

5-2010

Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations: A Reexamination of the 1916 Report on Social Studies

C. Gregg Jorgensen
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [History Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education and Teaching Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jorgensen, C. Gregg, "Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations: A Reexamination of the 1916 Report on Social Studies" (2010). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 633.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/633>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact dylan.burns@usu.edu.



UNRAVELING CONFLICTING INTERPRETATIONS: A REEXAMINATION
OF THE 1916 REPORT ON SOCIAL STUDIES

by

C. Gregg Jorgensen

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Education
(Curriculum and Instruction)

Approved:

Barry M. Franklin, Ph.D.
Major Professor

Ronald W. Evans, Ed.D.
Committee Member

Martha Whitaker, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Barre Toelken, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Jeanne Thomas, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Patricia Gantt, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Steven P. Camicia, Ph.D.
Committee Member

Byron R. Burnham, Ed.D.
Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

2010

Copyright © C. Gregg Jorgensen 2010

All rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations: A Reexamination of the 1916

Report on Social Studies

by

C. Gregg Jorgensen, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 2010

Major Professor: Barry M. Franklin, Ph.D.
Department: School of Teacher Education and Leadership

This study examines the *1916 Report on Social Studies* in order to determine how it has been interpreted and regarded over time. The underlying question involved is “Which interpretation, or interpretations, most embodies the intent, goals, and purpose of the 1916 Committee”? Key members of the 1916 committee have been identified for extended research and analysis. One additional individual frequently quoted throughout the Report, John Dewey, has been included in this research on the 1916 committee. The design, format, and content of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was closely examined. This study dissected the three individual reports by time, intent, topic, and authority. The wide variety of interpretations offered by the scholars identified for this study was examined within an organizational framework utilized to discuss and analyze the broad spectrum of interpretations that exist. This examination of the report encompassed the existing theories, the meaning and intent of the 1916 committee, as well as the social and

political aspects and impacts of the era. The overarching intent of this study was to make sense of the various scholarly interpretations and offer insights as to whether or not a consensus of opinion among scholars existed. This study explored if, in fact, there was one dominant interpretation, or whether or not different interpretations were possible for the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. That is, was there an opportunity for this study to employ a new lens through which to view the *1916 Report on Social Studies*?

(265 pages)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to begin by expressing my heartfelt thanks to Ron Evans at San Diego State University. Dr. Evans acted as an advisor, mentor, and a committee member in the final 2 years of my dissertation. I cannot adequately express how appreciative I am for the generous commitment of time he provided and for his guidance at every stage of the process. I also want to acknowledge and wholeheartedly thank my dissertation committee chair, Dr. Barry M. Franklin, and the other members of my committee, Dr. Martha Whitaker, Dr. Jeanne Thomas, Dr. Barre Toelken, Dr. Patricia Gantt, and Dr. Steven P. Camicia, for their support through the various stages of my progress and the conclusion of my oral defense.

When I was in the drafting stages of my dissertation, I was most fortunate to connect with both Fred Newmann and Herbert Kliebard of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. I would like to thank Dr. Newmann for arranging to meet with me and engaging in an enlightening dialog in Madison. I extend special thanks to Dr. Kliebard for graciously allowing me to share my idea and approach with him in his home in Madison. Both Dr. Newmann and Dr. Kliebard were kind enough to review portions of my dissertation and to provide challenging written feedback. I remain extremely grateful for their assistance and thank them for their kindness. In addition, I want to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Murray Nelson at Penn State University for reviewing the early drafts of my final dissertation and for providing valuable written feedback. Moreover, I wish to express my thanks to Dr. Rene Antrop-Gonzalez at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee for his support and assistance along the way.

Further, I want to thank Kay Camperell at Utah State University. In the early stages of my dissertation work, Dr. Camperell continually brought issues related to social studies education to my attention. She provided a great deal of sound advice and support. As always, I benefited tremendously from the ongoing encouragement of my mother, Joan, and my stepfather, Dick Arndt.

Finally, I wish to express my thanks to Diane Schlough. Not only did she edit this dissertation, but provided insight and feedback along the way. I am most grateful for her continued support.

C. Gregg Jorgensen

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Overview	1
Statement of Thesis.....	5
Overview of Key Arguments.....	6
Overview of Chapters	12
Conclusion	14
II. THE COMMITTEE.....	15
Introduction.....	15
Clarence Darwin Kingsley.....	20
Thomas Jesse Jones.....	26
Arthur W. Dunn	35
J. Lynn Barnard.....	40
James Harvey Robinson.....	43
William H. Mace.....	48
John Dewey.....	52
Conclusion	58
III. THE REPORTS	60
Introduction.....	60
1913 Preliminary Statement.....	60
1915 Report on Community Civics	67
1916 Report on Social Studies.....	74
Chapter Conclusion.....	98
IV. THE SCHOLARS	100
Introduction.....	100
Celebratory Historians	105
Revisionist Interpretations	110

Conclusion	187
V. THREADING THE NEEDLE OF INTERPRETATIONS.....	189
Introduction.....	189
Different Intentions and Influences	189
Social Efficiency Influence.....	190
Multiple Influences	197
Influential 1916 Committee Members.....	204
Illustrations of Principles in Action	213
The Case for Dewey’s Influence.....	217
A Trilogy of Reports—Independent Intent.....	220
Cardinal Principles Effect.....	228
The Tipping Point	230
The Circle Is Unbroken.....	231
Conclusion	233
VI. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	236
Summary	236
Implications.....	243
REFERENCES	248
CURRICULUM VITAE.....	254

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Problem Overview

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* consisted of three separate, distinct reports produced by three different overlapping groups of individuals with three different philosophies and agendas. Yet, to date, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* has seldom, if ever, been considered as three separate and philosophically diverse documents. Instead, scholars, for the most part, interpret the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as a single unified document that encompasses a wide variety of social, political, and economic implications.

Undoubtedly, the 1916 committee was confronted by numerous concepts advocated by influential interest groups during their era. These included social efficiency, social meliorism, social reconstructionism, humanism, and developmentalism. These social concepts represent issues that may have affected or influenced each of the three separate reports to varying degrees.

This spectrum of social aspects influencing the 1916 committee was driven by concern over significant societal changes in the United States and other areas of the globe prior to and throughout the committee's tenure. The number of societal reactions to unforeseen challenges can be viewed as both an extremely varied and a frenetic response to immigrants literally flowing into the country, expanding urbanization, industrialization, and the resulting transformation of American institutions. During this time, society developed multiple interest group movements in what could be described as

a coping mechanism. In particular, citizens were facing significant problems that were by-products of the rapid industrialization initiatives involving the efforts to merge industry to accomplish wealth concentration as well as industry's ruthless exploitation of natural resources. Coupled with inefficiency and corruption in government at all levels and the incredible growth that added to the already increasing complexity of political and social problems in urban areas was a growing fear that the American middle class would adversely react to these intense problems (Callahan, 1962; Kliebard, 2004). Both as individuals and as an educational work group, the 1916 committee shared the same deep concerns as these various societal groups.

A major factor during this era was that industry was under increasing pressure to counter, Germany's industrial success. The industrialists were thrust into quick action to move the United States into the top competitive position in the world in industrial development and expansion (Kliebard, 2004). Growth in industry precipitated growth in urban populations as citizens migrated from rural areas in search of the new jobs. In tandem with this impact was the increasing tendency for the African American population, also seeking a new life and a new way of making a living, to migrate from the south to the industrial northern cities. Growth in cities was further exacerbated by the tremendous impact of immigrants from Ireland Scotland England and other countries in Europe. The immigrant population created concern among many about methods of Americanizing this massive influx of people in order to address fear of the different cultures and beliefs. The population changes caused by citizen migration and immigration from foreign countries created a concern to provide "youth with the skills that were

required by industry and commerce” (Kliebard, 2004, p. 130). The United States, as a nation, was tremendously affected by both the immigration and migration population movements (Cremin, 1961; Kliebard, 2004).

At the same time, the threat of entering into the war in Europe loomed overhead. The steps needed to prepare for a world war became a concern for government, industry and business, as well as private citizens over an extended period—the United States did not enter World War I until 1917. This was after the 1916 committee concluded its work and published their recommendations. However, the pending war almost certainly represented an impact on their educational planning.

Thus, immigration, urbanization, industrialization, and the threat of war were the modern problems of that era. Educational leaders wanted the schools to step in and help address these significant issues while at the same time helping to keep, in general, the status quo of liberal capitalist democracy (Evans, 2004). As a result, the 1916 committee was confronted with critical social problems emanating from the rapidly changing social, political, and industrial environment of their era.

From different vantage points, the influential interest groups of the era addressed the various critical problems of a society that was changing at a rapid pace. How influential were these groups on the 1916 committee? Indeed, what constitutes influence? Influence is not limited to a linear cause and effect hierarchy. Versions of influence can be generated from peers, mentors, leaders, political representatives, and interest groups of all types. It seems reasonable to speculate that any individual or group subjected to outside influences potentially affecting their tasks or endeavor at hand needs to carefully

evaluate and assess the level of validity and importance relative to the likelihood of successfully completing their own intended goals. A key question to address is: Does anyone influence, or a selection of multiple influences, provide value and a positive effect on projected outcomes? The challenge for historians is to determine which, if any, particular leader, interest group, peer, colleague, or governmental entity influenced their deliberations and ultimately their recommendations for the newly created social studies.

These factors may partially explain why the *1916 Report on Social Studies* suffered from various interpretations over time. The variety of interpretations may have exacerbated a commonly expressed belief that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is, at best, inconsistent. Thus, while considered seminal in social studies education, it is not understood in a uniform manner among scholars. Nor do the recommendations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* appear to be easily transferable to the classroom—either then or now. The grammar of schooling (Tyack & Cuban, 1995) may provide insight to explain the partial support for adoption of the teaching and learning principles recommended by the 1916 committee.

This study will address the 1916 committee, its work, and the various scholarly interpretations of its *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The goal is to determine the schools of interpretation that have developed over time, and whether or not another interpretation can be identified. In the process of doing so, this study will discuss and analyze the various entities and individuals relative to the 1916 committee and its *1916 Report on Social Studies*. It is important to note that in-depth discussions surrounding entities such as the Committee of Ten and the Committee of Seven as well as the Cardinal Principles

report are not part of this formal study. That is, they are referenced in context to this study but are not a focus in this study.

Statement of Thesis

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* is much more Deweyan than many educators and researchers over the decades have suggested. Thus, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is not as social efficiency oriented—or in today’s terms, scientific management oriented—as many modern scholars believe. Instead, in the opinion of this author, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* reflects a uniquely engineered microcosm of Kliebard’s (2004) analysis of the competing ideological camps of the day.

This study recognizes that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is three separate reports produced by three different and overlapping groups of individuals with three diverse ideologies and world views that entered into three different influences—one for each report. The recognition of a trilogy of separate reports—not one, sole report—creates the opportunity for this study to employ a new lens through which to view the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The trilogy of reports began with the 1913 Preliminary Report, which was prepared and submitted to the Commission of the National Education Association on the Reorganization of Secondary Education (CRSE) by Thomas Jesse Jones as the chairperson. This preliminary report included extensive individual statements written by J. Lynn Barnard, William A. Wheatley, James Harvey Robinson, and Henry R. Burch. The *1913 Preliminary Statement* was published as a part of a compilation of preliminary statements from all the subject committees formed by the

CRSE. Next in the sequence was the *1915 Report on Community Civics* prepared by J. Lynn Barnard, F. W. Carrier, Arthur W. Dunn, and Clarence D. Kingsley. This second report was submitted by this special committee of four directly to the U. S. Bureau of Education. The *1915 Report on Community Civics* was published as a separate manual by the U. S. Bureau of Education and made available to teachers. The final report in the trilogy was the *1916 Report on Social Studies* prepared and submitted by the full membership of the 1916 committee to the CRSE. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* was published as the final recommendations for the teaching and learning of the newly created social studies in secondary education in all public schools.

I believe that the third and final report of the trilogy, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, reveals the overall intent of the entire body of the 1916 committee. That is, the adopted, accepted and operational philosophy for the new era of social studies resulted from elements of multiple personal and philosophical influences including social efficiency, social meliorism, social reconstructionism, humanism, and developmentalism as imbedded in the third and final report. The unique conceptual microcosm that I believe evolved could be considered a synthesis of educational philosophy and ideas in which John Dewey directly and indirectly exerted the single most important influence on the 1916 committee. The influence of Dewey acted as an umbrella, which was a buffer over the various influences of other individuals and the societal era of that day.

Overview of Key Arguments

I have developed eight main arguments in support of the thesis statement. First,

the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is three separate, distinct reports. That is, it was produced by three overlapping but different groups of individuals with three different philosophies and agendas and published as three separate documents at either one year or two years apart. The reports are: (a) the *1913 Preliminary Statement*, (b) the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, and (c) the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The following is a summary of the base distinctions and differences for each individual report.

The first report, the *1913 Preliminary Statement*, can be regarded as a call to the full 1916 committee to begin its work. The report is brief in length—approximately 11 pages. After an introduction, the report included extensive verbatim statements from four 1916 committee members. It also included recommended readings by authors who were not members of the 1916 committee. The *1913 Preliminary Statement* was submitted to the CRSE by Thomas Jesse Jones as chairperson. It does not necessarily follow that this report constituted a concrete directive solely from Jones for guiding the full 1916 committee in its efforts.

The second report, the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, was authored by a separate subcommittee consisting of four members. One, J. Lynn Barnard, was a member of the 1916 committee. However, the remaining three special committee members, F. W. Carrier, Arthur W. Dunn, and Clarence D. Kingsley were not members. That is, these three special committee members were not members of the 1916 committee at the time P. P. Claxton, Commissioner for the U. S. Bureau of Education, recommended the *1915 Report on Community Civics* for publication to make available to teachers. While the second report was widely read by educators and acknowledged by the National Education

Association (NEA) at the time, it primarily became a stand alone, isolated report. In striking contrast to the final report, the second report—*1915 Report on Community Civics*—focused primarily on the inculcation of citizenship ideals in the form of a stand-alone report. In the introduction to the third and final report, the second report is acknowledged to be an integral part of the final report. However, only limited sections of the second report were highlighted in the third and final report—the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The third report, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, was produced by the full working committee. The 1916 committee verified in its own statements that as a group they met frequently and relied on input from various and numerous educators, professional organizations, and existing school entities across the United States. As such, the entire body of the 1916 committee collectively reached a revised and common philosophy of a more Deweyan approach to teaching and learning in social studies education than was evident in the first report and more particularly in the second report. However, while the *1916 Report on Social Studies* itself was eventually generally accepted, it also experienced mixed reaction from various groups.

This may explain an account set forth in *Historical Outlook* concerning the events surrounding the NEA Committee on Social Studies meeting in Cleveland on February 24, 1920. The NEA made a distinction between the third and final 1916 report—which they considered to be a “somewhat radical document” (American Historical Association, 1920, p. 203) and the second report involving community civics. However, the NEA merely referenced the second report as a byproduct produced by a subcommittee. At the

same time, the NEA determined that no changes were needed for the third and final report. According to the NEA, by 1920 what had by then become the generally accepted principles of social studies education remained in good stead.

Second, I argue that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* has generally been defined and regarded by many modern scholars primarily as a document representing a social efficiency oriented, or scientific management point of view, in contemporary terms. This could be the result of strict, literal interpretations or misinterpretations or the various perspectives, beliefs, and worldviews of the authors. This could also be the result of a lack of recognition that the three reports were separated in time and by authorship, which involved different philosophical and pedagogical stances. At any rate, I believe there were other important influences that had a profound influence on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Third, Krug (1964) suggested that in reality two recognized understandings of social efficiency were in place during the tenure of the 1916 committee. That is, education for social control and education for social service. He suggested that social reforms during the 1916 committee's era involved both. This represents a potentially very different view on the premise for the *1916 Report on Social Studies* than has been suggested by many modern scholars.

Fourth, most modern scholars believe social efficiency was the most dominant influence of the era. However, this belief does not necessarily mean that the 1916 committee was equally influenced. It is reasonable to look to a multitude of other influences on the 1916 committee, such as social meliorism, social reconstructionism,

humanism, and developmentalism as well as the influences of key individuals such as Mace, Robinson, and Dewey. Sorted through and added together, these multiple influences combined to mitigate and soften social efficiency as social control as the perceived overarching influence throughout all three reports. This was especially the case in the first and third reports. Therefore, there is reason to believe that the 1916 committee's view on social efficiency may have (a) differed among individual 1916 committee members, (b) differed from the mainstream thoughts of their day, and (c) also differed from how contemporary scholars view the concept of social efficiency as it existed at that time.

Fifth, as a result, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* represents a microcosm of Kliebard's (2004) competing camps. That is, in order to meet their goals for the newly created social studies in secondary education, the 1916 committee developed a consensus to carve a new path for teaching and learning. Indeed, they state this need in the initial paragraphs of the third and final report by pointing out the difference in the character of social studies in comparison to the other subjects.

Sixth, as chair of the 1916 committee, Thomas Jesse Jones became more of a managerial figurehead after the *1913 Preliminary Statement* was published. Correia (1994) documented that from 1912 to 1917 Jones was on staff for the Phelps-Stokes Fund working on a special project and also personally issued a seminal two volume study published in 1917 by the Bureau of Education under the title *Negro Education*. Thus, evidence suggests that at least one or more key 1916 committee members may have become the actual overseers of the 1916 committee through the conclusion of their work.

In view of the possibility that Jones was not available to exert direct philosophical influence over the activities and actions of the 1916 committee, it remains to be determined who or what influenced the recommendations and intent of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Seventh, the operational common denominator for the full complement of 1916 committee members who produced the third and final report was that they were educators and educational administrators with a variety of backgrounds and training. This education-focused 1916 committee maintained a commitment to develop a new approach in order to achieve its goal of launching a new subject field known as social studies. As a group, they prepared to tackle new educational reform. Both their goal and the content of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* suggested a line of demarcation from the other committees convened by the NEA at the time and also from the formal NEA report published in 1918 as *Cardinal Principles*. Thus, the third and final report of the 1916 committee reflected Deweyan principles and philosophies to a much greater extent than either of the first two reports or *Cardinal Principles* (Kliebard, 2004).

Eighth, John Dewey was a much stronger influence on the 1916 committee than many modern scholars recognize. Several scholars (Evans, 2004; Hertzberg, 1981, 1989; Nelson, 1994; Saxe, 1991) have published direct statements to this effect. The third and final report of the 1916 committee reflects Deweyan principles and philosophies to a much greater extent than the first report and certainly, than the second report. Dewey's philosophy and pedagogy are clearly presented through direct quotations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The 1916 committee consistently integrated John Dewey's

principles into their recommendations from the beginning to the conclusion of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The teaching illustrations used as examples by the 1916 committee for the newly created social studies subject were Deweyan based teaching approaches either in planning or already in practice in a diverse set of schools across the country. Dewey was the strongest influence on the 1916 committee because it was Dewey's concepts and philosophy that provided the methodology to realize their goals for the newly created social studies.

Overview of Chapters

The analysis and findings in this study will be presented in Chapters II through VI as follows:

Chapter II—The Committee—examines 1916 committee members. The membership included 21 diverse individuals. Key members of the 1916 committee have been identified for more extended research and analysis. The focus is on their particular roles and levels of participation in the deliberations of the 1916 committee and on the production of their reports. One additional individual considered by many scholars to be influential to the 1916 committee, John Dewey, has been included in this research and analysis. The intent is to determine the degree to which 1916 committee members, including John Dewey, may have actually influenced the final recommendations for the newly created social studies for secondary education comprising the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Chapter III—The Reports—examines the design, format and content of what has

become known as the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. In reality, the 1916 committee published a trilogy of separate reports. This chapter will dissect the three individual reports, which are separated by time, frame, intent, topic, and authorship. Most scholars have recognized the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as the seminal report in social studies education. It is important to this study, however, to examine each report separately as a building block to an analysis of the various scholarly interpretations of the third and final report, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Chapter IV—The Scholars—examines the variety of interpretations offered by scholars identified for this study on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. It also examines the social, political and economic issues surrounding the 1916 committee discussed by many of these scholars. This study's analysis of the wide spectrum of interpretations and opinions is organized within a framework. That is, schools of interpretation which have emerged from the positions taken by the various scholars in this study are applied. The intent is to organize their multiple ideological stances and to situate their individual discussions within several overarching interpretations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. This will involve an examination of the existing theories and ideas on the meaning and intent of the work of the 1916 committee as well as on the social and political issues of the era.

In Chapter V—Threading the Needle of Interpretations—this study will attempt to make sense of the various schools of interpretation and offer insight as to whether or not a consensus of opinion exists among these scholars. In doing so, this chapter will explore if, in fact, there is one dominant interpretation. In addition, this study will determine if

insights gained from this study reveal possibilities for a different interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Chapter VI—Summary and Implications—provides a summary of findings from this study and relates the findings to other relevant contemporary research.

Conclusion

A resolution for each of the eight key arguments involved in this study will be discussed in Chapter V. The resolution will be reached by addressing the following questions derived from the thesis statement.

1. What was the true nature of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*?
2. What were the effects of the multiple and various social, political, and economic influences on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*?
3. Who or what were the strongest overall influences on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*?

The study will conclude with a discussion of why the *1916 Report on Social Studies* still matters and why it should continue to be regarded as consequential to social studies education in contemporary times. Implications derived from the study will lead to linkages to relevant contemporary research which may be consistent with the recommendations contained in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and which may illustrate the continuing relevance of the 1916 report for today's social studies education, that is, ways in which the 1916 committee's recommendations may be applied in the 21st Century.

CHAPTER II

THE COMMITTEE

Introduction

It is difficult to imagine a committee comprised of individuals and influences who are more extreme or diverse and that has experienced so many absolute and unwavering yet conflicting statements about it voiced by scholars over time. A number of scholars have interpreted the work of the 1916 committee as an example of social efficiency applied to curriculum. For instance, Kliebard (1994) initiated the title of an article on Thomas Jesse Jones, chairperson of the 1916 committee, with a W.E.B. Dubois phrase describing Jones as “*That evil genius of the negro race.*” In clearly noting the dislike that Dubois held for the chairperson of the 1916 committee, Kliebard restated his opinion that Jones’ work in curriculum development resulted in courses that were “designed for future ‘servants and laborers and *not* educated men and women...” (p. 5). Another group of scholars have emphasized the influence of progressive historians and educators. For example, Jenness (1990) in his discussion of the 1916 committee stated that James Harvey Robinson and John Dewey were not only close friends, but also that Dewey was influenced by Robinson during their association at Columbia University. Robinson became one of the most notable individuals within the 1916 committee membership. Dewey, although not appointed to serve on the 1916 committee, is considered by many scholars to have substantially influenced the deliberations of the 1916 committee and the trilogy of reports published by them (Correia, 1994; Evans, 2004; Hendricks, 1946;

Hertzberg, 1981; Jenness, 1990; Nelson, 1994; Saxe, 1991; Westbrook, 1991).

The Creation of the 1916 Committee

The process of initiating and setting up the 1916 committee occurred during a time of social movements that advocated a focus on vocational education and the expansion of social efficiency approaches for secondary schools. In light of these expectations, Clarence D. Kingsley, chairperson of the CRSE, prepared an outline for each of his CRSE subject committees to use as a guideline before submitting their respective preliminary statements to the reviewing committee. Krug (1964) stated:

The portion of the outline dealing with purpose ran as follows: ‘To which the following ends does the subject make substantial contribution? (a) Development of specific efficiency: civic, vocational, domestic. (b) Development of general efficiency: that is, intellectual power. (c) Development of ideals: civic, vocational, domestic, personal character. (d) Development of appreciation: aesthetic, literary, scientific, social. Indicate how the dominant purposes or purposes of the subject modify and control the methods of instruction. (pp. 339-340)

Within the realities of the existing social and secondary education environment, the 1916 committee and all its various personalities commenced their work in 1913 to construct recommendations for the social studies subject in what is now commonly called the 1916 Report—actually a trilogy of reports to be examined later in this study. Nelson (1994) related his belief that an examination of the report required an understanding of the 1916 committee members. He argued that, measured in terms of the number of publications, the ideas of Thomas Jesse Jones and Arthur W. Dunn dominated the 1916 committee. In addition, he noted that correspondence existed which indicated that both Jones and Dunn claimed to have written the report.

The Members of the Committee

By the time of the publication of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, the 1916 committee was composed of 21 members. The membership roster first listed the chairperson and secretary of the 1916 committee followed by the remainder of the members listed alphabetically.

- Thomas Jesse Jones, Chairperson, United States Bureau of Education, Washington, D.C.
- Arthur William Dunn, Secretary, United States Bureau of Education, Washington, D.C.
- W. A. Aery, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.
- J. Lynn Barnard, School of Pedagogy, Philadelphia, Pa.
- George G. Bechtel, Principal, Northwestern High School, Detroit, Mich.
- F. L. Boyden, Principal, High School, Dearfield, Mass.
- E. C. Branson, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.
- Henry R. Burch, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
- F. W. Carrier, Somerville High School, Somerville, Mass.
- Jessie C. Evans, William Penn High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Frank P. Goodwin, Woodward High School, Cincinnati, Ohio
- W. J. Hamilton, Superintendent of Schools, Two Rivers, Wis.
- Blanch C. Hazard, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
- S. B. Howe, High School, Newark, N.J.
- Clarence D. Kingsley, State High School Inspector, Boston Mass.
- J. Herbert Low, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N.Y.
- William H. Mace, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
- William T. Morrey, Bushwick High School, Brooklyn, N.Y.
- John Pettibone, High School, New Milford, Conn.
- James Harvey Robinson, Columbia University, New York City.
- William A. Wheatley, Superintendent of Schools, Middletown, Conn. (U. S. Bureau of Education, 1916, pp. 6-7)

Observations about the Committee

The composition of the 1916 committee membership is significant. Various accounts regarding the actual number of members range from 16 to 17 to 21 (Hertzberg, 1981; Krug, 1964; Saxe, 1991). Their educational and career backgrounds varied. The

membership was dominated by secondary education professionals (Saxe, 1991). Nine of the members were from regional history teacher's associations, predominantly from the Middle States region (Hertzberg, 1981). College and university professors were hardly represented (Nash, Crabtree, & Dunn, 2000; Saxe, 1991). Specifically, the membership included seven teachers from the secondary schools and three college professors, at least two of which were history professors, Robinson and Mace (Krug, 1964). Barnard was also considered as a history professor (Saxe, 1991). Robinson has been described variously as the "doyen of the 'new history'" (Hertzberg, 1981) and "the prophet of 'new history'" (Krug, 1964). In addition, Robinson served on both the NEA Committee of Ten's Subcommittee Conference on History, Civil Government, and Political Economy in addition to numerous other committees on history education. At the time, he was also considered a leader of the Middle States Regional History Teachers Association (Hertzberg, 1981). Kingsley, Jones, and Dunn, considered notable 1916 committee members, were bureaucrats (Saxe, 1991). Bechtel, Carrier, Hamilton, and Kingsley were appointed or nominated to serve mid-stream during the tenure of the 1916 committee (Nelson, 1994). Dunn was not listed as an original 1916 committee member in the *1913 Preliminary Statement*. However, after Dunn joined this group, he became a notable member and was listed as the report compiler for the 1916 committee.

Jones, Dunn, Barnard, Robinson, and Kingsley were probably the most influential 1916 committee members (Saxe, 1991). It was suggested that "Control over policy and philosophical positions appeared to rest squarely upon" these five noted 1916 committee members (Saxe, 1991, p. 167). Kingsley's specific best contribution or influence was

considered to be his judicious selection of committee members and appointment of the chairperson (Saxe, 1991). Kliebard (2004) suggested Kingsley's contributions to *Cardinal Principles*, the culminating report of the findings and recommendations of their subject-oriented secondary education committees issued by the CRSE in 1918 after the publication of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* can never be underestimated.

Apparently outside relationships were held in common by various members of the 1916 committee which might be of importance. One stream of relationship outlined was a connection of the 1916 committee to sociologist Franklin Giddings: Jones, Kingsley, Arey were students of Giddings; Barnard and Burch shared Darwinian theory with Giddings; Bechtel, Boyden, Evans, Low were all students at various institutions using Giddings textbooks; Carrier was a student in a class taught by Barnard; and Hazard was a member of the Cornell faculty with deep roots in social welfare movement. Another common link was through the National Municipal League (NML). The 1916 era saw the growth of the NML as civics oriented organization throughout the metropolitan areas of the country. Local leaders from various entities including education institutions joined the membership ranks. The NML's intent was to address social and economic aspects and impacts on the growing municipalities. Morrey, Wheatley, Barnard, Bechtel, Branson, Burch, Carrier, Jones, Kingsley, Dunn all were members of the League (Lybarger, 1981; Nelson, 1994). Mace was retired by the time he served on the 1916 committee (Nelson, 1994).

A cursory review of the membership list indicates a broad scope and variety of individuals selected as members. Some of the members are considered relatively

unknown to the contemporary scholar, while others are now viewed as individuals of fame and notoriety in the educational history of the 20th century. As Nelson (1994) advised, the next step is to take a closer look at these contributors to the 1916 committee's trilogy of reports.

The remainder of this chapter will examine members of the 1916 committee based on available research and their writings. This approach will attempt to gain insight into the *1916 Report on Social Studies* through the eyes and ears of the 1916 committee members. Individuals who comprised the 1916 committee on Social Studies who have been deemed influential in the field of social studies will be presented in some depth. The goal of this endeavor is to understand key 1916 committee members as individuals and to attempt to determine what each one brought to the meeting table of the 1916 committee. The discussion for each key member involves two aspects: First, a summation of their life history and philosophies from the viewpoint of scholars, and second, a look into their writings and the beliefs or philosophies that may be ascertained from their own words.

Clarence Darwin Kingsley

Life, Career, and Committees

As a personality, Clarence D. Kingsley was described as “Brisk, efficient, and businesslike” (Krug, 1964, p. 295). As chairperson of the CRSE, Kingsley also appointed himself as an additional member of the 1916 committee. One can surmise this occurred during or after the completion of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, which he participated in authoring by also serving on the special committee that was formed to

prepare it. Indeed, these factors may explain why “His presence on it [1916 committee] may have accounted for the speed with which the committee prepared its major report, having it completed by 1916” (Krug, 1964, p. 354).

Kingsley’s role on the CRSE included the oversight of the *Cardinal Principles* report ultimately issued as a culmination of the efforts of both the subject committees and more particularly the reviewing committee. This CRSE report was published under the auspices of the NEA in 1918. Throughout his tenure on the CRSE, Kingsley wrote articles and presented speeches that continued to develop the points of view that he brought to the work of the CRSE. He also held employment with the State Department of Education of Massachusetts and reported to David Snedden. Saxe (1991) noted that this employer-employee relationship created the opportunity for Kingsley to be influenced by the concepts of social efficiency in a fashion similar to Snedden. However, in observing that Kingsley and Snedden were both advocates of social efficiency, Saxe noted they were not of the same opinion regarding the social efficiency movement. Saxe argued that Snedden’s “version was more directed at social control” (p. 145) According to Saxe, Kingsley’s version required that students of every type be combined as one cohesive group in the schools.

Kingsley’s view for the new civics curriculum design was to socialize the students in a methodology that resulted in a new, more cosmopolitan group of citizens. Kingsley’s belief that subject matter could become a method or avenue to an achievement, not merely the product, was in contrast to the social efficiency ideas of the era. For instance, Kingsley indicated one aim in studying history topics was for students to learn to

appreciate the continuing development of individual rights of Anglo-Saxons. In civics, according to Kingsley, a teaching approach that resulted in students learning to better cooperate with charity organizations was an appropriate aim under the concepts of social efficiency (Krug, 1964; Nelson, 1994). Indeed, one point of view held that “Kingsley’s selection of Jones aimed to realize that goal” (Saxe, 1991, p. 145).

In explaining the reasons why Kingsley appointed Thomas Jesse Jones to be chairperson of the 1916 committee, a less ideological explanation is more likely. There is evidence of the value Kingsley placed on the similar background that Jones shared with him. Nineteen of the 26 members of the Reviewing Committee that Kingsley appointed also possessed the same common ground: (a) Columbia University, (b) the U.S. Bureau of Education, (c) the Massachusetts School system, and (d) the City of New York. A review of these shared background factors indicates a pattern followed by Kingsley in the process of selecting individuals to serve on his commission (Correia, 1994). Despite the fact that Kingsley belonged to a higher socioeconomic class, his life and career background actually paralleled that of Jones to a significant extent (Kliebard, 2002).

Kingsley’s father passed away when he was young (Kliebard, 2002). He attended Colgate as an undergraduate where he simultaneously studied at the Colgate Theological Seminary (Correia, 1995). However, instead of becoming a minister, he developed a focus on social work. Kingsley served as an agent of the New York Charity Organization Society after he taught math for four years at Colgate. During this time, he earned a Master of Science degree at Teacher’s College of Columbia in 1904 for which he wrote a thesis titled “The Treatment of Homeless Men in New York City.” From 1904 to 1912,

he reverted to teaching mathematics—this time at the Brooklyn Manual Training High School and was an active member in the New York Teachers' Association. During his participation with the teacher's association, he studied aspects of the New York school systems and became chair of this association's Committee on the Articulation of High School and College. This latter endeavor was a key factor leading to his future role on the CRSE. He then served as inspector of high schools in Massachusetts.

At this point, Clarence Darwin Kingsley made a leapfrog jump into a higher level of academic related endeavors. He was nominated to the chairpersonship of the NEA's Committee on the Articulation of High School and College. This career leap resulted from the fact that he ambitiously circulated a report from his New York Teacher's Association Committee. This report caught the attention of the NEA during their 1910 annual meeting. The NEA's Department of Secondary Education promptly established a corollary committee and selected Kingsley as chair. This NEA committee expanded into several subject oriented subcommittees. Thus, the CRSE was born in 1913. Based on his previous experience, Kingsley moved into the CRSE chairpersonship (Correia, 1995; Evans, 2004; Saxe, 1991). As such, he became the key figure in coordinating and administering the CRSE and joined the company of "Prominent names, or names that were later to become prominent, on the reviewing committee" (Krug, 1964, p. 378). Kingsley himself became head of the Reviewing Committee of the CRSE. It is important to note that one of the original CRSE subcommittees, the Committee on Social Science, was reformatted and renamed the Committee on Social Studies in 1913 after Kingsley nominated Thomas Jesse Jones as chair.

The Writings of Kingsley

After joining the 1916 committee officially as a member, Kingsley introduced a curriculum concept for consideration. The concept was presented in an article by Kingsley published in 1916 entitled, *The Study of Nations: Its Possibilities as a Social Study in High Schools*.

Kingsley (1916) established that his study of nations would be based on an in-depth teaching of what he defined as a select subset of what he considered to be well-developed, successful cultures. In other words, in attempting to present a study of a variety of nationalities, he limited its scope to those nations he determined worthy of studying. These included England France, Germany, Russia, and Japan. Kingsley also emphasized that his study would not be from a science-oriented viewpoint. Rather, he determined that the times required a change to a research and study oriented approach. In advocating for his course, Kingsley represented his rationale as:

It would lead us to be more helpful in our relations with backward peoples, because it would help us to value them on the basis of their latent possibilities rather than on the basis of their small present achievement. This gain would be of special value in dealing with the Negro and the Indian. (p. 40)

In part, Kingsley (1916) advocated this social studies course content because of his apparent concern that little time was being devoted in the schools to the subject.

However, it appeared that his real underlying concern was that new curriculum needed to be developed for African Americans and the Native Americans that he identified as being a different and backward people. Indeed, Kingsley's rationale appeared to be that he also defined his student audience as "backward."

Kingsley's view of history as a subject that represented a study of nations may be

considered in two distinct ways. First, Kingsley's concept was highly influenced by the viewpoint of Herbert Spencer (Krug, 1964). Underlying assumptions for this first observation regarding his view of history as the study of nations may be evidenced in his concern for what he described as "typical backwards peoples" (Kingsley, 1916, p. 39) and for what he believed was a responsibility to enable them to learn and to make distinctive contributions to society.

Spencer, a 19th century English philosopher, believed science was the key to knowledge and the basis to establish a good, productive life. His thesis was that the aim of education needed to be relevant to effective living and not be used as a vehicle to merely reflect tradition and history. According to Krug (1964), Kingsley was influenced by Spencer and adapted Spencer's expression "education for complete living" (p. 401). Second, while Kingsley's work in the Study of Nations was influenced by Spencer, he also accepted the views on history from his colleague and fellow 1916 committee member, James Harvey Robinson. Robinson's concept was considered the "notion of history as related to present problems and as service to the citizen" (Krug, 1964, p. 402). That is, Krug suggested that Kingsley was not opposed to Robinson's concepts even though Robinson presented a position directly opposite from the writings of Spencer and from the social efficiency concepts in general.

Kingsley's Influence

Along his career path, Kingsley left mathematics to take up social studies as his major field of concern. This led to Kingsley serving not only as the director over all the CRSE committees but also as a member of the 1916 committee. His background was

very similar to other 1916 committee members. Kingsley's academic history was traced to Giddings and a sociological outlook, albeit he trained in engineering. He, too, was involved in charity organizations. His career steps indicate a unique, driving personality that resulted in a significant influence on the 1916 committee, as well as an influence through his CRSE oversight of all its subject committees (Correia, 1995; Krug, 1964; Lybarger, 1981).

Drawing on his level of energy and a desire to keep his various committees to a tight schedule, Kingsley was considered the motivating force behind the work of the 1916 committee. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* has become one of the most successful of all the CRSE subject committees (Krug, 1964). Many of its recommendations were and have been adopted in secondary education. More importantly, the work of the 1916 committee served as an important reference in the field of social studies.

It is very reasonable to suggest that Kingsley was responsible for keeping the 1916 committee on target to complete their mission for the newly created social studies (Krug, 1964). One significant reason may be that it is also conceivable that even more important both to Kingsley and to scholars is the fact that "...Kingsley was to engineer, almost single handedly, the Cardinal Principles Report, as a major landmark in secondary education in the United States" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 95).

Thomas Jesse Jones

Life, Career, and Committee

In *Personal*, a writing in the style of an obituary, on Thomas Jesse Jones, Carter

G. Woodson (1950) wrote:

On the fifth of January Thomas Jesse Jones, a career man in Negro life, died. He was born in Wales on August 4, 1873 and claimed relationship with Lloyd George, the premier of England during the First World War....

Jones' judgment led most Negroes to consider him an evil in the life of the Negro; but he nevertheless, catapulted into fame among the capitalists and government officials supporting the education of Negroes. (p. 107)

Woodson's view was modified indirectly to a certain extent by Correia (1994), who described Jones as having the reputation of an influential individual in the history and development of social studies. However, the African American education models designed by Jones have been considered to possess a dangerous, even sinister, theme (Ravitch, 2007). It would appear Jones' Native American education model could have received the same criticism because his models were intended for both African Americans and Native Americans. Based on this view, Jones' persona was considered indicative of a leader in education whose career success varied in degree (Correia, 1994).

However, another point of view is offered for Jones, namely, that he had become a societal "do gooder" who was also influenced by the educational reforms occurring in his era. Over time "Jones came to personify the humanitarian zeal, the supreme faith in science, and the emerging professionalism inherent in what became known as progressive education" (Kliebard, 1994, p. 6). These aspects of Thomas Jesse Jones' character were not reflected in the trilogy of reports published under the members of the 1916 committee. This view of Jones will be examined after further looking into Jones as both an individual and as chair of the 1916 committee, as well as examining the reports of the 1916 committee.

Jones' began as an immigrant from Wales, his country of origin. Jones joined family members living in Ohio. Thus, Jones' path was not through the typical immigration locations of New York or Chicago where immigrants grouped in country-oriented enclaves. Whether Jones' early experience included any instances of language or assimilation issues generally associated with immigrants is unclear. However, Jones attended school in the public education system. His schooling continued through higher education in several universities on scholarships obtained through his ministers. Along the way Jones became an ordained minister (Lybarger, 1981).

Jones' scholarship to Washington and Lee University was from a religious organization. Linking the scholarship arrangement with his on-going church activities formed the "bond of formal religious training to education [that] would continue throughout Jones's lifetime" (Correia, 1994, p. 95). Jones' Master's thesis may be his first authorship of note. The theme and tone of Jones' thesis completed in 1899 at Columbia University encompassed the idea that good citizens were those who accepted leaders in all levels of government and conducted themselves to be responsible to society and put it ahead of their personal needs. For Jones, education was the avenue to use in order to create this type of good citizen (Correia, 1994).

Jones' study of a New York City block—Block X—which comprised Jones' doctoral dissertation completed in 1904 at Columbia University, represented a reflection of Jones' ideas to that point in his career. Jones believed the schools at that time did not meet the needs of students. That is, schools needed to provide students the opportunity to learn and gain experiences for an improved life and not have students learn in isolation

(Correia, 1994). In relationship to this view, it is possible that Jones interpreted “needs” to be life acquisitions or experiences which provide the opportunity for “lower races to evolve in the Anglo-Saxon ideal” (Correia, 1994, p. 101).

Jones developed his Hampton Institute social studies program from a five article series first published in the “Southern Workman” during the span of 1905—1906. It was later published in book form in 1908. In particular, the article “Sociology and Society” has been identified as the outline for the course in sociology at Hampton. Several scholars have argued that because Jones studied under Franklin Giddings at Columbia, he subscribed to Giddings’ philosophy, became his avid student, and later became his associate. Under Giddings’ tutelage, Jones elected to conduct his study of immigrants living in a New York City urban block as his thesis. Later, Jones joined the Hampton Institute as a social studies curriculum expert. The goals of Hampton—designing and establishing course curriculums involving African Americans and Native Americans—matched with the work and philosophy of Jones (Lybarger, 1981)

Jones’ course at Hampton incorporated the use of one textbook author in particular. His textbook of choice was *The Elements of Society* by Franklin Giddings. Another text by Giddings apparently was used in Jones’ sociology course. This text was *Inductive Sociology*. The Hampton course was organized around categories that were extrapolated from Giddings: “social population, social mind, social organizations, and social welfare” (Lybarger, 1981, p. 58).

