

AN INQUIRY INTO THE CRITERIA FOR CHOICE OF
SUBJECT MATTER IN CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVE,
NEW-TYPE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS

by

Mary Elizabeth Cooling

B.S., State Teachers College, 1940
(Glassboro, N.J.)

M.A., Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944.

Submitted to the Department of
Education and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the
degree of Doctor of Education.

Diss
1954
Cooling
c.2

May, 1954

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. The Setting, Nature, and Purpose of the Inquiry	1
VALIDATION OF THE ASSUMPTION BASIC TO THE INQUIRY	
II. Existence of Criteria for Selection of Subject Matter in the Curriculum Proposals of Rousseau, Bobbitt, and Morrison	21
ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION OF CRITERIA IN CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVE, NEW-TYPE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS	
III. Criteria Suggested by Hollis L. Caswell in <u>Curriculum Development</u>	58
IV. Criteria Suggested by Caswell in <u>Democracy and the Curriculum</u>	91
V. Criteria Suggested by Caswell in <u>Education in the Elementary School; The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity, and Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems</u>	119
VI. Criteria Suggested by J. Paul Leonard in <u>Developing the Secondary School Curriculum</u> and in Other Works	144
VII. Criteria Suggested by Stratemeyer, Forkner, McKim, et al., in <u>Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living</u>	171
SUMMARY	
VIII. Review of the Inquiry, Conclusions, Further Comments	181
BIBLIOGRAPHY	193
ABSTRACT	198

Chapter I

THE SETTING, NATURE, AND PURPOSE OF THE INQUIRY

A. The Setting

The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education was an inventory and appraisal of curriculum-making in American education.¹ The intent of the Committee on Curriculum-Making, which produced the work, was to determine how the content of the curriculum should be assembled and, if possible, to unify or reconcile the various philosophies of curriculum then current.²

The Committee recognized the existence of three well-established curriculum views--one in which fixed subject-matter boundaries were heeded, another with focus on child growth, and a third which emphasized the scientific study of social usage.³ The Committee also found a nationwide curriculum revision movement to be just getting under way. Educators seemed to be becoming increasingly dissatisfied with traditional programs. Their modifications of curriculum, however, were seen to consist primarily

1 National Society for the Study of Education, The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, Part I, Curriculum-Making, Past and Present; Part II, The Foundations of Curriculum-Making; Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926.

2 Ibid., Part I, p. ix.

3 Ibid., p. xi.

"of the century-old practice of the introduction of new subjects and the dropping of old ones."¹

Within the movement several apparently related practices of a different nature were also noted.² In some few schools, subjects were being enriched with new content. In others, broad departments were being formed, with separate but related subjects combined into such courses as general mathematics and social studies. Courses embracing two different departments such as English and social studies were being organized. New textbooks and syllabi were being produced, chiefly in laboratory schools, but administrators and teachers in other schools were beginning to use such materials. Taken all together, these curriculum changes seemed to indicate to the Committee that within the nationwide movement there was a tendency to break down traditional subject-matter lines. The Committee commented:

Among the more promising efforts at reorganization are those which point towards the re-departmentalization of the program. Although the starting point of curriculum revision is the school subject, although this procedure ordinarily consists of the rearrangement by committees of materials within school subjects, nevertheless there is a discernible tendency to break down certain barriers which have been erected between departments of knowledge.³

1 Ibid., pp. 428-429.

2 Ibid., p. 431.

3 Loc. cit. Underscoring not in original.

That this tendency to alter subject-matter boundaries was proceeding very slowly was readily admitted.¹ But the Committee who wrote the yearbook apparently deemed it a tendency to encourage. In the Committee's "General Statement: Foundations of Curriculum-Making," it pointed out "the necessity of grouping in broader units much material which is now distributed through several distinct school subjects."² The Committee said:

Because of the great changes in modern life, there is at present a real need in certain fields for a new synthesis of knowledge and, correspondingly, for a new grouping of the materials of the school.... This proposal does not imply mere merging or fusing of the present content of existing school subjects. It implies, on the contrary, that the materials of instruction should be assembled from the starting point of the needs of the learner, irrespective of the content and boundaries of existing subjects.³

The Committee concluded its statement on the place of school subjects in instruction by hearty commendation of experimentation in uniting "in single general courses bodies of knowledge which heretofore have been separated."⁴

1 Ibid., p. 432.

2 Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, Part II, p. 22.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Ibid., p. 23.

Complete accord could not be reached in the general statement, so supplemental statements were made by nine of the twelve Committee members.¹ Examination of the statements seems to reveal distinctly differing suggestions for rearrangement or replacement of school subjects, but all Committee members seemed to agree that movement toward some kind of unification of subject matter had already started and should be guided by experimentation. This conclusion, it is to be noted, was drawn as early as 1926.

Twenty-eight years have elapsed since then. Let us see what has happened to the tendency to break down subject-matter boundaries to which the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook called attention and gave encouragement. Leonard shows that, when a number of small professional organizations, in the late 1920's and in the 1930's, studied their own subject-matter fields (at both elementary and secondary levels), they recommended for the most part the subject approach to curriculum organization but provided for some kind of correlation with other subjects.² This was not a great change, but it was a step. Within a few years, venturesome steps seem to have been taken. Statewide, city, and individual school programs built on a framework of themes,

1 Ibid., pp. 29-162.

2 J. Paul Leonard, Developing the Secondary School Curriculum, New York: Rinehart and Company, 1946, Chapter VI.

culture epochs, or social functions instead of subjects became somewhat common after 1930, particularly in elementary schools.¹ By 1937, Spears observed the following as one of twelve definite tendencies in curriculum-making:

Even though subject matter lines still stand out clearly, the present curriculum movement is already providing means by which departments may cooperate and even merge parts of their program in the effort to place the child above administrative procedures. Learning situations rather than subjects or classes are in the minds of teachers and administrators.²

Increasingly during the last three decades, schemes for reorganization of subject matter have been described and discussed by individuals and by professional groups.³ These proposals have included, for the elementary

1 Henry Harap, et al., The Changing Curriculum, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1937, pp. 87 ff.

2 Harold Spears, Experiences in Building a Curriculum, New York: The American Book Company, 1937, p. 189.

3 See all volumes of Education Index. See also: Harold Alberty, Reorganizing the High School Curriculum, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948; Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Curriculum Development, New York: The American Book Company, 1935; Caswell, Education in the Elementary School, New York: The American Book Company, 1942; Caswell, et al., The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946; Harap, op. cit.; Leonard, op. cit.; Florence B. Stratemeyer, H. L. Forkner, M. G. McKim, et al., Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947.

level, variously defined projects, units, activities, areas of living, centers of interest, and broad fields. For the secondary level, unified studies, social-living classes, core curricula, fusion courses, integration courses, and common-learnings programs have been recommended. Perhaps representative of recent suggestions have been those of the Educational Policies Commission. In 1944, it proposed for secondary schools (not as an entire curriculum but as a major portion of one) a core or common-learnings course which abandoned traditional subject-matter organization.¹ In a companion volume on elementary education, issued in 1948, emphasis was placed upon "continuous, accumulative" learning through experiences.² Kinds of experiences which might be thought of as corresponding to subject-matter divisions included the arts of communication, number, social orientation, health, science, and the arts.³ One must gather from this book, "a statement of policy for elementary education," that the Educational Policies Commission anticipated and valued a departure from strict

1 Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944.

2 _____, Education for All American Children, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1948, p. 123.

3 Ibid., pp. 131-143.

subject-matter demarcation in the curriculum. A sampling of current educational literature, both in periodical and in book form, gives the decided impression that many other educators feel as do those on the Commission.

Proposals of professional groups and of individuals for breaking down subject-matter lines seem not yet to be acted upon to any great extent by either elementary or secondary schools. After making a study of the status of curriculum on both levels, Douglass, Otto, and Romine concluded:

Current educational theory tends to favor more progressive curriculum organization, but practice is limited largely to more traditional types.¹

Perceptible trends "toward integration" were noted, however, in several studies reported by the same authors.² Caswell found that

... the war years served to break currents of curriculum development started in the 1930s.... By the close of the war it appeared that a considerable proportion of schools that had made beginnings had discontinued their efforts. Attacks were made on the basic idea by those who supported the conventional program, and it seemed that the plan core curriculum might receive little further trial. More recently,

1 Harl R. Douglass, Henry J. Otto, and Stephen Romine, "Curriculum: Status and Description," Review of Educational Research, 18:236, June, 1948.

2 Ibid., pp. 232, 236.

however, there has been evidence of a marked revival of interest and experimentation... The Office of Education reported in 1950 that more than 800 public high schools had core programs in operation. Some teacher-educating institutions are developing programs for preparation of core teachers.¹

On the other hand, Alberty pointed out that the eight hundred schools having core programs represent "only three and one-half per cent of all the public high schools of the United States" and that "most of the reorganized programs are in junior high and involve little more than putting subjects together."² His outlook seems a little less optimistic than Caswell's when he says:

From the data presented, we must conclude that most high schools are not moving toward basic reorganization of general education. Undoubtedly new subjects are being added and old ones revamped, but the basic structure remains very much the same as it existed before World War II--indeed, before World War I.³

Alberty considers this situation discouraging but does not question that curriculum reorganization is desirable, and

1 Hollis L. Caswell, "Postwar Trends in Curriculum Development," Journal of the National Education Association, 41:93-94, February, 1952. Underscoring not in original.

2 Harold Alberty, "Progress in Curriculum Organization," Educational Leadership, 8:257, January, 1951.

3 Loc. cit.

proceeds to suggest aids for improving leadership so that reorganization can be effected.¹

When one considers that the idea of breaking down subject-matter lines has been before educators for at least twenty-eight years, that curriculum proposals incorporating this idea seem to be multiplying, and that some schools² have been attempting to eliminate subject-matter boundaries, one wonders when the perceptible trends which Douglass, Otto, and Romine reported will dominate actual practice. In any event, it would seem fair to say that the movement toward eliminating subject-matter boundaries, which was pointed out and encouraged in the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, seems to be widespread in curriculum theory. In practice, the movement apparently is alive but not flourishing.

B. The Nature and Purpose of the Inquiry

Ours is a swiftly and steadily changing society which perforce demands rapid and steady educational change. Movements entailing numerous alterations in thought and

1 Alberty, Ibid., pp. 257-259.

2 See: Robert B. Toulouse, "Curriculum Development Survey," School Executive, 68:32-33, August, 1949. (Report of questionnaire study of fifty cities.) Harold G. Shane, "Curriculum Practices in 35 Educationally Interesting Schools," Nation's Schools, 50:41-42, August, 1952. U.S. Office of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Schools, Core Curriculum in Public High Schools, an Inquiry into Practices, 1949. Bull. 1950, No. 5, 32 p.

practice have from time to time swept through our educational system. Not always have these movements represented continuous progress. Now we seem to have a potential movement toward new-type curriculum programs.¹ Before sheer momentum in curriculum theory brings about wholesale and possibly unwarranted adoption of these programs, it behooves us to give them careful consideration.

Our society is avowedly democratic, and educators seem sincere in their commitment to democratic educational practices. It seems reasonable to maintain that any movement to be followed in our schools should be appropriate for our democracy. It also seems reasonable to maintain that to declare one's purpose to be democratic and to persist on a large scale in lines inconsistent with this purpose, thereby standing in one's own way, would seem to be most unwise.

The current movement toward new-type curricula apparently is meant to be appropriate for our democracy. Even casual inspection of the literature reveals intentions to be democratic on the part of advocates of new-type curricula. Also to be found are numerous statements concerning "the relative ineffectiveness" of subject-

1 Inasmuch as no well-established term embracing curricula which break down traditional subject-matter lines seems to exist, the terms "new-type curriculum programs," "proposed curricula," and "new-type curricula" will be employed, interchangeably, in this study.

centered curricula "in contributing to democratic purposes."¹ Apparently, there is a growing conviction that curricula which do not cut across subject-matter lines do not fit students for life in a democracy, and that those which do cut across subject-matter lines do contribute to democratic purposes.

Insofar as this writer has been able to ascertain, the question "Are curricula which cut across subject-matter lines necessarily democratic?" seems not to have been raised. To act intelligently in respect to proposed curricula, it would seem urgent for educators to ask such a question--i.e., to evaluate curricula in terms of their appropriateness for schools in a democratic social order. Limits of time and space preclude comprehensive examination of new-type curricula in all aspects, including criteria for selection of subject matter, modes of organizing subject matter, psychology of learning to be employed, suggested methods of testing, and implications for administration. In this study the writer will deal with only one aspect--criteria for selection of subject matter.

Investigation of criteria employed in choice of subject matter would seem highly important. The vast extent of man's knowledge obviously makes necessary some

1 Alberty, op. cit., pp. 117-118.

selection of subject matter. Criteria for selection, therefore, are fundamental. They are the tests¹ by which one decides to include or to omit any particular bit of subject matter. It is difficult to conceive of a program in which no selection of content takes place, even though the term "criteria for selection of subject matter" appears less frequently in literature than one might expect. Creators of school programs may be unaware of the criteria for subject-matter selection which actually operate in their work. But this fact would scarcely mean the existence of no such criteria. Recognized or not, bases for choice of content would seem to function importantly in every educational program. Assuming this to be true, the writer proposed to conduct an inquiry into the criteria for choice of subject matter in certain representative, new-type curriculum programs. The purpose of the inquiry is to evaluate one aspect of new-type curricula in terms of its appropriateness for democratic education.² It is the hope of the writer that the results of the inquiry will be helpful in determining whether the present movement toward new-type curricula should be encouraged, redirected, or abandoned, inasmuch as ours is a democratic society and democratic educational practices are said to be desired.

1 By dictionary definition, criteria are coercive in nature.

2 This thesis is based on the assumption that it is possible to formulate criteria which are both coercive and democratic. It is, however, not within the scope of this study to propose such criteria, but simply to evaluate criteria which have been proposed in certain representative, new-type curricula.

In making the inquiry, there will be no attempt to examine all new-type curriculum programs. Careful study of a few of the better-known proposals would seem to serve our purpose here.

Curriculum programs selected for study have been determined by asking the following questions:

1. Which proposals seem to appear most frequently in curriculum literature in the last decade?
2. Which proposals are apparently acceptable, at least in theory,¹ to large groups of persons in education?

These questions are obviously not so definitive that they exclude subjective judgment. It is believed, however, that they indicate proposals which can be accepted as reasonably representative. The proposals thus selected are those suggested by the following persons and groups:² Hollis L. Caswell, J. Paul Leonard, and F. L. Stratemeyer, H. L. Forkner, M. G. McKim and their associates.

In examining these specific proposals one might proceed in any of several ways. This writer has chosen to explore each one by asking the following questions:

-
- 1 It has already been indicated (pp. 7-8) that new-type programs have not been put into practice to any great extent.
 - 2 Leonard has pointed out that numerous groups have made significant reports of curriculum studies but that "in general they continue the subject approach to the problem."--Developing the Secondary School Curriculum, pp. 200-201. Such reports are not used in this inquiry inasmuch as they are not considered to be new-type curricula.

1. What criteria for choice of subject matter are to be employed by anyone who wishes to follow the program?
2. Are the criteria for choice of subject matter appropriate for democratic education?
3. Insofar as criteria for choice of subject matter are concerned, can we feel justified in adopting new-type curriculum programs, assuming that the one in question is representative?

Clear-cut, comprehensive, and easily located answers to the first question about each of the proposals would be very helpful in our inquiry. If such answers are obscure or not to be found in direct statements, we shall be obliged to infer them from the total program suggested, from casual comments, and possibly from other writings by the same authors. Weaknesses in this procedure may be apparent, but can scarcely be avoided. Only as we know what the criteria for subject-matter selection are taken to be in a specific program, can we judge, as we plan to do, the appropriateness of the criteria in that program.

