INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

74-8483

SIMON, Lawrence Howard, 1944-
   TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAMMATIC
   LANGUAGE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM AND
   INSTRUCTION.

   University of North Carolina at Greensboro,
   Ed.D., 1974
   Education, curriculum development

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

TOWARD THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PROGRAMMATIC

LANGUAGE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

CURRICULUM AND

INSTRUCTION

by

Lawrence Howard Simon

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1973

Approved by

Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

Oral Examination
Committee Members

Date of Examination

ii

SIMON, LAWRENCE HOWARD. Toward the Development of a Programmatic Language for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction. (1973) Directed by: Dr. Dale L. Brubaker. Pp. 119.

The purpose of this study was to examine the problem of confusion over the meaning of social studies curriculum terminology, as well as to systematically develop, apply and validate an original conceptual framework for the field in an effort to bring clarity to selected terms.

The conceptual framework consisted of a discussion of relevant curriculum considerations for each of five discrete "focal points" or traditions in the field of social studies curriculum: (1) factual subject matter, (2) the child, (3) the reflective inquiry process, (4) the structure of the social science disciplines and (5) socio-political involvement.

The conceptual framework was used to generate sets of hypothetical definitions for perhaps the two most commonly used terms in the field of social studies curriculum: citizenship and inquiry. All definitions were discrete, and philosophically and pedagogically consistent with the identified premises of their respective "focal points" or traditions.

In order to validate the conceptual framework for its intended purpose, assessments were made in separate chapters of the extent to which the hypothesized definitions for citizenship and inquiry conformed with the predefinitional usage of these terms in the professional

literature since 1900.

As predicted in the hypothetical definitions, it was found that there are only five discrete views of citizenship in the professional literature since 1900, although most writers' definitions of the term reflect an eclectic position with regard to these discrete views.

Finally, it was discovered that only three of the five hypothetical definitions of inquiry were supported by discrete examples of pre-definitional usage of that term in the professional literature since 1900. Many writers' definitions of the term inquiry, however, reflect an eclectic position with regard to the three discrete views of that term.

In view of these findings, the investigator concluded that the conceptual framework does possess substantial validity and utility for the purpose of generating philosophically and pedagogically discrete and useful definitions for social studies curriculum terminology. By establishing a measure of conceptual clarity for such terms as citizenship and inquiry, the framework was useful in beginning to develop a programmatic language for the field of social studies curriculum.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Communication within the field of education has long suffered

from a lack of precise terminology. Nowhere is this generalization

more true than in the field of social studies curriculum and instruc-

tion.[1] In a November, 1970, article in Social Education, James Barth

and Samuel Shermis refer to this dilemma, stating that "somehow in

social studies . . . we seem not to be able to talk to each other. We

all use the right words, i.e., inquiry, concepts, etc., and make the

right noises about individual differences, but we continue to talk past

each other."[2] The magnitude of the dilemma over terminology within

the field is underscored by these authors' attempt to bring conceptual

clarity to the generic term "social studies" on the occasion of the

---

[1]The writer recognizes a possible distinction between the concepts
of "curriculum" and "instruction," viz., that "curriculum" can be
viewed as a statement of educational ends and the intended means of
achieving these ends, while "instruction" would be the implementation
of the curriculum. For purposes of this dissertation, however,
curriculum will be viewed as a broader concept which subsumes the
process of instruction.

[2]James L. Barth and Samuel Shermis, "Defining the Social
Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, XXXIV
(November, 1970), 743.

fiftieth anniversary of the National Council for the Social Studies. If no consensus has been reached regarding the meaning and usage of this parent term after five decades of debate in the professional literature, it is little wonder that disagreement exists over the meaning and usage of the construct inquiry, for example.

It would appear that the underlying reason for the quandary over terminology in social studies curriculum is that there is a plethora of terms in the field, with most terms having several modes of usage. There is not, however, a language for the field. A language would be a system of interdependent linguistic symbols that are used in a more or less uniform fashion by a number of people, who would thus be enabled to communicate intelligibly with one another.

In varying degrees, systems of linguistic symbols, or languages, can be found in the specialized areas of such professions as engineering, medicine and the law. These disciplines, however, are either scientific or technical in nature, or both. They are relatively more restricted in their concerns than social studies curriculum, which cuts across a wide variety of disciplines and contexts. The languages of engineering, medicine and the law, then, are made up of terms and definitions that are by their very nature technical in purport.

On the other hand, as Israel Scheffler, the educational philosopher, points out, the discourse of curriculum is not technical in nature but

is instead a general communication in a practical context. [3] The

question logically arises: "Does this preclude the possibility of

developing a language for social studies curriculum?" The answer, of

course, depends upon what is meant by a language. For reasons which

will be discussed later, it does not seem probable that a single,

generally acceptable language will ever emerge in the field of social

studies curriculum. What does seem feasible, however, is the sys-

tematic examination of past and present usage of social studies

curriculum terminology, culminating in a measure of conceptual clarity,

from which guidelines for the future usage of terms can be deduced and

prescribed.

It is interesting to speculate about why no language of any type has

emerged in the field of social studies curriculum. A possible factor

retarding the development of a language is the existence of philosophical

and pedagogical differences among scholars which often are never

sufficiently articulated in their writings. Even if such differences were

spelled out, it would be difficult enough to bring a measure of conceptual

clarity to the usage of terms within the field. Too often, however,

writers fail to be explicit at all about their assumptions and biases.

An example of this might be that when a writer is discussing the

relationship between the concepts of citizenship and values, he fails to

---

[3]Israel Scheffler, The Language of Education (Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1960), p. 12.

mention whether or not he is convinced that certain values are ultimately right or wrong and whether or not he feels values are caught or taught. A lack of candor and explicitness in writing complicates the task of clarifying the usage of conceptual terms.

Another factor hindering the development of a language for social studies curriculum might be the lack of sufficient two-way communication between writers and practitioners in the field. Publishers often solicit the opinions of professors of education on behalf of an author, but rarely make an effort to obtain feedback from the classroom teacher who encounters a social studies curriculum text as a graduate student. The lack of two-way communication is unfortunate because writers and classroom teachers often have different kinds of expertise and orientations which can lead to an estrangement between them if not aired. For example, teachers often feel that writers' prescriptions are too theoretical and are divorced from the realities of the class-room. On the other hand, writers often feel that teachers are too concerned with the practical and do not have a sufficient appreciation of the role of theory. To the extent that these stereotyped views of each other are justified, gross differences of viewpoint may exist between writers and practitioners over the meaning of certain concepts. The concept inquiry serves as a good example. A classroom teacher oriented toward the practical might view inquiry mainly in terms of a method that contrasts with exposition. A writer oriented toward the

theoretical might view inquiry primarily as a sophisticated intellectual process engaged in by the student.

Undoubtedly, there are many other reasons why a language has not emerged in the field of social studies curriculum. The reason cited, and others, are unfortunate because a language would seem to be a plausible solution to the very difficult problem of confusion over the usage of terminology. Before pursuing possibilities for the genesis of a language, however, it would be helpful to articulate more thoroughly the nature of the problem at hand.

It was stated previously that the apparent underlying reasons for the confusion over terminology in social studies curriculum is an abundance of terms, each with several methods of usage. This is a rather diffuse explanation. The problem can be better understood by examining some general modes in which social studies terms have been used in the professional literature. It seems to this writer that there are four general modes. The first three of these, for reasons which will be cited, constitute elements of the problem of confusion over terminology. The fourth mode does not contribute to the confusion.

First, some terms have had little, if any, commonly accepted meaning. Examples of such terms are curriculum, understandings, attitudes and skills. Confusion abounds over the meaning of these terms because they are such broad and imprecise concepts. The confusion is compounded by writers and practitioners who use these

terms without being sufficiently acquainted with some of the optional

ways the term has been used in the professional literature. As a result

of this confusion, it becomes incumbent upon each writer to stipulate

what he means when he uses the term. The aim of such stipulation,

according to Scheffler, is communicatory. In other words, it is done

in the hope of facilitating discourse. [4]

Since terms such as curriculum are so intrinsically vague, it is

imperative that a writer communicate what he means by them. For

example: "Does curriculum subsume the process of instruction, or

not?" "Does curriculum include unplanned learning experiences as

well as planned ones?" "Does the curriculum include only what happens

in the classroom, or on the school premises in general, or does it

include experiences beyond the premises of the school?" Answers to

questions like these are necessary when employing vague terminology.

A second general mode of usage is for the same term to be

employed by various writers, but with several different, conceptually

distinct meanings. Examples of such terms are citizenship and social

studies. Unlike the term curriculum, these have a limited number of

meanings which accord with generally accepted predefinitional usage.

The apparent reason for the differences in meaning is that the philo-

sophical or pedagogical orientation of various writers differs. The

---

[4]Ibid., p. 22.

problem of confused usage does not spring from philosophical or peda-

gogical differences, per se, as long as they are sufficiently articulated.

It comes from having one label for several conceptually distinct

meanings. Perhaps the term citizenship is the best example of this

dilemma.

Is citizenship the possession of a set of values and behaviors,

such as patriotism and voting? Is it the exercise of democratic choice

over matters of social concern? Is citizenship the actual process of

decision-making in a socio-political context?[5] Is it possession of the

knowledge and inquiry methods of the social science disciplinarians?

Finally, is citizenship a process of decision-making as well as action-

initiation in a socio-political context? The logical answer to these

questions would seem to be that citizenship can be any of these things,

depending upon one's philosophical and pedagogical viewpoint.

A third general mode of usage is to employ different terms to

convey the same fundamental meaning. A set of examples would be

the terms: inquiring, problem solving, discovery learning, reflective

thinking and scientific investigating. While these specific terms are

different, the definitions they are paired with are basically similar and

descriptive, in that they provide an explanatory account of meaning

based on a past usage for which some consensus existed.[6]

---

[5]Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 750.

[6]For a discussion of descriptive definitions, see Israel
Scheffler, op. cit., pp. 15-18.

The terms cited probably should not be used interchangeably. The fact is, they are often used in this manner because of some apparent commonality among the terms.

From the vantage point of the inquirer (or thinker, or learner), the commonality would appear to be the belief that all learning is motivated by the perception of a blocked goal or by a new, disturbing situation that does not fit the individual's previous experiences.[7] This situation forces the individual to assume an active role in the learning process. Instead of undertaking the rote memorization of information, the individual is engaged in rigorous thought. The thought may be inductive in nature or deductive, or both modes. In induction, the individual is attempting to utilize data to built generalizations and reach conclusions. In deduction, the individual is testing generalizations with which he deals, by the use of logic and with evidence he gathers. These two modes of thought adequately express what the inquirer is engaged in intellectually, regardless of what we choose to label the process.

From the vantage point of the teacher, the commonality of the terms cited is that when viewed as instructional methods, they stand in opposition to the traditional didactic-expository method. The teacher acts as a catalyst in the student's learning process. He

_____

[7] June R. Chapin and Richard E. Gross, "Making Sense Out of the Terminology of the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, LXIII, no. 4 (April, 1972), 149.

abandons the traditional role of covering the textbook and dispensing the right answer.

The commonalities mentioned with regard to inquiring and its related terms illustrate how a cluster of terms can be used to convey the same fundamental meaning. This, of course, contributes to the confusion over terminology.

Why are we faced with this particular problem? Perhaps it is because different writers wish to usher into popular usage their own distinctive terminology for old, prevailing concepts at various times in history. If a writer is successful in this endeavor, usage of a proposed term may become a fad for a given period. It is possible that the "publish or perish" phenomenon at universities helps explain the proliferation of new terms for old concepts.

There is a fourth general mode in which social studies terms have been used in the professional literature. Occasionally unique terms, each with its own distinctive meaning, will be used. Examples of this are jurisprudential teaching and confluent education. Terms such as these are used when a writer wishes to introduce a new, unique concept into the professional dialogue and to prescribe its correct future usage. The definitions for such terms are often programmatic in nature, in that they convey implicitly or explicitly a moral-philosophical position and an educational program commensurate with that position.[8] The

---

[8]For a discussion of programmatic definitions, see Israel Scheffler, op. cit., pp. 19-22.

program is one of action and is valued by the writer.

As was stated before, terms in this fourth category do not contribute to the confusion over terminology. This is because they are precise in the meaning they convey. They are also unique in that they do not mirror any predefinitional usage. Therefore, terms in this category are not part of the problem to be considered. Mention was made of this type of term in order to make the analysis all inclusive.

Now that the nature of the confusion over terminology in social studies curriculum has been explored, the need for a proposal to resolve the problem becomes evident.

Proposal for Resolving the Problem

In discussing the traditions of social studies curriculum, James Barth and Samuel Shermis contend that most professionals within the field spurn reasoned theory and operate with a "thoroughgoing eclecticism." As a consequence, their language reflects a mixture of several philosophical and pedagogical positions. These authors contend that a "linguistic hash" results, which largely obscures what these professionals are really doing. [9]

Barth and Shermis conclude: "If we accept the belief that theory is a guide to practice and conflicting theory guides practice in different directions—likely to be inconsistent and self-defeating—what seems to

[9]Barth and Shermis, op. cit., pp. 750-751.

be required is <u>conceptual</u> <u>clarity</u>."[10] [emphasis mine] These writers

insist that professionals in social studies curriculum ". . . need to

identify the premises from which they operate."[11]

The present writer believes that if the premises of <u>all</u> the major

traditions in social studies curriculum could be adequately articulated,

a conceptual framework would emerge which would have utility in

bringing the much needed <u>conceptual</u> <u>clarity</u> to the usage of terminology

in the field. Once a measure of conceptual clarity is achieved with past

and present usage of terms, work could begin on the ultimate solution

to the problem of confusing terminology: a language.

In the second chapter of the dissertation, the writer will introduce

a newly hypothesized conceptual framework for social studies curric-

ulum. This framework, or model, will then be used to generate philo-

sophically and pedagogically consistent and discrete sets of hypothetical

definitions for perhaps the two most commonly used terms in the field

of social studies curriculum: <u>citizenship</u> and <u>inquiry</u>.

The writer's purpose in this endeavor will be to inquire into the

<u>validity</u> of the model for generating conceptually distinct and useful

definitions for social studies curriculum terminology. Success with

the two chosen terms will demonstrate that the model has <u>utility</u> for

bringing a measure of conceptual clarity to the field. If this is possible,

---

[10]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 751.

[11]<u>Ibid</u>.

then perhaps the model could be used by others to generate sets of programmatic languages for social studies curriculum.

In separate chapters, an effort will be made to see if the hypothesized definitions for citizenship and inquiry conform with the predefinitional usage of these terms in the professional literature since 1900. Major sources constituting evidence for this examination will be:

(1) Selected textbooks on social studies curriculum, K-12

(2) Materials from social studies projects

(3) Social Education and other publications of the National Council for the Social Studies

(4) The Social Studies.

(5) The Instructor

(6) The Grade Teacher.

(7) Other professional journals

(8) National Commission reports on the social studies

(9) The Encyclopedia of Educational Research

(10) The Encyclopedia of Education

These chapters will thus be a descriptive accounting of how the selected terms have been used historically, as well as an inquiry into the validity and utility of the hypothesized model.

The final chapter will summarize the findings of the study, set forth appropriate conclusions, and state any necessary modifications of the proposed conceptual framework.

CHAPTER II

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM

Introduction

In the first chapter a case was made that attaining conceptual
clarity must be a prerequisite to resolving the confusion over termi-
nology in social studies curriculum. Moreover, it was postulated that
in order to move toward conceptual clarity, professionals in the field
must first identify the premises from which they operate. It is
assumed that a thorough articulation of the premises of all the major
traditions in social studies curriculum will result in a conceptual
framework which can be utilized to bring clarity to the usage of
terminology in the field.

In this chapter premises for each social studies tradition will be
identified, and a newly hypothesized conceptual framework for social
studies curriculum will be introduced. Finally, the new framework,
or model, will be used to generate hypothetical sets of definitions for
the terms citizenship and inquiry. Each definition will be philo-
sophically and pedagogically consistent with the identified premises of
its particular social studies tradition.

Before detailing the proposed conceptual framework, it would be
instructive to take note of other models for social studies curricula.

