events. The characteristics of the Amherst Project seem to be similar in nature to Barr, Barth, and Shermis’ Social Science Tradition (1978) with its belief that the greatest training for democratic citizenship is exposing students to issues in society and letting them analyze the issues as social scientists do. Therefore, of the three Amelioristic curricula, the Amherst Project seems furthest from the Critical tendency.

If the level of societal critique were the determining factor in the acceptance of innovative materials, we might expect the Amherst Project to have met with the most success and Rugg with the least. However, that was not the case. While the level of critique each curriculum makes of US society and the message within their materials are important factors for how materials are received, other factors must be considered to explain the outcomes observed for the curricula under study.

Among other ideological considerations, we should think about the influence of the particular time period in which materials are created. For example, Rugg's materials, which challenged the economic infrastructure of our nation, came on the scene at the most opportune time. Rugg's Social Science Course seemingly challenged students to question the status quo. Moreover, the Teacher's Guides expected teachers to push students to be skeptical of many of the societal structures in place at the time of the curriculum's creation. As a nation, the United States was going through one of its most wrenching economic time periods to date. This likely affected the public's willingness to question the status quo regarding political and economic structures. However, as Rugg's curriculum development continued through the decade of the 1930's his materials became more and more heavily criticized. While his viewpoints shifted little if any, the country had gone from a time of economic strife to a time of war. This external threat likely prompted many Americans to focus more on supporting the country instead of questioning her policies. This could be a factor for why his popularity waned. As World War II became front and center on the national agenda, patriotic organizations regained a foothold in the media. Therefore, they influenced what was and was not considered permissible in terms of speaking out against governmental policies. For example, Rugg

himself challenged the American Legion publicly for attempting to censor a high school magazine. This action resulted in him being a primary target of the American Legion and similar organizations.

The Amherst and Harvard Projects benefited from competition with the Soviet Union and the development of Sputnik. In an effort to align American schools with the realities of the Cold War, the government sought to influence the academic curriculum in ways that would support its foreign policy objectives. The government felt that curriculum projects needed to refocus their materials. These key reasons resulted in an effort to increase technical trades, national educational standards, and an amplified focus on the more academically talented in society. The government attempted to financially support education by focusing on individual disciplines and professional development (Evans, 2004; Oswald, 1993; Hertzberg, 1981; Barr, Barth, and Shermis). Newmann confirmed how positive the availability of funding in the 1960's was to the Harvard Project (Interview conducted February 9, 2007). Nonetheless, the time period in which these materials were created may have affected the reception of both projects. While monies were available for curriculum development, most of the projects were only minimally accepted.

Competitive concerns raised by the Cold War initially supported curricular reform, but the resulting projects were completed during a period of great societal turmoil with the rise of the civil rights movement, Vietnam War protests, and counterculture movement. Historians have noted that reactions to this unrest encouraged sentiments in society for law and order and a distaste for groups who confronted authority. It seems reasonable to expect that increasing concerns over domestic upheavals and escalating

tensions with the Soviets might have played some role in the less than enthusiastic reception of the New Social Studies projects.

Similarly, TCI began its curriculum development amid published reports proclaiming that American public schools were not adequately preparing students to compete with her international equivalents. Many critics claimed the United States had lost its economic competitive edge among the international community. These ideas prompted further curriculum development, mostly of the traditional variety (Evans, 2004; Stern, 1994). Reform advocates called for detailed knowledge-based standards to guide curriculum content and to assess student performance. Many of the development projects resulted from attempts to address these new standards. On its face, the TCI materials seem to fit within this mainstream movement for standards-based materials. Their packaging and presentation of content seems to reflect traditional views of essential historical knowledge. This surface level conformity with the prevailing public and political sentiments may help account for the widespread acceptance of TCI materials despite the underlying innovative and critical elements embedded in the actual student activities of the program.

My findings suggest that those innovative materials that more overtly challenge the status quo are less likely to become widely accepted. However, the era in which curriculum projects are created or implemented may affect the reception of such materials. The shift in acceptance of the Rugg materials highlights this claim. More critical materials might be created in a time when it is permissible to question the status quo. However, should national and international affairs cause the public's perception of society to shift, the acceptance of such materials could be weakened.

## Epistemological Assumptions about Knowledge, Teaching and Learning

There are a variety of factors that are influenced by the epistemological assumptions that teachers have about knowledge, teaching and learning. While individual beliefs likely drive how curriculum materials are implemented, they also seem to influence how curriculum materials are created. In this section I will examine two key factors that offer insights into epistemological assumptions: essential questions and learning strategies. The use of essential questions and the learning strategies advocated to address those questions raise issues of familiarity, certainty of knowledge, and critique of the status quo.

Every curriculum that I investigated incorporated some form of an essential question. The reasons that essential questions are incorporated into curricula vary from project to project. Nonetheless, the idea of organizing content around broad topics or questions is itself a deviation from mainstream curriculum organization around a chronological narrative. The unfamiliarity of this organizational structure, as well as the assumptions about the certainty of knowledge, and the level of societal critique implied by the questions may play roles in the acceptance of innovative curriculum materials.

The curriculum developers of the Rugg Social-Science Course used questions to help guide the study of broader problems that were developed from content suggestions by Beard and other Frontier Thinkers. Usually two or three central questions were asked that related to each problem (Rugg, 1931a). The Amherst Project proclaimed that the universal question was the backbone for the entire unit. They believed that central questions provided relevance for students and posed a value conflict. To the authors of the Amherst Project, the universal question was a hook to get students interested in

learning (Brown and Traverso, unpublished). The Harvard Social Studies Project curriculum developers saw interconnectedness between issues and questions. They built units around persistent, controversial societal issues and/or questions (Oliver and Newmann, 1967). There was minimal evidence of essential questions in the materials or theoretical writings of the *History Alive!* project surveyed as part of this study. However, most of the culminating activities that were created as part of TCI's supplemental binder materials were based on essential questions.

While each project made mention of the use of essential questions in the curricula, there are two elements to these questions that might suggest more about the purposes the developers had for incorporating them. First, the epistemological assumptions about how knowledge is generated, implied by the questions is important to understand. Also, knowing the types of questions asked in the curricula aids in understanding the overall goals of curriculum developers. These two components of essential questions also help gauge the level of criticism that curriculum developers are likely infusing into their curricula. The more basic the questions, the less likely they are to imply a critical viewpoint of society. Conversely, the more ill-structured and/or ethically-related the questions, the greater the likelihood that the reader will infer that substantial reforms are needed before the ideal democracy is realized. As the preceding paragraph suggests, each curriculum claimed that questions were vital to their overall project. However, each curriculum offered different types of questions. The intention of these questions likely will provide further insight into each curriculum developers' assumptions about the certainty of knowledge.