C. Justification for the Study

Justification for the proposed inquiry is to be found in the educational situation already described, one which may be summarized as follows:

1. There is a nation-wide movement in both elementary and secondary schools toward

curriculum revision which bears, as one important characteristic, the cutting across of subject-matter lines.

2. The movement appears to be accelerating in curriculum theory.
3. In order to act intelligently in respect to this movement, it would seem highly important to make an inquiry into new-type curriculum programs in order to evaluate them in terms of their appropriateness for democratic education.
4. No inquiry of the kind mentioned seems to have been made.

The writer offers for consideration, therefore, her inquiry into one aspect¹ of new-type curricula, which aspect she assumes is highly important in any curriculum, even though it may not be mentioned often in educational literature.

Justification of the assumption upon which the writer makes her inquiry also seems necessary. If criteria employed in choosing subject matter are not of fundamental importance, i.e., do not function importantly in every program, then an inquiry into criteria for choice of subject matter would seem to be of little consequence in the evaluation of new-type curricula. Inasmuch as the worth of the present study depends directly upon the assumption that criteria are fundamental, Chapter II will be devoted to a critical examination of the validity of the assumption.

1 Criteria for choice of subject matter.

Following Chapter II, which in terms of the study as a whole might be thought of as a lengthy parenthesis, the study will proceed with the basic inquiry. For readers who believe the validity of the assumption to be obvious, for those who are willing to postpone its validation, and for those who for one reason or another are eager to get to the heart of the inquiry, it is recommended that Chapter II be omitted and that the reading of the rest of the study follow immediately upon the conclusion of this chapter.

D. Explanation of the Style and Procedure Used

Some explanation of the style and procedure used by the writer may be in order. This dissertation is not a report of an inquiry nor the recording of the process of making one. For the writer, it IS the inquiry.^{1,2} Studying was not performed and questioning completed, then the results set down upon paper in the manner in which a scientist might report an experiment which he had previously conducted in his laboratory. Rather, the setting-down-upon-

1 Stripped of non-essentials, of course.

2 Mental processes, both the getting of thoughts by means of reading and the construction of "one's own" thoughts, cannot yet be recorded. The nearest thing to them--verbal indication of the line of thought pursued--the writer has faithfully recorded to the best of her ability, believing that the mental processes which were employed are an inextricable part of the written work of this inquiry.

paper process was an integral part of the inquiry. It is said that one's thoughts are clarified and stabilized as they are expressed to others. The truth of that concept seems to have been borne out in this endeavor. Not until some writing was done was each step in the search fully accomplished. As the author first wrestled (in reading, thinking, and writing) with a problem area, then gradually concentrated on one manageable problem within the area, clearing that up in her own mind by collecting data, testing the data by following out their implications in writing, and reworking the whole from time to time, discarding irrelevant material, the inquiry little by little took shape and the writer came to know with more exactness what she was asking and what she was finding. Irrelevant material was judged to be so only after unsuccessful attempts had been made to apply it (again in writing) to the problem at hand. Rewriting, then, was fully comparable in function to rereading, reformulating questions, and reconsidering ideas. As a matter of record, it might be stated that it was not until considerable progress in writing had been made that the writer came to realize how small a segment of the original problem-area in which she was interested was actually being investigated. In fact, one chapter, already written but thought to be superfluous, was laid aside only to be later restored because efforts to supplant it with briefer statements made from a different

approach simply did not take the writer closer to her goal the way she had expected they would. This written document, it is repeated, IS the inquiry; so much so that when the search has reached¹ the place where the author will feel willing tentatively to accept the conclusions, the manuscript should be ready for the typist.

The general procedure employed throughout the study is that of problem-raising, problem-solving--with successive exploration of subsidiary problems as they arise along the way of solving the central problem. Illustrative of this procedure is the present chapter. First, there is stated the immediate setting out of which comes the central problem; next, indications of the reasoning which led to its formulation; and, then, the statement of the problem itself, followed by what justification seems due the reader.

No detailed pattern of formal steps has been followed in the problem-raising, problem-solving procedure. All of the well-known steps in the experimental method--forming hypotheses, collecting data, testing hypotheses, tentatively drawing conclusions--have been employed, but not in any fixed order. In many instances individual steps were not finished before others were started, and what was

1 This section is being written after much but not all of the inquiry has been accomplished.

one moment a tentative conclusion became a hypothesis the next. It was impossible to keep the steps separate nor did the author try. Her chief concerns were that, within necessary limits, all available, relevant data be applied in reasonable fashion and with sincere effort towards full and frank recognition of personal bias, and that her inquiry be developed in such a way that others, in reading it, go through the same line of research and know precisely wherein they concur or differ.

Carrying out the problem-raising, problem-solving procedure seemed to require a style different from that employed in dissertations reporting results of research. Instead of assertions followed by data defending them or of a step-by-step description of procedure with a summary of conclusions, there are numerous questions or statements which in effect raise questions, many quotations from which answers to questions are formulated, frequent projections of ideas (If such and such were adopted where would it lead?) and, in general, a "teasing out" from the accumulating data whatever conclusions seem to be warranted. The writer is conscious of the process she is employing and deliberately tries to make the reader aware of it also. In doing so she runs the risk of disturbing readers accustomed to flat assertions followed by defense. The experience of reading this inquiry, the writer believes, should be as if one were to stand beside a laboratory

scientist who thought aloud as he worked. One would see what materials were used, what questions he was posing for himself, how he went about answering them, wherein he failed or succeeded in using available, relevant data intelligently, at what points he began uncovering what eventually became his conclusions, and what form his conclusions took when search was suspended. In at least one respect this analogy does not hold. The waste motions, the irrelevant material, the inept expression of ideas have to the best of the writer's ability been eliminated from this study. She repeatedly used, as a measure of her own grasp of the problem, the question "Is it clear enough for others to follow?"

This dissertation then, minus indications of dead-end streets and trackless wastes explored by the author, constitutes her inquiry. Other persons in the field of education, because of the style and procedure, should be able to make similar inquiry via the printed page and arrive at similar conclusions if the data have been adequate and the reasoning accurate.

Chapter II

EXISTENCE OF CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF SUBJECT MATTER IN THE CURRICULUM PROPOSALS OF ROUSSEAU, BOBBITT, AND MORRISON

A. Introduction

Basic to the present inquiry is the assumption that criteria for choice of subject matter function importantly in every program of instruction. Because the worth of the present study depends directly upon this assumption, a critical examination of its validity is felt to be needed before the inquiry proceeds

If the assumption be true, criteria for choice of subject matter will be present in all curriculum proposals, either in straightforward statement or by implication. One way to check the validity of the assumption, then, is to examine specific educational plans to see whether criteria for selection of subject matter are present and functioning in each one. We shall conduct such an examination in this chapter. Investigation of many educational plans would, in the writer's judgment, make this work unnecessarily long. In order to return as soon as possible to the study's major line of thought, only a sampling of plans will be used to determine the validity of the assumption. The programs proposed by Jean Jacques Rousseau, Franklin Bobbitt, and Henry Clinton Morrison have been chosen for

this test inasmuch as they are widely known and broadly representative of other educational plans.

B. Criteria in Rousseau's Program

At the first mention of Rousseau one might think, "Surely that exponent of freedom, that emancipator of childhood employed nothing so binding as criteria for choice of subject matter. If there be educational plans without criteria, his must head the list." We ask ourselves, "What does a study of Rousseau's plan indicate in regard to his use of criteria for choice of subject matter? If Rousseau dispenses with such criteria, then other educational planners may also, and the basic assumption of this study would seem unfounded." We turn to the well-known Emile for answer.

In Emile, Rousseau takes as his goal of education the teaching of a child to live, to be a man as nature intended.

Before his parents chose a calling for
him nature called him to be a man.
Life is the trade I would teach him.¹

Three masters of all men are acknowledged by Rousseau--
nature, men, and things.

1 Jean Jacques Rousseau, Emile, translated by Barbara Foxley, New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1911. Everyman's Library Edition, p. 9.

The inner growth of our organs and faculties is the education of nature. The use we learn to make of this growth is the education of men, what we gain by our experience of our surroundings is the education of things. . . . if their teaching agrees, he [the child] goes straight to his goal, he lives at peace with himself, he is well-educated.¹

Harmony among the three conflicting forces is to be achieved by subordinating all else to the "development of the child and the natural growth of the human heart,"² "follow [ing] the lead of that which is beyond our control [nature]."³ This following of nature seems to be for Rousseau the method of education by which to arrive at the goal of knowing how to live.

In following the lead of nature, is there anything in particular to be taught, i.e., is there any selection to be made of subject matter? One might think not, after recalling the very first sentence in Emile: "God makes all things good; man meddles with them and they become evil." We might infer from this declaration, if we take it to be true, that the proper thing to do is to employ a "hands-off" policy, teaching nothing at all, lest it be meddlesome to do so and result in evil. We continue our reading of Emile to

1 Ibid., p. 6.

2 Ibid., p. 18.

3 Ibid., p. 6.

see whether this idea of teaching nothing at all is reinforced in subsequent statements, and find:

What must be done to train this exceptional man! We can do much, but the chief thing is to prevent anything from being done.¹

[In speaking about a tutor for a child]
... I prefer to call the man who has this knowledge master rather than teacher, since it is a question of guidance rather than instruction. He must not give precepts, he must let the scholar find them out for himself.²

As I said before, man's education begins at birth; before he can speak or understand he is learning. Experience precedes instruction;...³

The only habit the child should be allowed to contract is that of having no habits...⁴

With our foolish and pedantic methods we are always preventing children from learning what they could learn much better for themselves...⁵

Exercise his body, his limbs, his senses, his strength, but keep his mind idle as

1 Ibid., p. 9.

2 Ibid., p. 19. Underscoring not in original.

3 Ibid., p. 29.

4 Ibid., p. 30.

5 Ibid., p. 42.

long as you can... Leave childhood to ripen in your children.¹

Therefore the education of the earliest years should be merely negative. It consists, not in teaching virtue or truth, but in preserving the heart from vice and from the spirit of error.²

When these direct statements are considered it would seem possible to think of Rousseau as advocating negative education, negative in the sense of teaching nothing at all, letting nature take her own course. A desultory sampling of educational literature reveals casual statements which would seem to indicate that this is the way Rousseau is sometimes interpreted.³ When the belief is held that there is no body of subject matter to be taught, criteria for selection of subject matter could scarcely be necessary. They are insignificant if not non-existent in this interpretation of Rousseau's plan. It would seem, then, that criteria for selection of subject matter are not fundamental and are probably not even present in Rousseau's

1 Ibid., p. 58.

2 Ibid., p. 57.

3 See the following: H. L. Caswell, Education in the Elementary School, New York: American Book Company, 1942, p. 88. G. D. Strayer, G. W. Fraser, and W. D. Armentrout, Principles of Teaching, New York: American Book Company, 1936, p. 36. Adolph E. Meyer, The Development of Education in the Twentieth Century, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939, pp. 1-2.

educational program.¹

It is difficult for the writer, however, to terminate at this point a study of Rousseau. It seems far-fetched to think of no subject matter at all being taught, or of permitting circumstances alone to determine what is learned. The questions arise, "Does everyone construe in this fashion Rousseau's suggestion to 'follow the lead of nature'? Is he truly believed to be advocating complete, unhindered freedom, teaching no subject matter at all?" It would seem that some educators interpret him thus, especially when they make such statements as:

Education is conceived of as a negative process, a matter of laissez-faire, a "hands-off" policy. Rousseau aims at warding off the evils of artificial society so that the natural goodness of the child may be free to unfold itself in all its spontaneity.²

Moreover, the whole system of instruction is likewise to be abandoned, for it is founded upon a false psychology. Emile is not to be taught the curricula of the schools; nor indeed, is he to be taught anything. Experience alone will form his course of study. He learns what he likes, when he likes, and how he likes.³

-
- 1 One might labor the point and reason that if nothing is taught by the teacher then natural circumstances determine, i.e., "select" subject matter. In this case, one criterion does exist: whatever natural circumstances dictate or "select."
 - 2 Elmer Harrison Wilds, The Foundations of Modern Education, New York: Rinehart and Company, 1936, p. 384.
 - 3 Frederick Eby and Charles Flinn Arrowood, The Development

But these writers, and others, also point out or at least imply that Rousseau really goes beyond this sheer negative education to a modified form in which there is provision of an environment which will encourage development according to nature. As soon as mention is made of providing a particular environment with a view toward accomplishing a specific end, assuredly a teaching program of some sort is implied. Not often is this aspect of Rousseau's theory--provision of a particular environment--given as much emphasis as his more revolutionary idea of "negative education," but many interpreters of Rousseau do mention it. Wilds, for instance, says:

Since naturalistic education is largely negative in character, the task of those in charge of education consists mostly of keeping the traditional subject matter away from the pupil.¹

But he also says:

The content of the curriculum is made up of the phenomena of nature, presented in the natural order in which they become manifest to the child.²

of Modern Education, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934, p. 490.

1 Wilds, op. cit., p. 389. Underscoring not in original.

2 Loc. cit. Underscoring not in original.

So some subject matter is to be taught. Eby and Arrowood likewise hint at finding in Rousseau's writings somewhat of a teaching program:

However, Rousseau had in view something quite different from the ordinary conception of the easy-going life.... He relieved his fictitious pupil of the harsh yoke of the conventional system of education. But in its place he put the severe yoke of necessity. Just what Rousseau means by subjecting the child to things and necessity he does not fully reveal.¹

In all this opposition to the aims of education of the past, Rousseau was pleading for a generous, liberal cultivation of the natural endowments of the child.²

Monroe interprets Rousseau even more clearly as having a teaching program:

By this negative education... Rousseau did not maintain that there should be no education at all; but that there should be one very different in kind from the accepted educational practices.³

Mulhern says about Rousseau:

1 Eby and Arrowood, op. cit., pp. 490-491.

2 Ibid., p. 479.

3 Paul Monroe, A Textbook in the History of Education, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909, p. 558. Under-scored words originally in italics.

So sweeping is his negation of the old traditional education that he would preserve but the merest fragments of it. Do the opposite, said he, of what is customary and you will almost certainly be right. But his was not a merely negative position. In the place of the old, which he would destroy, he places the new education which he describes in great detail...¹

Despite the many statements to the effect that Rousseau advocates no teaching at all² there seems also to be some kind of teaching program referred to or described wherever his work is carefully analyzed.³ Apparently, in regard to the following of nature, the interpretation of Emile has been made in contradictory ways: (1) No subject matter is to be taught. (2) Certain subject matter is to be taught.

Whether this dual interpretation is justified remains to be seen. It has already been shown that, at

1 James Mulhern, A History of Education, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946, p. 348.

2 See the following: R. Freeman Butts, A Cultural History of Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947, pp. 323, 345; Stephen Duggan, A Student's Textbook in the History of Education, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1936, p. 203; Frank P. Graves, A History of Education in Modern Times, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913, pp. 9, 10, 11.

3 See the following: I. B. Berkson, Education Faces the Future, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943, p. 103; Duggan, op. cit., p. 208; Eby and Arrowood, op. cit., p. 469; Graves, op. cit., pp. 18, 120-121; Tadasu Misawa, Modern Educators and Their Ideals, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1909, p. 62.

least in isolated sentences, Rousseau proposed a "hands-off" policy. If he gave other counsel which permits a different interpretation of his proposal it should be readily apparent in Emile.