Several models in the field are obviously adapted from Ralph Tyler's 1949 statement of the three "sources" of the school curriculum: subject matter, contemporary life, and the learner.[1] For example, in discussing social studies curriculum organization, Frank J. Estvan refers to three types of curricula: disciplines-oriented, society-oriented, and individual-oriented.[2]

The disciplines-oriented curriculum is concerned primarily with the content that pupils are to be systematically taught. The rationale behind this emphasis is that the best way for pupils to achieve educational objectives is through the mastery of subject matter.[3]

The society-oriented curriculum gives precedence to social problems and processes. Pupils are expected to formulate partial, hypothetical solutions to these problems by drawing upon all the resources of the culture rather than a limited number of disciplines. This type of curriculum is based on the belief that pupils attain educational objectives best by developing competence in solving problems of living.[4]

---

[1] For a discussion of curriculum sources, see Ralph W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949), pp. 5-33.

[2] Frank J. Estvan, Social Studies in a Changing World (Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968), pp. 120-132.

[3] Ibid., p. 140.

[4] Ibid., pp. 140-141.

The individual-oriented curriculum gives top priority to the individual's personal needs, interests and concerns as guides to what to include in the educational program. To satisfy his needs, the pupil draws upon the funded wisdom of mankind, so that all the disciplines become a second guide to what should be included in the curriculum. The rationale behind this emphasis is that the best way to achieve educational objectives is to provide for the optimum development of the individual at each phase of his growth.[5]

Another model, proposed by Dale L. Brubaker in 1967, suggests that at present there are basically two alternatives for social studies curricula: good citizenship and social science inquiry. Conceding that good citizenship is an abstract term with many acceptable meanings, this writer nevertheless contends that it constitutes the majority position within the field of social studies curriculum. In other words, most professionals accept good citizenship as the primary objective of their social studies programs.[6]

According to Brubaker, a minority of social studies professionals view the inquiry methods of social science disciplinarians as the primary objective of their programs.[7]

---

[5]Ibid., p. 141.

[6]Dale L. Brubaker, Alternative Directions for the Social Studies (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1967), pp. 1-17.

[7]Ibid., pp. 23-39.

In 1970, following Brubaker's lead, James Barth and Samuel Shermis proposed a model which characterizes social studies curricula as being one of three types: (1) social studies as citizenship transmission, (2) social studies as social science, and (3) social studies as reflective inquiry.[8]

Social studies as citizenship transmission carries with it the connotation that there is a body of largely factual subject matter which is known in advance and which should be passed on from one generation to the next. Furthermore there is an assumption that pupils should become committed to certain values which reflect the accepted behavior of the community that the school services.[9]

According to Barth and Shermis, social studies as social science advocates teaching the "structure" of the various social science disciplines. This would include the important concepts of each discipline, as well as the appropriate mode of inquiry used by scholars to discover new knowledge within each field. The pupil would be given practice in using the various modes of inquiry on significant problems identified by professionals within a discipline. It is assumed that if the pupil is trained as a junior historian or a quasi-political scientist, he will then

---

[8]James L. Barth and Samuel Shermis, "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, XXXIV (November, 1970), 743.

[9]Ibid., pp. 744-746.

better understand and cope with the problems of the world. [10]

Finally, Barth and Shermis contend that social studies can be regarded from the perspective of reflective inquiry. With this emphasis to the curriculum, the pupils would be trained to make rational decisions about personally sensed and significant social problems. The training would include practice in the generalized inquiry method of: (1) identifying a problem, (2) gathering and evaluating all relevant data, and (3) arriving at the most rational decision possible, when faced with several ambiguous alternatives. [11]

The present writer believes that existing social studies curriculum models are adequate for some purposes. However, in order to bring clarity to the usage of terminology, a single model is needed that acknowledges past, present and emerging focal points within the field. At present, no published model does this.

The writer also holds a certain set of assumptions about social studies curricula which is not found in any one of the models cited, or in any other single model. These assumptions are, however, considerations incorporated into the proposed conceptual framework. As such they contribute to the uniqueness of the model.

The first assumption is that citizenship training is an implicit if

---

[10]Ibid., pp. 746-748.

[11]Ibid., pp. 748-750.

not explicit aim of all types of social studies curricula, regardless of

their emphasis. That is to say, citizenship transmission should not be

viewed as a separate and discrete emphasis or tradition in social

studies education. The general public has come to expect any social

studies curriculum to prepare pupils for good or effective citizenship.

This objective takes precedence over others in the public's mind. [12]

Social studies professionals are aware of the public's expectations.

That is why every social studies curriculum—whether it gives emphasis

to factual subject matter, the reflective inquiry process, or the concepts

and inquiry methods of the social science disciplines—can claim some

implicit or explicit provision for contributing to good citizenship on the

part of the pupils.

A second assumption is that a fundamental difference exists be-

tween a social studies curriculum focused on factual subject matter and

one focused on the basic concepts of the various social science disci-

plines. The fact that these types of curricula would share an emphasis

on knowledge is overshadowed by the difference between them.

Briefly, that difference is that in certain curricula, disparate facts

are dealt with as if they were important in their own right; whereas in

other curricula, concepts—subsuming bodies of facts—are dealt with

as a means to the end of understanding the essence of a discipline.

---

[12] See Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley
and Sons, Inc., 1958), p. 118.

A third assumption is that, on the level of practice in the class-room, there are some important differences between the reflective inquiry process, as advocated by John Dewey, and the methodical modes of inquiry of the various social science disciplinarians. [13] Therefore, it can be stated that at least two legitimate traditions exist with regard to inquiry in the field of social studies curriculum. One example of the differences between these traditions is the question of who poses the problem to be inquired into. Is it the social science disciplinarian who writes curriculum materials; or is it perhaps the classroom teacher? In a classroom with a program of study based on the structure of the social science disciplines, the textbook author or the teacher generally poses the problem. On the other hand, in a curriculum focused on the reflective inquiry process, the pupil would probably identify his own problem. The problem would originate from the pupil's personally sensed interests and needs.

A final assumption is that social and political action-initiation by pupils to change their environment is a new, emerging focal point or tradition in social studies curriculum. While it is doubtful that any social studies program focuses exclusively on this emphasis, partial programs do exist. The focus on socio-political involvement is funda-mentally different from the traditional child-centered curriculum, even

---

[13] For support of this position, see Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 748.

though the individual is a dominant concern in both types of curricula.

Finally, while socio-political involvement presupposes serious inquiry

and decision-making on the part of the pupil, it goes beyond the realm

of the cognitive in its scope. This is because the pupil culminates his

inquiry and decision-making with overt action.

A case has been made that a new conceptual framework, or model,

is needed which acknowledges all the major focal points or traditions in

social studies curriculum. In addition the salient assumptions upon

which the proposed model rests have been discussed. Let us turn now

to an enunciation of the framework.

Conceptual Framework

The proposed conceptual framework isolates five "focal points"

for social studies curricula. [14] These can be viewed as either past,

present or emerging traditions in the field. The "focal points" are:

(1) FACTUAL SUBJECT MATTER

(2) THE CHILD

(3) REFLECTIVE INQUIRY PROCESS

(4) STRUCTURE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE
DISCIPLINES

(5) SOCIO-POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT

[14] Adapted from Dale L. Brubaker, Lawrence H. Simon and
Jo Watts Williams, "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies
Curriculum and Instruction," unpublished manuscript of the University
of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project,
September, 1972.

The "focal point" in each case is that element of the curriculum which appears to be most highly valued by the curriculum planners and which is central to the determination of other considerations.

Secondary curricular considerations, shaped by a philosophical commitment to a given focal point, are:

(1) What provision is made for citizenship education?

(2) What assumptions are made about the social and intellectual maturity of the pupil?

(3) How is the content of the curriculum selected?

    (a) What constitutes the body of knowledge for the curriculum?

    (b) What are the sources of content for the curriculum?

(4) How is the content of the curriculum utilized?

    (a) What is expected of teachers in dealing with the content of the curriculum?

    (b) What is expected of pupils in dealing with the content of the curriculum?

    (c) What is expected of significant others (e. g. professors in academic disciplines, publishers) in dealing with the content of the curriculum?

(5) How is evaluation of pupils and teachers with regard to curricular objectives accomplished?

Each focal point or social studies tradition will now be systematically discussed. After a statement of the principal concern of each focal point, the secondary curricular considerations enumerated

will be explored. While a discussion of these concerns can rightfully be interpreted as a statement of the premises upon which each tradition rests, it is not this writer's intention to imply that archetypes of these five curricula exist in practice.

Factual Subject Matter

Perhaps the oldest, most widely accepted, yet least openly acknowledged focal point in social studies curriculum is the emphasis upon factual subject matter. With this emphasis, separate, divergent facts become important in their own right. Even though they are the principal concern of the curriculum, isolated facts are usually dealt with at the very lowest cognitive levels, such as recognition and recall. Analysis, synthesis and evaluation—all high level cognitive acts—are rarely called for. Even applicability of factual knowledge is of no great concern. To the extent that it is a concern, it is assumed that facts will be useful at some time in the future. [15]

With this emphasis to the social studies curriculum, professionals assert that pupils should be prepared to exercise good citizenship as adults. Accordingly, an effort is made by the authorities developing the curriculum to prescribe the events, people, phenomena and ideas thought worthy of being studied by all future citizens. In addition, teachers are charged with the responsibility for

---

[15] For a discussion of levels of cognitive acts, see Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956).

persuading pupils of the ultimate rightness and wrongness of certain values. An instance of this is the conviction that our parliamentary democracy is the best possible form of government.[16]

Advocates of this curricular focus believe that knowledge of the prescribed subject matter, as well as a commitment to the generally accepted values of the community, should be held in reserve in the pupil's mind until such time that he needs to use them in discharging his duties as a citizen.

As can be surmised from the provisions for citizenship education, pupils are not credited with possessing social maturity. There is an unspoken assumption that it will descend upon pupils at or about the age of legal maturity. In addition pupils are assumed to be intellectually immature. Therefore their role in the selection and use of content to be studied is limited or non-existent. The pupil's mind is viewed as an empty vessel into which teachers pour selected content.[17]

As has been stated previously, the body of knowledge dealt with in this type of social studies curriculum consists of the disparate facts deemed worthy of study by those who develop the curriculum. Class-room teachers and pupils are generally excluded from the curriculum development process.

---

[16] Barth and Shermis, op. cit., pp. 744-745.

[17] For an analysis of this viewpoint, called "mind substance theory," see John P. Wynne, Theories of Education (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), Ch. 1.

There appear to be two sources of content for the prescribed

curriculum. The first of these is tradition. It is assumed that those

facts considered valid and important in the past must be equally valid

and important in the present. In the case of the more recently created

branches of the social studies, however, tradition can not be relied

upon. Therefore another source of content must be the facts deemed

important by a consensus of scholars in the various disciplines.[18]

From whatever source the content of the curriculum is drawn, the

knowledge is generally organized into separate social studies subjects

prior to use.

With regard to the utilization of content, teachers are expected

to transmit the prescribed facts to pupils through description. The

description should be unadulterated by the teacher's own interpretation

or bias. In addition, as was stated previously, the teacher should try

to persuade pupils of the ultimate rightness and wrongness of certain

values, as sanctioned by the curriculum planners.[19] In brief,

teachers are supposed to faithfully execute the curriculum guide and

closely follow the adopted textbooks and materials.

The pupil is expected to commit the prescribed facts to memory,

even though they may seem unrelated to each other and irrelevant to

his present concerns. The teacher may expect the pupil to recognize

---

[18] Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 745.

[19] Ibid., pp. 744-745.

or recall memorized facts on command. The pupil, however, is generally not expected to perform high level cognitive acts with his knowledge. That knowledge which is not forgotten generally lies dormant in the pupil's mind until some indefinite time in the future when it supposedly will have applicability.

There are certain significant persons outside of a school system who perform prominent roles with respect to the subject matter content of the curriculum. College and university professors do research which contributes to the body of factual knowledge. They also have the important function of coauthoring most of the textbooks that are used in social studies classes. Finally, publishing companies determine which textbook manuscripts will be printed, and in what form. This is a very important influence because textbooks are the basis for most of the fact-oriented social studies curriculum.

Evaluation of the pupil in this type of curriculum generally involves objective testing by the teacher to ascertain if the pupil can recognize or recall the facts prescribed for memorization.

Evaluation of the teacher is a more difficult proposition. Ultimate evaluation of the teacher's success in description and persuasion must of course be deferred until the pupils are adults. A more immediate evaluation might be inferred from the pupils' performance on objective teacher-made tests and standardized achievement tests.

The Child[20]

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the child, the primary concern is with the child's manifest needs and interests.[21] This concern goes beyond the realm of the intellect and includes personality needs, social skill needs, physical needs, and a wide variety of interests. That is to say, the whole child is the concern of the professional. In keeping with this emphasis, knowledge is relegated to a position of secondary importance. It is viewed merely as a means to the end of satisfying a child's need or interest.

With the child as the focal point of the social studies curriculum, citizenship is taken to be an ongoing process within the "miniature society" of the classroom. In other words, to a considerable degree, the child is a citizen now. This view is typical of progressive or child-centered education theory which holds that education is life itself and not preparation for life.

The essence of citizenship is the present exercise of democratic choice over matters of group concern. Accordingly, children might

---

[20]The term "child" is used for this focal point rather than "pupil" because the main thrust of this emphasis in social studies curriculum has been in the elementary school. The former term better connotes the intended distinction.

[21] Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 750, have suggested that the terms needs and interests are so frequently used that they have become debased. For a clear discussion of the meaning of these terms, however, see Tyler, op. cit., Ch. 1.

make group decisions concerning curriculum matters affecting the entire class. They might also take the initiative in voting a code of self-discipline and government into existence, rather than losing leadership in these areas of responsibility by default to teachers and school administrators.

Since democracy is the guiding principle of citizenship education within this curricular tradition, acknowledgment of the most fundamental tenet of democracy—respect for the individual—is not overlooked. Therefore, as will be demonstrated, children have the privilege of making some very important individual decisions regarding their schooling.

Advocates of this curricular focus believe that children pass through a variety of developmental stages, and that their growth rate during these stages is not uniform with respect to any personal characteristic. Nevertheless, children at all ages are assumed to have a sufficient measure of social and intellectual maturity to play a central role in determining what educational experiences are most appropriate for them, as individuals, at some given time.

The content of the child-focused social studies curriculum begins with the real, personal experiences of the child in his total environment. Also included would be the vicarious experiences of the child. While both types of experiences can legitimately be viewed as content or knowledge in their own right (e.g. as the content of the socialization

process), they can also be used as springboards for the identification of topics of interest and concern to the children. When topics are identified by the children for study, another source of content is tapped, the entire body of organized knowledge without regard to discipline or subject matter area. In other words, children and teachers would not restrict themselves to the generally recognized content of the social studies. It is evident that in this type of curriculum, the knowledge to be dealt with is never pre-determined. Accordingly, it is never studied in separate subjects or in an established sequence.

With this type of curricular emphasis, the teacher relates predominantly to the child and to those experiences he has which can rightfully be considered the content of his socialization. In other words, this type of professional does not view himself as a teacher of reading, arithmetic or social studies. He sees himself as the provider of one environment in which the child can learn and mature. The teacher facilitates learning in the provided environment by being of assistance to the child. No attempt is made by the teacher to impart a prescribed body of factual knowledge to the child, and no attempt is made to inculcate children with the accepted values of their community.

Even though he is assisted by the teacher, the child makes the major decisions concerning his own learning, regardless of his age. Therefore, the child will select the content for a curriculum that is appropriate to his own interests and perceived needs. The content is

likely to be dealt with in high level cognitive acts, such as those involved in creative expression. There would be no expectation for the child to memorize and recall knowledge.

With regard to the experiential aspect of content cited, psychologists and experts in child growth and development can offer classroom teachers significant help in the interpretation of children's experiences.

With the child as the focal point of the social studies curriculum, evaluation with respect to pre-determined objectives would, of course, be inappropriate. Evaluation of the child would instead be a shared, subjective assessment of pupil progress. On one level, the child would assess his own learning with reference to his developing, individual standards. On a more sophisticated level, the teacher would assess the progress in the child's total development. This would include a subjective determination of change in the child's personality, social attitudes and skills, physical well-being, and knowledge and command of subject matter. The considerations regarding subject matter would be of relatively minor importance compared to the former ones.

