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Editorial

This issue of TRSE includes an intensive critique of the elementary school expanding environments curriculum sequence made popular initially by Paul Hanna in the 1930s; a detailed case study of one teacher's innovative approach to teaching U.S. History to fifth-graders; an historical account of the report of the NEA's 1916 Committee on Social Studies, including key figures involved in its preparation and a summary of the ideas it contained; and a description of how some social studies teachers are making use of computer databases to teach problem solving in their classrooms.

The first article should be of interest to those seeking an alternate view to the expanding environments sequence that remains so prevalent in elementary social studies; the second should give researchers some ideas about the kind of topics that lend themselves well to case study research; the third should provide social studies historians with information about the 1916 Committee and its influence on the development of the field; and the fourth should supply researchers with ideas about how to compare and contrast information obtained in several case studies.

Once again, we encourage potential contributors to submit manuscripts which describe current practice, present theoretical arguments, conceptualize new approaches and ideas, or present ongoing research. We welcome submissions on a variety of topics, as long as they are related directly to social studies education. We also encourage your written reactions to the articles in this, or any previous issue, of the journal.

Jack R. Fraenkel
March, 1992
THE POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION OF CHILDREN IN THE EXPANDING ENVIRONMENTS SEQUENCE

Leo W. LeRiche
Edith Cowan University
Perth, Western Australia

Abstract
This article analyzes the implications that the expanding environments sequence holds for the social education of students. The analysis demonstrates that this sequence, in teaching that the various levels of government are separate, isolated political entities, fails to portray the political culture realistically. In being transmitted tacitly to students through the categories of thought used, the values inherent in this sequence tend to become part of subjective reality and are thus extremely difficult to unlearn. A different approach is suggested, therefore, that would bring all of the levels of political organization in the expanding environments sequence together at each grade level, thus emphasizing their interrelatedness and portraying the political culture more realistically.

Introduction

As I wrote in a previous article in Theory and Research in Social Education, Charles McMurry, "the great Herbartian," originated the expanding environments sequence in his late nineteenth and early twentieth century curriculum recommendations (LeRiche, 1987). His curriculum was based on the culture epochs theory of child growth and development, the idea that students pass through all of the earlier stages of cultural development of their ancestors. It is important to keep in mind how powerful McMurry's influence was in the early twentieth century. His teacher training textbooks for all elementary school
subjects were used extensively in the United States (Dunkel, 1970), and as far away as Australia (a country with a strong British educational tradition) in teachers colleges from Sydney to Perth as early as 1910 (LeRiche, 1988).

In 1903, under the pressure of earlier criticism from John Dewey, McMurry modified his 1893 curriculum of fairy tales, Robinson Crusoe, myths, state, and nation to the present expanding environments curriculum without changing the theory (he had also suggested including family, neighborhood, and community studies for the primary grades as early as 1893). In that previous work (LeRiche, 1987), I suggested that the idea of expanding environments should be rejected because it is based on an obsolete, discredited theory of child growth and development. It is also the product of nineteenth century philosophical thought and has remained almost untouched by the many cataclysmic events of the twentieth century.

Diane Ravitch (1987) has deplored the absence, in the form of myths, fairy tales, and hero stories, of history in the primary grades. She blames this loss on the influence of the expanding environments sequence and its sociological content, and attributes (correctly) its content to the progressive educators of the 1930s, principally Paul Hanna. The expanding environments sequence, however, does not prescribe sociology. In fact, McMurry recommended history as the focus of study (family, neighborhood, and local histories) for the primary grades (LeRiche, 1987). Ravitch also suggests indirectly (and incorrectly) that the expanding environments idea originated with the 1916 Committee on the Social Studies of the NEA Secondary Education Commission, a common misconception.

Larkins and others (1987) also have recommended that the expanding environments curriculum sequence be dropped as the basis for the elementary social studies curriculum because (they argue) it leads to a vacuous, superficial subject matter content. Akenson (1989) maintains that freeing elementary social studies from the developmental theory expressed in the expanding environments curriculum will foster a variety of organizational patterns throughout the curriculum. There are, however, more compelling reasons for rejecting the idea of organizing the social studies curriculum around the idea of expanding environments.

One purpose of this article is "...to inquire into the values and ideologies that lead to the choice of the organizing principles in the curriculum" (Cherryholmes, 1987, p. 311). In more general terms, we need to be "...analyzing curriculum...whose guiding interests must be uncovered and critically interrogated" (Giroux, 1987, p. 119). The specific purpose here is to analyze the consequences of the continued use of the expanding environments sequence in terms of the political socialization of students. How does such an apparently innocuous
sequence of topics possibly influence students to such an extent that their political behavior as adults is affected? It is suggested here that this sequence does indeed affect students to this extent through establishing categories of political thought that they will continue to use as adults. These categories include assumptions that are taken for granted, reflect outmoded patterns of thought, and utilize traditional beliefs that represent obsolete ways of thinking about current social problems.

The expanding environments sequence is a set of geopolitical categories that have been used to organize the elementary social studies curriculum. This pattern subtly influences the way students think about such things as political and social problems. It has been the major organizing idea for the elementary social studies curriculum in the United States for nearly ninety years. Its use has also spread to other countries, including Canada and Australia. The basic idea is that the child's understanding of the world grows in a manner comparable to a set of ever widening concentric circles and the child's social education is therefore based on this presumed sequence of development.

As presently interpreted in the social studies curriculum, the sequence expands from a study of the home and family to school, neighborhood, city, and county in the early grades, followed by a study of the state, the nation, the inter-American community, and the Atlantic or Pacific communities of nations in the later elementary grades. The problem is that only one community is studied for an entire school year, and the communities are associated with each grade in lockstep order. There are some variations of the sequence, but the progression suggested here is the most common version.

In the 1980s most major educational publishers published one or more elementary social studies series that were based on the expanding environments sequence. None of these works made any reference to the theory of learning with which the sequence is associated, however.

In terms of the concept, "the sociology of knowledge" (Berger and Luckmann, 1966), the expanding environments sequence represents an institutional, or objective, view of reality. By being transmitted tacitly to students through the indirect means of curricular categories of thought, however, it becomes part of their subjective reality. Consequently, it takes a good deal of personal experience outside the school to "unlearn" the message that the expanding environments sequence conveys.

Very little criticism of the expanding environments can be found in teacher training texts, as only a very few recent writers have challenged it. Those who have done so usually assert mildly that young students already know many of the concepts presented in the early years of the sequence. More substantive criticisms have been made by Douglass (1967), and Welton and Mallan (1992), who suggest that
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studying only one "community," such as the neighborhood or state, for an entire year prevents students from seeing their society as a whole. Furthermore, Douglass (1987) maintains that this sequence also has caused curriculum writers to avoid controversial material. Welton and Mallan (1992) question whether the sequence is based on research in child growth and development. Rather, they contend that it is based on adult logic. They extend Douglass' second criticism by pointing out that studying the communities one year at a time increases the chance that students will not see the interrelationships that exist between different levels of community organization. A second purpose of this article, therefore, is to elaborate and extend the criticisms raised by Douglass, Welton and Mallan—in short, to argue that the expanding environments sequence is an inappropriate curriculum tool for promoting democratic political socialization among elementary school students, and to present an alternative approach to the organization of the elementary social studies curriculum.

Beyond the level of home and family, the idea of expanding environments is defined in explicitly political terms. Yet the expanding environments curriculum does not portray the political culture realistically. At least one other writer has leveled the same criticism about the elementary social studies curriculum. Goldstein's (1972) review of American curriculum guides and textbooks concluded that the political and social culture was not being reproduced realistically. He was, however, considering only the scope or content of the curriculum, and not the sequence. The expanding environments curriculum imposes categories of thought that convey an unrealistic view of political life to students, one that portrays different levels of government as isolated political entities.

The Effects on Children

Paul Hanna has probably been the foremost advocate of the expanding environments idea in the latter half of the twentieth century. McMurry's earlier work appeared to be unknown to Hanna who indicated that he had invented the concept in his work on the Virginia elementary social studies curriculum in the 1930s. If he had taken a cursory glance at the Virginia courses of study before 1930, however, he would have seen McMurry's sequence already firmly entrenched in the 1920s (LeRiche, 1974). Hanna's personal view of the expanding environments sequence provides the basis for an examination of its effects on students. His political bias is evident in his description of the purpose of the sequence. During an interview regarding his contribution to the development of the sequence, he expressed his view of the central purpose of the curriculum:
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The curriculum's inherent emphasis is that societies should avoid passing on to the larger community problems that logically belong to the lesser community. The curriculum helps the child to see that there is a logical place for the solution of problems arising in each of the basic human activities. It is improper for the lesser communities to avoid their responsibilities in carrying out the basic human activities. It would be inappropriate for a state to pass on to the federal government problems that logically belong to the state community. This is one of the lessons that the teacher emphasizes repeatedly as the child passes through this sequence (personal communication, 1972).

This overly simplified view of the complex political-economic relationships that exist between different levels of political organization has certain inherent problems. One need only ask what is to be done if the community in question has insufficient resources to solve its problems? Hanna's position fails to take into account the interrelationships of complex political-economic issues that exist in modern post-industrial societies.

One can argue that the "inherent emphasis" of the curriculum is only Hanna's idiosyncratic view and is not a true reflection of what this sequence provides. By placing the different levels of community organization in separate categories, however, and presenting them to students one level per year, the sequence is, in itself, suggestive of Hanna's interpretation.

Hanna's description of the political ideology that underlies the expanding environments sequence provides an answer to Michael Apple's question, "...what is the ideological coding in the material?" (1982, p. 32). Hanna's term, "inherent emphasis," is a form of political ideology. He intended his statement, I believe, to be a positive one; otherwise, he might never have stated it so explicitly. The ideology of expanding environments was achieved and has been maintained to date with no conscious conspiracy to indoctrinate students in a particular political ideology. Nonetheless, the result is the same as if there had been one. The fact that only one "environment" is studied at each grade level creates the unrealistic notion of isolated and separate levels of political organization.

Political Socialization Research Designs

Positivist research supports the idea of an objective, unbiased view based on carefully constructed quantitative models that precisely measure the subject in question. Positivist research is derived from the
same school of sociological thought that produced the functionalist perspective. The functionalist perspective is based on the idea that a society is held together by a general agreement about what are its norms, values, and attitudes. The problem with this view is that it ignores conflict. The functionalist perspective has dominated socialization in schools while positivist research has dominated investigation into this area.

Beginning in the 1960s, much of the research into the political socialization of students in schools has utilized positivist, quantitative research methodologies. Quantitative approaches, however, use research designs that seriously limit the extent of the inquiry. In political socialization research, researchers have demonstrated that the diffuse, transient nature of political attitudes in young people makes them virtually unquantifiable with any long term accuracy. Large scale surveys of the political attitudes of students have been widely used in this research. The problem is that students' attitudes change as they grow and develop into political beings, and these periodic quantitative checks of attitudes cannot measure this growth adequately.

Positivist research into political socialization in the schools, largely conducted in the 1970s, has been seriously criticized. Palonsky questioned "...the appropriateness of earlier research designs and the conclusions drawn from those investigations" (1987, p. 495). He further asserted that,

...our understanding of the ways in which students think about the political aspects of their lives—for example, power, partisanship, authority, justice, fairness—has been limited by functionalist views of schooling and positivist research paradigms (Palonsky, 1987, p. 493).

Positivist quantitative research designs have a narrow focus that usually renders researchers incapable of seeing issues as a whole or of inferring beyond immediate results. This has limited political socialization research in schools, leading many researchers to conclude that the political attitudes of students are too diffuse and changeable to be measured with any precision.

Nevertheless, the concerns that positivist researchers have expressed are still of great importance to society. The difficulty of quantifying the political attitudes of students has not undermined the legitimacy of studying those attitudes. It was thus unfortunate that researchers initially chose quantitative approaches to the analysis of political socialization. Qualitative methods, drawn from the interactionist perspective in sociology, could have produced a more
holistic view of attitudes since that tradition is concerned with human interests and values rather than a rigid objectivity. The recent criticisms leveled at positivist research, I believe, are causing the holistic view to take on a position of greater importance for research into political socialization.

The study of socialization from a holistic, or interactionist, perspective utilizes different research techniques. Appropriate research procedures for examining political socialization from the interactionist view include Connell's (1971) and Jaros's (1973) in-depth interviewing techniques, as well as Coles' (1986) "interview plus" methods. Palonsky recommends that careful observation of normal student activities in schools be added to interviewing techniques. This approach to the study of political socialization creates a neutral, apolitical perspective that still allows sharp criticism of any observed political indoctrination by the schools.

Effect of the Sequence on Political Socialization

The effect of the expanding environments sequence on political socialization has never been analyzed. What effect does the transmission of an unrealistic view of political culture have on the political socialization of students? It could result in a distorted conceptual schema about political life. The curriculum implies that communities cannot expect larger political bodies to help solve community problems regardless of their nature or the resources available to solve the problems. Personal political experience outside of school, however, contradicts the view expressed in the curriculum. Massialas and Hurst observed that, "Through personal experience, some students soon discover that what is taught in school about the system is far removed from reality" (1978, p. 16). They noted that, "Other students go through life thinking that the system operates in accordance with the textbook" (1978, p. 16). Unfortunately, too many students continue to believe that different levels of political organization are isolated and separate. Of greater concern are those students who Massialas and Hurst contend,

... become frustrated when they discover that school has provided no opportunity for them to learn the realities of the system—to learn, for example, that decisions are often the result of organizing, bargaining, and tough negotiating (1978, p. 16).

Some students may well become bitter and disillusioned when they discover that the school curriculum has transmitted to them an unrealistic view of their political system. This may, in turn, lead to political alienation and withdrawal from participation in political
life at any level. According to Barber (1984), direct participation in the political system is highly desirable in a democracy if the democratic process is to survive. Some will argue that in a representative democracy, however, there are limits to the number of people who can participate directly in the democratic process. Obviously, every adult cannot participate directly in national and state government. Nevertheless, local government places few restrictions on direct participation, and it is perhaps at this level that it is most effective. Pratte’s (1988) concept of community service may prove to be the most viable form of direct political participation.

The elementary social studies curriculum needs to equip students realistically for political participation. It should not impose an unrealistic view that needs to be overcome if children are to participate effectively in political life as adults. The impact of the expanding environments sequence has been (and continues to be) considerable. It underlies most curriculum designs at the local and state levels. It has been financially successful for publishers, and they will be reluctant to exchange it for a new, less proven model. A solid social education of students requires a new sequence that is soundly based on political realities and that reflects current theory about child growth and development. Social studies educators need to develop a sequence that will significantly change the elementary social studies curriculum.

The Search for an Alternative Sequence

Before proposing an alternative sequence to replace the expanding environments idea, it is appropriate to consider previous attempts at curriculum reform and their results. The problem is one of developing a sequence so compelling that it will demand curriculum revision.

Social studies curriculum reformers of the 1960s and 1970s believed that they were going to improve the schools, and by extension the society, by changing the content and teaching methods of the elementary social studies curriculum. The fact that they failed to penetrate the schools in any significant way was, in Whitty’s terms, “partly because their proposed reforms were out of line with the perceived political priorities of hegemonic forces within the wider society” (1985, p. 161).

The general failure of the new social studies projects to impact the schools is due undoubtedly to many complex reasons, but Whitty’s poignant remark seems to capture the essence of the problem. The reformers largely failed to see their social studies curriculum materials implemented partly because of the requirements of publishers that textbook writers adhere to the expanding environments sequence. For most publishers, the expanding environments sequence represented, at
least partially, the "political priorities" mentioned by Whitty. By requiring adherence to the expanding environments sequence, many (perhaps a majority) of publishers ensured that the elementary social studies curriculum (at least as represented in elementary social studies textbooks) remained essentially the same as it had been for decades. Although many of the new social studies projects developed curricula in which subject matter details were changed and new and innovative teaching methods were utilized, the tacit message hidden in the expanding environments sequence remained unchanged. It seems likely, in fact, that the new subject matter and teaching methods probably posed significant problems for the acceptance of the "new social studies" by many of the schools in which they were tried. Teachers were not ready to receive these innovations and perceived them as threatening.

Students, even young first graders, can think, question, puzzle, criticize, and doubt. This fact has important implications with respect to the sequencing of learning experiences. Learning experiences should not be sequenced from simple to complex in such a way that critical thinking is encouraged only in the higher grades. Curriculum planners need to examine the sequencing of learning experiences to develop an awareness that fixed, sequential learning experiences place severe limitations on the resources students bring to learning tasks. Narrow sequencing organizational patterns, such as the expanding environments notion, stultify students and their capabilities. Considering the child development theory of culture epochs on which the idea of expanding environments is based, its continued use in elementary social studies is inappropriate if the curriculum is to portray the political system realistically.

A Different Sequence

If the expanding environments sequence is to be abandoned, its replacement should certainly not be another rigid sequence that locks students into limited areas of investigation. Children begin school equipped with the basic tools of thought and receive data inputs daily from the electronic media. Since the expanding environments' generalized headings encompass virtually all possible subjects, it makes sense to include all of the expanding environments topic headings at each grade level. Such an apparently modest change need not arouse anxiety on the part of teachers, parents, publishers or "hegemonic forces within the wider society."

Teachers at each grade level should develop units of study based on all of the different levels of political organization. The order, however, should be randomized rather than occur in a rigid sequence. This will make the learning experiences that occur in school more akin
to the randomized sorts of learning experiences that take place outside the classroom. The sequence of topics for each year would be determined by the teacher, as they arise from the teacher's perceptions of student interests. In this way, the social studies program for a given year would consist of several units of study of various lengths dealing with different topics. Teachers could involve students in increasingly complex studies under these general topic headings as they move up through the grades, however. For example, first grade students studying United States geography might put together a jigsaw puzzle map of the country, while sixth grade students would draw detailed maps of the United States.

In addition to the social benefits that would accrue from having students study several topics each year, there would be the added bonus for both students and teachers of not having to face the same general topic for an entire school year, an experience that quickly becomes tiresome. The recommended alternative would provide more diversity, stimulation, and interest for students. The study of oneself would provide an additional and much needed topic that could be included in each year's course of study.

Thelen's "group investigation strategy" (Joyce and Weil, 1992, pp. 29-52) could be used as a model for this approach. Using the group investigation strategy involves teacher negotiation with students about the sequence of the units to be studied, as well as the content and associated activities. Negotiation is a normal human activity in which students naturally attempt to engage except in the most rigidly teacher-directed classrooms. Even when the goals, content, and activities are set by the teacher in a lesson, students can attempt to extract some social value from an assignment through negotiating procedures ("May we work together on this?"). Teachers who are willing to negotiate with students can provide excellent training in democratic procedures and in mature decision-making. It is appropriate that teachers be the ones to initiate negotiations with students about the sequence of the units to be studied, in fact.

The problems to be studied could be associated with each level of community. Such problems should increase in complexity and level of difficulty as the students move up through the grades.