We turn to Emile and find:

Yet things would be worse without this education [by man] and mankind cannot be made by halves. Under existing conditions a man left by himself from birth would be more of a monster than the rest...shield it [the child] from the crushing force of social conventions. Tend and water it ere it dies.... From the outset raise a wall around your child's soul; another may sketch the plan, you alone should carry it into execution.¹

As soon as the child begins to take notice, what is shown him must be carefully chosen.²

As he gets older I would have the child trained to bathe occasionally in hot water of every bearable degree and often in every degree of cold water.³

His geography will begin with the town he lives in and his father's country house, then the places between them, the rivers near them, and then the sun's aspect and how to find one's way by its aid.⁴

1 Rousseau, op. cit., pp. 5-6. Underscoring not in original.

2 Ibid., p. 30.

3 Ibid., p. 27.

4 Ibid., p. 134.

To select these objects, to take care to present him constantly with those he may know, to conceal from him those he ought not to know, this is the real way of training his early memory; and in this way you must try to provide him with a storehouse of knowledge which will serve for his education in youth and his conduct throughout life.¹

Here we seem to find instance after instance wherein Rousseau asserts that Emile is not to be left alone but is to be taught something. Although shielding the child from society, teaching him nothing, does seem to be a part of Rousseau's plan,² teaching him something likewise seems to be a part. To emphasize one of these aspects to the exclusion of the other would seem to be making choices in theory which Rousseau himself did not make.³ It would scarcely be a fair presentation of Rousseau's beliefs to cite some and ignore the others. It is unfortunate, perhaps, that he did not notice his apparently contradictory statements and refute one position or the other. But, since no refutation seems to have been made, it would seem only just to take his work as it stands, acknowledging both possibilities of interpretation.

1 Ibid., p. 76. Underscoring not in original.

2 See pp. 23-25 of this study.

3 Throughout Emile, Rousseau appears to take first one position, then the other. Neither position seems to predominate, nor can any one direction of shift be discerned by this writer.

As has been indicated previously, if one insists that Rousseau advocates only strictly negative education, with a complete "hands-off" policy, letting nature take her own course, then one might say no criteria for choice of subject matter by a teacher exist in his plan. (Criteria for a teacher's choice are superfluous when a teacher does not have to choose.)¹ But it is difficult, in light of foregoing data, to see how anyone can so insist. It seems necessary to conclude that at least a little teaching is to be done, in spite of Rousseau's repeated assertions to the contrary.

If something--over against nothing--is to be taught, is not selection of subject matter implied? This writer thinks it is. If there be any doubt that Rousseau intended selection to be made, there are to be considered the numerous choices which he made for Emile, as well as the following expression of his views:

Human intelligence is finite, and not only can no man know everything, he cannot even acquire all the scanty knowledge of others... We must, therefore, choose what to teach as well as when to teach it.²

1 Some persons might stretch the meaning of the word "choice" and reason that, even so, there is the criterion of selection by default--choosing not to choose.

2 Rousseau, op. cit., p. 129. Underscoring not in original.

There can be little doubt that Rousseau, at least at this point in his writing, intended selection to take place. We look for criteria which guided his selection and find:

Some of the information within our reach is false, some is useless, some merely serves to puff up its possessor. The small store which really contributes to our welfare alone deserves the study of a wise man, and therefore of a child whom one would have wise. He must know not merely what is, but what is useful. From this small stock we must also deduct those truths which require a full-grown mind for their understanding, those which suppose a knowledge of man's relations to his fellow-men, a knowledge which no child can acquire; these things, although in themselves true, lead an inexperienced mind into mistakes with regard to other matters.¹

Would you guide him [Emile] along this dangerous path and draw the veil from the face of nature? Stay your hand. First make sure that neither he nor you will become dizzy.²

In other words, teach what is useful and what can be understood; proceed cautiously in doing so, preferring ignorance to error. But what is useful? Specifically he does not seem to say, other than what really contributes to our welfare (for which, apparently, we must be the judge). In no place does Rousseau seem to come closer to criteria for

1 Loc. cit.

2 Loc. cit. See also p. 76, "...all the ideas..."

choice than the preceding quotations indicate--whatever is useful and understandable. Since he made definite choices for Emile, it may be presumed that he used, consciously or unconsciously, some particular definition of what is useful and understandable. But what the definitions were, it is difficult to know. Many educators would differ considerably in their choices of "what is useful and understandable." Consequently, one seems obliged to conclude that there is no really clear plan for choosing subject matter in Rousseau's treatise, and that any one group that attempted to follow him would become confused.

In summary, it seems not too much to say that, unless a one-sided and scarcely fair interpretation is given to Rousseau's Emile (construing it to be sheer negative education), there is to be found in his proposal a teaching program in which criteria for choice of subject matter are inherent, and acted upon, but not as clearly identified as one might wish. Besides being present, criteria for choice of subject matter also seem to be functioning importantly in Emile. The goal (knowing how to live) is to be reached by following nature. In following nature, only certain experiences are to be given children so that (1) they will have an adequate "storehouse of knowledge" by which to conduct themselves through life, and (2) they will not make mistakes because of getting

information prematurely. In choosing which experiences are to be had and when they shall occur, it seems that criteria for choice must be applied. In this one curriculum proposal, then, we can say that criteria for selection of subject matter are present and are functioning importantly. Thus far out basic assumption seems valid.

C. Criteria in Bobbitt's Program

The second educational plan to be examined is that of Franklin Bobbitt. The question to be considered is, "Are criteria for choice of subject matter present and functioning importantly in his proposal?" For answer we turn first to his book, How to Make a Curriculum,¹ which presents the plan of approach used in a program of curriculum improvement in Los Angeles.

To the would-be curriculum-maker Bobbitt suggests:

It is helpful to begin with the simple assumption, to be accepted literally, that education is to prepare men and women for the activities of every kind which make up, or which ought to make up, well-rounded adult life; that it has no other purpose; that everything should be done with a view to this purpose; and that nothing should be

1 Franklin Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924.

included which does not serve this purpose... When we know what men and women ought to do along the many lines and levels of human experience, then we shall have before us the things for which they should be trained. The first task is to discover the activities which ought to make up the lives of men and women; and along with these, the abilities and personal qualities necessary for proper performance. These are the educational objectives.¹

The plan to be employed is activity-analysis. The first step² is to analyze the broad range of human experience into major fields. . . the second step is to take them, one after the other, and analyze them into their more specific activities.... The activities once discovered, one can then see the objectives of education. These latter are the abilities to perform in proper ways the activities.³

Essentially, this appears to be the same proposal that Bobbitt made in his earlier book, The Curriculum.⁴ There he seemed to say, "Find out what men and women are doing or ought to be doing, analyze these activities into specific

1 Ibid., pp. 7-8. Underscoring not in original.

2 This appears to be, in reality, Bobbitt's second step, and his stated "second" no doubt is his third. From the previous quotation (underscored portion) we gather that only selected phases of human experience are to be analyzed. If so, one must determine desirable experience before taking the so-called "first" step of analyzing it.

3 Ibid., pp. 8-10. Underscored work originally in italics.

4 _____, The Curriculum, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918.

'abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that men need'¹ then arrange as the curriculum a 'series of things which children and youth must do and experience.'² Educators should know the total range of specifics that one should possess and then aim at those 'not specifically attained as a result of the general un-directed experience',³ and those to be found in the best kind or quality of human affairs."⁴ In 1924, Bobbitt added further modifications to the list of what is to be taught. This can be seen in the following quotations:

Certain attitudes, characteristics, and abilities cannot be made the objectives of public education because the community is too much divided.⁵

Certain abilities are precluded by practical conditions. The ability to swim, for example, cannot be an objective where the schools lack swimming facilities.⁶

Some of the abilities that will be set down in the general comprehensive list

1. Ibid., p. 42.

2. Loc. cit. Italicized in the original.

3. Ibid., p. 44.

4. Ibid., p. 48.

5. Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum, p. 36.

6. Loc. cit.

must be of a type which are possible and practicable for only a part of the population. Whether we like the matter or not, we must recognize the plain fact that individuals differ in their natural capacities.¹

The heart of Bobbitt's message, then, seems to be: Prepare men and women for adult life by finding activities which men perform, or those which they should perform, training for those. Emphasize in the schools what is not learned elsewhere, what the community is willing to have, and what physical facilities and children's abilities will permit.

What, then, is Bobbitt's basis for selection of subject matter? It seems to be whatever specific abilities² men need in order to do what they are doing or should be doing, modified to some extent by expediency. For some educators, this seemed to mean simple (though extensive or prolonged) and very objective observation of the actual activities of mankind, basically adult. To find what should be taught in spelling, Ayres analyzed two thousand simple business and personal letters because he took them to be

1 Ibid., p. 41.

2 After Bobbitt characterizes the objectives as "abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that men need" (The Curriculum, p. 42), he seems to adopt the one term "abilities" to include them all. It is in this sense that "abilities" is used from here on, in referring to Bobbitt's writing.

what the ordinary person writes.¹ In determining what language and grammar should be taught, numerous studies were made of errors committed both in oral and written work.² Wilson made a study "to determine the arithmetic actually used by adults in their social and business relationships,"³ so that decision could be made as to what arithmetic should enter the curriculum. From Bobbitt's own statements, these observations and analyses⁴ would seem appropriate, especially in light of the following:

The central theory is simple. Human life, however varied, consists in the performance of specific activities... However numerous and diverse they may be for any social class, they can be discovered. This requires only that one go out into the world of affairs and discover the particulars of which these affairs consist.⁵

-
- 1 L. P. Ayres, The Spelling Vocabularies of Personal and Business Letters, Division of Education, Russell Sage Foundation, Pamphlet No. E 126, 1913. Cited by Bobbitt in The Curriculum, p. 47.
 - 2 Summarized in W. W. Charters, Curriculum Construction, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1923, pp. 194-211. Cited by Bobbitt in How to Make a Curriculum, p. 9.
 - 3 G. M. Wilson, A Survey of the Social and Business Usage of Arithmetic, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1919.
 - 4 Analyses in the sense of finding by inference the specific "abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge that men need." Bobbitt, The Curriculum, p. 42.
 - 5 Loc. cit. Underscoring not in original.

It is questionable whether all persons would care to accept at face value Bobbitt's assertion that discovery of activities is a simple matter. This writer would not, and she believes that she would have company in her refusal. The world of affairs commonly includes such activities as petty thievery, malicious gossip, and cut-throat competition. It would seem contrary to the aims of our society to analyze these activities and to train children for them. Furthermore, Bobbitt himself does not include such aspects of life in his investigations. Simple observation and analysis of social practice, therefore, do not seem to be just what he means for his method of choosing subject matter.

For more light on what he does mean, we look again at his apparent criterion for choosing subject matter, "whatever men are doing or should be doing." When we attempt to apply this criterion we seem immediately to fall into a dilemma. When shall the activities which men now perform be considered unworthy of analysis and perpetuation so that we must, instead, analyze what they should perform? In regard to this Bobbitt has made the comment that:

Investigators, without pre-suppositions as to content of vocational curriculum /for example/ set out to discover the major occupations of the city, the processes to be performed in each, and

the knowledge, habits, and skills needed for effective work.¹

And again:

He [the curriculum-maker] will start out without prejudice as to the specific objectives. All that he needs for the work is pencil, notebook, and a discerning intelligence.²

But Bobbitt also says:

The objectives of education are not to be discovered within just any kind or quality of human affairs... Education is established upon the presumption that human activities exist upon different levels of quality or efficiency; that performance of low character is not good; that it can be eliminated through training; and that only the best or at least the best attainable is good enough.³

Investigators apparently are to work "without presuppositions" or "prejudgments" yet the objectives of education are to be found only in the "best" kind of human affairs. This indicates that throughout their canvasses investigators must decide which of man's activities are worthy of analysis so that they may discover the objectives within them. Presumably, if good activities are not found, then those

1 Ibid., p. 47. Underscoring not in original.

2 Ibid., p. 48. Underscoring not in original.

3 Loc. cit.

which men should be doing are to be substituted, again with decisions made by the investigators.

Bobbitt does not seem to specify that a particular view is necessary for carrying out his program. But when decisions similar to these just described are called for, a point of view seems necessarily to be involved. Investigators of social practice may be expected, in Bobbitt's plan, to work without presuppositions or prejudgments as to what the objectives of education shall be, but it is difficult to see how selection is to be made of the best quality of human affairs without predisposition toward certain choices because of the investigators' own outlook on life. The writer can visualize a situation wherein, because of their differences in choice of activities to be analyzed, two educators would differ widely in carrying out Bobbitt's program.

Curiously enough, Bobbitt found himself in a comparable situation toward the close of his career. The American Historical Association's Commission on the Social Studies made an extensive investigation of the conditions and trends of contemporary society.¹ Bobbitt looked forward to their report, believing that these "experts" would

1 American Historical Association, Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (Report, pt. 16), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

furnish suitable direction for education in the social studies. The experts, however, differed in their conclusions so that some refused to sign the report. Furthermore, to Bobbitt's great dismay, the majority concluded that a new type of collectivistic democracy was emerging. Bobbitt burst forth in scathing denunciation of their findings,¹ basing his judgment, apparently, on his own sturdy faith that democracy can only mean rugged individualism. As one writer pointed out, "Professor Bobbitt's merited success during an era of economic individualism and acquisitive egoism makes him partial to that era."² Clearly, the simple prescription of investigating social practice "without presuppositions" did not work as Bobbitt had expected.

Anyone who wishes to use Bobbitt's method for choice of subject matter should be aware that one's socioeconomic philosophy will necessarily play a large part in determining what is to be taught. By the very act of selecting "good" activities to be analyzed, the abilities, attitudes, habits, appreciations, and forms of knowledge to be derived from those activities will be slanted in a

1 Franklin Bobbitt, "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies," School and Society, 40:201-208, August 18, 1934.

2 N. J. Weiss, "Concerning Professor Bobbitt's Criticism," School and Society, 40:446-449, October 6, 1934.

particular direction. As Bode has clearly shown, "No scientific analysis known to man can determine the desirability or the need of anything."¹ What we see as a "need" depends upon what we happen to want.

Another aspect of Bobbitt's curriculum program should be considered at this point. After analysis has been made of what men are or should be doing, the abilities "needed" for those activities must be ascertained. The abilities constitute the objectives of education. It would seem important, then, that curriculum workers be told how to determine the abilities, i.e., the objectives of education. We look into Bobbitt's writings for guides on this matter and find:

The activities once discovered, one can then see the objectives of education. These latter are the abilities to perform in proper ways the activities. The two are cognate, but not identical.²

Perhaps it appeared to Bobbitt that recognition of cognate abilities would quite naturally and obviously follow discovery of the activities. But, to this writer, recognition of abilities does not seem natural and obvious. Precisely,

1 Boyd H. Bode, Modern Educational Theories, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927, pp. 80-81.

2 Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum, p. 10. Underscoring not in original. "Abilities" originally in italics.

how does one see the objectives of education, i.e., the abilities related to activities of man?

We turn to a sample situation which might throw some light on this matter. Let us suppose that an educator is aware of the common activity of shopping in self-service super markets. Involved in the general activity, the educator finds such particular tasks as choosing one can of food from several brands, and waiting in line for purchases to be checked and paid for. Having discovered these specific activities (among numerous others, to be sure) he should, then, according to Bobbitt, see the related abilities to be taught. Undoubtedly, the educator would see some related abilities. But the difficulty is, he might see more than one of a kind, some of which were contradictory to each other. For example, he might "see" the ability to make good guesses as to the quality of canned goods, being grateful for having several brands from which to choose, and also "see" the ability to agitate for standardized information on can labels. He might "see" the ability to wait patiently in line to pay one's bill as well as the ability to write to Congress asking for a return to small, privately owned stores. To complicate matters, if he were working with other educators to determine the objectives of education, they might "see" still other abilities to be taught. Since people must

frequently wait in line in super markets they could be taught to recite poetry, chat with their fellow-sufferers, plan revenge, meditate upon their sins, refashion the social order, or just stay in line, more or less devoid of mental activity. Which of these abilities are "seen" as objectives of education would seem to depend upon one's outlook upon life. Whatever appears important in carrying on life's activities in the way the educator thinks they should be carried on will tend to be interpreted as cognate with the activities which have been "discovered." Once more we seem to find that one's socio-economic philosophy will play a large part in determining what is taught if Bobbitt's method for selection of subject matter is used. Besides influencing the choice of activities to analyze, one's philosophy will affect the way "cognate abilities" are "seen" as objectives of education.