Finally, with this curricular emphasis, evaluation of the teacher would have to be a subjective judgment, based on how well each child seems to be maturing intellectually, emotionally, morally, socially and physically. Any judgment concerning a teacher's effectiveness would have to be mitigated with an acknowledgment of the fact that the

teacher provides only one of several environments where the child can learn and mature.

Reflective Inquiry Process

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the reflective inquiry process, the principal concern is with inculcating a generalized method of problem solving. That method would include sensing a problem, articulating it, hypothesizing a plausible solution, gathering data, testing the hypothesis, and drawing appropriate conclusions. These acts would not necessarily occur in the order listed, and short-cuts might be taken, as for example when one plays out a hunch.

The important emphasis in this social studies tradition is a commitment to the process of reflective inquiry. The specific knowledge dealt with in moving toward a solution to a problem is not of particular concern.

With this emphasis to the social studies curriculum, citizenship is viewed as a "process" of decision-making within the sociopolitical framework imposed by our form of democracy.[22] It is assumed that the pupil is not wholly a citizen while in school, but that he can be prepared for future citizenship by being given practice in making decisions, when faced with complicated and ambiguous alternatives arising from personally sensed and significant social problems. The

[22]Barth and Shermis, op. cit., pp. 748-749.

method of decision-making would be the reflective inquiry process.[23]

When faced with social problems as an adult, it is assumed that the

individual will be able to effectively use the method he has practiced

as a pupil.

Advocates of this curricular focus assume that normal pupils of

all ages have sufficient intellectual maturity to learn and comprehend

the fundamentals of the reflective inquiry process. It is recognized,

however, that individuals will always vary significantly in their ability

to apply the process to social problems.

The social studies professional further realizes that the pupil

will have to possess a minimal degree of social maturity to be able to

sense and identify problems of social concern. Therefore, the very

young or socially immature pupil will be given some assistance in this

endeavor by the teacher. As the individual pupil acquires a minimal

degree of social maturity, the teacher will withdraw his help in

isolating problems for inquiry.

The most important element of content in this type of social

studies curriculum is the methodology of reflective inquiry. The

generally recognized steps in this process have been enumerated. The

importance of the methodology derives from its applicability to all types

of problem situations. The reflective inquiry process has its

_____

[23]Ibid., p. 749.

philosophical and methodological origins in the writings of John Dewey. More recently, the process has been explained and advocated by Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence Metcalf in the 1955 text, <u>Teaching High School Social Studies</u>, and by H. Gordon Hullfish and Philip G. Smith in the 1961 text, <u>Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education</u>.

Another element of content in this type of curriculum is the data of the inquiry process. These data include anything needed to solve the problem at hand. Therefore, the working content of the curriculum is truly interdisciplinary in nature. In other words, it is drawn from all of the social sciences, as well as other disciplines and organized bodies of knowledge. The data element of curriculum content can not be prescribed in advance because the problems to be dealt with by the pupils are not known to the curriculum planners.

With regard to the utilization of content, teachers are expected to inculcate the pupil's mind with a knowledge and comprehension of the reflective inquiry process. After this initial phase of directiveness on the part of the teacher, he is expected to assume the role of helper or facilitator in the inquiry process. In this role, the teacher assists the pupil in such tasks as articulating the problem he senses, stating the hypothesis in the form of a testable proposition and locating and organizing data which might be relevant to the problem at hand. The teacher will not pose a problem for a pupil unless he does not possess the prerequisite minimal degree of social maturity.

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the reflective inquiry process, the pupil assumes a great deal of responsibility in dealing with content. He must first personally sense and identify significant social problems as targets for inquiry. The pupil must then be able to carry out the other steps of the inquiry process, including the selection and processing of the data he deems relevant to the problem. In order to process the data, the pupil engages in specific, high level cognitive acts such as application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation. He is not interested in committing knowledge to memory. His interest is with using knowledge as a means to an immediate and well-defined end —the resolution of a problem.

The pupil's general pattern of thought in reflective inquiry can not usually be characterized as predominantly inductive or deductive in nature. In most cases, it is an inseparable blend of these two modes of thought that ultimately leads the pupil to a tentative solution of the problem. The solution tendered by the pupil is generally unique and therefore could not have been predicted in advance by the teacher or any other person.

In general, there are no other significant individuals who play a conspicuous role in dealing with the content of this type of social studies curriculum. Certain individuals do, however, play supportive roles which indirectly contribute to inquiry. Researchers and writers in all disciplines, for example, add to the potential body of knowledge that

can be utilized as data in reflective inquiry. In addition, reference librarians make knowledge more readily accessible to inquirers.

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the reflective inquiry process, pupils are evaluated with respect to only one pre-determined objective—the extent to which each individual has command of the inquiry process. This assessment can be a subjective determination arrived at jointly by the teacher and the pupil, or the determination can be inferred by examining the results of certain standardized tests of critical thinking skills administered to the pupils.

The more commonplace type of pupil evaluation consists of a pupil-teacher assessment of the extent to which the solution advanced for a problem is warranted by the data examined and the extent to which the problem has been resolved.

Finally, with this curricular emphasis, the teacher's merit is determined by the extent to which the pupils can apply the process of reflective inquiry in solving personally-sensed problems. It is assumed that the pupils will be able to successfully demonstrate this skill if the teacher has inculcated the inquiry method and has consistently provided opportunities for its guided practice in a social and emotional classroom climate conducive to an open search for answers.

Structure of the Social Science Disciplines

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the structure of the social science disciplines, the principal concern is with imparting

the basic concepts and specific methods of scholarly inquiry for each of

the separate disciplines.[24] The assumption is that this two-part

structure will provide the necessary intellectual tools for the pupil to

engage in a lifetime of learning after his formal education has ended.[25]

Just as in the factual subject matter tradition, organized knowledge is

the central concern of this type of social studies curriculum. The

knowledge prescribed for learning, however, is conceptual rather than

factual in nature. Indeed, selected facts are used only as a means of

developing concepts from the various disciplines. The concepts de-

veloped will be relatively more enduring than facts, given the realities

of the present knowledge explosion. Moreover, concepts, along with the

specific methods of scholarly inquiry, will have some immediate utility

in generating additional, new knowledge.

With this emphasis to the social studies curriculum, pupils are

not viewed as citizens in the present. Advocates of this curriculum

feel that the most effective way to prepare pupils for future citizenship

[24]Agreement does not exist on what constitutes a social science discipline. Generally acknowledged as social science disciplines are geography, economics, sociology, anthropology, political science and social psychology. Sometimes acknowledged as social science disciplines are history, philosophy, and general psychology.

[25]For a thorough explanation of the term structure, as it applies to curriculum, see Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960). Also see Joseph J. Schwab, "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline," The Educational Record, XLIII (July, 1962), 197-205.

is to teach them the basic concepts and methods of inquiry for each of the social science disciplines. With an ever increasing grasp of the structure of the disciplines it is implicitly assumed that the pupil will eventually become e. g., a junior economist or a quasi-political scientist. The skills he learns as a pupil will presumably carry over into his adult life and enable the individual to effectively discharge his duties and responsibilities as a citizen.[26]

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the structure of the social science disciplines, professionals assume that virtually all pupils have the intellectual maturity necessary to master the structure. This assumption is based on psychologist Jerome Bruner's 1961 assertion that ". . . there is no reason to believe that any subject cannot be taught to any child at virtually any age in some [intellectually honest] form."[27] Bruner explained that "The task of teaching a subject to a child . . . is one of representing the structure of that subject in terms of the child's way of viewing things."[28]

While all pupils are assumed to have the intellectual maturity needed to comprehend this curriculum's abstractions at some level of understanding, they are not credited with possessing social maturity.

---

[26]Barth and Shermis, op. cit., pp. 747-748.

[27]Bruner, op. cit., p. 47.

[28]Ibid., p. 33.

Therefore, pupils are not generally given a role in the selection of curriculum content or in the isolation of problems for inquiry. For the same reason, pupils are not given genuine opportunities for the independent exercise of their developing citizenship skills.

The content of this type of social studies curriculum consists of (1) the important concepts from each social science discipline, (2) the unique mode of scholarly inquiry from each social science discipline, which enables an individual to discover concepts and generalizations,[29] and (3) some significant problems from each social science discipline, which lend themselves to investigation by the unique mode of inquiry.[30] Each of these aspects of curriculum content is presented to the pupil at a level of sophistication commensurate with his mental ability. Therefore, it is evident that a pupil's command of conceptual knowledge and inquiry modes will be less sophisticated than the social scientist's. As a result, the pupil may, for example, be able to use his present

---

[29] Every social science discipline purports to have a unique mode of inquiry used by scholars within the field. The uniqueness supposedly derives from differences in point of view, as well as methodological differences. Even though several social science disciplines may share a given method of gathering data (e. g. the interview technique or the participant observer technique), the present writer believes that there are sufficient differences in the methods of gathering, organizing and utilizing data, that each discipline can legitimately lay claim to a unique mode of inquiry. This would be true even if we did not acknowledge the fact that various social science disciplines deal with fundamentally different types of problems.

[30] Barth and Shermis, op. cit., p. 748.

knowledge in an episode of historiographic inquiry to generate new know-

ledge. The new knowledge might take the form of a generalization that

is novel to the pupil but not to the professional historian. It is most

important to underscore the fact that on the level of practice in the

classroom, "social sciencing"[31] is qualitatively and quantitatively

different from the work of the social scientist. The truth of this

assertion will become evident when the nature of pupil inquiry is dis-

cussed later.

Each of the three elements of content in this type of social studies

curriculum is derived from the same source: the research and writings

of the scholars in each social science discipline.

With regard to the utilization of content, teachers are expected to

transmit social science concepts and inquiry methods to pupils through

exposition. Occasionally, teachers will personally pose a problem

for pupils to solve. Generally, all aspects of curriculum content are

predetermined by the selection of curriculum materials. This rele-

gates the teacher to the role of a technician whose responsibility is to

transmit what a consensus of scholars has decided is important. Indeed

some social science curriculum materials are almost "teacher-proof."

---

[31]The use of this term is borrowed from Bruce Joyce, "Social Sciencing—New Concept in Social Studies," The Instructor (October, 1968), 85.

When the social studies curriculum is focused on the structure of the social science disciplines, the pupil is expected to know, comprehend and apply the important concepts that he is taught. In addition, he is expected to have a rudimentary command of each mode of scholarly inquiry to which he has been exposed. The pupil is given an opportunity to apply his conceptual knowledge and demonstrate his competence in an inquiry mode by solving a problem deemed important by the teacher or a scholar in a discipline. The problem, and quite often the data needed to solve it, are presented to the pupil by the teacher or through the curriculum materials. The problem and data are generally drawn from a single social science and are not interdisciplinary in nature. The pupil solves the problem by arriving at the correct social science generalization. The generalization might constitute new knowledge for the pupil, but it is not new to the scholars of the discipline. Thus, the product of the pupil's social science inquiry is almost always a predictable one.

Just as with the reflective inquiry process, the pupil must engage in specific, high level cognitive acts in order to process the data of inquiry and arrive at a solution to the problem. Unlike reflective inquiry, however, the pupil's general pattern of thought or reasoning in social science inquiry, as defined here, is predominantly inductive in its nature. This is because he is attempting to discover a generalization from the social science data provided.

Social scientists and publishers play very important roles with respect to the content of this type of social studies curriculum. The social scientists create knowledge through their research efforts and convey and interpret it to the public through their writings. Publishers have the important role of disseminating the knowledge of the social sciences through the production of textbooks and various non-print educational media. Quite often coordinated multi-media kits or packages of curriculum materials are produced and marketed for a course of study in a given social science. Just as with the factual subject matter tradition in social studies curriculum, this tradition places a great deal of importance on professionally prepared curriculum materials. In fact, such materials determine the very nature of the curriculum in practice.

With this emphasis to the social studies curriculum, evaluation of the pupil would consist of some form of assessment by the teacher to determine if each individual can demonstrate knowledge, comprehension and application of a social science's concepts and mode of scholarly inquiry. The assessment of conceptual knowledge might be accomplished with teacher-made or standardized tests of achievement. The assessment of inquiry skills might be accomplished by determining if a pupil can discover and articulate a social science generalization, when given a problem and the data necessary to solve it.

A teacher's merit would primarily be evaluated on the basis of his pupils' performance on standardized tests of achievement.

Socio-Political Involvement[32]

When the social studies curriculum is focused on socio-political involvement, the principal concern is a humanistic one, providing opportunities for the development of personal and social awareness[33] on the part of the individual pupil. This is accomplished through activities which ". . . encourage a consonant integration of intellect and feeling."[34] The rationale behind this type of curriculum is based on the assumptions that personal and social insights are prerequisites of personal and social change and that both types of change are desirable.[35] The individual pupil needs to identify and resolve his personal problems and thereby mature. Likewise society needs to identify and resolve

---

[32]For a discussion of the philosophical foundations of this emerging social studies tradition, see Robert Ubbelohde, "Social Studies and Reality— A Commitment to Intelligent, Social Action" (Publication No. 1 of the University of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project, 1972).

[33]When the stated curricular objective is limited to pupil awareness, involvement — the next logical step — is left as an option to be decided by the pupil.

[34]R. Murray Thomas and Dale L. Brubaker, Curriculum Patterns in Elementary Social Studies (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971), pp. 254-255.

[35]While change is certainly valued and desired as one end in this type of curriculum, the means to this end are never dictated by the teacher.

its collective problems and thereby be reconstructed. Problem situations thus constitute the raw material of this type of curriculum.

Activities which facilitate personal and social awareness on the part of the pupil, generally range from varieties of simulation (e. g. games and role-playing) for the young, to problem-solving experiences for the more mature. No type of activity is reserved exclusively for an age group, however.

With this emphasis to the social studies curriculum, the pupil is treated as a citizen in the present. Accordingly, he is given an opportunity to exercise his developing citizenship skills within the contexts of the classroom, the school and the community. Just as in the reflective inquiry tradition, the essence of citizenship is decision-making within a socio-political context. Therefore, using the reflective inquiry process, the pupil has to decide among ambiguous alternatives, arising from significant personal or social problems. All problems dealt with are personally and genuinely sensed by the pupil.

Unlike the reflective inquiry tradition, however, the exercise of citizenship in this curriculum does not stop with an intellectual solution to a problem. The pupil next becomes personally involved after inferring an appropriate line of social or political action from the intellectual solution to the problem. In other words, the pupil ultimately attempts to implement his solution by acting upon his environment.

Advocates of this social studies emphasis assume that normal pupils of all ages have sufficient intellectual maturity to learn and comprehend the reflective inquiry process, as well as to apply it with some measure of success to significant personal and social problems.

Another critical assumption of this curriculum is that most pupils possess a sufficient measure of social maturity to be able to identify problems of social concern and to take responsible, appropriate action to implement their solution to a problem. This does not mean that there are no limits imposed on pupil activity by the environment. Determining exactly where to draw the line on pupil activism will always be a sensitive issue for advocates of this curriculum.

The content of this type of social studies curriculum consists primarily of (1) the personal and social problems pupils wish to inquire into and actively resolve, (2) the methodology of the reflective inquiry process, (3) the data relevant to the problem at hand, and (4) the relevant values (beliefs and emotions) of the inquirer and other significant persons.

With regard to the sources of content, the problems and a statement of the relevant values generally come from the pupils. The data are drawn from any of the social sciences or other organized bodies of knowledge. The source of the reflective inquiry methodology was discussed previously.

The role of the teacher in dealing with the content of this type of social studies curriculum is identical with that outlined in the reflective inquiry tradition, except that in the present tradition the teacher must also help the pupils clarify their values.

The role of the pupil in dealing with the curriculum content is also the same as that described in the reflective inquiry tradition but includes two additional responsibilities. First, the pupil must identify relevant values and use them as legitimate, additional data in the inquiry process. Secondly, the pupil must infer an appropriate and workable course of action from the intellectual solution to the problem.

As in the case of the reflective inquiry tradition, there are no other significant individuals who play a conspicuous role in dealing with the content of this type of social studies curriculum.

With this curricular emphasis, evaluation of the pupil consists of a joint pupil-teacher assessment of the extent to which the problem dealt with was resolved by the inquiry and social action undertaken. There would also be a joint determination and assessment of any side effects the social action might have precipitated. Finally the pupil himself would decide whether or not other types of action might have better implemented his intellectual solution to the problem.