A review of Jones’ education and background appeared to determine that Jones’ ideas stemmed from two major reform initiatives of the time that became known as social

gospel and society's application of science to human affairs. Jones maintained that some of the characteristics of people he studied were undesirable, but Jones' "do-gooder" thinking may have led Jones to also determine that the same people could be educated. Based on this thought process, Jones proceeded to utilize the four mental types identified by Giddings in *Inductive Sociology* to evaluate and classify immigrants involved in his studies (Kliebard, 1994; Lybarger, 1981).

Jones' concept of social studies was not in the academic vein supporting the study of traditional history or the social sciences. Instead, it was intended to address "directly the problems faced by his students and by society at large. Jones was always careful to delineate the sources of problems of people of color" (Kliebard, 1994, p. 11). Jones' course design, therefore, was focused on practical or functional utility; namely, civics was oriented to social welfare and economics encompassed material welfare (Kliebard, 1994).

In reviewing the education and career moves of Jones prior to his chairpersonship of the 1916 committee, Correia (1994) formed the following summary.

Jones's sociological theory fitted him with the belief that ALL races were inferior to the Anglo-Saxon race. Therefore, it was logical that any education program with which Jones was associated would reflect both his sociological training and religious beliefs. (p. 105)

During his tenure as chairperson of the 1916 committee, Jones also started a full-time career in Federal government employment. Jones began as early as 1912 what became a successful association with the Phelps-Stokes Fund, which spanned 40 years. From 1912 to 1917 Jones worked on a special project for the Fund and issued what has been considered a seminal study published in 1917 by the U.S. Bureau of Education that

was titled *Negro education: A Study of the Private and Higher Education Schools for Colored People in the United States*. Ravitch (2000) portrayed Jones as a racial matters specialist. She also described Jones' *Negro Education* as an important Federal report (Ravitch, 2007). As a noted study, this publication became a report that recommended an education for African American students, which prepared them for employment as domestic employees or for general farm or labor positions. This report was considered to significantly discourage African American parents from even considering a college track for their children (Correia, 1994; Ravitch, 2007).

Several scholars cited in this study acknowledge that Jones and Clarence Kingsley were kindred or like spirits—alluding to the striking similarities of both their education and work background. This similarity may be the key reason that Clarence Kingsley, as chairperson of the CRSE, solicited Jones in 1912 to be chairperson of the 1916 committee. Kingsley's selection of Jones to chair the 1916 committee was not necessarily based on Jones's career at Hampton Institute. Most likely Kingsley's decision was reinforced by the similarity of Jones' education and work background to his own—the same decision process he used in selecting most of the other CRSE committee chairs (Correia, 1994; Kliebard, 1994).

The Writings of Jones

Thomas Jesse Jones' career in education was reflected in multiple publications prior to and during his tenure as chairperson of the 1916 committee. In Jones' (1906) book, *Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum*, he included seven chapters: (a) *Why Are They Needed?* (b) *Civics and Social Welfare*, (c) *Economics and Material Welfare*,

(d) *United States Census and Actual Conditions*, (e) *Tuberculosis Among the Negroes*, (f) *Sociology and Society*, and (g) *The Progress of the Indians*. Many of its themes rest on several influences—the work he did at the Hampton Institute, the outlines and publications of Franklin H. Giddings, a sociologist at Columbia University, and in Jones' (1904) publication of *Sociology of a New York Block*. As a result, *Social Studies in the Hampton Curriculum* considered the teaching and learning of social studies—and especially sociology—on several different levels.

In the chapter, *Why Are They Needed*, the “they” in question was actually the spectrum of the social studies subjects at the Hampton Institute. Jones reported that historically political economy, civil government, mental and moral science, general history, and the historical study of the Bible all came under the social studies umbrella taught at Hampton (Jones, 1906). The reason such subjects were taught to African Americans and Native Americans at that time, he suggested, was because “they have been suddenly transferred from an earlier form of society into a later one without the necessary time for preparation” (Jones, 1906, p. 4).

The section titled, *Civics and Social Welfare*, indicated that the civics course at Hampton was divided into three parts: (a) the origin and development of government, (b) government and public welfare, and (c) the machinery of government. Of the three, Jones stated that the section on the machinery of government—the one he claimed was most often taught in the traditional government or civics course—was the least important. The reason he expressed was the total extent of the contribution of machinery of government to the student was knowledge of government form and function that generated ideas on

the value of government and the power of democracy (Jones, 1906).

Another course at the Hampton Institute was economics. The aim of this course was to “impart knowledge of the simple principles underlying the acquisition and use of wealth” (Jones, 1906, p. 12). The following topics were listed in the course: (a) consumption or demand (b) production or supply, (c) distribution and proportion, (d) educational progress among races, (e) economic conditions between races, and (f) vital statistics and rates of increase among races.

A course at the Hampton Institute known as sociology and society was also taught. This course included subjects such as: (a) social population—including the study of the relation of population to natural features, such as fertility of soil, kind of crops, waterways, and rainfall, (b) social mind—that purported to enable students to recognize the various grades of mental and moral activities, (c) social organization—that in theory enabled the student to understand the character and efficiency of such institutions as the home, church, club, and state, and (d) social welfare—where the social well-being of a people was variously interpreted by students. Jones (1906) indicated that the “types of character” (p. 43) developed with respect to the social mind were derived from his 1904 research conducted through Columbia University which resulted in his Block X study.

Block X

Jones’ (1904) rationale for doing his study, *The Sociology of a New York City Block*, was “A previous knowledge of the people is necessary to accuracy in studying their mind and character” (p. 10). In his estimation, prior studies had incomplete results or conclusions. One reason was that those investigations were not systematic and

comprehensive when they tried to study all types of characters (Jones, 1904).

In contrast, his study was developed on a premise that is unequivocally systematic. It was designed to study the residents on a street in New York City using a system based on social principles. One reason for his specific approach is that, “Without a system the study of a people is but a wild goose-chase...” (Jones, 1904, p. 8).

The Block X study was centered on detailing and documenting what he perceived as unique differences in nationalities. Jones argued that establishing structured data to define these differences would lead to methods of addressing the education of the variety of individuals in Block X. He suggested that the public schools did not adequately meet the needs of the various nationalities due to a lack of understanding. He suggested that the level or amount of discipline applied to students was in the hands of teachers (Jones, 1904). He specifically pointed out that “Some teachers handle their pupils so as to develop independence; others manage them so that they always require a boss to direct them (Jones, 1904, p. 119).

In the Block X study, Jones (1904) indicated that the public schools at that time were failing in their teaching of students. His concern was that the teachers were not tailoring their curriculum to the different types of students in their classes. He suggested instead that public schools should be teaching courses to “develop the ideal American or ‘Anglo-Saxon’ character” (p. 131). In his opinion, public schools needed to conduct research and develop curriculum so that the students would be able to learn and adopt what he termed “American disposition” (p. 131). By way of example, he stated,

Furthermore, public teachers are so occupied with their schedule duties that they have little time to study individual defects in the personality of the children.

Consequently, such extreme types as the Jews and the Italians are educated in an almost identical manner. The nervous, flitting, uncertain little Italian receives the same treatment as the steady, persevering, plodding little Jew. (p. 131)

Jones' Influence

Hertzberg (1981) wrote succinctly about Jones' role on the 1916 committee by noting that Thomas Jesse Jones, "who had been on the staff of Hampton Institute for blacks and a few Indians" (p. 25), was chair, and is also most likely responsible for naming the committee which, according to Hertzberg, became the "Committee on the Social Studies" (p. 25).

Over time, Jones has consistently been noted for his chairpersonship of the 1916 committee. He has been recognized as the author of the *1913 Preliminary Statement*. He has been portrayed as the author of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. However, Arthur W. Dunn has also been awarded the authorship status of the 1916 Report (Correia, 1994; Lybarger, 1981; Nelson, 1994). Therefore, Jones' authorship the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is in doubt and so is the level of his influence on the final report.

Arthur W. Dunn

Life, Career, and Committee

Arthur W. Dunn has been singled out as an example of the 1916 committee members who were representative of educational and sociological ideas that differed from Thomas Jesse Jones. In general, Jones' perspective diverged significantly from other members of the 1916 committee. This idea, in part, is supported by the fact that Dunn graduated from the University of Chicago. The environment at that university

apparently did not involve the positivism and evolutionary constraints professed by Giddings at Columbia (Correia, 1994).

Dunn's *The Community and the Citizen*, published in 1907 presented radical innovations for the subject of civics (Wesley, 1937). The premise of his book surrounded the student's involvement in community activities or civic endeavors. He argued that civics, as a process to teach students, needed to be dynamic and not static. He stated, "It is a mistake to think that the school is merely a place to prepare for life, it is life" (Dunn, 1907, p. 125). It appeared that differing versions of Dunn's text were prepared for the culminating elementary grades as opposed to the secondary schools. However, it appeared that a definitive dividing point between elementary and secondary usage was not very clear (Wesley, 1937).

To some extent Dunn enjoyed a more prominent role than other 1916 committee members. Dunn served on the special committee that wrote the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. Subsequently, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was compiled under Dunn as its secretary (Kliebard, 1994). Because Dunn served as chief secretary of the 1916 committee, and because he is acknowledged as the report compiler, he is considered influential in the work of the 1916 committee (Nelson, 1994).

While not necessarily considered in most accounts as an originator of social studies, Dunn was significant to the trail of the development of social studies. Dunn might have been the motivator behind the idea of community civics as opposed to civics. As will be discussed in the writings of Dunn, apparently, a connection has been found to exist between Dunn's views and the ideas of Dewey (Saxe, 1991).

The Writings of Dunn

Almost a decade prior to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, Dunn (1907) authored *The Community and the Citizen*. A review of Dunn's preface indicates that the book was designed to represent a departure from the traditional teaching of the subject he termed as civics. Dunn was concerned with the development of citizenship. He believed that the current traditional method of teaching civics failed to create and instill in students the meaning of being a member of the community and becoming an active citizen. In referencing a change in the teaching of civics, Dunn pointed out that the pedagogical method of observation, analysis and inference was used in his new book. He also believed it was important to begin the teaching of civics in the elementary grades and to continue it through secondary education.

In addition, under a section titled "Suggestions to the Teacher" (p. vi), Dunn (1907) emphasized that teachers needed to do their homework, that is, to really learn and understand the content of his or her specific text. In addition, he expressed that teachers should be prepared to present the content with "spirit." He stated, for the teacher's benefit,

No better preparation can be made for the use of the text in the spirit in which it is intended than by a careful reading of Professor Dewey's "Ethical Principles Underlying Education"...and also "The School and Society" by the same author. (p. vi)

Further, in a passage reminiscent of Dewey's notion of "immediate interest," Dunn offered In support of the pedagogical method he applied in his text: "...the surest way to kindle and maintain the child's interest is to build on his own experience, passing constantly from the facts of his experience to related facts just beyond his experience, and

back again to his own experience” (p. vi).

Dunn (1907) also pointed out to teachers that he included study aids at the end of each chapter. These aids were to assist the student in the study of community life in his own backyard. Dunn believed this would be a benefit to the teachers but also would give them license to modify or substitute as they deemed necessary. He expressed the opinion that the students needed to be exposed to readings and other information, including local newspapers, in the teaching of civics. He delegated to teachers the responsibility for creating a class that is even more current and more relevant to the student than he believed his own textbook could supply.

The chapters in Dunn’s (1907) text followed a progression from definitions of a community, people and families in a community, to the various areas in which the community aids the citizen. This included the topics of health, life and property, business life, transportation, knowledge, religion, beautiful neighborhoods, self-government, and government. In his chapter on knowledge, for instance, Dunn taught that the avenue for the community to aid citizens was through education.

With the community held responsible for providing education, Dunn also believed that the cost of education should be considered a means or method to exchange for the development of good citizenship. Dunn stated that there were two primary ways for the schools to train students for citizenship: (a) through a course of instruction that revealed to students their various roles throughout life by providing levels of information and developing avenues of analysis, and (b) through the realization that the school setting was representative of life and could, therefore, train the student for citizenship. In Dunn’s

view, the school was synonymous with community, which translated into larger community relationships. His idea was that the school should be elevated from just a place to be as a student into living life both as a student and as a community member (Dunn, 1907).

Nevertheless, while it appeared that Dunn's apparent Deweyan progressive education notions were reflected throughout his text, it should be noted that the overall tone reflected his belief the role of the school was to inculcate students with what he believed were the attributes of a good citizen. This is particularly shown in a section that indicated concern about the effect of citizens who could not or would not be good citizens in the community. His text outlined how the community could either aid or control citizens. Dunn accomplished this by classifying citizens into three categories or types that he identified as: (a) defectives—those who are physically or mentally unable to contribute positively to the community, (b) dependents—those who are physically able but are not self-supporting and need community support, and (c) criminals—those who are violators of the law (Dunn, 1907).

Dunn's Influence

Arthur Dunn numbers in the group of notable 1916 committee members. He served as secretary for the 1916 committee during the preparation of the 1916 Report and has been recorded as the report compiler for the 1916 committee (Nelson, 1994). In addition, records exist in which Dunn indicated he actually wrote the *1916 Report on Social Studies* (Lybarger, 1981; Nelson, 1994). Nevertheless, as the author of the first textbook on community civics, Dunn has been considered the major contributor to, and

advocate of, the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. As such, he has been recognized as a strong supporter of social efficiency in education (Nelson, 1994; Saxe, 1991).

J. Lynn Barnard

Life, Career, and Committee

J. Lynn Barnard became associated with the 1916 committee at its outset. His first appointment was to the special committee assigned to research and study civics. At some point, he joined the entire body of 1916 committee and worked on the production of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Barnard completed his Ph.D. dissertation at the University of Pennsylvania in 1897 under the title of “Factory Legislation in Pennsylvania: A Study in Social Politics.” At that time, Barnard demonstrated a concern with social welfare and improvement. Barnard also taught at their School of Pedagogy during this same time. A relationship between Barnard and Robert Ellis Thompson was been drawn (Lybarger, 1981). Thompson was considered the only early social scientist who devoted most of his career to teaching at the University of Pennsylvania. Lybarger suggested that Thompson’s approach to social science both influenced Barnard and was reflected in the School of Pedagogy curriculum at the University of Pennsylvania (Lybarger, 1981).

In 1911, the American Political Science Association (APSA) formed a group of individuals to serve on its new Committee on Instruction. Barnard was nominated as a member. This committee worked together with the U.S. Bureau of Education to conduct a study that solicited information directly from schools. Wesley observed that due to some

of the individuals serving on this committee, taking note of the contents and tone of its recommendations, that a possible connection could be drawn between this APSA committee and the 1916 committee (Wesley, 1937). There were definite similarities.

Barnard apparently held a personal goal of establishing civics as a mainstay within the history subject in schools, but not to the detriment of traditional history. He believed that the teaching of civil government needed to be replaced with community civics and that the civics that existed in the curriculum should not be taught as a part of history (Saxe, 1991).

The Writings of Barnard

In September 1916—the same year that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was issued—Barnard (1916) penned and published an article titled *Training in the Schools for Civic Efficiency*. As a basis for his article, Barnard took the position that up to that point schools had not been teaching civics in a manner that produced an attitude of “civic efficiency” in students. However, he acknowledged that schools had recognized this deficiency and were in the process of changing. Using the traditional term civics as opposed to community civics, Barnard noted that in his opinion this type of course came into being much earlier, perhaps after the Civil War. However, he further claimed that the course had been poorly developed and remained undeveloped. Thus, it made sense to Barnard that a traditional civics course would be criticized by all groups battling for the American curriculum. He stated, “A course so lacking in interest for pupil and teacher alike, and so valueless as a means of real civic training, could hardly fail to be attacked from all sides” (p. 27). He concluded that educators were now motivated to initiate “new

civics” under a two-fold premise. The first would be cultural and allow the student to learn about his environment. However, the second would be practical and allow the student to train for citizenship (Barnard, 1916).

In discussing civics in secondary education, Barnard (1916) noted that it was wholly inadequate—barely more than a repetition of elementary school—and needed to be changed. At this point, Barnard apparently coined what he considered to be the new term of social science to replace civics. He proposed that social science would lead to a richly enhanced civics curriculum. It appears that he believed that social science could be taught as both interesting and important because it would be problem based. Barnard stated,

Social science will include the elements of social theory—economic, political, sociological—with constant illustration and application to the concrete problems of life. All the practical civics and the socialized history that the school has found time for must be drawn upon as a basis, no matter what the method of approach that shall finally be adopted. (p. 32)

Barnard (1916) viewed the goal of teaching social science as not encompassing rote memory. Instead, he believed the goal should be to create the ability and desire to learn and understand society and its surroundings. He concluded that his proposed social science curriculum would also move beyond the practical. The reason was that it would provide training involving the “powers of observation and demand a fair modicum of close, consecutive thinking” (p. 33). Barnard argued that new social science studies would set the path for schools to positively change the training for civic efficiency and lead the way toward achieving his stated goals for new civics.

Barnard (1916) suggested that the goal of the new civics was to become a solution

for the teaching and learning of a broad scope civics curriculum. He apparently believed the new civics reflected the interrelated nature of ever expanding communities and also captured the interest of the students. He proposed that the teaching of civics in elementary schools could result in students learning how their future possibilities might be increased by completing high school. Indeed, he viewed the civics curriculum as the way for students to gain a high regard for hard work no matter which career path (trade or professional). This ideal of hard work was especially important to Barnard because he viewed the alternative to be acquiring the tendency to become inefficient and lazy.

Barnard's Influence

J. Lynn Barnard was considered a very influential member of the 1916 committee. He was known as a political scientist and professor of pedagogy. However, he has also been called a history professor (Saxe, 1991). He, like other 1916 committee members, was involved in charity work. In addition, being one of the four authors of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, However, the ideas and recommendations in his 1916 article may be seen as a positive reflection of his several years' participation as an active member of the 1916 committee (Lybarger, 1981; Tryon, 1935).

James Harvey Robinson

Life, Career, and Committee

Prior to the formation of the 1916 committee, James Harvey Robinson had gained recognition and prestige as a noted historian. In particular, he was an author and co-author of history textbooks for secondary schools. Indeed, according to records, two of

his high school texts sold over a million copies (Hendricks, 1946). This is quite an astonishing number for those times. More important to the purposes of the 1916 committee, Robinson had acquired a reputation as the foremost proponent of “the new history” (Krug, 1964) which became the title of his most well known book. Thomas Jesse Jones stated during an interview with a researcher on April 3, 1945, “Robinson was selected to be a member of the committee because of his leadership in advocating more attention to contemporaneous life and less attention to the remote facts” (Hendricks, 1946, p. 61). The leading intellectual influence on the 1916 committee may well have been Robinson, the author of *The New History* (Jenness, 1990).

James Harvey Robinson had been a member of the 1893 NEA Committee. A significant elapse of time occurred until the initiation of the next NEA committee, which evolved into the CRSE, and its numerous subject-oriented committees. The 1916 committee, which developed a new focus well beyond the Committee of Ten, allowed Robinson to once again exert effort to directly impact history in education. Robinson apparently moved to the forefront of the 1916 committee because he was motivated and determined to have the recommendations of this committee become noteworthy and accepted (Hendricks, 1946). Robinson was a valuable 1916 committee member who strongly influenced the work and recommendations that emanated from the 1916 committee (Krug, 1964; Saxe, 1991).

One reason was that during the time of the 1916 committee, a tremendous change was underway in the secondary schools. This was precipitated in large part by the significant increase in the number of high school students. Up to that point in time,

secondary education had been designed to prepare small numbers of select students to go to college. Robinson was among other 1916 committee members who recognized that their task on the committee involved developing a type of general education for the large number of students who were entering the high school—including those who did not plan to go to college. This task was further challenged by the incoming wave of immigrants' children attempting to merge with the children and ideologies of long-time residents.

No doubt, Robinson welcomed this opportunity. He indicated his on-going concern with society's reluctance to examine and use history in order to think and to effect change (Robinson, 1912). Robinson had adopted the position that "He was repelled by what appeared wasteful, unjust, regimented, or standardized" (Hendricks, 1946, p. 23). The 1916 committee represented an avenue that Robinson would use, and use well, toward fulfilling his goals for the new history.

The Writings of Robinson

When *The New History* was published, Robinson (1912) was aware that society had a fixation with scientific management and social efficiency. This was especially true for those who supported the idea that these concepts would enhance education. Yet, Robinson believed society's fascination with scientific management and social efficiency neglected aspects of the cultural, political, and social dimensions of being human. Indeed, rather than support a bottom-line profit motivated agenda without concern for human cost, Robinson asked why industry could not strike a balance between making a reasonable profit while also attending to the growth of the worker through the promotion of humanism, aspects of mental discipline, and social meliorism in the workplace.

This is particularly apparent when Robinson (1912) described the interaction of the assembly-line worker with his or her employer. He did not paint the worker as an efficient link in the industrial cog, or even as a victim of top-down processes that enveloped the worker under the umbrella of social efficiency, which he considered a hindrance to the individual's mental capacities. Instead, Robinson took the opportunity to illustrate what could be accomplished with the human spirit through the study of history if reason, mental discipline, a humanistic rationale, and notions of social meliorism were applied to the manufacturing process.

One reason Robinson (1912) believed history could be expanded in order to improve the human condition was timing. At the turn of the 20th century, developments were occurring in the fields of anthropology, economics, psychology, and sociology. These emerging disciplines, it was believed, would allow people to understand the origins, progress and prospects of the human race in ways that had never before been possible. At the same time, Robinson recognized that historians still viewed history as a static entity. This, he suggested, rendered historians unable to respond to rapidly changing social environments. In response, Robinson argued that history itself had to evolve. Thus, Robinson proposed a new approach to the teaching and learning of history.

Robinson (1912) suggested that within the realm of history there was room for the complexity of human events. Indeed, rather than follow the manner in which historians had attempted to refine their methods through the traditional ways of accumulating, criticizing and assimilating new material, Robinson's purpose was to engage traditional notions of history with the emerging social sciences. What was needed, according to

Robinson, was the unprecedented approach of applying a scientific approach to the study of history in a way that had never been tried.

For instance, Robinson (1912) suggested this be accomplished by negotiating the difficult business of applying scientific principles to the subject in a manner that would bring all people—including what he called common pupils—into the educational policy making process through the application of equalitarian principles. For instance, Robinson advocated that history and the social sciences be used to answer questions that met the “modern needs and demands” of “our boys and girls.” According to Robinson, this approach would commence with historical narratives that discard the “facts that are not worth while” and concentrate on “those things that are best worth telling” (p. 137).

Robinson’s new history was so highly regarded that an extensive quote from Robinson was included in the *1913 Preliminary Statement* as its narrative for the subject of history.

In part, it stated,

No one questions the inalienable right of the historian to interest himself in any phase of the past that he chooses. It is only to be wished that a greater number of historians had greater skill in hitting upon those phases of the past which serve us best in understanding the most vital problems of the present. (U. S. Bureau of Education, 1913, p. 24)

Robinson’s Influence

Robinson’s new history concepts recognized the comprehensive quality of history as a subject and established the need to closely coordinate it with the family of social science disciplines. He identified history as obligated to draw facts from past events and years in order to begin to solve modern day issues. Robinson believed that by explaining the beginnings and back stories of existing beliefs and traditions, history would facilitate

individuals to think and reason out adjustments to make in a rapidly changing world environment (Hendricks, 1946). It has been noted that John Dewey, while teaching at Columbia, benefited and learned from close association with several professors, particularly from social science. James Harvey Robinson was one of these close associates (Westbrook, 1991)

In turn, Robinson's concepts were a direct influence on the other 1916 committee members (Evans, 2004; Hendricks, 1946; Saxe, 1991). Indeed, Hendricks (1946) stated: "The many direct quotations from *The New History* reveal that the members of the committees had been influenced by its ideas and that the members were of the belief that it contained the best statement of the philosophy of history appropriate to our times" (p. 63). Later, Barr, Barth, and Shermis (1978) summed Robinson's persona and influence with: "such eminent historians as...James Harvey Robinson set out to see that history was to be taught in the schools and taught well" (p. 68).

William H. Mace

Life, Career, and Committee

William Mace was known as a professional university historian. Yet, at the time of the formation of the 1916 committee, he was retired (Saxe, 1991). Still, as a member of the 1916 committee, Mace (1902) much like Robinson (1912), did not represent a voice or an approach for the continuation of existing educational policies or even traditional historical thought. Rather, he became a major contributor to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* by way of his developing principles to structure the study of subjects.

This represented a break with the traditional notions of how history should be learned and taught.

Mace was considered a less than prolific writer among the 1916 committee members, especially when compared to Robinson (Saxe, 1991). The theory that Mace presented in his *Study on History* in 1902 was adopted for use by the 1916 committee. Mace (1902) believed that knowledge, that is, the extent of knowledge to be gained by a student, was open ended. When a particular subject was studied, the process of doing so involved the discovery of principles that could be used as study guides for students. Applying this methodology allowed the students to be more efficient, more productive in learning. This technique was a significant improvement over covering a text from beginning to end in absolute page number order. Mace's principle for study was consistently applied throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies* (Saxe, 1991).

The Writings of Mace

In addition, in a manner similar to James Harvey Robinson and some other 1916 committee members, rather than support the notion of top-down decision making—the essence of social efficiency and scientific management concepts—Mace was an early proponent of developing and supporting teachers to enable them to conduct their subjects in the classroom. Mace (1902) did not believe that school administrators should be assigned that role. The reason was that Mace believed that teachers need the autonomy to make instantaneous decisions in the classroom. This is particularly true when presented in the context of traditional classroom resources. The historical textbooks of his day first tended to cover military exploits, especially with respect to Native Americans. Eventually

the texts made a transition from covering less war, and more political events. At the time of his writing, textbooks were beginning to deal with the life of a people in the process of their growth. However, he believed the texts still did not provide a complete understanding of historical information

The problem with traditional notions of teaching and learning in history was that it did not often account for real life. For instance, Mace (1902) suggested that in life, one could find five phases that would apply to all civilizations: (a) political, as represented by government institutions, (b) religious, as demonstrated by churches, (c) education and culture, encompassed by schools, (d) industrial, which included occupations and work skills, and (e) social, which were contained in family life. The institutions involved in these five phases “have become great crystallized centers of life around which the thoughts and feelings of people grow” (p. 11).

Mace (1902) believed that the teaching and learning of history should include the concept of history as a living organism. That is, historical figures and events should not be presented merely as data. Rather, they should be presented in a manner that would give the student an understanding of the motives, thinking, and resulting actions that would carry forward and have an effect on subsequent times. He believed that history curriculum played a much larger role in education than mere dates, faces, and places. Mace represented the position that history as course work should explain events and personalities with a view toward learning how to approach future community, nation and world life experiences. Prior to his service on the 1916 committee, Mace provided an illustration of how this could be accomplished.

In *A School History of the United States*, Mace (1904) put the theory articulated in his 1902 methods text into practice. His 1904 elementary history text was both friendly and challenging to the elementary student in the learning process. The text encompassed aspects of historical narratives that were contrary to the manner in which history was often presented in the classroom. For instance, Mace utilized a chronological order simply as a tool to maintain continuity in order to relate history. He advised the teacher and student to observe historical dates as a frame of reference. Memorization and recitation was not a part of this teaching and learning method.

Even though Mace (1904) promoted the concept of a text with a friendly approach, it is interesting to see that he also offered the student challenges by providing essential study guides and study questions. His intent was to create an expanded and higher level of learning that the student would still perceive as friendly. This was carried throughout his textbook. His theory was contained within his conclusion that:

We have studied about the great things that it has done, the noble history it has made, and the lofty principles it has established.... Year by year, we shall each have an increasing opportunity to play a part in determining what the future history of our country shall be; if we have profited by the study of its past, we shall not be unworthy of its future. (p. 466)

Mace's Influence

One should not overlook the influence that Mace may have had on the outcomes of the 1916 committee. While “a less prolific writer,” Mace was certainly published and noted for his textbooks. It is not hard to imagine that his approach to teaching and learning in history was seen as consistent with Robinson's in the eyes of the 1916 committee. Mace's approach to history education paralleled that of Robinson in many

respects. The one notable exception was the impact of social science knowledge which was in its beginning stages and which Robinson was in a position to begin adapting. Mace, on the other hand was retired. This, however, did not diminish the influence and value of Mace's approaches to the deliberations of the 1916 committee as evidenced by their use of his principle for study throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies* (Saxe, 1991).

John Dewey

Influential but Invisible

John Dewey was not a member of the 1916 committee. However, before, during, and subsequent to the tenure of the 1916 committee, Dewey was regarded as a leading educator, and in particular an educational philosopher (Hertzberg, 1981; Westbrook, 1991). As a result, Dewey's brand of principles and educational philosophy was of benefit to the 1916 committee in their development of teaching principles for the newly created social studies. Rather than risk paraphrasing and making Dewey's practical teaching methodology unclear, the 1916 committee relied on his principles in their recommendations and in their use of direct, verbatim quotations of his philosophy throughout the body of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* was replete with reflections, examples, and recommendations the 1916 committee deemed most advantageous for the purposes of secondary education. These recommendations cumulatively called for the adoption of a problem solution method and the selection of study topics that met both the students'

immediate interests as well as social significance in the teaching and learning of social studies. Therefore, it can be argued that their ideas for formatting the new social studies were drafted straight from Dewey's educational playbook.

Lybarger (1987) chose not to include views of Dewey in his work. However, he did briefly call attention to the 1916 committee's adoption of the immediate needs principle by stating that they "claimed the work of John Dewey as warrant for their principle" (Lybarger, 1987, p. 177). Saxe (1991) adopted a more direct view. He indicated that the 1916 committee's primary principle was indeed Dewey's needs and interests principle for education. This factor made "Dewey another important though somewhat passive contributor [to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*]" (Saxe, 1991, p. 168).

Yet, when it came to determining which philosophy from the competing camps vying for the American curriculum Dewey embraced during the time of the 1916 committee, Kliebard (2004) believed it was unclear. On the one hand Kliebard suggested Dewey viewed the various curriculum reform groups that emerged at the end of the 19th century as not desirable options for education. On the other hand Kliebard believed these groups provided Dewey with the raw material for his own educational research and reflection. To further muddy the waters, Kliebard suggested Dewey used the same terms, such as social efficiency, as his contemporaries. However, Dewey's ideas stemmed from different intentions and goals. Kliebard wrote "while competing interest groups eagerly looked to him for support and leadership, Dewey's own position in critical matters of theory and doctrine actually represented a considerable departure from the main line of

any of the established movements” (p. 26).

One of Dewey’s stances, which were very different from these groups, can be seen in his own statement.

It must be borne in mind that ultimately social efficiency means neither more nor less than capacity to share in a give and take of experience. It covers all that make’s one’s own experience more worthwhile to others, and all that enables one to participate more richly in the worthwhile experiences of others. Ability to produce and to enjoy art, capacity for recreation, the significant utilization of leisure, are more important elements in it than elements conventionally associated oftentimes with citizenship. (Dewey, 1916, p. 141).

Thus, Dewey was not central to any single reform group. Kliebard (2004) suggested that Dewey selectively chose interpretations and reconstructed some of the ideals available from the various groups competing for influence in the American curriculum. This most likely accounted for scholars identifying Dewey with multiple reform groups. At the end of the day, Kliebard argued that “Dewey’s position in curriculum matters is best seen, not as directly allied to any of the competing interest groups, but as something of an integration and especially, a transformation of the ideas they were advocating” (p. 26).

Volumes of literature have been written about John Dewey. This includes writings by a wide range of scholars resulting in varying assessments of his life’s work and the level of impact he may have had. In general, Dewey has been widely recognized as one of the 20th century’s most well known and highly regarded American educators.

Throughout his life, Dewey maintained a very broad focus on issues and concerns in the areas of philosophy, education and politics. Both during his lifetime and since his death, the scholars who have read Dewey’s works have continuously interpreted and

reinterpreted Dewey's views and ideas. As closely as Dewey's works have been followed by educators and scholars, it is difficult to ascertain the reasons why his ideas were not brought forth into classrooms across the country. Yet, across the board, Dewey's educational philosophy remains relevant to education. After all, Dewey wrote: "the teacher is engaged not simply in the training of individuals, but in the formation of the proper social life" (Dewey, 1897, p. 80).

In addition to his own teaching endeavors—primarily in philosophy—at several universities, Dewey was an active participant on an ongoing basis in a wide range of educational, social, and political issues. These experiences and his personal involvement with an experimental elementary school, while at the University of Chicago, formed the background that helped Dewey develop his educational and philosophical ideas that were disseminated in his many articles and books. Dewey was particularly concerned with developing a fundamental philosophy of education. He wrote, "If we are willing to conceive of education as the process of forming fundamental dispositions, intellectual and emotional, toward nature and fellow men, philosophy may even be defined *as the general theory of education*" (Dewey, 1916, p. 328).

To Dewey, schooling was the platform from which intellectual development as well as social change was to occur. That is, he believed schooling should not only embrace the democratic process, it should promote democracy itself by embodying the principles of democracy as a showcase of how a working and evolving society changes over time. This could be accomplished by making "each one of our schools an embryonic community life, active with types of occupations that reflect the life of the larger society

and permeated throughout with the spirit of art, history, and science” (Dewey, 1899, p. 27). In turn, the foundation of a democratic community required educated individuals who possessed reasoning methods that allowed for rigorous, thoughtful academic inquiry. For instance, Dewey wrote, “There is indeed no magic by which mere physical activity or deft manipulation will secure intellectual results” (Dewey, 1910, p. 168). Thus, schooling and education, in Dewey’s belief, was the open door to intellectual development and social development within the community.

Dewey placed his focus on the pedagogy of schools. His design for a school community was a curriculum based on addressing children’s present interests, not only in a motivational way, but, as a method of teaching “the essential relationship between human knowledge and social experience” (Apple & Teitelbaum, 2001, p. 180). His embryonic or miniature version of democratic society—as schooling itself—was in sharp contrast to the factory model of schooling in vogue at the time. This perspective was opposite to the ideas being proposed for schools that positioned students as essentially open books to be formed into future citizens by rote teaching methods absent of any social or moral content. Rather than recommend courses that differentiated between those that were aligned with college entrance requirements and those that were designed solely for vocational education, Dewey believed both should be available for all students. Rather than supporting a top-down curriculum, Dewey believed teachers were capable of designing their own bottom-up curriculum. Dewey also advocated experimentation in the curriculum. He was opposed to so-called “expert” control of the curriculum. As a result, Dewey envisioned the school as a micro-version of the community that could be capable

of supporting the growth of democracy in spite of the stresses caused by an increasingly industrialized society.

Dewey was clear in outlining that the teacher's role was to help establish a link between the child's interest and ongoing intellectual growth as well as his or her experiences. This perspective maintained an experimental and present oriented posturing. According to Dewey, educators have a twofold responsibility: "First, that the problem grows out of the conditions of the experience being had in the present, and that it is within the range of the capacity of students, and secondly, that it is such that it arouses in the learner an active quest for information and for production of new ideas" (Dewey, 1938, p. 79). As a result, Dewey was opposed to blueprints for teaching fixed social beliefs. Instead, he advocated developing solutions to social problems by applying creative and reasoned inquiry based on conditions found in present student experiences.

Dewey has received accolades for his educational philosophy and reasoned, yet creative, approach to the development of curriculum that has survived the test of time. The 1916 committee may have been a group of educators well ahead of the curriculum curve. That is, they may have determined that Dewey's ideas for education brought the creativity and the enduring platform for an emphasis on knowledge growth that they determined was needed for the newly created subject of social studies.

The author believes that Dewey's influence transcended the multiple societal issues and challenges confronting the 1916 committee. The trilogy of reports published under the umbrella of the 1916 committee address the complexities of developing a new social studies subject but each stands alone in purpose. It may be argued that the 1916

committee's final and third report resolved their concerns for the newly created social studies by embracing and imbedding the philosophy of John Dewey through many of their recommendations. The author believes it is not only warranted but it is important to include John Dewey and the impact he had on the deliberations of the 1916 committee in this study

Conclusion

I presented the idea that the 1916 committee adopted a decidedly historical approach. Indeed, I have argued and provided evidence that it was Robinson who was instrumental in separating the 1916 committee from any outcomes of the Committee of Seven and led them in creating new outcomes for this new social studies subject (Saxe, 1991).

Quite separate from this idea, however, a theme of connectivity has been used by some scholars to trace the academic background of Kingsley, Jones, Arey, Dunn and Howe to sociologists Franklin H. Giddings, George Vincent, and Albion Small. All these identified 1916 committee members, except Dunn, studied under Giddings at Columbia. Dunn was a student of both Vincent and Small at the University of Chicago. Dewey was also influenced by Vincent and Small (Cremin, 1961). The more influential Jones, Kingsley and Dunn—leaving out Aery and Howe—are thought to lend a sociological outlook to the 1916 committee.

Nevertheless, the 1916 committee looked favorably to Robinson and his views of the new history. Robinson wanted the 1916 committee to rethink, reexamine, experiment

and utilize their initiative to be able to develop the new social studies (Saxe, 1991).

A critical question to pose regarding the 1916 committee's work is: How influential were Thomas Jesse Jones and Clarence Darwin Kingsley in preparing the reports of the 1916 committee? A follow-up question becomes what other 1916 committee members presented an influence on their deliberations? The ultimate question then becomes which 1916 committee members actually influenced their final recommendations for the new social studies in secondary education? And what about the influence of Dewey as a nonmember?

The 1916 committee members strived for a final document that was both practical and flexible—one that would become a tool for teachers (Evans, 2004, p. 29). As a group, these developers of the new social studies gave a voice and an emphasis to many issues of concern that had been arising from the various social reform movements for decades prior to the work of the 1916 committee. It is unfortunate that no known notes or records of the 1916 committee members' discussions or deliberations exist to reveal more personalized insight to their actions and inter-actions (Evans, 2004). However, based on the concern regarding the impact of immigrants, the influence of social efficiency concepts, as well as the influence of Robinson and Dewey as evidenced in the 1916 committee's trilogy of reports, we can surmise that the 1916 committee was very representative of a microcosm of Kliebard's (2004) competing camps.

CHAPTER III

THE REPORTS

Introduction

The design, format, and content of what has become known as the 1916 Report is presented in this chapter. The colloquially titled 1916 Report will be dissected into its actual three individual reports, which are separated, by time frame, intent, and topic. The reports are differentiated and discussed individually. One important factor is that each report has distinct and separate authorship. For ease and continuity of readability, this dissertation uses the following titles for the three reports of the trilogy: the *1913 Preliminary Statement*, the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, and the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

1913 Preliminary Statement

Introduction

The *1913 Preliminary Statement* of chairperson of the committee on social studies was made part of the publication of preliminary reports prepared by the chairmen of each of the CRSE committees. Officially, this publication is known as U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1913, No. 41. Thomas Jesse Jones, as chairperson of the Committee on Social Studies, was the sole signatory on the *1913 Preliminary Statement* as presented and published under the umbrella of the CRSE. Jones' preliminary statement was third on the table of contents listing nine other subjects and Kingsley's statement of the

chairperson of the Committee on the Articulation of High School and College.

The entire group of CRSE committee reports was published under a letter of transmittal from The Department of the Interior, U.S. Bureau of Education, dated September 23, 1913, and signed by P. P. Claxton, Commissioner. His letter explained the need to address “the problem of secondary education,” acknowledged that “this bureau [of education] has no specialists in secondary education,” and “welcomes all the more heartily” the CRSE’s cooperation (p. 5). Claxton set the goal for the CRSE to research and search the entire country for the best advice and ideas for improving aims and methods for secondary education. The transmittal letter advised that the CRSE was to publish a final report as a revision to this bulletin.

1913 Preliminary Statement

At the outset, the title of this first report of the trilogy that comprised the complete set of reports by the 1916 committee was immediately footnoted. Attached to the title, Footnote 1 clearly stated that the term “social studies” was used to include history, civics, and economics. Under the sub-title, “The Point of View,” the *1913 Preliminary Statement* delineated not only the need for the new subject of social studies, but differentiated the new subject using an expanded goal from the existing, or old, subject considered as traditional civics. To this effect, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* stated, “Good citizenship should be the aim of social studies in the high school” (p. 16). In addition, it stated, “Facts, conditions, theories, and activities that do not contribute rather directly to the appreciation of methods of human betterment have no claim” (p. 17).

By way of explanation, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* provided an extensive list

of topical items to be included under social studies. This list was identified in order not to simply teach the student how a bill becomes law or how the President is elected. Rather, the list emphasized the opportunity to use social studies more effectively to teach topics such as community education, public recreation, human rights versus property rights, and what is described as the selfish conservation of tradition, to name a few. However, it is important to note that a caveat was added to the list: “Long as the foregoing list is, it is quite apparent that many more vital topics could be added” (p. 17). This broad scope vision for the new subject of social studies apparently was expressly geared to give the student (a) a clue to the significance of these topics, and (b) to create a desire in students to know more about their environment.

The *1913 Preliminary Statement* highlighted the importance of this new subject in order to: (a) make a contribution to the social welfare of the community, and (b) allow the “boy and girl” to be a constructive member of the social group. History was presented separately and challenged as the topic that “must answer the test of good citizenship” (p.17). It stated that in order to realize the social studies aims just presented, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* proposed five units of social studies: a community civics topic, three history topics, and an economics and civic theory topic.