Further investigation might be made of Bobbitt's proposal to see whether he himself was fully aware of, and vocal in, what he believed and how it was influencing his choice of subject matter. That, however, hardly seems necessary here. The question which we raised at the beginning of this part of Chapter II--Are criteria for choice of subject matter present and functioning importantly?--seems to be answered in the affirmative. Bobbitt's proposal was found to suggest one criterion--

whatever specific abilities men need to do what they are doing or should be doing, modified to some extent by expediency. To be sure, that which is selected by means of this criterion seems considerably influenced by the philosophy of those who do the selecting. A more accurate statement, even though a bit clumsy, might be, "whatever specific abilities the curriculum worker believes men need to do what they are doing or to do what the curriculum worker believes they should be doing."

In Bobbitt's proposal, then, as in Rousseau's, more considerations seem to be demanded of the curriculum worker than at first meet the eye. Be that as it may, we seem obliged to say that at least one criterion for choice of subject matter is present in Bobbitt's plan. Moreover, his criterion seems to function importantly. According to him, education is solely "to prepare men and women for the activities which make up, or which ought to make up, well-rounded adult life."¹ To reach this goal, one is obliged to use Bobbitt's criterion for choice of subject matter to find both what to include and what to exclude in school curricula. In the two educational plans used thus far as examples, our basic assumption of the existence and functioning of criteria for subject-matter selection seems to be valid.

1 Bobbitt, op. cit., p. 7.

D. Criteria in Morrison's Program

The third and last curriculum proposal to be examined in this chapter is Henry Clinton Morrison's. We wish to see whether criteria for choice of subject matter are present and functioning importantly in his plan.

Education, for Morrison, is "adjustment to the objective conditions of life."¹ It "is not learning what to do but becoming the kind of person who knows what to do."² The race of man through organic evolution has made physical adjustments to the universe by a long series of adaptations. In a similar way the individual human being makes permanent and unitary personality adaptations in the form of attitudes or acquired abilities.³ But, instead of being inherited, personality adaptations are learned and thus become the objectives of education.⁴

Morrison calls these personality adaptations "inward personality accretions" for every one of which there is an "external objective correlate of the learning--

1 Henry C. Morrison, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Rev. Ed., 1931, p. 37.

2 _____, Basic Principles in Education, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934, p. 107.

3 Skills are but temporary adjustments in the application of new attitudes or abilities.

4 Morrison, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, pp. 19-21.

that is to say, a thing to be learned as well as a learning."¹ In his first and probably best-known book on teaching theory he loses no time in defining these "things to be learned," i.e., subject matter.

... we may define for our purposes the external things-to-be-learned as learning units, and further define a serviceable learning unit as a comprehensive and significant aspect of the environment, of an organized science, of an art, or of conduct, which being learned, results in an adaptation in personality... The term environment must not be understood as limited to the physical external universe. Within our meaning, our own bodies are part of the environment. More important, the institutions which constitute the working fabric of society are environment. So is the great body of cultural inheritance found in literature and in the products of the fine arts.²

The term "comprehensive" means that the unit must have wide connotations in order that it may be an economical feature in the program.... The unit must be not only comprehensive but significant, that is, it must be important in the field of general education contributing something to fundamental adjustment.³

When these "comprehensive and significant aspects" are "mastered" the necessary personality changes are

1 Ibid., p. 23.

2 Ibid., pp. 24-25. Underscored portions italicized in original.

3 Ibid., pp. 25-26.

ipso facto effected.

... the subject matter... is serviceable
in generating intelligent and useful
inclinations and abilities in the pupil.¹

Morrison's program of education becomes, first, a period in which the essential tools for learning are acquired and, next, a period in which pupils, under the constant guidance of teachers, master "comprehensive and significant learning units" until, as a result, they have "(a) a wide range of interests and... some dominating interest, and (b) the capacity for self-dependent intellectual life."² All this would seem to mean that school is a place where certain subject matter is learned in order to accomplish a particular personal adjustment to this world.

What shall this subject matter be? He says the units must be comprehensive, that is, they must explain a great deal. They must also be significant--important and essential. But, we must ask, how much is a "great deal"? And what is "important"? Although he discusses specific units in The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, he acknowledges therein that not much has been done in the way of selecting units.

1 Ibid., p. 20.

2 Ibid., p. 34.

... there is undoubtedly implied, for appraisal of pupil progress as well as for teaching, an analysis of the whole process of general education into the learning units which are of necessity its content. Such an analysis would carry us far beyond the scope of this volume... Nor is such an undertaking essential in the present connection, for every school, up to and including college, has its own curriculum made up of a content which the school conceives to be best fitted to the achievement of its purpose. The present problem is to effectuate that curriculum in the teaching program which is employed.¹

In later writing, characterized as his final "development of the argument in instruction and education," Morrison does seek "to find a defensible answer to the question, 'What then must the content of General Education be?'"² His conclusion seems clear enough.

... the curriculum leading to General Education of the non-specialized person must be constituted of the universal institutions which are good in all advancing societies.³

The problem of "enumerating the universal institutions" is to be met by finding those that "exist as relationships between

1 Ibid., pp. 75-76.

2 Henry C. Morrison, The Curriculum of the Common School, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940, p. vii.

3 Ibid., p. 25.

individuals," that "are in origin in the nature of folkways ... about which a great many others have clustered and become integrated," that are "still found in all societies which we rate as enlightened," that are universal in the sense that they are found among people whose social-structure elements have been judged to be emergent, following a trunk line of progress.¹ A list of seven additional criteria for institutions is given for further help,² but all of this theory seems merely to clarify the injunction: Teach the universal institutions of civilization.

How Morrison arrived at his conclusion to select, for subject matter, universal institutions, should have bearing upon our problem. It may be recalled that Bobbitt stated early in his book that there are some goals of which we are certain--"the ability to read, to write, to spell, to compute, to use language grammatically, and to perform the specific tasks of one's vocation."³ Then he went on to find what other goals were to be planned for. Perhaps Morrison had this in mind when he declared:

In the many years during which thought has been maturing, I have tried to impose upon myself the obligation of

1 Ibid., pp. 25-27.

2 Ibid., pp. 27-29.

3 Bobbitt, How to Make a Curriculum, p. 4.

refusing hospitality to any pre-
 sumptions whatever, or to be
 influenced by any sort of tradition.
 So much so that I have gladly gone
 on as if the final result might be
 to prove that an entirely new kind
 of Curriculum is essential or that
 the General Education of the masses
 is an impossibility.¹

Just prior to this statement he had reasoned:

... we recognize at once that the
 individual human is inescapably social
 in his educational status at any period
 of his development, as contrasted with
 his equally asocial nature at birth.
 The problem then becomes at the outset
 one of finding a workable definition of
 Society and its elementary structure.²

If Civilization is the art of community
 existence and of conquest of the
 environment, and if the universal insti-
 tutions are the fabric of the art, then
 it follows that the curriculum leading to
 General Education of the non-specialized
 person must be constituted of the universal
 institutions which are good in all
 advancing societies. The problem of the
 Curriculum of the Common School is
 reduced then to the enumeration of the
 universal institutions.³

Instead of starting with accepted goals or subject matter,
 Morrison apparently asked himself, "How is the educated

1 Morrison, The Curriculum of the Common School, p. viii.

2 Ibid., p. vii.

3 Ibid., p. 25.

person different from the non-educated?" and, finding the answer "inescapably social," he next asked, "What is Society?" When he found Society to be made of institutions by a process of evolutionary development he seemed to conclude that education should promote understanding of institutions by which Society progressed. In this way Morrison seemed to satisfy himself that without prior assumptions he had arrived at a way by which selection of justifiable content for the Common School could be made: Look at Society as it is now and has been in the past to determine the universal institutions which are good in all advancing societies.

It is interesting to note that with this procedure subject matter is little different from what it always has been.

... the pathway to the determination of the curriculum of general education is fairly clear. It is not difficult to identify the major social learnings which have produced civilization and which are therefore best calculated to be good instruments for the development of the civilized individual, the citizen. They are not very different from what we long have taught but have often taught in a mistaken sense.¹

Meantime, we can go forward with considerable confidence that the

1 Henry C. Morrison, School and Commonwealth, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937, p. 76.

fundamental content of the curriculum, as it has come down to us, is essentially sound.¹

If anyone were content with the way civilization has developed in the past, these statements of Morrison might seem reassuring. But, for those of us who are at least somewhat dissatisfied with the pace and general direction of social evolution, Morrison would seem to bring slight comfort. In regard to effecting improvements, he says:

If he [a child] eventually becomes civilized he does so by learning what the older generation teaches him. In his maturity he may add something to civilization which he can teach his children in turn. Thus civilization is reproduced, or goes backward, or collapses in proportion to the effectiveness of the school.²

Disquieting thoughts are provoked by those assertions. To what extent can mankind trust children, rooted and grounded solely in present and past institutions, to add enough to civilization to preserve it from self-destruction? Shall nothing be given curricular consideration that would seem to provide deliberately for improvement of life? It is difficult to turn aside from issues as vital as these, but they take us beyond the scope of this chapter.

1 Ibid., p. 111.

2 Ibid., p. 116. Underscoring not in original.

Although one may question the way Morrison derives his criterion for selection of subject matter or even reject the criterion which he uses, it would seem difficult to deny that his program employs a criterion, namely, whatever will bring to children the civilization of the present--"as we know it"--so that the slow but inevitable evolution of civilization can take place. One who tried to follow Morrison's plan would assuredly be obliged to use this criterion in selecting what to teach.

E. Summary

Of the three programs which have been examined in this chapter, that of Morrison seems to be the most clear about criteria for choice of subject matter. Not only does he endeavor to present his criterion, but he also tries to show how he derived it. In Rousseau's plan it seems that criteria, which might not be expected in a proposal commonly known as "negative education", do exist, albeit inconspicuously. In Bobbitt's plan, criteria seem also to be present, although more obscure than might be anticipated in an otherwise simple and direct presentation of theory. Although varying in clarity with regard to criteria, each plan appears to possess some basis or bases for selection. Persons who would try to follow these plans would doubtless find it necessary to employ the respective criteria or would, at least, use them unknowingly.

It may be that, with much wider sampling, some educational plans would be uncovered in which no criteria for selection of subject matter are to be found. That seems a bit unlikely, however, when in the foregoing examination of diverse and representative programs at least one criterion seems to be evident in each. Our sampling of educational plans seems to uphold the validity of the assumption that criteria for choice of subject matter are present and function importantly in most, if not all, curricula. It seems reasonable, then, to proceed with the basic inquiry into criteria employed in certain representative new-type curricula, for the purpose of evaluating (in one aspect) such curricula in terms of their appropriateness for democratic education.

Chapter III

CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY HOLLIS L. CASWELL IN
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

In making inquiry into certain representative, new-type curriculum programs it seems appropriate that we examine the work of one whose name is particularly respected in the field of curriculum--Hollis L. Caswell. He has done extensive writing both independently and with other educators. Since 1929 he has been called upon by at least six states and eight cities to assist in developing curricula. In Caswell's work at George Peabody College for Teachers and at Teachers College, Columbia University, he has been associated with hundreds of teachers and laymen interested in curriculum problems. Active membership in professional organizations has extended the range of his influence.¹

The curriculum developed by Caswell and Campbell in Virginia was one of the earliest proposals to abandon subject-matter boundaries. The theory which lay back of this program and much material from the program itself are presented in their well-known and influential text,

¹ Supporting data for the foregoing statements about Caswell are to be found in Jaques Cattell and E. E. Ross, Leaders in Education, Lancaster, Pa.: The Science Press, Third Edition, 1948, p. 179.

Curriculum Development.¹ In it they devote an entire chapter to the selection of subject matter,² a practice which is relatively uncommon among curriculum writers. We turn to this chapter to ask the questions of major importance to us, "By what criteria shall subject matter be chosen? Are they of such nature as to be appropriate for democratic education?"

Caswell and Campbell assert at the very outset that treatment of subject matter in instructional organization is perhaps the most disputed issue in educational theory, yet a curriculum worker "must make choices with the full realization that whatever his position there will be those who hold that his decision is wrong."³ Assuming this to be the case, we shall welcome from the authors a clear statement as to how they would have us justify choices. Specifically, we shall want some test or tests by which to know whether to include or to omit any particular bit of subject matter in or from a curriculum. Furthermore, we shall want to be assured that, in doing so, we are providing an educational program which is in that respect essentially democratic.

1 Hollis L. Caswell and Doak S. Campbell, Curriculum Development, New York: American Book Company, 1935.

2 Ibid., Chapter X.

3 Ibid., p. 248.

According to Caswell and Campbell, subject matter is "the facts, generalizations, information, or objects an individual uses in activities to promote a purpose which he is endeavoring to realize."¹ The whole body of race experience cannot possibly be learned by one person. It is merely potential subject matter, available for use by individuals if needed.

From all existent subject matter, curriculum workers are to select potential subject matter for pupils.² Obviously, this will require use of criteria for selection. Then the situations which children experience will determine finally what subject matter is acquired. As the authors express it:

... what does or does not become the actual subject matter of the pupils is determined by specific learning situations. Teachers cannot make pupils master certain subject matter. They can only guide them in situations that require subject matter and help them to select and use subject matter wisely.³

If just any situations are to be permitted to occur, there would seem to be little point in curriculum workers selecting potential subject matter. The writers surely have in

1 Ibid., p. 250.

2 Ibid., p. 254.

3 Ibid., pp. 286, 288. See also p. 254.

mind that only those situations are to take place which call for subject matter already designated. This strongly suggests that criteria, in addition to those used by curriculum workers, are to function. To put it another way, whoever decides which situations are either brought about or allowed to develop will be obliged to use some bases for each decision. As already indicated, teachers are the persons in position to control the situations which come to pass, hence they, along with curriculum workers, will be using criteria.

The question might well be raised, "Do children, according to Caswell, have anything to do with subject matter selection?" By the time that curriculum workers choose potential subject matter and teachers choose situations to draw upon that subject matter and help children use it wisely, there would seem to be little overt choosing left to do. But if children take part in selection,¹ they too will be employing criteria which we shall want not to overlook.

It appears, then, that we can expect to find in Caswell and Campbell's program criteria for use in at least

1 In a sense, children always do some selecting, consciously or unconsciously. Native intelligence, physical and emotional condition, maturation, and previous experiences play a large part in determining what is actually learned by any one person. Our concern, here, is for criteria in Caswell's plan other than personal limitations of learners.

two successive selections of subject matter--the first by curriculum workers, the next by teachers. Possibly there will even be criteria for a third selection--by children.

In our search for criteria for choice of subject matter, we shall concern ourselves first with those to be used by curriculum workers. Just prior to listing such criteria Caswell and Campbell mention that

The control that should be exerted on the selection of content by the aims of education and by the scope of the curriculum has already been considered in Chapters VI and VII. Whatever the specific basis or bases for selecting potential subject matter, their use should be consistent with the procedures accepted for defining aims and scope in so far as these procedures relate to content.¹

Because we wish to overlook no possible answer to our question--What criteria are to be employed?--we search in Chapters VI and VII to see what the procedures are for defining aims and scope of education and how we can be consistent with them.