An evaluation of the teacher's merit would be inferred from his pupils' success in inquiring into problems and their ability to effect change.

Application of Framework

The proposed conceptual framework for social studies curriculum will now be used to generate hypothetical sets of definitions for perhaps the two most commonly used terms in the field: citizenship and inquiry. Each definition is intended to be philosophically and pedagogically consistent with the identified premises of its particular social studies tradition or focal point.

The present writer has attempted to maximize the utility of the definitions by making them succinct, simple and discrete.

Citizenship is defined in Table 1, and inquiry is defined in Table 2.

The hypothesized definitions for each term constitute the full spectrum of predictable, predefinitional usage. In the following chapters, a descriptive accounting of how the selected terms have been used historically will determine the validity of the model for generating conceptually distinct and useful definitions for social studies curriculum terminology.

Table 1. Term: Citizenship.

Curriculum Focal Point		Definition
Factual Subject Matter	:	Possession of a set of values (e. g. , patriotism, individualism) and a set of behaviors (e. g. , voting, jury duty, church and fraternal organization service) that will be acted upon and carried out by the pupil when he becomes an adult.
The Child	:	The present exercise of democratic choice by pupils over such matters as curriculum and discipline in the "miniature society" of the classroom.
Reflective Inquiry Process	:	The process of decision-making in a socio-political context that is to be learned and practiced as a pupil and held in one's behavioral repertoire for application later as an adult citizen.
Structure of the Social Science Disciplines	:	Acquiring knowledge of the concepts and methods of scholarly inquiry of the various social science disciplines, which will allow one to behave similarly to the social scientist when faced with a social problem as an adult.
Socio-Political Involvement	:	The present application of the process of decision-making and action-initiation in the socio-political context of the classroom, the school and the community.

Table 2. Term: Inquiry.

Curriculum Focal Point		Definition
Factual Subject Matter	:	The pupil finds the factual answer to a question posed by the textbook or the teacher.
The Child	:	The pupil gathers information under the teacher's guidance, concerning a topic that has emerged from his present needs or interests.
Reflective Inquiry Process	:	The pupil attempts to solve a problem that he senses and articulates, through the application of both inductive and deductive reasoning to multi-disciplinary data and generalizations that he gathers for himself.
Structure of the Social Science Disciplines	:	The pupil attempts to solve a problem posed by the teacher or the textbook, primarily through the application of inductive reasoning to the social science data presented. A successful solution consists of stating the appropriate social science generalization.
Socio-Political Involvement	:	The pupil attempts to solve a personally meaningful social problem posed by his environment (using the same process as the reflective inquirer) in such a way that appropriate social action to remedy the problem can be inferred from his intellectual solution.

CHAPTER III

CITIZENSHIP

Introduction

The purposes of this chapter are twofold. First, an attempt will be made to clarify the implied aims (or objectives), content, and methods for each of the five, discrete definitions hypothesized for citizenship. This is necessary because each definition is stated succinctly and uniformly as a _process_ to be carried out by the individual pupil. Therefore, the important considerations cited could not be explicitly incorporated into each statement by the present writer. The second purpose of this chapter is to report the extent to which the present writer's research of the literature on _citizenship_ has revealed examples of predefinitional usage of that term in accordance with the five hypothetical definitions. In other words, there is to be a brief assessment of the apparent validity and utility of the conceptual framework for generating discrete and useful definitions for the ambiguous term _citizenship._ Citations from the body of the literature will be representative of what has been found in research, for it is beyond the scope of this chapter to trace and review thoroughly the historical development of the concept of citizenship.

With regard to the second purpose of this chapter, some points must be made concerning the methodology and limitations of the research. The primary focus of the literature search was upon how various writers have used the term citizenship, and what meaning was implied or expressed. In other words, the main focus was upon the way in which the term was used as well as upon definition. In addition, notice was taken of implied or expressed curricular aims, content and methodology.

During the course of the literature search, an effort was made to find examples of usage which would establish the validity and utility of the framework for bringing conceptual clarity to the use of the term citizenship. Considerable caution was exercised by the researcher, however, to make certain that no example of usage reflecting the influence of some social studies tradition other than those hypothesized was overlooked. This effort was made difficult by the philosophical and pedagogical eclecticism that is apparent in most authors' writing.

The major sources constituting evidence for the research into the usage of the terms citizenship and inquiry were listed in Chapter I. With regard to citizenship alone, special mention must be made of John Hardin Best's scholarly dissertation, which reviews the development of the concepts "citizenship" and "citizenship education" in the

professional literature from 1900 to 1950.[1] The present writer relied

heavily upon Best's findings and references for this fifty year period.

For the period 1950 to 1972, the four target journals mentioned in

Chapter I as well as other periodicals were searched for relevant

articles with the aid of Education Index.[2]

An important limitation of the research is that the usage of the

term citizenship was only examined within the context of the literature

of social studies and the humanities. It is, of course, widely acknow-

ledged that other areas of the school curriculum have traditionally

played supportive roles in the development of citizenship. Moreover,

social institutions other than the school have played supportive roles

in this endeavor. These considerations are beyond the scope of this

chapter however.

Let us turn now to a systematic analysis of the five hypothetical

definitions and an assessment of the extent to which they are in accord-

ance with predefinitional usage.

_____

[1]See John Hardin Best, "A History of the Development of the
Concept of Citizenship Education in America, 1900 to 1950"
(Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at
Chapel Hill, 1960). (Hereinafter cited as Best, "A History of the
Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education.")

[2]Descriptors used were "citizenship," "citizenship education,"
"civics teaching," "social education," "value education," and
"teaching values."

Citizenship: Focus on Factual Subject Matter

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon factual sub-
ject matter, citizenship, viewed as a process, was previously hypothe-
sized by the present writer to be:

>Possession of a set of values (e. g. , patriotism,
>individualism) and a set of behaviors (e. g. ,
>voting, jury duty, church and fraternal organi-
>zation service) that will be acted upon and carried
>out by the pupil when he becomes an adult.

The aims of the social studies curriculum needed to produce this
type of citizenship in pupils would include passing on to each new gene-
ration those values, character traits and behaviors sanctioned by the
curriculum planners and the community at large. The pupil would
acquire these desired ends for future use.

The content used to develop these aims would consist of those
facts traditionally considered important in the social studies curriculum
or those facts judged important by a consensus of scholars in the various
social science disciplines. Most of the traditionally important facts
would be drawn from the fields of history, civil government and place
geography. In addition, the body of endorsed values can rightfully be
viewed as an element of content.

The methodology used to achieve the stated educational aims
would consist largely of teacher and textbook description of the pre-
selected facts. There is an apparent assumption that pupil memori-
zation of the prescribed facts will develop a desirable set of civic

behaviors for later application. Little or no attention is paid to developing these behaviors through active pupil involvement. As far as the sanctioned values and character traits are concerned, these are transmitted to the pupils mainly through teacher persuasion. With sufficient persuasion, the assumption is that the values and traits will become inculcated in the pupils' minds.

To what extent does the professional literature show examples of usage of the term citizenship similar to the definition hypothesized for this social studies tradition?

According to Best, in the early decades of the twentieth century, education for citizenship was defined in a narrow and limited sense as essentially "character education" or the "teaching of personal ethics and virtues." The obvious curricular aim was upon the acquisition of sanctioned values and behaviors. For example, "religious and moral uprightness" were among the desirable values to be developed through the acquisition of specific behavioral virtues such as "honesty," "obedience" and "punctuality."[3] It was not until the outbreak of the First World War, that "patriotism" and "loyalty to national ideals" were accorded an important place among the aims of citizenship education in American education.[4]

---

[3] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education," pp. 216-217.

[4] Ibid., pp. 43-44.

As far as the content of social studies curricula in the first two decades of the twentieth century is concerned, Best indicates that it was focused to a considerable degree upon the factual subject matter of civics. For example, he writes that "in many instances <u>citizenship</u> . . . was seen as a product of a course in civics, or 'city govern- ment'. "[5] "As it was usually constructed . . . the course was a study of the details of American government and of the intricacies of state and local institutional politics. "[6]

Best also indicates that history was accorded a prominent place in the social studies curricula of early twentieth century America be- cause it purportedly taught "individual social ideals. " Even though it was only loosely related to the social studies, Best points out that literature was an important means for instruction in character or citizenship. It was credited with teaching "individual ideals" through example. [7]

As far as the instructional methodology used to implement the social studies curricula is concerned, Best explains that it followed logically from an acceptance of the prevailing psychological theory of the late 1800's and early 1900's—faculty psychology. Since it was believed that good character could be taught directly, hard work and

---

[5]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 217.

[6]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 34.

[7]<u>Ibid</u>., p. 32.

disciplining the mind through memorization were viewed as the appropriate methods.[8] The classroom teacher was viewed as the central figure in the development of citizenship in pupils. He was ". . . seen as the agent who must employ and manipulate the instruments of subject matter."[9]

Even recent social studies curriculum literature contains many examples of a view of citizenship similar to that hypothesized for this tradition. Unfortunately, most writers do not clearly define the term citizenship when they use it. If the term is defined, the writer often discusses only citizenship aims, or content, or methods. Rarely are all three of these concerns discussed.

Max Rafferty, for example, once defined "good citizenship" and implied certain aims without concerning himself with content or methodology. His definition, certainly consistent with this social studies tradition, seems to reflect an idealistic philosophy and a view of morality typical of the last century:

> The good citizen stands in relation to his country as the good son to his mother.
> He obeys her because she is his elder, because she conjoins within herself the vision of many, and because he owes to her his begetting and his nurturing.

---

[8]Ibid., p. 25, 219.

[9]Ibid., pp. 28-29.

He honors her above all others, placing her in a special niche within his secret heart, in front of which the candles of respect and admiration are forever kept alight.

He defends her against all enemies, and counts his life well lost in her behalf.

Above all else, he loves her, deeply and without display, knowing that although he shares that privilege with others, the nature of his own affection is unique and personal, rising from the deepest wellsprings of his being, and returned in kind.

This is the good citizen. While his kind prevails, so also flourishes the Great Republic. [10]

Leonard Irwin, as the editor of The Social Studies, once defined citizenship as a group of desirable behaviors which constitute civic duties. A citizen's obligations are these:

1. To obey the law.
2. To seek no special privileges or profit from government that are not available to all.
3. To inform himself on public issues, procedures and candidates, and then to vote. [11]

. . . .

4. To pay his legal share of public expenses.
5. To give voluntary time and talents for the public good.
6. To deny to no one else the rights which he expects for himself.
7. To do his best to see that his children are properly trained and educated to be self-supporting and worthy citizens. [12]

---

[10] Max Rafferty, "Education in Depth," California Education, II (April, 1965), 2.

[11] Leonard B. Irwin, "As the Editor Sees It," The Social Studies, LV (February, 1964), 42.

[12] Ibid., LV (March, 1964), 82.

Finally, one writer, deploring the ". . . appalling disdain for moral and ethical values often displayed by young people today," suggests that the schools be used to ". . . train capable civic leaders and supporters to perpetuate our way of life." He further implores, " 'What good is a school with the highest academic standards if it educates geniuses who have no <u>character</u> [emphasis mine] and who later become criminals, traitors, and dictators. ' "[13]

The concerned writer advocated "training" for a kind of "citizenship" that would include such aims as the following:

> Students should know the pledge to the American Flag, when and how to execute a proper salute, know the national anthem, and understand the freedom documents according to their ability to comprehend. [14]

As for methods for attaining the previously stated aims, the same writer endorses "experience-learning," as well as the use of the textbook, because ". . . the printed word has a vital role in promoting ideas, as a source of reference, and inspiration. "[15]

---

[13]Troy Holliday, "Better Training Means Better Citizens," The Social Studies, LIX (April, 1968), 169-170.

[14]Ibid., p. 171.

[15]Ibid.

Citizenship: Focus on the Child

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the child, citizenship, viewed as a process, was previously hypothesized by the present writer to be:

> The present exercise of democratic choice by pupils over such matters as curriculum and discipline in the "miniature society" of the classroom.

The aims of the social studies curriculum needed to produce this type of citizenship in pupils would include a knowledge and comprehension of the democratic process, as well as an ability to apply the process in the present to matters of group concern. The application of the process would take place within the context of some social setting, such as the classroom or a school club.

The content used to develop these aims would consist of simple, everyday problems of social living and matters of concern to a group of pupils. In addition, it would include any subject matter from any discipline or field of study that might seem to the pupils relevant to the matter of group concern.

The methodology used to achieve the stated educational aims would consist of some form of pupil participation and experience. Whatever the type of pupil experience, it is likely to be structured or supervised in some manner by the teacher. In addition, the pupil

experience would provide some opportunity for the exercise of a democratic form of group decision-making.

To what extent does the professional literature show examples of usage of the term citizenship similar to the definition hypothesized for this social studies tradition?

According to Best, the decade following the First World War—the 1920's—had no national crisis and therefore made it possible for the growing educational philosophy of progressivism to consolidate its influence upon the aims of citizenship education. Since there apparently were no urgent national demands, some educators took full advantage of the opportunity to theorize a new emphasis in the aims of citizenship education. That new emphasis was "education for social competence."[16] The new emphasis in citizenship aims was still referred to as "character education," in the professional literature, but it had lost the connotation of developing personal ethics and virtues.[17] Gone too from the new aims was a fervent commitment to patriotism.[18] In short, the educational aims leading to the new conceptualization of citizenship, reflected ". . . an effort to disengage from the emphasis on emotional nationalism and the mechanics of government," and a movement toward

---

[16]Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education," pp. 81, 217.

[17]Ibid., p. 86.

[18]Ibid., p. 83.

". . . more direct concern for the individual and his place in society as a citizen. "[19]

While the main thrust of progressivism's early influence upon the aims of citizenship education was concerned with educating for "social competence," another major influence was an emphasis upon ". . . more freedom and self-direction for the individual in matters of citizenship. "[20]

As far as the content of social studies curricula during the decade of the 1920's is concerned, history continued to be the dominant subject matter, while civics retained a very important role. For the first time, various "out-of-class activities" such as student government, the school newspaper and group sports were assumed to provide an important content element for the development of citizenship. [21]

The instructional methodology used to implement the new citizenship aims of social studies curricula in the 1920's was strongly influenced by the mechanistic psychological theory of behaviorism, which had largely replaced the influence of faculty theory. [22] The behaviorist

---

[19]Ibid., p. 87.

[20]Ibid., p. 89.

[21]Ibid., pp. 119-123.

[22]Ibid., p. 100.

viewed citizenship as the product of a response to a stimulus. There-
fore, action was demanded in the method of citizenship education. It
was believed that pupil experience could constitute the desirable
stimuli which would lead to transfer and the development of the desirable
response of "good citizenship."[23]

The new methodology was characterized by Best as follows:

> "Socialization" of the school was the cry: students must no
> longer sit passively to be taught, but they must become ac-
> tively involved in learning. Participation and interaction of
> students seemed to be most needed and most effective in the
> area of citizenship education.[24]

Some of the typical student activities for ". . . active participation
within the school program . . ." were military training, debating
clubs, the school paper, mock elections, and student self-
government.[25]

A writer in the Fifth Yearbook of The National Council for the
Social Studies presented a view of citizenship and citizenship educa-
tion that closely parallels the one hypothesized for this social studies
tradition: "Citizenship is not for pupils a thing of the future any more

---

[23] John Hardin Best, "A Review of the Development of the Con-
cept of Citizenship Education Since 1900," The High School Journal,
XLIV (December, 1960), 99. (Hereinafter cited as Best, "A Review
of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education.")

[24] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of
Citizenship Education," p. 66.

[25] Ibid., p. 109.

than it is for adults. It is a real present affair."[26] To the same

writer, education for citizenship in the present involves "training"

that:

> . . . implies helping boys and girls to become acquainted
> with the situations and problems of the life of which they
> are already a part and upon the character of which they will
> in the future exercise a controlling force, and giving them
> such experiences while they are young as will help them to
> take active and responsible places in community life in what-
> ever way the community requires.[27]

The same writer states that content from civics and history, as

well as economics, sociology, English, science and other subjects

might be relevant to training pupils for citizenship.[28]

With regard to methodology, the same writer states, " 'The

curriculum has come to mean not what is said by textbook and teacher

but what is experienced by the pupil.' " Accordingly, "The right kind

of civic education will give pupils experience in doing things in school

and community life that are just as real as anything done outside the

activities of the school."[29] Among the recommended experiences are

---

[26]R. O. Hughes, "Changing Methods in Civic Education," in
Edgar Bruce Wesley, ed., The Historical Approach to Methods of
Teaching the Social Studies, Fifth Yearbook of the National Council for
the Social Studies (Philadelphia: McKinley Publishing Company, 1935),
p. 84.