The Amherst and Harvard Projects consistently offered central questions that were ill-structured. Ill-structured questions either had no right answer or the answers were open for interpretation based on one's own perception of the information provided to them. Both projects sought to have students develop their own judgments on issues. This suggests an assumption that historical knowledge emerges from one's own interpretation of the events under review. Such views run counter to conventional beliefs about the nature of history and the production of historical knowledge and might be expected to generate questions about the legitimacy of such an approach among the general public.

Many of the questions asked by the Amherst and Harvard materials also raised ethical questions about society that might cause students to question how close we are to the ideal democracy. Both projects sought to have student grapple with moral issues. The major difference in the use of questions for these two Projects was their end goal. The Amherst Project used this process to help students become more humanistic – understanding themselves and the world around them. The Harvard Project wanted students to develop strong conclusions so they could deliberately discuss their viewpoint with others whose views may be different so that some sort of consensus could be reached.

The *History Alive!* materials sporadically provided specific questions to students. Some questions were ill-structured, but many were not. Bower spoke repeatedly in an interview about the use of questions as a central part of the creation of their materials. While he did not clarify this, one could suspect that he was referring to the planning meetings the TCI staff had as they developed the materials. This is an important point

because there are places within the *History Alive!* textbook where ill-structured questions were posed. However, the curriculum materials themselves do not reveal the use of questions to the level that Bower seems to indicate. The decreased emphasis in essential questions gives the TCI materials a more conventional appearance than the 1960's curricula.

Meanwhile, the Rugg Social Science Course incorporated numerous questions into its materials. However, the Reading Books' content virtually always provided students with the answers to the questions. The content students engaged in related to these questions helped students learn more about the influences of those in positions of power. The organizational emphasis Rugg placed on essential questions suggested that he was more focused on providing students with specific information, rather than letting them come to their own conclusions about historical events.

Given the receptions of the study curricula, these findings suggest additional factors that may affect the success of innovative materials. It may be that the more similarities that essential questions have to more traditional questioning techniques, the more that essential questions impart a specific (most often patriotic) set of knowledge, and the lower the level of criticism of the status quo, the more likely a curriculum is to be accepted.

A second component related to epistemological assumptions centers around the learning strategies advocated by the curriculum under study. Materials provided by adopted curricula do not always align with the teacher's vision of learning. The teacher's beliefs about students and what they are willing and able to do relate to the learning strategies they incorporate into their classroom. If materials are perceived by



teachers to be more difficult for themselves or their students, they likely will revert to their own preferred instructional methods. While this might be a pragmatic issue at the root, the epistemological issue about learning strategies is whether or not they fit the teacher's beliefs about knowledge and how it is created. A key similarity in all four curricula that related to learning strategies was a focus on student-centered learning.

“Learning by doing” was a hallmark of the Rugg Social Science Course. However, this approach was more representative of a planned course of study than students seeking answers through methods of inquiry. Students were expected to complete a series of activities in their Pupil's Workbook that related to the content they read about in their Reading Books. By and large, Rugg's learning strategy was more about received knowledge than it was about individual construction of knowledge. The problems that arose from the Rugg Social Science Course did not seem to be related so much to learning strategies as to the knowledge Rugg was trying to impart to the students who engaged in his curriculum (Rugg, 1931; Rugg, 1930; Rugg, 1929).

Historical inquiry was a noticeable part of the critical analysis of the New Social Studies curricula. The Amherst Project was quite explicit that one of their main purposes was to teach students how to connect with historical data and analysis. Essentially, they expected students to analyze what seems to be true and how it affected society. Moreover, as Brown discussed in the interview, he wanted teachers who would encourage inquiry instead of being “answer givers.” On the other hand, the Harvard Project incorporated a more problem-based historical inquiry approach where the end goal was to have students decide what seemed to be good, fair, and just. Newmann thought this approach was at least partially to blame for the Harvard Project's lack of

success. He stated, “Another explanation [for why the project was not accepted] is that for years educators’ major mission was to impart knowledge. Since they’ve learned all of this knowledge, they think it is important for other people to learn it. Rather than spending a lot of time helping students develop their own views, their major task was to impart the knowledge into their heads. That was generally what education was about. That’s the way parents learned in school so that’s the way they expected their kids to learn. There was a strong cultural emphasis to have kids learn what the content is. That’s the way teachers are trained. I think the whole issue of why progressive education was not recognized more openly was related to our work from the standpoint of to what extent did teachers really take students seriously and try to develop students’ minds as opposed to feeding them the nutrients that the teachers felt would make them healthy, productive citizens” (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007). This comment realistically applies to each of the four curricula examined as part of this study.

The teaching strategies promoted by Teachers’ Curriculum Institute seemed to keep learning focused on the student, rather than teacher. The specifics provided in the Lesson Guides made implementation of such methods easy. If teachers truly want a student-centered classroom and teacher friendly materials, these strategies and the materials that accompany them offer an excellent starting point for curriculum materials in social studies because TCI’s integrates both aspects into their curriculum. They have created materials that require little prepare time on the part of teachers, yet they include activities that require active involvement by students. Bower’s view was that “curriculum needs to be developed in a way that any teacher can teach it.” Therefore, TCI developed a complete curriculum that is ready-made for implementation. The onus

is definitely placed on the students through the activities in which they engage. However, the lesson guides offer more specific expectations of teachers and students than there was in either the Amherst or Harvard Projects.

My findings suggest that student-centered instruction requires teachers and students to engage in learning from a perspective that is atypical from the norm. This requires teachers to move away from the idea that they are the bearers of all knowledge. For many people, this notion is a difficult one to accept. Given the findings in the literature, a focus on student-centered instruction is likely a hindrance to those curricula attempting to gain wider acceptance (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991; Thornton, 1991; McNeil, 1986). However, in those cases where usage of the materials is well-defined for the teacher and students, there might be more acceptance than in those situations where ambiguity is present. This is more a pragmatic issue that will be addressed in the subsequent section. The TCI and Rugg materials exemplify this notion. Their materials offered teachers the scaffolding necessary to implement student-centered learning strategies. However, the Amherst and Harvard Projects did not fully develop the expectations they had for teachers and students. The uncertainty of how to successfully and efficiently implement their materials could be a factor for why they were less well-received than the Rugg and TCI projects.

### **Pragmatic factors**

Pragmatic factors seem to influence whether or not materials have been accepted more widely or not. The usability of materials provokes certain sentiments that frequently can result in their success or failure. Oftentimes teachers and students are the people who are affected most by the kinds of issues that are brought on by the practicality

of curriculum materials. Therefore, the manner in which teachers and students relay the usefulness of materials to those who actually adopt materials can deeply influence if materials are more widely accepted. The structural analysis of each curriculum offered significant similarities and differences among the four curriculum sets. In this portion of the summary of findings, I will address those pragmatic factors that were prevalent throughout the four curriculum cases. The relationship between these pragmatic factors is quite complex. Therefore, they will be discussed in a manner where the most interrelated factors are in the closest proximity within the chapter so that their associations are more easily understood.