The *1913 Preliminary Statement* qualified the term “civics” as including the spectrum of possible activities of individuals, private organizations, or government. The purpose of developing a community civics course was to make students aware of civic conditions in their own communities. Community civics courses, therefore, would start as early as possible with the elementary grades. An extensive quotation from an article by J.

Lynn Barnard supported this concept by describing methods applied in his practice school—fifth to eighth grades—in Philadelphia. He believed his methods proved successful in these grades. To some extent, the general tenor of Barnard’s school was emphasized by noting that the more general term “community” was used to replace the word government. By doing so, an important concept, according to Barnard, was impressed upon the students that they were “now citizens of various communities, namely, the home, the school, the playground, the church, the city, the State, the Nation” (p. 19). This, in turn, involved students in a series of studies to discover how the community helped “the normal citizen” with issues involving “life, health, property, working and business conditions, transportation and communication, education, recreation, [and] religious worship” (p. 19). Then, Barnard’s approach engaged students in a “brief study of how the community takes care of its subnormal citizens, usually referred to as the dependents, the defectives, and the delinquents” (p. 19).

Barnard’s article stressed that textbooks were not used until the seventh and eighth grades. However, he highlighted that “a helpful textbook has been found which admirably illustrates the newer civics” (p. 20). Dunn’s textbook “*The Community and the Citizen*” (p. 20) was a good illustration of the new approach to civics. His conclusion offered that a desired outcome of this instructional method would eliminate superficial teaching practices such as memorizing historical documents—apparently in vogue during that time. He also anticipated that another positive outcome would take place through the interplay of the community acting with government and the citizens. Barnard suggested that the result was to liberate teachers who sought methods of revising courses of study.

The *1913 Preliminary Statement* indicated flexibility should be built into teaching the new social studies civics in the sense that “The subject matter of community civics will vary with the community in which the school is located” (p. 21). This flexibility surfaced in a proposed “Survey of Vocations” course. Its contents were written by William A. Wheatley, a 1916 committee member, as a description of a course under his supervision at Middleton High School in Connecticut. Wheatley detailed a half-year course in vocations. The outline of this course was intended to acquaint the student with most, if not all, the vocations or employment opportunities available within the sphere of their community. The course covered background information and other factors besides qualifications for the vocations presented. Wheatley indicated in the *1913 Preliminary Statement* the course was successful. He concluded with a recommendation that his “Survey of Vocations” course be taught in all high schools. After all, Wheatley reasoned, high schools “are the people’s elementary colleges” (p. 22).

The *1913 Preliminary Statement* opened a section on history with the announcement that the 1916 committee was relying on and deferring to James Harvey Robinson to address this part of the new social studies. Robinson was a member of the 1916 committee and one of the most prominent historians of his time (Barr et al., 1978; Hendricks, 1946; Whelan, 1991). In typical fashion, Robinson eloquently wrote his section of the *1913 Preliminary Statement* endorsing the adoption and/or adaptation of a new history. First, in support of his position, Robinson suggested that teaching and learning in history should involve historians who “would look back on the past for explanations of what he found most interesting in the present and would endeavor to

place his readers in a position to participate intelligently in the life of their own time” (p. 23). Second, he recognized that historians established methods of teaching history which a “new history” approach did not need to dramatically change—but change was needed to be more effective. Both these concepts form the basis of Robinson’s new history format of using past issues to reach understanding of current problems. Robinson explained: “No one questions the inalienable right of the historian to interest himself in any phase of the past that he chooses. It is only to be wished that a greater number of historians had greater skill in hitting upon those phases of the past which serve us best in understanding the most vital problems of the present” (p. 24).

Based on Robinson’s views on teaching and learning of history, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* included a recommendation that the 1916 committee identify skilled historians to begin the process of developing and experimenting with material for phases of history they determined useful to high school students that met Robinson’s criteria. The plan called for reviewing and referring this new coursework to high school history teachers to be used on a trial basis.

The subject of economics was covered in a statement written by Henry R. Burch, a 1916 committee member, which was made part of the *1913 Preliminary Statement*. Burch outlined that the emphasis for high school economics should be on the concept of production and consumption, which he asserted were essentially concrete and objective in nature. To this end, Burch included the caveat “Concrete economic problems should be taken up whenever possible in connection with that factor of production to which it is most closely related” (p. 25). His concluding statement was all inclusive of the era’s

particular economic factors that were evident in society. Through studying economics, the student would gain an awareness of the economic reform currently underway. More importantly, the student would ideally learn what the groups which were active in this reform—proponents of organized labor and government regulation, social workers, socialists, individual taxpayers—hoped to gain.

In comparing the proposed Civic Theory and Practice course to community civics, the content of the former was identified as “formal elements of thought.” The aim for this course was to allow students to evaluate what they observed and studied to ascertain the relationships between events and the forces behind them. Woodrow Wilson’s “The State,” James Bryce’s “American Commonwealth,” and Charles A. Beard’s “American Government in Politics” were texts intended to be used to support this premise.

In addition, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* pointed out that other publications and reports should be used in the Civic Theory and Practice course to cover a litany of topics. This effort to provide outside materials was considered in order to add a dimension to the actual observations made by students of conditions and events. However, “Emphasis on the formal study [civic theory and practice] must not be permitted to crowd out the observation of actual conditions nor such experience in social service as the time will permit” (p. 26). A topical outline was provided primarily as an aid to teachers wanting to change their methods for teaching civics.

Without any concluding or summary remarks, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* simply ended with Thomas Jesse Jones’ signature. A list of the 1916 committee members as of the issuance of this report followed. It indicated 17 members in addition to Jones.

Notably missing from this initial list was: Clarence D. Kingsley, Arthur W. Dunn, and F. W. Carrier.

Conclusion

Jones called upon a broad scope representation of the 1916 committee members as contributors to his preliminary statement to the CRSE. Barnard, Wheatley, Robinson, and Burch can be considered multi-faceted in their ideas for approaches proposed for the new social studies subject. Indeed, a cross-section of ideas was presented ranging from a selected definition of community civics, to teaching about available vocations, to essentially, in today's terms, beta testing for a new approach to history. Yet, the *1913 Preliminary Statement*, which is approximately 11 pages, concluded without definitive directions from the Chairperson of the 1916 committee.

1915 Report on Community Civics

Introduction

The second report, *The Teaching of Community Civics*, was published in 1915. In a letter of transmittal dated June 8, 1915, P. P. Claxton, Commissioner, recommended the publication of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. He pointed out this report was prepared by a special committee of the CRSE identified to perform work on behalf of the 1916 committee. He named the four members: J. Lynn Barnard, F. W. Carrier, Arthur William Dunn, and Clarence D. Kingsley. As noted above, three of the four, Carrier, Dunn, and Kingsley, were not among the 1916 committee members listed on the *1913 Preliminary Statement* publication.

Preface

As introductory remarks, this four-person “special committee of the committee on social studies,” (p. 7) advised their work was based on a course conducted by Barnard in the summer of 1914. They acknowledged that part of the material for Barnard’s course was prepared by a committee of five Massachusetts educators, which included Carrier and Kingsley. This special committee also noted “valuable suggestions from Dr. David Snedden...Thomas Jesse Jones...and Jessie C. Evans” (p. 7). David Snedden was not listed as member of the 1916 committee.

Part I

Introductory paragraphs covered defining a good citizen and the stages in developing good citizenship through schooling. It was noted that civic education should include elementary history, community civics, and some type of study on typical vocations. The report offered the rationale that civic education would help students learn to compare their current and previous community conditions with those in other communities. More importantly, it pointed out a belief that “this habit of comparing social conditions will be almost indispensable to the pupil when he comes to the history that should follow, because the new type of history is placing its emphasis on such comparisons” (p. 10). The premise of the *1915 Report on Community Civics* was designed to outline an area of civic education identified as “community civics.”

The special committee defined community civics and the place they believed community civics should play in the school program. They outlined that this course would reside in the elementary grades and carry into high school for one year. The

special committee highlighted their concern that many students did not go to high school. They indicated that this course, if made part of elementary education, would allow students to be prepared, in particular, for social studies in secondary education. In detailing the aim of community civics, this special committee stated “Many courses in civics fail because they fix attention upon the machinery of government rather than upon the elements of community welfare for which government exists...” (p. 12).

The special committee suggested the topics of (a) health; (b) protection of life and property; (c) recreation; (d) education; (e) civic beauty; (f) wealth; (g) communication; (h) transportation; (i) migration; (j) charities; (k) correction” (pp. 12-13) for community civics. These topics were titled the “elements of welfare.” In detailing ideas for the method of teaching community civics topics, this special committee outlined that the student needed to be trained to evaluate facts, make value judgments, and find best solutions.

The special committee defined a method of how to conduct a study of each of the topics, or elements of welfare, in three steps: first, explain a suggested approach to each particular topic; second, conduct an investigation of agencies involved in the topic of study; and third, present a summary recognizing present and future responsibility to the topic for individuals. This was followed by a narrative defining and outlining these steps. In this narrative, they provided two quotations from Dunn that related classroom examples or stories of right motives and wrong motives for civic actions.

The *1915 Report on Community Civics* wove through an extended discussion on civics education or training as applied to student conduct. This included observations

concerning “Conduct that has self-interest as an evident end...and...Conduct that is more evidently social in character and based primarily upon the *interest of others* or upon a *common interest*” (pp. 18-19).

Part II

This section of the *1915 Report on Community Civics* presented an extensive written discourse applying the recommended study approach detailed in Part I with personalized examples from the special committee on each of the elements of welfare topics. Their consistent application of this same study format essentially utilized a limited problems approach. However, the study approach was somewhat repetitive even with the premise of tailoring each topical section

The first step, or approach, was dominated by a laundry list of specific questions that could be addressed or researched and potentially answered by students. Each question for research concerned one or more of the recommended agencies, which were listed uniquely for each topic. Here the term “agencies” was more expansive in intent. The sample question list for each topic included numerous subjects, items, places, and private as well as public organizations.

A representative theme for Part II was presented in the Civic Beauty topic or element: “As in the case of other topics, the study should be related as closely as possible to the pupils’ interest, proceeding from matters familiar to them to matters less familiar” (p. 32). A philosophical outlook regarding monetary versus life values or the value of elements of welfare was expressed under the topics or element of Wealth,

It should be made clear to the pupil that the money a worker receives for his work

is only a measure of his 'living' or of the value of his services, and that the real 'living' that he receives in return for his work is the more or less complete enjoyment of the 'elements of welfare'—protection of health, life, and property, education, recreation, etc. Wealth is merely the material means by which the real elements of welfare are secured. (pp. 33-34)

Intermingled throughout Part II were comments and suggestions for the student's study approaches that were examples of utilizing history for the research. The Communications topic contained such a reference: "Make comparisons between present and past times with reference to means of communication" (p. 38). The special committee emphasized the importance of examining and linking multiple elements, such as Transportation with Communication, during the student's research.

Under the Migration topic, the special committee offered the following opinion and philosophy on the value and potential good impact of immigration,

Migration is no unusual thing. The motives that lead to it consist of the desire to secure one or other of the elements of welfare. The motives that bring foreigners to America are the same as those that have led to the settlement of the West, or the early colonization of America, or the movement of a family from one town to another, or from the country to the city; except that the desire for political and religious freedom have played a more important part in immigration than in the ordinary movements from place to place within this country. (p. 41)

Another philosophical view is contained under the Charity topic. This view concerned the need for charities due to the failure of some individuals on their own, or because of outside organizations, to attain or enjoy all the elements or topics of welfare. Continuing this thought, the special committee wrote under the Correction topic, "A free community is one in which a maximum of liberty is secured to all members" (p. 46).

The theme of the twelfth topic, How Governmental Agencies Are Conducted, used an aim to set up government (a) as a vehicle for cooperation within the community,

(b) to afford students and citizens a clear and broad knowledge of government functions and organizations, and (c) to allow students to see how the character of government changes to meet new conditions. This topic, therefore, would create an interest in and a desire to know more about it.

The special committee's philosophical view of responsibilities under the *How Governmental Agencies Are Financed* topic was plainly expressed. It stated, "The subjects of evasion of taxes, extravagance and inefficiency in the expenditure of the people's money, and ignorance on the part of citizens regarding the way in which their money is spent and the returns they are getting for it, are among those that may be discussed" (p. 49).

Part III

This third section of the *1915 Report on Community Civics* is titled using the term "suggestions." However, under "biographical suggestions," the special committee covered a broad arena of items considered of importance. The first was an emphasis by the special committee to explain the scope and method of community civics. In order to make it clear, they believed this subject needed to be a study of "the real community and the real relations of each citizen to his own community life" (p. 51). The second was their emphasis on having a textbook that reaches beyond facts into serving as a true guide for students in their research and study. A text, in their opinion, needed to assist teachers and pupils in looking for and interpreting information beyond set facts and figures.

Under the heading "reference texts," the special committee recommended that multiple textbooks be used for each class in order to provide a variety of versions of civic

information. In addition, source materials well beyond books and texts were presented and enumerated. To this end, the special committee stated, “It is not intended in community civics that the mechanism of government be entered into in great detail, but it is sometimes necessary to trace out such facts” (p. 52).

At the time, apparently availability of textbooks was limited. Therefore, the special committee appeared compelled to provide references they qualified as both appropriate and available for the new subject of community civics. Included in their list of numerous and various references was John Dewey’s “Ethical Principles Underlying Education” which was followed by Arthur W. Dunn’s “Aims and methods. Introduction for teachers in *The Community and the Citizen* (revised edition).”

Part III is the conclusion of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. This second report of the trilogy is 55 pages. It was signed by all four of the members of this special committee.

Conclusion

The *1915 Report on Community Civics* special committee essentially was formatted as an independent unit to research and report on civics education. It could be considered merely a civics study group (Jenness, 1990). This study group relied on their own personal, then contemporary, school course of study experiments as well as input and criticisms from several other teachers. The narrative gravitated into a sharing of ideas for teaching the subject of community civics while stressing the importance it held for public education. This special committee or study group used the terms “suggestions,” “study” and “problems for study,” among others, throughout the *1915 Report on*

Community Civics. The end result of their work did not actually develop into specific planning or direction. Indeed, to attempt to say that this group prepared guidelines to follow could be a tremendous over-statement. In essence, the publication is a summary report that the special committee apparently submitted directly to the CRSE, and not through the auspices of the full 1916 committee. Moreover, the *1915 Report on Community Civics* embodied a direct application of education for social efficiency.

1916 Report on Social Studies

Preface

The brief introduction to *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* report clearly stated that the 1916 committee identified that the growth of the schools and the numbers of schools and students created an unanticipated impact on communities and society in general. At the same time, the 1916 committee believed this growth provided social studies teachers with the unique opportunity to improve the education of citizens

The preface concisely presented that the 1916 committee was a real, working committee. Over a continuous three-year span from the publication of the *1913 Preliminary Statement* through the completion of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, the 1916 committee met frequently and appointed subcommittees and occasionally individuals to conduct assignments that would add contributions to the committee as a whole. It was made clear that the 1916 committee planned to search wide and far across the United States in order to consult with many people to gather both suggestions for the new social studies and to research criticisms of existing courses. Conferences were

scheduled with both the American Historical Association (AHA) and the American Political Science Association (APSA). It is noteworthy that the 1916 committee chose not to highlight the American Social Science Association (ASSA). This particular group (ASSA) was founded on an interdisciplinary format yet this association was still absent from the report. However, the preface stated: “In short, the committee has sought for every available source of suggestion, criticism, and contribution of material that would aid it in formulating and explaining its conclusions” (p. 5).

The preface acknowledged that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was compiled by Arthur William Dunn who had been secretary for the last year. The fact that Dunn served as a special agent in civic education for the U.S. Bureau of Education was noted as a valuable connection by the 1916 committee to draw on “the experience and thought of the entire country” (p. 6). It was stated that the bulletin that comprised the *1915 Report on Community Civics* “is referred to in the body of the present report” (p. 6). As such, it was to be considered an integral part of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The preface concluded with a statement that a summary of the 1916 Report was approved by the reviewing committee of the CRSE. It then added the caveat that their approval of the summary did not necessarily represent that all the members of the CRSE reviewing committee endorsed all the recommendations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The approval, however, meant agreement with the general recommendations. Therefore, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was authorized for publication by the CRSE. The preface was signed by both Thomas Jesse Jones as chairperson of the 1916 committee and Clarence D. Kingsley as chairperson of the reviewing committee of the CRSE.

Part I Introduction

The body of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* does not begin until page 9, which puts the length of the actual report at 54 pages. The initial statement presented the 1916 committee's definition of social studies. They stated, "The social studies are understood to be those whose subject matter relates directly to the organization and development of human society, and to man as a member of social groups" (p. 9).

At the outset, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* differentiated the social studies from other subjects by the aspect of social aims or goals versus social content. After noting that social efficiency was a key ingredient to achieve the social aims in the education of their day, the 1916 committee offered: "Yet, from the nature of their content, social studies affords peculiar opportunities for the training of the individual as a member of society" (p. 9). The Introduction continued to outline social studies as a forum to cultivate the concept of membership in the "world community" that encompassed an understanding of the different aspects of society. Finally, the 1916 committee highlighted that an intelligent loyalty to national ideals should be one of the aims of social studies.

It appeared that the 1916 committee was concerned with the status of the interplay between history and the other social studies. Was one preempting any of the others? Were any privileged over the others? The 1916 committee directly stated that "it was appointed, not to 'obtain justice' for a group of social studies as against other groups, or for one social study as against others, but to consider wherein such studies might be made to contribute most effectively to the purposes of secondary education" (p. 10).

Using traditional civics as an illustration in this regard, the 1916 committee

offered the conclusion that no matter how a course in civics was designed, if it was not flexible and adaptable to students “immediate needs of social growth” it would not hold value for education. Essentially, they also point out that this concept of flexibility and adaptability was needed for the other social studies subjects. In this light, the 1916 committee believed that any use of detailed course outlines in their report may have the negative impact of fixing, formatting, or stereotyping instruction. Therefore, they clearly avoided this practice and remained steadfast in the idea that “The selection of topics and the organization of subject matter should be determined in each case by immediate needs” (p. 10).

The 1916 committee identified one principle that it would utilize throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies* “because of its fundamental character” (p. 10). This principle that they adopted set out that it was important to teach children what they need to know in the present which they carry into their future lives. This concept was considerably different from the traditional adult stance of teaching children what adults think children need to know for future use. The heart of the 1916 committee’s key principle was incorporated into the text of the report by citing the following quotation from John Dewey.

We are continually uneasy about the things we adults know, and are afraid the child will never learn them unless they are drilled into him by instruction before he has any intellectual use for them. If we could really believe that attending to the needs of present growth would keep the child and teacher alike busy, and would also provide the best possible guarantee of the learning needed in the future, transformation of educational ideals might soon be accomplished, and other desirable changes would largely take care of themselves. (p. 11)

In view of this primary principle, the 1916 committee expressed a need to identify

a balance between the “needs of present growth” and basic, immediate utility. The 1916 committee’s vision appeared to be that education expanded a student’s horizons and created an interest in learning facts as long as the same would be of immediate interest. The 1916 committee stated, “The best question that can be asked in class is the question that the pupil himself asks because he wants to know and not the question the teacher asks because he thinks the pupil some-time in the future ought to know” (p. 11).

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* offered that in order for social studies education to be effective in high school, some social studies work must be conducted in the elementary grades. The 1916 committee conducted a discussion on potential elementary and secondary school cycle plans for social studies. It outlined as illustrations both the Indianapolis course discussed in the *1915 Report on Community Civics* and a new course being developed in Philadelphia.

The 1916 committee clearly stated that its recommendations were not dependent on the type of cycle plan adopted for schools. However, with an eye toward the 1916 committee’s concern with the drop-out rate of students, it pointed out that the 8-4, or elementary-secondary, cycle was more likely to experience students leaving at the end of the eighth year. As such, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was essentially outlining that the proposed ninth grade civics course would have a tendency to keep students in school under either one of these plans. The Introduction ended with the following emphasis: “Let it be repeated, however, that one of the chief purposes of both eighth and ninth civics should be to provide the pupil with a motive for the continuation of his education” (p. 14).

Part II: Social Studies for the Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Years

This section detailed that the social studies courses for the seventh, eighth, and ninth grades was comprised of geography, history, and civics. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* identified that, as a subject, geography should be correlated or coordinated with the other two. The narrative moved into a discussion of suggested alternative plans for organizing social studies for these three grades. The 1916 committee discussed one planning method in particular and used the Indianapolis plan from the *1915 Report on Community Civics* as an example. In highlighting that the Indianapolis schools integrated civics into the lower elementary grades, the 1916 committee indicated civics was not a separate subject until the eighth grade. A quote from the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, in part, stated: “The aim in the Indianapolis elementary schools seems to be to make of education, not a process of instruction in a variety of subjects, but a process of living, of growth, during which the various relations of life are unfolded—civic, geographical, historical, ethical, vocational, etc.” (p. 16).

The 1916 committee pointed out in this example a skillful teacher was capable of closely coordinating civics with American history so that the students were not truly aware that two subjects were involved. According to the 1916 committee, the second plan for the Indianapolis schools, based on their observations, was advantageous because of a concentration and continuity of a focus on interests. In their opinion, this second plan was more likely to be effective for a greater majority of teachers. A third suggested plan was one that involved the Philadelphia schools. This plan apparently presented advantages by providing continuous civics courses in the early years on a limited basis and continuing

into the junior high school years. They believed this would provide in some fashion a cumulative learning effect. However, the 1916 committee observed that at the time data did not substantiate this claim.

Apparently, the suggested plans were subject to criticism due to a misperception that the term “community civics” indicated the focus was only on the local community. However, in the view of the 1916 committee: “The term ‘community civics’” has arisen (it was not invented by this committee) to distinguish the new type of civics from the traditional ‘civic government,’ to which the name civics was also applied” (p. 17). In defense of the various plans, it was made quite clear the course and content recommendation was not isolated to a study of “the pupil’s own town” (p. 18). Related to this point, the 1916 committee continued with suggestions for expanding community civics content to allow students to confront problems of society emphasizing vital issues for sixth, seventh, and eighth grades. In quoting the Indianapolis plan published in 1914, the 1916 committee focused on the need to provide a sample of typical problems but with the understanding that no more than a suggested outline would be presented in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. They noted, “The most vital problems, however, grow out of current events that stimulate questions in the minds of children. Therefore, problems may change from year to year” (p. 18).

This same format of sample typical questions for students to research and study the subjects of both geography and history during the seventh and eighth grades was presented. A review revealed what appears to be a very broad scoped topical view of each of these two subjects. For instance, seventh grade geography study was suggested to be

focused on prominent world nations with a look to the world in general. To this end, the 1916 committee suggested studying such topics as: (a) the sea as a great commercial highway, (b) causes which contributed to an increase in commerce, (c) natural conditions affecting commerce, (d) human control of commercial activity, and (e) types of transportation involved.

In discussing seventh grade history, the 1916 committee again turned to John Dewey. They noted,

In his "Moral principles in education," Dewey says: "History is vital or dead to the child according as it is, or is not, presented from the sociological standpoint. When treated simply as a record of what has passed and gone, it must be mechanical, because the past, as past, is remote. Simply as the past there is no motive for attending to it. The ethical value of history teaching will be measured by the extent to which past events are made the means of understanding the present." (p. 21)

The 1916 committee continued this important idea with, "No history, therefore, should be treated as though it had meaning or value in itself, but should constantly be made to show its relation or contribution to the present" (p. 21).

The 1916 committee appeared to consider that eighth grade history in conjunction with community civics was a separate subject. As such, it provided a link with the value of historical background and the elements of welfare topics in community civics. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* stated, "This means primarily that the history of the Nation is treated as the story of the growth of a national 'community,' involving all the 'elements of welfare' ...made familiar in their civics work" (p. 22). That is, the 1916 committee outlined that learning the background of historical exploration and colonization, east coast to west coast, was similar to studying a student's own community and state

development and growth. For instance, historical study emphasized the importance that the development of transportation and communication—as elements of welfare or topics—had on a student’s community, state, and nation.

Civics for Years VII—IX

The 1916 committee noted that the *1915 Report on Community Civics* represented a manual made available to and for educators. Therefore, they believed it was not necessary to present the entire report, and instead chose to highlight some essential facts from the report. The 1916 committee stated community civics was not geographical. Instead, the term’s significance implied a community of interests. They noted that the aim of community civics for a student was “not merely a lot of facts about it [community], but the meaning of his community life.... (p. 23). The 1916 committee incorporated the portion of the *1915 Report on Community Civics* that included (a) the content of community civics involving the 14 elements of welfare as organizing principles, (b) social facts on which the methods that the teaching of community civics should be based, and (c) the recommended three-step approach for teaching the elements of welfare.

In discussing that the ninth grade civics course should not be a repetition of the earlier civics course no matter which school plan was in place (6-3-3, 8-4), the 1916 committee expressed that the ninth grade should lay the foundation for succeeding years of social studies courses. The 1916 committee presented a concern that there was a negative public reaction to the “exclusive and formal study of national government” (p. 25) which resulted in increasing the study of local community relations. Instead, the 1916 committee apparently believed the two aspects of civic life and relations—that is, local

and national—should function together and support each other. They expressed that community civics should expand beyond thinking locally. It should cultivate the idea that “humanity as greater than its divisions” and therefore should develop the concept of a “world community” (p. 26). In amplifying the idea of world community, the 1916 committee stated, “Common world interests need emphasis, world sympathies need cultivation” (p. 26).

Further, the 1916 committee encouraged breathing life back into the term “patriotism.” The 1916 committee was concerned with the fact that it had been abused. They emphasized restoring its real meaning and significance—thus making patriotism a good word once again. This thought was extended by taking the stance that this should be an aim of secondary education. The 1916 committee stated,

The committee submits that this should be a definite aim of secondary education, and that one of the means of attaining it is by applying to the study of our national interests, activities, and organization, the point of view, the spirit, and the methods of community civics. (p. 26)

This was the 1916 committee’s solution to bring the use of the word patriotism back to its deserved level of significance and “to imbue it with real meaning and to make it a potent influence in the development of a sound national life” (p. 26).

In addition to the opportunity to cultivate world community concepts, and restore the good meaning of patriotism, the 1916 committee opened up another opportunity in the area involving the civic relations of vocational life. They viewed the high school as a vehicle to take advantage of this perceived opportunity. The 1916 committee acknowledged that students needed vocational guidance but that there were many diverse opinions as to what guidance and how it should be afforded to the students. However,

they noted their plans for ninth year community civics as:

The committee is here interested in its vocational guidance aspect only as an incident to the broader social and civic training of the youth. If it can be made to contribute anything to his guidance toward a wise choice of vocation and intelligent preparation for it, it is that much gain. (p. 27)

The view of the 1916 committee was that the community civics course emphasized the importance that real life situations and social occurrences played in a student's life. Thus, in their opinion, this course was in a position to enable students to understand issues surrounding life's vocations. After searching for an example of a vocational civics course that met their criteria, the 1916 committee provided a half-year course by William A. Wheatley, superintendent of Middletown, Connecticut, schools. Wheatley's course, titled, "Vocational Enlightenment" was introduced in the *1913 Preliminary Statement*. The 1916 committee followed up by including a lengthy section written by him in their *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Wheatley's conclusions on his course were quoted as:

Besides being intrinsically interesting to the pupils, it gives them greater respect for all kinds of honorable work, helps them to choose more wisely their life work, convinces them of the absolute necessity for a thorough preparation before entering any vocation, and holds to the end of the high-school course many who would otherwise drop out early in the race. (p. 29)

The 1916 committee then expressed their view, which reflected Wheatley's work. That is, the approach for teaching about any vocations would not be with an emphasis on remuneration, but rather on the role, a vocation would play in the life of the individual. They suggested that students should be taught how to seek a vocation that would be the best for them as individuals.

In addition, the 1916 committee recognized there would be a difference for

teaching community civics in rural schools. An example of a successful course that applied to most local rural conditions is a lesson plan that was detailed first in the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. It was determined valuable and important to reproduce it in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The lesson plan quoted was developed by Professor J. F. Smith. It was considered a very creative study and report on conditions of roads in the community. In the study, the students and teachers actually performed road work in order to assist them in researching the problems presented. The 1916 committee provided several other rural classroom examples including one from Delaware, which covered a number of topical issues.

The 1916 committee stressed a positive relationship between community civics and history teaching. They reiterated that the study of the past related to the present. For example, the 1916 committee noted that children in the early grades have a natural, positive reaction to historical hero and pioneer stories. In addition, the 1916 committee recommended that by the first year of high school teaching community civics was a good transition for the high school history courses that followed later. The rationale was that community civics provided opportunities for students to actually use historical information. The 1916 committee stated, "Community civics affords opportunity to use history to illuminate topics of immediate interest" (p. 32). They detailed suggestions for utilizing history in conjunction with community civics under several of the element topics.

The 1916 committee concluded its recommendations for the seventh through ninth grades. Part II was summarized as follows.

Community civics is a course of training in citizenship, organized with reference to the pupil's immediate needs, rich in its historical, sociological, economic, and political relations, and affording a logical and pedagogically sound avenue of approach to the later social studies. (p. 34)

Part III: Social Studies for Years X-XII

For the last 3 years of secondary education, the 1916 committee outlined three history courses—European history to about the end of the 17th century, European history and English history after the 17th century, American history since the 17th century—followed by Problems of American Democracy as the final course. It was noted their outline repeated the social studies course cycle for seventh through ninth grades. At the outset, it was stated that their suggested principles of course organization were designed to be flexible, and adaptable for the schools and the students.

The 1916 committee recognized that not all students would be taking each of the social studies courses outlined for grades ten through twelve. They clearly stated, "...this means that any course of history instruction should be so organized that the pupil will inevitably acquire some familiarity with the economic, social, and civic factors in community life, just as in the study of civics or of social problems he should inevitably learn much history by using it" (p. 36).

The 1916 committee did not negate teaching all the historical periods. They clearly emphasized spending a longer time on European history through the 17th century because this historical period both contained a wide range of material and allowed topics to be developed continuously, not impeded by chronology or geography. They also recommended spending equal or more time on either the European or the American

history period after the 17th century. To support this later history period course, the 1916 committee expressed the “conviction that recent history is richer in suitable materials for secondary education than the more remote periods, and is worthy of more intensive study” (p. 36). They noted that since the secondary education cycle was repetitive of the elementary cycle, any student who could not complete the secondary cycle would still be the beneficiary of history education.

The 1916 committee expressed concern that many teachers were inadequately prepared to follow their recommendations for the teaching and learning of history. A key phrase recognized that their conceptual premise for secondary education “requires the selection of materials on the basis of the pupils’ own immediate interests and of current problems” (p. 37), the 1916 committee emphasized that their organization for history instruction “...unquestionably requires greater skill on the part of the teacher than the traditional method...” (p. 37).

Two different teachers—Miss Harris and Miss Dilks—were used as examples of applying greater skill in their teaching methods. The 1916 committee pointed out that certain topics, due to their universal appeal, lent themselves to a broad range of available material—including ancient history as needed. Based on the variety in types of topics being taught, the 1916 committee believed both these teachers should not be constrained in selection of materials. In particularly noting that the concept of beauty or beautiful was universal in interest, the 1916 committee stated “It is hardly conceivable, for example, that Miss Dilks could have omitted a study of ‘Athens—the City Beautiful’.” (p. 37).

The 1916 committee stressed using their organizing principles outlined for

community civics in the teaching of history. Their intent was to maintain the same design for meeting both interests and the topics involved in the elements of welfare. In their opinion, utilizing the same principles of organization facilitated discussion and experiment in the teaching of history and improved instruction.

In discussing aims or goals in teaching history, it naturally flowed that the 1916 committee presented that the nation needed to develop solidarity—economic, social, and political efficiency—in order to function effectively in the world community. However, it was noted that studying the history of other nations would result in cultivating an understanding of those nations and people. To this effect, the 1916 committee pointed out that a 1-year history course known as “A Study of Nations” was available for use at that time. Clarence D. Kingsley was quoted as suggesting this particular study course. The 1916 committee noted that Kingsley viewed that rather than leading with a focus on the past, this course “would start frankly with the present of typical modern nations—European, South American, oriental—and would use history in explanation of these nations” (p. 39).

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* outlined that by focusing on tradition and the requirements of going to college, the existing traditional history curriculum was “ill adapted to the requirements of secondary education” (p. 40). Regarding this concern, the 1916 committee quoted a portion of a speech by Miss Jessie C. Evans, from a high school for girls in Philadelphia as, “The new definitions of culture and the new demands for efficiency are causing very severe tests to be applied to any subject that would hold its own in our schools” (p. 40). This led the 1916 committee to pose an important question

regarding the ways, or to the extent, that college requirements and life requirements might be mutually exclusive. They relied on John Dewey for an answer.

If we could really believe that attending to the needs of present growth would keep the child and teacher alike busy and would also provide the best possible guarantee of the learning needed in the future [in college or elsewhere], transformation of educational ideals might soon be accomplished, and other desirable changes would largely take care of themselves. (p. 40)

In taking an extraordinary measure by repeating a major portion of the Dewey quote already represented on page 11 of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, the 1916 committee appeared to encourage and endorse that each level of schooling—elementary, secondary and college—would best serve students by focusing on “proper attention to the needs of present growth” (p. 41).

Following the passage from Dewey, the 1916 committee asked an intriguing question regarding whether or not an increase in the amount of history instruction offered assurance of broad scope or better social education. In response, the 1916 committee provided their own answer in that they suggested that there was not necessarily a direct proportional relationship to the number of history courses actually taken by a student and the amount of history the student gains. They recognized that the number of history courses taken was dependent both upon the student’s personal selection and the time constraints imposed by the other subjects in the required curriculum. However, they viewed history as an underlying component of social studies courses in general. Therefore, the student continued to gain history knowledge throughout their total course of studies.

The 1916 committee posed a third query regarding what criteria should be

considered in order to ascertain whether or not history courses provide a value to students. In answer, they pointed out that traditional history failed to meet new definitions of culture and new demands for efficiency. In particular, the 1916 committee noted that the designer of the course of study, the author of the textbook, and the teacher all needed to supplant for the historian's oversight. In support of this conclusion, the 1916 committee reintroduced a passage from James Harvey Robinson's book *The New History*.

In this quote Robinson wrote:

No one questions the inalienable right of the *historian* to interest himself in any phase of the past that he chooses. It is only to be wished that a greater number of historians had greater skill in hitting upon those phases of the past which serve *us* best in understanding the most vital problems of the present. (p. 41)

The 1916 committee specifically noted that they italicized the words "historian" and "us" in the James Harvey Robinson quotation. The indicator on "us" allowed the 1916 committee to interpret for the purposes of their discussion the meaning to be high school students. As an additional highlight, they also interpreted and amplified that "'the most vital problems of the present' for the high-school pupil are the problems which he himself is facing now or which are of direct value to him in his present processes of growth" (p. 41).

The 1916 committee then used an extensive quote from William Mace, a noted historian, also supporting this view. The essence of the Mace quotation is, "Whenever or wherever he [the student] strikes a point in history...the point must be connected with modern life. Otherwise it may have only a curious or perhaps an academic interest for him, or it may have no interest whatever" (pp. 41-42).

The supporting statement from Mace was followed by yet another Robinson

quotation to further bolster the view of the 1916 committee. The entire Robinson quotation appears to be a portion of a memorandum written on behalf of the 1916 committee. They specifically included the notation that they italicized a portion of Robinson's statement for the reader's future reference. A key phrase in the Robinson quotation is, "While events can be dealt with chronologically, conditions have to be presented topically if they are to become clear" (p. 42).

Robinson concluded the memorandum with a statement regarding the importance of content knowledge. According to Robinson, this was particularly important for the role of the teacher. He emphasized that a teacher must avail him or herself of every opportunity to obtain in-depth knowledge of each subject that will be presented in class. The Robinson memorandum stated, "As for the teacher, no satisfactory results will be obtained until he learns to outrun the textbook and becomes really familiar, through judicious reading or university instruction, with the institutions which he proposes to deal with" (p. 43).

What Does It Mean to Be Functioning in the Present?

The 1916 committee acknowledged they established general agreement between themselves that, as a subject, history must function in the present to be of value. However, disagreement among the 1916 committee members involved first, the meaning of "functioning in the present" and second, a method of how to organize history material to this effect.

According to the 1916 committee, "functioning in the present" could result in two

interpretations: (a) sociological, in which it is sufficient to make history explain present conditions and institutions, and (b) pedagogical, in which to be of educational value history needs to address the present interest of the student. It was pointed out that “children have very little chronological perspective” (p. 43). Thus, the 1916 committee expressed that even though recent periods provided better history material for present application than earlier historical periods, it did not necessarily follow that present issues were of more educational value than prior historical issues.

The 1916 committee developed a principle that was essentially an answer to Robinson’s question, “what is worthwhile?” (p. 44). The 1916 committee stated,

The selection of a topic in history and the amount of attention given to it should depend, not merely upon its relative proximity in time, nor yet upon its relative present importance from the adult or from a sociological point of view, but also and chiefly upon the degree to which such topic can be related to the present life interests of the pupil, or can be used by him in his present processes of growth. (p. 44)

In outlining this principle, the 1916 committee acknowledged that it placed the underlying problem of both selection of topics and method of approach directly upon the teacher. To guide the teacher in applying this principle, the 1916 committee provided three examples from teachers in the field illustrating selecting topics and using different approaches in order to fulfill the students’ immediate interests. The first was from a teacher in Massachusetts. Miss Hannah Harris’ program illustrated the topic selection and method of approach as related to the student’s immediate interests. The second was from a teacher in Philadelphia, Miss Dilks. This example used the City of Athens and Greek art and architecture to illustrate a method to cultivate the aesthetic interests of students. A third example was provided from Blanche Hazard from New York Agricultural College.

This approach used native crafts or skills used in occupations to illustrate using a practical approach as a teaching method. As outlined, the selected examples spanned a variety of topics from the War of 1812 to the City of Athens to a study of crafts in medieval history. Each example uniquely applied the history of the topic to teaching understanding of present day issues.

How to Organize History for Secondary Education

The opening statement regarding the method of history organization for secondary education is a quotation from Robinson. He outlined that up to this point in time, history was organized in a chronological, political fashion. In addressing their sociological and pedagogical interpretations under the 1916 committee's new principle of meeting a student's present processes of growth, a statement provided by Hanna Harris, a Massachusetts teacher, was used. Her statement proposed that the solution involved the possibility of combining facets of both the sociological and pedagogical interpretations. As an illustration of her premise, the 1916 committee included "One of the most radical experiments in the reorganization of history instruction to 'meet the needs of present growth'." (p. 49) developed by J. L. Meriam for an elementary school in Missouri. They noted that Meriam believed the experiment was successful enough to make it adaptable to secondary schools. In his explanation, Meriam included a study outline borrowed from Robinson's *New History*.

The 1916 committee apparently viewed Meriam's reliance on Robinson important. To this effect, the 1916 committee reserved a section of the *1916 Report on*

Social Studies to print an excerpt from a Robinson speech to school superintendents on the “History for Common Man” chapter in his book. The 1916 committee noted,

What Prof. Robinson suggests is that, given a group of boys and girls whose economic and social position is preordained to the ranks of the great majority of men and women “who do common things,” the history instruction should be organized, not on the traditional basis of chronology and politics, but on that of their own immediate interests. (p. 51)

The 1916 committee noted that both their illustrations of work by Blanche Hazard and Dr. Meriam directly reflected Robinson’s concept. The 1916 committee endorsed the experiment and creativity involved in these illustrations. At the same time, they recognized the difficulties involved for teachers to adopt similar methods of teaching history. The 1916 committee strongly urged experimenting in order to overcome teacher unpreparedness, unsuitable textbooks, and conservative tendencies towards traditional methods.

Problems of American Democracy

The last section of Part III was devoted to the 1916 committee’s outline and recommendation for the Problems of Democracy course. The 1916 committee engaged in an extensive narrative presenting the background, the problems, and three options available to consider for the last year—the twelfth year of study. Their options included: (a) to agree to select one of the three fields of study [political science, economics, and sociology], (b) to suggest a type of course for each of the three fields of study, leaving the choice of one as optional to the local school, and (c) to recommend “a new course involving the principles and materials of all three fields, but adapted directly to the immediate needs of secondary education” (p. 52).

After analysis, the 1916 committee concluded that the third option would be their recommended course of action. This third recommended option was designed to answer an important question posited by the 1916 committee, which was written as if in their own voice. However, their question was shown in quotes as an indication the words were borrowed from Robinson's *New History*: "Is it not time, in this field as in history, 'to take up the whole problem afresh, freed ...from the impressions of' the traditional social sciences?" (p. 53).

The new course was based on the same principle the 1916 committee used for organizing civics and history. That is, the course of study should involve problems or issues that would be identified by teachers based on immediate interest to the students and vital importance to society. It was inherent in their selection of the third option that history was included as the unnamed, but fourth, subject in their options for the Problems of Democracy course.

As an illustration for Problems of Democracy content, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* outlined a suggested broad scope study approach involving the economic, sociological and political relations or issues surrounding immigration. The illustration by the 1916 committee maintained the same study-planning format of sample questions, topics, and issues that was used throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The illustration led to a notation that secondary school students were ready for studying facts and issues related to the "social mind" if there had been sufficient background and study planning. The 1916 committee noted that they found two study illustrations in a social studies description for the Hampton Institute curriculum. The

illustrations of social mind expressions were listed as: (a) any daily newspaper or the life of any large school, and (b) the power and effects of tradition. As a result, the 1916 committee briefly noted that it “found 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” (pp. 55-56). This represented the total extent of their narration on both the “social mind” and the Hampton Institute as an illustration or example.