[27]Ibid., p. 72.

[28]Ibid., p. 77.

[29]Ibid., p. 83.

thrift clubs, student elections, student participation in school admini-
stration, the Junior Red Cross, and Boy Scouts. [30]

Citizenship: Focus on the Reflective Inquiry Process

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon reflective
inquiry, citizenship, viewed as a process, was previously hypothe-
sized by the present writer to be:

> The process of decision-making in a socio-political context,
> that is to be learned and practiced as a pupil, and held in one's
> behavioral repertoire for application later as an adult citizen.

The aims of the social studies curriculum needed to produce
this type of citizenship in pupils would include a knowledge and com-
prehension of the reflective inquiry process, as well as an ability to
individually apply the process in an effort to reach a decision about
the best possible solution to a significant social problem. The
decision-making process would be carried out by the individual within
the limits imposed by the socio-political context of American political
democracy.

The content used to develop these aims would consist of the
genuinely-sensed and significant social problems articulated by the
pupils and the methodology of the reflective inquiry process. In
addition, data might be selected from any organized body of knowledge

---

[30] Ibid., p. 84.

relevant to the problem at hand.

The methodology used to achieve the stated educational aims would consist of providing repeated opportunities for pupils to make individual decisions by employing the generalized problem-solving methodology of the reflective inquiry process. In short, the methodology would consist of <u>practice</u> in solving personally-sensed social problems.

To what extent does the professional literature show examples of usage of the term <u>citizenship</u> similar to the definition hypothesized for this social studies tradition?

According to Best, during the economic depression of the 1930's, the concept of citizenship and the aims of citizenship education were expanded and given a new emphasis. This reflected the full influence of the educational philosophy of progressivism.[31] The objectives were broadened ". . . to include as a most important aim of citizenship education a strong <u>social responsibility</u>. Citizenship education, it was thought, must deal directly with the <u>problems</u> of recovery, with the political, economic and social problems of the times . . ."[32] [emphasis mine]

---

[31] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education," p. 133.

[32] Best, "A Review of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education," p. 102.

In addition, during the 1930's, the emphasis upon the aim of
more pupil self-direction was greater due to the progressive influence.[33]

Finally, due to the full influence of progressivism, citizenship
was seen as "both process and end."[34] In other words, it was viewed
as an ". . . end-that-is-not-yet as well as a process that already is."[35]

As far as the content of the social studies curricula during the
decade is concerned, efforts were made to "reorganize" and "re-
vitalize" the traditional subject matter so that it might ". . . give
insight into current social and political problems . . . ."[36] There was
an increased interest in the utility of subject matter for solving
problems. Fading from the scene was an interest in subject matter
for its own sake.[37]

The instructional methodology used to implement the new
citizenship aims of social studies curricula in the 1930's, was strongly
influenced by the new gestalt psychology, and its concern with the

---

[33] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-
ship Education," p. 92.

[34] Best, "A Review of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-
ship Education," p. 101.

[35] George A. Coe, "Character as End and as Process," Pro-
gressive Education, VII (May, 1930), 162.

[36] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-
ship Education," p. 164.

[37] Ibid., pp. 164-165.

the individual organism and the interaction of that organism with its

environment.[38]   Best summarizes the influence as follows:

> In the method and curriculum of citizenship education the new
> psychology meant several marked changes: doctrinaire teach-
> ing of ethics toward the forming of habits was considered no
> longer adequate; instead, free and dynamic student participation
> and active problem solving appeared to be essential.[39]
> [emphasis mine]

With regard to instructional methodology, Best states:

> The problem-solving approach in teaching citizenship seemed
> to be accepted by the profession during the decade of the
> 1930's. Experimentation was seen as a most effective basic
> method underlying any specific technique in citizenship educa-
> tion.[40]

In short, the school was viewed as a ". . . 'laboratory' for

experimentation in citizenship." It was a place where students could

"live citizenship" by solving the actual problems of democracy as

they arose.[41]

---

[38] Best, "A Review of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-
ship Education," pp. 102-103.

[39] Best, "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-
ship Education," p. 220.

[40] Ibid., p. 151.

[41] Ibid., pp. 150-151.

A contemporary writer presented a view of citizenship and citizenship education that parallels the one expressed for this social studies tradition. Because he views citizenship as a dynamic process, Richard Phillips rejects the type of citizenship education that is an attempt to ". . . inculcate political values in a prescriptive-descriptive fashion via the textbook and teacher lecture. . . ." Instead, he believes that ". . . the emphasis should be placed upon open-ended [emphasis mine] student inquiry into socio-political issues of interest to students themselves."[42]

James Barth and Samuel Shermis have stated a view of citizenship and citizenship education that is congruous to the one hypothesized for this social studies tradition:

> Citizenship is defined not as pre-commitment to a given set of community norms or values but as a process . . . . The end product of this process is one who is practiced in the skill of identifying social problems, evaluating social data and making rational decisions. This is how a good citizen is defined.[43]

Accordingly, it ". . . is the reflective-inquiry position that preparation for citizenship means that students acquire practice in making decisions

---

[42] Richard C. Phillips, "Implications of Political Socialization Research for the Social Studies Curriculum," The High School Journal, LIII (November, 1969), 108.

[43] James L. Barth and Samuel Shermis, "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, XXXIV (November, 1970), 748-749. The present writer feels that it is significant that these authors do not refer at all to the rational examination of values and emotions.

which reflect significant social problems and which presently affect

them or are likely to affect them. "[44]

Citizenship: Focus on the Structure of the Social Science Disciplines

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the structure

of the social science disciplines, citizenship, viewed as a process,

was previously hypothesized by the present writer to be:

> Acquiring knowledge of the concepts and methods of scholarly
> inquiry of the various social science disciplines, which will
> allow one to behave similarly to the social scientist when
> faced with a social problem as an adult. [45]

The aims of the social studies curriculum needed to produce this

type of citizenship in pupils would include an elementary knowledge

and comprehension of the basic concepts, problems and issues of each

social science discipline. In addition, each pupil would need to develop

---

[44] Ibid., p. 749.

[45] Barth and Shermis have stated: "Because of the premium
placed on knowledge for its own sake, social scientists [emphasis mine]
are in an ambiguous position vis-a-vis citizenship. Since the purpose
of social scientists is to generate knowledge and not citizenship, there
seems to be an implicit assumption that possession of the knowledge and
tools of a particular social science will, somehow, create a good citizen.
I. e., there is no explicit connection between social sciences and citizen-
ship, only an expectation that acquisition of the attitudes and knowledge
of social scientists will in and of itself prove sufficient." Ibid., p. 747.
While the preceding may be an accurate assessment of the social
scientist's view of citizenship education, the present writer believes
that many social studies educators, who focus their curricular objec-
tives upon the structure of the social science disciplines, do make an
explicit connection between the social sciences and citizenship. Such a

a rudimentary understanding of each discipline's method of scholarly inquiry, as well as an ability to apply the methods in a simplified form to some of the significant problems identified by academicians within each discipline.

The content used to develop these aims would consist of the significant concepts, problems and issues identified by the scholars in each discipline. The various methodologies of inquiry would also constitute an element of content.

The instructional methodology used to achieve the stated educational aims would consist, in part, of teacher and textbook description of the conceptual knowledge, problems and issues. Ideally, pupils would acquire command of such knowledge without memorization. In addition, there would be repeated opportunities for pupils to simulate and thus learn the rigorous inquiry methods of social scientists.

The professional literature shows few examples of usage of the term citizenship similar to the definition hypothesized for this social studies tradition. Perhaps this is because an emphasis upon the structure of the various social science disciplines is a relatively new phenomenon in social studies curriculum. [46]

connection is incorporated by the present writer into the definition for citizenship, hypothesized for this particular social studies tradition.

[46] Attempts to isolate the "structure" of social science disciplines began in the early 1960's, a few years after the launching of the Soviet Union's Sputnik. Such attempts were perhaps triggered by a

As early as 1959, one writer expressed a view of citizenship and citizenship education that reflected a preference for a strong social science influence in the social studies curriculum. Observing that ". . . the word 'citizenship' seems to be an all-inclusive term which has come to mean many things," the writer argues that the only logical way to view the concept is as a "political role."[47] Accordingly, he contends that education for citizenship should consist of "training for political competency." This would include ". . . developing in individuals the understandings and behavioral patterns necessary for effective participation in the democratic state."[48] This would be accomplished methodologically by teachers helping pupils to ". . . develop the skills and habits of the scientific method in acquiring and analyzing information." This is imperative because "Citizenship is an active role, in which the importance of critical thinking in group problem-solving activities should be stressed."[49]

With regard to curriculum content, the same writer states that ". . . a program of citizenship education should be primarily concerned

---

desire to make pupil learning more efficient by focusing it on important, related ideas, rather than disparate facts.

[47] S. Alexander Rippa, "Toward a Definition of Citizenship Education," Social Education, XXII (December, 1959), 379-380.

[48] Ibid., p. 380.

[49] Ibid.

with the teaching of government and the <u>subject</u> <u>matter</u> <u>and</u> <u>methodology</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>various</u> <u>social</u> <u>sciences.</u> "[50] [emphasis mine].

A contemporary writer who also views citizenship mainly as "political efficacy," advances a view of citizenship education that closely parallels the one hypothesized for this social studies tradition. Writing in <u>School Review</u>, Edgar Bernstein's thesis is that there is a lack of relevance in our present efforts to educate pupils for citizenship. In stating his own view of relevance, he defines "effective citizenship" thusly:

> At the general level, it is a sequence of learning activities which results in the development of adults capable of participating in and contributing to a free, democratic society. Such persons will be well informed; conversant with the basic values of this society; have the critical and creative thinking skills that enable them to evaluate, preserve, repair, modify, or replace existing social practices through appropriate means in keeping with basic social values; and have the ability to act, alone,and with others, on the basis of their knowledge, values, and insights.[51]

To implement the aims incorporated in his definition of "effective citizenship," Bernstein recommends the use of a body of content and a type of inquiry methodology drawn from the social science disciplines.

---

[50]<u>Ibid.</u>

[51]Edgar Bernstein, "Citizenship and the Social Studies," <u>School Review</u>, LXXIX (May, 1971), 456.

He states that most students already possess a great deal of knowledge.
He believes, however, that the majority of them lack the intellectual
means for "perceiving," "organizing," and "analyzing" this knowledge.
Therefore, he states it logically follows that "By incorporating social
science concepts and the inquiry process [emphasis mine] into secon-
dary social studies, provision for the development of these qualities
can be made when students are old enough to deal with them but young
enough to be flexible and receptive."[52]

Bernstein believes that the concepts of the social sciences have
utility for pupils as "information-organizing categories that enable
them to meaningfully classify disparate data." Furthermore, "such
categorization also offers understanding of the interrelatedness of
facts." This helps pupils in "retaining as well as comparing data about
many societies through time and space."[53] These are among the
logical reasons advanced for using social science concepts in educating
for citizenship.

With regard to the development of thinking skills, Bernstein
states that "through rational inquiry students can effectively learn
important facts and the intellectual skills necessary for effective

---

[52]Ibid., p. 460.

[53]Ibid., p. 461.

citizenship. "[54] It seems that by "rational inquiry" Bernstein means

something other than open-minded reflective inquiry. He apparently

endorses the structured inquiry of a given social science. For example,

he calls for pupil "intellectual independence within preset goals, " such

as "within the boundaries of a world-history course. "[55]

Citizenship: Focus on Socio-Political Involvement.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon socio-

political involvement, citizenship, viewed as a process, was previously

hypothesized by the present writer to be:

> The present application of the process of decision-making and
> action-initiation in the socio-political context of the classroom,
> the school, and the community.

The aims of the social studies curriculum needed to produce this

type of citizenship in pupils would include a knowledge and compre-

hension of the reflective inquiry process, and an ability to apply the

process in an effort to reach a decision about the best possible solution

to a significant social problem. Other important aims would be an

ability to infer an appropriate line of social or political action from

the intellectual solution to the problem, and an ability to carry out that

action in an attempt to alter the environment. These Reconstructionist

aims are appropriate for individuals as well as for groups of pupils.

----

[54]Ibid., p. 463.

[55]Ibid.

These aims are to be simultaneously developed and implemented in the present.

The content used to develop the stated aims would consist of (1) the genuinely-sensed and significant social problems articulated by the pupils, (2) the methodology of the reflective inquiry process, (3) data from any organized body of knowledge relevant to the problem at hand, and (4) the relevant values of the inquirer or inquirers.

The instructional methodology used to achieve the stated educational aims would consist of providing repeated opportunities for pupils to make decisions by employing the generalized problem-solving methodology of the reflective inquiry process, and to implement those decisions with appropriate social or political action.

The professional literature shows relatively few examples of usage of the term citizenship similar to the definition hypothesized for this social studies tradition. This is understandable because, as was stated previously, the focus upon social and political action in social studies curriculum is new and marks the development of an emerging tradition. At present no known social studies curriculum for citizenship education focuses exclusively on social and political action.

In terms of its philosophical origins, the new curricular emphasis upon socio-political involvement is not new. Best points out that a minority of progressive educators in the 1930's, while sharing the popular view of "citizenship education for social responsibility," felt

that the aims and methods of citizenship education must reflect a

commitment to reconstruct American society. In other words, in

their view, citizenship education must not only ". . . deal directly

with the problems of recovery, with the political, economic and social

problems of the times, (but) . . . must even act directly to bring about

a changed and improved social order. "[56]

In the opinion of the present writer, one major difference exists

between the citizenship aims of many early reconstructionists and

those of present advocates of socio-political involvement. The former

group seemed to want the social studies curriculum to program pupils

as advocates of "positive social policies" and as agents of sanctioned

social change.[57] The latter group, while attempting to train pupils in

reflective inquiry and action-initiation, would be content to let them

operate as free agents, guided by their own values.

Dale Brubaker is one contemporary writer who makes a case for

social action as the desired end of citizenship education. He takes his

cue from George S. Counts's thesis in Dare the School Build a New

Social Order? Counts's thesis is that ". . . society requires great

---

[56]Best, "A Review of the Development of the Concept of Citizen-ship Education, " p. 102.

[57]See, Vernon Jones, "Character Education, " Review of Edu-cational Research, VIII (February, 1938), 14. Also see, John L. Childs, "Should the School Seek Actively to Reconstruct Society? " Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CLXXXII (November, 1935), 1-9.

numbers of persons who, while capable of gathering and digesting facts,

are at the same time able to think in terms of life, make decisions and

act."[58] Reacting to this view, Brubaker states:

> It logically followed that being a good citizen meant being an
> active citizen - one who supported a worthy cause with actions
> as well as words. Critical thinking and the analysis of values
> did little, in themselves, to remedy society's ills . . . .
> Therefore, it was the responsibility of social studies teachers
> to have their students deal with the important social problems
> which confronted society.[59]

In conclusion, Brubaker cautions concerning socio-political

involvement:

> To think critically is one thing; to act according to conclusions
> arrived at via critical thinking is another. To act is to chal-
> lenge a society's power structure. A student should know the
> possible consequences that may occur as a result of actions
> which challenge a society's or a group's power structure.[60]

Bruce Joyce is a contemporary writer who strongly endorses

socio-political involvement by pupils - not as an end in itself, but

"as the means to positive emotional involvement" on the part of

----

[58]George S. Counts, _Dare the School Build a New Social Order?_,
as cited in Dale L. Brubaker, _Alternative Directions for the Social
Studies_ (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company,
1967), p. 10.

[59]Brubaker, _op. cit._, p. 11.