I begin the discussion of the pragmatic factors with format because it is often the most easily identifiable characteristic that influences the concerns that stakeholders have with curriculum materials. Next, I discuss how professional development and other scaffolding for teachers might alleviate or raise concerns brought on by format. Finally, I address how the level of difficulty of texts and tasks for teachers and students affects the reception of materials.

#### Format

In curriculum development, format often focuses on how closely materials relate to conventional layouts. Stand-alone unit types of materials, such as those produced by the Harvard and Amherst Projects, are commonly seen as supplemental rather than the central element of a curriculum. The paradigm that was established long ago for what an educational textbook should look like might psychologically affect whether or not the curriculum is actually adopted by a school, system, or state. If materials do not have a

certain “presence” to which administrators, teachers, and parents are accustomed, they likely will not be widely received.

The Rugg Social-Science Course materials and TCI’s *History Alive!* materials came closest to traditional norms in terms of format. They both offered a textbook, a guide for teachers to use in implementation, and a workbook for students. Both curricula were so thorough that they left little interpretation on the part of the teacher. If the teacher followed the accompanying guides for each chapter or unit of work they would have completed lesson plans for the entire courses. Onosko (1991) asserted that lack of planning time is a key barrier to instruction for higher-order thinking. Therefore, teachers have often chosen to present the most readily available and easily understood materials to their students. The detailed nature of the Rugg and TCI materials could be a factor for why they were more widely accepted than the Harvard and Amherst materials.

While the Harvard Project used a consistent approach to the format of their materials, it was less conventional than that of TCI and Rugg. The Public Issues Series provided students an extensive unit book that comprised all materials associated with the topic under review. Additionally, teachers were supplied with a guide that gave them a synopsis of the themes and concepts pertinent to the unit of study. While the teacher’s guides were informative and necessary, they provided very little continuity for the overall project. Additionally, Newmann believed that the Harvard Project’s use of Xerox and American Education Publication, which were not traditional textbook companies, to publish their materials adversely affected the perception of their materials by adoption committees and the public (Interview conducted February 9, 2007).

The Amherst Project was farthest afield in format. They openly promoted the notion that all their materials were “not necessarily” created as a stand alone curriculum. They argued that compiled together all units could make up an entire curriculum or the units or parts of the units could be used as supplemental materials. Nonetheless, the materials were difficult to decipher in terms of practice. The only resources available to the teacher were a plethora of primary and secondary documents and a teacher’s manual that offered minimal support. The teacher’s manual did give a brief synopsis of many of the documents included in the individual units and some instructional activities (discussions, essays, debates, role plays, etc.). However, as I surveyed the materials, I felt as though the student unit books were a collection of documents accompanied by some related questions that were included in an attempt to tie the great volume of documents together. The topics, themes, and/or questions students were supposed to investigate with the evidence presented to them and the possible conclusions they were likely to surmise from those investigations were obscure at best. Without the teacher’s manual, they would have been virtually impossible to understand. While the teacher’s manuals were helpful in understanding the purposes of the documents, they still portrayed a disjointed presentation of content in practically every unit.

The implications of format on acceptance of materials focus on appearance and clarity. It may be that the more conventional the materials appear, the more likely they are to be accepted. For example, the use of a neatly-packaged product by TCI has likely influenced their national acceptance. Likewise, the Rugg Social Science Course materials offered a more traditional textbook as the core of their curriculum. They, too, were widely accepted initially. Conversely, the Harvard and Amherst Projects designed

unit books for each topic of their curricula. This unconventional method could be a factor for why their materials were not as well received. Closely related to format, clarity and guidance in how materials are to be used may play a key role in the acceptance of new curricula.

#### Professional development for teachers

Guidance offered to teachers within materials about how to successfully implement a curriculum can deeply influence whether or not materials are more widely accepted. Additionally, follow-up professional development opportunities might be expected to have an effect on how widely accepted materials might be. In this regard, TCI seems to be at the forefront of professional development for teachers. Throughout the year, the TCI staff offers continual professional development opportunities. Some of the opportunities are in the form of conferences while others include TCI staff members going into schools to model the lessons used in the *History Alive!* curriculum. Of course, the advent of the internet may be a factor that has enabled TCI to be in more places at one time than prior curriculum development projects.

Rugg and his counterparts in the Teachers' College discussion group seemingly did very little to prepare teachers for incorporating their materials in public schools. While the Teacher's Guides were wrought with theoretical underpinnings, I found no formal evidence that suggested any type of professional development on the part of Rugg. He oftentimes published writings explaining the rationale for his materials. However, the actual process of rolling up his sleeves and teaching teachers how to use his materials was not evident anywhere except in the Teacher's Guides that accompany each Reading Book. This approach was similar to that of the Harvard Project. Newmann was candid

that, as theorists, he and his contemporaries left teachers out of the equation (Interview conducted on February 9, 2007). Brown's assessment of the Amherst Project's work with teachers was bleak, too. He addressed professional development while discussing the importance of setting goals for curriculum development projects (Interview conducted on January 26, 2007). The Amherst and Harvard Projects found their lack of attention to teachers' professional development as a pitfall to their success.

Studies have asserted that teachers' beliefs about alternative teaching methods affect the acceptance of innovative curriculum materials. If teachers do not understand how or believe that informal classroom settings will work effectively, they are less likely to accept materials (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991). These findings suggest that if projects intend to have a sustained implementation period of their curriculum materials, they must do more than design and package materials. They should offer continual growth through professional development opportunities.

#### Level of difficulty of texts and tasks

It seems that if teachers do not feel they have been adequately advised on how to successfully implement new curriculum materials through curriculum materials themselves or professional development that they are forced to make more complex decisions about curriculum implementation. Teachers' own understanding of content and pedagogy and their beliefs about how students learn could be a factor for how curriculum materials are received. Studies have shown that teachers believe that students of above-average ability are the only students capable of completing more difficult classroom tasks. Therefore, students observed to be lower level learners are oftentimes relegated to more basic instructional techniques (Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992; Onosko, 1991).



Whether it is the reading level or intellectual challenges posed by the tasks, level of difficulty is likely to influence the perception that people have on materials.