There we see that, in order to define aims, we are directed to "study the democratic ideal and to discover in so far as possible its many implications," then indicate "the generalized controls of conduct which, if widely developed by the individual members of the social group,

1 Ibid., pp. 254-255.

will lead progressively to greater realization and effective interpretation of the ideals stated in the first step."¹ In defining scope, the procedure is to include:

- a. Provision for consecutive, cumulative movement of children through curricula.
- b. Freedom to organize instruction around purposeful experiences of children of varying capacities and abilities.
- c. Orientation of the individual to the aspects of social life in which he must participate.
- d. Provision of a core around which materials from the various subjects may be organized.²

To be consistent with the procedures accepted for defining aims and scope, it appears that we are to choose potential subject matter of such nature as will permit development of the desired generalized controls of conduct with regular, consecutive movement of experience in the desired direction. Here we seem to have found the first controls over choice of content which are indicated in Caswell and Campbell's program--the democratic ideal, its implications for behavior, and the above four provisions. It is to be noted, in passing, that the democratic ideal and its implications are also to control a teacher's selection of

1 Ibid., pp. 124-126.

2 Ibid., pp. 184-187. (Not strictly quoted.)

activities which call for potential subject matter.

Keeping these requirements in mind, we read next:

There are four principal bases upon which the selection of potential subject matter may be made: (1) significance to an organized field of knowledge; (2) significance to an understanding of contemporary life; (3) adult use; and (4) child interest and use.¹ The first two of these bases rest largely on tradition and judgment. [What have subject matter specialists believed important to an understanding of their subject? What do curriculum workers believe important to an understanding of contemporary life?] The last two may be determined by scientific procedures. [What facts and skills do adults use? What are children's interests?] ²

All of these bases for selection will probably be recognized as having been well established ten years or more before

-
- 1 In Caswell's explanation of item 4, "child interest and use," he refers to "children's interest or use" and also speaks of "the materials children use with interest" (p. 265). The writer assumes that Caswell includes, as his fourth criterion, any indication of deep-seated child-preferences which are expressed verbally or in action. (See also pp. 209-211.)
 - 2 Ibid., p. 255. It is to be hoped that those who try to read Caswell and Campbell's program and read this list (or a parallel one on page 275) will notice the reference to Chapters VI and VII, and find therein implications of other criteria. In this writer's opinion, it is regrettable that Caswell's lists sound all-inclusive when they are not, and that not all the controls, such as we are engaged in finding, are summarized in any one place.

Caswell and Campbell's book was written.¹ The authors acknowledge and, to some extent, define the weaknesses of these bases, suggesting that "Although inadequate, when taken separately, they provide a valuable check when all are employed."²

Accepting this claim at face value for the moment, we move on in our search to consider criteria for teachers' selection of activities which will draw upon potential subject matter, chosen as suggested above. Already we have noted certain controls on teachers' selection arising out of the definition of aims of education, namely, the democratic ideal and its implications for behavior.³ In the entire chapter, "Selection of Subject Matter," Caswell and Campbell have only this to say about teachers' criteria:

... the first and primary point of orientation is the end to be achieved or the purpose of the learner. Subject matter is selected first of all [in organizing instruction] from this point of reference. A second point of orientation is the logical relationship that exists between the facts, information, principles, and formulas used, and those used previously.⁴

1 Ibid., pp. 255-272. See also the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, Part I, pp. 39-41; 68-80.

2 Ibid., p. 274.

3 See pp. 63-64 of this study.

4 Ibid., p. 286. Underscoring not in original.

Considerably farther on in the book they declare:

The importance [in organizing instruction/
of making purposes and needs of the
learner the primary point of orientation
in selecting activities and subject
matter has been emphasized in foregoing
chapters.¹

We cannot but note the discrepancies in terms as used in the two quotations. No significant difference seems to be intended. Both statements are used in connection with the same kind of teaching program.² We must assume that the term "needs" refers to eventual need for logically organized subject matter to use in realizing one's future purposes. As for "purposes," the authors seem in every case to mean worthy ones only and to mean also that teachers guide pupils to formulate such purposes on the basis of pupil interests.³ In choosing subject matter, then, from among that pre-selected by curriculum workers, teachers are to be guided by the democratic ideal, its implications for behavior, and purposes and needs of learners.

Our search for criteria employed in choosing content cannot be considered complete until we know whether

1 Ibid., p. 381. Underscoring not in original.

2 See pp. 285-286; 384. This instance of rather carefree use of terms might be cited as just one of the hurdles to be confronted by any would-be student of modern curriculum programs.

3 See pp. 209, 211.

children have any part in the selection¹ and, if so, by what criteria their choices are to be made. Lacking a direct statement concerning children's choices, we turn to theory regarding instructional organization for whatever implications might be manifest.

Caswell and Campbell's suggested teaching program is to have two phases. In one phase, teachers are to create situations based upon the dominating purposes of children.² The purposes must be considered worthwhile by the children. (If they are not so considered, the teacher must gradually change the children in order to make such purposes seem worthwhile.)³ The purposes must also be compatible with the aims of education--showing promise of developing socially desirable conduct.⁴ Teachers help pupils formulate worthy purposes,⁵ estimate the value of each activity which is proposed and either encourage or discourage its use,⁶ then see that pupils perform the activities so as to realize educationally desirable outcomes.⁷

1 Beyond the "selection" by the learner's personal limitations. See p. 61 of this study.

2 Ibid., p. 384.

3 Ibid., pp. 384-385; 202-204.

4 Ibid., p. 385; pp. 124-126.

5 Ibid., p. 385.

6 Loc. cit.

7 Loc. cit.

Subject matter to be used in carrying out the children's purposes can come from any field at all. "Teachers, of course, guide development so that the most worthwhile subject matter is used."¹

It is apparent that, in the first phase of the program, both the purposes of children and the way in which they will be carried out are to be strictly limited. If children have physiological drives, passing fancies, or even deliberate, conscious aims, none may be legitimately developed into a learning situation unless it first be considered "worthy" by the teacher.

Although children's decisions as to which purposes to follow may be drastically curtailed, this writer does not consider them to be completely ruled out. In view of the countless activities taking place in school, there would seem to be, for all the restrictions, some slight opportunity for genuine choice by children. This could occur when several of the children's own purposes calling for similar subject matter happen to coincide with their teacher's views as to what is worthy. In planting a garden in certain locations, for example, it would seem to be immaterial whether children planted beans or potatoes, pumpkins or corn, lettuce or radishes, although in each alternative some differences of subject matter

1 Ibid., p. 387.

would be involved. There is the possibility, then, that children's choices function to some very small extent. The criterion by which choice can be made appears to be children's personal interest in one among several activities which teachers approve.

In the other phase of teaching, situations are to be "developed from the need for organization and mastery for effective use of specific habits or knowledge as a means of realizing dominating purposes and of carrying on routine life activities."¹ Teachers select for direct instruction subject matter which will develop abilities (a) which can be used now in meaningful experiences in or out of school, (b) which can be mastered economically at his present level of development, and (c) which cannot be mastered unless there is special emphasis.² Children are to be made conscious of relationships among principles, generalizations, facts, and specific habits in subject fields. The extent to which this is done is to be adjusted by teachers according to the capacity, needs, and maturity of learners.³ Clearly, children have little or no voice⁴

1 Ibid., p. 384.

2 Ibid., pp. 390-393.

3 Ibid., p. 393.

4 Other than personal limitations. See p. 61 of this study.

in decisions involving subject matter in the direct teaching phases of the instructional program.

In the study which we have been making thus far in this chapter, we seem to have found a series of controls over subject matter selection. These controls operate successively to narrow the total field of available subject matter until that which is actually to be learned has been determined. The controls include:

1. The democratic ideal
2. The generalized controls of conduct which lead to realization and interpretation of democratic ideals
3. Consecutive, cumulative movement through the curriculum
4. Teachers' estimates of children's capacities and abilities
5. Aspects of social life in which children must participate
6. Core organization to guarantee integration of subject matter
7. Significance to an organized field of knowledge
8. Significance to an understanding of contemporary life
9. Adult use
10. Child interest and/or use
11. Pupil purposes developed from interests
12. Pupil needs for logically organized subject matter
13. Children's interest in one among several activities approved by teachers.

This is an impressive list. Let us consider whether it is such as will ensure a democratic educational

program. Simply because controls are present would seem to be insufficient reason for calling a procedure undemocratic. Most thoughtful persons would quickly concede that the immature cannot safely have complete freedom even in a democracy. But whether the controls on selection of subject matter as listed are appropriate in democratic education is another matter.

First among Caswell and Campbell's controls is "the democratic ideal." When curriculum workers must select potential subject matter and again when teachers choose activities to draw upon potential subject matter, they presumably must do so in accordance with this ideal. In order to use it as a criterion, i.e., as a test for including or excluding a single bit of subject matter, we would need to know what the democratic ideal is taken to be. Turning to the authors' discussion of it and checking their every reference, we are somewhat disturbed to find in their text no clear definition whatsoever.¹ Typical statements seem to be:

... a democracy, by its very nature, tends to have neither a clear, fixed statement of its ideals, nor a planned course of action to achieve its

1 It is a little disconcerting, too, to read "the democratic ideal" in some passages and "democratic ideals" in others. But, with general vagueness in the use of each term, there seems to be little reason for not considering them approximately synonymous.

purposes. Instead, it has a relatively vague concept of social ideals stated in general terms, such as equality, liberty, and justice, and a continuously evolving program of action.¹

The schools cannot sit by and wait for other agencies to discover and define democratic ideals in usable terms, but must undertake this task in co-operation with other social institutions.²

He [curriculum worker] must understand how changing conditions and deepening insight necessitate new interpretations of the ideal. When he commences to understand these things he is ready to undertake the task of defining suitable aims for education in a democracy.³

We can only gather from these declarations that groups are, by consensus, to decide for themselves what democratic ideals ought to be. Then schools are to use their conclusions, regardless of possible limitations, as a basis for choosing subject matter. Continuous reinterpretation of democratic ideals thus decided upon is to take place. But at any point of time some ideals must be employed, if one is following Caswell and Campbell's program. There seems to be no manifest guarantee that either authoritarian or laissez-faire views will not predominate in the consensus

1 Ibid., p. 29.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Ibid., p. 124.

by which particular ideals are chosen. Subject matter selected on the basis of such ideals could be slanted toward authoritarian or laissez-faire social practices and, in either case, would scarcely be appropriate for democratic education.

Although no definition of the democratic ideal is given by Caswell and Campbell, one at least is implied in off-hand fashion--"the democratic ideal of respect for individual rights."¹ But how this concept is to operate in subject matter selection we are not given to understand. When conflicting "rights" of individuals cannot both be given "respect," what then? Shall we teach children to respect the rights of migrants to enter California without limit even though they swamp both housing and educational facilities? Or to respect the right of California residents to set up barriers at their borders at any time they wish? Shall we respect youth's right to knowledge and make available the teachings of the Planned Parenthood Association, or shall we respect the right of certain youth to accept censorship imposed by their church and thereby deny the knowledge to all in public-school classrooms? The expression, respect for individual rights, does not seem an effectual basis for making clear-cut choices of subject matter.

1 Ibid., p. 126.

Another definition is intimated in Curriculum Development but it, too, seems not to be clarified in such a way that one might sort out worthwhile subject matter from what is available. We are merely informed that

In a democracy the intelligent participation of all members in the solution of problems is required. This means that individuals must have command of the means of solving problems rather than of ready-made solutions.¹

Caswell and Campbell do not then indicate what they conceive to be "intelligent participation" or "means of solving problems," so we can scarcely know how to use this proposal for subject matter selection.

To make the charge that a man of Caswell's stature defines democratic ideals so loosely that they cannot be of use is not something to be done lightly. But to substantiate this charge fully just now would take us far afield. To avoid this, the writer can only say that lengthy investigation of Caswell's position, as found not only here but in all of his books, brought her to this conclusion:

Democracy, according to Caswell, is a social order directed by the ideal of respect for individual personality, and possibly other ideals, and continuously being reconstructed by the intelligent participation of all members, whatever

¹ Ibid., p. 125.

that may be. The interrelationships of ideals and their respective functions in the social order are not made clear to us. But we are told that study of the democratic tradition and of existing social conditions will bring understanding.

It may be all well and good for us as curriculum-makers or as teachers to be admonished to use our own democratic ideals to decide whether to include or ban a fact, habit, generalization, or other aspect of subject matter in our curriculum. If we study tradition and existing social conditions and perchance arrive at truly democratic ideals, then we can try to make our selection of subject matter consistent with them. But, if we fail to formulate truly democratic ideals (and, as far as Caswell's program is concerned, is there any protection from doing so?), then it would be of little avail, for a democratic teaching program, to make our selection consistent with whatever ideals they turned out to be. If the democratic ideal, in all its looseness of definition as Caswell treats it, cannot be used conclusively as a test in differentiating desirable from undesirable subject matter, then it cannot in fairness be called a criterion for selection of subject matter. We must look further in his list for a criterion which will so function.

Second in the list is "the generalized controls of conduct which if widely developed by individual members

of the group will lead to greater realization and effective interpretation of democratic ideals." Without knowledge of what the democratic ideals are, it would seem a bit puzzling to know which controls would serve to realize and interpret them. Our curiosity as to how Caswell and Campbell would thus have us manage to work sends us to their explanation of "the nature of these generalized controls of conduct."¹

We are assured that "certain general types of conduct" in which men "conform to certain standards" and "observe certain relationships" are commonly recognized. The existence of differences of opinion about these standards and relationships is acknowledged but simply brushed aside. Any general characteristics, generally agreed upon as desirable, seem to qualify for the authors' use in deciding upon subject matter. To locate the characteristics, someone (presumably a curriculum worker or workers) uses "the reflective process" aided by "controlled observation" of the activities which people engage in, and by "consensus of opinion" of "competent persons" who are "asked to indicate types of conduct deemed necessary and contributory to the realization of the democratic ideal of life."²

1 Ibid., pp. 125-127.

2 Loc. cit.

This "explanation" seems only to confuse us the more. General characteristics of human behavior, only generally agreed upon, are suggested for use in determining content. If we agreed to develop considerateness (and the authors suggest this as one control of conduct useful in realizing the democratic ideal of respect for individual rights), would it lead us to teach the advantages of area flood-control (in consideration of our neighbors) or to teach legal means to hold possession of our land (in consideration of our family's sentimental attachments to it)? No amount of imagination serves to reveal to a reader how generalized controls of conduct can even vaguely point the way, let alone serve as a precise directive for choosing subject matter. In both cases, the apparent criteria related to procedures for defining aims of education are not found to be criteria at all, in a functional sense.

The next suggested criteria on our list are related to procedures for defining scope. Provision is first to be made for consecutive, cumulative movement of children through curricula.¹ Chance incidents are not to dictate the general movement of pupil activities and thus determine subject matter. General areas (of culture, we presume--we are not told) must be indicated through which the growth of children "may advisedly" proceed," may "most

1 Ibid., p. 184.

profitably be guided," or which will "probably yield richest experiences."¹ We look in vain, however, for aid in deciding which areas to select so that there will be desired movement. There is but slim comfort in being told that "the consecutive, cumulative movement required by this criterion will be found through study of the growth of children."² To the writer, that seems like a tremendous field to wander in--one which, in light of the present state of research, offers altogether too many conflicting views to be utilized in the manner suggested. It seems that again we are counselled to do something, but are given no tools with which to do it, no real bases for making choices, and no suggestion as to what the choices are likely to be.

In defining scope, "freedom should be allowed for the teacher to organize instruction around purposeful experiences of children of varying capacities and abilities."³ This criterion requires that whatever is chosen by curriculum workers be broad enough to allow leeway in a teacher's choice. Very plainly this concerns quantity, not essence, of subject matter selection. It does us little good to be told to choose an ample amount of something when we are not

1 Ibid., p. 185.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Loc. cit.

enlightened on what the something is, nor what may be considered ample.

Third in the procedures recommended for defining scope is orientation of the individual to aspects of social life in which he must participate.¹ If we were advised, in connection with this procedure, what kind of orientation would be desirable or by what means a curriculum worker or teacher should determine the ideas which would contribute to this orientation, our problem in choosing subject matter would be at least partly solved. But no such advice is given. As elsewhere, we are left in a state of indecision with an injunction to give consideration to something, by what means we know not and with what results we have no notion.