[60]_Ibid._, p. 16.

pupils.[61] He labels as "valuing" the citizenship education program that
would lead to such "positive emotional involvement."[62] "Valuing" con-
sists, in part, of certain "affective goals" such as the following:

> To develop a commitment toward the betterment of mankind.
> Included would be involvement and lifelong endeavor to work
> with others in finding ways of improving social life in one's im-
> mediate vicinity, nation, and throughout the world.
>
> To reach out to all others and to try to make contact with and
> understand them, to share affection and to grow with them. To
> be willing also to explore with them the different kinds of problems
> that keep men apart and - as one matures - engage in a dialogue
> with them over the problems of mankind.[63]

These "affective goals" sound very much like those of an earlier era,

when training pupils for "social responsibility" was the main emphasis

in citizenship education. Joyce, a modern Reconstructionist, states,

however, that the means of implementing these goals today would

---

[61]Bruce R. Joyce, "Social Action for the Primary Schools,"
Childhood Education, XLVI (February, 1970), 256.

[62]It seems that most advocates of socio-political involvement
stress the importance of examining values and developing emotional
commitment on the part of the pupil. As was stated previously, the
primary concern of this overall curricular emphasis is to provide
opportunities for personal and social awareness through problem-
solving activities that involve an integration of intellect and feeling.
For an excellent example of a partial social action curriculum, em-
phasizing the importance of valuing and emotional commitment, the
reader should see the description of Dale Brubaker and James
Macdonald's University of North Carolina at Greensboro Humanistic
Education Project in Chapter 10 of: R. Murray Thomas and Dale L.
Brubaker, Curriculum Patterns in Elementary Social Studies
(Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971).

[63]Joyce, op. cit., p. 256.

consist of " . . . Social Action on a Child Scale."[64]

According to Joyce, some representative social activities appropriate for children are (1) raising animals and tending them when they are sick, (2) visiting sick children, (3) giving parties, (4) operating and caring for audiovisual equipment, (5) operating a messenger-shopping service for invalids and, (6) interviewing neighboring parents to find out what can be done to improve a neighborhood.[65] Activities such as these might be thought of and carried out by pupils in an attempt to implement their intellectual solution to a social problem they have perceived.

Conclusion

A final assessment of the conceptual framework's validity and utility for generating discrete and useful definitions for social studies curriculum terminology will be deferred until the final chapter of this dissertation.

With regard to the single term citizenship, however, the weight of the evidence, though less than compelling, suggests that the model did generate hypothetical definitions that accorded well with predefinitional usage of that term. The present writer states this conclusion—notwithstanding the fact that over 90 per cent of the articles examined stated a view of citizenship and citizenship education

[64]Ibid.

[65]Ibid., pp. 256-257.

that could be characterized as eclectic with regard to the five views

of citizenship outlined in this chapter. Although no unique, discrete

view of citizenship or citizenship education was found in the literature

search, it was clear that the main emphasis, even in eclectic positions,

placed the authors primarily in one of the five social studies traditions.

CHAPTER IV

INQUIRY

Introduction

The purposes of this chapter are two fold. First an attempt will be made to clarify each of the five, discrete definitions hypothesized for inquiry. This is necessary because each definition is stated succinctly and uniformly—as a process—to be carried out by the individual pupil. Therefore, the present writer could not explicitly incorporate a number of curricular considerations into each statement. The second purpose of this chapter is to report the extent to which the present writer's research of the literature on inquiry has revealed examples of predefinitional usage of that term in accordance with the five hypothetical definitions. In other words, there is to be a brief assessment of the apparent validity and utility of the conceptual framework for generating discrete and useful definitions for the ambiguous term inquiry. Citations from the body of literature will be representative of what has been found in research, for it is beyond the scope of this chapter to trace and review thoroughly the historical development of the concept of inquiry.

With regard to the first purpose of this chapter, it will be necessary to express distinctly and fully all curricular viewpoints implied or alluded to in each of the five hypothetical definitions of

inquiry. Accordingly, the following curricular considerations will be explored for each definition, when appropriate:

(1) What educational aims (or objectives) are implied or alluded to in the process of inquiry, as defined?

(2) What type of content (or data) is implied or alluded to in the process of inquiry, as defined?

(3) What method of pupil reasoning is implied or alluded to in the process of inquiry, as defined?

(4) What type of solution or end product is implied or alluded to in the process of inquiry, as defined?

As far as the implied methodology for teaching each type of inquiry is concerned, the assumption is that in every case pupils will acquire command of a given inquiry process through opportunities to practice it.

With regard to the second purpose of this chapter, some points must be made concerning the methodology and limitations of the research. The primary focus of the literature search was upon how various writers have used the term inquiry, and what meaning was implied or expressed. In other words, the main focus was upon the way in which the term was used as well as upon definition. In addition, notice was taken of implied or expressed statements of the curricular considerations enumerated above.

The review of the body of literature concerning inquiry was complicated by the fact that this rather general term has been used with

great frequency only since the mid-1960's. [1] Prior to that time, a

number of other terms were used more or less synonymously in the

professional literature to indicate, in whole or in part, what the

generic term inquiry means in the present. Most prominent among

these terms are "problem-solving, " "critical thinking, " "reflective

thinking, " "inductive thinking, " "scientific analysis, " "scientific

investigating, " and "discovery learning. " It is unfortunate for the

researcher that not one of the preceding "synonyms" has replaced

another in popular usage as was the case when "citizenship education"

replaced the term "character education" in the professional literature.

Rightly or not, the terms cited have been used, and continue to be used

interchangeably in the writings of social studies educators. [2] This

necessitated openly acknowledging the apparent commonality among

the terms cited and including all of the terms in the survey of the

_____

[1]"Inquiry method" first appeared as a descriptor in Education
Index in 1965.

[2]For support of this assertion, see June R. Chapin and Richard
E. Gross, "Making Sense out of the Terminology of the New Social
Studies, " The Social Studies, LXIII (April, 1972), 149. See also R.
Murray Thomas and Dale L. Brubaker, Decisions in Teaching
Elementary Social Studies (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub-
lishing Company, Inc., 1971), p. 239. Not only have the terms cited
been used interchangeably with the term inquiry, but some of the
terms are frequently used as adjectives to modify the meaning of
inquiry (e. g. "reflective inquiry, " "inductive inquiry").

literature undertaken. [3] Therefore, the present writer also focused

his research upon the meaning and method of usage of each of the

"synonyms." As in the case of the generic term inquiry, notice

was also taken of implied or expressed statements of the curricular

considerations previously enumerated.

The major sources constituting evidence for research into the

usage of the terms citizenship and inquiry were listed in Chapter I.

With regard only to inquiry and its related terms, however, the

Readers' Guide To Periodical Literature was used to search pro-

fessional journals for relevant articles written during the period from

1900 to 1928. [4] For the period 1929 to 1973, Education Index was used

for the same purpose. [5]

─────────────

[3]It was explained in Chapter I that the apparent commonality
among "inquiry" and its related terms is that (1) from the vantage
point of the pupil, all inquiry learning is motivated by the perception
of a blocked goal and (2) from the vantage point of the teacher, all of
the terms, viewed as pedagogical methods, stand in opposition to the
traditional expository-didactic method. In keeping with this viewpoint,
the concept of "inquiry" is researched and discussed in this chapter in
the dual context of a pupil thought process and an instructional method.
These two broad senses in which inquiry and its "synonymous" terms
are used in the professional literature are inextricably related to each
other, because many writers view the inquiry thought process (however
articulated) as an instructional method in and of itself. For support of
this position, see William M. Hering, Jr., "Social Studies Education:
The Inquiry Method," The Encyclopedia of Education, ed. Lee C.
Deighton (New York: The Macmillan Co., and The Free Press, 1971),
p. 277.

[4]Descriptors used were "teaching," "learning and scholarship,"
and "social sciences."

[5]Descriptors used were "inquiry," "problem solving," "critical

During the course of the literature search, an effort was made
to find examples of usage which would establish the validity and utility
of the framework for bringing conceptual clarity to the use of the
generic term <u>inquiry</u>. Considerable caution was exercised by the re-
searcher, however, to make certain that no example of usage reflect-
ing the influence of some social studies tradition other than those hypo-
thesized was overlooked. This effort was made difficult by the philo-
sophical and pedagogical eclecticism that is apparent in most authors'
writing.

An important limitation of the research is that the use of the
term <u>inquiry</u> (and its related terms) was only examined within the con-
text of the literature of social studies and the humanities. The concept
of inquiry in other fields, such as the physical and biological sciences,
was not examined unless there was a manifest connection with the
social studies through some interdisciplinary context.

Let us turn now to a systematic analysis of the five hypothetical
definitions and an assessment of the extent to which they are in
accordance with predefinitional usage.

Inquiry: Focus of Factual Subject Matter

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon factual
subject matter, inquiry, viewed as a process, was previously

---

thinking, " "thought and thinking, " "reasoning, " "scientific method, "
and "discovery method. "

hypothesized by the present writer as being:

> The pupil finds the factual answer to a question posed
> by the textbook, or the teacher.

The educational aims implied in the preceding definition of inquiry are quite limited. The pupil is not even expected to generate his own questions for inquiry. His only clear responsibility is to locate requested information. It is assumed, of course, that the pupil will report his findings to the teacher.

The type of content used as the data of this form of inquiry would generally consist of those disparate facts from a single social science discipline or subject matter area considered important by the textbook writer or the teacher.

No method of pupil reasoning is clearly implied for the process of inquiry, as defined above.

Finally, the solution or end product in this type of inquiry would be in the form of a brief factual answer that can easily be judged as correct or incorrect by the teacher. The printed word in the appropriate textbook would be the basis of authority for the teacher's judgment.

A search of the professional literature since the turn of the century did not yield <u>any</u> examples of <u>writers</u> using the term <u>inquiry</u> or its related terms in such a limited sense as hypothesized here. As was pointed out in the first chapter, however, there are significant

differences between writers and practitioners in the field of social

studies curriculum. These differences are ones of viewpoint as well

as expertise. Accordingly, while writers in the field may not view

the process hypothesized as legitimate "inquiry," many classroom

teachers would so label such activity. [6]

In discussing the varied forms of social studies inquiry in the

elementary school, R. Murray Thomas and Dale L. Brubaker cite

an excellent example of pupils being asked by the teacher to locate

and report information that is clearly factual in nature:

> During a study of the Orient, a sixth-grade teacher wrote on
> the chalk-board ten questions whose answers the pupils were
> to seek in their geography textbook. At the end of the class
> period, they would hand in the written answers to be corrected
> by the teacher. The nature of the questions is suggested by
> the following three from the list:
> 1. What government owns or controls Hong Kong?
> 2. What is the racial and national background of most
>   of the people who live in Hong Kong?
> 3. Why has Hong Kong been called "Mainland China's
>   Funnel to the Western World"? [7]

Thomas and Brubaker point out that ". . . some teachers might dub

this activity inquiry. . . ."[8]

---

[6] In the present writer's public school experience, he has fre-
quently heard such activity referred to by classroom teachers as
"inquiry."

[7] Thomas and Brubaker, op. cit., p. 241.

[8] Ibid., p. 255.

In identifying the "chief traits" of such a form of "inquiry," the same authors state:

> With such an approach, the pupils do not face the problem of deciding what questions they should ask or where to find the answers. These two steps have already been taken by the teacher. The children are thus limited to practicing how to use a table of contents, an index, subheadings, and the skills of scanning and paraphrasing the book's information. Furthermore, the pupils are not responsible for evaluating the adequacy of the answers. Evaluation is the teacher's task. [9]

Finally, while Thomas and Brubaker concede that they can understand why certain teachers might label the activity cited as "inquiry," given an extremely broad definition of that term, they personally reject such an assertion. Their reason is that the activity described concerns itself with only one step of the inquiry process - data collection. They further point out that there is not even an opportunity for pupils to exercise judgment about sources of information. [10]

Inquiry: Focus on the Child

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the child, inquiry, viewed as a process, was previously hypothesized by the present writer as being:

> The pupil gathers information under the teacher's guidance, concerning a topic that has emerged from his present needs or interests.

---

[9]Ibid., pp. 243, 255.

[10]Ibid., p. 278.

A number of educational aims are implied in the preceding definition of inquiry. First, it is expected that the pupil will become aware of his own personal needs and interests. This state of awareness can be achieved through individual pupil effort, or through assistance from the teacher, or a combination of these two means. Secondly, it is expected that the pupil will be able to articulate topically related questions, growing out of his manifest needs and interests. Finally, it is expected that the pupil will be able to make and implement decisions concerning where and how to gather the information that will satisfy his intellectual curiosity about a topic. He will receive guidance in this latter task from the teacher, when needed.

The type of content used as the data of this form of inquiry would always be determined by the topic of concern which grows out of a pupil's manifest need or interest. The content would never be predetermined and would almost always be interdisciplinary in nature.

No method of pupil reasoning is clearly implied for the process of inquiry, as defined above.

Finally, the solution or end product in this type of inquiry might be in the form of a collection of related factual and conceptual knowledge bearing on the topic, compiled in the form of a pupil report or project.

The review of the professional literature since the turn of the century showed almost no examples of writers using the term inquiry or its related terms in the limited sense hypothesized here. As in the case of the definition preceding this one, the present writer believes that while most writers might not label the process hypothesized as legitimate "inquiry," many classroom teachers would so label such activity.[11] Once again, this apparently reflects the differences between writers and practitioners in the field of social studies curriculum.

Two contemporary writers do, however, cite an example of social studies inquiry in the elementary school that is very similar to the one hypothesized for this social studies tradition. The pupils are being asked by the teacher to suggest both the instructional goals and the means of reaching these goals in the following situation:

> On the bulletin board in a first-grade classroom, the teacher displayed a dozen pictures of diverse scenes in which people interacted with other people, animals, or their physical environment. In a discussion session, she asked the pupils to tell what questions came to mind when they inspected the pictures. As children proposed questions, the teacher listed them on the chalkboard, then asked the pupils to guess what the answer to each question might be. Those questions that seemed to generate the greatest curiosity among the class members were investigated in greater depth over a period of several days, with the children suggesting sources of answers and the teacher helping them use these sources.
> In the first day's discussion, during which questions about the pictures were solicited, the class worked as a single group. However, on subsequent days the teacher divided the pupils into

---

[11]In the present writer's public school experience, he has frequently heard such activity referred to by classroom teachers as "inquiry."

three groups, each group composed of children more of less interested in a particular type of question. The teacher met with each group separately to guide their attempts to answer their study question. [12] [emphasis mine]

In analyzing the "chief traits" of the preceding examples of "inquiry" the same writers point out that the teacher's role, although an important one, is delimited to that of "facilitator" and "editor of activities." More specifically, the teacher in the example first stimulates the pupils with pictures in an effort to trigger their curiosity and then solicits questions or remarks from the pupils. The responses obtained are taken as "evidence of pupil interests" and therefore determine the content objectives or the subject matter to be studied. There is no attempt by the teacher to impose specific subject matter on the pupils.[13]

The same writers explain that after certain "topics" are identified from pupil interests, the teacher guides the children through two other steps that are generally recognized as parts of the inquiry process: (1) proposing hypotheses, or likely answers, to the questions raised and (2) estimating how the pupils might discover which of the proposed answers is correct or most reasonable. In the example, the number of "topics" investigated is limited to three because the pupils

---

[12] Thomas and Brubaker, op. cit., pp. 241-242.

[13] Ibid., pp. 243, 267-268, 271.

are not mature, independent inquirers.[14]

The writers of the preceding illustrative lesson state that they would label it as an example of inquiry under their broad definition of that term. They consider "inquiry" to be ". . . the process individuals or groups go through in attempting to answer questions or to solve problems they consider worthy of their attention. "[15]

As the same writers see it, whether or not a given activity should be labeled as inquiry must logically be determined by the relative number of inquiry "components" or "sub-skills" it contains. They view the "components" of the inquiry process as:

1. Identifying problems or questions to investigate
2. Analyzing the problems or questions into component parts so that the kinds of data to be gathered for answering them become apparent
3. Planning who will collect what data, where, and how
4. Collecting the desired information
5. Organizing the information into a comprehensible pattern
6. Interpreting the information in a fashion that solves the problems or answers the questions
7. Reporting the results
8. Evaluating the success of the process[16]

The writers reason that since the illustrative lesson contains the first component as well as portions of components two and three, there is justification for labeling it as inquiry.[17]

---

[14]Ibid., pp. 268-270.

[15]Ibid., p. 276.

[16]Ibid., pp. 276-277.   [17]Ibid., p. 278.