A type of curriculum that would help to prepare upper elementary students effectively for political life would be one consisting of detailed studies of specific social, economic, and political problems at the neighborhood and community levels, based on historical evidence. The study of a number of examples of community problems that require state and federal assistance, for example, could help to demonstrate the web of interrelationships that exist between different levels of government. The idea that there are no final solutions to some social problems is an important lesson inherent in this idea. Instead of
emphasizing the political separateness of different community levels, as the expanding environments sequence does, the teacher in this curriculum design would be able to stress the political interdependence of the various levels of community organization.

Such curriculum materials would need to be carefully designed, of course, to meet the needs of elementary school students. Pratte's (1988) concept of incorporating community service into the curriculum, mentioned earlier, would become an important part of student activities in studies of the local community. Shopping for the handicapped, distributing meals to the needy and tutoring other students are some examples that he mentions as possible after-school activities. Primary students could, for example, make regular visits to homes for the aged during school time and perhaps "adopt" a grandparent whom they visit on a regular basis.

Through concept attainment, simulation, role-play, and other innovative strategies, students could begin to deal with a problem as if it were their own and in as realistic a manner as possible. In this way, students would actually participate, albeit through simulated techniques, in the "organizing, bargaining, and tough negotiating" mentioned by Massialas and Hurst (1978, p. 16).

History could be restored to the topic headings at the lower end of the expanding environments sequence by revitalizing McMurry's idea of family, neighborhood, and local community histories. Wheeler and Kelly (1975) have made several suggestions for developing social history studies of local families and communities. Students could be encouraged to bring pictures of grandparents and other elderly relatives (or the actual individuals!) to school to talk about their lives and times. They could also bring antiques from home that are of historical interest to school to share with their classmates. Older students could construct family trees (including as much information as possible) about their ancestors. This could then be expanded to an analysis of an entire group's ancestry in terms of changes in family size, occupation, and residence. Visits to local historical museums could provide stimuli for a study of community history. Teachers could continually utilize the historical resources available in the community as well as those of the students themselves.

Conclusion

Curriculum reform is an activity for which Apple has posed a set of six directive questions.

What reforms can we genuinely call non-reformist reforms, that is, reforms that both alter and better present conditions and can lead to serious structural
changes? What reforms could be supported because of their possible contribution to the political education of a large group of people or to their learning strategies that may ultimately enable them to reassert control of their economic and cultural institutions? Which reform contributes to coalitions that may alter the balance of forces? What kinds of coalitions will tend to be progressive in the long run? Are there elements within students and parents themselves, in their lived culture, that penetrate into the reality of dominant social relations? How can these be employed? (1982, p. 134).

In what ways would the study of several of the expanding environments topics in each year of the elementary school answer Apple's questions about curriculum reform? While the proposed reform of the social studies sequence may not fully answer all of his questions, it deals with many of the more important aspects. First, it will eliminate the isolated, separate levels of political organization inherent in the expanding environments approach. Instead it will train students to think about communities as interdependent and provide them with a more accurate view of the political reality in which they live. Students would then no longer be studying an unrealistic version of their society.

Second, the proposed alternative would transmit a more realistic message to students about present political organization. Although a sequence of studies is not a learning strategy, the new sequence would help students to have a better understanding of their political and cultural institutions and consequently be more inclined, perhaps, to try and improve them.

Third, the proposed change would bring a recognition that common goals and aspirations of communities are achieved through intergovernmental cooperation and mutual responsibilities between different levels of government.

Fourth, the proposed change will tend to be progressive in the long run. It may help to create a society different than the present one, a society in which an "us against them" mentality is reduced.

Fifth, the proposed change may awaken "elements within students and parents themselves that penetrate into the reality of dominant social relations." People in every community are confronted with real problems in their everyday lives, serious problems such as poverty, unemployment, pollution, crime, inadequate housing, and a deteriorating natural environment. Most of these problems cannot be resolved without responsible intergovernmental cooperation and mutual assistance. This is simply a fundamental fact of life. A school
curriculum has long been needed that develops the skills and knowledge needed for individuals to deal effectively with this fact.

Finally, the real problems that students face every day will be translated into curriculum problems. Real problems do not appear in lock-step order one year at a time according to successive levels of governmental hierarchy as the expanding environments sequence suggests.

In addition to the questions that Apple has asked, one might wonder if the proposed change will ensure that students see the interrelationships that exist among different levels of government. Some might even ask if passing problems on to a higher level of government is not inappropriate. It is not possible to say with absolute certainty, of course, that the change suggested here will ensure a solution to all the problems associated with the expanding environments idea. Nevertheless, teaching all of the different levels of political organization at each grade level should, in and of itself, demonstrate interrelationships and interdependencies, especially if the teacher emphasizes the point. Upper grade teachers can, for example, develop units on the relationship between state and local governments.

In sum, then, the expanding environments sequence does not accurately portray reality. Instead, it depicts a bland, nonexistent political system based on conventional textbook social science that, in effect, masks reality. It is thus a poor plan for teaching students how to deal with the real world. A bold change in the sequence is required. The expanding environments notion has been masking reality in elementary classrooms for several generations. The time has come for a curriculum sequence that will help prepare students realistically for life in the socio-political world outside the classroom.

Endnote

1 The author would like to thank Professor Sharon Pray Muir of Oakland University in Rochester, Michigan for her helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.
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Abstract
This article summarizes findings from a detailed study of an exemplary fifth-grade teacher's approach to teaching U.S. history. The teacher's general rationale, goals, and methods are described, and the article focuses examples on a unit on the English colonies that was recorded and analyzed in depth. The teacher's approach is notable for the limits placed on breadth of coverage in order to focus on connected main themes and related basic facts; the use of storytelling, rather than the textbook, as the major source of information to students; the frequent integration of history content with language arts teaching; and the emphasis on significant writing assignments and cooperative learning activities instead of more typical worksheets and tests.

Introduction
The process-product research of the 1970s identified classroom management and instructional behaviors associated with student gains on standardized achievement tests (Brophy & Good, 1986). This research was important for showing that teachers differ in the levels of achievement gain that they elicit from their students and for identifying some of the teacher behaviors associated with these differences. However, the research was limited in several respects. First, it focused on very basic aspects of teaching that differentiate the least effective teachers from other teachers, but it did not address the more subtle points that distinguish the most outstanding teachers. Also,
it relied mostly on standardized tests as the outcome measure. Consequently, it emphasized the mastery of relatively isolated knowledge items and skill components without assessing the degree to which students developed understanding of networks of related information, or the ability to use this information to think creatively or critically, solve problems, or make decisions. In short, this research did not give much attention to teaching for understanding and higher-order applications.

A new kind of research on subject-matter teaching has emerged more recently. It focuses more intensively on particular curriculum units or even individual lessons, taking into account the teacher's instructional objectives and assessing student learning accordingly. This newer research emphasizes the teaching of school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application. The goal is to go beyond memorizing miscellaneous content by teaching students integrated understandings of networks of related content, developed to the extent that students can explain the information in their own words and can access and use it in appropriate application situations in and out of school.

This new research emphasis already has produced successful experimental programs in most school subjects. Analyses of these programs (Anderson, 1989; Brophy, 1989; Prawat, 1989) have identified a common set of principles and practices that characterize the teaching of school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application:

1. The curriculum is designed to equip students with knowledge, skills, values, and dispositions they will find useful both inside and outside of school.
2. Instructional goals stress developing conceptual understanding of knowledge and self-regulated application of skills.
3. The curriculum balances breadth with depth by addressing limited content, but developing it sufficiently to foster conceptual understanding.
4. The content is organized around a limited set of powerful ideas (basic understandings and principles).
5. The teacher's role is not just to present information, but also to scaffold and respond to students' learning efforts.
6. The students' role is not just to absorb or copy input, but also to make sense out of it and actively construct meaning.
7. Activities and assignments feature tasks that call for problem solving or critical thinking, not just memory or reproduction.
8. Higher-order thinking skills are not taught as a separate skills curriculum. Instead, they are developed in the process of teaching subject-matter knowledge within application
contexts—contexts that call for students to relate their learning to their lives by thinking critically or creatively about it or by using it to solve problems or make decisions.

9. The teacher creates a classroom environment that could be described as a learning community, featuring discourse or dialogue designed to promote understanding.

In order to use these methods of teaching school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application, teachers need to possess not only sufficient knowledge of subject matter and related pedagogical techniques, but also a well-articulated set of instructional goals to guide them in selecting and representing content to students. Once they can identify the important ideas that they want their students to understand, appreciate, and apply, they can use these ideas as the central core around which to structure a coherent curriculum. However, if they approach the subject with a content coverage focus that is not guided by larger goals, they may end up with a curriculum that is (or at least, appears to the students as) a "parade" of disconnected bits of information.

Teaching school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application can be difficult even for teachers who possess clarity of goals and adequate subject-matter knowledge. Pressures for content coverage make it difficult for teachers to devote enough time to particular topics to allow them to develop important ideas in depth. Textbooks and other curriculum materials can also be impediments if they emphasize breadth of coverage over in-depth and coherent development of key ideas. This is an especially serious problem in subjects such as history, in which a great deal of information must be conveyed to students.

Recent critiques of K-12 textbooks across the curriculum (Elliott & Woodward, 1990; Tyson-Bernstein, 1988); of elementary social studies series (Brophy, McMahon, & Prawat, 1991); and of fifth-grade history texts (Beck & McKeown, 1988) agree that the following problems are endemic in such texts: (a) an emphasis on breadth of coverage over developing ideas in depth; (b) the presentation of information in the form of disconnected parades of facts rather than networks of connected content structured around important ideas; (c) the use of paragraphs that are unclear because the material is compressed and lacks elaboration; (d) frequent disruption of content flow by inserted vignettes or skills exercises that have no connection to the rest of a chapter or unit; (e) excessive allocation of space to pictures or graphics that are unrelated to important ideas developed in the text; and (f) a general lack of coherence and reader friendliness in the exposition of content.

Fifth-grade teachers who want to teach U.S. history for understanding, appreciation, and application cannot do so by simply
leading their students through such texts (in effect, making text content their total curriculum). Instead, they will have to supplement or substitute for the text to address their own curricular goals by (a) limiting what they try to teach to important content and omitting or skimming over the rest, and (b) structuring what they choose to teach around important ideas and elaborating those ideas considerably beyond the introduction provided by the text.

In this article, I shall describe how one fifth-grade teacher does this by using her own illustrated "storytelling" (rather than the textbook) as the main source of input for her students. In doing so, she uses children's literature and historical artifacts to make the material more personalized and concrete. She also builds art and writing activities around historical topics in ways that provide students with useful application opportunities for her students and which provide useful assessment information for the teacher. Taken together, these activities have the effect of extending the coherence and thrust of the history curriculum.

Case Study: Mary Lake

The following is based on a detailed case study of this teacher's approach to teaching U.S. history, focusing in particular on her teaching of a unit on the English colonies. The case study was based on several lengthy interviews with the teacher, transcriptions of tape recordings and field notes documenting each class session held during the unit, inspection of student work, and transcriptions of interviews with six students who were questioned both before and after they experienced the unit.

Plans for the study called for focusing on "exemplary" teaching of elementary social studies for understanding, appreciation, and life application. This led to a search for elementary teachers who (a) had had several years of experience; (b) had established reputations as good teachers in general and good teachers of social studies in particular; (c) valued social education and thus consistently allocated significant time to social studies instruction; and (d) gave evidence in their teaching of reliance on the principles and practices (listed above) that characterize the teaching of school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and life application.

Names of potential case study teachers were solicited from local informants. One such teacher whose name was mentioned by several informants was Mary Lake (pseudonym), who teaches fifth grade in an elementary school located in a working class suburb of Lansing, Michigan. I called Mrs. Lake, ascertained her willingness to serve as the focus of a case study, and arranged for a preliminary interview and several pilot visits to her classroom. These preliminary contacts
confirmed the expectation, based on what had been reported by informants, that Mrs. Lake would meet the established selection criteria. This led to negotiation of an agreement to develop a formal case study based on her upcoming colonies unit (taught between November 21 and December 21, 1989).

Formal data collection began with a pre-unit interview in which Mrs. Lake shared her plans for the unit in detail. This interview included questions about the social studies program for the year and how the colonies unit fit into it, the major goals of the unit itself, correlated activities occurring during time periods allocated to subjects other than social studies, and what would occur during each of the planned lessons and activities. Copies of all materials to be distributed to the students during the unit (e.g., activity sheets, tests) were obtained, and additional pilot observations were done in order to build familiarity with everyday routines and to perfect techniques for audiotaping classroom discourse and recording field notes.

Pre-unit interviews with students also were done during this time, using a stratified sample of six students (a high-achieving, an average-achieving, and a low-achieving boy and a high-achieving, an average-achieving, and a low-achieving girl, nominated within those categories by Mrs. Lake). Each student was interviewed individually, using questions about history and why it is taught, the previous unit on explorers, and the upcoming unit on the colonies. These tape-recorded interviews lasted between 20-40 minutes each and were later transcribed for analysis.

Mrs. Lake taught social studies during three 45-minute periods each week. The colonies unit spanned 12 such periods. Audiotapes and related field notes were made for each of these 12 periods, as well as for two language arts periods that focused on writing assignments correlated with the colonies content of the social studies unit. During each of these 14 class periods, teacher-student discourse was tape-recorded and running field notes were written describing classroom events as they unfolded. The field notes placed particular emphasis on preserving information that would be needed to contextualize or interpret the taped-recorded discourse (nonverbal responses such as hand-raising or head-nodding, descriptions of what the teacher was pointing to or showing the students, explanations for lesson interruptions, etc.).

Immediately after the unit was completed, the six students who had been interviewed prior to the unit were interviewed once again. This interview repeated a few of the questions from the previous interview, but most of it concentrated on the main ideas that Mrs. Lake had emphasized during the colonies unit. Folders containing all of the written work produced by these six students also were collected at this time, and their contents were copied for later analysis.
In addition to the detailed information gathered about what had been learned by the six students interviewed before and after the unit, brief, self-report data on what all of the students had learned were obtained by collecting and copying the KWL sheets that the students filled out at the beginning and end of the unit. KWL is a technique, based on schema-theoretic views of the reading comprehension process, for promoting learning by helping learners to retrieve relevant background knowledge and learn with metacognitive awareness of purpose and accomplishment (Ogle, 1986). Learners fill out KWL sheets in two steps. As they are about to begin studying the topic, they write down what they already know (or think they know) about the topic and also indicate, to the extent that they are able, what they want to learn about it. After completion of the unit, they fill out the third section in which they describe what they learned about the topic.

I drew upon all of these sources of information in preparing the case study, treating them collectively as a single body of raw data to use as the basis for writing a synthesized account of Mrs. Lake's teaching. In selecting and organizing information in the longer report (Brophy, 1990), I sought to develop a coherent and reasonably complete account of how Mrs. Lake teaches U.S. history to her fifth graders, why she teaches it that way, and how it appears to affect the students. My intention was to provide enough information about Mrs. Lake's teaching to enable readers to understand it well enough to assess its strengths and weaknesses and to imitate or adapt it for themselves if they wish to do so. I draw from the longer report in this article, emphasizing how Mrs. Lake arranged to focus her teaching on key ideas developed in depth.

Scheduling for Sustained History Teaching and Learning

Mrs. Lake has taken several steps to increase the coherence and impact of her social studies teaching. First, she and the other two fifth-grade teachers at the school have worked out a semi-departmentalized arrangement that allows them to specialize in some subjects rather than teach all of the subjects. Mrs. Lake teaches three sections of language arts and three sections of social studies. This allows her to concentrate on these two subjects, as well as to integrate them.

Second, the teachers have devised a schedule that allows them to teach both science and social studies for three 45-minute periods per week, rather than teaching these subjects daily, but for only 20 to 30 minutes at a time. The total time allocated to these two subjects remains the same, but the longer class period allows for more coherent and sustained instruction and greater flexibility in the length and nature of learning activities and assignments.

Third, scheduling has been arranged so that Mrs. Lake can concentrate on teaching U.S. history throughout the school year,
instead of trying to teach both U.S. history and U.S. geography (as prescribed in the district's social studies guidelines and as covered in the adopted text). She and her colleagues have discovered that the state-prescribed health curriculum can be completed in just one semester, so they have arranged for one of the other teachers to teach U.S. geography during the other semester. Mrs. Lake includes use of maps and other coverage of aspects of geography needed to understand the history that she teaches, but systematic coverage of U.S. geography (focusing on the present) is handled by her colleague. This arrangement adds 30-40 percent to the time that these fifth graders spend studying U.S. history.

Fourth, Mrs. Lake further allows time for depth of development of key ideas by restricting her content coverage. She covers U.S. history only up to the Civil War and she tries to restrict her coverage to content that is directly relevant to the main ideas that she wants to emphasize. For example, she omits Magellan from her unit on voyages of exploration because her main themes focus on the establishment and development of the United States as a country, and Magellan's voyages are less relevant here than the voyages of those who explored the New World. She teaches units on (1) history and the work of historians, (2) Native Americans, (3) the explorers, (4) the colonies, (5) the Revolution and establishment of a new nation, (6) westward expansion and the frontier, and (7) the Civil War.

Goals and Content Selection

Mrs. Lake emphasizes both affective and cognitive goals. She wants her students to enjoy school and feel successful there, and she also wants them to understand, appreciate, and be able to apply what they are learning. In U.S. history, she wants them to develop a knowledge and appreciation of life in the past and of the main themes that describe and explain the establishment and development of the United States as a nation. She believes that the publishers' textbooks are not very helpful for accomplishing these purposes because their content is boring and choppy and their ancillary materials are too focused on low-level memory tasks. Consequently, she no longer uses the texts except as back-up resource books. Instead of a text, she uses her own lecturing and storytelling as the basic source of input to her students. These presentations are designed both to make the material more interesting for students and to make sure that key ideas are emphasized rather than buried in a parade of detail.

Mrs. Lake is a talented storyteller, and much of the initial information that students receive about historical events comes in the form of dramatic readings from historical literature (i.e., children's trade books, not texts). Much of the rest comes in the form of storytelling or explanations backed by photos, artifacts, or other props. This input
is presented in ways that capture students' imagination and interest, but also in ways that develop understanding of key ideas and major themes.

Mrs. Lake's colonial unit emphasized the different kinds of people who came to settle in the colonies, the reasons that they came, and the conditions of life during the colonial years. Compared to other units, the colonial unit featured less emphasis on key people and events but more emphasis on developing understanding and appreciation of the everyday lives of ordinary people. She wanted the students to know about and appreciate the powerful motives and willingness to take risks that led people to immigrate to the new world, the small size of their ships and the cramped conditions endured in them, the enormity of the task and the many obstacles faced in establishing the first settlements, the relatively primitive conditions of everyday life at the time, the heavy dependence on hand tools and personal labor for meeting basic needs, and so on. Much of the instruction and many of the assignments were built around diaries, artifacts, and historically based children's literature designed to develop concrete and visualizable understandings of what life in colonial times was like.