The fourth and final procedure said to be related to defining the scope of education is provision of a core organization to guarantee integration of subject matter.² Although the educational program is to be developed so that facts and principles from all fields may be related in a child's thinking, the authors do not say that only those facts and principles are to be selected which can be related, nor do they describe any desired relationship which shall determine subject matter. In the absence of their commitment

1 Ibid., p. 186.

2 Ibid., p. 187.

to any other view, this writer takes Caswell and Campbell to mean that provision of core organization has little, if anything, to do with selection of subject matter; it merely concerns what happens to subject matter after it is chosen. As in the procedures for defining aims of education, so has it been in the procedures for defining scope--no evidence of a genuine criterion for choice of subject matter has been located. We may fare better if we peruse Caswell and Campbell's twice-given list of "bases upon which the selection of potential subject matter may be made."¹

It will be recalled that the authors explained to us that their "four principal bases" for selection of potential content are "inadequate when taken separately" but "provide a valuable check when all are employed."² For this reason it is thought best to consider them together. According to the first basis, a particular item of material is to be included in a curriculum when it is important to an organized field of knowledge. We know from long experience numerous facts and generalizations which are traditionally acclaimed as "important." Which shall be taught? If the decision is turned over to a subject specialist, what test of importance does he apply? Since none is given, we must assume that he makes his choice in

1 See pp. 255, 275.

2 Ibid., p. 274.

any way he pleases, following whim, intent, or chance. "Importance to a subject field," as a criterion, does not seem to amount to anything. Nor does the basis, "significance to an understanding of contemporary life." What is significant in someone's estimation falls short in another's, unless more distinctive qualifications are first set up and agreed upon. These seem to be lacking in the program as described. The third basis for choice is to be adult use. The authors themselves show that, after applying this criterion, one may be committed to decidedly undesirable facts and skills which, though actually in present use, must undergo selective elimination (by some criterion not specified.)¹

Lastly, there are "children's interests and use" proposed as criterion for selection of content. It is clearly pointed out that children under varying conditions can become interested in or will use widely different content.² Furthermore, interests are to be developed into "worthy" purposes³ and apparently will be ignored or suppressed if they cannot be used to develop purposes in the "right" direction. If interests of children can be shifted so easily, how can they be considered dependable as

1 Loc. cit.

2 Ibid., p. 211.

3 Ibid., p. 272.

a basis for choosing subject matter? They may be taken into account during the process of choice, but they are most certainly not to be taken as criteria by which subject matter enters or stays out of an educational program.

Upon examination, each of the "four principal bases" for selection has been found to amount to essentially no basis, no decisive test, at all. It is hard to believe that, even by taking them all together, they would be any more conclusive. The authors designate them as "a valuable check." Some other persons may find them so, but this writer cannot, inasmuch as they seem to permit about as much personal bias as one cares to inject.

Two controls on subject matter selection are proposed for use by teachers in organizing instruction. The first is given as the purposes of children. This is not to say that any and all subject matter which can be used to fulfill children's purposes is to be accepted and, conversely, that any and all which has no relation to their purposes is to be neglected. If this were so, children's purposes would truly serve as the criterion. But not all purposes are to be utilized. Only those which require behavior compatible with the aims of education are deemed worthy.¹ A more literal statement of the criterion might be:

1 Ibid., pp. 200-206. Five other criteria for judging the quality of purpose are given, but the one cited is listed first.

whatever teachers believe children should be purposing in line with aims of education. Therefore, aims of education seem to have prior bearing on subject-matter selection.

And what are the aims of education? They are to be derived from the democratic ideal (or ideals) and, as we have found already, they can mean about anything we wish them to mean. We find ourselves in the same indefinite situation as before, with no criteria for choice because almost any choice can be considered acceptable under the terms specified.

At risk of belaboring the point we might call attention to the claim, "Socially desirable traits will be developed if pupil purposes are compatible with the aims of education."¹ Without a clean-cut (and clean-cutting) definition of democracy and of the aims of education therein implied, the distinguishing features of socially desirable traits can but remain unknown. Agreement upon these traits is far from being reached in a country where suave hostility can be directed by hotel clerks toward even eminent Negroes, where a gambling spirit considered demoralizing by lawmakers can be openly cultivated by a major church, and where undisputed moral courage on the part of pacifists can lead to disfranchisement. Nor can teachers agree what traits are to be considered socially desirable

1 Ibid., p. 201.

in any particular curriculum program until its proponents commit themselves to one definition of democracy and to one statement of the aims of education in that democracy. If any given trait, or nearly so, can be developed by arousing pupil purpose to that end, then there would seem to be almost free rein in subject-matter selection.

Another basis for teachers' choice of content is "pupil needs for logically organized subject matter." Teachers are primarily to promote purposeful experiences, which probably will cut across subject-matter lines. But they are gradually to establish relationships within and between subject fields in the minds of children, as soon as the children seem able to comprehend.¹ "Essential knowledge and specific habits must be mastered and organized for most effective use in new situations."² Here Caswell and Campbell's program most nearly touches traditional practice. It would seem a simple matter for teachers to embrace familiar modes of teaching, with the customary selection of content, unless differences in the two types of program were elucidated. What does a teacher do when she chooses content on the basis of "needs for logically organized subject matter"?

1 Ibid., p. 285.

2 Ibid., p. 390.

Selection of subject matter or, as Caswell says, abilities¹ to be given direct emphasis because they are "needed" is to be accomplished by application of three criteria:

- a. The child uses or can use the ability now in meaningful school or out-of-school experiences....
- b. The ability can be mastered economically by the child at his present level of development....
- c. The ability cannot be mastered adequately without special emphasis not possible in ordinary use.²

No list of abilities which children should possess at the conclusion of their formal schooling has been attempted by the authors. To the best of this writer's knowledge, there is not common agreement among educators as to what constitute "essentials." Even if data from "extended analyses" and "numerous experimental studies" were employed, as Caswell suggests,³ conflicting results which abound in these studies would require teachers to choose from among them. It is common belief that, when knowledge is possessed in systematized form, gaps will be recognizable.

1 Abilities as used here involve remembrance of facts and performance of skills, i.e., knowledge and habits.

2 Ibid., pp. 390-392. Originally in italics.

3 Ibid., p. 390.

But such is the complexity of present-day knowledge that only specialists have any grasp of the total organization within one field, to say nothing of comprehension of relationships among fields. How, then, is a teacher to decide which gaps in learning should be filled by the school and which should be left for out-of-school or adult experience? If a teacher should conscientiously apply the above criteria, and these alone, to selection of knowledge to be mastered, would her results include recognition of military aircraft, location of all cities of any importance, and the multiplication table of twelves? If they were chosen, and such is within range of possibility, what would be omitted? Time does not permit the teaching of all useful knowledge which children are able to learn. Yet, even when we utilize the given criteria, there does not seem to be any one decisive factor in them which would commend or disapprove, for mastery, particular knowledge or even particular habits.

Under this program a teacher is not only obliged to decide (without a true criterion) which subject matter is to be mastered; she must also decide when children can do so economically. The authors indicate that opportunity to establish relationships within and between subject fields increases as learners approach maturity.¹ But, with

1 Loc. cit.

differences among children, "constant adjustment is needed to the capacity, needs, and maturity of the learner."¹ Again, major decisions are being called for but bases for those decisions are wanting. Teachers who are experienced in textbook teaching and to close following of a prescribed course of study would no doubt turn to the familiar for their answers. Beginning teachers, knowing even a little of the dangers of slavery to a text, might nobly follow their own "hunches" and be fully as authoritarian as any textbook writer. When we are enjoined to study children and organize knowledge, then to decide for ourselves what their "needs" are and set about to teach them, we have no small assignment. When such a task can be entered upon in good faith and carried out with unconscious personal bias, the teaching program from which it comes is scarcely appropriate for democracy.

Only one control over subject-matter selection remains for consideration. By analyzing Caswell and Campbell's theory about teaching programs, we found that, under certain circumstances, subject matter may be selected by children. The criterion seems to be, children's personal interest in one of several activities which teachers approve. Without question, this is a functional criterion, the first of its kind in all thirteen which we have examined. Within

1 Ibid., p. 393.

specified limits, children can simply indicate their preferences. By this action indisputable choice is to be made.¹

If our analysis be valid, Caswell and Campbell's proposal has one feature which with certain qualifications might be acceptable for democratic education: Children should make some of their own decisions. But will they be required to do so, and in a manner so as to promote education in democratic practices? Nowhere are provisions of this kind laid down. It is the belief of this writer that there is considerable likelihood of some teachers overruling class preferences despite the fact that other criteria might be met. Let us suppose that, when interest in the purpose to make a garden is being aroused, a class prefers to make a miniature golf course. (Much of the same subject matter--measurement, plant growth, computation of expenditures, assuming responsibility in a group, and so on--could be learned in either activity.) Since there is no stipulation that children's wishes are to be granted, it is easy to conceive of teachers immediately vetoing a miniature golf course on the grounds of "foolishness." When children's choices are possible but not obligatory, a teacher can use amiable persuasion (or otherwise) to set

1 No provision, however, is made for resolving conflicting desires among a class.

aside the choice if he so wills. Consequently, the program at this point may be democratic but is not necessarily so.

In this chapter we have been asking two questions concerning curriculum programs of the kind Caswell and Campbell would have us develop--"By what criteria shall subject matter be chosen? Are they of such nature as to be appropriate for democratic education?" It has been noted that Caswell and Campbell first list four criteria as bases for selection of subject matter. In addition, they tell us to be consistent with certain procedures which indicate six other controls. Two more are mentioned in connection with the teaching program, and one can be inferred. This makes thirteen in all.

Each of these thirteen controls over subject matter has been examined to determine its usefulness as a test by which to know whether to include or exclude any particular bit of subject matter in or from the curriculum. We have found that twelve controls are not criteria in any functional sense. Teachers are admonished to take certain measures in choosing subject matter, but it is not made clear how they are to do so or what may be expected as results. Merely to study in groups and arrive at consensus does not guarantee that democratic procedures will be used in the selection. With no decisive factor in the suggested controls, almost any choice of subject matter may be considered acceptable. This gives a decidedly laissez-faire flavor

to the whole procedure. The thirteenth criterion is functional. It is, however, applicable to decisions only within strict limits; it is not considered important enough by the authors to rate direct mention (we had to infer it from the teaching program); and it may be used or not, dependent on whether teachers happen to notice that children's choices are permissible. Because of the inconclusiveness of all the criteria in the program which we have examined, we can only hope that those who decide to follow it will both desire and know how to be democratic.

When a suggested program may in practice mean anything or everything, it comes to mean nothing at all. We must conclude that, insofar as criteria for selection of content are concerned, Caswell and Campbell's program is not necessarily appropriate for democratic education. If their's can be taken to be representative of new-type curriculum programs, then serious question should be raised as to the wisdom of adopting such proposals when our avowed purpose is to promote democracy.

In light of our conclusion, it would seem important to know whether Caswell has, through the years, maintained his position on criteria for selection of subject matter. Chapter IV will be devoted to an investigation of his books written since Curriculum Development was published.

Chapter IV

CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY CASWELL IN
DEMOCRACY AND THE CURRICULUM

Since 1935 when Caswell and Campbell's Curriculum Development was published, a book bearing Caswell's name and dealing in some measure with curriculum has been issued approximately every four years.¹ Caswell was the sole author of one book and shared responsibility for three others. Each work was undoubtedly intended for use in promoting democratic education.² To determine whether Caswell's criteria for subject matter selection have continued to be essentially the same as those in Curriculum Development, his books will be examined, and in chronological order.³

1 Harold Rugg, Editor, Democracy and the Curriculum: The Life and Program of the American School, Third Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1939. Hollis L. Caswell, Education in the Elementary School, New York: The American Book Company, 1942. Hollis L. Caswell, Editor, The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity, Eighth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. Hollis L. Caswell and Associates, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.

2 See: Rugg, op. cit., pp. v (Rugg), 413-414 (Caswell). Caswell, Education in the Elementary School, pp. 57, 161.
_____, The American High School, pp. 50, 67.
_____, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems, pp. 20, 38.

3 Caswell has also contributed numerous articles to professional journals. This writer has read a number of his articles which give promise of bearing upon criteria for

In the first, Democracy and the Curriculum, Caswell wrote two chapters. One was entitled "The Design of the Curriculum," the other, "Administrative Considerations in Curriculum Development." In neither chapter, nor elsewhere in the book, are criteria for choice of subject matter listed. But Caswell did present (for the Third Yearbook Committee as well as for himself) "several major recommendations which... should be operative in the evolution of a more satisfactory curriculum design, one through which the function of education in American democracy may find expression."¹ It is in these recommendations that we should find implications of criteria for choice of content.

The recommendations, stated briefly but in the author's own words for the most part, are:

- A. Engage in "a continuous process of curriculum planning," not "specific prescription of subject matter" nor "day-by-day opportunistic improvising," so that the "curriculum emerges as an evolving whole, so guided that experiences lead forward most naturally and effectively into later stages of development."

"A tentative program of attack would be agreed upon by group action of all workers who influence the curriculum."

"Individual teachers would work with reference to group agreements."

selection of subject matter. She has found no significant difference in, nor addition to, his point of view as expressed in books. Furthermore, it is believed by the writer that, if changes have occurred in his ideas concerning subject matter selection, they will be sufficiently reflected in his books for us to discern them.

1 Rugg, op. cit., pp. 413-414. (Caswell.)

- B. "... take into account the stage of growth of each individual involved."
 "... provide optimum adjustment to... varying factors at the various stages of physical development."
 "... be influenced by the ever-changing character of child interests and purposes."
- C. Be concerned "that every child has a rounded daily program of living."
 Take into account "recreation, health, creative activities, home adjustment, and the like," "quite as much as problem solving and work situations in the classroom."
- D. Provide directly "for democratic organization and direction of the school community."
 Give "the operation of the school community... a significant part of school time."
 Give students "the dominant place in carrying forward these activities."
 Extend "the areas of democratic control in a school community far beyond disciplinary and similar problems." "Student concern and responsibility should reach such matters as the maintenance and operation of the school plant itself, the operation of cafeterias, school services to the community, and the like. It is assumed, of course, that students should take an increasing responsibility for sharing the instructional program as well."
- E. Provide "direct emphasis on understanding of the problems of contemporary living."
 Make "this phase of the curriculum... basic for all students."
 "From the kindergarten through the junior college a portion of the student's experiences should be planned with particular reference to broadening his understanding and deepening his insights in areas of immediate social concern."
 "... give wide opportunity for cooperative group action."

Make the work "broad in scope and varied in possibilities" to fit children of all types of ability. Stress "those problems and issues which have been of persistent and long-time importance," including some from each of the "major areas of living."