Inquiry: Focus on the Reflective Inquiry Process

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon reflective inquiry, inquiry, viewed as a process, was previously hypothesized by the present writer as being:

> The pupil attempts to solve a problem that he senses and artic-
> ulates, through the application of both inductive and deductive
> reasoning to multi-disciplinary data and generalizations that he
> gathers for himself.

Several educational aims are implied or alluded to in the preceding definition of inquiry. First, it is expected that the pupil will personally sense and become aware of an indeterminate situation or problem. This sub-process of inquiry is likely to be carried out independently by the pupil. In any case, the pupil is not "fed" a problem by the teacher or the textbook. Secondly, it is expected that the pupil will be able to articulate the problem through verbalization. Furthermore, it is expected that the pupil will be able to hypothesize a plausible solution to the problem, gather data he considers relevant to the problem, test the hypothesis proposed and draw appropriate conclusions. These educational aims would not necessarily occur in the order in which they are listed.

The type of content used as the data of this form of inquiry would consist of facts, concepts and generalizations drawn from any of several social science disciplines as well as other organized bodies of

knowledge. The content used as data would never be predetermined and would almost always be multi-disciplinary in nature.

In the definition just hypothesized for inquiry in the reflective tradition, both inductive and deductive pupil reasoning are alluded to. In this form of inquiry, it is assumed that there is an inseparable blend of these two modes of thought in moving toward a tentative solution to the problem at hand. [18]

Finally, the intellectual solution or end product of this inquiry would almost always be unique in form and substance. It is a safe assumption that neither the teacher nor any other person could predict these aspects of the solution in advance. The unique and tentative nature of the solution which is characteristic of this form of inquiry, is a clear manifestation of the open-endedness of the process.

The professional literature abounds with excellent statements of the nature of the process of inquiry in the reflective tradition. As a matter of fact, it is clear to the present writer that the reflective form of inquiry constitutes one of the two major variations of that endeavor. [19]

Since all discussions of the reflective mode of inquiry have their philosophical and methodological origins in the writings of John Dewey,

---

[18]For support of this position, see Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf, Teaching High School Social Studies (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 98.

[19]For support of this position see Hering, op. cit., p. 278. Also see Shirley H. Engle, "Objectives of the Social Studies," New Challenges in the Social Studies, eds. Byron G. Massialas and Frederick

it is fitting that we sample what he has written on the subject.

Dewey's first discussion of logical thought, with special reference to the field of education, is found in the 1933 volume, How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process. In this book he defines "reflective thought" as: "Active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends . . . ."[20]

Dewey states that there are five "phases" or "aspects" of reflective thought. These "phases" occur between the "pre-reflective" situation and the "post-reflective" situation. In the former situation, the subject is "perplexed," "troubled," and "confused" before finally realizing the problem to be solved. In the latter situation, ". . . the doubt has been dispelled, . . . there results a direct experience of mastery, satisfaction, enjoyment."[21] According to Dewey:

> In between, as states of thinking, are (1) suggestions, in which the mind leaps forward to a possible solution; (2) an intellectualization of the difficulty or perplexity that has been felt (directly experienced) into a problem to be solved, a question for which the answer must be sought; (3) the use of one suggestion after another as a leading idea , or hypothesis,

---

R. Smith (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965), p. 14.

[20] John Dewey, How We Think (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1933), p. 9.

[21] Ibid., pp. 106-107.

to initiate and guide observation and other operations in collec-
tion of factual material; (4) the mental elaboration of the idea or
supposition as an idea or supposition (reasoning, in the sense
in which reasoning is a part, not the whole, of inference); and
(5) testing the hypothesis by overt or imaginative action. [22]

In order to dispel misinterpretation of his ideas, Dewey made

clear in a 1938 volume, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry, the ". . .

express identification of reflective thought with objective inquiry. . .."[23]

In this book, Dewey postulated ". . . the most highly generalized con-

ception of inquiry which can be justifiably formulated."[24] His

definition is as follows:

> Inquiry is the controlled or directed transformation of an
> indeterminate situation into one that is so determinate in its
> constituent distinctions and relations as to convert the ele-
> ments of the original situation into a unified whole.[25]

According to Dewey, it is the reflective thought process (as previously

defined)that "controls" or "directs" the "transformation" of an in-

determinate situation into a determinately unified one. Therefore, the

---

[22]Ibid., p. 107.

[23]John Dewey, Logic (New York: Henry Holt and Company,
1938), p. iii.

[24]Ibid., p. 104.

[25]Ibid., pp. 104-105.

pattern of inquiry <u>is</u> the pattern of the reflective thought process.[26]

Maurice P. Hunt and Lawrence E. Metcalf are two contemporary writers who explain and advocate inquiry in the reflective tradition. These two writers are in fundamental agreement with John Dewey that the <u>reflective thought process</u> can for all intents and purposes be equated with the "scientific method of inquiry." They qualify this assertion, however, by stating that:

> Reflection, . . . refers to the essential but non-gadgetlike features of science, and to an attitude of mind and a <u>generalized set of mental operations</u> with which to approach <u>all problems,</u> whether social or physical in nature.[27] [emphasis mine]

Hunt and Metcalf view the reflective inquiry process as being congruent with the elements of a complete act of thought which ". . . progresses from belief, to doubt, to idea, to testing of idea, to verified belief or conclusion."[28] In their view, the reflective inquiry process contains the following steps:

---

[26]<u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 105-119.

[27]Hunt and Metcalf, <u>op</u>. <u>cit</u>., p. 67. The present writer thinks it is significant that these writers, like John Dewey, outline the reflective inquiry process <u>only</u> in terms of "mental operations." Overt actions such as collecting and organizing data and reporting the results of inquiry are only parenthetically referred to. Also like Dewey, Hunt and Metcalf's discussion of inquiry seems to suggest that the process terminates when an intellectual solution is reached for the problem under consideration. As will be demonstrated later, this view contrasts with a reconstructive view of reflective inquiry.

[28]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 68.

(1) Recognition and definition of a problem
(2) Formulation of hypotheses
(3) Elaboration of logical implications of hypotheses
(4) Testing of hypotheses
(5) Drawing of a conclusion[29]

The same writers caution, however:

> The purposes of reflection will be defeated by a teacher who regards the above five steps as mechanical procedures to be followed in a certain order . . . . Thinking can not be put on a schedule, and there will be much backing and filling in any problem-solving experience.[30] [emphasis mine]

With regard to the reflective inquiry process being used as a teaching method, Hunt and Metcalf point out that such teaching, like the reflective process itself, contains both inductive and deductive elements.[31]

Finally, the same writers indicate the widespread applicability of the reflective inquiry process in the social studies curriculum and their strong advocacy of its use: "The foremost aim of instruction in high-school social studies is to help students reflectively examine issues in the problematic areas of American culture."[32]

---

[29]Ibid., pp. 68-69.

[30]Ibid., p. 69.

[31]Ibid., pp. 98-99. This contrasts with "inductive teaching," exemplifying the "discovery" form of inquiry. Such a teaching method would elicit primarily inductive reasoning from pupils. For elaboration of this position, see Ibid., pp. 96-98.

[32]Ibid., p. 288.

Inquiry: Focus on the Structure of the Social Science Disciplines

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the structure

of the social science disciplines, inquiry, viewed as a process, was

previously hypothesized by the present writer as being:

> The pupil attempts to solve a problem posed by the teacher or
> the textbook, primarily through the application of inductive
> reasoning to the social science data presented. A successful
> solution consists of stating the appropriate social science
> generalization.[33]

The preceding hypothetical definition of inquiry has but a single

expressed educational aim. The pupil is expected to "solve" a

"problem" that is rather limited in its scope, by "discovering" an

answer that is already known to the teacher or the textbook writer.

Unlike the reflective inquiry tradition, the pupil is not expected to

personally sense and articulate the problem. It is likely that the

problem will be related to the "structure" of a given social science

discipline, and that it will be "fed" to the pupil along with the data

needed to solve it. Therefore, by employing at some level of sophisti-

cation, elements of the unique mode of scholarly inquiry appropriate

for a given social science discipline (e. g. the historiographic method)

the pupil can discover new knowledge in much the same way that the

social scientist does. While the knowledge is new to the pupil, it is

---

[33]This rather generalized definition of pupil "inquiry" in the
social science tradition illustrates a point that was previously made
in Chapter II, viz., that on the level of practice in the classroom,

not, of course, new to the social scientists in the field.

The type of content used as the data of this form of inquiry would consist of facts and concepts generally selected from a single social science discipline rather than several. The data presented to the pupil would most likely be sufficient to enable him to reach the intended conclusion, assuming that he reasons properly.

With regard to pupil reasoning, it is assumed that the inquirer will "discover" the pre-determined solution to the problem presented him, primarily through the application of induction to the social science data. If deductive reasoning is employed, it would probably be used to apply the solution discovered to other situations.

Finally, the solution or end product of this type of inquiry would usually be in the form of a generalization from a given social science. The "correct" solution would be known in advance by the teacher or the textbook writer and therefore would not be a unique contribution to knowledge by the inquirer.

The professional literature since 1960 contains many statements of inductive forms of inquiry related to the structures of the various social science disciplines. The apparent impetus for elaboration of a generalized discovery method of inquiry in social studies was Jerome S. Bruner's The Process of Education. Bruner argued that any concept

---

attempts to emulate the methods of social scientists are generally rather crude.

could be mastered by any pupil at any stage of development if presented in an intellectually appropriate form. [34] He further argued that there is no reason why pupils in the social studies should not be able to "discover" generalizations through an "inductive approach" just as was possible in mathematics and physics. [35]

One contemporary writer puts the meaning of inductive inquiry into clear perspective by stating that:

> [It] aims at getting students to replicate the type of reasoning used by social scientists in their research. Under the inductive method, students are given factual data and asked to discover their own generalizations and make their own interpretations. For example, in anthropology classes students may be asked to make statements about the probable nature of a culture after examining artifacts or analyzing a map of the remains of a campsite. [36] [emphasis mine]

Though not advocates of the method, Hunt and Metcalf have stated a lucid view of the "inductive" inquiry process. Their purpose was to contrast the "inductive" thought process with the "reflective" thought process in the context of a discussion of teaching methodology. The steps or phases of the "inductive" inquiry process are:

---

[34] Jerome S. Bruner, The Process of Education (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960), pp. 33, 47.

[35] Ibid., p. 21.

[36] Hering, op. cit., p. 279. Several other writers seem to agree that this view of inquiry constitutes a legitimate and discrete mode of inquiry. See for example, Gary A. Manson and Elmer D. Williams, "Inquiry: Does It Teach How or What to Think?" Social Education,

First, the teacher <u>selects</u> a <u>concept</u> or <u>generalization</u> that he wants students to learn.

Second, the teacher selects, or has his students select, <u>instances</u> of the concept or generalization. In the social studies this might well mean that the teacher who wants his students to learn the concept of revolution would put before them descriptions of several cases of revolution. Each revolution would have its unique features, but there would hopefully be some properties that all the examples would have in common, and which would constitute the meaning of revolution.

Third, the teacher <u>guides</u> the students' thinking so that their <u>attention</u> <u>is</u> <u>focused</u> <u>upon</u> <u>relevant</u> <u>detail.</u> He does this through questions and prescriptions. He is concerned at this stage that students look for common features of revolutions. He wants students to learn what distinguishes revolution from non-revolution.

Fourth, the teacher actually <u>educes</u> <u>the</u> <u>concept</u> to the point where students can <u>put</u> <u>it</u> <u>into</u> <u>words,</u> or some other kind of symbolization. If he encounters difficulty at this stage, he may repeat stages two and three, using different and perhaps simpler questions and prescriptions.[37] [emphasis mine]

The same writers point out that an "inductive" form of inquiry is a central emphasis in many of the curriculum projects in the social studies.[38]

XXXIV (January, 1970), 79-80. Also see Albert L. Nelson and Lisso R. Simmons, "Using Learning Resources for Inquiry," Social Education, XXXIII (May, 1969), 545.

[37] Hunt and Metcalf, op. cit., pp. 96-97. These writers adapted this description of the "inductive" inquiry process from a rather famous statement of the process in the field of mathematics. See Kenneth B. Henderson, "Anent the Discovery Method," The Mathematics Teacher, April, 1957, pp. 287-291.

[38] This assertion is supported by Norris M. Sanders and Marlin L. Tanck, "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects," Social Education, XXXIV (April, 1970), 383-388. Also see

Finally, James G. Womack boldly advocates an "inductive" form of inquiry in _Discovering the Structure of Social Studies_. He argues that pupil "discovery" of principles and generalizations should be the principal aim of social studies instruction, but cautions, "Generalizations are not an integral part of social studies content. . . . That is, one does not open any social studies text and find generalizations written out."[39] Womack explains, however:

> . . . they are there and can be _discovered_ by a process of _inductive_ thinking. Inductive thinking may be defined as a mental skill wherein an observer sees a finite number of items, parts, events, or phenomena and _reasons_ that each of them falls into a particular _pattern_ based on some criteria such as size, shape, quantity, order, or distance. Since they do fit into a certain pattern, the observer can make a cautious prediction concerning the next phenomena, its size, shape, quantity, order, or distance. Inductive thinking has that marvelous scientific asset of _predictability_, but it also has the defect of uncertainty, since the validity of the prediction rests solely on the perceived pattern of events holding true to form.[40] [emphasis mine]

With regard to the role of deductive reasoning in this form of inquiry, Womack states, "From the outset, it should be made clear that inductive thinking helps primarily in _discovering_ generalizations, while deductive thinking helps in _applying_ the generalization to another situation

---

Edwin Fenton, _Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools_ (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), p. 117.

[39]James G. Womack, _Discovering the Structure of Social Studies_ (New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1966), p. 10.

[40]Ibid.

or body of content. "[41]

Inquiry: Focus on Socio-Political Involvement

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon socio-political involvement, inquiry, viewed as a process, was previously hypothesized by the present writer as being:

> The pupil attempts to solve a personally meaningful social problem posed by his environment (using the same process as the reflective inquirer) in such a way that appropriate social action to remedy the problem can be inferred from his intellectual solution.

The educational aims implied or alluded to in the preceding definition of inquiry include all of the aims previously discussed for inquiry in the reflective tradition. Beyond that, however, it is expected that the pupil will be able to decide the most appropriate, effective and reasonable course of action to implement his intellectual solution to a problem. Finally, it is expected that the pupil will act upon his decision by carrying out the proposed action and that he will evaluate the impact of the action. These final steps represent a reconstructionist view of reflective inquiry in that the inquiry process is not viewed as an end in itself. The final end is the hope that the action taken will improve the larger society. [42]

---

[41] Ibid., p. 14. This assertion is supported by Thomas and Brubaker, op. cit., p. 248.

[42] Dale L. Brubaker, Secondary Social Studies for the Seventies (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1973), p. 73.

The type of content used as the data of this form of inquiry would be the same as in the reflective inquiry tradition. In addition, however, the pupil would be expected to treat as legitimate data those personal values relevant to the problem at hand.

Just as in the reflective inquiry tradition, it is assumed that the pupil will employ an inseparable blend of inductive and deductive reasoning in reaching an intellectual solution to a problem and in deciding upon an appropriate form of action to implement his solution.

Finally the solution or end product of this form of inquiry would consist of an intellectual component as well as a component of action. Both components would be unique in form and substance and would not be predictable in advance.

The professional literature contains relatively few statements explaining and advocating a reconstructionist form of reflective inquiry.

Perhaps the most famous contemporary statement of inquiry in this tradition can be found in the 1961 book, Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education. The authors of this volume postulate the following components or phases of reflective problem solving:

1. The presence (and recognition) of a problem situation
2. Clarification of the problem
3. Hypotheses formed, tested, and modified
4. Action taken on the basis of the best-supported hypothesis[43] [emphasis mine]

---

[43] H. Gordon Hullfish and Phillip G. Smith, Reflective Thinking: The Method of Education (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, Inc., 1961), pp. 43-44.