Mrs. Lake's main knowledge goal is "that every fifth-grader can tell me the story of United States history" (through the Civil War). This general goal subsumes the main knowledge goals taught in each unit, along with related time lines and map locations. She also wants her students to appreciate the fact that the country has developed as a nation of immigrants, and in particular, to learn about their own families' roles in this development.

In selecting content, Mrs. Lake emphasizes the degree to which a potential topic is basic to her main theme of telling the story of the establishment and development of the United States as a country and her perceptions of students' interest in and readiness to understand and appreciate the topic. A secondary consideration is the availability of good teaching materials and activities. She constantly adds to her collection of children's books, historical artifacts, models and illustrations, and learning activities that she believes will be helpful in teaching her students to understand and appreciate history. She has one or more boxes of such materials for each of her curriculum units.

General Approach to History Teaching

Aware that this is usually her students' first systematic exposure to history as a discipline, Mrs. Lake begins the year by engaging them in developing information about their own personal histories. She has them interview their parents or other family members and collect artifacts and source materials (birth certificates, newspaper or almanac information on what was happening in the world on the day they were born, mementos marking events in their lives). Then they
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construct illustrated autobiographical charts built around time lines that start at their date of birth and continue through the present. Through this direct experience in acting as historians investigating their own lives and summarizing key information along a time line, the students develop a basis for understanding the reconstructive and interpretive nature of history as a discipline, the process of tracing developments through time, and the uses of information sources and time lines. Mrs. Lake then makes the connection with the study of U.S. history by noting that, like the students themselves, our nation had a beginning (birthday) and subsequently experienced growth and development that can be studied historically and illustrated through time lines.

A time line describing and illustrating some of the salient events in U.S. history extends across most of the front wall of the classroom, above the chalkboard. Mrs. Lake refers to this time line periodically, especially when beginning and ending units, to help students keep track of where the current topic fits within the big picture. Similarly, she refers to maps frequently to provide geographical orientation.

Mrs. Lake studies state and district guidelines and various U.S. history textbooks to identify key ideas to emphasize in her teaching, but she conveys content to students primarily through reading or telling stories from sources such as the children's history magazine *Cobblestone* or fictional but factually based and well-illustrated children's trade books. Most of her teaching about life in the colonies was based on two fictional but fact-based diaries—one describing a day in the life of a nine-year-old girl in Plymouth Plantation in 1627 and another describing the ordeals endured by one of the original settlers at Jamestown. Mrs. Lake believes that these sources personalize the information in ways that make it interesting and memorable for her students. Another advantage is that they contain realistic drawings or photos of fact-based reconstructions, thus offering visual illustration as well as narrative description of life at the time.

In connection with her reading and storytelling, Mrs. Lake uses repetition, visual aids, and story mapping techniques to help students remember main themes. She emphasizes key ideas when telling stories and repeats them several times in review and follow-up activities. She posts key words (organized within "people," "places," and "events" columns) on a special social studies unit display as they are introduced, and they remain displayed throughout the rest of the unit. She also develops story maps and other content outlines or diagrams on the chart stand and posts these when she has finished teaching from them.

Her storytelling features eye contact, physical proximity, and use of props and surprises. Rather than tell the story from the front of the class with the students seated at their desks, she sits in a low chair in her history teaching station at the rear of the class, with the students
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gathered close to her seated on the floor. This allows her to use proximity and eye contact in telling them stories, as well as to assume a more intimate, less authoritarian role in interacting with them.

Mrs. Lake has a flair for theatrics that makes her a gifted storyteller. She establishes and maintains student engagement through enthusiastic readings and theatrical role enactments, effective use of timing and pauses, questions that invite speculation about what happened next, and other dramatic techniques. Occasionally she will don a costume to enact the role of a particular historical character or will arrange for students to reenact historical events. She shows and circulates photos, illustrations, and props (arrowheads, colonial tools and household implements), often using them with dramatic flair. Following initial storytelling, she reviews by asking questions focused on the posted key words and story maps. She selects and sequences her questions so as to lead students to retell the stories with emphasis on key ideas.

Mrs. Lake's activities and assignments reflect this same emphasis. Most of them call for students to synthesize and communicate what they are learning. Many call for students to work together in pairs or small groups, working with geographic maps that incorporate salient aspects of unit content or writing about that content in some way (typically by developing networks of key terms or preparing a report or composition that synthesizes key ideas).

The Colonial Unit

Most of these aspects of Mrs. Lake's general approach to history teaching were seen in her colonial unit. She began by implementing the KWL technique and then telling the students about how Europeans eventually began coming to the New World not just to explore but to establish colonies. She illustrated this using a book that contained pop-up models of the ships used by the Vikings, Columbus, and the Pilgrims. Then she told a gripping version of the story of the lost colony of Roanoke Island, illustrating it with pictures from a book and outlining it with a story map constructed on the chart stand. A follow-up assignment called for students to answer several questions, including "If you were one of the first settlers, why would you have wanted to come to the New World?" and "What natural resources would you consider important for your survival?"

Mrs. Lake then told the story of Jamestown, basing it in part on excerpts from a poem by Rosemary Vincent Benet that dramatized the story by emphasizing the hardships endured during the first year and appealing to the students' sense of wonder at the notion of founding a new nation in a New World. During this and the next class, she went on to give a great deal more information about the Jamestown and Plymouth colonies, mostly in the form of storytelling based on content
drawn from *Cobblestone* magazine articles and from several children's books on these two colonies. Follow-up assignments called for students to work in pairs and small groups to develop their own versions of the story maps relating key facts about each colony and to answer questions calling for comparing the colonies on dimensions such as the reasons for their founding, who came and why they came, how they were governed, and the roles that local natives played in getting them established.

Also, as a combined language arts and social studies assignment, the students worked on "Jamestown journals." Here, they pretended to be one of the settlers that survived the first year at Jamestown. They were to adopt an appropriate name and make fictional but historically accurate entries for May 14, 1607 (arrival), August 5, 1607 (building construction, futile search for gold, establishment of relations with local Native Americans, food gathering, government), January 4, 1608 (the hard winter), and June 28, 1608 (new settlers arrive). To provide the students with more information as well as ideas about journal entries, Mrs. Lake read to them from a fictionalized but factually based treatment of the diary of Israel Worth, an actual settler at Jamestown.

In a later class, Mrs. Lake read the book *Sarah Morton's Day* to her students. This book depicts a day in the life of an English child born in Holland in 1618 who came to Plymouth in 1623. Her father died during the first winter at Plymouth and her mother has recently remarried. Sarah is developing a relationship with her new stepfather as well as coping with life in the colony. Through engaging narrative and photographs (taken at the reconstructed Plymouth Plantation in Massachusetts), the book chronicles a typical day in Sarah's life. This provides a basis for learning and discussion about life in the Plymouth colony and life at that time generally. As a follow-up assignment, students wrote compositions about Sarah Morton, "acting as historians" in selecting and assembling information taken from this book and from other sources about the Plymouth colony and about colonial life at the time. Again, this was partly a language arts assignment as well as a social studies assignment.

Later in the unit Mrs. Lake worked to help her students to understand and appreciate life at the time, both in terms of its commonalities across all colonies and in terms of the contrasts between the New England, the middle, and the southern colonies. For this, she showed artifacts and photos and gave dramatic, story-like lectures that described and contrasted life in the eastern seaboard settlements and plantations with life on the frontier. Occasionally she had the students close their eyes and visualize a scene as she described it (communal activities in the village green of a New England settlement, the process of clearing land and constructing a log cabin on the frontier). Related assignments called for students to note the various components
of a typical plantation and to compare and contrast key aspects of life in the northern, middle, and southern colonies.

Mrs. Lake's lessons incorporated a lot of oral review and she gave one test mid-way through the unit that focused on key names and facts. In general, however, she relied more on student performance associated with assignments than on tests for evaluation and grading purposes. This was especially the case for the two major writing assignments (the Jamestown journals and the Sarah Morton composition) and the assignments calling for students to synthesize or compare and contrast key information. Student performance on these and other indicators (KWL sheets, interviews) suggested that she was quite successful in accomplishing her stated knowledge goals and classroom observations indicated that students found the class enjoyable and the material engaging. The students paid consistent, often rapt, attention to her when she was telling stories; they frequently initiated comments and questions; and they typically engaged in activities and assignments with an unpressured informality that nevertheless appeared to include a seriousness of purpose.

Discussion

Mrs. Lake's teaching is exemplary in many respects. She exemplifies virtually all of the personal qualities and teaching strategies that process-product research has identified as correlates of student achievement gain, and she also exemplifies most of the features that have been identified as important in teaching school subjects for understanding, appreciation, and application. In particular, she limits her breadth of coverage in order to develop limited content sufficiently to foster conceptual understanding; she organizes this limited content around a few key ideas; she emphasizes the relationships and connections between these ideas; she provides students with frequent opportunities to actively process information and construct meaning; and she develops skills through activities that capitalize on naturally occurring opportunities for students to communicate or apply the history content that they are learning (rather than through isolated skills exercises).

In addition, she integrates social studies with language arts by making assignments that provide students with opportunities for authentic oral or written communication about their history learning; she situates historical content within time and space, referring frequently to time lines and maps; and she tries to connect the information to students' lives by linking it to their family histories, local examples, or current events. She "makes history come alive" for her students through her use of artifacts, her own personal storytelling, and her use of historical trade books in addition to textbooks. She
frequently appeals to the students' imaginations by asking for predictions about what happened next, asking them to think about how they might have responded in the situation, or helping them to visualize the scene. She embeds each new cluster of content within the context that she has established through frequent reference to the timeline that stretches across the front of her classroom, but she emphasizes the general chronology of events and the causal linkages between them rather than the memorizing of dates or isolated events.

Although Mrs. Lake's teaching is exemplary by all these criteria, it also can be criticized on the basis of other criteria. For example, although historians are likely to be pleased by the factors mentioned in the previous paragraph, they are likely to be bothered by certain aspects of her content coverage. In particular, they might prefer a more complete chronology than Mrs. Lake offered, they might want coverage up through the present time, and they might want to see more things presented as disputed issues rather than as established facts. Those who are especially concerned about content accuracy and disciplinary fidelity also might want to see Mrs. Lake reduce her use of children's fiction and curb her fanciful storytelling in favor of greater reliance on actual historical source material or the nonfictional writings of professional historians. Revisionist historians and critical theorists, although pleased with Mrs. Lake's emphasis on the history of ordinary people in general and women in particular, would want to see her adopt a more critical, less Eurocentric approach to the material.

Mrs. Lake's teaching might also be criticized by educators who favor pedagogical approaches that are not emphasized in her classroom. Those who place a premium on inquiry, discovery, or creative expression, for example, might feel that too many of her questions and activities involved repeating or applying ideas that she had told the students, and not enough providing students with opportunities to conduct inquiry on their own questions or to generate and express their own ideas. Educators who emphasize reflective forms of classroom discourse, although pleased with Mrs. Lake's emphasis on cooperative learning activities, would want to see less recitation and more dialogue, debate, or other sustained discussion. Educators who believe that students need a great deal of practice analyzing, interpreting, and evaluating what they read in order to construct knowledge for themselves might like to see Mrs. Lake reduce her emphasis on oral presentation of information and instead require students to develop ideas by working with written sources more frequently.

Finally, educators concerned about challenging students to their limits might criticize Mrs. Lake for overprotecting her students. Such educators might feel that her expectations are set too low—that she structures and scaffolds her students' work on assignments more than she
needs to, that the assignments themselves are not as demanding as they might be, or that she should be challenging her students with more demanding reading and homework assignments rather than shielding them from such assignments. This may be true to some extent, although it should be kept in mind that (a) most of the material in U.S. history is new to fifth graders, who do not possess the educated adult's rich fund of background knowledge to draw upon as a context for interpreting it, and (b) some fifth graders have developed only limited reading and writing skills, so that their content learning and communication opportunities will be severely limited if they are forced to rely solely on these skills, rather than on their better developed listening and speaking skills.

Notwithstanding these potential criticisms, Mrs. Lake's teaching clearly is exemplary in many ways, offering a coherent alternative to the reading-recitation-seatwork-test approach that is taken by teachers who rely too heavily on material supplied by the publishers. It should be particularly attractive to teachers seeking to increase curricular integration, especially those seeking to integrate more children's literature into social studies teaching.
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Abstract

Social studies has a rich and varied past, but few historical accounts have appeared to date. Very few social studies practitioners, in fact, have even heard of the 1916 Committee on Social Studies, or the report it prepared. This article provides some information in this regard by describing the formulation of the 1916 report, the individuals who prepared the report, and the ideas the report contained.

Introduction

To many traditionally-minded historians of the 1910s, the publication of the 1916 prototype social studies curriculum by the Committee on Social Studies was not a welcome addition to school curricula. On the eve of the initial dissemination of the report (Dunn, 1916), one historian wrote that there were only two things that this new report was apt to do: confuse and destroy whatever curricular unity existed within history programs (Sutton, 1916). This premonition proved essentially correct—within ten years, ideas drawn from the committee's report did indeed alter the landscape, contributing to a curricular chaos that one writer of the 1920s called "a confusion of tongues" (Dawson, 1924).
Although the 1916 report was not meant to be final in any sense of the word (it was drafted to generate a dialogue about curriculum choices among theorists, practitioners, and school officials), critics have not ceased, since its dissemination, to question the value or place of social studies in the public schools. Nonetheless, the field and its practitioners have endured, but not without considerable difficulty. Despite its survival, the social studies field has not been able, on the whole, to realize the promise of democratic citizenship outlined in the 1916 social studies report.

One reason for this failure may be that practitioners simply have no idea of the 1916 charge for social studies. Today, very few social studies teachers even know the 1916 report existed, much less what it contained. In this article, I hope to remedy this lack of knowledge by focusing upon the formulation of the 1916 social studies report, the individuals who prepared it, and the ideas it contained.

### A Context for Social Studies

The authors of the 1916 social studies report did not originate the concept of social studies. The idea of combining democratic dispositions, academic subject matter, and the social needs and interests of students in the development of school curricula for young citizens emerged in the second half of the 19th century. Amid the trials of living in a rapidly changing world, some scholars, through their writings and actions, sought to soften the hard edges off the impact of industrialization, urbanization, altered demographics, and general social unrest on the population of an emerging major world power.

In the 19th century, two dominant strains of thought materialized in the social theories of Herbert Spencer (1881) and Lester Frank Ward (1883). Eventually, each theorist's ideas influenced the growth of social studies. Both thinkers characterized society and its institutions as changing. Spencer, however, believed that individuals could not alter the path of social evolution. In contrast, Ward held that individuals could bend and shape both their present and future.

The distinctions of Spencer and Ward can be found in the 1916 report: Spencer in the form of curricular prescriptions based upon predetermined views of society, and Ward in the form of experimentalism. Two social studies theorists, tied to the 1916 report, were intimately connected with the development of the Spencerian and Ward positions. Taking the Spencerian view, Thomas Jesse Jones, chairman of the Committee, who studied under the Spencerian sociologist Franklin Giddings, worked in situations where social evolutionary themes and ideas were paramount. Representing Ward's vein of thought, Arthur William Dunn, secretary and compiler of the
1915 and 1916 documents, studied under the sociologists Albion Small and George Vincent (both followers of Ward).

That both views were represented in the 1916 social studies report illustrates the revolutionary atmosphere of the Committee's deliberations. By the 1910s, however, Spencerian views of society, as found in the works of Giddings and Jones, were dying, overpowered by the potent, active and more socially responsive thoughts of Ward, John Dewey, and Arthur William Dunn.

Introducing Selected Members of the Committee

The Committee on Social Studies that produced the 1915 and 1916 documents was composed of 21 members from various educational backgrounds. The Committee's membership heavily favored professional secondary school educators over university historians. Of the 21 members of the Committee, only James Harvey Robinson of Columbia University, a member of the original Committee of Ten history subcommittee as well as the Committee of Five, and William Mace of Syracuse University, could be described as professional historians.

By way of contrast, earlier committees were dominated by college and university historians, who naturally favored their discipline over the newly emerging social sciences. It appeared, however, that despite the educationally diverse composition of the 1916 Committee, policy was dominated by a few government bureaucrats. Clarence Kingsley, who actively supported and attended Committee deliberations while serving as chair of the overall Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Schools, to which the Committee on Social Studies was to report, joined Jones, Dunn and a few academic experts, mainly Robinson and James Lynn Barnard, to provide support for the idea of social studies.

Although the Committee largely supported the notion of practical history, they adopted a decidedly ahistorical approach. The academic and professional backgrounds of many Committee members were, in fact, rooted in sociology, not history. Members Jones, Kingsley, William Arey, and Samuel Howe were students of sociologist Franklin H. Giddings at Columbia. As noted earlier, Arthur William Dunn had studied with George Vincent and Albion Small at the University of Chicago. It was no coincidence, therefore, that the writings of the Committee, particularly with Jones, Kingsley, and Dunn present, took on a sociological cast. Only historian James Harvey Robinson appeared to bridge the gap between those who would reject outright and those who sought an accommodation with the then-popular recommendations of the Committee of Seven.
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Which of the original 21 members of the 1916 Social Studies Committee made the most significant contribution to the cause of social education? If the pen is any indication, those on the Committee who exerted the greatest influence on the shaping of the social studies would include James Lynn Barnard, Arthur William Dunn, James Harvey Robinson, Thomas Jesse Jones, and Clarence Kingsley. These five authored more articles, books, curriculum projects, and government reports, and gave more speeches related to the beginnings of social studies, than any of the other original 17 members.

Notwithstanding the Committee's composition (that is, its large inclusion of secondary school personnel), control over policy and philosophical position appeared to rest squarely with these five individuals. Evidence for this assertion lies with the record of their collective and individual thoughts as largely expressed prior to their appointment to the Committee. Kingsley, Dunn, and Barnard had been early advocates and sponsors of community civics in public schools in New York City, Indianapolis, and Philadelphia respectively; Jones championed the use of the social sciences at Hampton Institute; and Robinson was the leading spokesman for the "new history"—all well before the 1916 Social Studies Committee came into existence.

By comparison, their fellow conferees offered little in terms of new formulations or conceptions other than those that were already in print and credited to them. This gave the impression that the 17 supporting players were needed to prove that the Committee wasn't top heavy with college professors and government bureaucrats, (which, of course, it was), but more representative of secondary practitioners. The Committee produced three documents.

The first was entitled "The Preliminary Report of the Committee on Social Studies." Issued in 1913, this statement was written in part by Jones (Kingsley), and included a brief section on history prepared by Robinson; a slightly longer section on community civics prepared by Barnard; and a short section on economics by Henry R. Burch. The second document of the committee, The Teaching of Community Civics (Barnard, et al), released in 1915, was actually a separate work prepared by a special subcommittee co-authored by Barnard, Dunn, Kingsley, and F. W. Carrier. This subcommittee credited David Snedden, the most vocal critic at that time of traditional history in the schools, Jones, and fellow Committee member Jessie C. Evans (one of only two female members of the Committee) with providing "valuable suggestions" in the preparation of the paper.