- F. "Provide creative and recreational opportunities." Make "the 'extra-curriculum' ... a part of the life and program of the whole school." Give guidance "in intelligent choice of activities." Develop the program "with attention to the possibilities in the community." Make available special guidance "for those who display skills and interests."
- G. "Provide for work interests."
 Give emphasis to "the general problems of work and the place of work in the life of our people."
 "... provide a variety of activities which permit the individual to discover special interests and aptitudes..." Give guidance in discovering permanent work interests. Provide "definite training for given occupations or professions."
- H. Give "direct training for the mastery of complex abilities and techniques."
 "The ability or technique" must be able to "be used in meeting situations which are meaningful or purposeful for him." (pupil) Relationships among abilities and techniques should be recognized and understood. If injecting them into a situation would be an intrusion upon an on-going project they should be learned in separate sessions as individuals show need.¹

"In conclusion, what the curriculum design is or is not depends in the final analysis upon the understanding of teachers... Curriculum design in operation depends upon what teachers understand to be the purposes of the school, the nature of

1 Ibid., pp. 414-432.

education and learning, and the restrictions [administrative and supervisory] under which they work."¹

In each of the recommendations there seem to be directives for subject-matter selection. From the conclusion we gather that another factor influences what is learned--the understanding of teachers. When we list all the factors to influence teachers in selection of subject matter which we can derive from Caswell's recommendations for curriculum design, we have:

1. Curriculum an emerging whole with experiences leading into later stages of development
2. Children's physical development and ever-changing interests
3. Balance in each child's total (daily) program
4. Democratic organization and direction of the school community (for experience in democratic procedures)
5. Understanding of persistent and long-important problems of contemporary living
6. Creative and recreational opportunities
7. Work interests and training
8. Mastery of complex abilities and techniques, and relationships among them
9. Understanding of teachers

The foregoing list is not identical with the one which we formulated from a study of Caswell and Campbell's Curriculum Development. Some similarities, however, may be

¹ Ibid., pp. 432-433.

discerned if we rearrange what we have just found and place the two lists side by side:

Factors to Influence Teachers in Selection of Subject Matter as Found in Curriculum Development, 1935.

1. The democratic ideal
2. The generalized controls of conduct which lead to realization and interpretation of democratic ideals
3. Consecutive movement through the curriculum
4. Teachers' estimates of children's capacities and abilities
5. Aspects of social life in which children must participate
6. Core organization to guarantee integration of subject matter
7. Significance to an understanding of an organized field of knowledge
8. Significance to an understanding of contemporary life
9. Adult use

Factors to Influence Teachers in Selection of Subject Matter as Found in Democracy and the Curriculum, 1939.

-
4. Democratic organization and direction of the school community (for direct experience in democratic procedures)
 1. Curriculum an emerging whole with experiences leading into later stages of development
 - 2a. Children's physical development
 7. Need for guidance in discovering work interests and training for life work
 6. Creative and recreational opportunities
 5. Understanding of persistent and long-important problems of contemporary living. (Basic for all students from kindergarten through junior college, i.e., the core)
 -
 5. See above.
 -

- | | |
|--|--|
| 10. Child interest and use | 2b. Children's ever-changing interests and purposes |
| 11. Pupil purposes developed from interests | 2b. See above. |
| 12. Pupil needs for logically organized subject matter | 8. Mastery of complex abilities and techniques, and relationships among them according to individual needs |
| 13. Children's interest in one among several activities approved by teachers | (Children's choices may be possible but there is very little reason to believe that they are expected) |
| | 3. Balance in each child's (daily) total program of living |
| | 9. The understanding of teachers |

Certain differences between the lists are at once noticeable. "The democratic ideal" is not included in the second list, for it does not appear in the recommendations for evolution of curriculum design. The entire design, however, is to be appropriate for education in American democracy.¹ The concept of democracy which is held by curriculum designers is doubtless to influence subject-matter selection.

"Significance to an understanding of an organized field of knowledge" and "Adult use" are both missing from the later list. Does their omission mean that children are

¹ See Chapter I and pp. 406, 413-414 of Democracy and the Curriculum.

no longer to master knowledge, i.e., subject matter in logical order, or to master facts and skills in common use by adults? If that were the case, then a real change in curriculum would be indicated.¹ But Caswell does not seem to mean just that. According to his eighth recommendation, complex abilities and techniques and relationships among them are to be mastered. Not having evidence to the contrary, we presume that mastery of abilities entails the acquisition of knowledge.²

Seeing relationships among abilities (which involve knowledge) and techniques surely means acquiring an understanding of organized subject matter. So organized subject matter involving both facts and skills is to be learned, if

-
- 1 As we have seen (p. 84 of this study) Caswell and Campbell say that experiences are to cut across subject-matter lines at first. As learners approach maturity they are increasingly to master and organize in their thinking essential knowledge and specific habits. To drop all organized subject matter from this program would make a great difference.
 - 2 In his earlier book Caswell uses "abilities" to include both "knowledge," i.e., facts, generalizations, and principles, and "habits," i.e., skills and techniques. (See Curriculum Development, pp. 390-393.) In Democracy and the Curriculum extensive search was made for Caswell's definition of abilities and techniques, but to no avail. The terms are so used as to appear sometimes the same in meaning, sometimes different. (See pp. 430-432.) The sole example given of a complex ability was in reference to golf. (p. 432) This might lead one to think of an ability as something involving only physical performance. Yet "abilities and techniques, particularly those which relate to language and number" are mentioned. (p. 430) This writer concludes that inasmuch as Caswell uses both terms--abilities and techniques--and frequently uses them together,

we have read aright. Whatever Caswell's reasons may have been for leaving out the two criteria in question, use of the eighth recommendation in his later list will lead to the same result, so the omission is of little consequence.

"Balance in each child's (daily) total program of living" is mentioned only in the second list. There is no apparent recognition by the author that this is an addition to his earlier list of controls. It may be that this recommendation stemmed from the mental-hygiene movement which was well under way when the Third Yearbook was published. Whatever its source or reason for being added, it seems to fit well into the total pattern but not to effect any great change in Caswell's ideas.

"The understanding of teachers" appears in the second list but not in the first. In his earlier book Caswell had advocated that teachers participate in curriculum development to insure their knowledge of and interest in new curriculum materials. (Curriculum Development, p. 470) Four years later he concludes his recommendation for curriculum design by saying, "In conclusion, what the curriculum design is or is not depends in the final analysis upon the understanding of teachers." (p. 432) This seems more a recognition of fact than a suggestion of a new basis

that he is stressing that knowledge (in common use by adults) as well as skills be taught, and that his views in the two books are substantially the same.

for subject-matter selection--something to take into account but not to use as a criterion.

If there is any significant, over-all difference in the two lists of controls over subject matter, it would seem to be that the second is more specific. Instead of indicating to us that we should have a core organization, it stipulates that persistent and long-important problems are to be the core. Rather than leaving it to us to determine aspects of life in which children must participate, it specifies that attention be given to two aspects--work interests, and creative and recreational opportunities. In place of suggesting that we develop generalized controls of conduct fit for democracy, it urges that we give direct experience in democratic operation of the school community.

In our comparison of Caswell's two lists of controls over subject matter, we might summarize by saying that both lists are extensive, they are not identical but very similar, and the second one seems more specific.

The controls over subject-matter selection in Curriculum Development were found to be most inconclusive, so much so that the present writer considers them to be not necessarily appropriate for a program of democratic education. Inasmuch as Caswell's criteria in Democracy and the Curriculum seem more specific, we are led to ask, "Is it possible that criteria implicit in Democracy and the Curriculum are truly criteria in a functional sense, and

are appropriate for a democratic program? Can they serve as a test for knowing whether to include or to exclude any particular unit of subject matter?" We shall examine these controls, following the same procedure as was used in Chapter III, but in somewhat briefer fashion.

1. Curriculum an emerging whole with experiences leading into later stages of development

All workers who influence the curriculum are to agree upon a program of attack, then individual workers are to function with reference to group agreements. By planning this way the curriculum is to become "an emerging whole." But Caswell does not seem to indicate how the original agreement is to be worked out. Whose judgment, for instance, shall have more weight in a final decision? And by what test shall all suggestions be evaluated? A group could conceivably agree upon a curriculum fit for an autocracy or a dictatorship just as easily as for a democracy. Or the group could reach no agreement at all, with a resultant deadlock in planning. Before this criterion can be utilized to select subject matter for a democratic program of education, it would seem necessary to indicate how agreement is to be reached in planning and what kind of "emerging whole" is to be planned. In other words, something more than "wholeness" or step-by-step development of experiences must be sought by teachers if the curriculum is to be distinctively democratic. The experiences should be

developing in a particular direction and by a particular means.

2. Children's physical development and ever-changing interests and purposes

Available knowledge about stages of physical growth in children is not yet so dependable, nor detailed, as to give any but general guidance to teachers in their selection of subject matter. When in any group of children there can exist a wide range of maturation levels and when growth within individuals tends to be uneven and relatively unpredictable, it would seem a perplexing task to use uncertain data to make certain choices. As for interests and purposes, Caswell himself says that the known differences at various age levels should "suggest desirable general phases of curriculum content."¹ But specific content yet remains to be chosen and teachers need criteria with which to do it, unless within some broad limits they are to choose entirely as they please. Moreover, considerable change of children's interests can be effected by merely changing their material, intellectual, and/or emotional environments. Though we may take what we know about physical development and interests into account, we can scarcely use them as bases for selecting particular subject matter.

1 Rugg, Editor, Democracy and the Curriculum, p. 417.

3. Balance in each child's total (daily) program of living

When Caswell recommends that we take into account various types of worthwhile activities¹ but does not indicate how balance is to be achieved nor what might be considered desired balance, we again face an impasse. How do we attain balance, for instance, in a teen-ager's activities which include reading classics, becoming introduced to a foreign language, making scenery for a class play, practicing a musical instrument, attaining proficiency in mathematics, attending Teen-Town and Scout meetings, mowing the lawn, drying dishes, and having teeth straightened, to say nothing of serving a paper route, baby sitting, practicing football, attending church, dating, and watching television? In average communities, opportunities for "cultivation of individual interests" are legion. Which shall we choose to promote? For which other customary school activities shall these be a substitute? We are told only to see that every child has a rounded program of living. We must look further for a functional criterion for choice of subject matter.

4. Democratic organization and direction of the school community (for direct experience in democratic procedures)

In building and maintaining a democratically operated school community, teachers must decide which experiences

1 Ibid., p. 418.

out of all possible ones should be utilized. There may be a point of diminishing return, beyond which children will be practicing democracy but not learning enough more about it to justify the expenditure of time. When is that point reached? A teacher needs to know how many experiences of one kind shall be permitted. Moreover, certain democratic processes are extremely time consuming. Shall lobbying and filibustering, for example, be learned by direct experience to the exclusion of some other subject matter? In answer to these questions, teachers are merely told that "the operation of the school community must be given a significant part of school time."¹ And that is easily seen to be no answer at all since what is "significant" would vary according to personal or group outlook.

Teachers must also know what is to happen in the experiences of operating a school community. It is said that "students must actually be given the dominant place in carrying forward these activities."² It is also declared that "the areas of democratic control must be extended far beyond disciplinary and similar problems."³ Here teachers would seem to be in a precarious position. What are teachers to do when students in their immaturity arrive at decisions

1 Ibid., p. 419.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Loc. cit.

which taxpayers simply will not tolerate? And, if democratic control by students reaches the operation of school cafeterias, as Caswell suggests, to what extent shall teachers permit students to make decisions concerning wages of workers? The subject matter which students learn in these experiences would seem to hinge directly upon the interpretation which teachers give to a democratic school community. Caswell does not seem to mean that immediate and full control can be given to students, but he does aver that "the success of a school can be measured to no small degree by growth in interpretation and utilization of democratic processes in its government."¹ What that "utilization" is to be, teachers apparently must decide for themselves. Perhaps, if we knew Caswell's definition of democracy, it would clarify the matter somewhat.

Caswell presents no explicit definition of democracy in his chapters in Democracy and the Curriculum. Several other contributors, however, did make statements with which Caswell undoubtedly concurred.² In them, one particular ideal, variously expressed, is designated as basic.³ Democracy seems to be taken as a social order in which there is concern for the maximum development of the individual,

1 Loc. cit.

2 Ibid., p. xi.

3 Ibid., pp. vi, 80 (Rugg); pp. 188, 190 (Counts); p. 254 (L. Thomas Hopkins).

i.e., respect for personality. One author (Rugg) does place in position of parallel importance the concept of free play of intelligence in determining social policies.¹ But, since neither "respect for personality" nor "free play of intelligence" are defined in such a way as to show what they would mean for action in a school community, it would be impossible for a teacher to select experiences on the basis of this conception of democracy.

To know the nature of democratic experiences possible and desirable in democratic organization and direction of a school community would be to have a clue to content, for children would be obliged to learn whatever is involved in the experiences which are provided. But, since Caswell does not make clear the nature of democratic experiences, the subject matter to be learned in them remains a matter of conjecture. Caswell's suggested control over subject-matter selection does not, therefore, deserve to be called a "criterion."

5. Understanding of persistent and long-important problems of contemporary living, including some from each area of living

Here is an ostensibly specific control over subject matter. To use it teachers must know answers to two questions. The first is, "Are there any particular problems which must be

1 Ibid., p. vi.

dealt with or may any problems be used, so long as they meet the above requirements?" No problems are specified. Caswell gives numerous ones as illustrations,¹ says that it is "impossible to include in a school program all the important problems and issues of today,"² and suggests (in an example) that some be dealt with "at the time when they are of direct concern to the student."³ Choosing problems which are persistent and long-important, then, should not be difficult. To be sure, one could even justify the selection of a conspicuously new problem such as control of atom bombs by saying that it is one aspect of the persistent problem of war.⁴ With a little roundabout reasoning of this sort, almost any social problem could meet Caswell's requirements for he does not define "persistent" nor "long-important." With plenty of time (kindergarten through junior college) many problems could be studied, and, since no specific ones are required, a teacher could safely choose some.

The second question is, "In what way or ways are students to 'understand' the problems?" Superficial reading of Caswell's recommendations for a basic social program⁵

1 Ibid., pp. 420, 421, 423.

2 Ibid., p. 423.

3 Ibid., p. 425.

4 Attention would have to be given to historic as well as immediate aspects if "new" problems were chosen. (See p. 423.)

5 Ibid., pp. 420-425.

leads one to his only direct comment about understanding-- each student should have developed within him the degree of understanding and insight of which he is capable. Does saying only this seem to mean that broadening of understanding and deepening of insight may proceed in any direction to which the study of problems happens to lead? In other words, when persistent and long-important problems are examined will students learn (within their own range of ability) whatever of race experience is found to be pertinent to the solution of these problems? In no place does the author state that this is his intent. Nor does he describe when study of a problem may reasonably be terminated so that limits of subject matter can be known.

If the "understanding" is not dependent upon the outcome of study, on what does it depend? For each child to be permitted to arrive at any understanding he pleases would be anarchy. Is the understanding of social problems, then, to be in the minds of teachers? Careful rereading brings us only a little light on Caswell's thinking at this point. He explains that, instead of getting a background for understanding contemporary life by studying cultures developmentally, problems should be given attention and race experience should be employed in relationship to problems.¹ Later on in school experience "it may be expected that

1 Ibid., p. 420.

important abstractions basic to understanding of contemporary life may be further illuminated through study of the evolution of cultures."¹ If basic abstractions are to be further illuminated, it must be expected that some light is to be shed upon them when problems are first considered. Vaguely we get the idea that teachers are to promote some particular understanding of current problems through the teaching of basic abstractions. Unfortunately we are not told which abstractions are basic nor are we given means by which to determine them. If the author assumes that "important abstractions basic to understanding of contemporary life" are common knowledge, and fully accepted, then he would seem to be laboring under a misapprehension. The one abstraction which he used for illustration--cultural lag²--is being questioned by at least one authority as an adequate description of social change.³ Few social scientists would be so sure of knowledge about contemporary life. As we have found before, teachers who try to follow Caswell's criteria for choosing subject matter face decisions with no bases for action save their own personal views or the consensus of their group. Typical of the loose counsel which

1 Loc. cit. Underscoring not in original.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Horace M. Kallen, Patterns of Progress, New York: Columbia University Press, 1950, pp. 31-52.

they receive are statements like the following:

Changing conditions necessitate continuous modifications of solutions. This makes it important that instruction designed to develop understanding of the problems of American life should be organized so as to bring together in meaningful relationship the pertinent knowledge provided by the various subject fields, information on the conditions of the present, and a survey of the possibilities of the future. This process of organization is a most difficult aspect of education and the phase most generally slighted. Yet it is of utmost importance if the demands of the present are to be faced intelligently.¹

By whose standards "pertinent knowledge," "information on conditions of the present," and "possibilities of the future" are to be selected is anyone's guess. The counsel, therefore, is merely an admonitory gesture with no stated characteristics designed to make it serve democratic education and that alone.