The Amherst and Harvard Projects required higher level reading. Obviously the developers struggled with this because they reserved a section in the theoretical guide that addressed the impact of reading skill level on the curriculum, Brown addressed it in his valedictory address, and it was mentioned in many of the teacher's manuals. In an effort to provide more interest and understanding, the Harvard Project included six different types of texts in their materials. These texts ranged in ability from court proceedings documents to fictitious stories about a particular historical event. While some materials were more difficult for students than others, the multitude of questions that accompanied the texts offered students scaffolding assistance as they worked through the documents. The Rugg Social-Science Course included Reading Books that were in excess of 600 pages in many cases. Granted the text was to be used over an eighteen-week period, but it still was lengthy for the intended age group. Due to the volume and rigor of the Rugg text, the reading requirements were likely geared for students of above average reading ability. TCI used a traditional textbook to convey content knowledge. Furthermore, they placed importance on scaffolding those words that may be more difficult for students to understand. Bower explained the value of placing key words in blue throughout the textbook to make sure students know that they need to comprehend the meaning of those particular words if they are to understand broader social studies concepts. Additionally he highlighted the importance of supporting images and the use of headings to aid student understanding (Interview conducted on February 6, 2007).

TCI also emphasized that students were to complete extensive reading notes as they gained foundational knowledge about particular historical phenomena.

Beyond reading level the tasks posed for students also determine the level of difficulty for a curriculum. The tasks associated with each of the four curricula varied greatly. *History Alive!* developers expressed great disdain for the traditional “drill and kill” methods of instruction. Therefore, they focused a great amount of their curriculum on creating engaging activities. Rugg also incorporated an exorbitant amount of activities through the Pupil Workbook’s that accompanied each volume within the series. Both curricula specifically addressed teachers on how best to implement tasks. However, TCI’s guidebook was more practical while Rugg’s was more of a theoretical narrative. In essence, teachers had to do more studying and preparing with Rugg’s materials. That was not the case with TCI’s materials. The *History Alive!* lesson guides were so explicit that they at times told the teacher exactly what to say.

As for intellectual challenges for the students, Rugg’s activities were more objective in nature than TCI’s. An interesting component of the Rugg Pupil’s Workbooks was the inclusion of an introductory section entitled “To the Pupil” which explained the types of activities in which students will have to participate. It provided a short synopsis of the expectations of students as they worked through each task. While writing and acting plays were included in Rugg’s activities, short answer and multiple choice questions were much more prevalent. Overall, Rugg’s tasks asked students to regurgitate the information they learned through reading. Conversely, TCI’s tasks were more open-ended. Varied types of learning strategies required students to play a particular role in a historical episode so that they might gain a more diverse perspective

of the event under review. *History Alive!* was not without its own more traditional tasks. Social Studies Skills Builders offered a more basic attempt by the developers to have students review important concepts about social studies through an activity. *History Alive!* and the Rugg Social Science Course have both been widely adopted. The explicit instructions offered by each set of curriculum materials for teachers and students could be a factor that positively affects wider acceptance. Although each curriculum had their own issues related to the level of difficulty in the intellectual challenges, they both seemed to effectively scaffold how they expected teachers and students to navigate their materials.

The intellectual challenges of tasks for students created by the Amherst and Harvard Projects was more focused on the manner in which they prepared for culminating activities. Equally important, the Projects posed a high level of difficulty in the intellectual challenges for teachers. The Amherst Project expected students to decipher historical data so that they could adequately report their conclusions through an essay or discussion. The amount of rigor involved in this preparation was not well-defined by the developers. Students did have a series of questions to guide their thinking. However, the lack of further scaffolding to prepare for the final product required of the activity likely affected the students' final work product. For example, students were given questions to ponder as they analyze the historical data. However, based on the materials, the bulk of the final work product was left up to the teacher. If the teacher either did not fully comprehend the topic under review or adequately scaffold their expectations for the culminating activity, the student would be left in limbo regarding how they should bring their work to closure. On the other hand, the Harvard Project

scaffolded each case they included in their materials with a variety of questions. Furthermore, they even addressed the expectations of students in discussion in the unit book, *Taking a Stand*. However, besides the questions and basic activities provided to students, scaffolding towards the final work product was not easily comprehensible. As for teachers, while each project offered teachers fairly extensive theoretical writings and teachers' manuals, they required much thought and additional preparation time on the part of teachers. In most cases, the teachers' manuals offered a broad synopsis of the collection of documents for the Amherst Project unit book it accompanied. Conversely, the teachers' guides associated with the Harvard Project provided a brief summation of the case study book it was related. While there were implementation pointers in each of the teachers' guides, they seemingly left more for the teacher to decipher than implement. The lack of direction by curriculum materials for teachers and students could be a factor in why curricula are less accepted than other materials.

My analysis corroborated what other studies have claimed. Specifically, if teachers look at the materials and disagree with what is presented in the content or think they are too difficult to understand or implement, they are probably not going to fully integrate them into their classrooms (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991). Additionally, if teachers believe the level of tasks for students is too difficult, they are not as apt to incorporate the activities included in the curriculum (Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992; Onosko, 1991). Specifically, if teachers and/or students are expected to use a set of materials, they likely would prefer to see a logical flow between the activities and the required reading. These implications appear to be supported by the four curricula surveyed as part of my study. Of the four curricula, Rugg and TCI appear to be the more

widely accepted. The Rugg and TCI materials provided extensive instructions for teachers and students about how to integrate curriculum tasks into the classroom. However, there was a much greater amount of ambiguity with the Amherst and Harvard Projects when they addressed how teachers and students should tackle the tasks. Of the four curricula, Rugg and TCI appear to be the more widely accepted.

### **Study Implications**

Four broad implications emerged from my research that might heavily affect whether or not curriculum materials are widely accepted. These implications should help future curriculum developers as they account for those factors that have influenced the reception of materials.

The first implication of my research is that those innovative materials that more overtly challenge the status quo are less likely to become widely accepted. The time period in which materials are created does allow for this implication to fluctuate. For example, the creation of more critical materials might be permissible in a time when it is more tolerable to question the status quo. However, should the public's perception of society begin to shift, the acceptance of materials could be minimized.

The second implication of my research is that curricula which incorporate questioning techniques and learning strategies that communicate an explicit traditional set of knowledge and offer a lower level of criticism of the status quo are more likely to be accepted. Learning strategies that are focused on student-centered instruction require a learning environment for teachers and students that is oftentimes uncomfortable. Student-centered instruction forces teachers to abandon the notion that they are the sole possessors and arbiters of knowledge.

The third implication of my study relates to the format of curriculum materials. Specifically, it seems that the more conventional the materials appear, the more likely they are to be accepted. The two curriculum sets that were more traditional-looking, Rugg and TCI, were the two that were the most widely accepted. Their materials provided extensive instructions for teachers and students about how to integrate curriculum tasks into the classroom.

The last implication of my research is that if projects intend to have a sustained implementation period of their curriculum materials, they should provide professional development opportunities. While the curriculum projects of the 1960's openly admitted that professional development was a key weakness, TCI seems to pride themselves on the growth opportunities they offer teachers.