Much of the work of the 1915 civics document was reproduced in 1916 in what became the final report of the Committee. The authorship of these documents appears to support the notion that policy formulation was actually in the hands of only a few individuals and
did not include work by the other Committee members. In addition, the
conferees approach to civics revealed curricular traces to courses taught
by Jones at the Hampton Institute and to the many addresses and
writings on citizenship education of Snedden, as well as more directly
to the work of Dunn as outlined in the preface of his 1906 text, *The
Community and the Citizen*.

The preliminary statement of 1913 and the civics document of 1915
provided several clues as to who exerted the most influence within the
Committee. It is in these reports that Jones, Barnard, Dunn, Kingsley,
and Robinson revealed the Committee's working spirit and defined and
organized the content of the Committee's work. Moreover, the
preliminary statement outlined the method or "tests" that educators
needed to give their current curriculum to ascertain if it did or did not
contribute to "human betterment" (Kingsley, p. 17). The notion that
schooling was tied or linked to "social betterment" or "social welfare"
(via Ward, Small, Vincent, and Dunn) and "social efficiency" (via
Spencer, Giddings, and Jones) was emphasized in the first two
publications of the Committee.

As used in the 1916 Committee report, the terms "social welfare"
and "social efficiency" were central to social study and the mission of
citizenship education. The conferees used the term "social welfare" to
represent putting the needs and interests of the group ahead of the
individual. Any improvement of society was to be actualized through
the betterment of the whole, not segments of the whole. On the other
hand, approaching citizenship from a social efficiency angle, the
conferees sought to make individuals more productive and proficient
members of their community. The adoption of this business-like
scientific approach illustrated a new faith that science could be used to
identify and solve social problems (Callahan, 1962). In the theory and
practice of social change, as outlined by Ward, the more humane idea
of social welfare was cast against the hard edge of social efficiency.
When the conferees' concept of "social control" (the agent to affect
social change) was added to the 1916 report, the central underlying
elements of social studies philosophy were set into place.

However, when social welfare and social efficiency are placed into
the same context, the meaning of social control vacillates between a
benign or humane means to effect change and a form of control that
literally directs the thoughts and lives of individuals. That each
strain of thought was represented in the Committee's work was not
troubling to the conferees who understood the paradoxical forces at
play. However, to later theorists and practitioners, these disparate
meanings create a general failure either to understand or appreciate
the work of the 1916 Social Studies Committee. Revisionist historians
in particular have highlighted the definition of social control as
referring to class domination and ignored the softer version of a
communal and equitable process of beneficial change. Recent works by Ross (1991), Westbrook (1991), and Saxe (1991) have called into question the meanings of the term social control so that we may better understand and interpret the work of theorists during the turn of the century.

The following sketches of Jones, Dunn, and Robinson offer a look at three of the leading participants of the committee whose work launched social studies into the mainstream of public education.

Three Leading Contributors to the Work of the 1916 Committee on Social Studies

Thomas Jesse Jones

Thomas Jesse Jones emigrated to the United States from Wales in the summer of 1884. Jones (1929) wrote of the thrill of seeing the "beautiful New York harbor" in his autobiographical introduction to Essentials of Civilization. He outlined his dream of seeing the "American Paradise of which we had heard from aunts and uncles" that had filled his young imagination. "So long as we sailed the blue waters of the harbor," Jones remembered, "and viewed the green shores, the stately buildings, and the skyline at a distance, our eager expectations were fulfilled." Continuing, "America was the Land of Hope; Americans were the happy people of whom we had been dreaming from earliest boyhood" (Jones, 1929, p. xi). After the ship docked and Jones saw the reality, "dirty workmen, wild confusion, noises, smells, and ugly sights, flies everywhere, people everywhere, buildings everywhere," his "illusion was smashed" (1929, p. xi). The experience was to leave a lasting impression. For the balance of his life, he sought to match his early dreams to the realities he experienced.

Jones' family moved to a small mining town in Ohio where he learned the values of working men and their resentment of capitalists. His early college years were spent absorbing the ideals of "cultured southern founders" at Washington and Lee University. Later, he attended Marietta College (Ohio), which "embodied the spirit of New England" (1929, p. xiii). Working class values, cultured southern values and New England values all influenced the character of the young Jones. He even spent time studying theology at Union Technological Seminary (where he received his Bachelor of Divinity Degree) while he was working on his doctorate under Franklin Giddings at Columbia. The title and role of the Reverend Jones, however, was something that he decided not to pursue.

While working on his dissertation, "The Sociology of a New York City Block" (1904), Jones lived in one of the bustling slums of New York. He took a keen interest in the people who lived in these slums, and
their problems, and decided to spend the rest of his life laboring for the just treatment of poor and oppressed people. Jones became convinced that for these men, women, and children, the only means of relief would come from the effects of formal education. He went on to spend his life teaching and writing about how citizens might become able participants in society regardless of their race or circumstances.

Jones received his first teaching appointment from the Hampton Institute in 1902 while he was still completing his Ph.D under Giddings, in the relatively new field of sociology. Giddings, a self-made scholar, represented the beginning of a "scientific-academic" orientation for those interested in social welfare and reform. At Hampton, Jones began teaching a unique brand of "social study" with a sociological outlook.

At first, Jones taught courses similar to those recommended by the Committee of Seven, such as ancient and American history. Jones also served as an assistant Chaplain. Later, he presented a curriculum that highlighted a mixture of sociology, political science, economics, and civics. These subjects were to become future components of the 1916 social studies report. Wanting to help the young "Negroes and Indians" understand and thrive in American society, Jones taught students the value of knowing how to use the system not only for their own benefit, but more importantly for benefit to the society at large, even if the education meant second class citizenship.

In addition to Giddings, Jones was greatly influenced by Samuel Chapman Armstrong and Booker T. Washington. Jones' work reflected what would be labeled in contemporary terms as a paternally racist position. He believed in the theory of "social evolution" as well as human (racial) evolution. The idea that Africans were inferior and that Europeans, particularly Anglo-Saxons, were superior was a given to him. The "younger races" (Africans and Native-Americans) needed guidance in understanding their lot, which essentially amounted to enduring second-class citizenship. The rationale behind the Hampton program was the belief that African-Americans were not mentally capable of claiming their share of political power with European-Americans, because they possessed several perceived moral deficiencies. Therefore, Jones attempted "to educate young men and women of the Negro and Indian races [to] apply themselves to similar tasks of regeneration through well-directed and unselfish effort" (1908, p. 63).

These views placed Jones and Hampton in a curious position. On one hand, Jones may be judged as moving away from the prevailing racism by advocating education for Africans and Native-Americans. On the other hand, Jones and his version of social studies at Hampton were clearly traditionally-oriented. In this light, Jones was both progressive and traditional. W.E.B. DuBois called Jones an "evil genius of the black
race" (cited in Correia, 1991, p. 1). Other contemporaries of Jones labeled him an "educational colonialist" and "cultural imperialist" (cited in Correia, p. 1). Despite these critics, clues to the dimensions of Jones' complex character may be traced through his work at Hampton.

The Hampton social studies program included four areas of study: civics, the understanding of the basis of government; political economy, the understanding of the world of finance and labor; government, the understanding of the use of modern government and the African-American's place in it; and sociology, the understanding of the various institutions of a civilized nation. History was neither a separate study or the focus of the social studies program. To the educational elite, the proper education for African-Americans was limited to vocational training. This view necessitated that African-Americans learn work skills and the proper civic virtues, but they were not to enjoy political aspirations. The connection between this sort of educational approach for African- and Native-Americans and the newly arrived immigrants was not lost on the 1916 Committee, who saw in the Hampton program the value of a socially-based efficiency model of direct social controls.

Jones presented the Committee with a working model of "social studies," built upon his experiences at Hampton, from which the members could freely draw. Jones' teaching at Hampton marked a sharp departure from the traditional concept of "civic education" under the banner of history instruction that stressed a passive study of political machinery. Believing that African-Americans should work within the system, Jones taught his students about social problems and the methods that could be utilized to try and solve them. While the committee ultimately did not accept the Hampton model in its entirety, Jones' racial and political outlook did correspond closely with the values and attitudes of most of the committee members.

Jones was part of a group of like-minded educators who recognized the need for a curriculum which emphasized civil responsibility and civic efficiency over individualism, self-sufficiency, and laissez-faire attitudes. For Jones and the committee, his plan for civic education, which he developed at Hampton and which he called social studies, was related to the needs of the American secondary students. Indeed, the Committee reported that it could find no better illustration of the organization of economic and sociological knowledge on a problem basis, and of the selection of problems for study with direct reference to the pupils' immediate interests and needs than that offered in the work of this institution [Hampton] (Dunn, 1916, pp. 55-56).
David Warren Saxe

Literacy, land ownership, high morals, civil obedience, and civic awareness were stressed by Jones, who later characterized his beliefs as the consciousness of the community (Jones, 1926). This concept reflected the core of Jones' philosophical outlook and brought him to national attention in Washington, D.C. where he was put in charge of analyzing Negro census tracts for the United States Census Bureau.

By the time Clarence Kingsley appointed Jones to chair the Social Science Committee in 1912, Jones had accepted another important position in Washington as Director of the Phelps Stokes Fund. This philanthropic organization was entrusted to disperse monies for the cause of Negro education. Although not given a recommendation for the post by his former mentor, Booker T. Washington, who considered Jones "a professional statistician" (cited in Harlan, 1986), Jones remained loyal to Washington and later lobbied heavily at Washington's request for the defeat of a bill to bar all potential immigrants of African descent from the country.

Throughout his work with the Committee and the Phelps Stokes Fund, Jones carried his Hampton "social studies" with him—accept the status quo without social criticism and work toward developing a sense of community responsibility. In later years, although Jones claimed in private that he was in effect the inventor of social studies (Jones, 1941), curiously, in his own published writings after 1917, he did not mention his work with the Committee. Whereas Dunn, Barnard, Robinson, and others authored secondary school social studies texts in support of the Committee's recommendations, Jones never did. It appears Jones managed the Committee without taking any real interest in the dissemination and implementation of its report. Notwithstanding ahistorical trends, Jones' own professional neglect of social studies after 1916 may account for his lack of familiarity among scholars in the field.

Arthur William Dunn

Arthur William Dunn's greatest impact on the Committee was through his work in the field of civics, specifically the new "community civics." Dunn had worked toward developing his civics ideas, first as a secondary civics teacher in Indianapolis; next, as a member of an urban organization to further the cause of social welfare (the National Municipal League); and then as a "specialist in civic education" with the United States Bureau of Education. Dunn believed, as did Jones, that the education of the youth of America reflected the future of America—a future that needed to be nurtured carefully. Dunn's interpretation of social education, however, included not just select groups of students, but all students.

Not much has been reported about Dunn's life prior to 1900. However, his seminal work in the public schools with community civics
projects, as well as his leadership in the National Municipal League, made him an outstanding choice for membership on the Committee. Soon after his appointment to the committee, Dunn collaborated with Jones (his colleague at the Bureau of Education), Kingsley, Barnard, and Carrier on the Committee's second report, which dealt specifically with "community civics," Dunn's primary area of work.

According to one writer, the historical record (in Jones' own hand) seems to indicate that Dunn prepared the final (1916) report for review and acceptance by the overall Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Education (Lybarger, 1981).9 As noted earlier, this mention was not repeated by Jones in later life, where he seemingly took all the credit for "my Committee on Social Studies," claiming "Social Studies began with my course at Hampton Institute" (Jones, 1941). Nonetheless, Jones' claim to the authorship of social studies is clearly suspect when compared to the work of Dunn. The fact that the Committee accepted Dunn's text as appropriate for secondary use illustrates (or at least implies) a foundational credit to Dunn's work. In fact, the 1916 report stated that with the exception of Dunn, "unquestionably there are very few textbooks [and related materials] prepared along the lines suggested in this report" (Dunn, 1916, p. 60) that were acceptable for the new curriculum. This assertion exposes Dunn as tooting his own horn10(if he was the single author of the document), or it simply highlights the currency of Dunn's ideas (thus negating Jones' later claim).

Following the dissemination of the 1916 report, it was Dunn, not Jones, that contemporaries hailed as the driving force and instigator behind the recommendations for the new community civics in the report. Seven years after the publication of the final report, Earle Rugg credited Dunn's 1907 text The Community and the Citizen as being epoch making in several ways...[and instrumental] in the creation of the 1916 Committee...First, it widened the concept of what civics courses should teach...Second, it stimulated many other communities to work out courses adapted to their own particular city or town. Third, it led to the creation of a very influential committee, the N.E.A. Committee on the Social Studies (Rugg, 1923, pp. 69-70).

According to Rugg, Dunn's text was a product of the new influence of sociology (that Dunn credited to Small and Vincent, not Giddings) and "the social efficiency aim of John Dewey" that presented "in a vivid, concrete way the activity of a modern community . . . by means of excursions, debates, [and] investigations of community activities"
Dunn cited the source of the book's "justification, aim, and spirit," as found in the prefaces of the initial and final edition as Dewey's "Ethical Principles Underlying Education" (1906, p. i). The notion that "[t]raining for citizenship . . . develops the power of observation, analysis, and inference" formed the core of Dunn's text (1907, p. iii). In the Ward tradition of social welfare, Dunn's new civics stressed the identification of social problems and working toward their solutions. Other contemporaries such as Albert Shiels (1922), Henry Johnson (1940) and Charles Judd (1918) also credited Dunn as the principal figure of the committee.

The Committee also used a speech Dunn had given (undated) as its statement of "the standards by which to test methods [and values of] civic instruction" (1916, pp. 57-58). Even though Dunn's speech specifically addressed the teaching of civics, the Committee believed it had "a general application to all the social studies" (p. 57). Dunn stressed the importance of "civic judgment, civic initiative," and "right motives," explaining that "no man can be effective in civic life unless teamwork is good." Also that "[T]he possession of a spirit and habit of cooperation is an essential qualification for good citizenship" (p. 58). As gleaned from Dunn's writing, the focus of the new social studies was civic education. This civic education highlighted the production of the "good citizen" for social welfare and efficiency over the education of citizens for what might be called selfish individualism.

Remembering that the 1916 Social Studies Committee focused exclusively upon secondary education, in a related publication printed by the Bureau of Education, Dunn (1915) carried his social studies thoughts over into the elementary school with a case study of "social studies" in the Indianapolis public schools. Because Dunn is the sole author, this publication sheds more light on Dunn's thinking about social studies during the time the Committee was collaborating on the secondary social studies project. In fact, when contrasted to the earlier work of Jones or other Committee members, Dunn's version of social studies reveals a social studies more familiar to contemporary readers than that of Jones' social studies at Hampton.

Dunn's presentation of Civic Education in Elementary Schools as Illustrated in Indianapolis identifies a major shift from theory and symbolic posturing (as found in the primary documents of the 1916 Social Studies Committee), to a practical "case study" for citizenship education. Early on, Dunn described "social studies" as an integration of geography, history, and civics, not separate subjects (1915, p. 8). It was not content that was primary, however, but the method of treating content. Underlying Dunn's social studies is the "theory [sic] that if children are to be trained to live in self-governing communities, they must be given practice in self-management" (p. 30). The notion of "training" children to become masters of their own destiny was a direct
challenge to Spencerian evolutionary thought. Furthermore, Dunn's emphasis on the Deweyan idea of treating children as citizens in the present, not citizens of the future, was a theme not found in Spencerian thought. Viewing children as citizens, and training them to direct and be responsible for their private and public actions, were cornerstones of Dunn's theory.

All of Dunn's work reflects a community spirit in which "cooperation is the keynote of the community life." Jones' writings, too, developed a cooperative theme for Hampton students; however, Jones' cooperation meant complying with a racial status quo that maintained an Anglo-Saxon dominance. Jones' social studies makes no suggestion of self-government. This is the critical difference between Jones and Dunn. Jones taught an obligation to the racial status quo (which made him a bitter enemy of activists like Dubois), whereas Dunn's social studies program advocated the pro-active citizen, responsible for the welfare of every citizen.

Dunn highlighted the child's current citizenship status within the community. He did not mention race or cultural ties, immigration-related tensions, or a hope or role for future citizenship. In the spirit that John F. Kennedy captured in his presidential inaugural address, Dunn's citizenship emphasized "what the child can do for the community" (p. 17), not what the community can do for the citizen.

Dunn's major contribution to the Committee's work was his commitment to "community civics." While Dunn was more visible nationally and in the press than many members of the Committee, others, such as James Lynn Barnard had independently reached conclusions about the nature and practice of social studies education as had Jones at Hampton. The bringing together of Dunn, Jones, Kingsley, and Barnard may have provided not only mutual support, but the integration of their ideas.

For example, the outline for a proposed course in the "Problems of American Democracy" was the first course of its kind developed by a national committee. Here the Committee adopted Kingsley's suggestion that twelfth-year students would study "actual problems, or issues, or conditions as they occur in life and in their several aspects, political, economic, and sociological" (Dunn, 1916, p. 53). Later, other social studies educators would adopt the Committee's "several aspects" approach for other areas of the field. That is, this meant viewing the various subjects of social sciences as one interconnected field of study.11

Without question, Dunn was a significant contributor to the Committee and certainly embodied the "new social education" mold that sought to foster citizenship through active experience. While his more obvious contribution may have been articulating his vision of "community civics," Dunn's true legacy may have been fostering a
combination of the social sciences, history, geography, and contemporary issues, for the purpose of citizenship education, into a practical combination of subjects called "social studies." This action was the logical extension to what such theorists as Ward, Small, Vincent, and others had earlier called for and what Edgar Bruce Wesley (1937) would later identify as "the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes."

Following his work on the Committee, Dunn compiled and presented for acceptance what came to be the final report of the 1916 Committee to the N.E.A. Commission's reviewing committee. Dunn also continued to encourage the cause of civic education by authoring texts specifically designed to encourage "community civics."

James Harvey Robinson

The last figure of importance on the 1916 Social Studies Committee was James Harvey Robinson, who served as the bridge between the "old line" historians and the new social studies advocates. An original member of the sub-committee on history, political economy, and civil government of the Committee of Ten and the American Historical Association's Committee of Five, Robinson ironically was representative of both the older, more traditional historians and a new wave of historians who advocated modernizing the traditional secondary history curriculum.

According to Thomas Jesse Jones, Robinson was selected to join the Committee "because of his leadership in advocating more attention to contemporaneous life and less attention to remote facts." Jones reported that while serving on the Committee, Robinson "had a profound influence on all the Committee deliberations" (cited in Hendricks, 1946, p. 62). Robinson's biographer, Luther Hendricks, also found that Robinson's "new history," as reflected in "his addresses, writings, and textbooks, was directly in line with the new requirements of secondary schools" (p. 61). Beyond embodying Dewey's vision of a progressive historian, Robinson's views on history blended nicely with the ideas of Jones and Kingsley, his two former students at Columbia University.