In their summary for Part III, the 1916 committee suggested that this newly designed course—Problems of Democracy—was needed to fulfill the purposes of secondary education. The 1916 committee advised that their defined principles needed further experiment and refinement and urged educators to move forward in this effort.

Part IV. Standards—Preparation of Teachers—Availability of Material

In the final section of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, the 1916 committee addressed standards by which to test methods of teaching. They did so by inserting a substantial portion of a speech by Arthur W. Dunn on “Standards by which to Test the Value of Civics Instruction” (p. 57). The 1916 committee considered Dunn’s standards applicable in general to all social studies subjects. Regarding preparation of teachers, the 1916 committee reiterated their belief that the greatest obstacle to initiating and beginning the teaching of social studies as a subject was the deficiency in teacher training and preparedness. Their concern was followed by extensive suggestions to solve this

problem.

One primary issue related directly to inexperienced or untrained teachers or teachers trained only in traditional methods. The 1916 committee recognized that the lack of availability of textbooks written based on their principles and recommendations exacerbated this issue. With this in mind, they noted that having all their recommendations adopted for the next school year would most likely not occur. Optimistically, the 1916 committee believed that teacher training and organized textbooks would follow the publication of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The 1916 committee expressed belief that as development continued in education, history and other social science instruction, both the elementary and secondary levels would be organized more definitely “around the immediate interests and needs of the pupils” (p. 62). The 1916 committee issued caution regarding a tendency—especially in the teaching of community civics—to dispense with a textbook altogether. Their second caution regarded using textbooks that were more descriptive of the local community and prepared in the local community. The favorable aspect of “local textbooks” was recognizing the value of local life and conditions in educating students, but the danger involved leading to confusion between “community civics” and “local only” civics.

The 1916 committee specifically observed that in reality locally prepared texts often just swapped detailing the national government organization and mechanism with a similar detail description of the functions of local government. In lieu of a locally prepared textbook, the 1916 committee recommended obtaining useful supplements to a good text from public libraries, chambers of commerce and other civic agencies.

Part IV concluded the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Signatures of the Chairperson of the 1916 committee or of any of the 1916 committee members were not evidenced on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. It is reasonable to assume that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was acknowledged by the entire 1916 committee membership.

Conclusion

In its *1916 Report on Social Studies*, it became clear that the 1916 committee attempted to be transparent in its reasoning, deliberations, and multiple points of view. In their statement that they sought input from a variety of institutions, stakeholders, and educators from every walk of life, the 1916 committee indicated that it was confronting real world education and curriculum issues of their day. They endeavored to make informed decisions in order to formulate their recommendations for the newly created subject of social studies in secondary education. Indeed, the motivation needed to understand the present—particularly when manifested as an outcome once the “needs of present growth” were attended to—became the underlying rationale of the manner in which teaching and learning in community civics, history, and Problems of Democracy would occur.

Chapter Conclusion

In summary, it is reasonable to consider a snapshot of the trilogy of reports to be as follows.

1. The *1913 Preliminary Statement* was not intended to be a standalone report. It was not written by a committee. Instead, it represents a package of statements compiled

from several noted individuals.

2. The *1915 Report on Community Civics* was intended to be a special study of one subject from the several social studies subjects. It is a summary of a study conducted and written by a small, specifically appointed special committee.

3. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* was designed, prepared, and finalized by the entire, actively engaged 1916 committee. It presents the 1916 committee's recommendations for the teaching and learning of the new social studies.

Two common threads of expertise and insight from experts in the field during the era of the 1916 committee weave their way throughout the entire trilogy of reports: Dewey and Robinson. Herein, lays the foundation and basis for the principles formed by the 1916 committee. At the same time, however, nuts and bolts experience from the school environment is amply drawn from teachers, administrators, and other outside sources to round out the actual recommendations for the newly created social studies.

Moreover, the 1916 committee evidenced throughout their report the impact of dealing with the prominent social movement of the era, namely social efficiency. Also, it cannot be overlooked that both Dunn and Barnard were on-going, contributing members throughout the deliberations of the 1916 committee. However, their major input was in the *1915 Report on Community Civics*.

It is evident throughout the trilogy of reports, but more particularly in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, that the 1916 committee accepted the gauntlet from Claxton's first transmittal letter in 1913. That is, the committee embraced the challenge to develop the aims and methods that should prevail for social studies in secondary education.

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOLARS

Introduction

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* has been called a “seminal document” by several scholars. Other scholars have said it has “stood the test of time.” Opinions from additional scholars lie somewhere in between or on a tangential path. Likewise, scholars have offered a variety of interpretations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and the social, political, and economic influences surrounding the 1916 committee. Thus, the following schools of interpretation have emerged in my attempt to read and interpret works by each of the scholars identified for this study. The intent is to identify ideological positions as well as to facilitate discussion of the various existing interpretations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The schools of interpretation for this study are titled: celebratory historians, revisionist interpretations, and post-revisionists. The School of Revisionist Interpretations, however, is a varied conceptual spectrum. To become manageable for this discussion this school lent itself to a breakdown into satellite schools of interpretation which are Social Efficiency, The Dewey and Robinson School of Interpretation, Multiple Influences, and The Neoconservative Revisionists. Therefore, six schools of interpretation emerged for this study.

First, some scholars are celebratory historians in an essentially traditional fashion. Celebratory historians view the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as the creation of social

studies as a new field. They accept the official reasons for the creation of the 1916 committee and view it as part of the march of progress in education. Celebratory historians are essentially progressive educationists who view each development in education as progress. These scholars hold to a belief that each step forward leads to a positive end. In their view, history is a vehicle to create pride in all education professionals. They maintain that history can provide solutions to present day problems and prevent repeating mistakes from the past. That is, there can be very positive results from learning and understanding past struggles (Tryon, 1935; Wesley, 1937).

Second, revisionist interpretations are identified as several somewhat unique strands each of which offers a revisionist school of interpretation. Each strand has a different view of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and its recommendations. All have merit. One does not necessarily override the other. A pecking order of importance or a value cannot be attributed, nor would one be warranted. A number of revisionist scholars believe the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is a social efficiency document that consistently attempts to promote citizenship education as a vehicle to inculcate citizen actions and thinking. Social efficiency revisionists consider themselves as scholars who have a heightened awareness of social class, gender, and ethnicity. This group maintains ideological notions to explore power relationships in curriculum construction. In their view, principles of efficiency, centralization, and bureaucratic decision-making were prominent factors in development of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Their social efficiency theory suggests the pervasive influence of business models allows for economic interpretations of educational reforms (Callahan, 1962; Kliebard, 1994, 2004;

Krug, 1964; Lybarger, 1981, 1983, 1987).

Both Dewey and Robinson are quoted in, and their concepts permeate, the narrative throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. These factors represent the starting point for another group of historians who believe that the 1916 committee and its recommendations were strongly influenced by Deweyan ideals and by the writings and 1916 committee membership of James Harvey Robinson. In the case of Dewey, this is particularly due to his wariness of large, industrialized organizations, which claimed to be scientifically managed by strong leaders. Historians of the Dewey and Robinson School of Interpretation believe that both the philosophy of John Dewey and the “new history” promoted by James Harvey Robinson are prevalent and pervasive throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The Dewey and Robinson revisionists believe Dewey, and thus the 1916 committee, favored participatory democracy and openness to racially and socio-economically diverse students. They apply Dewey’s understanding of community as their frame of reference. Dewey and Robinson revisionists believe Robinson’s approach of designing the teaching and learning of history assists the common person to rise and realize higher human achievement is vastly different from Thomas Jesse Jones’ view of maintaining the acceptance of the status quo. In addition, they believe Robinson viewed history as an instrument of change. This group also believes that Dewey generally agreed with Robinson’s philosophy of education. In the alternative, the group also believes Robinson generally agreed with Dewey’s philosophy of education. Thus, at the end of the day, the Dewey and Robinson revisionists believe both Dewey and Robinson strongly influenced the tone and character of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* (Correia, 1994;

Evans, 2004, 2007; Hendricks, 1946; Saxe, 1991).

Other scholars reflect a revisionist school of interpretation involving multiple influences. Multiple influence revisionists believe a combination of social issue aspects and certain individuals affected the philosophy and outlook of the 1916 committee and its recommendations. For instance, Krug (1964) argued that at the time of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* the slogan “education for social efficiency” was understood to encompass: (a) the school as an agency of social control, and (b) the school as an agency of social service. That is, the multiple influence revisionist group supports the notion the concept of social efficiency involved training individuals to act on behalf of the group in conjunction with supporting Dewey’s ideal that schools act as social and community centers (Cremin, 1961; Jenness, 1990; Nelson, 1994; Whelan, 1991, 1993, 1997a, 1997b, 2006).

A different revisionist school of interpretation enters into play with the neoconservative revisionists. Neoconservatives are traditional history and anti-social studies activists who, in the main, do not support the work of the 1916 committee. The reason is that they firmly believe social studies detract from the teaching and learning of traditional history. The neoconservatives believe academic standards have eroded and academic achievement has declined because schools have suffered from two problems: (a) social experiments that both placed demands on schools and diverted schools from their basic mission, and (b) undue government pressure on schools to promote educational equity. Their philosophy reflects the back-to-basics movement. They support the idea that schools should recommit themselves to academic excellence, reinstitute

basic-skills courses, emphasize competitiveness and other “traditional” values and pedagogy, as well as school and teacher accountability. The neoconservatives believe social studies is not useful, promotes social efficiency, and is utilitarian (Hertzberg, 1981, 1989; Ravitch, 1978, 1985, 1989a, 1989b, 2000).

Third, another related school of interpretation is post revisionist. These scholars reach either beyond or outside the various revisionist groups. The post revisionists maintain the NEA, as it was structured during the era of the 1916 committee, and its Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education embodied both a mix of influences and had multiple effects. They generally view urban school reform during the early part of the 20th century as a contested terrain involving administrative progressives, working-class immigrants, and racial minorities. This group developed the term administrative progressive. The post revisionists conceptually contrast administrative progressives against Dewey. They also use administrative progressives to connect the NEA to social efficiency concepts. Post revisionists support a willingness to embrace the complexities of education as a social and political process of change involving not only struggle, but also opportunity for growth with the hope of progress. They view education as building upon, not rejecting, past experience of schools. Their approach challenges traditional and celebratory thinking as well as revisionist interpretations. They utilize “no blame” statements and strive to provide a framework for understanding curriculum change. Moreover, they attempt to strike a balance between traditional and revisionist camps. In reaching beyond or outside any of the revisionist schools of interpretation, the post-revisionists also strive to develop new schools of thought aiming to synthesize a

variety of interpretations. Therefore, their work relates to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* without providing direct analysis or interpretations (Tyack & Cuban, 1995; Westbrook, 1991).

Next follows a discussion of each scholar and school of interpretation.

Celebratory Historians

This school of interpretation holds that each and every development in education represents progress. In turn, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*—the document that created the new subject of social studies—is, in their opinion, considered the cornerstone of progress in social studies education. In addition, they believe the subject of history is the primary avenue to find solutions to current problems and prevent repetition of past mistakes. This study examines their individual views within this school of interpretation.

Rolla M. Tryon

Tryon (1935) celebrated the fact that, in his opinion, by 1913 the NEA finally decided to reassume its leadership in secondary education. In that year, the NEA formed the CRSE, which published preliminary statements from the chairpersons of its committees on various high school subjects. Among the first of the school subject committees to publish a final report was the 1916 committee. According to Tryon, the 1916 committee, in its final document, “set forth its revolutionary recommendations with respect to the social sciences in the senior high school” (p. 16). He observed that the 1916 committee recommendations for elementary grades were generally in accordance with existing teaching practices. He believed their methodology of recommending alternative

plans represented a significant and liberal change. He also noted their recommendations for the high school grade courses on early European history and Problems of American Democracy were revolutionary. Tryon indicated the 1916 committee considered the existing courses in advanced civics, economics and sociology inadequate. Tryon believed the 1916 committee's solution was the new course, Problems in American Democracy.

Tryon stated, "It would be difficult to overstate the influence of the report of this [1916] Committee" (p. 20). He identified that he traced teaching practices contemporary to his time directly to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Indeed, Tryon noted that numerous social science associations formed committees essentially in a cooperative effort to support social sciences in the schools. In particular, he mentioned that the National Municipal League's committee was focused on the need for teaching municipal government issues. He stated it most likely paved the way for a social movement to study local institutions. In particular, he noted that American Sociological Society's committee reports "were influential in backing up the report of the Committee on Social Studies in Secondary Education which appeared in 1916" (p. 71).

Tryon believed the 1916 committee validated the term social studies for education. He acknowledged that the expression first appeared in a description of the Hampton Institute's work in the subjects of civics, economics, and sociology published in the *Southern Workman* in 1905. He noted at the same time the instructor in social studies at Hampton Institute was in fact the chairperson of the 1916 committee, Thomas Jesse Jones. Thus, it was an easy transition to use this term—social studies—in naming the 1916 committee and in publishing the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He indicated in

1916 the term social studies became accepted into general circulation.

Tryon discussed the significance of issues regarding the social value of history and the proper type of instruction for history, which was in controversy at that time. He suggested there were two different, competing groups: history writers and history teachers. The two groups or schools were significantly opposed to each other. He described the older school as “the conservative, reactionary, stand-pat school [that] says history should be studied for history sake” (p. 88). The other or second school, he termed “the insurgent, progressive, radical school” (p. 88). This newer school, according to Tryon, advocated “study the past, know the facts of the past, study the things that have been, but [also study] *what* things and why...but don’t stop *right* there” (p. 88). The new group focused on a study of the past in order to understand the present as it has evolved. In other words, Tryon stated the new school believed history teaching needed “to develop *constructive* and *interpretive power*” (p. 89). This would allow students to learn to evaluate society’s problems, initiatives, organizations and government. Tryon believed the first or older school was comprised of history specialists. However, he suggested the second or newer school educators were formed under the “able leadership in the Dean of American Philosophers, Professor John Dewey” (p. 89).

Tryon believed the extensive secondary education recommendations by the 1916 committee under the auspices of the CRSE caused educators to change their minds. He stated after 1916, the secondary school educators had one primary question: “shall we join the revolt or stand pat on the four-block system of the Committee of Seven?” (p. 208). Tryon observed that as early as January 1916, many states changed their history

teaching programs to meet the recommendations of the 1916 committee. Numerous individual cities and towns followed this lead. Tryon indicated that some scholars put forth the idea the Committee of Seven's influence ended after the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was published. He believed these scholars would be surprised to discover that the influence of the 1916 committee's recommendations commenced almost immediately and "was somewhat dominant during the 1920s" (p. 213). In fact, Tryon stated: "the revolt from the *status quo* in the realm of high-school history content began with the report of the Committee on the Social Studies in Secondary Education in 1916" (p. 217).

The 1916 committee's focus on the teaching of social sciences in schools was covered extensively by Tryon. In doing so, he highlighted, in his opinion, the significant influential role the *1916 Report on Social Studies* had played, and continued to play in social studies programs. As a result, he observed the social sciences material changes would only result in a continuing quest for the most desirable balance of the various social studies subjects. Tryon suggested that educators "will probably feel that there is not *the* method of organizing the social sciences for teaching purposes, but only *a* method" (p. 229).

Edgar B. Wesley

Wesley's (1937) view of the history of the social studies was incorporated into his methods text *The Teaching of Social Studies* in 1937. He expressed in general, "the *social studies* are the *social sciences* simplified for pedagogical purposes" (p. 4). After the Committee of Ten successfully completed their work, in his opinion, the NEA entered into a period of neglecting social studies. He believed the NEA finally redeemed itself in

1912 and reassumed its leadership role by forming the CRSE, which included the 1916 committee. In his opinion, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* announced the social studies focus for the 1916 committee would be community problems as well as history. Wesley quickly passed through the *1915 Report on Community Civics* noting it affected “radical changes in the teaching of civics” by moving “the emphasis from the machinery of government to community civics” (p. 97). It was the *1916 Report on Social Studies* that Wesley welcomed and praised the NEA for sponsoring. However, his opinion went beyond the subject of social studies. He stated, “Perhaps the history of American education affords no other instance in which so unpretentious a booklet has wielded so great an influence upon the curriculum” (p. 97).

In Wesley’s opinion, the 1916 committee’s recommendations were flexible and stressed using one of two grade-level cycle plans, while at the same time noting either plan would be workable. As a result, he believed either plan provided for repetition of social studies subjects from the elementary cycle to the secondary cycle. That is, the cycle plans not only embraced a concern with students dropping out of school, but also included provisions designed to encourage students to remain in school. In Wesley’s opinion, the 1916 committee’s recommendations for the Problems of Democracy course and for extending American history to a full year course were considered revolutionary. In turn, he indicated these recommended changes represented a tremendous enhancement in teaching and learning.

Wesley believed the *1916 Report on Social Studies* rightfully brought the NEA to its traditional leadership role in curriculum development. In addition, in his opinion, it

raised social studies to the level of respectability it deserved. Lastly, he recognized the *1916 Report on Social Studies* brought attention to the actual needs of students and recognized an emphasis on students' growth.

Revisionist Interpretations

Several tangential revisionist interpretations have been applied in this study. The four separate revisionist interpretations are social efficiency, The Dewey and Robinson School of Interpretation, multiple influences, and the neoconservative revisionists. No significance is attached to the sequence of these interpretations. Each revisionist interpretation stands on its own.

Social Efficiency

One prominent group of curriculum historians, some based at the University of Wisconsin's consortium of educators, has argued that principles of efficiency, centralization, and decision-making were significant influences at the time of the 1916 committee. Indeed, some have specifically indicated that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* itself represented a social efficiency oriented point of view.

Raymond E Callahan. Callahan (1962) provided a detailed, introspective view of the growth of the impact of social efficiency on schools brought upon by the demands of society during the era of the 1916 committee. He created a basis to rationalize that the 1916 committee's recommendations were formed, in large part, by progressive school administrators who had already experienced the influence of social efficiency concepts in their work. At the same time, Callahan made it very clear he believed social efficiency

concepts had a tragic and detrimental effect on education during that time, and from that time forward.

Callahan suggested during the period 1900 to 1925 procedures became standard for schools to adopt the appearance of operating in a more business-like fashion. The procedures developed through a process that first involved an unfavorable comparison of schools to business organizations. Second, the process applied business economic and efficiency principles to education. Ultimately, the final step suggested, “business and industrial practices be adopted by educators” (p. 6)

As a result, Callahan indicated schools were pressured to move further into skills training which was perceived to be needed by industrial workers. This effectively moved schools further away from their focus on general education. He stated this situation also made educators very aware of the power of the industrialists and “it served to condition them to the pattern of capitulation which was to become prevalent in educational administration between 1911 and 1925” (p. 14).

Callahan suggested a number of factors contributed to the change in educational administration. These included the: (a) dominance of businessmen, (b) widespread acceptance of business values such as efficiency and economy, (c) profit-seeking entities, (d) accusations that all American institutions were mismanaged, and (e) increased cost of living. Callahan believed this paved the way for Fredrick Taylor, who he called “the great preacher of the gospel of efficiency” (p. 18) and others of similar philosophy and business outlook. These factors, according to Callahan, brought school administrators “under even stronger criticism and forced to demonstrate first, last, and always that they

were operating the schools efficiently” (p. 18).

It was not surprising, Callahan suggested, that educators decided to strive to mirror business efficiency. Callahan stated, “The idea was a new system of industrial management known as ‘scientific management,’ or the ‘Taylor system’ after the man generally credited with its origin and development” (p. 19). At this point, scientific management principles were enthusiastically received and scientific management surfaced to the top of the then current business methods. As a result, that era’s society attempted to apply scientific management concepts to numerous areas of society such as homes, families, churches, military organizations, legal professionals, “and last but not least, to education” (p. 23).

Callahan indicated that in 1910 the so-called efficiency expert “made his grand entrance into American society” (p. 42). As a result, overnight, Taylor became nationally known and moved the country into “efficiency-conscious” thinking. Callahan suggested in the years after 1910 the terms “efficiency” and “scientific management” received such significant press coverage “it is appropriate to label this period in American history as an ‘age of efficiency’” (p. 42). The press kudos awarded to scientific management, according to Callahan, increased the intensity of society’s perception that “great waste existed everywhere” (p. 46). The public, Callahan stated, directed more criticism at “many institutions, especially those large enough to be suspected of gross managerial inefficiency and those supported by public taxation” (p. 47). Still, according to Callahan, Taylor’s design for industrial management did not become widely known in the United States until after 1910.

Thus, Callahan stated school administrator's actions to adopt various business efficiency practices prior to the time of the 1916 committee were related to what he termed "the magic words 'scientific management'" (p. 95). This was particularly applicable to administrators adopting what they perceived to be efficient operation changes. Callahan stated: "This was especially true when someone who could lay claim to the title 'educational efficiency expert' had participated in what was done, or when the work could be traced to the recommendation of such a person e.g. ...[Franklin] Bobbitt" (p. 95).

As criticisms of the school systems rose, school systems were increasingly investigated. School administrators were advised of industry's developments in areas such as labor saving, more detailed instructions, and keeping accurate records. One of the fundamental doctrines, according to Callahan, was the elimination of waste. Callahan suggested detailed record keeping was highly regarded by business leaders. Based on this theory, if educators adopted the same practice, this new tool would assist them when the public or business was critical of an educator's product.

However, Callahan believed the appearance of scientific management on the education scene was not beneficial. One reason suggested was that "instead of approaching the study of administration through the social sciences, school administrators applied the 'science' of business-industrial management as they understood it" (p. 245). In spite of this, school administrators found maintaining the perception of adopting business-industrial practices helped them maintain their positions and realize a level of status in the new industrialized society. By 1925, Callahan noted

that the appearance of applying business and industry practices to school administration was in place and “efficiency seemed to have been accepted as an end in itself” (p. 246).

Due to their inadequate training and vulnerability to public criticism, Callahan believed the new school administrators really had no other alternatives than to turn to industry concepts. He expressed that university leaders had alternatives but they would have had difficulty completely resisting industry’s influence and the demands for efficiency. One alternative suggested by Callahan was that university leaders could have presented some resistance to the pressures of industry by achieving balance in graduate programs. In Callahan’s opinion, this could have at least tempered industry’s influence. Instead, he believed universities also moved with the force of public opinion. Once educators began their movement and gained momentum in adopting industry practices, it was too late to resist.

The result, Callahan stated, was (a) education issues were subordinated to business practices, (b) administrators became non-educators, (c) scientific management terms were used to identify dubious and unscientific methods and practices, and (d) an already prevalent anti-intellectual environment was strengthened. Therefore, Callahan believed industry practices led educators to make ongoing educational decisions based on either economic or noneducational premises. He stated, “The whole development produced men who did not understand education or scholarship” (p. 247). More importantly, “Their training had been superficial and they saw no need for depth of scholarship” (p. 247). Indeed, the new school administrators did not view schools as education centers. Instead, they formed a view that schools were efficiently run as long as

students did not fail, graduated on time, and schools operated economically.

As administrators further developed their move into what could be argued was businesslike efficiency, society continued their pressure for this change. As a result, Callahan believed “American public education did little but to respond to the dominant forces. But some evidence has been given of the existence of dissenting opinion by educators” (p. 120). He identified John Dewey as one educator who provided insightful criticism. Callahan stated Dewey was a voice against “the inappropriate application of business and industrial values and procedures on schools” (p. 124). Callahan also stated Dewey “criticized the oversimplified and superficial activity being engaged in, often in the name of science” (p. 124).

However, impending war actually highlighted and created more attention to adopting efficiency measures. Callahan expressed that on the surface, no one could deny that business practice applications to schools could be appropriate to some extent. However, he believed they should have been a tool to provide the best possible education for students. He stated, “When efficiency and economy are sought as ends in themselves, as they were in education in the age of efficiency...the education of children is bound to suffer” (p. 178). Nevertheless, he believed that school administrators after 1911 and during the era of the 1916 committee did not seek efficiency per se, but instead sought “*economy plus the appearance of efficiency*” (p. 178).

Callahan believed the adoption of industry’s basic values and techniques was a serious error for the schools. After all, education was their primary purpose he argued. However, he indicated the real mistake of educators was not borrowing from industry’s

values, but from its method of application. His reason was “the record shows that the emphasis was not at all on ‘producing the final product’ but on the ‘lowest internal cost’” (p. 244). Therefore, according to Callahan, educators at that time demonstrated efficiency including per pupil cost data, but the schools were not showing product excellence.

Edward A. Krug. Writing a history of the curriculum in secondary education was Krug’s overarching aim. Krug (1964) afforded the reader an in-depth look into the history and evolution of the American high school from the years 1880 to 1920 in his first volume. He wove wide-ranging aspects and issues involved in the American curriculum into his narrative, which surrounded and included the 1916 committee. He argued that social efficiency concepts were in conflict with several competing camps advocating for control of the curriculum during that era. He believed the social efficiency movement took supremacy and entered into the recommendations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Krug’s research was broad scoped in its coverage of the social theories, educational theories, and practical realities concerning the 1916 committee and its various personalities. In addition, his treatment of the social, economic, and civic environments of the era gave perspective to the issues surrounding and confronting the 1916 committee members as they constructed the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Krug believed the 1916 committee commenced its work as the CRSE barely entered its infancy stage. In his opinion, the *1913 Preliminary Statement* was essentially an early publication issued during the initial steps of the NEA’s renewed initiative to improve education. He described the *1913 Preliminary Statement* as an overview for

future work to be done.

Krug stated the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was issued under a social atmosphere adhering to social efficiency. He noted that other curriculums such as mathematics easily accomplished a move toward social efficiency concepts, and many believed the social studies and history subjects needed to make the same transition. In his opinion, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* met the challenge that “Social efficiency called upon the school subjects to prove their right to exist” (p. 336). In his opinion, social efficiency, in the refined definition that Krug articulated, became much more inclusive in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Social efficiency was, in Krug’s definition, composed of the dual components of social control and social service. He stated that a marriage of education for social control and education for social service occurred. While social control was part of the social efficiency reform movement, social service was its corollary part. In his opinion, those who started with social aims as their goal frequently gravitated to the idea of combining both—thus education for social efficiency. However, Krug indicated John Dewey believed the schools should be oriented in the social service vein much more than social control. Specifically, he observed Dewey wrote of his aim to educate students in “the spirit of service” and to provide them with a sense of self-direction to become worthy and harmonious citizens. He noted, “This was also a kind of social control, but the spirit and the accents of Dewey in this [Dewey’s *The School and Society*] essay differed fundamentally from those of Small, Snedden, Ellwood, and Ross” (p. 255).

Krug indicated social efficiency became the ruling reform movement for

education and even wrapped in what was known as industrial education under its wing. However, he argued, teachers spoke of the total school program. He believed their idea was that high school should be one, cosmopolitan school for all students and courses. Disdain for breaking out separate high schools for manual training or vocational education grew significantly. At the same time, differentiated programs for social or economic groups were not to be abandoned.

Krug argued that not separating high schools into two types—academic and vocational—was a significant conceptual move promoted by educators. Combining academics with vocationalism was developed to address the growing school enrollment, which the 1916 committee intended to help solve. Related to this issue was the 1916 committee’s recommendation that teachers be given the responsibility and authority for the curriculum. In its concern for dropout rates, the 1916 committee was echoing the ongoing concern of the NEA and society in general. This concern was tied directly to the effectiveness of schools. The number of failing students was blamed on teachers and schools. Krug believed this failure was due to a disconnect between high schools and elementary schools. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* recommended the repetitive school cycles as a solution.

The *1916 Report on Social Studies*’ inclusion of vocational education was, Krug believed, in answer to the issue of colleges dictating that only traditional subjects should be taught in high schools. Up to this point, a fight between classics and modern subjects existed but was moving into a new fight he called “new dualism” (p. 294). The new dualism exemplified the conflict between the academic and the practical “so much

deplored by Dewey” (p. 294). Krug drew a relationship between Dewey and the 1916 committee’s view that colleges should not dictate secondary education curricula.

However, he believed the 1916 committee also held it was possible that the principles of tradition could still be preserved with appropriate changes to curriculum.

Krug identified that a variation on the traditional notions involved in the social efficiency movement of the day was encompassed in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He pointed out that the NEA president in 1913 indicated any institution would fail in the 20th century if it did not utilize established business methods. Krug stated it appeared educators adopted big business ideas. However, he also indicated this was not an indication of surrender to business interests. Actually, he believed that by 1913 skepticism of industry and business motives was already growing. In juxtaposition, enthusiasm for scientific management ran in conjunction with reaction against having separate vocational schools. Krug stated, “Imitation of so-called business efficiency did not, then, necessarily imply acceptance of the pedagogical motives of big business, whatever these may have been” (p. 305).

Social efficiency assisted the concept of “curriculum plan” which was adopted by educators of that day, in Krug’s opinion. He indicated the curriculum plan design was to have many plans in place based on groups or types of students. This resulted in an education system organized to differentiate courses to meet requirements of special groups of students, rather than the needs of each student. Conceptually, this was a social efficiency oriented basis. Krug outlined many educators of the day considered the possible merger of social efficiency and scientific management concepts. He concluded

this merger implied a culmination of various curriculum evolutions beginning in 1905. He outlined these as: (a) the inclusion of scientifically based social objectives, (b) the application of the social objectives to evaluate the demonstrated contributions by school courses to the same social objectives, (c) a significant negative view of foreign languages and mathematics, (d) a corollary positive view of vocational or practical subjects, (e) replacing history with the newly created social studies, (f) a view for socialized or functional forms of English, and (g) an approach aimed at differentiating groups.

Concerning the last point, Krug suggested that a need to emphasize society's perceived needs of different social groups continued. As a result, it was relatively easy to identify those not on a college track with lower socioeconomic groups. This further translated into a general societal view of this group of students that was completely non-academic.

The 1916 committee did not work in isolation from other educationists and academics, according to Krug. He discussed the 1916 committee's adopted view of maintaining history as a subject, but as new history in the newly created social studies. He observed the *1913 Preliminary Statement* contained extended passages from James Harvey Robinson. He particularly noted Robinson requested historians to demonstrate "greater skill in hitting upon those phases of the past which serve us best in understanding the most vital problems of the present" (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1913, p. 24). Next, he observed the 1916 committee's view of history. Krug stated, "It is true, of course, that the report emphasized modern or recent history but this "presentism" was then a popular notion in many quarters. Even so, the committee by no means confined

itself to current events” (p. 357).

In his opinion, social efficiency concepts permeated throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. However, Krug presented a theory that these concepts underwent considerable modification and adaption by the 1916 committee.

Michael Lybarger. Lybarger’s (1981) unpublished dissertation focused on the origins of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He began with a unique introduction, which forewarned the reader, as well as mirrored his final conclusions and implications. As if to catch the readers’ attention at the outset, Lybarger asked the following question: “How did it come about that a subject and course of study designed for former slaves, their children, and wards of the government came to be considered appropriate for all children in American schools?” (p. 2).

Subsequently, Lybarger indicated “subject” meant social studies, “course of study” meant the social studies program at the Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia, “former slaves” meant “recently emancipated slaves” (p. 287), and “wards of the government” meant “native Americans” (p. 287). He further indicated, “a subject and course of study designed for” African Americans and Native Americans meant one designed to “meet the needs” (p. 287) of these groups.

One of the derivatives from his theories on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* involved the social studies translation of the elements of welfare from both the *1915 Report on Community Civics* and the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. His six main interpretative theories on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* were: (a) 1916 committee members understood social studies curriculum in a manner that grew out of a program

designed to meet the needs of African Americans and Native Americans, (b) 1916 committee members as individuals, at best, only partly understood the history and the purpose of the elements of their recommendations, (c) American Social Science Association (ASSA) efforts resulted in the idea that advancing civic welfare was a major concern of social studies, (d) Giddings' and Small's work is the basis for the idea of a science of society, (e) the National Municipal League (NML) provided the idea for early social studies that efficient, economical, and expert government best served public interest, and (f) from social settlement and charity work, social studies developed the concept of "need" as one that reflected personal inadequacy and not institutional shortcomings. His interpretation involved a determination that Jones was the key figure orchestrating the *1916 Report on Social Studies* recommendations. This factor and his stated summary points all have solid roots in the "social efficiency" school of interpretation.

Lybarger's approach was based on his idea that Thomas Jesse Jones' work at the Hampton Institute was of tremendous interest to the 1916 committee. He launched into an extensive account and discussion of the Hampton Institute and Jones' involvement in the development of its social studies program. Lybarger believed that a series of articles in *The Southern Workman* written by Jones became the basis in 1905 for the Hampton social studies program. This represented the primary reason, in Lybarger's opinion, why Jones was recruited to join the Hampton Institute. He conducted a lengthy discussion of the Hampton social studies program, its founding father, and its popularity with some social entities of the day. Lybarger stated even though it had been a number of years

since its creation, the 1916 committee looked favorably upon the Hampton social studies program and reviewed its design.

Lybarger conducted an examination of Jones' background and life before he assumed the chair of the 1916 committee. He discussed Jones' family cultural background, his connection with religion through his education as a minister, and his ongoing involvement with social programs and education. Lybarger focused and refocused on Jones' education under Franklin Giddings as well as the related social reform movement activity underlying Jones' study of immigrants and the structure of their lives in adapting to, or not adapting to, their new home and work place in New York. He included an examination of Jones' social settlement service with the Columbia University Settlement House. In doing so, as one of his research themes, Lybarger laid the groundwork for linking Jones with other 1916 committee members through a commonality of factors found in Jones' background.

Lybarger portrayed Jones as a most, if not the most, direct influence on the social studies recommendations formed by the 1916 committee in its reports. Lybarger argued since Jones was their Chair, the vast number of 1916 committee members with similar life backgrounds most likely were inclined to look to Jones for direction and guidance. Lybarger believed it was a natural step for 1916 committee members to look favorably toward the Hampton Institute program as a prime example for the newly created social studies curriculum they set out to research, develop, and submit final recommendations to the NEA.

Pulling the 1916 committee members into a common link under Jones' influence,

Lybarger provided an interesting conclusion. He argued that the similarities between the content and rationale of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and the Hampton social studies program demonstrated that the vast majority of 1916 committee members were influenced by Franklin Giddings and Jones' work at the Hampton Institute. After all, Lybarger noted, Giddings' text, *The Elements of Society*, was used in Jones' sociology course, part of Hampton's social studies curriculum. Lybarger asserted this Hampton Institute course was organized around categories that were extrapolated from Giddings' concepts of "social population, social mind, social organization, and social welfare" (p. 58). He stated the 1916 committee referenced this course, which Lybarger described as a "model course" (p. 72). In addition, Lybarger observed, the 1916 committee included a notation concerning the "social mind" contained in the Hampton sociology course. He suggested the 1916 committee collectively formed an opinion of Jones' work at Hampton. He stated, "the Committee on Social Studies praised the social studies curriculum of Hampton Institute in Hampton, Virginia" (p. 286). However, Lybarger interjected the caveat that "...the Hampton social studies existed in context of a debate over the nature of education for Black people" (p. 287).

The importance of the American Social Science Association was one of his themes. Lybarger examined the history of the term "social science" as well as the founding of the ASSA to support his argument. He indicated Henry C. Carey's work, *The Principles of Social Science*, published in 1859 and 1860, represented "the first definition of social science in the United States" (p. 91). Lybarger stated initial attempts to disseminate social science knowledge started "when some of Carey's followers founded

the American Social Science Association in Boston in 1865” (p. 92).

Lybarger correlated the work of the ASSA with the development of social studies based on three points: (a) he suggested Horace Greeley regarded social science studies in a way that coincided with the elements of welfare used by the 1916 committee, (b) he stated the ASSA was key in promoting the study of individual social sciences, and (c) he articulated that Reverend Heber Newton, a high profile ASSA member, had indentified social studies with, among other topics, “the inability of the wives of workingmen to cook” (p. 105), the study and teaching of disease, ventilation, and nutrition. Lybarger argued these points formed a basis for the social studies concept of “elements of welfare” in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

To support his argument that 1916 committee members—particularly Jones and Kingsley—were influenced by individuals who espoused specific ideologies, Lybarger indicated the field of sociology in general influenced the 1916 committee. Lybarger traced and retraced early, and later, sociologists indentified for their evolutionary efforts to define a society of science and utilize the “findings of that science [once again] to advance the welfare of society” (1981, p. 291). Lybarger’s primary focus was the influence of Franklin Giddings and Albion Small on 1916 committee members as a whole. He outlined any 1916 committee members who took their particular courses or read their individual textbooks were afforded the same theories which Lybarger perceived as central to sociology at that time. Namely, he suggested that social change brought suffering, was slow to develop, and that people providing education should work to mitigate the detrimental aspects of social change.

As another overall theme, Lybarger (1981) isolated the National Municipal League (NML). In his opinion, it was the most notable organization to be linked to the progressive movement of the era. By tracing the growth of the NML, he drew a relationship between it and the 1916 committee. He believed direct links existed between several 1916 committee members and the NML. To do so, he examined the Civic Education Committee fostered by and through the NML. He determined similarities between social studies education as recommended by the 1916 committee and the NML's civics education efforts reflected in its Civic Education Committee's work. He believed both held five key features in common: (a) NML designed civic education programs emphasized government functions, not structure, (b) NML programs advocated citizenship duties not citizen rights, (c) NML programs focused on municipal housekeeping details, (d) NML programs were not developed in the spirit of non-partisanship, and (e) NML philosophy supported the belief that students should rely on business people both directly and indirectly as leaders in the municipal reform movement.

Lybarger (1981) determined the NML Civic Education Committee's recommended programs were reflected in the reports of the 1916 committee. His reason was primarily because: (a) at least 10 members of the NML also served on the 1916 committee, of which three members of the 1916 committee also served on the Civic Education Committee of the League, and (b) the executive secretary of the League's civic education committee, Arthur William Dunn became the secretary of the 1916 committee.

Lybarger (1981) bisected his correlation of the NML with the 1916 committee to

include the Hampton Institute. In support, he suggested five points: (a) both shared a common view concerning the ongoing evolution and gradual democratization of political and legal institutions, (b) both maintained evolutionary assumptions which legitimated their idea that social and institutional changes had to be gradual to be effective and enduring, (c) both emphasized the functions, not the structures of government, (d) both studied governmental functions closest to students (i.e., Department of Agriculture for Hampton and local government for NML), and (e) both emphasized duties more than rights and the obligations of citizenship more than its privileges.

Lybarger (1981) formed an idea surrounding a social studies political context he believed favorably affected northern educators and businessmen. He suggested his research: (a) detected evidence of the great prestige the civic education aspects of the Hampton curriculum enjoyed with influential northerners, and (b) suggested the Hampton program correlated with the north's educational problem regarding recent immigrants and their children. He argued this was because Hampton was designed to address former slaves and their children in the south.

The work at Hampton Institute, Lybarger (1981) stated, reached beyond the bounds of education, perhaps for both north and south. He believed the Hampton Institute was involved in a humanitarian effort to help less fortunate make the best of what they did possess under their current circumstances. He also pointed out that five of the 1916 committee members possessed experience with social settlement and charity organizations. In his opinion, this established another direct relationship between Jones and other 1916 committee members. This perceived relationship was the basis for

Lybarger's (1981) belief that "a conception of need and a way of addressing need that would not be foreign to people familiar with the Hampton social studies" (p. 297) and contributed to the 1916 committee's interest in Hampton's social studies program.

The 1916 committee agreed, Lybarger (1981) indicated, their recommendations should address the "immediate 'needs and interests' of students" (p. 303) At the same time, however, Lybarger believed the 1916 committee defined "need" as a defect of a moral, intellectual or personal nature. Lybarger argued, "'Need' was a consequence of the social judgments of the members of the Committee on Social Studies about what ideals ought to be inculcated in the weak by instruction in the social studies" (p. 304).

Lybarger (1981) offered what he believed to be a compelling point. He suggested the 1916 committee's recommendations were widely accepted primarily because its members shared a "Darwinian view." From that vantage point, he concluded the 1916 committee held the collective opinion that social studies education legitimated the privileged position of children from wealthy homes, pointed the way to success for middle class children, and assisted children of immigrants and others in making the best of their lot in life. However, Lybarger also took a curious, brief turn to Krug (1964). Lybarger argued: "The research presented here suggests that Krug's distinction between social service and social control is not as sharp as he claimed" (p. 312).

Lybarger (1981) believed the 1916 committee members held common social, academic, and intellectual backgrounds which most likely allowed them to reach substantial agreement on what he considered fundamental social efficiency oriented educational, political, and economic issues. Thus, Lybarger believed while the 1916

committee gave “explicit” support toward social service, “implicit in the reports was a strain of social control” (p. 312).

Subsequently, Lybarger wrote two articles that extended his conclusions and implications on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Lybarger (1983) took the position that “the [1916] Committee acknowledged a pedagogical debt to Hampton Institute, an industrial and trade school for Blacks and Native Americans in Hampton, Virginia” (p. 455). Consistent with his 1981 unpublished dissertation, Lybarger expanded on his notion that the Hampton Institute program served as the educational template for the recommendations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. In doing so, Lybarger stated the 1916 committee concluded that the social studies program at the Hampton Institute served as its model for teaching and learning in social studies education.