TCI made the most accommodations in curriculum development in relation to all of these suggestions. Teachers' Curriculum Institute's approach to innovative curriculum development seems to be the most successful of the cases surveyed in this study. TCI accepted the idea of a standards-based curriculum that arose with the conservative critique of American education. However, they shifted the paradigm from the textbook as the primary resource in the classroom to the textbook as a supplementary piece. The inclusion of a textbook in their materials offered at least the view of a more traditional curriculum to those responsible for adopting curriculum materials for state and local boards of education, and may have lessened the resistance to the more innovative elements in their student activities.

## **Suggestions for Further Study**

As is the case with any research undertaking, a I have recognized a bevy of other opportunities for further study. My study was no different. There were, however, three specific areas that seemed to need closer attention to extend the research.

Only a small subset of materials was examined as part of my research. The research community would benefit from similar studies that look more deeply at other curriculum projects that were developed throughout the last century. While I established a detailed rationale for why I chose the curriculum sets that I investigated as part of my research, research should be completed on different projects from similar time periods to see how or if the results vary.

The heuristic I created as part of this project might have influenced my interpretation of each curriculum examined. Therefore, researchers need to examine the curriculum projects that were part of this study using other frameworks to see if they draw similar conclusions regarding factors that may affect the reception of innovative curriculum materials.

A third major area that could benefit from further study is the content focus on the American Revolution used in my study as part of the in-depth analysis. Since Harold Rugg's materials were a key element of my research, I did not have the benefit of using any content that focused on historical events after World War I. The manner in which curriculum developers address more contemporary topics could offer a different viewpoint about their tendencies and the factors affecting the acceptance of innovative curriculum.

## **Conclusion**

As this summary illustrates, ideological and pragmatic factors seem to affect the reception of curriculum materials. Closely-related philosophical and organizational issues appear to have been influential at various momentous points throughout the history of curriculum reform.

The findings of my study corroborated findings in the broader literature. Past studies have shown that curricula which focus on student-centered instruction are less likely to be widely received (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991; Thornton, 1991; McNeil, 1986). My analysis also substantiated the claims of previous studies that if teachers preview materials and oppose what is presented in the content or think they are too difficult to understand or implement, they are unlikely to incorporate them (Rossi, 1995; Cuban, 1993; Onosko, 1991). Moreover, if teachers deem the tasks for students too complex, they are not as likely to integrate the activities included in the curriculum (Oakes, Gamoran, & Page, 1992; Onosko, 1991).

The notion that certain factors have hindered or hastened the reception of curriculum materials is important for contemporary curriculum developers to take into account. By understanding how the level of critique that curricula have of US society has affected how the public perceived curriculum materials in particular historical eras, developers can make more informed decisions in the content presentation of their materials. If curriculum developers understand that properly scaffolding more ill-structured and student-centered materials for teachers and students seems to affect the reception of materials, they will likely attempt to address these implementation concerns during development. Additionally, if curriculum projects account for teachers'



professional development needs during the creation phase they are likely to experience more successful outcomes. While these ideological and pragmatic factors are by no means the only ones that have or will influence the reception of materials, my findings suggest they have deeply affected the acceptance of curriculum projects in the past and may be expected to do so in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Apple, M. W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Baker, G. G. (1970a). *Communism in America: Liberty and security in conflict*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Baker, G. G. (1970b). *Communism in America: Liberty and security in conflict: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1977). *Defining the social studies*. Arlington, VA: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Barr, R. D., Barth, J. L., & Shermis, S. S. (1978). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC Publications.
- Beebe, R. K. (1972a). *Thomas Jefferson, the embargo, and the decision for peace*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Beebe, R. K. (1972b). *Thomas Jefferson, the embargo, and the decision for peace: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Bennett, P.S. (1970a). *What happened on Lexington Green? An inquiry into the nature and methods of history*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Bennett, P.S. (1970b). *What happened on Lexington Green? An inquiry into the nature and methods of history: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Berelson, B. (1952). *Content analysis in communication research*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Berg, B. L. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bicouvaris, M. V. (1994). Setting national standards for history: A teacher's view. *Journal for Education*, 176(3), 51-60.
- Bower, B., Lobdell, J., and Swenson, L. (1994). *History Alive!: Engaging all learners in the diverse classroom*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Bower, B., Lobdell, J., and Owens, S. (2005). *Bring learning alive! The TCI approach for middle and high school social studies, revised edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Bower, B. and Lobdell, J. (2005). *Social studies alive! Engaging diverse learners in the elementary classroom, revised edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (2002). Schooling in capitalist America revisited. *Sociology of Education*, 75(1), 1-18.
- Brinkley, A. (1993). *The unfinished nation: A concise history of the American people*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Brown, R. H. (1996). Learning how to learn: The Amherst Project and history education in the schools. *Social Studies*, 86(6), 267-74.
- Brown, R. H. and Traverso, E. (1970). *A guide to the Amherst approach to inquiry learning*. Unpublished paper. 1-17.

- Bruner, J. S. (1966). *Toward a theory of instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. S. (1960). *The process of education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buffinton, T. H. (1975a). *Imperialism and the dilemma of power*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Buffinton, T. H. (1975b). *Imperialism and the dilemma of power: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Casey, D. A. (1972). *The rights of Americans: The changing balance of liberty, law, and order*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Casey, D. A. (1972a). *The rights of Americans: The changing balance of liberty, law, and order*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Casey, D. A. (1972b). *The rights of Americans: The changing balance of liberty, law, and order: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Chapin, J. R. (1995). *The controversy on national standards for history*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on the Social Studies (Chicago, IL, November 9, 1995), 1-41.
- Cheney, L. (1994). The end of history. *Wall Street Journal*, October 10.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohan, G. (1970a). *Collective security in the 1930's: The failure of men or the failure of a principle?* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Cohan, G. (1970b). *Collective security in the 1930's: The failure of men or the failure of a principle?: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Cohen, E. (1986). *Designing groupwork: Strategies for the heterogeneous classroom*. New York, NY: Columbia University Teachers College.
- Cremin, L. A. (1964). *The transformation of the school: Progressivism in American education, 1876-1957*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Cuban, L. (1993). *How teachers taught: Constancy and change in American classrooms, 1880-1990, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Co.
- Evans, R. W. (2006). *Social studies vs. the United States of America: Harold Rugg and the teaching of social justice*. In K. L. Riley (Ed.), Social reconstruction: people, politics, perspectives, (pp. 45-68). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Evans, R. W. (2004). *The social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Evans, R. W. (1990). Teacher conceptions of history revisited: Ideology, curriculum, and student belief. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, XVIII(2), 101-138.
- Evans, R. W. (1989). Teacher conceptions of history. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 17(3), 210-240.
- Farmer, C. E., Discussion with Dr. Bert Bower, June 20, 2005. One hour.
- Farmer, C. E., Interview with Dr. Richard Brown. January 26, 2007. Fifty minutes.
- Farmer, C. E., Interview with Dr. Bert Bower, February 6, 2007. Forty minutes.