Robinson criticized traditional methods of teaching history as relying excessively on texts and lectures; as lacking in the clear aims and values of history; and as failing to deal with social, cultural, and economic achievements, issues, and conditions. Robinson complained that teachers lacked the essential qualification of having been trained in the historical method. History instruction, according to Hendricks' reading of Robinson's earlier views, was to provide students the "opportunity to become acquainted with [what Robinson called] historical methods" of research and criticism and to provide "the most accurate, objective, and comprehensive account of all fields of human endeavor" (pp. 33-34). Later, when his "new history" concept was more
fully developed, Robinson added that history instruction should select and interpret those facts from the past that have the most value in helping "us to understand ourselves and our fellows and the problems and prospects of mankind" (Robinson, 1912, p. 12).

Robinson's renewed connection with the National Education Association and the soon-to-be-formed social studies committee began with his address to that body at Indianapolis in 1910 on the question of what kind of history would be best for potential industrial workers, whom he called the "common man" (1910). Hendricks claims that Robinson's ideas, as outlined in the Indianapolis speech, were entirely accepted by the Committee. This certainly appears to be the case. Evidence can be found in the texts of the preliminary and final reports of the committee, in which various quotations, most at length, from Robinson's writings and addresses have been reproduced. Henricks found that the Committee employed Robinson's "method of approach for selecting the kind of history most suitable for...workers, [and] expanded and applied [it] to the selection of materials of history for all children" (p. 62).

Robinson's concept of history, as outlined in his book *The New History*, provided a missing element to the Committee's expression of social study. His N.E.A. speech, although given in the context of industrial education, was concerned with the development of a history to fit the "needs of common man...who must do common things" (cited in Dunn, 1916, pp 50-51). This view came to dominate the history thinking of the Committee. Robinson's ideas as found in his 1910 N.E.A. speech, and in another important address to the American Philosophical Society delivered in 1911 attracted the attention of Kingsley, Jones, and Dunn. They realized that Robinson's high standing as both a leading historian and educator added credibility to social studies, and would give the Committee instant recognition among educators.

Taking this supposition one step further, Robinson's value to the social studies field may have come more from his respectability and political qualities than from his ideas about history or pedagogy. Indeed, the Committee could just as easily have added Robinson's colleague and sometimes collaborator Charles Beard to their number to represent history. Beard might even have been a better choice than Robinson if the Committee would have been in the position to argue for a more proactive social studies.12 Notwithstanding conjecture, Robinson's thinking was radical enough to demonstrate that including history within social studies was decidedly different (and perhaps better) than traditional history alone. Nonetheless, it is interesting to speculate the sort of beginning that the social studies might have had with the more direct Charles Beard on the Committee, rather than
having to wait for Beard to enter the politics of social studies in the late 1920s as the intellectual leader of the American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies.

Following his work with the Committee, Robinson left Columbia to form the New School for Social Research with Dewey, Beard, and others. Robinson also continued making contributions to social studies by authoring and revising secondary school history texts.

Other Significant Contributors

Three other individuals should be discussed briefly as to the significant contributions they made to the 1916 Social Studies Committee. The notion of using principles to guide a particular study was outlined earlier by William Mace in his *Method in History* (1912). Mace believed that when a subject or topic was studied carefully certain principles began to appear. These principles, once discovered, could be used to guide a student's investigation into a topic more efficiently than having him or her begin on page one and work through to the end of the textbook. Utilization of the guiding principle concept was consistently applied throughout the 1916 Social Studies report by the conferees.

One of the primary principles employed by the Committee was Dewey's social "needs and interests". The use of these concepts made Dewey another important, although somewhat passive, contributor. Dewey may have embodied the philosophical spirit of the educational community and certainly wrote more and longer about American education than any other writer, but he authored nothing directly about either social studies or the work of the social studies committee. This is regrettable. Where Dewey may have clarified social studies concepts, the irony between Dewey and social studies was that social studies claimed Dewey, but Dewey preferred not to acknowledge social studies--the one curricular area closely allied to his own view of democratic education. Instead, Dewey chose to discuss the disciplines of history and geography (Dewey, 1916).

Nonetheless, it was Dewey's view that social welfare could be furthered through humane social controls that the conferees accepted. In fact, Dewey's influence was best illustrated by what the Committee selected from Dewey's writings. Although he may not have personally agreed with all the Committee wrote or the direction the conferees took with regard to social studies, most of Dewey's ideas blended nicely with the Committee's avowed interest in promoting social education.

Unlike Dewey, however, David Snedden, who led the fight against traditional secondary history, received little credit (just a brief
mention in the Committee's second report) for his views on community civics, modern history study, presentism, and social education in general. Although not acknowledged by traditional historians, Snedden's attacks on traditional history were well known in the educational community by 1915 (Snedden, 1907; 1914). Snedden, like many of his social activist contemporaries, came to view traditional history as not expressing functional "civic attitudes, ideals, or knowledge," nor contributing "essential or valuable elements to other studies" in the "interests of civic or social education" (Snedden, 1913, pp. 94-95). Consequently, Snedden lobbied heavily to have traditional history removed from the secondary curriculum to provide space for the social education program.

Snedden's idea of social education, however, was centered upon an education of direct social controls. Nonetheless, the Committee appeared to accept much of Snedden's view of community civics as the best educational means available to secure a more socially efficient society. Snedden's notion of social control, as formulated in the 1916 social studies prototype, may have appealed to urban educators overburdened by the massive influx of immigrants from Europe as well as from southern states. At the 1904 American Historical Association's Convention, given the increasing numbers of immigrant schoolchildren, noted historian John Bach McMaster suggested that the facts of American History be given to immigrant children "as so much medicine" to help convert them into patriotic citizens (American Historical Association Annual Report, 1905, p. 29). Although the use of history to foster citizenship was not supported by the the Committee of Seven's pursuit of history as an intellectual endeavor, urban educators could hardly resist the appeal of social control through indoctrination. Thus to urban educators, Snedden's concept of a two-tiered school system, with students attending either a vocational high school or general high school complete with a program for tracking students by ability, found a receptive audience.

For the Committee, however, Kingsley's view of a "cosmopolitan high school" which included vocational, general studies, as well as college preparation courses, was preferred over Snedden's tracking concept. Dewey took strong exception to vocational education apart from general studies. Where Dewey argued that the separation of students into vocational and general studies tracks was "immoral," Snedden recognized no immorality. Despite Snedden's effective arguments against traditional history, it was most likely his strong advocacy of social control and his verbal tangles with Dewey that excluded him from active participation on the Committee (see Wieth, 1974).

Three other members of the original Committee contributed to the cause of social studies education by authoring textbooks that followed
patterns identified by the 1916 Committee. Henry R. Burch (1921, 1918, 1937), who wrote a section of the 1913 chairman's document, prepared three textbooks (two were co-authored) suitable for the proposed community civics course as well as the Problems of Democracy course. Two other Committee members also completed manuscripts that conformed to the new social studies ideas. Jesse C. Evans worked with Barnard on a vocational civics textbook (1919) and a community civics textbook (1918), and Samuel B. Howe (1921) wrote one of the first Problems of American Democracy textbooks.

A Footnote to the 1916 Committee

Although still a "working committee" of the Commission of the Reorganization of Secondary Schools, the Committee met formally only once after 1916. They met in Cleveland on February 24, 1920 to "consider the desirability of supplementing or revising its original report [1916]." However, the Committee did not produce any further reports (Notes From Historical Field, p. 203). Nonetheless, a subcommittee "to undertake such revision of the details of the 1916 report as suggested by the trend of events since it was published, and to submit a revision or a supplement to the original report" was appointed at the Cleveland meeting (p. 203).

In the period between the release of the 1916 report and this meeting, seven of the original 21 members of the Committee resigned or simply left, and 11 new members were appointed, six being appointed to the special ten-member revision sub-committee. Among the new faces appointed to the N.E.A. Social Studies Committee were J. Montgomery Gambrill (Columbia University and chair of the revision sub-committee), Edgar Dawson (Hunter College), Ross L. Finney (University of Minnesota), Daniel C. Knowlton (Columbia University), Albert E. McKinley (University of Pennsylvania and editor and publisher of The Historical Outlook, formerly The History Teacher's Magazine), and Harold Rugg (Teachers College, Columbia University).

Summary

The individuals who interpreted, developed, and expanded the social studies conceptions as found in the 1916 Social Studies Committee report deserve the attention of those currently interested in studying the foundations of the discipline. Thomas Jesse Jones, Arthur William Dunn, and James Harvey Robinson are three theorists whose contributions and lives offer a keen insight into the workings of the prototype 1916 social studies. These three, together with Clarence Kingsley and James Lynn Barnard, were the most influential members of
the social welfare and efficiency prototype that introduced the inaugural social studies program. With the addition of the contributions of William Mace, John Dewey, and David Snedden, as well as the indirect inspiration of sociologists Lester Frank Ward, Albion Small, George Vincent, Franklin Giddings, and Edward Ross, the symbolic introduction of the social studies into American secondary schools was successfully completed.

Endnotes

1 Portions of this article were adapted from D. W. Saxe. (1992). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*, Albany: State University of New York Press.

2 The prototype social studies program was developed by a sub-committee of the National Education Association's Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. The sub-committee, known as the Social Studies Committee, was appointed in 1912 and prepared three reports (Kingsley, 1913; Barnard, et al, 1915; and Dunn, 1916). The Committee intended their reports to generate a curricular dialogue among educators and, consequently, did not expect that the 1916 report would be their last. Nonetheless, the 1916 report outlined the basic principles of social studies. This report is generally accepted by social studies writers as the beginnings of social studies in American education.

3 Much of the sub-committee report on civics was published in 1915. It was reproduced in the 1916 final report of the Committee on Social Studies. Since the 1920s, although the Committee on Social Studies worked from 1912-1920, the Committee's deliberations are connected to the term "1916 report;" thus the "1916 Social Studies Committee."

4 Besides Kingsley and Jones, other members of the 1916 Social Studies Committee and their affiliations included: Arthur William Dunn, Secretary, United States Bureau of Education; W. A. Arey, Hampton Institute, Hampton, VA; James Lynn Barnard, School of Pedagogy, Philadelphia, PA; George G. Bechtel, Principal, Northwestern High School, Detroit, MI; F. L. Boyden, Principal, High School, Deerfield, MA; E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC; Henry R. Burch, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, PA; F. W. Carrier, Sommerville High School, Sommerville, MA; Jesse C. Evans, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, PA; Frank P. Goodwin, Woodward High School, Cincinnati, OH; W. J. Hamilton, Superintendent of Schools, Two Rivers, WI; Blanche C. Hazard, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; Samuel B. Howe, High School, Newark, NJ; J. Herbert Low, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, NY; William H. Mace, Syracuse continued on next page
University, Syracuse, NY; William T. Morrey, Bushwick High School, Brooklyn, NY; John Pettibone, High School, New Milford, CT; James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University, New York City; and William A. Wheatley, Superintendent of Schools, Middletown, CT.

5 The National Education Association's Committee of Ten (1892) represented the first major committee effort to place historical studies into the elementary and secondary schools. The American Historical Association's Committee of Five (1911) was the last major committee to report on the state of history instruction prior to the work of the 1916 Committee.

6 Jones used Giddings' (1896) text at Hampton and Dunn used Small and Vincent's (1894) text at Indianapolis. For more information, see Saxe, (1992, pp. 18-23).

7 The American Historical Association's Committee of Seven (1899) provided the basic "four block" framework of ancient, medieval and modern, English, and United States history in what might be labeled the traditional history curriculum. The four block system was widely used in American public schools from the 1890s to the 1920s.

8 The differences between what Hampton was and what the social studies were to be is certainly open to question. It is possible that more credit to Hampton (and indirectly Jones) was given than was actually deserved. The Committee might have easily credited John Gillette (1914) for his work in presenting social studies in North Dakota schools from 1906 to 1914.

9 Lybarger reported that Jones wrote Education Bureau Commissioner "P. P. Caxton [sic]" in January 29, 1916, noting that "Mr. Dunn has prepared a valuable little report for the Committee [on Social Studies]" (pp. 234, 245). In reviewing existing National Archives records, however, I was unable to substantiate this citation to Jones and Philander P. Claxton. Apparently, since Lybarger's research, the National Archives readjusted the filing system, and nearly all of what was once available in the Historical File is now lost or inaccessible.

10 This credit may also indicate that Committee members worked to praise each other and their colleagues as much as possible. Unlike the credit to Hampton (and Jones indirectly), I do think the Dunn credit is sincere and substantiated not only by later writers, but by the documents of the committee.

11 The synthesis of different fields of study was a cornerstone of the sociology of Albion Small and George Vincent (see Vincent, (1906). continued on next page
Endnotes (continued)

12 By the mid-1910s, Beard had certainly established himself as the most controversial historian of the decade. If the Committee had given Beard the opportunity, Beard's intellectual marriage of ideas from economics, political science, and history may have provided social studies with a more history-centered social studies than the then-dominant sociologically-based social studies. Although Beard's use of history and social science would have certainly complemented the 1916 Social Studies report, it was his supposed socialist dispositions (despite his rejection of Marx's ideas) that made him a public liability. Nevertheless, the omission of such vocal school critics as David Snedden and Beard on the Committee demonstrate that although the Committee took a decidedly different view of education than traditionally-oriented historians, they were not prepared to cross the line into totally uncharted waters. Later, Beard, Counts, Beale, and others did make the move into social reconstruction.

13 Another interesting fact about the Committee was that they completely ignored Dewey's Democracy and Education (1916) (suited for secondary education) and used instead several quotes from Dewey's earlier works that he had written specifically about elementary education.

14 The other new members included Thomas W. Gosling, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, WS; W. D. Lewis, Deputy Superintendent of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, PA; A. B. Meredith, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Trenton, NJ; Henry Neumann, Ethical Culture School, New York, NY; Ida A. Tourtellot, McLachlen Building, Washington, DC; and Harriet Tuell, Somerville High School, Somerville, MA.
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Abstract
This article describes a study in which the authors combined information from case studies of eight social studies teachers and their students to describe how teachers used computer databases to aid student problem solving, what students learned from the experience, and what enabled and inhibited effective use. Findings emphasized the importance of time constraints and pressure, prior student knowledge, use of cooperative student groups, and the use of structure by the teacher during the problem-solving process. Students also exhibited a greater confidence in using data during problem solving.

Introduction
During the last decade, many educators have encouraged the use of computer databases in social studies classrooms, because such tools are
thought to facilitate higher-level thinking goals (Budin, Kendall & Lengel, 1986; Collins, 1988; Ehman & Glenn, 1987; Hodges, 1985; and Hunter, 1983, 1988). The results from a recent survey by Sheingold and Hadley (1990) indicate that social studies teachers are indeed beginning to incorporate databases into their instructional plans. In fact, 52 percent of the social studies teachers in the survey indicated that they were using computer databases with their students.

While it is encouraging to discover more and more teachers using sophisticated computer courseware in their classrooms, we are still not sure how teachers are using the databases and what the outcomes are from such use. The research reported here addresses three descriptive questions related to classroom use: (a) How do teachers use computer databases in teaching problem solving? (b) What do students learn during this kind of activity? and (c) What are the enablers and inhibitors of successful database use during the teaching of problem solving?

To explore these questions, we decided to utilize a series of case studies in which the teachers would be free to implement a general problem-solving model. Supported by a grant from the Minnesota Educational Computing Corporation, the studies took place during the spring of 1990 in eight different classrooms located in four different states: Indiana, Minnesota, Virginia, and Washington. Utilizing a common research design, teachers and their students were observed during at least ten different class sessions; teachers and selected students were interviewed; and written teaching plans, class materials, and student projects were reviewed. By observing these actions and analyzing these materials, we sought to create an authentic picture of what happens in the classrooms of experienced computer-using social studies teachers, and describe the issues, problems, and opportunities encountered while using computer databases as part of a problem-solving instructional unit.

Previous Studies of Database Use in Social Studies

Few relevant studies on the use of databases in social studies have been reported in the literature. Those that have been documented fall into two broad categories -- surveys of database use in social studies classrooms and field studies. Summaries are presented below.

Extent of Use

There appears to be a small but growing use of databases by social studies teachers and students. Hunter (1988) reported an increasing number of databases available for use in schools. Sheingold and Hadley (1990) found that social studies teachers represented the
largest percentage of all subject matter teachers who reported using databases. Northrup and Rooze (1990) also found a small but significant number of social studies teachers using databases. This increased use by social studies teachers reflects the growing use of technology during the last decade. Earlier studies (Becker, 1986; Martinez & Mead, 1988; Ross, 1988; White, 1988) revealed minimal use of computers and limited student knowledge. However, while the percentage of social studies teachers using computer databases remains small, it appears that during the last six years an increasing number of experienced computer users are beginning to use databases as part of their instructional units.

Field Studies Using Databases

Field studies that exist on this subject represent a wide spectrum. Some focused on cognitive outcomes, affective outcomes or teaching and learning process factors. Of these, some are impressionistic (descriptive reports of classroom use), while others are scientific studies. Summaries of the major studies are reported in Appendix A.

Cognitive outcomes. Six major field studies reported cognitive outcomes. White (1986, 1987), Elder (1988), Rawitsch (1987, 1988), Cornelius (1986), and Underwood (1985) compared classes of students using computer databases with those working on the same data without computers. None of the studies revealed differences in achievement of factual information. White and Underwood found differences in information skills that favored computer databases, but White’s findings were not replicated by Elder. Rawitsch found a difference in the number of problems solved that favored computer classes, but he also found that more time for problem solving was required by these students.

Five impressionistic studies reported interesting claims about cognitive outcomes. According to these studies, students can: (1) learn to use databases quickly (Elder, 1988); (2) visualize complex historical relationships, develop critical awareness of current events, and integrate information from various library sources (Rothman, 1982); (3) learn facts as well as concepts and show a deeper understanding of the concepts (Taberman, 1983, 1984); and (4) develop an awareness of the personal reality of history (Mendrinos & Morrison, 1986; Morrison & Walters, 1986a; 1986b).

Affective outcomes. Only two field studies reported results from using scientific measures of student attitude outcomes. Cornelius (1986) and Rawitsch (1987, 1988) found more positive attitudes toward the use of computer databases in problem solving among students in computer-using classes. Cornelius, however, found a difference in only one of two affective comparisons.

Impressionistic claims are made in four reports. Rothman (1982) suggested that general student motivation and involvement were
increased even in heterogeneously grouped classes. Lower ability level students were also stimulated by being able to manipulate the computer and by the visual aspects of the work. Classroom discussions were also stimulated. Mendrinos and Morrison (1986) observed that student learning appeared to be more fun, interesting, challenging, and involving with the use of computer databases. Traberman (1983, 1984) found similar findings in the classrooms she observed.