In a second article, Lybarger (1987) examined what he perceived to be the effect of charity organizations and social settlement work on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He noted that seven members of the 1916 committee had been involved in charity house or settlement house work. Lybarger selected Columbia University Settlement House in New York as his example of humanitarian work instead of work done by Jane Addams and John Dewey at Hull House in Chicago. His selection was partially due to his observation that at various times four 1916 committee members—Jones, Kingsley, Barnard, and Arey—were associated with the Columbia Settlement. Choosing Columbia Settlement as his best example was based mostly on his rationale that its settlement work was centered around Jones’ notion concerning the social evolution of the individual, namely “the transformation of the individual into the Anglo-Saxon ideal” (p. 184).

Herbert M. Kliebard. Kliebard (1994) stated the *1913 Preliminary Statement* gave Jones, who Kliebard named as the author, the opportunity to openly write about Jones' view of the new direction for American education, particularly with regard to social studies. The *1915 Report on Community Civics* was also discussed in his writing. Kliebard indicated that in comparison to it, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was somewhat muted. However, he concluded "its major thrust was still clear" (p. 16).

According to Kliebard (2004), the 1916 committee recommendations did not in general reorient subjects to the extent desired by social efficiency reform advocates. Some subjects such as history, mathematics, and English indicated a change to a functional orientation. He believed the 1916 committee recommendations were humanitarian based, addressing particular characteristics and deficiencies of students along the line of Jones' philosophy. Referring to the *1913 Preliminary Statement* he stated: "it was clear that the recommendations for the reconstruction of the social studies would follow the lines that Jones had pursued at Hampton" (pp. 108-109). The preservation of American values and the perception of a need to combat the undermining of American society—both of great concern—was the reason the 1916 committee used the Hampton Institute social studies program. Therefore, he determined "it is not surprising that a curriculum originally developed for a social underclass should eventually emerge as a model for the majority of America's schoolchildren" (p. 109).

In turn, Kliebard acknowledged that Dewey's ideas differed from those promoted by Jones and the Hampton Institute. Dewey advocated efforts underway to prevent students from dropping out of school. At the same time, Kliebard observed Dewey

desired the teaching to be of significance and importance to the students. Kliebard noted that Dewey used the terms industrial education and vocational education interchangeably. He determined Dewey used industrial education to present a more broad scope view for subjects than the methods used for basic skills training. Relating to Dewey's ideological positions, Kliebard discussed the dramatic differences between Snedden and Dewey. He pointed out Snedden supported legislation that called for a dual education system, involving one system for vocational and one system for general education. Dewey, Kliebard noted, believed Snedden's position would educate one student group in a strict book fashion and would educate the other group using a narrow focus on trade training. Kliebard (2004) indicated at a time when even organized labor was not really challenging vocational education "Dewey emerged as its ardent and perhaps even its most vocal opponent" (p. 125).

Kliebard (2004) stated that social efficiency was the dominant force in moving vocational education to a prominent position in the schools. He believed that individuals who followed Snedden and Charles Prosser, not followers of Jane Addams or John Dewey, were the most influential. One reason, he stated, was:

Vocational education also fit perfectly into the social efficiency ideal of education as preparation for a specific social and occupational role, and in this sense, it was the most important step in the direction of a policy of curriculum differentiation in order to achieve that ideal. (p. 128)

Kliebard believed Dewey's ideas of democratic values did not persuade the advocates of trade training to deviate from their ideas. However, he indicated that in the end, Dewey may have formulated a compromise that led to a school system where "all children shared a common setting for their education" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 129). Nevertheless, Kliebard

suggested that various issues attached to the rise of industrialism united in a favorably received campaign for vocational education. He believed that the various types of social issues and changes underway during that era were not solely responsible for revising vocational education into an innovative curriculum. Rather, Kliebard stated, “certain ways of interpreting social change made the infusion of vocational education into the public school curriculum the most plausible and politically expedient, although not necessarily the most efficacious, response to those perceived changes” (p. 129).

Kliebard’s (2004) interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* surrounds Jones, the Hampton Institute’s social studies program, and advocates of vocational education. He believed the forces and influences of social efficiency in place at that time triumphed and formed the basis for the recommendations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The Dewey and Robinson School of Interpretation

Another group of curriculum historians have argued that the influence of John Dewey and James Harvey Robinson should not be overlooked in the 1916 report on social studies. They argue that Dewey’s principles of education and Robinson’s concept of new history are very prevalent in the 1916 report on social studies.

Luther V. Hendricks. Hendricks’ (1946) intent was to outline the depth and breadth of James Harvey Robinson’s participation in the education changes experienced in history curriculum goals, organization, and content in the 20th century. He indicated Robinson was not the sole originator of new history concepts. However, he indicated it

was Robinson who enthusiastically and effectively promoted the concept to educators.

Robinson, he stated, was the “new history” (p. viii). Hendricks intended to determine the impact of Robinson’s “great influence” (p. viiii) on the teaching of history. He stated:

“This is a study of Robinson as an educator” (p. ix).

According to Hendricks (1946), Robinson’s vision to revamp history into a more effective curriculum to meet society’s updated, new century requirements was evidenced early on in his career. Hendricks observed it began to flourish when Robinson served in 1892 on the NEA subcommittee on History, Civil Government, and Economics attached to the Committee of Ten. Over the next two decades, Robinson concentrated on moving history study “into line with the newer discoveries concerning man’s past and with the educational needs of our own age” (p. 19). He consistently suggested methods of changing the study of history to avoid the shortcomings of the traditional history courses being offered.

Hendricks believed that by 1910 Robinson’s vision for the purpose and aim of history study realized significant changes for history educators. Robinson’s revised views required history education to “select and interpret those facts from the past which would be of most value in explaining the present and in directing human progress” (Hendricks, 1946, p. 37). Robinson’s change involved a move from considering history a static subject that only progressed as new data was accumulated to a history study that would secure its place intellectually by harmonizing “itself with the highest aims and ideals of modern society” (p. 38). Hendricks believed Robinson viewed contemporary society as willing to become entrenched in efforts to achieve social betterment. He indicated

Robinson believed intelligent social reform required understanding current issues and events. This type of understanding, therefore, would be resolved through a study of history, which would ideally provide potential solutions for current problems. Hendricks (1946) stated, “Robinson urged that the present, which had hitherto been a willing victim of the past, should now turn upon the past and utilize it in the interest of social advance” (p. 38).

Robinson’s vision for new history to reach its goals, Hendricks (1946) indicated, was for history to draw back from its singular stance and “recognize that it is but one of several ways of studying mankind” (p. 46). Hendricks observed that, in addition to his writings and public speeches, Robinson, significantly influenced history teaching through his active participation on “several professional committees which were considering the place and of history in the schools” (p. 52). The 1916 committee was the last education committee membership Hendricks listed for Robinson.

Hendricks stated the 1916 committee followed Robinson’s principles in recommending that history topics should be selected based on their relationship to current interests of students or on usefulness to students for their development. Hendricks (1946) stated, “this whole emphasis on the exploitation of the past for the sake of the present had been the essence of Robinson’s philosophy for over a decade” (p. 63). Hendricks indicated the 1916 committee also recognized Robinson’s principle that the historical story of humanity’s progress and development was not isolated to historians. Instead, the story needed to be told in conjunction with the other social sciences.

By the time of the 1916 committee, Hendricks (1946) stated, Robinson believed

the new history needed to: (a) be based on selected course material, (b) provide adequate instruction to criticize and interpret the material selected, (c) concentrate on important and essential data to study human progress, (d) focus on both events and issues, (e) provide knowledge on the blocks of time between notable human events, (f) provide understanding of past societies and cultures, and (g) channel understanding of present problems and issues. Hendricks (1946) noted the 1916 committee's acknowledgement of its debt to Robinson's ideas concerning the new history. He pointed out that the 1916 committee directly quoted and turned to his concepts numerous times throughout their report. As a result, Hendricks indicated that Robinson's ideas were "well substantiated by the report itself" (p. 62).

In an analysis of the impact Robinson's concepts had during the 1916 committee's deliberations, Hendricks provided a narrative assessment from Thomas Jesse Jones. In a personal interview with Jones in 1945, Hendricks (1946) stated that Jones: "believes that Robinson had a profound influence on all the committee's deliberations" (p. 62). Thus, Hendricks suggested Robinson's philosophy was a significant part of the 1916 committee's work and recommendations. In particular, he stated the 1916 committee believed *The New History* "contained the best statement of the philosophy of history appropriate to our times" (p. 63).

David W. Saxe. Saxe (1991) discussed many issues relative to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* in his work. These included a description of the social studies program formulated by the 1916 committee. He believed the 1916 committee suggested that history, if it were to remain a school subject, needed to be of direct value and therefore

only utilitarian. As a result, Saxe suggested the 1916 committee developed “curriculum that specialized in attending to the present growth needs and interests of the learner” (p. 147). This meant, in his opinion, the 1916 committee gravitated to a focus of educating students to be good citizens and therefore, learn the concepts of “social service, welfare, utility, efficiency, and responsibility” (p. 147). Saxe also believed the 1916 committee “adopted a decidedly a historical approach” (p. 147).

Nevertheless, Saxe observed the 1916 committee looked favorably to Robinson and his new history. Saxe determined the 1916 committee moved away from concepts derived from the AHA. Instead, in Saxe’s opinion, the 1916 committee was aligned with the NEA and its educators. Saxe (1991) attached to the group he called the professional educators of the NEA the label of “progressive education, new education, and social education insurgents” (p. 148). This label appeared to accent his idea that the 1916 committee forged ahead on their own with little or no input from traditional history advocates in the design for the newly created social studies. He stated, “The insurgents took this cautious attitude as a refusal to cooperate, thus mandating their call to action” (p. 148).

Saxe believed the 1916 committee’s definition of social studies was broad. He maintained they determined any of the several social science courses—including history—could be used. However, under the notions of social efficiency at that time, each school system was to identify the appropriate and practical course. Saxe outlined the 1916 committee’s definition created two paradoxes: “freedom vs. conformity” and “individual vs. society” (p. 49). He stated conformity would lie in the direction of social

control. The second paradox involved social service. Saxe believed the 1916 committee combined both paradoxes. He stated the 1916 committee recommended “that educators adopt social control measures as well as social service concepts” (Saxe, 1991, p. 149).

The 1916 committee, Saxe suggested, was determined to include community civics in social studies as an opportunity to educate students for citizenship. He determined the 1916 committee firmly believed their recommendations would be successful if the courses and the teaching were designed to meet the student’s immediate needs. However, he outlined this stance by the 1916 committee created a dilemma. In his opinion, the recommendations did not allow curriculum to be designed in advance of teaching courses. In particular, he observed the 1916 committee, in lieu of outlining courses, insisted topics and subject matter “should be determined in each case by immediate needs” (Saxe, 1991, p. 150).

Saxe emphasized the importance that Dewey played in relation to the 1916 committee’s recommendations by noting they followed Dewey’s ideas and philosophy for education. He observed the 1916 committee moved beyond the traditional idea that social efficiency and citizenship education were the essence of social studies. Instead, he pointed out, that the 1916 committee recommended teachers and administrators determine the needs and interests of their students. He noted this position was in line with Dewey: “who held that although the child’s needs and interests are a vital part of any school program, students were not to dictate curricula” (p. 151). Saxe observed the various committees who worked prior to the 1916 committee provided data to support their recommendations. However, he stated the 1916 committee appeared “to be dictating

a course of action without benefit of empirical support, using instead Deweyan philosophy as a base” (Saxe, 1991, p. 152).

Saxe identified the difference between traditional education and the 1916 committee’s newly created social studies education. He suggested the former was intellectually centered on the individual and the latter was designed around the social development of the group. However, Saxe indicated the 1916 committee made an inadequate attempt to draw a differentiation between “needs of present growth” and “immediate objective utility.” He highlighted this point as a failure to illustrate and define these terms. Thus, he suggested the 1916 committee created an educational program designed to prepare students primarily to be citizens and secondarily to be wage earners. Saxe believed this distinction was based on the 1916 committee’s definition of good citizen, not on how students or parents defined good citizen. In repeating his concern, Saxe (1991) stated the 1916 committee recommendations “were left largely undefined” (p. 153). As a result, he suggested they concluded it was better to provide a guideline for teachers and risk that schools would ultimately violate their guiding principles “than to confine the report to a revolving philosophical argument” (p. 153).

Saxe determined community civics was the main emphasis in the newly created social studies. He outlined that the ninth grade civics recommendation encompassed the social efficiency concept to the extent that learning to be self-supporting and contributing efficiently to world progress was stressed. He pointed out the history topics included would vary, but would not require a chronological approach. In addition, he took the stance that “No matter what the topic, everything had to relate directly to the present, and

that all topics had to deal specifically with ‘real situations and relations in the pupil’s own life’ to be considered socially efficient” (Saxe, 1991, p. 159).

In addition, Saxe adopted an “either or” interpretation of the 1916 committee’s recommendations on history course teaching approaches. He believed the 1916 committee applied two basic principles for selecting either the topics or the problems: That is, teachers were to select course material based on the immediate interest and social significance of either the topic or the problem.

Saxe outlined three key questions that the 1916 committee asked: (a) What were the ways and means that made college and life requirements mutually exclusive?, (b) If history subjects were to meet requirements, what tests needed to be applied?, and (c) If history instruction was increased, to what extent would history insure universal or improved social education? He believed the 1916 committee provided direct quotes from Dewey to answer the first question. In his opinion, statements from James Harvey Robinson and William Mace were used in response to the second. However, Saxe believed un-cited, “paraphrased arguments from Snedden represented a response to the third question” (p. 163).

Saxe pointed out the 1916 committee proposed approaches to meeting immediate needs and interests referencing Robinson’s concepts. In addition, Saxe indicated the 1916 committee favorably viewed a teaching approach that was used by both Blanche C. Hazard, a 1916 committee member, and Dr. J. L. Meriam, university elementary school of the University of Missouri, cited by the 1916 committee. Saxe (1991) believed the 1916 committee was cautious in their recommendations in changing traditional history

courses from a narrative, chronological approach in order “not to blatantly upset the status quo” (p. 164). He stated, “Teachers were to select from the whole of the traditional history course those facts that met the qualifications of ‘functioning in the present’; everything else was to be discarded “(p. 164).

In addition, Saxe indicated that within the community civics and history recommendations resided a stimulus for teachers to create their own ideas. That is, he suggested the purpose of the newly created social studies was not to train “the collective will” (Saxe, 1991, p. 166). Saxe pointed out the POD course design was not standardized in presentation form or content. He believed it was an experimental course that either displayed the flexibility of social studies or, in his opinion, revealed misconceptions or lack of agreement on social studies subjects. However, almost in contradiction, Saxe stated, “The primary principle used, of course, was Dewey’s ‘needs and interests,’ thus making Dewey another important though somewhat passive contributor” (p. 168). He clearly outlined that Dewey had a significant influence on the 1916 committee. Saxe stated: “Most, if not all, the selected philosophical points that appeared in the report were specifically drawn from his writings” (p. 168).

On several points, Saxe determined the *1916 Report on Social Studies* fell short on adequately addressing the issue of social studies concepts meeting the present needs as well as the present interests of students. However, Saxe did attribute the final recommendations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* to the influence and the enduring philosophy of both Dewey and Robinson.

Stephen T. Correia. Correia’s (1994) goal for his essay was to cover what he

deemed a shortfall in research on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* up to that point in time—a close look at the chairperson of the 1916 committee, Thomas Jesse Jones. Correia identified Jones' social studies program at Hampton Institute as a revolutionary forerunner in social studies curriculum. He believed the Hampton's focus was to train teachers who would in turn train their students to learn to be workers who accepted and appreciated their work in industry. However, Correia observed "...it is important to note that this Hampton-style social studies curriculum did not provide for the students to be trained to be intelligent and participating members of society" (p. 103).

Correia recognized Jones' leadership and his background in the development of social studies education. Due to Correia's perception of Jones' ability to initiate a compromise among groups of people, he believed Jones was the ideal selection to chair the 1916 committee. In contrast to Jones, however, Correia determined the 1916 committee's intent for its recommendations was to develop principles for teaching and encouraging teachers to exert initiative. The 1916 committee avoided issuing recommendations for curriculum. He stated, "instead they urged local educators to make the decisions as to what kinds of topics and subject-matter were appropriate for their unique local conditions" (Correia, 1994, p. 107).

Correia (1994) determined the 1916 committee was either unwilling or unable to present specific definitions of what would constitute "present needs and interests of students" (p. 107). He suggested this factor was the cause of the continuing confusion over what constituted social studies. Correia believed the aspects of present needs and interests were significant components of the 1916 committee's plans for a curriculum

design. The lack of definitions had a positive effect in one respect. He stated it afforded local educators flexibility to address needs and interests as they determined. However, this flexibility also generated a variety of teaching definitions, which he believed obscured the potential for the newly created social studies from its very beginning. As a result, Correia considered this lack of definition a failure in the 1916 committee's recommendations.

Correia held to his observation that Jones' Hampton Institute curriculum was geared to meet the immediate needs of students. In so doing, he noted the Hampton's social studies program was referenced by the 1916 committee. He determined Jones designed his program for adequately addressing needs in order to lift "the race from one level to the next higher level of development" (Correia, 1994, p. 107). Correia defined this intent as a "society influenced definition of needs" (p. 107). He determined Jones' program, therefore, used an educational philosophy aimed at social control. However, pointing to Arthur W. Dunn as an example, Correia stated that educational theories from other 1916 committee members were "from a different perspective..." (p. 108). Based on this factor, Correia concluded the *1916 Report on Social Studies* deviated from the aspect of social control favored by Jones. He suggested the 1916 committee recommended guidelines for educators to use in developing curriculum to effectively respond to their local conditions and students.

Correia discussed the growing success of Jones' career, even though it did have humble beginnings. For instance, he noted Jones' affiliation with the Phelps-Stokes Fund—maintained in tandem with Jones' chairpersonship of the 1916 committee—

allowed him to expand into vastly different job endeavors that diverged from social studies. Correia suggested subsequent to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* Jones ceased to have a leadership role in the 1916 committee and indeed in the field of social studies education.

Correia indicated Jones' skillful chairpersonship of the 1916 committee did not produce the results that Jones envisioned. Correia suggested that during the tenure of the 1916 committee it was likely Jones' educational philosophy, particularly for social studies, was on the wane and became out-of-date. Correia pointed out Jones was educated at the turn of the century. Correia indicated even at the turn of the century the sociological ideas and theories acquired by Jones were subsiding in general appeal to society. Yet, Correia believed that Jones maintained his same Spencerian ideas after leaving Columbia and throughout the remainder of his professional career.

In turn, Correia indicated Jones' penchant for Spencerian ideas put him on a different theoretical track from his colleagues on the 1916 committee. He stated, "The 1916 report of The Committee on Social Studies was not a document which reflected a Spencerian point of view" (Correia, 1994, p. 111). However, Correia determined that Jones himself maintained a belief the 1916 committee developed principles to establish and preserve order in society through the educational use of social control in the curriculum.

Correia's interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* moved toward a revised opinion. That is, he suggested, while Jones was noted for his chairpersonship of the 1916 committee, his educational philosophy was not a strong influence on the

members. Instead, Correia indicated the recommendations made by the 1916 committee members as a group only proposed social control to a limited extent. As a result, he believed the 1916 committee aligned their recommendations to coordinate and utilize a Dewey and Robinson type of educational philosophy.

Ronald W. Evans. Evans (2004) published an extensive historical account of social studies education that included an analysis of the background surrounding the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He noted scholars and individuals who influenced the 1916 committee. Giddings and Small were among those identified by Evans. However, he stated, “Probably the single most important influence on the committee was John Dewey” (p. 22). Evans observed Dewey held the position that traditional history failed to focus on students’ interests and needs. According to Evans, Dewey believed the study of history started with examining a present issue or problem. In addition, Evans pointed out the *1913 Preliminary Statement* “also included Robinson’s view of history instruction” (p. 24). This factor indicated to Evans that beginning with the *1913 Preliminary Statement* Robinson advocated a change in the teaching of traditional history.

Evans observed the 1916 committee presented a broad definition of social studies in their introduction to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He believed their definition fell short of addressing or dispelling existing debate over the precise nature of social studies. Evans determined the *1916 Report on Social Studies* incorporated social efficiency concepts. He indicated, in society’s broad view at that time, the essence of social efficiency was training students to become members of society. However, Evans (2004) determined the *1916 Report on Social Studies* brought social control and social service

together with “elements of both the meliorist and social efficiency camps” (p. 24). He indicated the 1916 committee adopted a broad, not a narrow, view of social efficiency. Thus, he stated it was “a form of social efficiency closer to the meliorist pedagogy of John Dewey” (p. 26).

Evans believed this stance was echoed in, or evidenced by, the fact the 1916 committee did not provide detailed course outlines. The 1916 committee clearly indicated they wanted to avoid stereotyped course formats that would not provide for addressing students’ interests and needs. For instance, Evans (2004) noted the phrase “present interests and needs” was used frequently throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He stated, “This was a Deweyan position” (p. 24).

Evans considered both the *1915 Report on Community Civics* and the Problems of American Democracy course proposed in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as radical in comparison to the AHA traditional history courses. Evans singled out community civics as the social studies education vehicle for social efficiency concepts of the era. He suggested that the *1915 Report on Community Civics* focused on the local community as an easier method of teaching citizenship responsibility. At the same time, Evans stated the 1916 committee argued a community of interests also equated to, and applied to, the national community.

In addition, Evans believed the 1916 committee’s failure to provide solid examples of curricula led to a failure to provide changes for teacher methods. However, he believed the proposed POD course was a compromise attempt. In his opinion, it represented a purest position and a revisionist plan for social studies. He also believed the

POD course followed the social science course modeled by the ASSA. As a result, he acknowledged social efficiency concepts were represented in the POD course. However, Evans stated: “it was social efficiency of a liberal, softer reconstructionist bent” (p. 26). The POD course demonstrated this idea. It focused on an examination of actual problems or issues. According to Evans, this was in contrast to the “direct inculcation of preferred citizen behaviors” (p. 26) discussed in the *1915 Report on Community Civics*.

The creation of the POD course, Evans suggested, envisioned the ideals of progressive reform. In turn, he labeled Dewey as the “most influential progressive” (p. 27). In addition, he determined under Dewey’s pedagogy, educational theory translated into social theory. Referencing part of Dewey’s social theory, Evans (2007) indicated: “John Dewey had frequently asserted that schools lagged behind social conditions and social problems” (p. 116). Evans (2004) indicated Dewey’s theories were identified through the 1916 committee’s idea that the educator, therefore, “becomes an agent for social change, a social reconstructionist” (p. 27).

In addition to Dewey, Evans identified Robinson as one of the two primary individuals who influenced the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The 1916 committee, Evans noted, was critical of previous treatments of history, primarily due to what could be termed an overemphasis on ancient and medieval history. He believed the 1916 committee blended Robinson’s new history with Dewey’s pedagogy. He stated, “Both were quoted liberally” (Evans, 2004, p. 25).

In addition, Evans (2004) discussed four major issues of influence on the 1916 committee: (a) the intellectual roots in progressive education, (b) the 1916 committee’s

social studies curriculum, created under the umbrella of reform, ultimately embodied “Protestant social gospel” (p. 27), (c) the impact of unprecedented immigration during this period, and (d) the perceived economic necessity identified by reforms of the time. Keeping these four issues in mind, Evans summarized his description of the character of the 1916 committee members. He stated the members were “White, middle-class northeast European Americans who generally assumed the hegemony of their own group and ignored race as an issue” (p. 28). In turn, Evans believed the 1916 committee, as a group, was unified in an effort to publish useful and practical, but flexible, secondary education recommendations for teachers.

On the surface, Evans suggested the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was intended to address educators’ concern for social improvement and to create a much improved method for teaching social studies. At the same time, the 1916 committee intended the new teaching methods and practices would provide some assistance to help society. However, beneath the surface, he suggested, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was striving to resolve the competing ideologies of social efficiency and social meliorism. Evans believed both Dewey and Robinson played major roles in the 1916 committee’s vision for conflict resolution.

Multiple Influences

Another group of educational historians has argued multiple influences were swirling around the 1916 committee. These scholars embraced a spectrum of ideas not necessarily held in a prioritized sequence. These scholars focus upon social efficiency and other social movement ideas of the 1916 era, Dewey ideals, and Robinson’s new

history.

Lawrence A. Cremin. Cremin (1961) tells the story of the rise and evolution of the progressive education movement. He assured the reader it was not a simple story. Progressive education evolved in the latter part of the 19th century. In Cremin's view, it was initiated in conjunction with extensive humanitarian efforts to ensure the promises of American living for the new industrialized urban society. He stated that progressive education commenced as the progressive movement became applicable to education.

This new industrialized society, Cremin (1961) suggested, caused the NEA to join the hotly debated manual training issue at the turn of the 20th century. As the NEA's involvement in the debate continued, an answer to America's need for vocational training was proposed in 1913 by the National Association of Manufacturers. Their recommendation was to allow independent vocational boards—mainly employers and employees—to “manage the training of the hand-minded half of the population” (p. 53).

Related to the concerns of industrialized society, Cremin (1961) suggested that the settlement workers movement of the time was founded to regenerate community neighborhoods. However, one of their primary goals was the humanizing of industrial society. He stated, “In this, education would always be the primary instrument” (p. 60). Cremin observed the work of Hull House, “the most famous of the American settlements,” together with other settlements, “found themselves more and more in the business of education” (pp. 60-61). He suggested the Hull House program was socialized education, which Jane Addams preferred to think of as a “protest against a restricted view

of the school” (p. 61). Cremin noted, “There is a patent similarity between Jane Addams’s educational outlook and John Dewey’s” (p. 63), which he believed was a result of their collaboration on Hull House during the time Dewey was at the University of Chicago.

Cremin (1961) suggested the settlement house workers were faced with fundamental problems involving “wealth, corruption, and the unwillingness of the privileged to share their knowledge and ideals with the poor” (p. 67). However, he suggested other reformists found the problems related directly to the immigrants themselves. That is, social gospel ministers were concerned with immorality and high crime rates couched vaguely in terms of racial origin. Unionists blamed immigrants for unemployment and lower wages. On the other hand municipal leaders were significantly concerned with the immigrant vote being driven by the political bosses. Society immediately involved education to address their perceived “ever-present need to Americanize those who had already come” (p. 67). However, Cremin observed society lacked agreement on exactly what Americanization of immigrants meant or should be. Therefore, the perceived need created more problems than solutions.

According to Cremin (1961), advocates of each of the progressive causes ranging from the late 19th century through World War I developed their own programs for the schools. Society’s reformists intertwined “social reform, reform *through* education, and the reform *of* education” (p. 85). Therefore, progressive education was initiated from a broad scope social and political reform called the progressive movement. It was, according to Cremin, started as a multifaceted protest against viewing the school in

restricted terms. However, he believed progressive education in reality was more than this. Cremin suggested its premise related education to politics to fulfill the new future of American life.

Within this era of progressivism, Cremin (1961) noted that Spencer's work immediately accelerated and supported the campaign for "new education" based on teaching pure and applied sciences, mathematics, and modern European languages. He believed Spencer's ideas were a significant influence on the NEA Committee of Ten's recommendations giving parity to the natural sciences in secondary education. Also, he stated Spencer was a potent influence on the CRSE's Cardinal Principles. He noted Spencer's work had a larger effect that may have been more important but elusive. He stated, "Spencer, after all, was the great proponent of evolution to the American people, the teacher of what later came to be called social Darwinism" (p. 93).

Cremin observed educators in the late 1890s could choose to follow the ideas of either Spencer and Sumner or Ward and Small. This represented a choice, in Cremin's (1961) words, between Conservative Darwinism and Reform Darwinism. Regarding the latter, Cremin believed that Ward and Small transformed the "harsh Spencerian doctrine of social Darwinism into a full-fledged philosophy of meliorism" (p. 99). Since John Dewey was Small's colleague, Cremin believed Dewey's choice to side with Ward and Small was not difficult.

As an indication of Dewey's influence on educational change, Cremin discussed Dewey, his philosophy, and career at great length. He stated that Dewey played an early role in the progressive education movement. With educational reforms around him

attempting to sort out existing pedagogy, Dewey placed the blame squarely on the industrialists for schools not providing the right solutions. Simply stated, Dewey believed society educated students. However, the society of the era was experiencing a completely radical change under the impact of the industrialists. Therefore, according to Cremin (1961), Dewey believed education needed to experience a complete transformation on a par with society in order to have any meaning for students.

Even though Dewey viewed education's aims in social terms, Cremin (1961) stated Dewey firmly believed that the successes of a transformed education would be evidenced "in the changed behaviors, perceptions, and insights of individual human beings" (p. 122). One of Dewey's key notions was that "education is growth and subordinate to no end beyond itself" (p. 123). According to Cremin, Dewey held that education's aim was not merely to create citizens or workers but to create human beings who would constantly add to the meaning of their experiences and their abilities to direct future experiences. Cremin believed that this idea became a much abused Deweyism. At the same time, Cremin stated it was Dewey's notion of growth that tied his theories of the individual to "progressivism writ large" (p. 123).

Cremin (1961) suggested that Dewey believed democracy in the new social era required both a reformatted culture and a reformatted curriculum. According to Cremin, Dewey included the introduction of vocational subjects not as training for manual skills, but as focal points to increase intelligent participation in the life and meaning of the new industrialized society. Cremin suggested Dewey believed that a narrow utilitarian education for one class of people and a broad, liberal education for another would not

allow democracy to flourish. Therefore, Cremin stated, Dewey viewed educational reform as “the first and foremost work of an ‘intentionally progressive’ society” (p. 126).

Due to a conflict between the University of Chicago and his experimental school, Dewey left and joined the professors at Teachers College, Columbia University. Teachers College had undergone a transformation into a “‘full- fledged reformist’ philosophy of teacher preparation” (p.175) via a merger of professionalism and progressivism. It had gravitated to the position of welcoming all major streams of progressivism in education. It provided its professors the financial and political freedoms to explore every avenue of pedagogical theory and practice. At the same time, it created a separation from arts and sciences that undermined the basic teacher preparation functions of Columbia. This situation “increasingly insulated the work of the pedagogical faculty” (p. 176). This situation was a boon to allowing free and unrestricted growth of progressivism ideology. At the same time, it harbored the progressive movement from valuable criticism.

Cremin (1961) suggested an interesting juxtaposition. That is, Dewey experienced the tenets of progressive education as it was connected with social reform. On the other hand Cremin suggested, Rugg and others, “found their insight in its tie with the historic battle of the artist against the superficiality and commercialism of industrial civilization” (p. 183).

David Jenness. Jenness (1990) completed a study intended to make sense of the social studies subject. Not unlike the 1916 committee members, Jenness was a participant in research for a national commission to identify goals, priorities, and recommendations for reorganizing and bolstering the social studies curriculum and teaching in schools. He

indicated at that time the term social studies was viewed as somewhat suspect, possibly even hypothetical. His extensive research included the early development of social studies.

Jenness noted that society after about 1910 was involved in sweeping educational change. The change was possibly part of a new national agenda that reflected social trends and aspects associated with, for instance, industrialism, technology and growth of cities. He suggested the social reform aspects of progressivism influenced the educational changes.

A less studied but important aspect to this educational change was the philosophy of progressivism. According to Jenness, this aspect implied change built on small steps and coordinated human action that could be adjusted to balance many interests and needs. Jenness (1990) believed this idea of small forward steps was a counterforce to another progressive concept in this era: social Darwinism or what he called vulgar evolutionism. Instead, in his opinion, the first aspect of progressive progress was a “result of deliberate and authentic human actions” (p. 74). Jenness suggested this was the essence of John Dewey.

Jenness believed that knowledge gained in education was accomplished through a student’s experience, not just simply acquiring it. In other words, knowledge was gained through actively interacting with the surrounding environment. It was a form of problem solving. This led Jenness (1990) to observe Dewey represented many aspects in education and social history. He suggested it was difficult to view Dewey against a progressivism and industrial democracy backdrop. At the same time, it was “difficult to

separate his [Dewey's] intentions from the inferences of those who followed him" (p. 75).

Jenness believed Dewey hoped the schools would teach students to be socially effective individuals who would not only earn a living but also represent a supply of practical knowledge for the improvement of society in general. Nevertheless, Jenness (1990) indicated Dewey was opposed to individuals and groups "who believed in the extremes of Social Efficiency, with its reliance on tests and routines and input-output functions" (p. 75).

Jenness introduced the *1916 Report on Social Studies* by first pointing out the CRSE did not issue its Cardinal Principles until 1918. He believed, however, the revolutionary ideas attributed to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* in hindsight reflected the CRSE's extended revisionist view of public education's purpose and goals. He believed Cardinal Principles gained significance for many years after 1918.

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* recommendations concerning traditional civics, Jenness stated, reflected and reinforced those contained in the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. He believed both the study group for the *1915 Report on Community Civics* and the 1916 committee concluded the current teaching practices for traditional civics did not work. According to Jenness (1990), the 1916 committee's solution to the problem with traditional civics was to design a new course in community civics. In the ninth grade, their community civics course would combine elements of government, economics encompassing largely the history of economic changes after 1880, as well as the analysis of social structures and processes that justified the term "community."

Jeness also believed solving the problem with traditional civics involved the 1916 committee's recommendation for the Problems of American Democracy course. According to Jenness (1990), the 1916 committee recommendation made it clear they viewed problems as a fact of life. Therefore, he suggested the 1916 committee believed that students who studied history, community civics, and the remaining social studies "should be able to face societal problems realistically" (p. 77). He suggested the 1916 committee did not identify or find a need to identify whether problems faced were temporary or reoccurring or actually a part of American democracy. He identified that later attempts were made to charge the social studies subject in general and the 1916 committee itself with "premature Social Reconstructionism" (p. 77). However, Jenness pointed out the 1916 committee referred to problems, issues, and matters of social importance or student interest in a very matter of fact manner. Jenness stated, "It is hard to see any provocative doctrine of social criticism here" (p. 77).

The 1916 committee's focus on community civics and social problems, Jenness (1990) suggested, most likely implied history was inadequate as a standalone subject to provide knowledge of society worldwide as well as its various institutions and forms. However, he stated, "proposals for alternation within history were not extreme" (p. 78). He believed the 1916 committee was aligning itself with "Robinson's concept of historical-mindedness" (p. 80) and that history needed to relate or contribute to the present. He argued, therefore, the 1916 committee was planning to remove "some dead wood" (p. 80) by realigning history and reducing somewhat the amount of time in the curriculum.

Jeness believed the 1916 committee's recommendations for secondary education were significant but hardly revolutionary. That was why, in his opinion, school curriculum did not necessarily immediately incorporate their ideas. On the other hand the Cardinal Principles, Jenness (1990) believed, "*was* revolutionary in its restatement of the *purpose* of public education, and thus its intended character" (p. 80). He suggested that the CRSE's Cardinal Principles was a mixture of the early reform movements starting with progressive reform. The remaining reforms were a confusion of concepts utilizing the term social. This was a mixture of "social meliorism, social determinism, social efficiency, social enrichment (in terms of lifelong adjustment), social reform" (p. 82).

However, Jenness suggested there was an important divergence between the Cardinal Principles and the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He stated the Cardinal Principles was "An example of social engineering and social reform carried to extreme" (Jeness, 1990, p. 82). On the other hand he indicated the *1916 Report on Social Studies* "might be expected to show the same pattern: anti-intellectualism, vocationalism, and the like" but the "language of the 1916 Report does not do so, however" (p. 82).

Jeness believed the 1916 committee held that of utmost importance were the ideas of practical citizenship and informed participation—inherently a part of social learning. He believed the 1916 committee clearly detailed that the heart of their social studies curriculum was aimed at citizenship. He believed the 1916 committee held that in order to fulfill their various social responsibilities students required knowledge of history—particularly historical mindedness, a solid understanding of civic processes, and development of a social awareness. Jenness (1990) stated, "No one who reads the 1916

report could miss the main point: that the social studies should enable one to know and to act in the real world” (p. 84).

To reach this conclusion, Jenness acknowledged his interpretation identified that multiple influences including different versions of progressivism, social efficiency, and other reform movements of the day were a combined backdrop to the combined influences on the recommendations of the 1916 committee.

Michael Whelan. Whelan (1991, 1993, 1997a, 1997b, 2006) wrote several essays or articles pertinent to the 1916 committee and various interpretations of their *1916 Report on Social Studies*. In an aggregate, he discussed key individuals and entities which influenced the 1916 committee and their *1916 Report on Social Studies*. In addition, Whelan reviewed and critiqued the work of other scholars regarding the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Whelan (1991) researched Robinson’s role. He pointed out Robinson was a member of the 1916 committee, served on the earlier Committee of Ten, and was cited extensively through verbatim passages in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. This led Whelan to conclude that Robinson, particularly through his book, *The New History*, exerted significantly more influence on the 1916 committee recommendations than Mace, his committee colleague, or even Dewey.

Based on the new scientific approaches to the social sciences in place at the time of Robinson’s writings, Whelan (1991) suggested Mace’s earlier approaches for the teaching and learning of history needed to be updated in an empirical manner. Whelan indicated Robinson’s new history concepts expanded “the scope of historical history

inquiry to be effected through the establishment of an intellectual alliance between history and the social sciences” (p. 193). Whelan also indicated Robinson held that limiting the extent of historical history study to past politics or selected events “tended to trivialize the richness and lasting continuity of human existence” (p. 194).

Whelan (1991) argued the 1916 committee repeatedly displayed reliance on Robinson’s new history. He believed Robinson’s concept of new history “served as the intellectual foundation upon which the Committee on Social Studies was based” (p. 196). As a final assessment, Whelan believed the 1916 committee intended “to infuse the history taught in the schools with the ideals of Robinson’s ‘modern historical outlook’” (p. 200).

Whelan’s (1993) book review of Saxe’s (1991) *Social studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* suggested the term “social studies insurgents” devised by Saxe to describe the 1916 committee members as a group was off key. He found the word “insurgents” misleading at best. Whelan argued Saxe fell short in adequately describing the intent of the 1916 committee. That is, he believed Saxe superficially interpreted the 1916 committee’s inclusion of current issues study for the newly created social studies.

In Whelan’s opinion, Saxe simply related notions of civics to Dunn, and connected Jones and Kingsley to aspects of citizenship education and sociology. According to Whelan, Saxe used these ideas as a basis to conclude history was not included in the early conceptual theories of social studies. Therefore, Whelan (1993) contended that Saxe’s work was limited in scope and obscured the “fact that historical study has been a central component of social studies throughout the twentieth century”

(p. 321). As a conclusion of his review, Whelan argued: “Had he [Saxe] analyzed the similarities between the insurgents and the historians, however, not just their differences, his study would have been more balanced, more accurate, and as a result, more valuable” (p. 323).

In subsequent writings, Whelan (1997a, 1997b, 2006) continued his discussion and critique of the analysis of the 1916 committee and the *1916 Report on Social Studies* by other scholars. More importantly, Whelan presented his own interpretations on the 1916 committee’s work. At the outset, Whelan (1997a) described his own educational philosophy as an argument not only to adopt history-centered curriculum, but also that the new curriculum needed to maintain “traditional ideals of social studies education, including, above all, social studies’ special responsibility for citizenship education” (p. 22). His goal for both articles was to study early social studies education in order to identify the intent of the various historical committees’ efforts to balance history study with current issues or events study.

Whelan (1997a) reiterated Saxe’s (1991) conclusion that the 1916 committee’s recommendations represented a revolution—not merely a piecemeal reform—for the subject of social studies. However, Whelan stated, contrary to Ravitch (1985, 1989a, 1989b) and Saxe (1991), he believed the 1916 committee was extremely diverse both professionally and philosophically. That is, he believed the 1916 committee comprised several schools of thought. In his opinion, the influence of diversity in thinking was evident in the 1916 committee’s recommendations. Whelan indicated the “history reformers” proposed redesigning existing history courses and the “pedagogy experts”

(Whelan, 1997a, p. 25) suggested improved teaching methods and provided examples.

Whelan (1997a) stated, contrary to Ravitch (1985, 1989a, 1989b) and Saxe (1991), the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was “misunderstood as a revolutionary document” (p. 28). He believed it did not eliminate the Committee of Ten’s or Seven’s history subject recommendations. However, the 1916 committee, according to Whelan, significantly reformed both previous committees’ proposals. His reason was that, in his opinion, the 1916 committee placed much more significance on developing citizenship values. Whelan did not believe this was revolutionary. Instead, he believed the Committee of Ten provided the “real revolution in history and social studies education” (p. 28) in secondary education. He stated both the Committee of Seven and the 1916 committee adopted the Ten’s fundamental principles. This was because he believed by 1916 history was well established in schools. Therefore, the 1916 committee was not justifying a need for history in the curriculum. Instead, according to Whelan, the 1916 committee was “free to clarify the type of history most conducive” (p. 29) to make an effort to significantly develop citizenship. To do so, Whelan stated, the 1916 committee specifically advised students to study “those aspects of the past that continue to affect their lives as individuals and as members of social groups” (p. 31).

Whelan stated history represented the best and most natural subject to serve as the vehicle to organize social studies curriculum. This philosophical belief was first reflected in Whelan’s suggestions that Robinson was a significant influence on the 1916 committee. Second, he believed a combination of groups represented an influence for the other various 1916 committee members. That is, insurgents, history reformers, and expert

pedagogical reformers diversely influenced individual 1916 committee members. His interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was that it “reflects the heterogeneity of educational reform in general during the progressive era” (Whelan, 1997b, p. 25). More importantly, instead of eliminating history education from the curriculum, he argued the 1916 committee recommended a “series of reforms in the way history was organized” (p. 25) for teaching and learning.