- Farmer, C. E., Interview with Fred Newmann, February 9, 2007. Thirty minutes.
- Finn, C. E., Ravitch, D., and Francher, R.T. (1984). *Against mediocrity: The humanities in America's high schools*. New York: Holmes & Meier.
- Fitzgerald, F. (1979). *America revised: History schoolbooks in the twentieth century*. Boston, MA: Atlantic Monthly Press.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences, 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary edition*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gredler, M. (2005). *Learning and instruction: Theory into practice. 5<sup>th</sup> edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Merrill, Prentice Hall.
- Goetz, W. W. (1994). The new social studies: A memoir of a practitioner. *The Social Studies*, May/June, 100-5.
- Gordy, L. L. and Pritchard, A. M. (1995). Redirecting our voyage through history: A content analysis of social studies textbooks. *Urban Education*, 30(2), 195-218.
- Gutek, G. L. (2006). *George S. Counts and the origins of social reconstructionism*. In K. L. Riley (Ed.), Social reconstruction: people, politics, perspectives, (pp. 1-26). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Gutmann, A. (1990). Democratic education in difficult times. *Teachers College Record* 92(1): 7-20.
- Guttmann, A. (1972a). *God and government: The uneasy separation of church and state*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Guttmann, A. (1972b). *God and government: The uneasy separation of church and state: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Guttmann, A. (1970a). *Freedom and authority in Puritan New England*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Guttmann, A. (1970b). *Freedom and authority in Puritan New England: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Haley, F. (1972). Analysis of 26 projects. *Social Education*, 36(7), 723-770.
- Harris, J. (1970a). *Hiroshima: A study in science, politics, and the ethics of war*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Harris, J. (1970b). *Hiroshima: A study in science, politics, and the ethics of war: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Hart, D. (2002a). *History alive! the United States*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002b). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 1: lessons 1-10*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002c). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 2: lessons 11-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002d). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 3: lessons 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002e). *History alive! the United States: transparencies 1: lessons 1-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002f). *History alive! the United States: transparencies 2: lessons 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002g). *History alive! the United States: user's guide*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.

- Hart, D. (2002h). *History alive! the United States: interactive student notebook 1: chapters 1-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002i). *History alive! the United States: interactive student notebook 2: chapters 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.
- Heilman, E. E. (2001). Teachers' perspectives on real world challenges for social studies education. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 29(4), 696-733.
- Hertzberg, H. W. (1981). *Social studies reform, 1880-1980*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.
- Kline, W. A. (1974). *The "Amherst Project": A case study of a federally sponsored curriculum development project*. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Leming, J. S. (1989). The two cultures of social studies education. *Social Education*, October issue, 404-408.
- Levstik, L. S. and Barton, K. C. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Levstik, L. S. and Barton, K. C. (2001). *Committing acts of history: Mediated action, humanistic education, and participatory democracy*. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), Critical issues in social studies research for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, (pp. 119-147). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.



- Loewen, J. W. (1995). *Lies my teacher told me: Everything your America history textbook got wrong*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
- Loewen, J. W. (1995). By the book: Who's to blame for the sorry state of history textbooks? *The American School Board Journal*, January issue, 24-7.
- Makler, A. (1994). Social studies teachers' conceptions of justice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, XXII(3), 249-280.
- Martorella, P. (1991).
- Martorella, P. H. (1997). *Teaching social studies in middle and secondary schools*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Massialas, B. G. (1992). The "new social studies" – retrospect and prospect. *The social studies*, May/June, 120-124.
- McNeil, L. M. (1986). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York, NY: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: Studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342-379.
- Minear, L. (1972a). *Lincoln and slavery: Ideals and the politics of change*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Minear, L. (1972b). *Lincoln and slavery: Ideals and the politics of change: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Moulton, M. (1975a). *Conscience and the law: The uses and limits of civil disobedience*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Moulton, M. (1975b). *Conscience and the law: The uses and limits of civil disobedience: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Newmann, F. M., Wehlage, G. G., and Lamborn, S. D. (1992). The significance and sources of student engagement. In F. Newmann (Ed.), *Student engagement and achievement in American secondary schools* (pp. 11-39). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Newmann, F. M. (1991). Higher order thinking in the teaching of social studies: Connections between theory and practice. In J. Voss, D. Perkins, and Segal (Eds.), *Informal reasoning and education* (pp. 381-400). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Newmann, F. M. (1975). *Educating for citizen action: Challenge for secondary curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Oakes, J., Gamoran, A., and Page, R. N. (1992). Curriculum differentiation: Opportunities, outcomes and meanings. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum* (pp. 570-608). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F. M, and Singleton, L. R. (1992). Teaching public issues in the secondary school classroom. *Social Studies*, 83(3), 100-103.
- Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F. M., and Morrill, G. P. (1972). *Social action: Dilemmas and strategies*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1970). *Revolution and world politics: The search for national independence*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969a). *The Civil War: Crisis in federalism*.  
Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969b). *Race and education: Integration and  
community control*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969c). *Status: Achievement and social values*.  
Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968a). *Colonial Kenya: Cultures of conflict* .  
Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968b). *Community change: Law, politics and  
social attitude*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968c). *The lawsuit: Legal reasoning and civil  
procedure*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968d). *Nazi Germany: Social forces and personal  
responsibility*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968e). *Rights of the accused: Criminal procedure  
and public safety*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967a). *The American Revolution: Crisis of law  
and change*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967b). *Cases and controversy: Guide to teaching*.  
Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967c). *The immigrant's experience: Cultural  
variety and the "melting pot"*. Middletown, CT: American Education  
Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967d). *Municipal politics: Interest groups and the government*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967e). *Negro views of America: The legacy of oppression*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967f). *Religious freedom: Minority faiths and majority rule*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967g). *Taking a stand: A guide to clear discussion of public issues*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Shaver, J. P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F. M., and Morrill, G. P. (1972). *Guide to teaching/ social action: Dilemmas and strategies*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1970). *Guide to teaching/ revolution and world politics: The search for national independence*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969a). *Guide to teaching/ The Civil War: Crisis in federalism*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969b). *Guide to teaching/ race and education: Desegregation and community control*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969c). *Guide to teaching/ status: Achievement and social values*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968a). *Guide to teaching/ Colonial Kenya: Cultures of conflict* . Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968b). *Guide to teaching/ community change: Law, politics and social attitude*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968c). *Guide to teaching/the lawsuit: Legal reasoning and civil procedure*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968d). *Guide to teaching/ Nazi Germany: Social forces and personal responsibility*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968e). *Guide to teaching/ rights of the accused: Criminal procedure and public safety*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967a). *Guide to teaching/ the American Revolution: Crisis of law and change*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967b). *Guide to teaching/ the immigrant's experience: Cultural variety and the "melting pot"*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967c). *Guide to teaching/ municipal politics: Interest groups and the government*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967d). *Guide to teaching/ Negro views of America: The legacy of oppression*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967e). *Guide to teaching/ religious freedom: Minority faiths and majority rule*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. (1965). Harvard University: A curriculum based on the analysis of public controversy. *Social Education*, April, 220-223.
- Onosko, J. (1991). Barriers to the promotion of higher order thinking in social studies. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 62(6), 356-362
- Oswald, J. M. (1993). The social studies curriculum revolution: 1960-1975. *The social studies*, January/February, 14-19.
- Parker, W. C. (2001). *Toward enlightened political engagement*. In W. B. Stanley (Ed.), Critical issues in social studies research for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, (pp. 97-118). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Parker, W. C. (2003). *Teaching democracy: Unity and diversity in public life*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Patrick, J. J. (2002). *Essential elements of education for democracy*. Paper presented at the Conference on Social Education in a Democracy. Riga, Latvia: December 5, 2002. 1-11.
- Patton, M. Q. (1987). *How to use qualitative methods in evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Romanowski, M. H. (1994). *Fleeing from democratic ideals: The content of U.S. history*