*Teaching and learning process factors:* What are the factors that influence the teaching and learning process? Few studies speak directly to this question. Rawitsch (1987, 1988) found that students with a more structured work style were more efficient in utilizing a database than those with unstructured styles. Impressionistic studies, however, reported a variety of classroom process factors relevant to the current study. Rothman (1982) and Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne (1985) all reported the positive effects of cooperative group work while using computers. Group work enhanced factual recall, application of factual knowledge, and problem-solving skills. The structure of the software program may also impact teaching and learning. Some packages may be difficult to integrate into the curriculum (Hawkins & Sheingold, 1986), and others may require considerable training and practice in direct and indirect teaching methods if they are to be used successfully (Elder, 1988).

**Summary of the Claims**

Although the research is limited and the conclusions tentative, it is possible to highlight several points related to the studies reported here. Using the three essential questions of the study as a framework, we can suggest the following conclusions:

1. *How do teachers use computer databases in teaching problem solving?* Teachers appear to use databases to develop higher-order thinking or problem-solving skills in their students. No study found a relationship between databases and lower-level knowledge acquisition or recall.

2. *What do students learn during this kind of activity?* There is some evidence that there is a positive impact on higher-order thinking skills when databases are used as part of the instructional unit. Students like to use computers to manipulate information, and student attitudes toward computer-assisted problem solving become more positive.

3. *What are the enablers and inhibitors of successful database use during teaching and problem-solving activities?* The most obvious conclusion is that cooperative student groups of two to four are effective in organizing instruction for computer use.
The Present Study

Description of Teachers, Students, and Schools

The key characteristics of the schools, teachers, and students are summarized in Table 1. It is important, however, to note some of the common features among the eight classrooms as well as the differences.

Common characteristics: All the teachers in the study were relatively experienced computer users and all but the fifth-grade teacher in Washington had a computer and printer in their classrooms. The students were also generally experienced in the use of computers and had previous experience in the social studies classroom. Each school had a computer laboratory. These features are noteworthy because they address some of the frequently cited reasons for the lack of computer use in classrooms: lack of teacher computer literacy, access to computers, insufficient number of computers, and student computer literacy (Cuban, 1986).

In addition, all teachers, with the support of their administrator, were willing to have the researchers in their classrooms; to be interviewed prior to and at the end of the units; and to take part in periodic post-lesson debriefings after classroom observations (such debriefings did not occur after every lesson). Except for the Washington teachers, all of the others had been involved in a pilot study the previous fall. Each teacher was willing to construct and teach a "problem-solving" unit of ten or more days, using the computer and a computer database, and all units were taught during the second half of the second semester of the school year. Each used small groups of students in non-competitive, problem-solving teams rather than individual or whole class instruction. They also agreed to have the student teams produce an oral report for the whole class, and most required a written product as well.

Differences among teachers, students, and schools: There were, however, many important differences among the eight teachers and their classrooms. Years of teaching experience varied widely, and their experiences with computer databases ranged from very little to extensive. The most fundamental difference among the eight teachers was their interpretation of "problem" and "problem solving," and how they incorporated these concepts into the units they planned and taught. For instance, Minnesota teacher #2 focused on contemporary social problems, while Indiana teacher #2 used a variation of the hypothetical-deductive method to examine economic and social historical trends over the past 40 years. Still other teacher "problems" were descriptive: collecting and displaying geographic information about the Western United States for Washington teacher #1, and defining empirically the categories of developed, less-developed, and under-developed countries for Indiana teacher #1 (See Appendix B for a
description of individual units). This broad array of meanings of “problem” and “problem solving” does not fit neatly into a scholarly conception of those ideas. Nevertheless, they were valid for the teachers because they used them in planning and teaching their units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Characteristics of the Eight Teachers’ Classrooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IN #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper. w/ computer databases</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size/type</td>
<td>Small rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student ability level</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student n</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit topic</td>
<td>Classifying developed/developing nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit length in days</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database used</td>
<td>MECC world communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/ printers</td>
<td>20 App Ile 10 printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group size</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was also a notable difference in the manner in which problems were selected by the students. Three teachers, Indiana teacher #1, Virginia teacher #2, and Minnesota teacher #1, were
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entirely closed. They chose the problem to be examined and students followed specific directions. At the other extreme were Indiana teacher #2 and Minnesota teacher #2, who encouraged students to address any

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics of the Eight Teachers' Classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exper. w/ computer databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size/type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small/suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School size/type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large/suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit ability level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit length in days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers/ printers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student group size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

problem they chose to define with the scope of the database used. These differences in student choice undoubtedly affected the instructional process.
Another difference among the sites was that students varied by
grade and ability level. There were large and small rural and suburban
schools, but none was urban. Two classes in Washington were
elementary school classes while the others were at the secondary
level. Class size ranged from 15 to 34, and courses taught spanned nearly
all social studies subjects as did the unit topics.

Methods Used in the Case Studies

The research plan and methods for collecting the data were
developed by the research team with a goal of providing a common
framework for each of the eight sites in the four different states.
However, depending upon local circumstances, which ranged from
constraints imposed by human-subjects committees to teacher
preferences, distance from the school, and the researcher's available
time and assistance, variations in methodology occurred. Table 2
details some key features of the methods used.

In all cases, teachers were introduced to a problem-solving strategy,
given assistance in developing a set of instructional materials to follow
the model, and, if needed, given appropriate software. Researchers
observed classroom activities and wrote field notes corresponding to
their observations. Interviews were conducted with each teacher prior
to and at the end of the units. Post-lesson debriefings also took place on
numerous occasions.

Different methods were used to obtain information from students
and student teams. Questionnaires to tap student perceptions about the
units were used in the Washington sites, while those used in Minnesota
aimed at prior student computer experience. No student questionnaires
were used in Indiana or Virginia. Post-unit student interviews were
conducted in the Minnesota sites with some teams while in Indiana the
teachers debriefed their classes as whole groups for perceptions about
the units, using questions devised by the researcher. No end-of-unit
interviews or debriefings with students were conducted in Virginia or
Washington. Videotaped student activities were used in Minnesota and
Virginia.

The Problem Solving Model Provided to Teachers

Teachers were instructed to use a specific problem-solving model
that had been adapted by the researchers. The model included these
parts:

Part I: Introduction

A. Teacher introduces the unit and its objectives.
B. Teacher introduces (as much as needed) the concept of
databases.
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C. Teacher introduces (as much as needed) the operation of the database tool to be used.

Part II: Problem Identification

D. Students practice with the database tool.
E. Teacher introduces the problem area.
F. Students scan the database to get a feel for the problem.
G. Students focus or define the specific problem they will work on.
H. Students formulate a question or hypothesis about the problem's solution.

Part III: Problem Solution

I. Students determine what information they need in order to solve the problem.
J. Students use the database to find the information.
K. Students organize and manipulate the data as they work on their solutions.
L. Students test their information against their question or hypothesis and draw a tentative conclusion.
M. Students test their conclusion against another situation and integrate their information in drawing a confident conclusion.

Part IV: Reporting

N. Students report on the results of their problem solving; teacher evaluates the reports on the following criteria: (a) clarity of problem description; (b) workability of hypothesis or question; (c) quality of data used -- relevance, sufficiency, fairness of use, and quality of organization and display, and (d) reasonableness of the conclusion.
O. Teacher leads a debriefing of the activity.

The teachers implemented the model in different ways. Differences included the meaning they placed on problems and the degree of choice permitted students in picking a problem to study. Teachers emphasized some parts more than others. We cannot claim, therefore, that each teacher put the model into practice in the same way, as would be the assumption in a field experiment where the fidelity and consistency of the treatment variable would be of the utmost importance. We made the conscious decision to let the implementation of the model vary from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of case study</th>
<th>IN #1</th>
<th>IN #2</th>
<th>MN #1</th>
<th>MN #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student interview/ debriefing (post-unit)</td>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>Whole class</td>
<td>Interview of 6 teams</td>
<td>Interview of 2 teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud't quest</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Pre-unit</td>
<td>Mid-unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotaping</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Small-group activity</td>
<td>Whole-class activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of researcher unit prep.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training by researchers</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same teach. as in Fall pilot study?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates of case study</th>
<th>VA #1</th>
<th>VA #2</th>
<th>WA #1</th>
<th>WA #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student interview/ debriefing (post-unit)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud't quest</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Post-unit</td>
<td>Post-unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotaping</td>
<td>Oral reports</td>
<td>Oral reports</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent of researcher unit prep.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training by researchers</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same teach. as in Fall pilot study?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using Databases in Student Problem Solving

teacher to teacher, depending upon how the teachers themselves chose to interpret and use it in their classrooms. The variations across cases are, perhaps, the most important features of the study.

Overlay Factors

Three themes run through our case studies, and transcend many of the different categories of the problem solving model. We viewed them as "overlay factors," impinging on the whole process. These are small group work, prior student knowledge, and time pressure.

Small group work. Teachers and students endorsed working in cooperative, noncompetitive groups as a positive feature of the problem-solving units. Students helped one another with computers, vocabulary, and other tasks. They collaborated on generating possible problems, hypotheses, strategies for testing ideas, and developing reports. Groups generally stayed on task in both their computer work and during other unit activities.

Of course, not all groups worked smoothly. A few students complained that some group members were taking "free rides" on the work of others. Absence by some students also caused hardships on group goal attainment. Occasionally one student would monopolize the computer or intimidate others in the group.

Prior student knowledge. Early in the units it became clear that many students lacked sufficient knowledge about the subjects they were investigating. This lack of knowledge hindered student success at problem solving and achieving unit objectives. For example, student lack of knowledge about geography in one of the Washington classrooms meant that the teacher needed to spend additional time teaching basic geographic knowledge and students had to refer to additional materials for background knowledge as they explored the database. Such problems existed to some extent in all eight classrooms.

Time constraints. Current classroom structures and curriculum design imposed significant time constraints on teachers and students. All felt pressure to finish the activity in an allotted time and to move on to the next one. Using computers exacerbated these problems. To do a good job, extra preparation, instruction, and practice with such mechanics as database commands were necessary. "We need more time," was a common complaint from students and teachers. Students needed more time to collect data, test hypotheses, and write reports. Teachers never appeared to have sufficient time to debrief classroom activities. Problem solving with computer databases tended to increase the amount of time needed for effective instruction and therefore pushed against other curriculum demands.

Although there were constant time pressures, we also observed time wasted by both students and teachers. For example, teachers sometimes
backtracked unnecessarily because of ineffective planning, organization, or instruction. Inexperience and discomfort with using technology and a problem-solving model were significant factors. Typical classroom maintenance activities such as taking students to the computer lab or library, getting groups started on computer database tasks, and handling individual group questions also contributed to the loss of time. In some cases, students were sometimes off task for extended periods of time, and sometimes teachers knowingly permitted such behaviors to continue.

**Classroom Applications of the Problem-Solving Model**

Each teacher followed a general problem-solving strategy. The overlay factors described above and other intervening variables shaped the outcomes of each unit. Given a general strategy, how did teachers choose to utilize the model? To explore the answers to this question, the problem-solving strategy was divided into four general areas: introductory activities, problem identification, problem solution, and reporting (see above for a summary of the problem-solving strategy).

*Introductory activities.* The essentials of the introductory sequence were an introduction of the unit and its objectives, databases, operating databases, and student practice with the database. It is not surprising that each teacher chose quite different sequences, implemented them in a unique way, and emphasized different elements. Four chose to begin with the overview of the units, assignment expectations, and, in two cases, the problem-solving model. The other four launched directly into the concept of databases and how to operate them. All introductory activities were concluded between one to four days.

Another common element among all the teachers was that they did not have the students practice database operations sufficiently before throwing them into the work on problem and hypothesis development or data exploration. Only one teacher, Virginia teacher #2, had carefully laid-out plans for introducing databases, and consistently checked practice exercises. Others assumed too much about student database understanding and skills. As a result, field notes repeatedly commented on specific database problems encountered by students. Reasons for this lack of attention to sufficient practice for students may only be speculated. Time constraints obviously pushed teachers to cut short introductory activities and to move directly into major instructional activities. The lack of database knowledge and skills by the individual teacher also contributed. For example, two teachers depended heavily upon the researchers for support in using the databases, and one asked the researcher to introduce the topic to the class.

The consequences of this inadequate introduction were evident in the way students acquired information about the meaning of database categories. Most tried to rely on simple database labels rather than consult definitions of the categories in print materials accompanying the
databases. This often resulted in almost comical misunderstandings of concepts like “arable land” or “gross domestic product.” The result was misleading use, or complete misuse, of data. The teaching of category meanings, and insistence by the teacher that students use care in applying the categories, is an important part of database use in the classroom. Lack of attention to this issue is an inhibitor of successful problem solving.

**Problem identification.** After introducing the unit and databases, and providing appropriate practice experiences, teachers were to introduce the problem, allow students to scan the database, define a specific problem and formulate some questions or hypotheses about how to solve the problem. Effective instruction put students on the right track toward systematically exploring a significant problem. Poorly structured instruction led to confusion.

Unfortunately, most teachers did not provide clear structure and expectations for students. As a result, some students were confused and overwhelmed at times, or they were unsure of what variables in their database might be related to the problem area they chose. Few teachers actually used example data to generate problems, questions, and hypotheses as a model process for what they expected of students.

In classrooms where a teacher provided a clear example to follow while exploring a problem, students were able to develop a number of problems on which to work. Effective teachers also monitored student progress, checked student work, and had students redo their work.

It is clear that teachers cannot afford to gravitate toward the mechanics of the database without first attending to the preconditions for assisting the students in problem identification. Effective teachers press students to spend sufficient time and thought on identifying and clarifying their questions and hypotheses. Monitoring, checking, and revising are essential elements during these early stages of problem identification and database exploration.

**Problem solution.** After identifying the problem, students were asked to engage in a number of instructional activities geared to have them work back and forth between the database and their questions, manipulating, adding to, and eliminating data, and modifying questions. Students engaged in a number of activities requiring that they work together in small groups, use the computer database system, and complete a series of instructional activities. During this phase, human and mechanical factors interacted and affected the learning outcomes. Field notes from this phase of the problem-solving process reflect the rough and tumble, nonlinear nature of the problem-solving process. The notes also provide insights into the enablers and facilitators of the problem-solving process.

Students exhibited little systematic analysis and planning behavior. Instead, they tended to “jump in” and “wade around” in the database,
search through various categories to see what seemed to fit. Those students who had a clearer mental process model and an understanding of the database categories were more successful in arriving at a solution to the problem. An example from the field notes illustrates these points:

[One] successful group spent a lot of time reading the category definitions and looking at individual years with all variables. Then they searched for patterns by "ZOOM"ing from a single year's record to multiple variable screens for successive years. They were satisfied with this strategy and made a lot of progress.

Even with a strategy students encountered difficulty with information overload. Some teachers adapted instruction to respond to this problem. In Washington, the fifth- and sixth-grade students were overwhelmed by the sheer magnitude of the data in the MECC GeoGraph database. As a result, the teacher reduced the number of unit objectives and provided worksheets to guide student explorations of the problem. In Indiana teacher #2's class, the teacher continued to insist that students make judgments about what data were most relevant and throw out that which was marginal or irrelevant in order to focus student attention.

While both teachers attempted to structure student problem solving, there was not much overt evidence in the classroom observations or in student debriefings that students used deliberate strategies to determine information sufficiently, even though they seemed to understand that it was important. For example, most of Indiana teacher #2's students responded during unit debriefing that they used their hypothesis as the primary criterion to determine if they had used enough information. Students in Minnesota #2's classes mentioned group discussion, following teacher directions, and trial and error as their means for judging sufficiency.

In other classes, students complained that the databases did not contain enough information to fully address their problems. They had to search out other sources of information, typically the library. Although students did not like seeking out additional information, it was a significant indicator that they were sensitive to the information-sufficiency issue, and that they were not blindly following a recipe in their work. Students wanting more information and needing to use multiple sources were positive evidence of higher-order thinking processes.

Which source of information did students prefer? Most tended to like the computer database because "all of the information is in one place" — it is convenient, easy to access, and data can be printed rather than written by hand. Students also recognized that both computer databases and
reference books were equally good and should be used to complement each other. Some indicated that to depend on only one would be misleading.

Students learned to use the databases, but went through cycles of forgetting and relearning many of the commands. This was most often a problem when insufficient instruction and practice were provided before engaging in heavy computer use. Software programs that were less dependent on complex commands facilitated student use. For example, Washington elementary students learned the commands for World and USA GeoGraph quickly and did not interfere with the inquiry process. Appleworks, on the other hand, with its more complex commands focused the user's attention on the database itself, and students needed to refresh their memories of the commands in order to access the database.

Nonmechanical and mechanical problems impacted the learning process. Screen limitations of the Apple IIe and software limitations permitted students to examine only a few categories of data and required students to engage in a number of cumbersome tasks in order to compare data. Other practical difficulties were brought about by time limitations. The GeoGraph programs took considerable time to boot-up on the Apple IIGS, and print time of the output was considerable. Mechanical problems were most often experienced with printers. They jammed, became unplugged, and caused bottlenecks when shared between computers. In only one case did an insufficient number of computers cause problems; in one classroom there were not enough diskettes.

Reporting. After identifying a problem and exploring alternatives, students were asked to report on their findings and debrief the problem-solving process. The most common report form was the oral report. The reports varied widely in format and quality. Some students used a computer word-processing program and a graphics package to complete their reports.

Feedback from teachers focused more on the content of the reports than on the problem solving process. In fact, no evidence indicated that teachers systematically used the problem solving criteria to give feedback to the students. Some teachers were convinced the reports demonstrated that students had used a problem-solving approach and were able to organize and synthesize information in addressing these problems. Others were distressed at what they saw as superficial and unconnected use of information just to follow an assignment.

It is clear that the reports provide a means for organizing the required thinking. The "publication" and presentation of inquiry results were important parts of problem solving and involved fruitful student-student and student-teacher interaction. In addition, teacher-led debriefings were useful; however, they appeared to be anticlimactic and it was clear that neither the teachers nor the students were seriously interested in the end-of-unit activity.
General Observations about the Problem-Solving Process

Teachers made a number of general comments about the problem-solving process. They agreed that it is a difficult activity to orchestrate, but students appeared to understand the process and be able to synthesize and apply information to the problems they chose. The fifth- and sixth-grade teachers in Washington considered the process to be unfamiliar to their students; however, the researchers observed that these students were able to develop grounded, descriptive generalizations about the states and countries.

Students reported feeling more confident in their use of data and more intelligent about and critical of statistics. They generally enjoyed using the computer to access a lot of information quickly and easily. Some were positive about the break from routine class work; they had more freedom to choose problems and ask questions in which they were interested, and to work at their own pace.