In the opinion of the present writer, the most definitive statement of inquiry in this final tradition is Frank Simon's 1970 book, A Reconstructive Approach to Problem-Solving in the Social Studies. In Simon's view the complete reflective inquiry and action-initiation process would involve the following steps:

1. Identifying and clarifying the problem
2. Formulating a hypothesis on the desirability and feasibility of taking action on the problem
3. Collecting a representative sample of data
4. Classifying the data
5. Analyzing the data
6. Evaluating (testing) the hypothesis on the desirability and feasibility of taking action on the problem
7. Proposing a course of action on the problem
8. Examining the desirability and feasibility of taking overt group action on the problem
9. Acting on a decision to take action on the problem
10. Evaluating the action[44]

The same writer points out that an examination of relevant values is very much a part of the problem-solving process.[45]

Finally, Simon states that his design for reflective inquiry and post-inquiry activity does not constitute a complete social studies program. Instead, "the design represents only one general dimension, though perhaps the principal one, of social education."[46]

---

[44] Frank Simon, A Reconstructive Approach to Problem-Solving in the Social Studies (Calgary, Alberta: John D. McAra Limited, 1970), p. vii.

[45] Ibid., pp. vii-viii.

[46] Ibid., p. ix.

Conclusion

A final assessment of the validity of the conceptual framework and its utility for generating discrete and useful definitions for social studies curriculum terminology will be deferred until the next chapter of this dissertation.

With regard to the term inquiry and its related terms, however, the evidence in the professional literature suggests that the model did generate hypothetical definitions that accorded well with predefinitional usage of these terms, at least as far as the last three social studies traditions are concerned.   With regard to the definitions hypothesized for the first two social studies traditions, the present writer believes that there is some evidence to suggest that while writers in the field may not use inquiry (and related terms) in either of these two limited senses, many practitioners in the field do.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There is a great deal of confusion over the usage of terminology in the field of social studies curriculum. This confusion leads to a problem in communications.

One facet of the problem is that some terms represent such broad and imprecise concepts, they have little, if any, commonly accepted meaning. When such terms are employed, the user must stipulate what he means by them.

Another facet of the problem is that a given term might have a limited number of meanings which accord with generally accepted pre-definitional usage. A problem arises, however, from having one label for several conceptually distinct meanings. Each meaning originates from a different philosophical or pedagogical orientation.

Finally, a cluster of different terms may be used more or less synonymously to convey the same fundamental meaning. In other words, the terms are different, but the definitions they are paired with are similar in that they provide an explanatory account of meaning based on a past usage for which some consensus existed.

It appears that the ultimate solution to the problem of confusion over terminology might be the development of a programmatic language

for the field of social studies curriculum. Such a language might be made up of several discrete, component languages with each such language springing from a separate tradition within the field. Each definition in a component programmatic language would convey a moral-philosophical position as well as an educational program commensurate with the basic tenets of its particular tradition.

A more modest and immediate solution to the problem of confusion over terminology is to bring a measure of conceptual clarity to the past and present usage of terms within the field. As a tool for bringing this clarity, the present writer suggests the development and application of a complete conceptual framework for the field of social studies curriculum. The framework would be a product of the systematic identification of operational premises for each of the major traditions within the field.

In order to address the problem of confusing terminology, it is suggested that the proposed framework be used to clarify the various meanings of the terms citizenship and inquiry. These are perhaps the most commonly used terms in the field of social studies curriculum. Clarification would consist of using the framework to generate hypothetical sets of definitions for the two terms. Each definition would be philosophically and pedagogically consistent with the identified premises of its particular social studies tradition.

Finally it is suggested that the validity and utility of using the framework for this type of undertaking be inquired into by determining if the hypothesized definitions for citizenship and inquiry conform with the predefinitional usage of these terms in the professional literature since 1900.

In Chapter II the proposed conceptual framework is presented, systematically explained and applied. The framework isolates five "focal points" for social studies curricula. Each "focal point" identifies either a past, present or emerging tradition within the field.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon <u>factual sub-ject matter</u>, knowledge of those isolated facts traditionally considered important by scholars and educators is the principal concern.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the <u>child</u>, the primary concern is with the individual pupil's manifest needs and interests. Accordingly, any subject matter from any body of knowledge can be used as a means to the end of satisfying such needs or interests.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the <u>reflective inquiry process</u>, the principal concern is with inculcating a generalized method of problem solving. That method would include sensing a problem, articulating it, hypothesizing a plausible solution, gathering data, testing the hypothesis, and drawing appropriate conclusions. It is presumed that this method would be applicable to all types of problems. In applying the method, the specific knowledge dealt with in

moving toward a solution to a problem is not of particular concern.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon the structure
of the social science disciplines, the principal concern is with impart-
ing the basic concepts and specific methods of scholarly inquiry for
each of the separate disciplines. The assumption is that this two-part
"structure" will provide the intellectual tools necessary for the pupil
to generate new knowledge.

When the social studies curriculum is focused upon socio-political
involvement, the principal concern is a humanistic one—providing op-
portunities for the development of personal and social awareness on
the part of the individual pupil. This aim is accomplished through
activities such as simulation or problem-solving with action-initiation.

Application of the framework consists of stating a separate hypo-
thetical definition for citizenship and inquiry in each of the five pro-
posed traditions.

Chapter III is an attempt to report the extent to which the
definitions hypothesized for citizenship are in accordance with the pre-
definitional usage of that term in the professional literature since 1900.

The evidence suggests that there are, as predicted, five discrete
views of citizenship in the professional literature:

  (1) Citizenship is the possession of a set of sanctioned values
      and behaviors.

  (2) Citizenship is the present exercise of democratic choice
      by pupils, within a social context.

(3) Citizenship is the <u>process</u> of making decisions within a socio-political context, by applying the reflective inquiry method.

(4) Citizenship is the acquisition and use of the concepts and methods of scholarly inquiry of the various social science disciplines.

(5) Citizenship is the present application of the <u>process</u> of decision-making (using the reflective method) and action-initiation within a socio-political context.

It is observed that most writers take an eclectic view of citizenship embracing two or more of the preceding views.

Chapter IV is an attempt to report the extent to which the definitions hypothesized for the generic term <u>inquiry</u> are in accordance with the pre-definitional usage of that term and its related terms in the professional literature since 1900.

The evidence suggests that <u>writers</u> have only used the term inquiry and its related terms in one (or a combination) of the three senses hypothesized for traditions three, four and five. In other words, there is support in the professional literature for the following discrete views of inquiry:

(1) Inquiry is a pupil's attempt to solve a <u>problem</u> that he senses and articulates. In moving toward the solution, the pupil is likely to apply both inductive and deductive reasoning to multi-disciplinary data that he gathers for himself.

(2) Inquiry is a pupil's attempt to solve a discipline-oriented <u>problem</u> posed by the teacher or the textbook. In discovering the generalization that constitutes the answer,

the pupil is likely to apply primarily inductive reasoning to the social science data presented.

(3) Inquiry is a pupil's attempt to solve a personally meaningful social _problem_ posed by his environment (using the same process as the reflective inquirer) in such a way that appropriate social action to remedy the problem can be inferred from his intellectual solution.

It is observed that while writers may not use the term _inquiry_ in either of the senses hypothesized for traditions one and two (i. e. fact-finding and data-gathering), many practitioners do.

In view of the preceding findings from Chapters III and IV, the present writer concludes that the conceptual framework does possess substantial validity and utility for the purpose of generating philosophically and pedagogically discrete and useful definitions for social studies curriculum terminology. It has been demonstrated that the framework can be used to bring a measure of _conceptual clarity_ to such social studies curriculum terms as _citizenship_ and _inquiry_. By establishing this clarity, the framework makes a very modest beginning toward the development of a programmatic language for the field of social studies curriculum.

The present writer believes that the framework can also be used to bring conceptual clarity to _general_ curriculum terms that are frequently used within the context of social studies curriculum. In other words, the terminology dealt with need not be exclusively or mainly identifiable with the social studies. For example, when the

general terms <u>objective</u> and <u>evaluation</u> are applied to the field of social studies curriculum, several discrete meanings are logically implied. These meanings are hypothesized for the former term in Table 3, and for the latter term in Table 4. Although each definition is intended to be philosophically and pedagogically consistent with the identified premises of its particular social studies tradition, no attempt will be made here to validate this assumption. The hypothetical definitions are presented only for illustrative purposes.

In view of the apparent utility of the framework for bringing a measure of conceptual clarity to the usage of curriculum terminology, the present writer believes that other researchers can employ the framework to dispel some of the confusion surrounding the usage of such terms as <u>fact</u>, <u>concept</u>, <u>generalization</u>, <u>theory</u>, <u>structure</u>, <u>disciplines</u> and <u>valuing</u>.

The conceptual framework seems to be applicable in another important respect. As a model, it clarifies the diversity within the field of social studies and provides a reference point for teachers and scholars to identify their positions in relation to others in the profession. It therefore makes clear the various options and alternatives that are open to one in the field. Because of this, it can be a useful tool in curriculum analysis.

Finally, once one has identified his philosophical and pedagogical position within the field, he can use the framework to help him uncover

Table 3. Term: Objective.

Curriculum Focal Point		Definition
Factual Subject Matter	:	An educational goal usually specifying which factual subject matter (content) will be "covered" by the teacher and learned by the pupils.
The Child	:	An educational goal that "emerges" from a child's present needs or interests. (It is usually stated in terms of satisfying those needs or interests and not in terms of subject matter to be covered. Needs and interests are often stated topically and not as a problem.)
Reflective Inquiry Process	:	An educational goal that defines a problem that has emerged in a pupil's mind. The problem is genuinely sensed by the pupil, and is articulated by him.
Structure of the Social Science Disciplines	:	An educational goal that usually specifies which concepts or generalizations from a given discipline will be "covered" by the teacher and learned by the pupils. The goal might also pose a problem for pupils which can be solved by "discovering" an appropriate generalization from the proffered data of a social science.
Socio-Political Involvement	:	An educational goal that defines an emergent social problem sensed and articulated by pupils, which needs to be solved. The solution is not only to be thought out, but it is to be implemented with social action.

Table 4. Term: Evaluation.

Curriculum Focal Point		Definition
Factual Subject Matter	:	<u>Testing</u> to ascertain if the pupil can recognize or recall factual subject matter.
The Child	:	A subjective, teacher's assessment of progress in the child's <u>total</u> development. (e.g. with regard to personality, social attitudes and skills, physical well-being, acquisition of knowledge. The latter concern is of minor importance compared to the former ones.)
Reflective Inquiry Process	:	A pupil-teacher assessment of the extent to which the tentative solution advanced for a genuinely sensed problem is warranted by the data examined, and the extent to which the problem has been resolved.
Structure of the Social Science Disciplines	:	A teacher assessment of the extent to which the pupil can demonstrate knowledge, comprehension, and application of a social science's concepts, generalizations and method of scholarly inquiry.
Socio-Political Involvement	:	A pupil-teacher assessment of the extent to which the social problem dealt with was resolved by the inquiry and social action undertaken by the pupil. Also an assessment of any side effects of the social action, and whether or not other types of action might have better implemented the intellectual solution to the problem.

the implicit assumptions or premises behind the objectives, methodology and means of evaluation he advocates or uses. This process of self-analysis might very well result in a state of dissonance which could lead to change.

The present writer believes that the conceptual framework developed in this dissertation is well-suited for the applications that have been proposed, because it is the only model to acknowledge past, present and emerging "focal points" or traditions within the field of social studies curriculum. There are, however, other conceptual models within the social studies and in such fields as anthropology and philosophy which might lend themselves to the clarification of terminology and the identification of assumptions and operational premises within the field of social studies curriculum. Future researchers are encouraged to pursue this possibility as a worthwhile alternative to the further application of the proposed model.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bloom, Benjamin S. (ed.). <u>Taxonomy of Educational Objectives,</u> <u>Handbook I: Cognitive Domain.</u> New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956.

Brubaker, Dale L. <u>Alternative Directions for the Social Studies.</u> Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1967.

_____. <u>Secondary Social Studies for the Seventies.</u> New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1973.

Bruner, Jerome S. <u>The Process of Education.</u> Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Counts, George S. <u>Dare the School Build a New Social Order?</u> New York: The John Day Company, Inc., 1932.

Deighton, Lee C. (ed.). <u>The Encyclopedia of Education.</u> New York: The Macmillan Co., and The Free Press, 1971.

Dewey, John. <u>How We Think.</u> Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1933.

_____. <u>Logic.</u> New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938.

Estvan, Frank J. <u>Social Studies in a Changing World.</u> Atlanta: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.

Fenton, Edwin. <u>Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools.</u> New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.

Gross, Neal. <u>Who Runs Our Schools?</u> New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Hullfish, H. Gordon and Phillip G. Smith. <u>Reflective Thinking: The</u> <u>Method of Education.</u> New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, Inc., 1961.

Hunt, Maurice P. and Lawrence E. Metcalf. Teaching High School Social Studies. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

Massialas, Byron G. and Frederick R. Smith (eds.). New Challenges in the Social Studies. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1965.

National Council for the Social Studies. The Historical Approach to Methods of Teaching the Social Studies. Fifth Yearbook. Philadelphia: McKinley Publishing Company, 1935.

Scheffler, Israel. The Language of Education. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1960.

Simon, Frank. A Reconstructive Approach to Problem-Solving in the Social Studies. Calgary, Alberta: John D. McAra Limited, 1970.

Thomas, R. Murray and Dale L. Brubaker. Curriculum Patterns in Elementary Social Studies. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.

_____ and Dale L. Brubaker. Decisions in Teaching Elementary Social Studies. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1971.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Womack, James G. Discovering the Structure of Social Studies. New York: Benziger Brothers, Inc., 1966.

Wynne, John P. Theories of Education. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

B. PERIODICALS

Barth, James L., and Samuel Shermis. "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions," Social Education, XXXIV (November, 1970), 743-51.

Bernstein, Edgar. "Citizenship and the Social Studies," School Review, LXXIX (May, 1971), 455-65.

Best, John Hardin. "A Review of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education Since 1900," The High School Journal, XLIV (December, 1960), 98-105.

Chapin, June R. and Richard E. Gross. "Making Sense Out of the Terminology of the New Social Studies," The Social Studies, LXIII (April, 1972), 147-55.

Childs, John L. "Should the School Seek Actively to Reconstruct Society?" Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CLXXXII (November, 1935), 1-9.

Coe, George A. "Character as End and as Process," Progressive Education, VII (May, 1930), 160-63.

Henderson, Kenneth B. "Anent the Discovery Method," The Mathematics Teacher, April, 1957, pp. 287-91.

Holliday, Troy. "Better Training Means Better Citizens," The Social Studies, LIX (April, 1968), 169-71.

Irwin, Leonard B. "As the Editor Sees It," The Social Studies, LV (February, 1964), 42.

_____. "As the Editor Sees It," The Social Studies, LV (March, 1964), 82.

Jones, Vernon. "Character Education," Review of Educational Research, VIII (February, 1938), 11-14.

Joyce, Bruce R. "Social Action for the Primary School," Childhood Education, XLVI (February, 1970), 254-58.

_____. "Social Sciencing - New Concept in Social Studies," The Instructor (October, 1968), 85-92.

Manson, Gary A., and Elmer D. Williams. "Inquiry: Does It Teach How or What to Think?" Social Education, XXXIV (January, 1970), 79-81.

Nelson, Albert L., and Lisso R. Simmons. "Using Learning Resources for Inquiry," Social Education, XXXIII (May, 1969), 543-46.

Phillips, Richard C. "Implications of Political Socialization Research for the Social Studies Curriculum," The High School Journal, LIII (November, 1969), 99-111.

Rafferty, Max. "Education in Depth," California Education, II (April, 1965), 2.

Rippa, S. Alexander. "Toward a Definition of Citizenship Education," Social Education, XXII (December, 1959), 379-80.

Sanders, Norris M., and Marlin L. Tanck. "A Critical Appraisal of Twenty-Six National Social Studies Projects," Social Education, XXXIV (April, 1970), 383-88.

Schwab, Joseph J. "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline," The Educational Record, XLIII (July, 1962), 197-205.

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Best, John Hardin. "A History of the Development of the Concept of Citizenship Education in America, 1900 to 1950." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1960.

Brubaker, Dale L., Lawrence H. Simon, and Jo Watts Williams. "A Conceptual Framework for Social Studies Curriculum and Instruction." Greensboro, North Carolina: University of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project, 1972. (Mimeographed.)

Ubbelohde, Robert. "Social Studies and Reality - A Commitment to Intelligent, Social Action." Greensboro, North Carolina: University of North Carolina-Greensboro Humanistic Education Project, 1972. (Mimeographed.)