- textbooks*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum (Chicago, IL, March 19-22, 1994), 1-30.
- Rossi, J. A. (1998). Issues-centered instruction with low achieving high school students: The dilemmas of two teachers. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 380-409.
- Rossi, J. A. (1995). In-depth study in an issues-centered social studies classroom. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 23(2), 87-120.
- Rossi, J. A. (1994). *The practice of in-depth study in an issues-oriented social studies classroom*. Paper presented to the College and University Faculty Assembly (Phoenix, AZ, November 18, 1994), 1-25.
- Rudestam, K. E. and Newton, R. R. (2001). *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rugg, H. O. (1936). *American life and the school curriculum*. Boston, MA: Ginn & Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1933a). *The great technology: Social chaos and the public mind*. New York, NY: The John Day Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1933b). *Social reconstruction: Study guide for group and class discussion*. New York, NY: The John Day Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1932). *Changing governments and changing cultures: The world's march toward democracy*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1931a). *A history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

- Rugg, H. O. (1931b). *An introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn & Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1931c). *An introduction to American civilization: A study of economic life in the United States*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1931d). *Culture and education in america*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1930a). *Changing civilizations in the modern world: A textbook in World geography with historical backgrounds*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1930b). *A history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1932). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1931a). *Teachers guide for a history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1931b). *Teacher's guide for a history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1930). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to changing civilizations in the modern world*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. (1929). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to American civilization*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1931a). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany a history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.



- Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1931b). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany an introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1930a). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany changing civilizations in the modern world*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1930b). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany a history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Ryan, G. W. and Bernard, H. R. (2003). *Data management and analysis methods*. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, (pp. 259-309). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sanders, N. M and Tanck, M. L. (1970). Amherst College: The committee on the study of history. *Social Education*, 34(4), 383-447.
- Santoli, S. P. (1997). *Analysis of the treatment given to selected aspects of World War II in secondary school history textbooks published in France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, Russia, and the United States*. A Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Auburn University (December 15, 1997), 1-208.
- Saye, J. W. (1994). Reasoning with democratic values: The paradox of the issues-centered curriculum. *Journal for social studies research*, 18(1), 48-54.
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., and Cook, S. W. (1959). *Research methods in social relations*. New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.

- Shaver, J. P., Davis, O. L., & Helburn, S. W. (1979). The status of social studies education: Impressions from three NSF studies. *Social Education*, 4(3), 150-153.
- Shaver, J. P. (1981). *Citizenship, values, and morality in social studies*. In H. D. Mehlinger and O. L. Davis (Eds.), The Social Studies Eightieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, (pp. 105-125). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, H. W. (1975). *Strategies for social research*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Stemler, S. (2001). *An introduction to content analysis*. College Park, MD: Eric Clearinghouse.
- Stern, B. S. (2006). *Curriculum design and Harold Rugg: Implementing social reconstructionism*. In K. L. Riley (Ed.), Social reconstruction: people, politics, perspectives, (pp. 167-187). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Stern, S. M. (1994). Beyond the rhetoric: An historian's view of the "national" standards for United States history. *Journal for Education*, 176(3), 61-71.
- Thornton, S. J. (1991). *Teacher as curricular-instructional gatekeeper in social studies*. In J. P. Shaver (Ed.), Handbook of research on social studies teaching and learning, (pp. 237-248). New York: Macmillan.
- Tindall, G. B. and Shi, D. E. (1999). *America: A narrative history*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company.
- Traverso, E. (1970a). *Korea and the limits of limited war*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Traverso, E. (1970b). *Korea and the limits of limited war: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Tyack, D. B. and Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- VanSickle, R. L., and Hoge, J. D. (1991). Higher cognitive thinking skills in social studies: Concepts and critiques. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19(2), 152-172.
- VanSledright, B. (1996). Closing the gap between school and disciplinary history. *Advances in Research on Teaching*, 6(1), 257-289.
- Wade, R. C. (1993). Content analysis of social studies textbooks: A review of ten years of research. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, XXI (3), 232-256.
- Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc. 1990.
- Wertsch, J.V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wilbur, W. A. (1973a). *The western hero: A study in myth and American values*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Wilbur, W. A. (1973b). *The western hero: A study in myth and american values: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Wineburg, S. S. (1991). Historical problem solving: a study of cognitive processes used in the evaluation of documentary and pictorial evidence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 83(1), 73-87.

## APPENDICES

## Appendix A – *Interview Questions*

1. What were the underlying principles that guided the project? To what extent did other emergent ideas in social studies education influence these principles?
2. What effect(s), if any, did social, economic, and/or political factors have on the project and its development of curriculum materials?
3. What did the curriculum developers intend for students (and teachers) to accomplish while working with the curriculum materials?
4. How were the products different from other typically-adopted classroom materials?
5. To what extent were project materials implemented in schools? Roughly speaking, what was the adoption rate nationally?
6. What factors might explain why the project was accepted on a national scope?
7. Based on your experiences, what recommendations would you give to curriculum developers who are tackling social studies projects today?

### *Tape Recorded Telephone Interviews and Discussions*

Farmer, C. E., Discussion with Dr. Bert Bower, June 20, 2005. One hour.

Farmer, C. E., Interview with Dr. Richard Brown. January 26, 2007. Fifty minutes.

Farmer, C. E., Interview with Dr. Bert Bower, February 6, 2007. Forty minutes.

Farmer, C. E., Interview with Fred Newmann, February 9, 2007. Thirty minutes.