Researchers repeatedly observed in the field notes and in post-observation discussions that lack of structure and organization by teachers was a major problem. Teachers who were most successful acted as “metacognitive guides.” They provided students with a clear road map of the unit at the beginning, and then gave continual reinforcement and guidance to show individuals, groups, and their whole classes where they had been, where they were at the time, and where they were going. Providing clear road maps meant teachers had to be quick thinkers, especially when students were working in groups, because teachers had to assess group learning needs and provide assistance in enabling the group to move forward with the learning task. When such assistance was lacking, the quality of student work suffered and students became impatient and discouraged.

An effective guidance strategy used by some of the teachers was a regular, short debriefing in the whole-class setting. The debriefing focused on specific phases of the groups’ progress, and examples of ways to carry out various steps in the process. These mini debriefings gave the teacher an opportunity to reinforce and clarify expectations for the students. Based on our observations, we believe the use of regular debriefings to be far more important than unit-ending debriefings which we found not to be useful.

Conclusions and Implications for Successful Practice

Five general overarching themes emerge from these eight case studies. They are time, student knowledge, cooperative groups, structuring, and databases. Each is summarized below.
Time

Time constraints and pressures affected teachers and students alike. Teachers had to determine how much time would be devoted to the problem solving unit and how the unit was to be integrated into the social studies curriculum. If integration was high, time pressure seemed less of a problem. When integration was low, the inclination was to hurry on to the next task. Throughout, teachers and students were confronted with other issues related to time. Precious time was lost as students moved from the classroom to the computer laboratory, loaded courseware into the computer, and puzzled over instructions or the recall of commands to operate the database. Teachers were constantly aware of the limitations of time. Secondary students had only a fixed amount of time in the social studies classroom and elementary students had to move on to another component of the curriculum. As noted earlier, students often said, “We need more time.”

Based on our observations, we suggest a number of ways that teachers and students can make better use of time. First, there are simple things like having students go directly to the computer laboratory or library rather than first coming to the assigned classroom. More specifically, more instruction can take place in the regular classroom where students are not distracted by the technology. Introductions, specific student assignments, and the answering of general questions can all occur in the regular classroom prior to computer activities. Also, clearer introductions to the components of the problem-solving model and computer use need to occur. Those teachers who provided clear introductions with opportunities for questions and feedback saved instructional time in the long run. Students need to observe the teacher practicing the problem-solving process. These issues are related to the next important theme.

Structuring

Based on our observations we conclude that structure is an essential element in problem solving. By “structure,” we mean a combination of several interlocking components: unit introduction; incorporation of clear expectations with a sequence of activities; development and modeling by the teacher and practice by the students of key problem-solving elements; and provision for regular checking of student progress in accomplishing the milestone tasks of problem solving. Why is structure so important?

It may appear contradictory to emphasize structure so much when discussing problem solving in social studies. Some might argue that because true student problem solving must be open-ended and fluid in nature, teacher-imposed structure would inhibit positive outcomes. Our observations led us to disagree. We found that because of the nature of problem solving, structure provided by the teacher adds a needed source
of support for students. Structure reduces some of the uncertainty for students about what to do. It can also help students develop the skills needed to solve problems. Keeping track of the overall picture of problem solving, especially when it involved computer databases, is often difficult. Clear structure assists students to find that picture and keep it in focus.

It should be noted that this teacher-organized structure need not be a heavy-handed approach, but one that assists students in focusing on key elements of the problem-solving process or in redefining the task at hand. Effective teachers in this study were able to assess student learning needs during group tasks and provide appropriate responses, and they had planned instructional activities to insure that students were on the right track and had an understanding of the problem-solving process. Examples of such activities follow.

Introductions, as we have previously noted, are the key point where the teacher familiarizes students with the big picture of the unit. The most successful teachers drew their students into the problem area without undue emphasis on the computer. The emphasis was on the problem, not on the lure of using the computer. These teachers also set forth clear expectations for student work and outcomes, including intermediate milestones in the process. Effective teachers used simple examples of problems and worked on these problems to reinforce the broad goals of the instructional unit.

Teachers also reinforced structure through the use of regular checking of individual student work at key points, as well as in whole-class debriefings of particular phases of the process. One of the teachers pointed out the wisdom of having a five-minute period each day in which the teacher leads the class to sum up where they have been, what they accomplished on a given day, and where they are going. This kind of regular debriefing was far more important for unit success than were the unit-end debriefings. Associated with the practice of regular debriefings is asking students for written products of their interim work, checking these products, and giving clear feedback and suggestions to students. The students who received this help were much more successful than those who did not.

One final component of structure is the importance of public sharing by students of the results of their problem solving and a discussion of these findings. Each group of students shared their findings with the other class members. In some cases, this sharing was quite extensive. In others, it was more informal. The public sharing, however, emphasizes one key value of inquiry—its public nature, the idea that results should be scrutinized by others.

These are all examples of what we mean by teacher “structuring.” Using examples, modeling steps and processes, providing for student practice, debriefing student learning, and sharing outcomes are all
essential elements of effective instructional structuring. The importance of such activities in helping students keep the big picture in focus cannot be overemphasized.

Student Knowledge
In all the classes, the lack of prior student knowledge played an important role in determining the success of instructional activities. This lack of knowledge affected the problem-solving process and student ability to use the computer database effectively. For example, student knowledge of meanings of database categories is essential if students are to use information from the databases in problem solving. Or, if students lack content knowledge about the general problem area, it seriously impedes their identification of the problem for study. Teachers who have students swim in a lake of data in the pitch dark can do little for their thinking skills. Lack of student knowledge must be anticipated by the teacher.

Small Cooperative Groups
All the classrooms involved in the study did not have enough computers to allow students to work alone on a particular problem. Consequently, small groups were the most effective instructional strategy utilized by all the teachers. Students cooperate within and across groups, teach each other, and learn important skills. Observation field notes document how students help each other with computer problems, challenge one another to think, clarify instructional tasks, and develop accurate generalizations. With interesting problems and guidance by the teacher, students make steady progress toward a solution to the problem.

Computer Databases
Two conclusions with clear implications for practice concern computer databases. First, databases with complex access instructions limit student learning. For example, the version of AppleWorks used in the study required that students learn a number of keystrokes and commands to access the data. Recalling such information often slowed student activities. More graphic-oriented programs such as MECC's World GeoGraph allow easier access. Teachers should carefully review the database to determine how much time and practice will be needed to access the information contained in the database.

Second, even teachers with considerable computer experience cannot be expected to do the planning, design, research, data entry, and detailed checking necessary to produce usable databases in their classrooms. In this study, both commercially-developed and teacher-developed databases were used. Experience and observation suggest that well-developed commercial products will, in most cases, be much more
dependable and useful problem-solving tools. More and more of these types of databases are becoming available for social studies classrooms.

Implications for Research

There is a host of possible projects that might be suggested based on this study, both qualitative and quantitative. But we are pessimistic about the worth of conducting extensive inquiry based on the typical computer "environment" now encountered in social studies classrooms. For example, the use of AppleWorks on Apple IIe computers tends to make the computer user the servant of the database, rather than the other way around. The teacher is equally subservient to the computer/software system, because of its limitations in numbers of variables, cases, and retrievable/display functions.

There is a glimmer of change on the horizon, however. Graphically-oriented databases like MECC's USA and World GeoGraph, running on Apple IIGS or the Macintosh, free the student and teacher from some of the limitations. Courseware that employs graphics such as maps, charts, and graphs, and permits printing them along with the raw data, can be powerful learning tools. Databases that provide more visual cues to the user and allow for multiple representations of data may provide more fertile ground for productive research.

Research employing hypermedia-based databases, for example, could yield important insights about the dynamics of problem solving with history and the social sciences. For example, hypermedia products such as National Geographic's GTV and Optical Data's ABC New Interactive series will become more common in social studies classrooms. Future research efforts may be wasted if they are based on ineffective data manipulation tools that are relics of an earlier time and that should be retired from service.

Research Topics

Drawing upon our classroom studies, a number of research topics emerge for further exploration. They are posed as questions:

1. What visual components of a database tool help the user to manipulate data efficiently and effectively? What visual metaphors make data manipulation easier and more intuitive?

2. Is student manipulation of data within the database an important part of information skill outcomes?

3. What are the differences in problem-solving outcomes between computer and non-computer databases?
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4. What are the implications for problem-solving skill development of hypertext/hypermedia databases that allow unrestricted data links?

5. What are the implications for social studies teacher training? For example, what type of preservice education is needed to enable teachers to effectively integrate technology into problem solving units?

6. What are ecological problems of modern database/computer environments? For example, can problem-solving units using computers be taught effectively in a classroom with just a few computers, rather than depending on the now-common centralized computer laboratories?

7. How much extra time, effort, and funds are required to gain how much extra benefit in terms of student learning or in terms of teacher time?

Endnote

1The case study was an appropriate research tool, because we were investigating a phenomenon within its real-life context, because the boundaries between the phenomenon and context were not clearly evident, and because multiple sources of evidence were being used (Yin, 1989).
### Characteristics of the Field Experiences Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade level</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student ability level</strong></td>
<td>College prep</td>
<td>Low &amp; average</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total student n</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small groups</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td>World cultures</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit topic</strong></td>
<td>26th Amendmt. (18 yr.old vote)</td>
<td>World geography</td>
<td>World nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database used</strong></td>
<td>Text about legal cases</td>
<td>Researcher-made</td>
<td>Researcher-made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatment length in days</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of treatment groups</strong></td>
<td>1) Linear research</td>
<td>1) Comp in room</td>
<td>1) Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Keywd. search</td>
<td>2) 15 comp. in lab</td>
<td>2) No computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) No computer</td>
<td>3) No computer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random assignment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome measure reliability</strong></td>
<td>Ach test: .47</td>
<td>Inf proc scale: .57</td>
<td>l) Prob solv.: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att. test: 91</td>
<td>Geog test: .62</td>
<td>2) Time tkin: NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome measure effect size</strong></td>
<td>Ach test: +.61</td>
<td>Inf proc scl: +.10</td>
<td>3) Efficiency: -.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att test: +1.08</td>
<td>Geog test: NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant differences</strong></td>
<td>Ach test: No</td>
<td>Inf proc scale: No</td>
<td>l) Prob solv: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Att test: Yes, linear search best</td>
<td>Inf geog test: No</td>
<td>2) Time tkin: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) Efficiency: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Characteristics of Field Experiences Reviewed (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade level</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student ability level</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total student n</strong></td>
<td>158</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small groups</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td>U.S. history</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Varied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit topic</strong></td>
<td>1) West Expans.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>U.S. history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Civil War</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>U.S. govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database used</strong></td>
<td>1) Oregon Trail</td>
<td>Factfile; seek</td>
<td>Scholastic PFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Rchr-made CW</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. hist/govt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatmt. length in days</strong></td>
<td>1) Comp simul: 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Comp db: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of treatmt. groups</strong></td>
<td>1) Comp simul</td>
<td>1) Computer</td>
<td>1) Computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Comp db</td>
<td>2) No computer</td>
<td>2) No computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Random assignment</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome meas. reliability</strong></td>
<td>1) Propr reas: NA</td>
<td>1) Classif: NA</td>
<td>1) PS: .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Deduc reas: NA</td>
<td>2) Facts: NA</td>
<td>IPS = info process scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome meas. effect size</strong></td>
<td>1) Propr reas: NA</td>
<td>1) Classif: NA</td>
<td>1) PS: +.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Deduc reas: NA</td>
<td>2) Facts: NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significant differences</strong></td>
<td>1) Propr reas: No</td>
<td>1) Classif: Yes</td>
<td>1) PS: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Deduc reas: No</td>
<td>2) Facts: Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Characteristics of the Impressionistic Field Studies Reviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ennals</th>
<th>Hawkins &amp; Sheingold</th>
<th>Medrinos &amp; Morrison</th>
<th>Rothman</th>
<th>Traberman (1983, 84)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grade level</strong></td>
<td>Secondary British</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student ability level</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total students</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1 class</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small groups?</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject</strong></td>
<td>Local studies</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Global studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit topic</strong></td>
<td>Village history</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Irish immigrant</td>
<td>Revolutions</td>
<td>Third Wd. geog/econ concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Database used</strong></td>
<td>Researcher made on village</td>
<td>Used for recording info.</td>
<td>Irish immigrant</td>
<td>Researcher made; graphic output</td>
<td>Researcher made in APL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Treatmt. length in days</strong></td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Descriptions of the Individual Classroom Units

Indiana #1. The problem to be solved, chosen and presented by the teacher, was, "How do we know what country is developed and which ones are less developed?" Students used database and library reference materials to retrieve and organize data into tables, so that criteria for classifying the countries could be applied and refined.

Indiana #2. The teacher integrated information about the U.S. Census with a researcher-provided county and state database extracted from Census Bureau books from 1949 through 1985. Students developed problems and then specific hypotheses from working with the 30 database categories -- social and economic variables recorded over a 40-year period.

Minnesota #1. Students used information from researcher-created databases to solve one of the following foreign or domestic policy problems that was assigned to them: (a) How does a nation's wealth and population affect the living conditions of its citizens? (b) What factors, other than who gets involved in politics, determine a nation's political climate? (c) What are some of the effects of the continued growth of our country's population? (d) How healthy is the country's economy? (e) What are some of the factors that give rise to crimes? (f) What problems can result from the poverty in our country?

Minnesota #2. Students identified and proposed a solution to a problem relating to Minnesota's economic future, and then were assigned a "political perspective" by the teacher. Students also had access to print materials and conducted telephone interviews with local experts. Three times they presented drafts of written proposals to a commission of students representing each team, which critiqued the proposals. The best proposals, as determined by a student commission, were presented orally to a bi-partisan commission of Minnesota state legislators in the state capitol.

Virginia #1. Students explored the interrelationship of executive and legislative branches of the U.S. government, as evidenced by study of 19th and 20th century national election data. Groups of students hypothesized about elections and electoral politics over time, and then applied data in testing the hypotheses. Oral reports were made by each of the student groups.

Virginia #2. Students applied information and ideas from their previous study of the French Revolution to current problem areas of the world. They used the database in extracting economic, social, and political data that suggested in which countries revolution might occur...
in the future. The student groups played the role a citizen of the country they had chosen, in a brief simulated radio or television spot.

Washington #1. Students found and integrated information from the computer database and other print materials. They used word-processing and Printshop programs on the computer to produce their written reports.

Washington #2. Sixth-grade students studied the geography of the Western U.S. and the economy of Europe, by using databases plus print and non-print sources. They focused on similarities and differences between states in the U.S. and countries in Europe. Students had the problem of describing the economy of a "perfect" country and justifying these scenarios.
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ESSAY REVIEW

What Matters for Citizenship Education?


Review by LYNDA STONE, College of Education, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI.

What matters for citizenship education? This is a question taken up by an important group of educational scholars in *Citizenship for the 21st Century*. It is also a question that significantly challenges not only the content of this volume, but of most of the present literature in citizenship education in general.

I recently uncovered on the department library shelves two books out of my own "civic ed" past. The first, I recall vividly, was a required reading in the very first political science course I took in what was to become my major at Berkeley. The second was a resource I specifically used as a secondary social studies teacher attempting to establish a public corporation for law-related education in the northern California county where I lived and worked for almost 20 years. What is striking about these books is that they look virtually identical to each other and to the book that I herein review: the dates of each publication are 1960, 1977 and 1990. They are paperbacks of the same approximate size (except that they grow thicker over the years) with "red, white and blue" covers adorned with patriotic symbols.

The significance of the three books on citizenship goals and education is itself striking, posing on the covers an analogy to what is between the covers. This is a largely singular, unifying and essentialist educational vision, seemingly as appropriate for 1960 as for 1990. What is problematic about this vision is its sameness over 30 years in spite of important changes in American society and education. This general problematic is framed by philosopher Stephen Toulmin and education social theorist, Thomas Popkewitz. Both utilize in their own ways the central concept of this review, that of historicization, and both inform the thesis of this essay. It is that what matters for citizenship
education is denied in a text (and by most of the authors) that does not historically contextualize its own writing. Further, it is that a particular meaning of historical contextualization is needed in order to support the central thesis. And, furthermore, it is that this historicization is necessary for understanding—and for implementing—"citizenship education."6

An initial point about what matters for citizenship education is that the current writing of this review is a particular event. It is embedded in a set of present circumstances, important to take herein as contingencies, that is, as a combination of probable, possible and unpredictable aspects of time and place. These coalesce as specific contributors to meaning that just as well could be others. What matters at this junction of circumstance, and at this point of inception of the review, is the identity(s) of the author: this is my essay, written in a specific way because of who I am at this time—and in the past and potentially. An initiating premise is this idea: to set out a personal context is an obligation of each writer in these postmodern times.7

The past of this context is being a California resident for most of my life, and for a large part of my adult professional life, a social studies teacher in a barrio junior high. There is more, of course. I am white,8 female, single, middle class, and now nearing middle age. I taught for fifteen years, primarily in California, before attending graduate school. Thereafter, I spent six years in residence at Stanford University, then taught in several universities and colleges before completing my degree and securing a tenure-track faculty position. Presently, I am an Assistant Professor in Philosophy of Education at the principal campus of the University of Hawaii. For the past decade, I have been active in social studies education, most recently in the College and University Faculty Assembly of the National Council for the Social Studies. Currently, my participation is largely limited to membership on the review board of TRSE. While I am not an active researcher in social studies, nor presently teach social studies methods, I continue to be interested in the field in general. My own "foundations" work with future teachers is peppered with stories of social studies teaching and I want to contribute to the social studies literature. One possible avenue is through my ongoing work in feminist theory. In sum, I consider myself a philosopher with interests in social education, broadly defined, and in particular aspects of social studies teaching and curriculum.

What matters about this biographic statement is, first, that this review is my own opinion and evaluation. Clearly someone with a different background and education, and different educational visions and ideological perspectives, will have some different things to say about the book. Second, is the significant postmodern point that precisely what matters for understanding is the historicization of what
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is written. Touman calls this "recontextualization," that is, a re-embedding of the present in relation to both the past and present, as manifested in the present. Emphasized is a multiple relation. For Citizenship in the 21st Century, this means first to take account of who I am and who the authors are—and in a multiplicity of selves that will be returned to subsequently. It means, moreover, to take account of what is presently said about citizenship education as related to what has been said about it in the past—again from a perspective of multiplicivity. Finally, it means to "take historical context most seriously," in an explication of historicization. This too will occupy subsequent attention.