In turn, Whelan (2006) outlined the contemporary debate over a history-centered social studies in which the study of history would be organized in order to promote traditional social studies education goals. This included “its special responsibility for citizenship education” (p. 38). He assessed that history “is the only social studies subject open to the whole range of human experience and its development through time” (p. 48).

Murray R. Nelson. Nelson (1994) in the introduction to his commentary on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* clearly outlined what he considered its relevant and pervasive effects and influence since its publication. However, he emphasized that few social studies education scholars had set aside the time up to that point to read its 63 pages, let alone closely examine its content. With a few exceptions, in his opinion, it had not been adequately, let alone, effectively, addressed. Nelson identified until that time the study completed by Michael Lybarger in 1981 was one of the few writings on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Nelson’s essay was a close, more contemporary interpretation of the content and structure. Nelson suggested the work of the 1916 committee was influenced by societal issues of that era such as the impact of immigration, the impending war, labor

exploitation, and union activity. He outlined these issues generated many concerns with the type and method of education in place. Nelson indicated the progressive movement during this period weighed in and influenced education. He highlighted Dewey's influence during the tenure of the 1916 committee. However, Nelson referred to Lybarger (1981) and indicated he concurred with Lybarger's suggestion that Giddings influenced the 1916 committee. That is, he cited Lybarger to establish either a firm, or somewhat firm, connectivity between Giddings, his teaching, and his textbooks with the majority of the 1916 committee members. He also indicated Small was influential in Dunn's work on the 1916 committee. In addition, Nelson noted that few of the 1916 committee members were actually members of the NEA. This observation allowed Nelson (1994) to conclude "it is no surprise that the Committee was heavily weighted toward social reformers" (p. 82).

Nelson indicated the elements of welfare topic was one of three major parts of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. He observed the same elements were actually introduced in the *1913 Preliminary Statement* and then developed in both of the subsequent reports with "minor modifications" (p. 83). Nelson also stated, in his opinion, "The aims of social studies were social efficiency, the cultivation of good citizenship, including loyalty to high national ideals" (p. 83).

In addition, Nelson (1994) believed one of the most important statements from the 1916 committee was made in the introduction to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He reiterated the fact the 1916 committee decided not to provide detailed course outlines in order to avoid stereotyping instruction. He stressed the 1916 committee wanted teachers

to organize and determine course material based on immediate needs. This stance by the 1916 committee indicated to Nelson their statements negated any idea that the social reform surrounding the 1916 committee transformed their thinking toward a social reconstructionist philosophy. Instead, he simply stated, “They noted the high school course had been determined too largely by supposed future needs and called for more emphasis on present needs and past experience” (p. 84). In addition, Nelson suggested many scholars overlooked the 1916 committee’s concern regarding the growing problem of students dropping out of school. He stated, “This is a vital component of the Report easily ignored by later eulogists of it” (p. 84).

Nelson observed Dewey made important contributions to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. He stated the basis for the seventh and eighth grade history courses was derived from Dewey’s idea of “relating to the child’s world” (Nelson, 1994, p. 84). Nelson believed the 1916 committee did not necessarily find issue with the chronological method of teaching history. However, he indicated the 1916 committee took up the issue that schools did not adequately cover the subjects being taught. He determined instead of recommending a more traditional, but comprehensive, overview of history, “the Committee considered one year of school work on one historical epoch, permitting the teacher free choice within these limits” (p. 86).

Nelson further suggested the 1916 committee viewed the POD course as an in-depth study. He believed the POD course was designed to be flexible and changed. He argued it represented the 1916 committee’s response to their perception of student needs as well as to the demands of economists and sociologists. He also believed the 1916

committee's examples for the POD course were "drawn in part from Jones' work at Hampton Institute" (Nelson, 1994, p. 86). Nelson determined the reason was the 1916 committee considered the Hampton program the best example for organizing problem-based economic and sociological knowledge. In addition, Nelson believed the 1916 committee encouraged applying the community civics principles that he considered to be the elements of welfare to experiment with the innovative nature of the POD course. Yet, Nelson noted one concern of the 1916 committee—that is, the lack of suitable textbooks. Nelson believed it was not actually a pervasive problem to their recommendations. He argued the 1916 committee was advocating local curriculum development as their primary objective, not the development of suitable textbooks.

Due to "nonreading," Nelson (1994) stated the *1916 Report on Social Studies* suffered from wide and varied misinterpretation. He believed the 1916 committee developed recommendations "far more flexible than the misinterpretations of the report would imply" (p. 87). At the same time, Nelson indicated ideological beliefs and biases of the 1916 committee members needed to be taken into account. Nelson was concerned, for instance, with the fact the 1916 committee failed to refer to educational recommendations from previous committees. He indicated, "Members of the 1916 Report chose not to do this" (p. 87).

Nelson then transitioned his commentary. He stated, "The Committee of 1916 believed in what we refer to as social Darwinism" (1994, p. 88). From this viewpoint, he suggested the 1916 committee advocated the overall opinion that individuals gained success by acknowledging their position in society and by gradually improving it. In

addition, Nelson took the position the 1916 committee promoted education as the path to local reform. Therefore, he believed teaching local government, not aspects of national civics education, was their focus.

Nelson also drew parallels between societal issues of the 1916 era to his current time. He correlated the same parallel between the writers of the 1916 Report and the writers of subsequent reports on education. He determined the 1916 committee intended teaching to be flexible and to have choices made available to students. Nelson suggested the same was true for contemporary reports. However, he cautioned that part of the strength and character of all reports was the underlying ideologies. He stated, “Those ideologies are often ignored in accepting reports at face value” (1994, p. 90).

Nelson’s interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* involved identifying and acknowledging who and what contributed the strongest ideological base. In so doing, he believed the 1916 committee’s ideology and pedagogy was derived from an individual—such as Jones, a social reform movement—such as social efficiency, or a combination of both.

Neoconservatives

The Neoconservative Revisionist School of Interpretation consists of historians. They argue that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* undermined and adversely affected the teaching of traditional history. The neoconservatives believe that social studies is not useful, promotes social efficiency, and is utilitarian.

Diane Ravitch. In numerous publications, Ravitch (1978, 1985, 1989a, 1989b, 2000) discussed and analyzed history and social studies as school subjects commencing

in the early development stages of the 20th century. She utilized similar themes over a complement of topics. She covered individuals such as Dewey and Jones, together with indirect references to Robinson, as well as the Committee of Ten, the 1916 committee, the CRSE, social efficiency concepts and what she termed radical revisionists and radical historians. Ravitch's educational philosophy is woven throughout. One result was Ravitch's interpretation of the intent and outcomes of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* which was little more than a utility-minded document

Views and opinions on the influence of John Dewey were extensively presented. Ravitch (1978) believed Dewey was not an innovator. Rather, she believed he was adept at analyzing and identifying major trends and historical forces that affected education over time. She viewed Dewey as a liberal. In addition, in her opinion: "Dewey was a progressive, but he frequently allied himself with radicals and anarchists on particular issues, and they in turn frequently borrowed his ideas" (p. 160).

Ravitch (1985) indicated Dewey was not actually opposed to organizing subjects systematically, "nor did he scorn the learning that comes from books" (p. 299). She believed he wrote *Experience and Education* (1938) to continue communicating his point "that children's experiences were a means, not the end of education" (p. 300).

Ravitch (2000) called Dewey the "leading spokesman" for progressive education. According to Ravitch, Dewey defined the goal for progressive education as making "the schools an instrument of social reform" (p. 57). That is, the school was not intended to develop different curriculum for students from different social classes. Ravitch suggested social and educational reformers at that time were in agreement on the need to eliminate

obstacles separating society from schools. She pointed out Dewey, in particular, did not want students trained to work. Instead, Ravitch (2000) stated, he wanted to “use the occupations to provide insight into how society evolved and how it functioned” (p. 61). She indicated, however, public schools during this era advocated a new education to simply “train better cooks, seamstresses and carpenters” (p. 61).

In contrast to Dewey, Ravitch suggested Snedden advocated teaching based on students predestined occupations. According to Ravitch, Snedden insisted on separate vocational schools. Ravitch (2000) indicated this differed from Dewey’s position because “Dewey believed that separate vocational schools were inherently undemocratic and would narrow both general education and vocational education” (p. 85).

According to Ravitch (2000), J. Meriam, Director of the University Elementary School at the University of Missouri, used Dewey’s ideas to design a child-centered school. Ravitch observed Meriam structured his school around the notion that students want to live in the present. Therefore, the teaching needed to meet ““real, present needs of the pupils”” (p. 91).

Ravitch acknowledged that *The New History* in 1912 also advocated a new approach to teaching and learning in history. However, she did not specifically identify Robinson as the author. This may have implied Ravitch held an identical view of Robinson himself. That is, she may have held the same opinion toward Robinson as she did for new history.

Ravitch (2000) identified Jones as “The specialist on racial matters who had written the important 1917 federal report *Negro Education*” (p. 127). She indicated Jones'

was a noted advocate of industrial education. She attributed Jones with being one of the initiators of the term social studies. She believed the newly created social studies contained two related notions. The first was social efficiency defined as “teaching students the skills and attitudes necessary to fit into the new social order” (p. 127). The second complementary idea was the new history, which in her opinion, outlined that social studies content “should be selected on the basis of ‘the pupil’s own immediate interest’ and ‘general social significance’” (p. 127). Ravitch argued the new social studies advocates contended students would not have any interest in history “unless it was directly related to the present” (p. 127).

From her view of Snedden, Jones, and Dewey, Ravitch (1985) suggested it was Dewey who gained a substantial following for the idea that curriculum should be built around the interests of the child and should be better related to the community—the so-called real-life activities. In her opinion, there was a growing sense among education policy makers that the schools would never be able to play a constructive role as a social agency until they broke free of the limitations imposed by traditional academic goals. Ravitch indicated the CRSE’s Cardinal Principles resulted from this new educational concept. She pointed out, the CRSE report stated, “The controlling principles in this readjustment were social utility and efficiency” (p. 73).

This led Ravitch to indicate progressive educators adapted to viewing the actual social function of schools. This group, she believed, asserted that schools in general needed to utilize social efficiency concepts. The progressive educators, she indicated, believed “In education, social efficiency meant that every subject, every program, every

study “must be judged by whether it was socially useful” (Ravitch, 1985, p. 125). In turn, Ravitch suggested by World War I the widely accepted educational goal was social efficiency. She believed “this consensus emerged full-blown” (Ravitch, 1985, p. 126) in the Cardinal Principles.

Ravitch (1985) suggested the Committee of Ten was a significant precursor to the CRSE. She highlighted the NEA formed and charged the Committee of Ten with “the first national commission on the high school curriculum” (p. 119). The Committee of Ten, according to Ravitch, was to determine if different course work needed to be developed for college bound versus non-college bound students. She argued the Committee of Ten “agreed that all children should receive a broad, liberal education, regardless of their future occupation or when their education was likely to end” (p. 119). She particularly noted the group was composed of school officials and academic scholars who “attacked the rote memorization method of teaching history” (p. 119). She named one of the scholars involved as Woodrow Wilson from Princeton but did not identify James Harvey Robinson from Columbia.

Ravitch (2000) suggested there were similarities between the Committee of Ten and the CRSE. However, she indicated the similarities ended by enumerating: (a) the Ten was dominated by college presidents, while education professors dominated the CRSE group, (b) the Ten chairperson, Eliot, was then the president of Harvard University, while the CRSE chairperson, Kingsley, was a former social worker, former mathematics teacher, and current supervisor of the Massachusetts High Schools—appointed by Snedden, and (c) the Ten held that each high school student “should have a solid liberal

education regardless of the student's ultimate occupation" (p. 123). However, the primary idea of the CRSE, she believed, "was that high schools should provide different curricula for different groups of students, depending on their likely occupation in the future" (p. 123). Ravitch argued the main goal of the CRSE included a directive that "behind the seven objectives was socialization, teaching students to fit into society" (p. 125).

To an extent, Ravitch (1985, 2000) in her analysis and interpretations blended the 1916 committee recommendations into the purview and outcomes of the CRSE. As part of her educational philosophy concerning historical education, Ravitch (2000) suggested school administrators and educators to a certain extent actually understood that the academic curriculum was not elitist. She believed it was democratic and encouraged all students to study all the subjects. In addition, according to Ravitch (2000), introducing vocational programs into secondary education did not "preclude participation in the academic curriculum" (p. 113). Indeed, Ravitch argued: "There must have been many who continued to believe in the educational ladder that kept educational opportunity open to all for as long as possible" (p. 113). She suggested progressive educators were vocally opposed to educators who disagreed with their ideas and considered their opposition as "conservative" or "reactionary." In turn, she contended during the time the CRSE was in place, "dissenters were relatively quiet, perhaps reluctant to be publically identified as 'absolutists,' enemies of modern education, or defenders of an 'aristocratic' tradition" (p. 113).

Ravitch (1978) argued educational historians representing radical revisionism made attempts to oppose the liberal ideas and policies advocated for public schools. As a

contrast, she stated: “Where liberals like John Dewey had seen education as an instrument of democratic politics to the extent that it enabled people to participate in shaping the culture and direction of their society, radicals saw education as a vehicle for teaching conformity and complacency” (p. 35).

Hazel Whitman Hertzberg. Hertzberg (1981, 1989) extensively covered aspects and issues involving the 1916 committee and its recommendations. One reason was that at the outset, Hertzberg (1981) asked, “How, then, did the future of social studies become so important by the time of the 1916 NEA report?” (p. 4).

Over the span of her writings involving the 1916 committee and its *1916 Report on Social Studies*, Hertzberg (1989) demonstrated conceptual links with Ravitch’s ideas and interpretations. For instance, Hertzberg suggested that at least half of the 1916 committee membership were school administrators. Under that premise, she strongly implied that the 1916 committee members were, in her terms, devoted to what she described as scientific management progressivism. In turn, she implied the 1916 committee chose to privilege social science subjects and current events, over history, and particularly ancient and medieval history. She reasoned: “It is not surprising that scientific management progressivism favors sociology, economics, current events, and other ‘practical’ and easily tested subjects, and that history is often regarded as impractical and irrelevant” (p. 81). Then she implied that “some tendencies in sociology,[and] especially educational sociology” (p. 81) exemplified the social control aspects of social efficiency.

Hertzberg (1981) began her commentary on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*

with a brief historical background of organizations, as well as committees who preceded the 1916 committee, which she considered influential. Professional societies, namely the American Social Science Association (ASSA), which founded the American Historical Association (AHA) as a separate organization, and the American Economic Association (AEA)—all founded in the late 19th and early 20th centuries—were considered in the group of national organizations of reform. However, Hertzberg observed professional social studies groups were also formed. The most important new organization or agency, Hertzberg stated, was the NEA, which became the leader in setting curriculum.

Hertzberg (1981) viewed the work of the Committee of Ten as the first important organizational effort by the NEA. Hertzberg noted Robinson was a member “who a quarter of a century later would be the chief mentor of the 1916 NEA committee” (p. 9). In addition, Hertzberg documented the Committee of Seven was formed under the AHA, but at the direction of the NEA. She believed the Committee of Seven’s recommendations served as a foundation for social studies and represented the most influential committee in the history of social studies education. However, this was the case only if the extent of the implementation of recommendations was used as a measurement indicator. Hertzberg believed the Seven’s report established a connection between history educators and schools. More importantly, it solidified what she believed to be history’s leadership role in the future of social studies.

Between the conclusion of the Committee of Seven and the commencement of the 1916 committee’s work, Hertzberg (1981) reported reform movements were intensely active. Entrenched in the effect of progressive reform on social studies were two ideas:

social efficiency and the “new history.” However, she noted, “In the education of citizens, ‘social efficiency’ like ‘social studies’ was an ambiguous term open to various interpretations” (p. 17).

Hertzberg described David Snedden as being at one end of the spectrum relative to interpretation of social efficiency—particularly, how this concept affected the notion of social studies in general. Hertzberg (1981) believed Snedden was influenced by both Herbert Spencer and Edward Ross—Snedden’s professor at Stanford—who supported a “doctrine of social control [that] inspired Snedden’s own extreme version” (p. 17). She stated Snedden based his educational model on juvenile reform schools. Thus, his model provided a view for all schools to be scientifically managed and organized hierarchically. The reason was to insure schools would become instruments of social control, which would provide separate education for the rank and file or common student. That is, Hertzberg indicated the common students under Snedden’s model would receive vocational training and the other students—those considered college bound consumers—would be taught Snedden’s version of liberal education.

Hertzberg believed John Dewey sat at the other end of the spectrum of interpretations concerning social efficiency. Hertzberg stated that Dewey’s vision was for a democratic society. Dewey’s school model was a community where the student would learn the spirit of service and become self-directed through the arts, history and science. Hertzberg noted other varieties of social efficiency in between the opposite ends of the Snedden and Dewey spectrum existed. However, she observed that no matter what version, “the doctrine of social efficiency became and remained a major influence on

education and a continuing element of controversy” (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 18). In identifying which variety of social efficiency was reflected in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, she stated, “Social studies reformers used the doctrine but tended to express a version closer to Dewey’s than to Snedden’s” (p. 18).

Hertzberg (1981) stated, “If social efficiency represented educational versions of progressive reform, the ‘new history’ was progressivism manifest in the historical profession” (p. 18). Hertzberg noted that Robinson was a leader in this movement. In her opinion, Robinson and his new history colleagues believed history would enlighten the student on the present while viewing the past. Hertzberg also attached the term “intellectual history” to the new historians. She believed this phrase fit as a description that reflected the expansion of teacher associations and the initiation of additional social science associations. This influence was evidenced by a shift toward the new history and the new civics. She indicated this shift in opinion created a value on: (a) recent history, (b) teaching community civics over several school years, (c) a new course on government in the last school year, and (d) recognition that teacher training and certification was needed. She believed all these issues became recommendations in the “influential 1916 NEA report on the Committee on Social Studies” (p. 22).

The *1915 Report on Community Civics*, Hertzberg indicated, was the first major output from the 1916 committee. However, she observed only excerpts of it were essentially merged into the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Hertzberg (1981) also focused on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* with the notation: “It became a landmark only in retrospect” (p. 26). Hertzberg believed the 1916 committee’s social studies definition

sidestepped detailing whether the group of social studies subjects should be centered on a central theme or a fusion of themes. She believed the 1916 committee's recommendations utilized both approaches.

For instance, Hertzberg indicated the two recommended curriculum cycles were intended to address the 1916 committee's concern that students dropped out of school. In addition, she believed the recommendation for the community civics course and its orientation provided "a logical and pedagogically sound avenue of approach to the later social studies" (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 27). Hertzberg further noted the 1916 committee's recommended changes for teaching multiple history courses as well as adding the new Problems of Democracy (POD) course. Based on these observations, she determined the 1916 committee merged Robinson's new history with Dewey's pedagogy. She stated, "Together with community civics, it was this version of social efficiency that triumphed in the report of the NEA Committee on the Social Studies, not the sterner stuff of Snedden" (p. 28).

Hertzberg (1981) believed the 1916 committee created the POD course to address the issue of how to adapt the social sciences to meet the requirements of secondary education. The POD's approach for teaching was to have students examine real problems, issues, or conditions. This meant, in her opinion, "A committee which had started under a 'social science' label ended up by abandoning the social sciences in favor of the social studies" (p. 28). In addition, Hertzberg concluded the *1916 Report on Social Studies* adapted the history teacher associations' consensus on the change to new history.

Hertzberg's overall interpretation of the 1916 committee's recommendations was

contained in her bottom line assessment of the CRSE's Cardinal Principles. In her opinion, the Cardinal Principles were actually outside the boundaries of the subjects studied. For instance, she refined the social efficiency aspects she detected in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* with an interpretation that encompassed how Dewey viewed the effects of social efficiency in education. As a result, Hertzberg (1981) stated, "The main line of social studies curricular development would be bonded to the 1916 Report rather than to that of its parent body" (p. 29).

However, by 1989, Hertzberg gravitated to a more humanistic philosophy of education. Hertzberg (1989) reexamined her ideas and positions on the history of social studies education. The revised views modified her previous interpretation of the deliberations and outcomes of the 1916 committee. As a premise, Hertzberg concluded there were actually four competing types of educational progressivism during the time of the 1916 committee. These were humanistic, scientific management, social efficiency, and child-centered. She believed all four were blended into the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, "although by no means [were they] integrated" (p. 83).

Hertzberg determined the Committee of Ten, followed by the Seven, developed the humanistic version of educational progressivism. She concluded progressive historians and Dewey held this view. In turn, she suggested the 1916 committee not only adopted the Ten's and Seven's core history and civics courses, but also expanded the duration of civics curriculum. Beyond this observation, Hertzberg entered into a compare and contrast discussion between the Ten, the Seven, and the 1916 committees. She identified one major difference for the 1916 committee as opposed to the Ten and Seven

was its membership. In her opinion, the 1916 committee was substantially populated with “practicing secondary school administrators and teachers” (Hertzberg, 1989, p. 85). From these groups, she placed an emphasis on what she argued was the preponderance of school administrators. As a result, Hertzberg indicated the *1916 Report on Social Studies* lacked the concern of developing the individual student’s “personal culture” which she believed was maintained by the Ten and Seven. Indeed, she stated, “This distinguishing feature of humanistic progressivism was notably absent” (p.85) in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Hertzberg argued the primary influences on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* stemmed from “sterling progressives” (p. 84) during that era. She indicated:

(a) James Harvey Robinson “was the major historian on the committee,” (b) Arthur W. Dunn, in addition to being the 1916 committee’s secretary, “was the best-known proponent of community civics in the country,” and (c) “John Dewey, while not a member of the committee, was quoted liberally” (Hertzberg, 1989, p. 84). In her opinion, she also determined that: “Permeating the report was the influence of sociology” (p. 84). She suggested Jones’ and Dunn’s doctorates in sociology presented a significant influence on the 1916 committee.

In addition, Hertzberg indicated Jones and Dunn were “officials” in the U.S. Bureau of Education. She suggested this was a significant connection to government. She believed this connection enhanced the fact the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was published as an official document of the U.S. Bureau of Education. In her opinion, this represented another notable departure from the committees of Ten and Seven.

Hertzberg enumerated several succinct points. She reiterated her 1981 conclusion that the 1916 committee developed its own version of social efficiency: “one closer to Dewey than to Snedden” (p. 85). Further, she suggested the 1916 committee proposed that each school cycle included a separate civics course. What she believed to be the two new civics courses—the ninth grade community civics and the twelfth grade POD course—in her opinion, “expressed the committee’s zeal for social efficiency” (p. 86).

Hertzberg believed significant segments of the 1916 committee’s recommendations went off-key and created an erroneous path. Namely, she suggested the “four-year high school history curriculum” (Hertzberg, 1981, p. 87) was reduced to only three years. As a result, she believed “In the 1916 report the chief losers in history were ancient and English history” (p. 87). She argued Robinson was an important influence for this change. After pointing out the 1916 committee essentially proposed Robinson’s new history, Hertzberg suggested this particular 1916 committee recommendation constituted a fallacy. Her notion was substantiated by an acknowledgment that in her opinion was made by the 1916 committee. According to Hertzberg, by using Robinson’s principles the 1916 committee held they had not solved the problem of how to organize history. In fact, Hertzberg stated subsequent questions posed by the 1916 committee “remain significant today” (p. 88). Indeed, she suggested the significance of the unresolved questions started with the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The reason, she argued, was that the 1916 committee’s “prime example of ‘meeting the needs of present growth’ was inappropriately drawn from an experimental campus elementary school” (p. 88).

Hertzberg (1989) indicated the 1916 committee clearly did not oppose

chronological history. Instead, she stated it was opposed to the “‘what-comes-next’ variety” (p. 88). She believed both the committees of Ten and Seven also held this position on history courses. However, according to Hertzberg, there was a significance difference between types of history advocated by each of the three committees. She believed the Ten and Seven were synchronous in favoring political history to educate students to participate in community government. However, the 1916 committee, in her opinion, advocated industrial, social, and economic history to educate students to participate in a wide range of organizations and institutions. Therefore, Hertzberg believed the 1916 committee “was in line with the thrust of the new or progressive history of the historians” (p. 89).

In addition, Hertzberg suggested the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was preoccupied with recommendations for elementary grade teaching and learning as opposed to its assigned charter for secondary education. She argued Dewey’s quotations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* were from his elementary education writings and therefore, were not appropriate for high school students. She was perplexed to understand why, in her opinion, the 1916 committee did not rely on Dewey’s *Democracy and Education*, published in early 1916. She believed this book represented “the most extended of his writings on the social subjects, which would have been more appropriate” (p. 89).

According to Hertzberg (1989), by combining the four types of educational progressivism, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* “was primarily a social efficiency document, strongly influenced by humanistic progressivism” (p. 89). In a brief

comparison of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* with the CRSE's Cardinal Principles, Hertzberg stated, "One can see in the latter a sterner version of social efficiency progressivism" (p. 90). Hertzberg concluded that subsequent social studies curriculum in reality "reflected the 1916 report rather than that of its parent commission" (p. 90).

Post-Revisionists

Other historians have done related work. Although they have not directly addressed the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, their work is of interest because their approach challenges traditional and celebratory thinking as well as revisionist interpretations and develops new schools of thought.

Robert B. Westbrook. Westbrook (1991) wrote extensively about John Dewey, educational philosopher. He endeavored to examine Dewey's democratic theory and activism development during his career. His emphasis was on an interpretation of what Dewey thought and the positions he supported.

Westbrook (1991) suggested Dewey believed individuals in a democracy "were entitled to an education that would enable them to make the best of themselves as active participants in the life of their community" (p. 94). In pursuit of that goal, he indicated Dewey did not advocate traditional pedagogy. Rather, he believed Dewey had a clearly differentiated pedagogy. For instance, Dewey advocated effective education required teachers to use both student interests and individual purposes in order to learn subject matter. In addition, he attacked child-centered education for overlooking the connection between student interests and activities to school subjects. Therefore, Dewey's educational philosophy required teachers "to perform the extremely difficult task of

‘reinstating into experience’ the subject matter of the curriculum” (p. 100).

According to Westbrook (1991), Dewey believed schools failed to integrate into curriculum the interests of the child. The result was that schools failed “to develop in children the character requisite for a democratic society” (p. 105). Westbrook suggested Dewey isolated history study as a vehicle to promote democracy in education. That is, Dewey believed it was the most effective tool for instruction that would enable students to learn the values of social life and understand the types of actions and activities that assist in the demands of the present.

Westbrook believed Dewey’s required character development remained as the core of his educational philosophy. However, this belief was “occasionally obscured by his discussion of the social aims of education in generic fashion” (Westbrook, 1991, p. 171). He suggested Dewey created ambiguities using short statements, such as, schools cultivated students’ interests in forming perceptions of what constituted social order and progress. The result was various interpretations “of the sort of character to be developed, depending on their competing definitions of ‘social order’ and ‘progress’” (p. 171).

Westbrook believed Dewey argued that all societies devised methods of educating students as a means of social control to consciously shape students’ character. However, he stated, Dewey believed “classrooms in a democracy had to be not only communities of inquiry, but *democratic* communities of inquiry” (p. 72).

Westbrook observed Dewey’s program for democratic education was self-evident in his arguments over vocational education. Dewey was advocating his ideas at a time when the movement to address industrial needs through vocational education created a

significant change in secondary schools. During that time, according to Westbrook, secondary schools moved from what was perceived as an elitist position tied to college requirements with an enrollment just under 7%—age 14 to 17. The schools changed to institutions of “mass education enrolling 32.3 percent of that same population and committed to fostering the social efficiency of the children of the nation’s working class” (Westbrook, 1991, p. 174). This resulted in a debate over whether or not to integrate industrial education. Industrialists were strong advocates of a dual or separate school system. However, Westbrook indicated, Dewey was an extremely vocal opponent of a dual system. He stated Dewey believed the dual system “was a form of class education which would make the schools a more efficient agency for the reproduction of an undemocratic society” (p. 175). As a side note, Westbrook observed Dewey held that some industrialists would welcome public tax supported schools supplying them with their labor force.

According to Westbrook, Dewey was concerned that the industrialists and the society of the day advocated manual training. Dewey believed their manual training or industrial education was designed to train children for routine, monotonous work that lacked intellectual content. Dewey opposed this type of manual or trade training, which was advocated by Snedden and administrative progressives. Westbrook (1991) stated Snedden’s version of industrial education would “continue to divide the education of hand and mind and perpetuate the class divisions it reflected” (p. 177). On the other hand Dewey’s version of vocational education “would prepare children for rewarding work in which they would be more than factors of production” (p. 177). In other words, Dewey’s

theory was that occupations were at the center of life. Dewey's brand of vocational education would prepare students not only for their occupation or work but also prepare them for the other functions they would fulfill in a democratic society, including citizenship. Westbrook stated, "It would obliterate distinctions between culture and utility by providing all children with an education that integrated the two" (p. 178).

Westbrook suggested that by the eve of World War I, Dewey was well aware of the limitations of school reform. That is, Dewey realized his vision of instituting a revolution in the classroom in order to reconstruct a democratic society could not take place until society gained his vision of democracy. In reality, Westbrook believed, Dewey not only had to change existing traditional educationalists but also face the opposition of the industrialists who viewed his vision for education as a threat to their existing ability to use labor for their own means. The industrialists' opposition might be viewed as a recognition that social reorganization itself depended on educational reconstruction. However, as Dewey optimistically predicted, it was not necessarily a precursor for a social order that was more equitable and enlightened.

Westbrook suggested Dewey was aware that the type of social reorganization involved in his reconstruction of liberal ideas would require a radical change in public education. Schools would need to be changed in order to provide all students with the skills and knowledge necessary in order to "participate to best of his abilities in the planning process as a worker, consumer, and citizen" (Westbrook, 1991, p. 437). Dewey did not believe that the required knowledge and skills "were beyond the reach of the average individual, and again he laid the blame for the existing incapacities of the

individual on the inequities of capitalistic society” (p. 437).

Westbrook’s work on Dewey helps us better understand the *1916 Report on Social Studies* because he clarifies Dewey’s philosophy that called for a unity of educational theory and practice. During his study of Dewey’s career, Westbrook gained through Dewey’s viewpoint an appreciation of the significant barriers that confront democracy in contemporary societies.

David Tyack and Larry Cuban. Tyack and Cuban (1995) presented a discussion of the various elements that encompassed public school reform from the conclusion of the 19th century through the conclusion of the 20th century. Their discussion is related indirectly to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. It is important to this study because they detail the nature of reforms in schools and provide the political, institutional, and cultural perspectives pertinent to the grammar of schooling. They outlined two competing ideologies in place during the beginning of the 20th century. The first group was described as a combination of religious and political faiths held by the 19th century school reformers. The second was a merger of evangelical ideas with the ideas of educators as a science. Tyack and Cuban stated this second group of reformers was united by a common educational background. This group was dominated by white men—that is, not many women and no minorities. This group, according to Tyack and Cuban, became the education and government professionals and leaders. They noted in particular that leaders of the NEA belonged to this group. Tyack and Cuban suggested that “Their program for progress stemmed from a shared conviction that education was the prime means of directing the course of social evolution” (p. 17).

Tyack and Cuban (1995) considered this second group to be administrative progressives. The authors' interpretation was that "The administrative progressives believed that school governments would be more efficient and expert if it were more buffered from lay control" (p. 18). They suggested that early 20th century educational leaders—administrative progressives—worked with professionals and businessmen to change "the character of urban school politics" (p. 18).

In addition, Tyack and Cuban indicated that administrative progressives held the view that students had different levels of competence as well as different interests and thoughts on life. Those students who deviated from the "norm" as defined by administrative progressives were given different labels. As a result, Tyack and Cuban (1995) stated, "Progress for these experts [administrative progressives] meant a place for every child and every child in his or her place" (p. 20). Tyack and Cuban suggested administrative progressives considered themselves as guardians of public interest and held that "teachers who opposed guidance by expert administrators were unprofessional trouble makers" (p. 22).

Tyack and Cuban discussed numerous issues regarding the impact of growth and enrollment spanning the decades. According to Tyack and Cuban (1995), the Committee of Ten's work at the end of the 19th century viewed the high school "as an agency for owning intelligence for its own sake but also as an institution for preparing students for careers in a complex and interdependent society" (p. 50). Then, Tyack and Cuban acknowledged another later group of educational reformers. This group was identified by the authors as the CRSE, which published Cardinal Principles. The authors believed the

CRSE established an extremely different position from the Committee of Ten. Tyack and Cuban indicated the difference was in the CRSE's focus on students using high school as their final stage of education. They observed that educators viewed the CRSE report as a social efficiency document that focused on "the broad socialization of youth for work, family life, good health, citizenship, ethical character, and worthy use of leisure" (p. 51).

On the other hand, Tyack and Cuban suggested Dewey was concerned about the potential influences of industrialization on democracy. Social efficiency advocates harbored concerns similar to Dewey. However, Tyack and Cuban (1995) stated, "They generally lacked Dewey's profound and subtle understanding of the processes that made democracy real both in the school and in the larger society" (p. 51).

Tyack and Cuban also formed a hypothesis that politics and education do not necessarily track together. They believed historians lives would be simplified and educational forecasters predictions would be easier "if in fact educational reform periods did simply cycle in accord with major political shifts. But the story is not so straightforward" (1995, p. 45).

Tyack and Cuban focused on the CRSE's Cardinal Principles—the umbrella document that represented the culmination of efforts by the underlying subject committees. This included the 1916 committee. They viewed cardinal principles as social efficiency driven recommendations for secondary education. In doing so, Tyack and Cuban developed theories about the educational leadership group they called administrative progressives. This group, according to Tyack and Cuban, influenced Cardinal Principles. The authors determined there was a difference in the extent or level

of this group's impact that was notably different from the softer progressive position of John Dewey. Tyack and Cuban (1995) suggested that Cardinal Principles represented "an enthusiastic rationale and blueprint" for social efficiency (p. 51).

Tyack and Cuban presented a view of the administrative progressives comprising the CRSE group that defines the group's philosophy as divergent from the 1916 committee. While both groups shared a concern over the impact of industrialization and the need to keep students in school even if they were not college bound, the two groups held different positions on how to educate students. Linking the CRSE administrative progressives with social efficiency advocates of the time, Tyack and Cuban (1995) suggested, "They generally lacked Dewey's profound and subtle understanding of the processes that made democracy real both in the school and in the larger society" (p. 51). The CRSE group placed an emphasis on the group of students using high school as their final step in education. Dewey, on the other hand believed the high school should serve all students—college bound and non-college bound. Tyack and Cuban's discussion on the Cardinal Principles relates to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* because they indirectly conduct a compare and contrast dialogue of the goals of the 1916 committee's *1916 Report on Social Studies* versus the CRSE's Cardinal Principles..

Conclusion

The various persuasions of 20th century reformers possessed one common idea—schools needed to change in order to deal with the impacts of industrialization, tremendous growth of cities, and wide spread immigration. To some extent, there was

agreement on the types of defects existing in schools at that time. However, the different reform groups held widely divergent views on how to improve and expand education for students.

There was significant disagreement between the proponents of school reform regarding ideas on or for vocational education. Tyack and Cuban (1995) asked, “Should educators sort out and train the ‘high-minded’ boys in separate schools or try to promote industrial democracy by infusing an understanding and appreciation of work in all pupils as John Dewey urged?” (p. 46). In fact, educators’ disagreements on goals for education ran the entire gamut of political and social philosophy. Tyack and Cuban suggested, “Radicals or liberals may favor a traditional academic curriculum as fervently as conservatives” (p. 46).

As we have seen, scholars have provided a widely divergent discussion of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The scholars within the various schools of interpretation address theories and ideas on the meaning and intent of the work of the 1916 committee as well as the social and political issues of the era. Moreover, the various scholarly interpretations run a wide gamut ranging in tone from soft to hard, from enthusiastic to radical. In the next chapter, we shall try to make sense of these conflicting schools of interpretation and offer a few insights on the potential for a new interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* for the 21st century.

CHAPTER V

THREADING THE NEEDLE OF INTERPRETATIONS

Introduction

One common thread between the schools of interpretation on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is the continually high appraisal of the value of its content. Nelson (1999) stated: “Since this 1916 report has been, over the past eighty years, cited and referred to innumerable by writers in the field, the significance of the report itself seems unquestioned” (p. 387). From this common point a full five years after Nelson’s comments, the interpretations by scholars from school to school—from celebratory historians, revisionists, and neoconservatives—are notable in their variation.

Different Intentions and Influences

Each interpretation stands on its own merit without necessarily reaching a common or unified outcome. Scholars within each school share similar ideas and opinions on the meaning and intent of the 1916 committee’s recommendations. However, the different schools of interpretation have not reached a consensus. For example, concepts of social efficiency are evidenced in the ideas of several scholars. At the same time, depending on the school of interpretation, there is a variation of views on the extent, depth, or even type of social efficiency underlying the 1916 committee’s recommendations.

There is also a variety of opinion on which particular individuals exerted the most

influence on the 1916 committee. For some it was Jones, or Jones and Giddings, or Jones and Kingsley. For others it was Robinson. Still other scholars believe Dewey did more than hover in the background.

In this, the 21st century, there appears to be ample room for a new look and a new interpretation to ascertain why readers of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* “can still turn to this report and find it useful in describing the notion and possibilities of social studies” (Nelson, 1999, p. 387).

Social Efficiency Influence

Several scholars have held that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is, in essence, a document most strongly influenced by social efficiency (Kliebard, 2004; Lybarger, 1981). In similar light, another adopted the position that the Report did little more than confirm that social efficiency would be the cornerstone of modern education (Ravitch, 2007). These two opinions may be considered as one in many aspects. At face value, this unified interpretation translates into a description of social efficiency as an educational framework in which the school sees its role as that of preparing students to become members of the work force. In this interpretation, curriculum responds to society’s needs. That is, curriculum is seen as a public good designed to meet collective needs. The underlying societal stance could be considered as the opportunity for all students and citizens to contribute to the public good.

Different Notions

However, Krug (1964) discussed notions of social efficiency, which suggested a

very different view on the underpinnings of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* that reflected more than preparing students to be workers. He suggested that the quest for social reforms at the turn of the 20th century encapsulated in the term “social efficiency” involved both education for social control and education for social service. First, Krug indicated that the origin of the term social control went as far back as 1901 in a book by Edward Ross. Krug believed the implication of social control involved “the management, and even the restraint, of individual behavior on behalf of the group” (pp. 249-250). In his mind, society could not exist without some form of social control.

Second, and more importantly, Krug suggested, “The persistent question...is whether to endure or to embrace it” (p. 250). This study suggests the the1916 committee chose to endure it. They did so by embracing the educational philosophy of John Dewey and applying it through James Harvey Robinson, as well as others on and off the 1916 committee. To this end, Krug argued, Dewey’s tenets held that schools were much more of an agency for social service.

Inexplicably, these two separate ideas—schools as an agency for social control and schools as an agency for social service—became joined as “one slogan, education for social efficiency” (Krug, 1964, p. 249). Saxe (1991) agreed with Krug’s definition of social efficiency. He concluded that the 1916 committee combined the two and recommended, “Educators adopt social control measures as well as social service concepts” (p. 149). Further, he indicated the 1916 committee’s actual position differed dramatically from some scholars’ assumptions that, under a description as progressive administrators, they solely promoted traditional social efficiency concepts, which in turn

merged with the ideas of scientific management.

Definitive Definitions?

It can also be argued that there were significant and varying degrees of interpretation within Krug's definition of social efficiency for social control and social efficiency for social service during the time of the 1916 committee (Dewey, 1916). In relation to this statement, the distinction between social control and social service is perhaps lost in many contemporary interpretations.

Therefore, there is reason to believe that the 1916 committee's view on social efficiency may have (a) differed between individual 1916 committee members, (b) differed from the mainstream thoughts of their day, and (c) differed from how contemporary scholars view the concept of social efficiency in the late 20th and in the early 21st century. Multiple influences of the time as well as the influence of individual educators and scholars could have combined to mitigate and soften social efficiency per se as an overarching influence throughout all three reports of the 1916 committee.

“The Appreciation of Methods of Human Betterment”

One reason for confusion over the role of social efficiency in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* may stem from scholarly accounts concerning the 1913 Preliminary Report. In its introductory paragraphs, the 1913 Preliminary Report clearly indicated, “Good citizenship should be the aim of social studies in the high school” and that “it is maintained that social studies have direct responsibility in this field” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1913, pp. 16-17). Immediately following this passage, the 1913 Preliminary

Report stated, “Facts, conditions, theories, and activities that do not contribute rather directly to the appreciation of methods of human betterment have no claim” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1913, p. 17).

The phrase “appreciation of” is absent from Ravitch’s (2007) interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. In quoting the 1913 Preliminary Report, she stated instead: “It proclaimed that ‘facts, conditions, theories, and activities that do not contribute rather directly to the methods of human betterment have no claim’” (p. 30). Not mentioning the phrase “appreciation of”—that is, “the appreciation of methods of human betterment”—may lend immense support to the neoconservative antisocial studies argument. However, it detracts from an understanding of the original intent of the 1916 committee.

The reason this warrants a closer examination is that Lybarger (1981) also did not provide the word “appreciation” in his revisionist interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Instead, Lybarger wrote, “In his *1913 Preliminary Statement*, Jones, then chairperson of the Committee on Social Studies, held that ‘Facts, conditions, theories, and activities that do not contribute rather directly to an understanding of the methods of human betterment have no claim for inclusion in the social studies’.” (p. 71). In doing so, the word “appreciation” was not only omitted but also replaced. He substituted the word “understanding” for the word “appreciation” in his version. It should also be noted Lybarger added the phrase “for inclusion in the social studies” which does not appear in the 1913 Preliminary Report.