## **Appendix B** – Harold Rugg Social-Science Course Materials Surveyed

### Reading Books

Rugg, H. O. (1932). *Changing governments and changing cultures: The world's march toward democracy*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1931). *A history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1931). *An introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1930). *Changing civilizations in the modern world: A textbook in World geography with historical backgrounds*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1930). *A history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1931). *An introduction to American civilization: A study of economic life in the United States*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

### Teacher's Guides

Rugg, H. O. (1931). *Teachers guide for a history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1932). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1930). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to changing civilizations in the modern world*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1931). *Teacher's guide for a history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. (1929). *Teacher's guide for an introduction to American civilization*.  
Boston, MA: Ginn and Company.

*Pupil's Workbooks*

Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1931). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany a history of American government and culture*. Boston, MA:  
Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1931). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany an introduction to problems of American culture*. Boston, MA:  
Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1930). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany changing civilizations in the modern world*. Boston, MA:  
Ginn and Company.

Rugg, H. O. and Mendenhall, J. E. (1930). *Pupil's workbook of directed study to accompany a history of American civilization: Economic and social*. Boston,  
MA: Ginn and Company.

**Appendix C** – Amherst Project Materials Surveyed

Unit Books

- Baker, G. G. (1970). *Communism in America: Liberty and security in conflict*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Beebe, R. K. (1972). *Thomas Jefferson, the embargo, and the decision for peace*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Bennett, P.S. (1970). *What happened on Lexington Green? An inquiry into the nature and methods of history*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Buffinton, T. H. (1975). *Imperialism and the dilemma of power*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Casey, D. A. (1972). *The rights of Americans: The changing balance of liberty, law, and order*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Cohan, G. (1970). *Collective security in the 1930's: The failure of men or the failure of a principle?* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Guttmann, A. (1972). *God and government: The uneasy separation of church and state*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Guttmann, A. (1970). *Freedom and authority in Puritan New England*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Harris, J. (1970). *Hiroshima: A study in science, politics, and the ethics of war*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Minear, L. (1972). *Lincoln and slavery: Ideals and the politics of change*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.



Moulton, M. (1975). *Conscience and the law: The uses and limits of civil disobedience*.  
Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Traverso, E. (1970). *Korea and the limits of limited war*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-  
Wesley Publishing Co.

Wilbur, W. A. (1973). *The western hero: A study in myth and American values*. Menlo  
Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Teacher's manuals

Baker, G. G. (1970). *Communism in America: Liberty and security in conflict: Teacher's  
manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Beebe, R. K. (1972). *Thomas Jefferson, the embargo, and the decision for peace:  
Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Bennett, P.S. (1970). *What happened on Lexington Green? An inquiry into the nature  
and methods of history: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley  
Publishing Co.

Buffinton, T. H. (1975). *Imperialism and the dilemma of power: Teacher's manual*.  
Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Casey, D. A. (1972). *The rights of Americans: The changing balance of liberty, law, and  
order: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Cohan, G. (1970). *Collective security in the 1930's: The failure of men or the failure of  
a principle?: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing  
Co.

Guttmann, A. (1972). *God and government: The uneasy separation of church and state:  
Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

- Guttmann, A. (1970). *Freedom and authority in Puritan New England: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Harris, J. (1970). *Hiroshima: A study in science, politics, and the ethics of war: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Minear, L. (1972). *Lincoln and slavery: Ideals and the politics of change: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Moulton, M. (1975). *Conscience and the law: The uses and limits of civil disobedience: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Traverso, E. (1970). *Korea and the limits of limited war: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Wilbur, W. A. (1973). *The western hero: A study in myth and american values: Teacher's manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

**Appendix D** – Harvard Social Studies Project Materials Surveyed

Unit Books

Singleton, L. R., Oliver, D. W., and Newmann, F. M. (1993). *Science and public policy: Uses and control of knowledge*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Greenawald, G. D. (1991). *The railroad era: Business competition and the public interest*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.

Lockwood, A. (1972). *Moral reasoning: The value of life*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F. M., and Morrill, G. P. (1972). *Social action: Dilemmas and strategies*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1970). *Revolution and world politics: The search for national independence*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *The Civil War: Crisis in federalism*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *Race and education: Integration and community control*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *Status: Achievement and social values*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Colonial Kenya: Cultures of conflict*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Community change: Law, politics and social attitude*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *The lawsuit: Legal reasoning and civil procedure*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Nazi Germany: Social forces and personal responsibility*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Rights of the accused: Criminal procedure and public safety*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *The American Revolution: Crisis of law and change*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Cases and controversy: Guide to teaching*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *The immigrant's experience: Cultural variety and the "melting pot"*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Municipal politics: Interest groups and the government*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Negro views of America: The legacy of oppression*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Religious freedom: Minority faiths and majority rule*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Taking a stand: A guide to clear discussion of public issues*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Guides to Teaching

Lockwood, A. (1972). *Guide to teaching/moral reasoning: The value of life.*

Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W., Newmann, F. M., and Morrill, G. P. (1972). *Guide to teaching/ social action: Dilemmas and strategies.* Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1970). *Guide to teaching/ revolution and world politics: The search for national independence.* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *Guide to teaching/ The Civil War: Crisis in federalism.* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *Guide to teaching/ race and education: Desegregation and community control.* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1969). *Guide to teaching/ status: Achievement and social values.* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Guide to teaching/ Colonial Kenya: Cultures of conflict .* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Guide to teaching/ community change: Law, politics and social attitude.* Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.

Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Guide to teaching/the lawsuit: Legal reasoning and civil procedure.* Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.

- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Guide to teaching/ Nazi Germany: Social forces and personal responsibility*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1968). *Guide to teaching/ rights of the accused: Criminal procedure and public safety*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Guide to teaching/ the American Revolution: Crisis of law and change*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Guide to teaching/ the immigrant's experience: Cultural variety and the "melting pot"*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Guide to teaching/ municipal politics: Interest groups and the government*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Guide to teaching/ Negro views of America: The legacy of oppression*. Middletown, CT: American Education Publications.
- Oliver, D. W. and Newmann, F. M. (1967). *Guide to teaching/ religious freedom: Minority faiths and majority rule*. Middletown, CT: Xerox Corporation.

**Appendix E** – Teachers’ Curriculum Institute Materials Surveyed

- Bower, B., Lobdell, J., and Owens, S. (2005). *Bring learning alive! The TCI approach for middle and high school social studies, revised edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Bower, B. and Lobdell, J. (2005). *Social studies alive! Engaging diverse learners in the elementary classroom, revised edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 1: lessons 1-10*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 2: lessons 11-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: lesson guide 3: lessons 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: transparencies 1: lessons 1-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: transparencies 2: lessons 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: user’s guide*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.
- Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: interactive student notebook 1: chapters 1-22*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers’ Curriculum Institute.

Hart, D. (2002). *History alive! the United States: interactive student notebook 2: chapters 23-32*. Palo Alto, CA: Teachers' Curriculum Institute.

*History alive! the United States: DVD*

*History alive! the United States: placards 1: lessons 1-22*

*History alive! the United States: placards 2: lessons 23-32*