Prior to attending to the historicity of the volume, something else requires consideration. This is the substantive content of the volume. In my view, there is substantial contribution here that is not to be downplayed or degraded because of the central critique. Overall, the book has a great deal of utility for social studies educators—for classroom teachers in their curriculum planning, for teacher educators in their instruction of new professionals, and for researchers in their exploration for a theoretical base of the field. The two purposes of the volume are laudable: to respond to a "growing danger of civic illiteracy" (p. 2),9 first, by extending the traditional civics study of government structures and processes into multidisciplinary connections in the social sciences; and, second, by emphasizing this approach for students in grades eight and nine. Moreover, the editors, William Callahan and Ronald Banaszak, are to be commended for their overall effort. Deserving of special mention is Callahan for his very useful introductory commentary throughout the book. The two substantive criticisms that I do have relate to the larger issue in this review (and will be referred to later): one is that I wanted more in the text about competing viewpoints and ideas, about the differences and debates among participants that receive only cursory mention; the other is that I wanted some evidence of self-reflection and self-criticism by the participants. There is no evidence that they "stood back from" their own pronouncements to see them in any way as limited or limiting.

In this section of the review, I take a brief look at all of the papers in order to highlight for the reader the important contributions to the literature in citizenship education that the volume does make. In each, I offer an overview and note the ideas that I found most interesting. For my own purposes, parts two through eight (each a substantive area of disciplinary focus in the curriculum) are included with the introduction and "context," as well as the concluding conference recommendations saved for later consideration. This is because the latter sections offer important connection to the general critique to follow.

Government, political science, and civics. Part two consists of two papers, the principal presentation by Michael Nelson and the response
from Chris Garcia. Nelson's contribution is rightly to expose the narrow, traditional foundation of civic education in the study of government rather than in a broader base in political science. He proposes an important curricular connection between politics and daily life in the fostering of media literacy and particularly in the use of television and newspapers as vehicles. Garcia extends Nelson's thesis in two ways, by suggesting that school life can be a key focus of political study as can a more global orientation. Overall, one useful aspect of this part is its practical and concrete illustrations, and a second is the media themes themselves. Many ideas, such as the ubiquitous presence of government bureaucracy, are not included in the traditional civics curriculum.

**Legal systems and the civics curriculum.** This part contains one of the most thorough of the volume's papers in Bruce Campbell's detailed curricular outline of a proposed study "about law." His general proposal is that the important law-related curriculum of the past twenty-five years has had a narrow focus. Law-related curricula has not included the study of "law's nature, its social functions, its limits, its interrelation with other social ordering resources and with social change" (p. 69). Mary Jane Turner nicely adds to Campbell's contribution by setting out the "historical" context for education about the law. She names the two routes of law's positioning in higher education--in political science as a university discipline and in the preparation of attorneys--that resulted in its lack of emphasis in precollegiate education. Of importance is Campbell's four-part outline of "legal content," a content easily utilized by law education teachers who wish to expand their curriculum.

**Economic literacy and citizenship.** Initially, Banaszak's introduction to part four extends its contribution significantly. He builds on the paper by Andrew Brimmer on the "nature and content of contemporary economics" (p. 103). Again a contribution is useful for educators: this is Brimmer's distinction between economics "tool makers and tool users," a concept that Banaszak and commentator, Mark Schug, extend and exemplify. The best part of Brimmer's paper is the examples of selected issues of economic analysis and policy; least helpful are detailed lists of Nobel Prize winners and general topics in economics (these are available elsewhere). Banaszak's additional correction is to apply the central paper to a general rationale for studying economics in precollegiate education and, moreover, to highlight particular utility for study by adolescents. Schug adds a helpful note in providing a connection to the teaching of economic values. Schug concludes with an important call for specific "ideas of good teaching [and] sound instructional materials" (p. 118).

**Social perspectives on education for citizenship.** The paper by David Watts, Donald Matlock, and Alvin Short is one of the strongest
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of the volume, in its utilization of major themes from sociology to describe the social context of present civic education. The focus, as Callahan's introduction attests, is on the "interaction of groups and individuals" (p. 121) in such domains as population dynamics and composition, and social institutional change. For example, curricular inclusion of migration, gender composition of the labor force, and the demise of the traditional family are significant. Carla Howery adds very important dimensions in her general support of a sociological perspective and its specific application for young adolescents. In the first paper one contradiction is possible, in a call both for valuing pluralism yet calling for a maintenance of a "cultural core." I like the addition of sociological concepts to E. D. Hirsch's proposal even as I cannot applaud the general "core" project.

Socialization and civic education. Arguably, Part six contains the two most innovative papers of the volume, by Judith Torney-Purta and Beverly Armento. Starting from developmental approaches to political and economic socialization, both advocate the utilization of recent theory in cognitive psychology. Torney-Purta's paper should become a classic, in its review of previous research and its move to the new paradigm. Extremely useful is the reconceptualization based on event and institutional schemata derived from problem-solving hypotheticals (p. 188). Rather than critique existing research, Armento's point is that, to date, there has been no body of research identifiable as paradigmatic in economic socialization. Her further contribution is to call for a "contextualization" of the predominantly psychological research. Finally, I applaud her suggestions for instructional improvement. Noteworthy also is the general commentary from voting analyst Curtis Gans.

Values, ethics and civic education. Important papers by Freeman Butts and Michael Hartoonian in Part seven respond to a present crisis in civic education: "insufficient concern with. . . and passion for the public interest" (Callahan, p. 230). Butts, the renowned civic educator, offers a schema of twelve values that unify the obligations and rights of American citizenship. Once again, there is clear utility for educators. Hartoonian adds to Butts' insight in an extremely thoughtful account of the ethical and philosophical foundations for citizenship. I especially like his turn to "criticism, meaning and love" as enlightening foundations (p. 266), and the key illustration from Australian anthropologist, James Marshall. Finally, James Leming adds his own well-respected perspective in an alternative emphasis on individual human dignity and by pointing out the instructional paradox that, from necessity, early education cannot enhance this dignity in developing autonomy, rationality and criticalness (p. 280).

Civic education and citizen participation. Lively are the final substantive papers in Part eight by Stuart Langton and Richard
Merriman. They consider (at last one notices) what I have continuously believed is the "invisible" piece of citizenship education--participation--that is, as long touted, but little realized. Such participation, Langton asserts, is increasingly more difficult given the alienating conditions of post-industrial society (p. 205).10 Useful is the breakdown of definitional forms of participation, the naming of four citizen virtues, and especially the turn to the school as a participatory site. Merriman offers what appears to be the strongest ideological dissent of the conference and the book--and is therefore very welcome. He proposes that the curriculum ought to teach "the truth" about participation, that is, that minimal or non-participation is itself a "viable option, a valued option, or an intelligent response to political reality" (p. 314). This interesting counter-viewpoint to traditional calls for civic participation concludes what are a significant set of contributions.

I want to return to the central point of this review. It is that what matters in order to understand citizenship education (both its content and potential implementation) is the necessary historicization of the volume. Indeed, as will be evident shortly, what does matter is beneath and already incorporated into the account just summarized, but this contextualization is largely unacknowledged and entirely unquestioned. That "context" receives some attention, but merely at a superficial level is a first, preliminary criticism. This attention comes in various papers in which the general times and places of present citizenship education are mentioned. Two examples are Langton's reference to post-industrial society and the writing on "ethnicity and class" by Watts, Matlock and Short. However, neither delves deeply enough into historicizing contexts, nor, significantly, do the tone-setters of the volume, David Matthews and Harold Hodgkinson. Both of their papers deserve comment because of the respect due to the noted authors and because of their specific contributions to the book.11 Matthews' notion of "politics as public work" (p. 18) is vital as a newly conceived aim for the field; likewise important is his commentary on diversity and community. Given the point of this review (and to my mind), Hodgkinson's presentation of the current social demography that is foundational to citizenship education is the most significant paper of the book. He ably describes the trends in population change, points out the complexity of such changes, and notes the need for local data that indicate "differences" within the larger national aggregation. Had the conference participants/volume authors taken his data and their implications seriously and in the way that I am about to explain, a different and more profound book would have been written.

The stage is set for historicizing the volume with a second, preliminary criticism. This is, that there is no "historical context" set out for the work. Here I am reminded of the "civic ed" books on my
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department shelves, and the fact that there is only one mention of these prior efforts on citizenship education in the book under review. This is a quotation by Watts, Mattlock and Short from the 1977 volume mentioned previously. (see p. 128). Editor Callahan, to his credit, also mentions historical connections from time to time. A chapter describing the history of similar efforts in citizenship education would have added significantly to the book--but it too would have required historicization.

Two steps are now necessary in order to explain and demonstrate the meaning of historicization. The first is to set out a series of ever-embedding contexts for understanding this particular volume on citizenship education. The second is to describe a process by which these authors might "recontextualize" their own work. The result will be the self-evident manifestation of what is lacking in the book in order for its own (somewhat enlarged and redefined) purposes to be fulfilled.

As indicated in the introduction, what follows is well-informed by the recent writings of two important theorists. Toulmin's influence is both in the concept of "recontextualization" and in his application to modernity in general. Two ideas are central. The first is that these times of intellectual change are significant for the writing of the book on citizenship education and for this review; they cannot be understood without acknowledgement and comprehension of this framework. And, except for a mention or two, the authors of the book express no awareness of this milieu or of its significance. The second is that by Toulmin's account (and by my own), this book is a modernist tract; in its agenda, in its language, in the social/educational practices. It values "the written, the universal, the general and the timeless," and it takes no account of the modern "construct" out of which these come or of traditional and postmodern counter-visions.

What is presented is taken in the modern way as given, natural, and universal. In its self-evidence, it is represented as "the truth" about citizenship education. The need for questioning this truth is illustrated for me by Popkewitz, in his own "historicizing" of present theory in teaching, teacher education, and research. Although he writes of educational reform and change in slightly different terms than I do herein, his work most ably exemplifies what I desire as historicization. As a model, he is "up front" about the multiple theoretical and personal origins of his work, and he writes, most saliently, of the particular "positioning of...[his] work in a social field of educational research" as itself a problem. In doing so, he points to the limitations of his own theorization. So, too, as a warning, must my own critique be positioned. This is, to remind the reader, the precise reason for the biographical situating at the inception of the review. It matters who I am as I write this. The times in which I live and the
particular spaces in which I think and write all matter. And, so do they for Toulmin and Popkewitz, for all others—and especially for the writers of this book about citizenship education.

One must begin with a reexamination at the meaning of historicization. The term transforms the meaning of 'history' and 'historical' into what can be called "the social turn." This socialized historicity has an intellectual history of its own, for instance in the writings of the later Marx and of Walter Benjamin, and in the genealogical accounting of poststructuralist, Michel Foucault. A handle on what the term means is that "things are always more than they seem." All events, as the writing of this book (and this review) are deeply embedded in encultured meaning. They are always bounded in a sense by what they are and what they are not. Most pertinently, as Cleo Cherryholmes has previously written for education, all meanings are dispersed and deferred; they are never contained nor essentialized.15 Historicized meaning is not easy to get at, but exploring the following relational contexts is a beginning. A caveat: each must be understood as opening up meaning, not closing it down; each is not taken as definitive nor universal. Through exemplification or questioning that arises from the present text, they are merely suggestive of this historic moment.16

Reading Citizenship for the 21st Century confirms a modernist search for certainty: the meaning of citizenship and citizenship education is taken for granted. In no place (save for Merriman's challenge over participation) is a problematic acknowledged. The historic construction of "citizen," a modern notion tied to the nation-state is assumed as is a universalized commitment to the state. That such a commitment belies much of current global reality never surfaces. Although there are occasional references to a global perspective, they are not deeply explored. Moreover the status of citizenship education is unchallenged: What has it been? What are possible connections to the disciplines? Are other definitional perspectives possible? There is not, for instance, one reference to the vast literature of critical theory in the book.

Previous mention has been made of the need for understanding the relation of this particular book and its content to modernist and postmodernist theorizing. For example, taken for granted are the core of modern, liberal values that underpin and are woven throughout the work: individualism, capitalism, democracy, and so on. These too, are social constructions of a particular intellectual era. These too, are contested concepts and values and are ignored by the authors. In two other ways is the intellectual context taken as given. One is in lauding the traditional forerunners of the call for citizenship such as the writing of Thomas Jefferson. The other is in lauding "paradigmatic" shifts without exploring their own histories, such as in the turn to
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cognitive psychology. Thus, an intellectual context, as it encompasses both tradition and change, is assumed and not interrogated.

A historical context encapsulates the book in a present moment, the present culturally, socially, politically, and economically. The work takes on a particular flavor given the times of its writing—this is one of the key elements of historicization. What this means, clearly, is that a universalized, essentialized portrayal of citizenship and citizenship education is not possible. This means that Citizenship for the 21st Century ought to "look" different than citizenship for earlier times. But difference is found other than merely across time and place. Difference also must be understood as inherent in any particular moment. Questions arise again: what multiple meanings are there to these social/political/economic times? How is this moment tied to developments as well as breaks with the past? What are the potential futures? Herein, descriptions of interesting demographics are just not enough.

One of my favorite problematics must be explored in order to ask this question: Whose citizenship education is it? One answer, of course, is that it belongs solely to those who write the book. It represents their particular interests and not the interests of others. Who they are is important for historicization: what are their race, class and gender identities? What are their occupational locations? One notes, for instance, that no major chapter is written by a teacher. One notes, also, the lack of minority viewpoints. Not one author acknowledges his or her own identity and interest; not one author poses the need for other identities and interests. Commonality, sameness, universality in need, want and desire—in living as an American citizen—is presupposed. Again present reality belies such essentialism.

Finally, it should come as no surprise that persons who are very alike appear to write in one ideological voice. Throughout the book there is a kind of "political correctness"—to turn this term on its head. Nowhere is direct attention given to the meaning of power and change. Nowhere is power connected to the social construction of knowledge. While there is a mention or two of lively discussion, dissent is ignored. Indeed it may be that there was no dissent, no great differences of ideologies among the participants. The point is, there ought to have been. Where is the conservative voice—is it dominant? Where is the radical critique—is it absent or silenced? Where is acknowledgment of the hegemonic control of American society by capitalist structures and values? Where is ideology made problematic?

What matters for citizenship education? A summary response to this question necessitates, initially, some understanding of "historicization," and then, a "recontextualization" of Citizenship for the 21st Century. Out of awareness, the present authors (and others) become cognizant of their own selectivity, partiality, and bias. By
"definition," historicizing means that some viewpoints, beliefs and practices are included and some others are not. Furthermore, the limitations of any one position must be seen in relation to more general societal perspectives. These, too, entail the representation of some persons and not others—or at the least a structural inequality.

What matters for this book? It matters who writes it. It matters how it is organized. It matters whether a monopoly or diversity of ideas and opinions is present. It matters who edits and publishes it. It matters who will read it and how they will respond. As indicated previously, the times matter as well as the voices, for these times influence what authors write. Moreover it matters whether the authors are self-aware, that is, self-critical as well as critical of others. Finally, it matters that the general orientation toward citizenship taken in this book promotes a singular, unifying and essentialist view.17

Historicization, most importantly, brings into question this process of totalizing. That the writing does this is self-evident in both the makeup of the conference participants and in their papers. Such totalizing, on the one hand, contributes to a kind of useful functionality. There are good ideas and these are presented effectively. On the other hand, however, totalizing fails to allow for self-critique, and importantly for the presentation of any kind of multiplicity. The denial of this multiplicity is theoretically inappropriate and ethically harmful.

Theoretical inappropriateness takes two forms. The first is a kind of internal contradiction: surely the promotion of a liberal democratic citizenship requires a range of beliefs and values—even the promotion of dissent. The second relates to the larger cultural context of modernity out of which the book emerges. Surely appropriate visions of citizenship for the next century must take account of present times, of what has been called the "postmodern condition."18 Few can convincingly dismiss the post-industrial nature of the western world today with its concomitant changes in societal organization. A traditional vision of citizenship education is just inappropriate.

Finally, by not taking account of the historicizing context of the book, its obviously well-intentioned authors are promoting ethical harm. This is because their monolithic vision, taken as "universally" representative, leaves many persons out who are different from them. Everyone does not have equal access to the rights of citizenship, everyone does not have equal opportunity for education. Everyone's diverse views of what matters for themselves are not incorporated. To assume this inclusiveness when exclusion is all-too-real is not only naive, but harmful as well.19

In this review I have tried to fulfill two purposes. The first is to laud what is a useful book about practical citizenship in the schools
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(and especially for early adolescents). The second is to suggest, in an educative fashion, a larger theoretical viewpoint by which the book can be evaluated. My hope, clearly, is that a notion of "historicization" not become a new dogma—I, along with the book's authors, need to continue processes of self-critique. At this moment, I think citizenship education, in general, requires the kind of "recontextualization" that is exemplified in the more general writings of Toulmin and Popkewitz. This matters, because without it, the worthwhile and enduring aims espoused in Citizenship for the 21st Century cannot be realized.20

Endnotes

1See President's Commission on National Goals (1960).

2See Brown (1977) in the references. One notes a thirty year span across the publishing of these books about goals and education for citizenship. As Harold Hodgkinson notes in Callahan and Banaszak (1990), "the future...[both] leaves footprints in the present" (p. 23) and is largely unpredictable. No one greatly questions that, although there are some similarities, the America of today is vastly different in significant ways from the America of three decades ago.

3The determination of the publishing date of the ERIC document is noted on the book's cover, but not in the publication information. Editor Callahan cites the date of the conference for which the book is entitled as Fall, 1988 (p. 1).

4All three books are blue and white, two had added red sections; the first and the last are adorned respectively with the symbol of the eagle and the American flag.


6An implication from this review is that there is no such thing as a unitary education for American citizenship for all people across all time. As will be indicated, such an essentialism is both harmful to people and contradictory of the professed aims of citizenship in this western, liberal democracy.

7This particularization is not to be taken as espousing a relativist position, since in postmodern theory the foundationalism of earlier ideas is given up and the relativist question put aside.

8An example of multiplicity of identity and its meaning is that I am called "Anglo" often in California and "haole" in Hawaii. Each term connotes a particular perspective toward my whiteness.

9All references to Callahan and Banaszak (1990) are given as internal cites.

10As discussed subsequently, Langton makes important connection to the larger social context; its labeling as post-industrial carries a great deal of meaning.

11An aspect of postmodern projects is the denial of essential
privileging of any voices. I remain humble in relation to the reputations of Matthews and Hodgkinson, and in relation to what I claim as well. Each voice can only count for what it has to say, for particular readers and for the moment of its reading.

12Toulmin (1990), beginning p. 30; and again, p. 186.
13A central topic of Toulmin's book is the relationship of modernity to postmodernity. In this age of transition, and given the character of the postmodern, no characteristics can be taken as definitive and essential.
15See Cherryholmes (1988), especially beginning p. 49.
16Examples of other contexts are those of language and institutional relations.
18This phrase is importantly attributed to French philosopher, Jean-Francois Lyotard (1984).
19Ethicist Noddings proposes that change must occur simultaneously at the relational and structural levels, working for reform as we can in our spheres of interest and influence and revisioning larger societal changes as well.
20A note in closing is that the foregoing is itself steeped in modernism—it is not a postmodern account by most definitions. But, my hope is that it is one of the first steps toward a postmodern accounting in social studies theorizing because it critiques as it does.
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