Both modified versions by Ravitch (2007) and Lybarger (1981) taint an

understanding of the 1913 Preliminary Report. These modifications by Ravitch and Lybarger represent a stumbling block to any analysis involving the aim and intent of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Why “Appreciation” Is Missing?

What is it about the concepts involving the phrase “appreciation of” or the word “appreciation” used by the 1916 committee that would cause these scholars to create modifications? What can be accomplished by these omissions or revisions? One explanation may be that the phrase “appreciation of methods of human betterment” does not appear to be utility minded. In addition, it is not easy to quantify or to evaluate and test. Despite these factors, neoconservative and social efficiency revisionists implied that the time and motion studies associated with Taylorism and scientific management were the primary concepts adapted by the 1916 committee. However, social efficiency driven concepts would not be easily applicable to suggesting the 1916 committee was utility-minded—especially in measuring “the appreciation of methods of human betterment.” This passage would not be considered a strong indicator of social control if “appreciation of” or “appreciation” were left in place as written by the 1916 committee. To first modify a select phrase from the 1913 Preliminary Report and then portray the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as simply an outcome of either social efficiency or scientific management appears to be overstated.

Instead, it is reasonable to suggest that the 1916 committee’s use of “the appreciation of methods of human betterment” in the 1913 Preliminary Report—the first report issued to the CRSE—actually sets the stage for the Deweyan notions which are

later reflected throughout the text of the third and final report, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The use of the word “appreciation” is consistent with the 1916 committee’s application of Dewey’s educational philosophy and concepts in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Even Hertzberg (1989) found it important to clarify Dewey’s position on the idea of social efficiency. She stated,

Social efficiency could also mean something quite different. John Dewey’s model for the school was an idealized community, permeated with “the spirit of art, history, and science,” saturating the child with “the spirit of service” and “providing him with the instructions of self-direction,” in a society that would be “worthy, lovely, and harmonious. (p. 82)

This is important to note because the neoconservative and the social efficiency revisionist interpretations generally imply that the phrase “social efficiency” and the singular term “efficiency,” as it appears in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, is translated in modern times, essentially, to mean scientific management.

Taking Care of Business?

Certainly, industry’s move to scientific management processes by way of Taylor and Bobbitt in the 1916 era became identified as the social change to implement in education, indeed in virtually every aspect of society. All organizations within society needed to appear as if they were taking care of their work in a businesslike manner. The impetus became that education was not to outline how schools were to function and teach. Instead educators were to follow the directives of business and industry. As Callahan (1962) pointed out, “Doubtless many educators who had devoted years of study and thought to the aims and purposes of education were surprised to learn that they had misunderstood their function. They were to be mechanics, not philosophers” (p. 84).

However, despite the 1916 era's society and industry forces, and contrary to neoconservative and social efficiency revisionist criticisms of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, it is reasonable to suggest the 1916 committee did in fact consider and resist what the national implications of a merger of social efficiency and scientific management would represent in education.

Krug (1964) argued that actual business practices during the 1916 era may not have been only partially mirrored by education's attempt to incorporate scientific management ideas. Krug, similar to Callahan (1962), argued that educators may not have been concerned as much with the cost of providing education—that is, elimination of waste or cost cutting measures—as much as they were concerned with what students learned. This created a perception that led society to call for some type of scientific testing in education. However, any change that may have been implemented in the schools did not equate to what was considered business-oriented management. According to Krug, the pedagogical dilemma “was whether or not the academic tradition could survive the more subtle pressures represented by social efficiency made scientific” (p. 308)

As a result, the 1916 committee was very aware of the influence social efficiency advocates were wielding in society and of their attempts to promote the same in the schools. Thus, the 1916 committee acknowledged and used the phrase “social efficiency” four times, the phrase “national efficiency” four times, and the phrase “demands for efficiency” twice in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. This latter phrase—“demands for efficiency”—was discussed not under the context of ideology, but more in expressions of

a difficult issue to handle. That is, the first use of the phrase is included in a quotation from a teacher sharing a frustration with developing a desirable social studies program under the pressures of social efficiency. This was followed by an echoing 1916 committee that the “demands for efficiency” were “causing very severe tests to be applied” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 41). It may also be noted that the term “scientific management” was not referenced in any part of the text.

In contrast, as will be discussed, there are close to thirty variations of Dewey’s terms “immediate interest” and “needs of present growth” used in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Given the 1916 committee’s limited use of the popular term social efficiency, concepts generally attached to this ideology were not necessarily incorporated and used by the 1916 committee in the same manner promoted by mainstream social efficiency advocates. The manner in which Krug (1964) differentiated between notions of schools as an agency of social control and schools as an agency of social service—both under the concept of social efficiency—would be one example.

Multiple Influences

How Progressive Is Progressive?

Indeed, the 1916 committee used other concepts from competing ideologies, and they did not actually subscribe to any one particular concept, much in the same method and the same way in which Dewey did not appear to fully embrace any specific ideology in total (Kliebard, 2004). For instance, the difference between the administrative progressives on one hand and other progressives of the era similar to Dewey as a

progressive was somewhat blurred (Westbrook, 1991). In referring to Dewey, Kliebard (2004) observed: “It was his fate to become identified with a vague, essentially indefinable entity called progressive education” (p. 27).

Dewey actually may have outlined or influenced the premise for the 1916 committee to use under their “*aims of the social studies.*” To start, Dewey (1916) penned the following: “For the *statement* of aim is a matter of emphasis at a given time (p. 130). The term “aim” as used in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* adopted a new look which the 1916 committee stated was unique to social studies—as opposed to other subjects. In doing so, it is possible that the following guidelines from Dewey were their philosophical basis: “That evil institutions and customs work almost automatically to give a wrong education which the most careful schooling cannot offset is true enough; but the conclusion is not to educate apart from the environment, but to provide an environment in which native powers will be put to better uses” (Dewey, 1916, p. 138).

However, Smith (1997) provided a more definitive view of the umbrella of progressives. In his approach, to the right of the progressive group were individuals like William Howard Taft and Herbert Spencer who (a) promoted economic individualism on pragmatic grounds, and (b) supported scientific management. The center of the progressive spectrum was identified in Theodore Roosevelt’s New Nationalism and Woodrow Wilson’s New Freedom. To the left were individuals, such as John Dewey, who, Smith indicated, were known as democratic progressives. Smith suggested Dewey was cautious of New Nationalism and “its efforts to herd people into big, efficient organizations, scientifically managed by strong leaders.” Instead, he believed Dewey

leaned toward “Jeffersonian traditions of local participatory democracy and openness to immigrants, reformulated on pragmatist premises and purged as far as possible of racism” (p. 420)

At the same time, the differences between Dewey and Snedden were distinct (Hertzberg, 1981, 1989; Kliebard, 1994; Krug, 1964; Westbrook, 1991). Though Dewey used many of the same common administrative progressive terms such as “social efficiency,” Dewey had vastly different definitions (Westbrook, 1991). Hertzberg (1989) noted in particular,

Dewey wrote that social efficiency in its broadest sense was “nothing less than the socialization of *mind* which is actively concerned in making experiences more communicable; in breaking down the barriers of social stratification which makes individuals impervious to the interests of others. (p. 82)

Dewey’s very different stance can be noted in his own statement: “It must be borne in mind that ultimately social efficiency means neither more nor less than capacity to share in a give and take of experience” (Dewey, 1916, p. 141).

In reality, education efforts at the time used the ideology of the sciences to justify and support both educational and ideological motives. However, the wide spread effort to make educational objectives scientific was translated into a practice in education that was far removed from being scientific (Callahan, 1962; Krug, 1964). It is reasonable to consider that perhaps the non-administrators both on and off the 1916 committee were aware that social efficiency and scientific management did not lend themselves to development of good curriculum. During that time, for example, individuals could question traditional subjects such as history without providing proof, but “those who defended it were called upon to do so scientifically. Since this could not readily be

managed, history, or any subject so questioned, necessarily remained under a cloud” (Krug, 1964, p. 318).

The 1916 committee’s—and Dewey’s—stance of incorporating various aspects of multiple and sometimes competing ideologies indicates that their combined ideas concerning social efficiency were not simply confined to what modern scholars now interpret as scientific management. After all, Krug (1969) argued, “The practical result of the move to define objectives scientifically was the reinforcement of social efficiency as the all-embracing educational objective into which others would be absorbed (p. 310).

However, Dewey (1916) cautioned, “The error is in implying that we must adopt measures of subordination rather than of utilization to secure efficiency” (p. 139).

Committee of Educators

The operational common denominator for the 1916 committee members, who produced the third and final report, was that they were educators. Though their background and training varied, some aspects were similar. At the same time, individual similarities did not combine to create an overarching influence on the third and final report. In other words, while many scholars consider social efficiency—today, translated essentially as scientific management—as the strongest, most dominating influence of the era and therefore, on the entire trilogy of reports, other influences may warrant equal or even more consideration.

Arguably, the 1916 committee recognized that values such as “loyalty” and a “sense of obligation” could ambiguously be used in a manner that appeared to stem from social efficiency constructs. At the same time, it is reasonable to conclude that these

words were used by the 1916 committee to recognize aspects of care and concern toward others that they wanted to promote through citizenship education. The 1916 committee's position represented a significantly expanded concept well beyond the status quo. That is, the 1916 committee was striving for citizens to achieve the social and political feelings of human beings that come from the process of socialization. In their mind, this encompassed aspects of social meliorism (reflectively thinking about how one can contribute to the betterment of a world community) and social reconstructionism (empathy and a sense of social justice within a world community). This was demonstrated when they addressed in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* what it meant in society to be a part of humanity,

Again, "society" may be interpreted to include the human race. Humanity is bigger than any of its divisions. The social studies should cultivate a sense of membership in the "world community," with all the sympathies and sense of justice that this involves as among the different divisions of human society. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 9)

It is apparent the 1916 committee was grappling with educational reform that was impacted by what Popkewitz (1983) has described as follows.

The modern American school was formed with intense debate about its function. The discussions focused upon the role of the school to socialize the new immigrants, the poor and the minorities; to provide for labor selection; to help create a "true" democracy in which reason prevailed, and to engage students in learning. The actual direction taken in the curriculum involved negotiation among various groups as schooling responded to the social predicaments it confronted in the larger society. (p. ix)

Thus, it is reasonable to look to a spectrum of other influences on the 1916 committee such as social meliorism, social reconstructionism, humanism, and developmentalism as well as influential key individuals related to these various theories such as Mace,

Robinson, and Dewey.

Microcosm

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* represents a microcosm of Kliebard's (2004) competing camps. As a result, the third and final report—the *1916 Report on Social Studies*—the product of the full 1916 committee, was both a consensus and a commitment to develop a new approach to achieve its goal of launching a new academic subject known as social studies. Its goal represented a line of demarcation from the previous committees convened by the NEA and the AHA, as well as from the formal NEA report published as the CRSE's Cardinal Principles. The 1916 committee reengineered its representation of society's concerns as a microcosm of Kliebard's ideologies. Its recommendations in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* can also be considered a reflection of Deweyan principles and philosophy much more powerfully than social efficiency concepts. Indeed, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is significantly more Deweyan than the 1913 Preliminary Report. In comparison to the separately published *1915 Report on Community Civics* which strongly recommended the inculcation of general social efficiency principles, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* undoubtedly and significantly embraced Dewey.

What's In a Term?

Krug (1964) believed that during this era the term scientific management was viewed by society as having two components: the management part was derived from industry, while the scientific part was applied to schools and derived from educators.

However, he indicated, educators had defined scientific management in a very different manner than society in general. That is, educational goals under a scientific definition were “centered in social efficiency, viewed in terms of citizenship, character, family living, the use of leisure, and other aspects of life” (Krug, 1964, p. 307). To Evans (2004) the social efficiency concepts for education in the 1916 era involved the training of individuals but in “the broadest sense” (p. 24). He believed, similar to Krug, that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* “combined social service and social control,” as well as “elements of both the meliorist and social efficiency camps” (p. 24).

Elements of the humanist camp appear sporadically in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Clearly, Robinson’s new history concept used the study of “Athens—the City Beautiful” in the classroom as an example of an ancient and aesthetically important study in history. Robinson’s example was represented in an approach taken by a teacher in the field. This exemplified a humanistic teaching approach. In turn, Hertzberg (1989) considered the *1916 Report on Social Studies* a social efficiency document written under a strong influence from humanistic progressivism. Developmentalism is also apparent in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. For example, in the section involving geography and history in the seventh and eighth grades, the 1916 committee presented extracts from Indianapolis schools. One example stated, “By the time children reach the sixth grade they are sufficiently mature to approach the study of a continent or a country with some problem in mind” (p. 18).

Kliebard (2004) believed Dewey was not “a staunch ally of either” (p. 50) the humanists or the developmentalists. In fact, the very way in which Dewey blended

various aspects of the competing camps of his day into his overall philosophy may specifically illustrate the approach taken by the 1916 committee. However, Kliebard (2004) believed Dewey was not influential in the sense of seeing his ideals realized in the schools. He stated,

John Dewey, the quintessential American philosopher, may, paradoxically, have been out of step, in at least some significant respects with dominant American values, and while, personally, he was much revered in his own lifetime, his educational reforms remained confined largely to the world of ideas rather than the world of practice. (p. 75)

As an opposite view, the majority of the authors identified for this study on the *1916 Report on Social Studies* acknowledged that Dewey had a significant influence upon the 1916 committee. Some of these scholars were somewhat balanced between Dewey and Robinson, but a vast number tipped to the Dewey side of the influence scale.

Influential 1916 Committee Members

Guiding Student Study

Using principles to guide student study of topics more effectively than strictly using a textbook from start to finish was a concept attributed to William Mace. Saxe (1991) determined that Mace was a notable contributor to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Saxe stated, “Utilization of the guiding principle concept” (p. 168) was evident throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

In addition, both Mace and Robinson were used by the 1916 committee to answer a conceptual question in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. The 1916 committee asked: “*What ‘tests’ must the history course meet if it is ‘to hold its own in our schools’?*” (U.S.

Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 41). Extensive quotations from Mace and Robinson comprised the 1916 committee's complete rationale and entire answer to the question posed.

Mace's 1916 committee colleague, Robinson, may have enjoyed more recognition than Mace because Robinson's consistent participation on other educational committees as well as in professional endeavors made him more visible. However, Mace may arguably be considered as a conceptual forerunner to both Dewey and Robinson. For instance, Mace's influence can be seen in the development of the teaching and learning concepts recommended for the newly created social studies—in particular, history.

It is clear that Mace (1902) believed that history curriculum played a much larger role in education than mere dates, faces, and places. He was a proponent of history courses that explained events and personalities with a view to learning how to approach future community, nation, and world life experiences. The problem with the traditional notions of teaching and learning in history, Mace suggested, was that it often did not account for real life. For instance, Mace believed that one could find five phases in life applicable to all civilizations: (a) political, represented by government institutions, (b) religious, as demonstrated by churches, (c) educational and cultural, encompassed by schools, (d) industrial, which included occupations and work skills, and (e) social, which were contained in family life. Mace suggested that the institutions involved in these five phases "have become great crystallized centers of life around which the thoughts and feelings of people grow" (p. 11).

Suffice it to say, the bottom line of his influence and contribution to the efforts of

the 1916 committee was summarized in part of his input used in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. A quote from Mace stated,

To connect events and conditions with life as the pupil knows it will make history more or less of a practical subject. The pupil will see where his knowledge turns up in the affairs of everyday life. He will really discover how present-day institutions came to be what they are. Whenever or wherever he strikes a point in history, in Egypt, Greece, Rome, England or even America, the point must be connected with modern life. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, pp. 41-42)

Here's to history, James Harvey Robinson

Scholars have identified James Harvey Robinson as the most influential historian on the 1916 committee (Hendricks, 1946; Hertzberg, 1981, 1989; Saxe, 1991). His advocacy for the new history exerted a profound influence on the 1916 committee's recommendations. Robinson's presence may have also served to bridge the gap between rejection and accommodation with the Committee of Seven (Hertzberg, 1981). His impact on the 1916 committee may have rivaled that of Jones, Kingsley, and Dunn—other 1916 committee members frequently noted as influential by scholars. Indeed, Hendricks (1946) verified directly with Thomas Jesse Jones that Robinson was a most significant influence on the 1916 committee. In addition to being quoted at great length in the 1913 Preliminary Report, the 1916 committee quoted Robinson at length another six times in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Participating Chair or Acting Chair?

It cannot be denied that many scholars regarded Jones as both chair and a major influence on the 1916 committee's recommendations. Kliebard (2004), in sentiments similar to Lybarger (1981), stated, "Given the almost obsessive concern with social

disintegration and an erosion of traditional American values, it is not surprising that a curriculum originally developed for a social class [Hampton Institute] should eventually emerge as a model for the majority of America's schoolchildren" (Kliebard, 2004, p. 109).

Ravitch (2007) also subscribed to the idea the 1916 committee's recommendations were in line with the Hampton Institute's social studies program taught by their chairperson Jones. She believed both Jones' Hampton program and the 1916 committee shared a common goal: "the social adjustment of students to their particular situation, which meant that these studies would prepare students for their future roles in society and their likely jobs" (p. 30). This is in sharp contrast both with Dewey's notion of history being a complement to geography and other subjects and the consistent way in which Robinson applied ideas from the social sciences to his new history. Essentially, neoconservative and social efficiency revisionists appear to support an interpretation that lacks consideration for the impact of Dewey's notion of "immediate needs of present growth" which the 1916 committee cited numerous times and in varying ways throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. Thus, prominent scholars who do not consider Dewey influential appear to hold a common view that the 1916 committee used the Hampton Institute as their all inclusive model for social studies curriculum (Kliebard, 2004; Lybarger, 1981; Ravitch, 2007). This view appears to stem from a belief that Jones was the most influential member on the 1916 committee.

A Pivotal Figure or Not?

To what degree was Thomas Jesse Jones influential on the 1916 committee?

Kliebard (2004) considered Jones a “pivotal figure” (p. 107) in the reconstruction of social studies. It was not surprising to Kliebard that Jones was appointed by Kingsley to chair the 1916 committee. Kliebard considered Jones a guiding force in educational reform. In addition, several scholars devoted considerable discussion to the influence of Giddings’ sociological teaching on 1916 committee members—most notably, Jones (Kliebard, 2004; Lybarger, 1981; Nelson, 1994). Lybarger (1981), in particular, argued that Jones’ study of Giddings social psychology regarding the social mind represented a significant portion of Jones’ Hampton sociology course. Jones (1906) examined social mind by identifying several types of character, which he extended, with definitions of various types of mind that were generally related to social psychology. He drew upon numerous detailed examples in support of what he called “different social types” (p. 48).

In turn, both Kliebard (2004) and Lybarger (1981) were impressed by a statement made by the 1916 committee.

These two particular illustrations of expressions of the ‘social mind’ are taken from a description of the social studies in the curriculum of Hampton Institute. It may be said in passing that this committee has found 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. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, pp. 55-56)

The entire quotation, however, indicates the 1916 committee briefly introduced social mind as an illustration of how educators could use real life examples in the classroom. Stated another way, social mind was introduced as part of an illustration which involved study of concrete problems of democracy in the recommended POD course. The two illustrations selected by the 1916 committee first involved the use of any

daily paper, or life in any school, to allow students to consider “the impulsive action of ‘crowds’ in contrast with the deliberative action of individuals and of the consequences of such action in social conduct” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 55). The second example involved evaluating tradition and its power and effects.

Regarding these two illustrations, the 1916 committee stated, “These two particular illustrations of expressions of the ‘social mind’ are taken from a description of the social studies in the curriculum of Hampton Institute” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 55). This apparently has resulted in confusion over the nature and meaning of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* concerning the term “social mind,” versus the actual extent to which the 1916 committee considered social mind as one illustration using two narrow topics in social psychology.

Both Lybarger (1981) and Kliebard (2004) appeared to rely on this particular passage to conclude, in their collective opinions, that the Hampton Institute provided the template for a national social studies educational program. It is this author’s contention that the term “social mind,” and the extent to which the 1916 committee considered it, was in reality one illustration out of many examples used by the 1916 committee as topic or subject illustrations. The difference is this passage represents a singular illustration, not a template for all of social studies teaching.

Description vs. Curriculum

The 1916 committee made advantageous use of illustrations of teaching materials and programs studied throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. However, the 1916 committee merely referred to two illustrations of expressions in the course description—

not the actual Hampton Institute course curriculum. This is important to consider because, as Correia (1994) noted, the concepts Jones used to develop his social studies program for Hampton Institute were on the wane even as the 1916 committee was formed. His research indicates Thomas Jesse Jones became personally involved with his two-volume report, *Negro Education*, published in 1917. In Correia's opinion, as chair of the 1916 committee, Jones may have become more of a managerial figurehead rather than a direct philosophical influence over the third and final *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

The Once and Future Boss

Clarence D. Kingsley is noted by some scholars as an influence on the 1916 committee's deliberations (Kliebard, 2004; Krug, 1964). After all, Kingsley was chair of the CRSE and was responsible for appointing Jones as chair of his CRSE social studies subcommittee. However, in a one-to-one comparison to Jones relative to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, Kingsley was afforded a singular course reference in similar fashion to Jones. That is, Kingsley's "A Study of Nations," was referenced but not actually used as an illustration or example for the newly created social studies.

Kingsley's (1916) article proposed "a *study* of nations rather than a *science*—is not only required by the times, but also can be made intensively interesting to high-school pupils and can be organized so as to be effective in accomplishing its purpose" (p. 38). It is important to note that when the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was published, Kingsley's Study of Nations had not yet been fully developed into a textbook.

Kingsley's concept, as detailed in his article, came to fruition in a book by Harriet E. Tuell in 1919. Tuell (1919) acknowledged that Kingsley reviewed her material

prior to publication. She noted “his careful reading of the manuscript” (p. xvi). In defining her method of approach for the text material, she stated, “the ‘Study of Nations’ is based upon the principle of which Dr. John Dewey is the great protagonist; namely, that it is the business of the school to meet the needs of present growth in the child. As the first step in that direction, the course is so planned as to begin at a point of contact with the pupil’s immediate interest” (p. 1). Thus, Tuell’s textbook based on Kingsley’s initial concept was definitively Deweyan in approach.

Eventually Kingsley did appoint himself as an actual member of the 1916 committee, perhaps during or after the publication of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. However, scholars have verified that his actual role was as chairperson of the CRSE and overseer of the Cardinal Principles report (Kliebard, 2004; Krug, 1964). Based on the several factors outlined, it is reasonable to suggest that both of the individual leaders—Jones and Kingsley—had a less than substantive influence on the actual deliberations of the 1916 committee.

The work of Arthur Link (1955) appears to support this idea. Link believed other scholars were significantly ignorant of the reality of the politics of the progressive era. He indicated some of the reform movement leaders in the 1916 era were likewise fooled. He believed that most of the progressive leaders were “realistic politicians who well knew that the changes they proposed were merely instruments to facilitate the capture of political machinery by spokesmen of the majority. They used these instruments, therefore, to gain and hold power” (p. 90). It is reasonable to consider the possibility that the 1916 committee required the political influence and power of Jones and Kingsley in

support of their efforts. Thus, while the Jones and Kingsley publications were among the numerous materials under consideration as illustrations by the 1916 committee, neither one of their works nor their ideals became key substantive contributions to the recommendations of the 1916 committee. Instead, it was Deweyan principles that ultimately encapsulated the 1916 committee's brief consideration of the works by Jones and Kingsley.

One Thread of Wisdom

The 1916 committee's regard for three influential committee members became evident in the threading together of their ideas. The similarity of theories and concepts from Mace to Dewey to Robinson as an influence on the 1916 committee is unmistakable and cannot be casually overlooked. In vignette fashion, their individual concepts of teaching history are portrayed in the following:

Mace (1902) said, "The understanding of history requires the student to take ideas as germs and trace them through all phases of their growth, thus putting continuous and parallel threads of thought through the entire subject" (p. 10).

Dewey (1899) stated, "History must be presented, not as an accumulation of results or effects, a mere statement of what happened, but as a forceful, acting thing. The motives—that is, the motors—must stand out" (p. 156).

Robinson (1912) determined, "It is clear that our interests are changing, and consequently the kinds of questions that ask the past to answer our most recent manuals venture to leave out some of the traditional facts least appropriate for an elementary review of the past and endeavor to bring their narrative into relation, here and there, with

modern needs and demands” (p. 137).

It can be said the 1916 committee adopted Robinson’s concept of new history.

The 1916 committee stated:

What Prof. Robinson suggests is that, given a group of boys and girls whose economic and social position is preordained to the ranks of the great majority of men and women “who do common things,” the history instruction should be organized, not on the traditional basis of chronology and politics, but on that of their own immediate interests. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 51)

It should not be overlooked, however, that Dewey offered a broad scoped, innovative philosophy that dovetailed with Robinson. In addition, Dewey provided the practical new teaching approaches needed by the 1916 committee to develop recommendations for the new social studies to educate a changing society.

Illustrations of Principles in Action

The 1916 committee formed a coalition of Mace and Robinson ideas, but added Dewey’s concepts as the ultimate umbrella over their recommendations. These factors can easily combine with research and the 1916 committee’s own statement verifying the full working membership met frequently as a group to develop the third and final report. As a work group, the 1916 committee still significantly relied on input from various and numerous educators, professional organizations, and existing school entities across the United States. As such, this full working committee was also armed and poised with real life teaching illustrations to reach a revised, new common philosophy and approach focused on immediate needs of present growth to carry out its mission for social studies education.

Rounding Out the Ideas

It is important to reflect on the reliance they placed on input from outside educators from numerous different areas and types of schools. The 1916 committee stated its intention was to consult—and consult they did. In lieu of developing curriculum on their own—a benchmark of their recommendations—the 1916 committee searched for and identified school programs either in development or in place that they utilized as illustrations for their newly created social studies concepts. Indeed, the amount of notations, references, and illustrations they gathered is remarkable. Their search for outside sources was intended to give a perspective to their efforts to produce a new, but knowledgeable and usable set of recommendations. It is noted these uniquely selected outside sources are in addition to the valuable input they absorbed and integrated into the *1916 Report on Social Studies* from fellow committee members such as Mace and Robinson at their meetings. A key move for the 1916 committee was to venture “outside the room” and extensively incorporate Deweyan concepts and statements as they began to search out illustrations for their new approach to teaching and learning in social studies.

Educational Ideas from Outside the Inner Sanctum

The following is a narrative listing of the outside input from other educators and references reflected in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. At the outset, the 1916 committee revisited both the Indianapolis school plan in place and the Philadelphia plan under development that were both introduced in the *1915 Report on Community Civics*. Specifically, these two plans were included under the *1916 Report on Social Studies*

section on methods to organize social studies for the seventh and eighth grades. They were considered exemplary illustrations “as well as anything available to the committee, [for] the socialization of geography and the coordination between geography, history and civics” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 18).

Next, the 1916 committee reproduced a lesson plan developed by J.F. Smith from the Berea College, Kentucky, Normal School. This was used as an example of a course in community civics that was successfully adapted to meet rural area requirements. To illustrate a teaching method to relate civics to history, the 1916 committee recommended using the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin. In the section on history devoted to organizing material on history courses, the 1916 committee cited a course taught by Miss Harris. In the same section, the 1916 committee used Miss Dilks’ study of “Athens—the City Beautiful” to illustrate her method to bring that ancient city “into the range of the pupil’s own interest and experience” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 38). After all, the 1916 committee noted, “Athens represents a climax in the development of esthetics” (p. 38).

As an example of the type of industrial history that was explained through the use of a Robinson quotation on page 50 of the 1916 Report on Social Studies, they described a lesson developed by Miss Blanche Hazard, a 1916 committee member. The 1916 committee also noted the same principle was applied in a course outlined and published by Dr. Leavitt and Miss Brown in their book chapter on history. In a section concerning principles for history instruction, the 1916 committee discussed input provided by Miss Jessie C. Evans from William Penn High School for Girls in Philadelphia. She relayed

her concern regarding “a growing danger that the traditional history course will only be permitted to the college-preparatory student” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 40).

Next, the 1916 committee, as an illustration of Robinson’s principle “*functioning in the present,*” cited lessons developed by Miss Hannah M. Harris, State Normal School, Hyannis, Massachusetts, and Miss Clara G. Dilks, Philadelphia, as well as Miss Blanche C. Hazard, New York State Agricultural College. These three lessons illustrated “both the selection of topic and the method of approach with reference to the pupils’ immediate interest” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 44).

The 1916 committee used the curriculum plan of the University of Missouri elementary school as an illustration of “One of the most radical experiments...to ‘meet the needs of present growth’” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 49). The 1916 committee further stated that this Missouri plan developed by J. L. Meriam, not only met, but also conceptually went farther than the curriculum plan developed by Miss Blanche Hazard. Meriam’s plan strongly emphasized developing history instruction not on the traditional chronology and political basis. Instead, his instruction focused content on the students’ own immediate interest. The 1916 committee further noted in illustrating Miss Harris’ history course plan that she referred to the difficulty presented by reconceptualizing history based on Robinson’s principle. She proposed her plan “to meet it by a compromise between the ‘chronological’ and ‘pedagogical’ methods” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 51).

For each course or lesson plan used to illustrate their educational concepts, the 1916 committee provided extensive discussion and descriptions in the body of the *1916*

Report on Social Studies. In other words, rather than create their own course plans, the 1916 committee lived up to their commitment not to do so by providing real, live, field-tested teaching approaches that met the recommended teaching and learning principles they determined applicable to the newly created social studies. Indeed, in today's vernacular, these illustrations and examples might be considered as "best practices" in social studies education.

The Case for Dewey's Influence

Behind the Scene

John Dewey was both philosopher and educator before, during, and after the 1916 committee's tenure. It is well documented that Dewey had accumulated significant experience in experimental school education prior to 1916 (Kliebard, 2004). In particular, Kliebard described Dewey's methodology of integrating various competing aspects of curriculum theory that Dewey believed would best support the child. Kliebard stated: "The way history was studied in the Dewey School also illustrates how Dewey was using the school to help him reconstruct the curriculum concepts that were being put forward by the various interest groups of his time" (p. 65).

As a result, throughout the development of his educational philosophy, "In all realms—political, social, psychological, epistemological, philosophical—Dewey was an enemy of absolutism, formalism, and a priori concepts" (Jenness, 1990, p. 74). Dewey worked vociferously through his experimental school and his writing to improve and reform education. He held the belief that a new school curriculum would assist in needed

reform for society. However, “he did not believe, as did the Social Reconstructionists of the 1930s, that those who managed American schools could create a new social order in one generation” (Jenness, 1990, pp. 74-75).

Principled Influence

Egan (1983) extensively utilized John Dewey “as the source of ideas influential in structuring the social studies curriculum” (p. 197). He believed Dewey provided a blueprint of concepts for social studies education. Saxe (1991) believed the 1916 committee viewed Dewey in much the same way. Specifically writing about the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, Saxe stated, “The primary principle used of course, was Dewey’s ‘needs and interests’ thus making Dewey another important, though somewhat passive, contributor” (p. 168). One of Dewey’s foremost principles held that the actual approach to study history always involved looking at a current life situation with its problems (Jenness, 1990)

In evaluating the success of school reform in general, Tyack and Cuban (1995) followed Dewey’s lead in reviewing reform concepts based on their practical outcomes, positive or negative. They stated when Dewey discovered the progressive educators claiming to be his followers “where downplaying the importance of coherent subject matter and condoning ill mannered behavior of students, he reformulated his progressive principles. Aims and practices, he thought, should be in continuous interaction” (p. 63). Again, the term progressive and the principles used here by Tyack and Cuban lead to a Deweyan format.

It appears Dewey maintained a relatively low profile as a contributor to the 1916

committee's recommendations but amplified his work by concentrating on developing and expanding his theories through practical school experiments—defining educational aims and developing teaching practices. In doing so, “Dewey rejected the rigid, lockstep practices that typified public schools in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries; the uniformity of curriculum...” (Ravitch, 1983, p. 47). It is reasonable to suggest that, in the minds of the 1916 committee, Dewey sat at their conference table between Mace and Robinson—invisible, perhaps, but there nevertheless.

The 1916 committee relied three times on lengthy direct messages from Dewey in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. More so, the 1916 committee relied on Dewey's concepts and philosophy through the use of his phrases in their narrative discussions. Such Deweyan phrases include: “immediate needs of social growth” (p. 10); “immediate needs” (p. 10); “needs of present growth” (p. 11); “immediate need of such mental and social nourishment” (p. 11); “processes of present growth” (p. 11); “importance of the immediate community” (p. 28); “when it is of immediate use” (p. 32); “topics of immediate interest” (p. 32); “pupil's immediate needs” (p. 34); “pupils' own immediate interest” (p. 37); “pupil's own immediate interest” (p. 37); “immediate interests” (p. 37); “immediate community” (p. 38); “pupils' immediate interest” (p. 44); “meet the needs of present growth in the pupils” (p. 47); “present interest of the pupil, or meet the needs of present growth” (p. 48); “meet the needs of present growth” (p. 49); “immediate interest” (p. 49); “own immediate interests” (p. 51); “meet the needs of present growth” (p. 51); “immediate needs of secondary education” (p. 52); “immediate interest to the pupil” (p. 53); “their immediate interest” (p. 53); “pupils' immediate interests and needs”

(p. 56); “present interest” (p. 57); “*pupil’s past experience, immediate interests, and the needs of his present growth*” (p. 58); ““needs of present growth”” (p. 59); “immediate interests and needs of the pupils” (p. 62; Bureau of Education, 1916, pp. 10-62)

A Trilogy of Reports—Independent Intent

The Bureau of Education published three separate, distinct reports produced by three different groups of individuals with three different philosophies and agendas. The first and second reports were developed by two separate small groups of committee and noncommittee members. In contrast, the third report is a product of the full complement of the 1916 committee.

The first report, the 1913 Preliminary Report, can be regarded as a call to the full 1916 committee to begin its work. It does not necessarily follow that it became a concrete directive solely from Jones for the full 1916 committee, especially in view of the extensive quotations from James Harvey Robinson as well as J. Lynn Barnard, William A. Wheatley, and Henry R. Burch. The input from these four individuals is multi-faceted and represented a cross-section of subject topics. It can be suggested that each of these authors prepared and submitted introductory ideas for the 1916 committee in order to pave their way to address history, civics—or more appropriately community civics, vocations or survey of vocations, and economics as integral pieces of the new social studies. In total, the information contributed by these four scholars and educators comprised a significant portion of the text contained in the 1913 Preliminary Report. It may be safe to assume the written input provided from these four key individuals enabled

Jones to complete and deliver his 1913 Preliminary Report to Kingsley's CRSE in very timely fashion.

The second report, the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, while widely read by educators and acknowledged by the NEA of the time, primarily became a stand alone, isolated report. Indeed the special subcommittee was formed to write and submit a report to the CRSE specific to this one topic of concern within the overall new social studies subject. It was immediately published as a separate bulletin under the auspices of the NEA. At the time of the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, only one of the four members of the special committee, Barnard, was also a member of the 1916 committee.

The *1915 Report on Community Civics* enjoyed being published by the Bureau of Education as a manual for teachers. Since it was a product of a separate special committee, the 1916 committee itself stated: "This special report has been approved by the Committee on Social Studies, adopted as a part of its present general report.... Some of the essential features, however, are here summarized" (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 22).

This special committee for the *1915 Report on Community Civics* emphasized the importance of the entire spectrum of social studies in training students for citizenship. Its assigned scope was limited to community civics. It attempted to fully define what was termed the elements of welfare. In teaching community civics, the special committee stated these elements should be adapted to the needs and interests of the students. In their opinion, each class possessed all the essential characteristics of the community. The special committee enumerated that the community civics class required cooperation, class

discussion, respect for opinions, individual responsibility for class welfare, teacher participation as a fellow citizen and learner, all culminating in an effort “to cultivate interest, judgment, initiative, cooperation, power to organize knowledge, and other qualities of good citizenship” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1915, p. 14).

The *1915 Report on Community Civics* is considered by some scholars the first formal publication of the 1916 committee (Hertzberg, 1981; Wesley, 1937). Wesley believed its publication brought about radical change to the teaching of civics—specifically: “It altered the connotation of the word by shifting the emphasis from the machinery of government to community welfare” (Wesley, 1937, p. 97). Realistically, the elements of welfare were tied to both the individual and the community as a joint venture.

As stated, the introduction to the third and final report, the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, acknowledged, or, more appropriately announced, the second report—*1915 Report on Community Civics*—was to be an integral part of the final report. In reality, based on the 1916 committee’s own statement together with a close examination, only portions of certain sections of the *1915 Report on Community Civics* were referenced and highlighted in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Overarching Influence

As the culmination of the trilogy of reports, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is arguably the most influential of the three reports on social studies education. As a result, the degree of Dewey’s influence upon the most significant report in social studies education should be emphasized. In an overall view of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, Saxe (1991), for instance, clearly identified that “Dewey’s influence on the committee

was strong. Most, if not all, the selected philosophical points that appeared in the report were specifically drawn from his writings” (p. 168).

This is seen in the manner in which the 1916 committee articulated its adoption of Dewey’s three faceted principle of meeting the immediate needs and addressing or solving present processes of growth through the judicious selection of topics. Nelson (1994) specifically noted a passage from the *1916 Report on Social Studies* that revisited the 1916 committee’s idea that education should still reference the future, but that placing an emphasis on present growth would allow the student to understand the present as a preparation for the future. It stated,

By the very processes of present growth he will make the best possible provision for the future. This does not mean that educational processes should have no reference for the future. It does not mean, to use a concrete illustration, that a boy should be taught nothing about voting until he is 21 and about to cast his first ballot. It means merely that such instruction should be given at the psychological and social moment when the boy’s interests are such as to make the instruction function effectively in his processes of growth. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 11)

Nelson’s specific annotation regarding the final sentence of the passage directly above stated, “This intersection of interest and capability was central to Dewey’s ideas as illustrated in *Child and Curriculum, Experience and Education*, among others” (p. 64).

Three-Prong Precept

As stated, the 1916 committee carried this three prong principle from Dewey as part of their vision into their history and Problems of American Democracy courses.

Thus, throughout their recommendations, the 1916 committee clarified that the three prongs of this teaching principle (a) started, whenever possible, with a problem or topic

of study carefully selected in order to meet; (b) the pupil's own immediate interest; and (c) provided a topic or problem of study that has significance to society. In doing so, they consistently maintained in a most Deweyan manner their educational theory for history and the POD courses in secondary education through the 12th grade for the newly created social studies.

Again, for each history course, the 1916 committee specifically recommended as a history organizing principle.

1. The adoption to the fullest extent possible of a “topical” method, or a “problem” method, as opposed to a method based on chronological sequence alone.
2. The selection of topics or problems for study with reference to (a) the pupil's own immediate interest; (b) general social significance. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 37)

Indeed, for the final twelfth-grade course the 1916 committee simply increased the level of challenge in their three prong teaching principle. The new POD course recommendation stressed organizing instruction, “on the basis of concrete problems of vital importance to society and of immediate interest to the pupil” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 53).

Yet, Ravitch (2007), for instance, believed differently. Her views on the 1916 committee's recommendations for community civics, history, and Problems in American Democracy—and their use of Dewey's phrase “immediate needs of present growth”—had an extremely limited and narrow focus. She wrote,

The recommendations of Jones' committee were closely aligned with the Hampton Program in social studies that Jones had taught. The main goal of both was the social adjustment of students to the particular situation, which meant that these studies would prepare students for their future roles in society and their likely jobs. (p. 30)

The importance of this difference is that Ravitch's view represents a singular concept of utility rather than a unified concept based on Dewey's notions of "immediate needs of present growth." Dewey's approach demonstrates an appreciation of human betterment as expressed by the 1916 committee.

Indeed, the 1916 committee specifically addressed and dismissed the utility argument posed by scholars such as Lybarger (1981, 1987) and Ravitch (2007). In fact, the 1916 committee brought the issue to the forefront of its discussion. They first wrote: "A distinction should be made between the 'needs of present growth' and immediate, objective utility" (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 11). Then, they clarified their intention by specifically stating,

As a boy's mental and social horizon broadens with the processes of education, he will become inquisitive about facts and relations perhaps long before he has direct use for them in the affairs of life. The best question that can be asked in class is the question that the pupil himself asks because he wants to know and not the question the teacher asks because he thinks the pupil some time in the future ought to know. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 11)

The 1916 committee dealt with this distinction in similar fashion for the community civics and history courses, as well as their new POD course. First, for community civics, the 1916 committee clearly stated that previous attempts to meet the goals for the traditional civics course were "more or less mechanical and superficial" (p. 10). The 1916 committee concluded unless community civics could be structured or restructured "to the pupil's immediate needs of social growth" (p. 10), traditional civics teaching would continue to fail. They stated, "What is true of civics is also true of the other social studies, such as history and economics" (p. 10).

It is important to note the common theme of the three facets of Dewey's philosophical principle. Dewey's frame of reference was that one should never assume pupils possess experience. Indeed, Dewey (1916) said, "The initial stage of that developing experience which is called thinking is *experience*" (p. 180). Thus, the situation or experience for teachers to confront the student with "should be of such a nature as to arouse thinking means of course that it should suggest something to do which is not either routine or capricious—something, in other words, presenting what is new (and hence uncertain or problematic)" (p. 181). More specifically, Dewey held, "The true starting point of history is always some present situation with its problems" (p. 251).

One Plus One Plus One Equals Three

That is, the 1916 committee was continuing to articulate its adoption of Dewey's three faceted principle of meeting immediate needs and in this case addressing or solving present processes of growth through judicious selection of topics. However, Lybarger (1981, 1987) concluded otherwise. First, Lybarger argued that "'immediate needs' of students [are] the major factor in shaping the social studies curriculum" (p. 176). Second, Lybarger stated his research would concern itself with "'immediate needs of students' [as] principles of selection in determining the content of this social studies curriculum" (p. 177) as a singular aspect. While the distinction between Lybarger's statements remains unclear at least to this author, there is reason to suggest that Lybarger believed that the term "immediate needs" referred to the singular, one-faceted manner in which Jones applied that phrase at the Hampton Institute. That is, Lybarger did not look to, nor consider, Dewey's application of the term under Dewey's principles and philosophy. As a

result, this study suggests that “immediate interest and immediate needs” in reality stem from complex and in many ways dense narrations on a philosophy that encompasses Deweyan ideals.

As noted, Correia (1994) expressed concern the 1916 committee failed to explain immediate interests and immediate needs in a clear manner. However, Nelson (1994) appeared to address Correia’s concern by examining an extensive 1916 committee discussion on “*What is meant by functioning in the present?*” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 43). Based on Robinson’s ideas, the 1916 committee further explained this principle and highlighted the following statement from the *1916 Report on Social Studies*:

The selection of a topic in history and the amount of attention given to it should depend, not merely upon its relative proximity in time, nor yet upon its relative present importance from the adult or from a sociological point of view, but also and chiefly upon the degree to which such topic can be related to the present life interests of the pupil, or can be used by him in his present processes of growth. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 44)

In his annotations, Nelson bolded this italicized statement. He indicated: “This response to Robinson is clearly based on the ideas and writings of John Dewey” (p. 66).

This author suggests Dewey’s ideas were one part—a part however that arguably represented the most prominent component in the battle over the social studies curriculum being developed for the newly created social studies. Thus, this study suggests that Dewey was a much more prominent combatant in what Kliebard (2004) referred to as “The Struggle for the American Curriculum.” Evans (2004), in what he termed the “Social Studies Wars,” called Dewey “Probably the single most important influence on the committee” (p. 22).

One cannot overlook the fact that the 1916 committee addressed, in various types of similar phrases, “needs of present growth” and the related “immediate interests and immediate needs” almost 30 times in their recommendations. In particular, the 1916 committee, in discussing their concept for community civics, stated: “The best time to introduce history in the education of the child is when it is of immediate use.... Community civics affords opportunity to use history to illuminate topics of immediate interest” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 32). The 1916 committee further identified their point of view on this principle by stating: “Unless the subject matter and methods of instruction are adapted to the pupil’s immediate needs of social growth, such attempts avail little. What is true of civics is also true of the other social studies, such as history and economics” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 10).

Cardinal Principles Effect

Using the CRSE as his frame of reference, Krug (1964) believed the *1916 Report on Social Studies* “turned out to be one of the most successful efforts” (p. 355) out of the entire group of CRSE subject committees. He attributed the 1916 committee’s success in part due to the fact that committee member Kingsley had become a tireless and energetic force for his new major field of interest—social studies. Krug believed the *1916 Report on Social Studies* ultimately “served as an important point of reference in subsequent discussions of the social studies field” (p. 355). Krug’s accolades for Kingsley appeared to reflect Kingsley’s ability to motivate his chosen committee to get their job done in timely fashion. Any influence of Kingsley’s theories and concepts for education was

channeled into and reserved for the significant role he played as overseer of the 1918 Cardinal Principles (Hertzberg, 1981, 1989; Kliebard, 2004; Krug, 1964).

Cardinal vs. Deweyan Principles

One should not overlook the fact that many scholars cited in this study believed the Cardinal Principles represented the dominant report that influenced educational change (Kliebard, 2004). Kliebard pointed out CRSE archives after the summer of 1916 had gaps in the records. In spite of this, he maintained the work on revising and finalizing the culminating CRSE report moved forward. He held that Kingsley essentially engineered the Cardinal Principles on a solo basis, “as a major landmark in secondary education in the United States” (p. 95).

However, other scholars believed the conceptual basis of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* was vastly divergent from the Cardinal Principles. Specifically, Krug (1964) stated,

What Kingsley set forth, however, was not so much a threat to the right of subjects to exist as a missionary call for the teachers of every subject to direct themselves to the strenuous pursuit of the seven aims. In the long run, this led to absurdities from which some subjects have not yet recovered. Nevertheless, when applied with discrimination and common sense, the seven aims have proved useful instruments in the making of some curricular decisions, and these are subjects to which some of the aims directly apply. (p. 446)

Kliebard (2004) used a different explanation to frame his belief the Cardinal Principles were universally accepted upon publication. In recognizing that successful efforts in curriculum reform had been occurring since 1893, he contended it was the right time for the Cardinal Principles to be published and “reflect the growing belligerence toward academic subjects through the ascendance of social efficiency in the educational

world” (p. 96). He stated, “With the possible exception of the second [aim—“Command of fundamental processes”], these aims each represented an area of life activity, and the curriculum was directed toward efficient performance within that area” (p. 97). Even though he indicated Kingsley was Snedden’s protégé, Kliebard, believed Kingsley’s report was couched in more moderate terms. He held that the seven aims were the prominent outcomes of the 32 page Cardinal Principles report.

Thus, the divergence between the CRSE report and the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is that in reality the Cardinal Principles was a very strong statement of the social efficiency ideology. In contrast, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* took a very different pedagogical path. Ravitch (1983) viewed the 1916 committee’s path as inverted to the Cardinal Principles. She held that the CRSE report transposed “Dewey’s notion of the-school-as-a-lever-of-social-reform into the-school-as-a-mechanism-to-adjust-the-individual-to-society” (p. 48). Almost all of the scholars identified in this study bring Dewey into their discussion and analysis time and time again. The 1916 committee followed suit, or, in reality, were in front of the scholars through the content of their actual written document.

The Tipping Point

The question then becomes: Was John Dewey the philosophical tipping point for the *1916 Report on Social Studies* divergence from the widely accepted social efficiency ideas of the era? Was Dewey a stronger influence on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*?

To revisit my earlier argument, in an overview of the *1916 Report on Social*

Studies, the 1916 committee included a total of four specific references to “social efficiency” in a report that was 54 pages in length. Chairperson Jones is noted once for a curriculum illustration. CRSE Chairperson Kingsley is noted once for a potential textbook. Mace is quoted once, albeit at considerable length. Robinson quotations and references to his philosophy appear ten times in all. All of these individuals were members of the 1916 committee. The 1916 committee used numerous teacher and educator illustrations—one from Miss Blanche Hazard, a fellow 1916 committee member—and the remaining from outside educator sources.

In comparison, extensive quotations from the one other non-1916 committee member, John Dewey, appear three times. Almost more important and more direct to the 1916 committee’s recommendations, Dewey’s philosophy appears in the application of teaching principles in similar Deweyan phrases almost 30 times. Further, scholars have pointed out that Robinson’s new history, which is referred to and quoted in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, benefited from his close association with John Dewey while both were at Teacher’s College, Columbia (Westbrook, 1991). Dewey (1899) succinctly stated his view of history as, “History must be presented, not as an accumulation of results or efforts, a mere statement of what happened, but as a forceful acting thing” (p. 156).

The Circle Is Unbroken

The 1916 committee completed its own circle back to Dewey. The circle began early in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* in “*The point of view of the committee*”

section. There, in the third item, the 1916 committee stated: “One principle the committee has endeavored to keep before it consistently throughout this report because of its fundamental character. It is contained in the following quotation from Prof. Dewey:” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 10). The full Dewey quotation that followed on page 11 included his “needs of present growth” principle. The circle back to Dewey’s principle was completed on page 40 of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* under the section “*To what extent and in what ways are college requirements and life requirements mutually exclusive?*” (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 40). At this point, the 1916 committee referenced their intent to repeat the entire Dewey quotation from page 11 as a restatement and wrote,

If we could really believe that attending to the needs of present growth would keep the child and teacher alike busy and would also provide the best possible guarantee of the learning needed in the future [in college or elsewhere], transformation of educational ideals might soon be accomplished, and other desirable changes would largely take care of themselves. (U.S. Bureau of Education, 1916, p. 40)

By the conclusion of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, the conceptual educational trail of Dewey to Mace to Dewey to Robinson to Dewey consistently circles around Deweyan ideas. After all, a document that puts faith in the hands of teachers, advocates decision-making and experimentation by teachers—not school administrators—and speaks of “transformation of educational ideals” (p. 40) can hardly be called efficient. There is nothing utility-minded or efficient in these passages. Rather, much like Dewey, the 1916 committee is taking some aspects of all the camps competing for their place in the American curriculum and is creating a usable document for education reflective of Deweyan ideals.

Conclusion

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* remains recognized as a seminal report on its own merit. The recognition of this report may flow from the high regard held for Dewey through the various schools of interpretation. Dewey's role in the competition waged between the ideological camps of the 1916 era that were reflected in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* may play a part in scholars considerations.

Dewey provided the 1916 committee with a conceptual guide to lead them through the entanglement of social efficiency ideology of their era. The *1916 Report on Social Studies* did not strongly emphasize the ideas of Snedden or Taylor. Instead, the 1916 committee relied on very different and broad scope Deweyan notions much better suited for their plans for social studies. They believed the newly created social studies were differentiated from other subjects due to an emphasis on social content, not on social aims. In their opinion, the newly created social studies content afforded unique opportunities to educate students as members of society. The attributes of the contents of social studies did not equate directly to the narrow social aims of social efficiency. Instead, social studies was driven by social content, which fed the immediate needs and interests of students.

Dewey also provided his concept of democracy in education which served to support the 1916 committee's goals that education should advocate citizenship and democracy. The 1916 committee directly acknowledged that their primary principles were borrowed from Dewey. They did not need to reinvent the wheel as evidenced by their own statements and repeated references in the *1916 Report on Social Studies* to the

students' needs of present growth coupled with immediate needs and interests. This was the 1916 committee's philosophical and pedagogical framework. In his discussion on this point Lybarger concluded: "Committee members called the adoption of such a principle 'a new and most important element', and claimed the work of John Dewey as warrant for their principle" (p. 177).

The numerous teaching illustrations used by the 1916 committee exemplified Dewey's approach through examples of educators designing lessons, units, and programs for students. The 1916 committee cited examples of approaches to teaching and learning that were quite different from the top down approach advocated by Snedden, Taylor and Bobbitt. Dewey's steadfastly maintained educational philosophy became the stalwart assistance that the 1916 committee needed to "bridge the camps" and created the avenue to provide recommendations that were not limited in scope to one or even two ideologies. Thus, Dewey was the strongest influence on the 1916 committee because his concepts and philosophy provided the methodology to fulfill the 1916 committee members' vision for the newly created social studies.

The 1916 committee integrated Dewey's principles into their recommendations from the beginning of the actual text of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* on page 9 through the conclusion on page 63. They applied Dewey's principles both directly and indirectly. Verbatim quotes by Dewey appeared three times. Direct reference to his "immediate interest" and "immediate needs" principles were used approximately thirty times—spanning the text from page 9 to page 63. The 1916 committee placed an emphasis on the three components of Dewey's primary teaching principle. This emphasis

became the central theme of the 1916 committee's recommendations.

Dewey's concepts and principles were usable, doable, and practical. That is, the Deweyan ideas amassed in their arsenal allowed the 1916 committee to publish recommendations that were already having a positive effect on teaching. A case in point, the 1916 committee cited a dozen or so illustrations which presented Deweyan based teaching programs from a variety of different schools in diverse geographic locations.

Indeed, as the *1916 Report on Social Studies* moves into the 21st century, its status as a seminal educational document remains. This study suggests that the reason is primarily due to the continuing influence and relevance of John Dewey's philosophy and principles for education. In short, Dewey's ideas have stood the test of time.

CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study examined the *1916 Report on Social Studies* in order to determine how it has been interpreted and regarded over time. The underlying question became: Which interpretation, or interpretations, most embodies the intent, goals, and purpose of the 1916 committee?

The central finding of this study is that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* may be overall much more Deweyan in approach than many others have argued. That is, contrary to the belief of some modern scholars, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* may not be specific to a social efficiency orientation. This author maintains that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* represents a uniquely engineered microcosm of Kliebard's (2004) assessment of the competing ideological camps during the era of the 1916 committee. The path to this belief starts with the recognition that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* is a trilogy of three separate reports. The individual reports were prepared by three different and diverse groups that resulted in each report reflecting three different influences. Only the third and final report of the trilogy reflected the intent and the educational principles that were held by the entire membership of the 1916 committee. That is, the recommended operational philosophy for the newly created social studies was the result of a combination of multiple personal and philosophical influences which included embedding in the third and final report elements of social efficiency, social meliorism,

social reconstructionism, humanism, and developmentalism. I believe that the ideological microcosm which enveloped the 1916 committee can be considered the platform for an educational philosophy and pedagogy which may have been significantly influenced directly and indirectly by John Dewey. John Dewey's influence may have provided an overlay and counterforce to the numerous other individual and societal influences exerted over the 1916 committee.

Chapters II-VI of this dissertation examined the 1916 committee, the three individual reports, the previous scholars who have studied these reports, the various interpretations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and developed findings and implications as follows.

First, the 1916 committee members were identified and researched. Key members including Kingsley, Jones, Dunn, Barnard, Robinson, and Mace were discussed and analyzed regarding their various roles and level of participation on the 1916 committee. John Dewey, not actually a member, was included in this section due to his influence on the deliberations of the 1916 committee.

Second, the three documents that comprised the trilogy of reports published under the 1916 committee were reviewed for topics and content. This author has determined that each report is a separate and distinct document.

Third, the work of 18 scholars who have written interpretations of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* or the societal conditions that influenced the 1916 committee's thoughts were analyzed. The scholars were placed in appropriate schools of interpretation relative to their view of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and the social impacts of the

era. The schools of interpretation were identified as: celebratory historians, revisionist interpretations—social efficiency, the Dewey and Robinson school of interpretation, multiple influences, neoconservatives—and postrevisionists.

Next, an analysis of the multiple societal influences and the influences of key individuals potentially impacting the 1916 committee and the various scholarly interpretations were discussed. This author determined that the 1916 committee's work represented a microcosm of Kliebard's (2004) analysis of the competing camps battling for control of the American curriculum.

Finally, my conclusion in this study suggests that a new interpretation of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* has emerged. That is, the 1916 committee published a document that may be significantly more Deweyan in concept and principle than held by many previous interpretations. Thus, this author supports the Deweyan school of interpretation.

In the introduction, I stated eight arguments to support the thesis statement. Let us revisit each of these arguments.

First, it is important to recognize that the 1916 committee published three separate, distinctly different reports. Modern scholars tend to analyze these three reports as one package under the singular title of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. However, when each of the three reports is treated as a stand-alone document, all are uniquely different. The differentiation in the three reports stems from the uniqueness of the composition of the committee membership involved in the production of each report

The first report, the *1913 Preliminary Statement*, consisted of Jones, the chairperson, plus four 1916 committee members who provided original text. Each of the

four members presented preliminary thoughts on four social studies subjects. The first report is a preliminary statement issued in the same vein and at the same time as the preliminary statements from the other CRSE subject committees.

The second report, the *1915 Report on Community Civics*, was produced by a selected special committee consisting of one existing and three future 1916 committee members. This report was limited in scope to the subject of community civics. It presented: (a) detailed examples of approaches for the teaching of community civics, and (b) emphasized the importance of this subject in the curriculum to that era of expansive population growth due to the influx of immigrants. It was published immediately upon CRSE approval as an aid to teachers.

The third and final report is the only report that addressed the charter for the 1916 committee from the CRSE. That is, the full body of the 1916 committee was directed to produce recommendations for teaching and learning of the newly created social studies in secondary education. According to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*, this was accomplished by the complete complement of 1916 committee members. These members worked as a collective group. They melded the educational philosophy and principles of Dewey with those of the established ideological camps of the era. Then, they molded those competing ideals into a document, which is a reflection of Kliebard's (2004) analysis of the competing camps battling for control of the American curriculum in the early part of the 20th century. As such, the full 1916 committee, as one cohesive group coming from diverse backgrounds, in the third and final report reached a revamped and common philosophy that may have been much more Deweyan in its approach to the

teaching and learning of social studies than was evident in the first or second reports.

Second, I argue that the *1916 Report on Social Studies* does not embody a social efficiency or social control orientation to the degree held by many modern scholars. The views and perspectives of the various scholars that supported the *1916 Report on Social Studies* as a document representing a social efficiency or scientific management viewpoint are numerous. This view could stem, in part, from not recognizing the unique individuality of each report in the trilogy. Instead, I argue that other numerous and significant ideologies as well as individual personalities that influenced the 1916 committee ultimately had a profound impact on the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Third, over the years, scholars have put forth competing definitions for social efficiency. Krug (1964), as an individual scholar, supported a very different view from other modern scholars. I believe his concept of two streams of understanding for social efficiency—education for social control and education for social service—represents a significant diversion from other scholars. He suggested, and I agree with his view, that the 1916 committee understood that the term “social efficiency” involved both education for social control and education for social service.

Fourth, a large segment of modern scholars believe that social efficiency was the dominant ideology that influenced the 1916 era. I agree. However, I argue it does not necessarily follow that the 1916 committee as a group was influenced by this single ideology to the same level and extent as the society of the day. The 1916 era was replete with other prominent ideological concepts such as social meliorism, social reconstructionism, humanism, and developmentalism. In addition, there were several key

people influencing the 1916 committee. These included Kingsley, Jones, Dunn, Barnard, Robinson, Mace, as well as nonmember John Dewey. All had differing types and degrees of influence on the 1916 committee. The most notable and most influential individuals were Robinson and Dewey as evidenced by their level of direct and indirect input in the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. As one adds together the various ideological and individual influences, the combination effectively softens and reduces the idea that social efficiency as social control represented the overarching influence throughout the entire trilogy of reports. Thus, I argue there may be sufficient reason to believe the 1916 committee as a group formulated a view on social efficiency that diverged from some individual committee members. I further argue that the revised view held by the 1916 committee also diverged from the society of the era and from the view of social efficiency held by some modern scholars.

Fifth, I argue, therefore, that the 1916 committee indeed represented a microcosm of the ideological camps that were conceptualized by Kliebard (2004). The 1916 committee, over their tenure, cohesively combined a new philosophical view that was intended to strongly support their recommendations for the newly created social studies. They clearly stated at the outset of the *1916 Report on Social Studies* that a new perspective and approach was a necessity due to the uniqueness of social studies as a subject among all the other subjects assigned to the various CRSE committees.

Sixth, I argue that Kingsley selected Jones as chair of the 1916 committee due to his background. Over time, Jones sufficiently expanded his own personal career endeavors. As a result, evidence suggests that Jones moved forward with his own career

goals as his main focus and allowed the 1916 committee to work without exerting his direct influence. One scholar in particular offered evidence that others may have stepped in as overseers of the work of the 1916 committee (Correia, 1994).

Seventh, I believe that as individuals, the 1916 committee members possessed one common denominator. That is, they were, for the most part, educators and educational administrators with a variety of backgrounds and training in education. Thus, they held a common focus on education and a common commitment to develop the best possible teaching and learning approach for the newly created social studies. The 1916 committee, as a group, was prepared to address educational reform for social studies head on. As such, this group produced recommendations that diverged from other NEA committees and from the NEA's formal CRSE umbrella report, *Cardinal Principles*. Instead, the 1916 committee's third and final report may have been a more significant reflection of Deweyan principles than either of the other two reports in the trilogy of the *1916 Report on Social Studies*.

Eighth, I believe that this dissertation has shown that John Dewey was much more of a significant influence on the 1916 committee than many contemporary scholars suggest. Several scholars (Evans, 2004; Saxe, 1991) have published direct statements on Dewey's strong influence on the 1916 committee. From beginning to end, the third and final report is replete with Deweyan philosophy and direct quotations. In addition, teaching illustrations selected to be highlighted as examples by the 1916 committee from educators in the field were based on Deweyan principles.

In summary, the central finding of this dissertation is that John Dewey may have

been a more significant influence on the 1916 committee members and Report than suggested by many contemporary scholars. As a result, the *1916 Report on Social Studies* might be seen as more strongly representing Deweyan principles. Therefore, educators today may benefit from the opportunity to view the *1916 Report on Social Studies* from the perspective of this Deweyan interpretation.

Implications

The *1916 Report on Social Studies* is of continuing relevance for several reasons. First, because its recommendations for the teaching and learning of social studies are due, in part, to the strong Deweyan influence on the 1916 committee, it is of interest to scholars and teachers who are part of the Deweyan tradition. A long line of educators have continued in the Deweyan tradition and educational philosophy, including the John Dewey Society (AERA) and the issues centered community (National Council for the Social Studies; NCSS), with a long history of scholarship and theory to practice work. Several of the leading theorists in curriculum and social studies have argued for alternatives to the strict disciplinary teaching approach. Because this traditional approach often failed to frame social studies in a way that would challenge and highlight perennial issues, theorists over time have supported social studies centered on existing societal issues (Engle & Ochoa, 1988; Evans, 2006; Oliver, 1957; Oliver & Shaver, 1966; Rugg, 1941a, 1941b; Saxe, 1991).

Second, the work of several contemporary scholars explores themes similar to the *1916 Report on Social Studies* and represents, in part, an extension of the 1916

committee's Deweyan based philosophy and an attempt to find empirical warrants for similar ideas (Evans, 2004; Hahn, 1996; Newmann, 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c, 1991a, 1991b). The work of Fred Newmann is especially pertinent because his research, as well as other scholars involved in issues-centered instruction, is conceptually linked to the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. That is, teaching and learning in social studies requires considering how students are able to apply in-depth knowledge to nonroutine situations. Newmann's recommended assessment methodology measured the ability to use information in nonroutine ways and thus promoted the application of higher order thinking and thoughtfulness.

Third, the constructivist paradigm of authentic pedagogy that has emerged to some prominence in recent years has much in common with Dewey and the key principles of the 1916 committee. The current concepts of authentic pedagogy are embodied in three key points. Specifically, the thrust of authentic pedagogy involves application of knowledge and skills in a creative, original manner, rather than a mere use of facts and information. The process includes, first, the development of an in-depth understanding of social studies problems and issues. The second step is the development of intensely defensible ideas and concepts about important topics and issues. These first two points become solidified when, third, students learn to analyze and see issues and problems from multiple viewpoints and identify several perspectives on these viewpoints, both within and outside of the subject being studied. Thus, authentic pedagogy principles indicate that knowledge is demonstrated when students actually analyze issues and form their own interpretations based on evidence gathered or given to them, rather than merely

reiterating existing beliefs and views. The viewpoints developed through this process have a value beyond school (King, Newmann, & Carmichael, 2009; Scheurman, 1998).

At the student level, the constructivist paradigm of authentic pedagogy speaks to the need for students to reach well beyond simply complying and meeting a teacher's requirements for the subject being studied. This principle, once again, is presented in three steps. Beginning with construction of knowledge, the principle then moves into an in-depth disciplined inquiry that results in communication of views and interpretations of issues and problems that are meaningful and valuable beyond school. The empirical evidence suggests that this three-step process provides the basis for addressing the more complex issues and problems that need to be analyzed successfully by adults in contemporary society (King et al., 2009; Scheurman, 1998).

When placed side by side with the 1916 committee's principles, the constructivist paradigm of authentic pedagogy thus becomes a mirror image of the principles drawn from the work of John Dewey imbedded throughout the *1916 Report on Social Studies*. That is, the overarching concern throughout the third and final report was Dewey's belief that adults are too often concerned about what they consider will be important in the future for the child, while at the same time ignoring the immediate needs of the child. Dewey believed in developing students to become discerning, problem-solving adults capable of understanding and contributing to their society (Dewey, 1916). As a result, the 1916 committee recommended that the teaching and learning of social studies (a) started, whenever possible, with a topic or problem of study carefully selected in order to meet; (b) the student's own immediate interest; and (c) provided a topic or problem of study

that has significance to society. In other words, the 1916 committee's three-pronged precept can be seen as a forerunner to what is now discussed as authentic pedagogy.

Fourth, many key principles and the main curriculum pattern proposed by the 1916 committee continue to survive, although it has been challenged and modified. The 1916 committee established a modal pattern that would work in either of the school cycles (8-3-3 or 8-4; Saxe, 1991). As time marched forward, the newly created social studies curriculum pattern recommended by the 1916 committee, which was widely accepted by teachers in that era, moved into an evolutionary state. The newer trends in social studies gravitated to an issues-centered focus which in many respects is not unlike the 1916 committee's approach of selecting a topic of interest to students that encompassed the significance of such topics to their communities. Indeed, in the 1960s the NCSS published articles with titles such as "Activism in Social Studies Education" reflecting the trend of the times. In the late 1960s and 1970s, the move was toward social reconstructionism thus reinforcing the issues-centered approach to social studies (Evans, 2004, 2006).

Modal patterns over the many decades since 1916 became variations of that detailed by the 1916 committee. The differences in pattern were not necessarily dramatic. Jenness (1990) tracked the similarities and dissimilarities of the curriculum patterns and identified the back and forth swings in courses either included or absent. In particular, the 1916 committee's POD course reached a zenith at one point and then fell out of favor. The 21st century is experiencing a modal pattern reflecting the 1970s and 1980s. However, development of individual state standards has led to variations in modal

patterns across the nation. The shift in patterns deemphasizes the social sciences and increases the teaching of discipline-based courses such as history and geography (Evans, 2004, 2006).

As a key organization involved in the evolution of curriculum, the NCSS continues to propose social studies curriculum standards. Today's NCSS standards are extensively covered under a spectrum of 10 broad thematic categories. In essence, the NCSS standards expand and explain the range of issues and problems that could be identified by teachers for students that adds significant detail to, and direction for, the 1916 committee's concise primary principle of selecting topics of interest and significance to society. Each category is prefaced with the leading statement that "Social studies programs should include *experiences* that provide for the study of...so that the learner can..." (NCSS, 1994; emphasis added). Thus, the evolution process is continuing while at the same time not straying significantly from the longstanding curriculum foundation provided by the 1916 committee based on Deweyan principles.

Finally, contemporary recognition of Dewey's influence may result in a renewed educational reference to the 1916 committee's recommendations for the teaching and learning of social studies in the 21st century. The social studies teaching framework recommended by the 1916 committee was designed to both create and meet student's interest and to provide a deeper understanding of topics of significance to society. A renewal of the 1916 committee's recommendations could motivate students and enhance efforts to make social studies more relevant and meaningful to result in improved learning experiences for today's students.

REFERENCES

- American Historical Association. (1920). Notes from the historical field: N.E.A. Committee on Social Studies. *Historical Outlook*, 11, 203.
- Apple, M.W., & Teitelbaum, K. (2001). John Dewey, 1859-1952. In J. A. Palmer (Ed.), *Fifty major thinkers on education: From Confucius to Dewey* (pp. 177-182). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Barnard, J.L. (1916). Training in the schools for civic efficiency. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 67, 26-33.
- Barr, R., Barth, J., & Shermis, S. (1978). *The nature of the social studies*. Palm Springs, CA: ETC.
- Callahan, R.B. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Correia, S.T. (1994). Thomas Jesse Jones—Doing God's Work and the 1916 Report, In M.R. Nelson (Ed.), *The social studies in secondary education: A reprint of the seminal 1916 report with annotations and commentaries* (pp. 93-120). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED374072)
- Correia, S.T. (1995). A small circle of friends: Clarence Kingsley and membership on the committee of the commission on the reorganization of secondary education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED398136)
- Cremin, L. (1961). *The transformation of the school*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal*, 54, 77-80.
- Dewey, J. (1899). *The school and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *How we think*. Lexington, MA: Heath.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York, NY: McMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier.
- Dunn, A.W. (1907). *The community and the citizen*. Boston, MA: Heath.
- Egan, K. (1983). Social studies and the erosion of education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 13(2), 195-214.

- Engle, S., & Ochoa, A. (1988). *Education for democratic citizenship*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Evans, R.W. (2004). *Social studies wars: What should we teach the children?* New York, NY: Teachers' College Press.
- Evans, R.W. (2006). The social studies wars, now and then. *Social Education*, 70(5), 317-321.
- Evans, R.W. (2007). *This happened in America: Harold R. Rugg and the censure of the social studies*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Hahn, C.L. (1996). Research on issues-centered social studies. In R.W. Evans & D.W. Saxe (Eds.), *Handbook for teaching social issues*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Hendricks, L.V. (1946). *James Harvey Robinson: Teacher of history*. Morningside Heights, NY: King's Crown.
- Hertzberg, H. (1981). *Social studies reform: 1880-1980*. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium.
- Hertzberg, H.W. (1989). History and progressivism: A century of reform proposals. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *Historical literacy: The case for history in American education* (pp. 69-102). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Jenness, D. (1990). *Making sense of social studies*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Jones, T.J. (1904). *The sociology of a New York City block*. New York, NY: The Columbia University Press
- Jones, T.J. (1906). *Social studies in the Hampton curriculum*. Hampton, VA: Hampton Institute.
- King, M.B., Newmann, F.M., & Carmichael, D.L. (2009). Authentic intellectual work: Common standards for teaching social studies. *Social Education* 73(1), 43-49.
- Kingsley, C.H. (1916). The study of nations: Its possibilities as a social study in high schools. *School and Society*, 3(54), 37-41.
- Kliebard, H.M. (1994). "That evil genius of the Negro race": Thomas Jesse Jones and educational reform. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 10, 5-20.

- Kliebard, H.M. (2002). *Changing course: American curriculum reform in the twentieth century*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Kliebard, H. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Krug, E.A. (1964). *The shaping of the American high school 1880-1920*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Link, A.S. (1955). *American epoch: A history of the United States since the 1890's*. New York: Knopf.
- Lybarger, M. (1981). *Origins of the social studies curriculum, 1865-1916* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Lybarger, M.B. (1983). Origins of the modern social studies: 1900-1916. *History of Education Quarterly*, 23(4), 455-468.
- Lybarger, M.B. (1987). Need as ideology: A look at the early social studies. In T.S. Popkewitz (Ed.). *The formation of school subjects: The struggle for creating an American institution* (pp. 176-189). New York, NY: Falmer.
- Mace, W.H. (1902). *Method in history*. Boston, MA: Ginn.
- Mace, W.H. (1904). *A school history of the United States*. New York, NY: Rand.
- Nash, G.B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R.E. (2000). *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). *Curriculum standards for social studies, expectations of excellence*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nelson, M.R. (1994). *The social studies in secondary education: A reprint of the seminal 1916 report with annotations and commentaries*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED374072)
- Nelson, M.R. (1999). Will the field of social studies survive? *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*, 20(4), 385-397.
- Newmann, F. (1988). Higher order thinking in the high school curriculum. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72(508), 58-64.

- Newmann, F. (1990a). Higher order thinking in teaching social studies: A rationale for the assessment of classroom thoughtfulness. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22, 41-56.
- Newmann F. (1990b). Qualities of thoughtful social studies classes: An empirical profile. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22, 253-275.
- Newmann, F. (1990c). A test of higher order thinking in social studies: Persuasive writing on constitutional issues using the NAEP Approach. *Social Education*, 54, 369-373.
- Newmann, F. (1991a). Classroom thoughtfulness and students' higher order thinking: Common indicators and diverse social studies courses. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 19, 410-433.
- Newmann, F. (1991b). Higher order thinking in the teaching of social studies: Connections between theory and practice. In J. Voss, D. Perkins, & J. Segals (Eds.), *Informal reasoning and education* (pp. 380-400). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Oliver, D. (1957). The selection of content in the social studies. *Harvard Education Review*, 27, 271-300.
- Oliver, D.W., & Shaver, J.P. (1966). *Teaching public issues in the high school*. Logan: Utah State University.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1983). The formation of school subjects and the political context of schooling. In T. S. Popkewitz (Ed.). *The formation of school subjects: The struggle or creating an American institution* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Falmer.
- Ravitch, D. (1978). *The revisionists revised: A critique of the radical attack on the schools*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Ravitch, D. (1983). *The troubled crusade: American education 1945-1980*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Ravitch, D. (1985). *The schools we deserve: Reflections on the educational crises of our time*. New York, NY: Basic.
- Ravitch, D. (1989a). The plight of history in America's schools. In P. Gagnon (Ed.), *Historical Literacy: The case for history in American education* (pp. 51-68). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ravitch, D. (1989b). The revival of history: A response. *The Social Studies*, 80(3), 89-91.

- Ravitch, D. (2000). *Left back*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Ravitch, D. (2007). History's struggle to survive in the schools. *OAH Magazine of History*, 21(2), 28-32.
- Robinson, J.H. (1912). *The new history*. New York, NY: The Free Press.
- Rugg, H.O. (1941a). A study in censorship: Good concepts and bad words. *Social Education*, 5, 176-181.
- Rugg, H.O. (1941b). *That men may understand: An American in the long armistice*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Saxe, D.W. (1991). *Social studies in schools: A history of the early years*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Scheurman, G. (1998). From behaviorist to constructionist teaching. *Social Education* 73(1), 43-49.
- Smith, R.M. (1997). *Civic ideals: Conflicting visions of citizenship in U.S. history*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Tryon, R.M. (1935). *The social sciences as schools subjects*. New York, NY: Scribner.
- Tuell, H.E. (1919). *The study of nations: An experiment in social education*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- U.S. Bureau of Education. (1913). *Preliminary statements by chairmen of committees of the national education association on the reorganization of secondary education*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of Education. (1915). *The teaching of community civics*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of Education. (1916). *The social studies in secondary education*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Wesley, E.B. (1937). *Teaching the social studies: Theory and practice*. Boston, MA: Heath.

- Westbrook, R.B. (1991). *John Dewey and American democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Whelan, M. (1991). James Harvey Robinson, the new history, and the 1916 social studies report. *The History Teacher*, 34(2), 191-202.
- Whelan, M. (1993). Review: Social studies in schools: A history of the early years by David Warren Saxe. *American Journal of Education*, 101(3), 320-323.
- Whelan, M. (1997a). A particularly lucid lens: The Committee of Ten and the Social Studies Committee in historical context. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 12, 256-268.
- Whelan, M. (1997b). History as the core of social studies education. In E.W. Ross (Ed.), *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 21-37). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Whelan, M. (2006). Teaching history: A constructivist approach. In E.W. Ross (Ed.). *The social studies curriculum: Purposes, problems, and possibilities* (pp. 37-49). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Woodson, C.G. (1950). Personal: Thomas Jesse Jones. *The Journal of Negro History*, 35(1), 107-109.

CURRICULUM VITAE

C. GREGG JORGENSEN

2676 W. Desert Springs Rd.
 St. George, UT 84770
 435-313-6914
gjorgensen@bajabb.com

EDUCATION: Ph.D., Utah State University, December 2009
 Curriculum and Instruction, Major: Social Studies Education

J.D., Antioch School of Law, Washington, D.C. 1977

B.S., Political Science (History minor), *Magna Cum Laude*,
 University of Utah, 1974

DISSERTATION: “Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations: A Reexamination of the 1916 Report on Social Studies.”

A qualitative analysis of the Report to determine how it has been regarded and interpreted over time. A study of the various multiple societal and individual influences on the 1916 Committee that explores if, in fact, there is one dominant interpretation, or, whether or not different interpretations are possible for the 1916 Report on Social Studies. The analysis and conclusions suggest a new interpretation of the 1916 Report on Social Studies that argues that its educational philosophy and pedagogy may have been significantly influenced directly and indirectly by John Dewey.

Advisor: Ronald W. Evans; Committee: Barry M. Franklin, Martha Whitaker, Jeanne Thomas, Steven P. Camicia, Barre Toelken, Patricia Gantt, Ronald W. Evans

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Dixie State College of Utah

2007-2009

Assistant Professor, Department of Education.

Courses Taught:

EDUC 2400 Foundations/ Multicultural/ ESL Education

ELED 4400 Methods/ Teaching Elementary Social Studies Education

ELED 4600 Methods/ Teaching Elementary Language Arts Education

ELED 4989 Elementary Education Capstone

EDUC 2500 Technology for Educators and Electronic Portfolios (K-12)

EDUC 4500 Technology in Education

Supervision of Student Teachers

Supervision of Practicum Students

Utah State University 2003-2007
 Graduate Assistant, Department of Secondary Education. I taught Social Studies Methods courses, the master's level course, Philosophical, Historical, and Social Foundations of Education, as well as the student teaching seminar for social studies student teachers. In addition, I supervised clinical experiences for social studies majors, and supervised student teachers. My responsibilities included the placement of all social studies practicum students. I served as an assistant for Dr. Barry M. Franklin in his distance education doctoral curriculum course.

I also taught Service Learning, the Teaching Practicum seminar, Social Studies seminar courses, and through distance education I taught Special Education for Secondary Teachers, for the Alternative Licensure Teaching Program in Continuing Education at Utah State University. I also supervised practicing teachers in the Alternative Licensure Teaching Program in classrooms throughout the state of Utah.

Davis School District 2002-2003
 Teacher, Farmington Junior High, Farmington, Utah. I taught 7th grade—Utah Studies.

Utah State University 2003
 Adjunct Instructor, Department of Secondary Education. I taught the master's level course, Philosophical, Historical, and Social Foundations of Education, during the summer of 2003.

Multimedia Consultant 2003
 Research Editor, *Promontory*, a PBS video documentary produced by KUED-TV, University of Utah.

Utah State University 2001-2002
 Instructor, Department of Secondary Education. The Davis School District, Utah, granted leave without pay for one year to teach Social Studies Methods courses, supervise social studies student teachers, and conduct a seminar for social studies student teachers at Utah State University. I also taught Social Studies Methods and a seminar for social studies student teachers face-to-face at the Uintah basin campus site. During the summer session, I taught the master's level course, Philosophical, Historical and Social Foundations of Education.

Davis School District 1997-2001
 Teacher, Farmington Junior High, Farmington, Utah. I taught 7th grade—Utah Studies. I served as Chair, Social Studies Department, 2000-2001.
Honor: Disney's American Teacher Award nominee for the year 2000.

LICENSURE:

State of Utah: 6-12 Social Studies Teaching Certification

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE PRIOR TO TEACHING:

Research Institute of America, New York, New York 1988-1998
 Sales Representative in Northern California and Southern Oregon for publisher of legal, business and tax information.
Honor and Award: National Director's Club 1992 award winner for RIA's national sales force.

Mountain West College, Salt Lake City, Utah 1986-1988
Instructor of Legal Research for paralegal program.

University of Utah, College of Law Library 1982-1988
Energy Law Librarian. Teaching responsibilities: Instructing second and third year law students in legal research on Westlaw and Lexis-Nexis online information services.

Western Survey Research, Salt Lake City, Utah 1980-1982
Polling for clients such as KUTV Channel 2 Television in Salt Lake City, Utah.

PRESENTATIONS:

National and International Conferences

Jorgensen, C. G., "Unraveling Conflicting Interpretations of the 1916 Report on Social Studies." Annual meeting of the Society for the Study of Curriculum History, Denver, April, 2010.

Evans, R. W., & Jorgensen, C. G., "A Dream Deferred: The (Unfulfilled) Promise of Critical Pedagogy." Annual meeting of the National Council for Social Studies, Atlanta, November, 2009.

Student Mentoring Seminar in Curriculum Studies. Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association Conference, San Francisco, April, 2006.

Chair and Discussant, "Educational Partnerships and Reform: Four Perspectives." Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, April 2005.

Jorgensen, C. G., "Critical Thinking and the Politics of Diversion." Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Quebec, April 2005.

Gallagher-Geurtsen, T., Jorgensen, C. G., & Shoemate, S., "Poplar Culture and the Civic Engagement of Youth." Conference on Civic Education Research, Reno, September 2004.

Co-Chair and Discussant, "Re-Visioning Disability: Cultural Signs and Experiential Knowing." Annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, April 2004.

Regional Conference

Jorgensen, C. G., "Teaching the Native American Stories of N. Scott Momaday in Social Studies Classrooms." The annual philological conference of the English Graduate Student Association, Idaho State University, April 2004.

Public Schools

Workshop presentation: “Special Education and School Law.” Conducted for Idaho Falls School District superintendents and public school principals, Utah State University, Logan, June 2004.

TEACHING INTERESTS:

Graduate and undergraduate courses in Social Studies Education, Curriculum History, Social Foundations of Education, Multicultural Education, History of Education, Curriculum Theory, Qualitative and Historical Research Methods; Supervision in Social Studies.

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND SERVICE:

National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), 2001-present

American Educational Research Association (AERA), 2003-present

National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME), 2006-present

SIG Issues Centered Community (NCSS), 2008-present

Society for the Study of Curriculum History (SSCH), 2010

Ad Hoc Reviewer, Theory and Research in Social Education, 2009-present

Ad Hoc Reviewer, College and University Faculty Assembly (CUFA) Proposals for Papers during NCSS annual conference, 2009-present

Faculty Advisor, Native American Student Association, Dixie State College of Utah, 2009.

Educational Testing Service (ETS) Social Studies Panel Member: Invited to review “The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers” for social studies teachers and students in Utah, Salt Lake City, September 2003.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE): Representative for the Department of Secondary Education at Utah State University, annual conference of the National Council for the Social Studies, Washington, D.C., 2001.

Utah State Office of Education: Social Studies Committee Member. 5-person committee wrote the Seventh Grade Utah Core Curriculum for Social Studies; served as state-wide facilitator to gain input and feedback from teachers throughout the state during the two years the committee wrote the core curriculum; served as facilitator to share information about the new requirements in the Utah Core Curriculum for Social Studies with Utah State University faculty and undergraduate students in the teaching program. 2000-2002.

Utah History Fair: Served as facilitator and supervisor of student entries. Served as judge for student entries. 1999-2003.