6. Creative and recreational opportunities

In following Caswell's recommendations concerning creative and recreational opportunities, teachers would guide children "into an appreciation and enjoyment of recreational activities that are not antagonistic to social welfare."² Does this mean that any activities not frowned

1 Rugg, op. cit., p. 423.

2 Ibid., p. 426.

upon by local conservatives are to become subject matter, or that all those not legally prohibited are to be encouraged? There would seem to be wide latitude in choice here, with no apparent, deciding factor.

When the "extra-curriculum" is made "a part of the life and program of the whole school" how extensive a part does it become? Over what other learning experiences does it take precedence? No limit is set upon either how many activities children are to be allowed to engage in nor how long is to be spent upon them. Community advantages are to be utilized, but again we lack information on how to decide which to use, and to what extent.

Teachers are to give guidance in intelligent choices of activities, but personal decisions on what is intelligent in recreational and creative affairs may vary greatly. Giving special guidance to those who show special interests and skills presents no less a problem. Merely to raise the question, "How much football for star players?" shows only too clearly the dilemma teachers face. Obviously, Caswell is asking us to take into account the need for education for leisure, but is not thereby giving us a decisive basis for choice of subject matter.

7. Work interests and training

Development of interest in and training for work is also to be included in the curriculum. As with recreation,

we are to "give emphasis," "give opportunities," and give "definite training."¹ But criteria to determine what content to emphasize, which opportunities to offer, and what training to provide are not indicated.

8. Mastery of complex abilities and techniques, and relationships among them

Shifting his point of view just a bit from that found in Curriculum Development,² Caswell is asking that teachers promote mastery of organized subject matter whenever need for it is observed.³ "Study of this kind" is to "hold a service relationship to the other aspects of the curriculum."⁴ That is to say, at any time during on-going school experience when an ability is required and cannot be mastered on the spot, a special time is to be set to acquire it. If that were the full measure of a teacher's concern relative to mastery of organized subject matter, she would have a functional criterion for choice of content. Gaps in children's knowledge and skill which were uncovered from day to day in the form of conflicts experienced by children would point directly to what should be taught.

1 Ibid., p. 429.

2 Organized subject matter is to be taught as soon as it can be comprehended, after a background of meaning and use has been obtained. (See pp. 81-83 of this study.)

3 Ibid., p. 431.

4 Loc. cit.

But that is not to be the limit of a teacher's concern. Mastery of organized subject matter is also to "hold a service relationship" "to out-of-school situations," future as well as present ones.¹ This means that any ability or skill which teachers anticipate that children will need is to be taught. How far into the future a teacher's estimate of need is to be projected and which abilities and techniques are to be judged essential are not made clear. The only guide offered is the question, "Will proficiency in this ability help these children do better the things which they will be doing during the course of their day-by-day living?"² Subject matter chosen on this basis with almost no exercise of imagination could conceivably range from carrying on courtship by correspondence to filing income-tax returns. Without question, some additional basis for selection must be found. This criterion is insufficiently conclusive.

Our search for a functional test for determining subject matter in Caswell's recommendations for curriculum design, as presented in the Third Yearbook, is as yet fruitless. One possibility remains to be explored. Caswell recognized that what a curriculum design actually becomes

1 Loc. cit.

2 Loc. cit.

depends upon a teacher's conception of the purposes of the school, the nature of education and of learning, and the administrative and supervisory restrictions under which she or he works. He even went so far as to say that curriculum improvement can be made only by deepening teachers' insight and understanding on these matters, and that "all steps of planning must be so ordered as to contribute to teacher understanding."¹ If teachers, working under favorable supervisory and administrative regulations, were to arrive at adequate insight and understanding about the purposes of the school and the nature of education and learning, would they then know what to include and exclude from their teaching? That would seem to depend upon how the purposes of the school and the nature of learning are conceived. Because Caswell merely alludes to these conceptions in his chapter, we must look to his co-authors in order to secure a reasonably complete idea of what they are to be.

The Yearbook as a whole seems to present this line of thought: The problem of our times is "to bring forth on this continent--in the form of a cooperative commonwealth--the civilization of abundance, democratic behavior, and integrity of expression and of beauty which is now potentially available."² Schools are "to promote development of the

1 Ibid., p. 433.

2 Ibid., p. v. (Rugg).

individual from conception until death" and to serve "as the community's instrument through which the conditions essential for a more adequate life are progressively achieved."¹ Schools thus become a "constructive social force,"² "a dynamic power for the upbuilding of democracy."³ Learning begins when a person is sufficiently concerned over a situation to bring his resources to bear upon it. Then "We learn our reactions; only our reactions, and all our reactions; and we learn them in the degree and with the conditions and limitations with which we respectively accept them."⁵ To put it another way, we learn what we live.⁶ To promote learning, a democratic school is "an enterprise in guided living,"⁷ guided in the sense that "promising kinds of better living" are anticipated and then people (of all ages but particularly the young) are helped to achieve them.⁸

1 Ibid., p. 382. (Paul R. Hanna). Underscored words originally in italics.

2 Ibid., p. 418. (Caswell).

3 Ibid., p. 273. (L. Thomas Hopkins).

4 Ibid., p. 362. (Kilpatrick).

5 Ibid., p. 370. (Kilpatrick).

6 Ibid., p. 377. (Kilpatrick).

7 Ibid., p. 3. (Rugg).

8 Ibid., p. 4. (Rugg).

If education is guidance in living which will promote individual development and at the same time improve community conditions, what subject matter shall teachers employ when administering this guidance? That is first to be decided by curriculum designers.¹ They are to study the culture and "build a stream of dynamic educative activities"² which "deal with the critical problems and factors of American life."³ The activities which curriculum designers select determine what is to be learned.

Behind the plan to study the culture and derive directly from it the life and program of the school are two apparent beliefs which merit examination. They are, first, that all curriculum designers in studying culture would arrive at the same conclusions, and, second, that from such study they would derive a stream of dynamic educative activities, rather than streams going in divergent directions. To the present writer, these beliefs would seem tenable only under one condition. If all curriculum designers were like-minded in social, religious, economic, and political views and, consequently, in their interpretations of and conclusions from history, they might emerge from their study with "a stream of activities" dealing with "the critical problems

1 Ibid., p. 7.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Ibid., p. 514.

and factors of American life." But curriculum designers are not thus like-minded, nor would we in America want them to be so because of the inevitably static condition which would result and the despicable kind of control possible in such a situation. The "facts" and "trends" in our culture will take on meaning according to the designers' outlook on life as they confront the "facts." There would seem, therefore, to be little assurance of reaching agreement upon what a study of the culture indicates as subject matter for democratic education, unless agreement were reached on what is and what is not democratic before the study began.

To urge curriculum designers, then, to "study the culture and derive a stream of educational activities" does not help. To do so would seem to mean subscribing to one particular interpretation of history or bogging down in fundamental disagreements.

The Yearbook also suggested that the purposes of the school--promotion of individual development and achievement of conditions essential for a more adequate life--would influence the selection of subject matter. This may be true, but these purposes cannot be used by teachers as criteria for subject-matter selection unless teachers know clearly the direction of desired development and the characteristics of a more adequate life. Neither can a conception of guided

living be so used, unless teachers know in which direction the guidance is to be applied.

Lengthy search through Caswell's first two books for his apparent criteria for selection of subject matter has now been made. Although his criteria in Democracy and the Curriculum seem more specific than those in Curriculum Development, they appear to be no more conclusive. For that reason they seem not necessarily appropriate for democratic education.

Chapter V

CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY CASWELL IN EDUCATION IN THE
ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, THE AMERICAN HIGH SCHOOL: ITS
RESPONSIBILITY AND OPPORTUNITY, AND CURRICULUM
IMPROVEMENT IN PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEMS

In the course of our inquiry into criteria for choice of subject matter employed in new-type curriculum programs we have examined the two earlier works of Hollis L. Caswell. To devote a like amount of space to each of his other books would make this inquiry unduly cumbersome. Particularly would this appear to be true when he has not been known to have made any drastic change in his professional views. Some means of rapid analysis would seem to serve our purpose.

To avoid possible repetition in such an analysis yet preserve both spirit and method of inquiry adopted at the outset, we shall continue our search in tabular form. On the left of the tabulation Caswell's apparent criteria will be summarized.¹ On the right will be listed comments and questions concerning each apparent criterion. Questions

1 Although Caswell saw fit in his first book (Curriculum Development) to devote a chapter to bases for selection of subject matter, the topic does not so much as appear in the index of his other books. In each case, the criteria which apparently are to operate when one follows Caswell's program were derived by this writer from his theory and/or examples of the program suggested.

which are raised but not answered are those about which this writer can find no help in Caswell's writing. It is presumed that curriculum workers and classroom teachers would be confronted with similar questions should they attempt to act upon Caswell's suggestions.

The purposes of our search remain the same--to discover what criteria Caswell suggests for choice of subject matter and to consider whether they are of such nature as to be appropriate for democratic education.

Education in the Elementary School¹

Caswell's Apparent Criteria
for Subject Matter
Selection²

Comments and Questions

1. Program conceived and operated as a whole

(Comparable to "Consecutive movement through curriculum" in Curriculum Development.)

Broad and integrating experience, continuous and cumulative throughout twelve years. All persons and agencies affecting education of children (including the children themselves) help to plan program, making their contributions within "an overview of a comprehensive educational program." (p. 51)

How is an overview of a comprehensive program to be arrived at, i.e., how is agreement achieved among the many persons involved? Will state department officials have more, or less, authority than local teachers? Phrases such as "must plan together," and "working out agreements" can be given varied interpretations.

Each individual school is to be conceived as a unit and its program operated as a unit. (See pp. 4, 50-52, 303-304.)

If a state highway department has a strong safety education program and a major newspaper campaigns for American history "fundamentals," do teachers yield to the stronger of the two pressures, or to both (to the exclusion of some other subject matter)? To the writer it would seem foolhardy for a group of teachers to attempt to meet with opposing interests in order to work out with them an overview of an educational program, without knowing clearly what such a program in a democratic society ought to be.

1 Hollis L. Caswell, Education in the Elementary School, New York: American Book Company, 1942.

2 Data from numerous statements throughout the book but chiefly from Chapter III, "Characteristics of a Good Elementary School Program," pp. 49-71, and Chapter XII, "Looking Forward," pp. 301-308.

2. Rounded educational program

Balance of in- and out-of-school activities, including rest, recreation, work, motor and sedentary activities, intellectual and manual activities, group and individual activities. Both vicarious and first-hand experiences are to be afforded.

Teachers are to be concerned with the fullest possible development of each boy and girl as a person. (See pp. 4-6, 52-54, 211-212, 305-306.)

(Comparable to "Balance in each child's total program of living" suggested in Democracy and Curriculum.)

Somewhere between pro-intellectual and anti-intellectual activities one is to find balance. Where is that point? "Neither traditional practice nor improvisation of the moment may be considered as an adequate basis for achieving this important purpose." (p. 306.) But Caswell does not say what is adequate. A school with certain equipment would want to offer basketball, darts, movies, and library orientation rather than photography, news writing, auto driving, and map making. In either case, variety would be afforded and worthwhile experiences would occur, but whether desirable balance and the fullest possible development would be achieved cannot readily be determined. Some of each kind of activity mentioned as desirable could be provided but teachers would still not be assured that they had chosen subject matter with balance fit for a democratic program.

3. Democratic organization of the life of the school

(See pp. 54-57, 301-302, 307-308.)

(Comparable to "Democratic organization..." in Democracy and the Curriculum and "Generalized controls of conduct..." in Curriculum Development.)

No clear definition of democratic living given. A crucial question--What authority shall the immature have in matters of action?--is not considered. Whatever is taught will depend

upon the conception of democracy which teachers happen to hold. Caswell does not help them to arrive at an operational definition.

4. Program to contribute to understanding of and appreciation for democratic values and achievements

Areas of study and investigation make clear the foundation and development of American tradition.

(See pp. 54-57, 301-302.)

To "make clear the foundation and development of American tradition," do we study early and modern witch-hunting, segregation, evangelism, carpetbagging, logrolling, rugged individualism, universal military training, or stock market manipulation? Without a functional definition of democracy it would be difficult to know which subject matter would develop the understanding and appreciation which is said to be desired.

5. Needs, interests, and capacities of children

(Comparable to "Children's interests and development" in Democracy and the Curriculum, and "Teacher's estimates of children's capacities and abilities" and "Child interest in use" in Curriculum Development.)

Broad periods of growth suggest general needs to be met.

Teachers need more than broad, undefined guides in order to decide for or against a unit of subject matter.

Prescott's three categories of needs (physiological, social and ego) should be given regard when planning.

How to reconcile conflicts among needs is not indicated. A shy, withdrawing, runt of a child may need physical activity yet, if that is prescribed, his ego needs may not be filled because of poor performance.

Needs, however ascertained, do not always point to certain subject matter and none other.

Children do help in planning the curriculum.

To what extent do their ideas prevail? When are they to be overruled?

Schools must deal with the multitude of problems which our country faces and the curriculum must call them to direct attention. (Problems of broad social significance and of immediate concern to the children.)

Each succeeding year seems to bring the peoples of the earth closer together, revealing problems and arousing concerns we never knew before. How shall a teacher select from among them?

Service centers are to be used to promote interests.

Since use of the centers is to be flexible, what is the basis for choice of activities carried on there? How much of the program will take place in the gym, the library, the music studio? Must each center be used? If so, when? Caswell does not indicate how a teacher is to decide.

Those interests which lead to sustained effort and extended activity are to be used.

Children's interests are subject to teacher influence. They can be of nearly any kind a teacher wishes.

Children are to be studied collectively and individually, and a program developed which will draw from each child his potential growth.

David, second son in a happy family, enters kindergarten. He can copy any message in English which is set before him, write from memory the names of members of his family, carry a tune, repeat in detail a story heard once, make up stories from pictures, count to one hundred, identify groups of objects to ten, throw a ball straight, and tie his shoes. To instruct him further along some of these lines will but create social-adjustment problems in his class,

(See pp. 37, 57-59, 96-97, 210, 243-244.)

for many five-year-olds could not keep up with him. What shall be taught? To study him and his peers will not tell a teacher what to teach him unless she has in her mind a conception of what she wants five-year-olds to know, be, and do. That conception has not been delineated by Caswell.

6. Breadth of experience

(Comparable to "Significance to an understanding of contemporary life" in Curriculum Development and "Understanding of persistent and long-important problems of contemporary living" in Democracy and the Curriculum.)

Experiences (compatible with children's maturity) in all areas of living which characterize normal social organization.

Granted that children should not have experiences in areas of social disorganization, what about studying them? Should children learn about crime, broken homes, mob violence, and the like? If they are learning it at home, what is the school's responsibility?

Children should have extensive contacts with issues and problems of day-by-day living. A careful analysis and study of areas of living will provide a framework against which the scope of school experiences may constantly be checked.

Will such an analysis indicate, for instance, what experience to give children in influencing legislation? Or indicate what sex education is desirable, and when? Examination of one area--worthy home membership--should uncover far more data than the public school can possibly teach. Basis for choice needs to be stated, if "breadth of experience" is not to open the door to any subject matter which a teacher chances to think of, or has a bias toward.

(See pp. 59-61.)

7. Integral relationship of school and community

Program should be planned in direct relationship to community so that school can contribute to better living and school work can thus be vital and real.

Each school should have a regular plan for studying the community so that teachers can discover needs and interests of children.

(See pp. 61-62.)

Who decides which is better living? Shall children help to establish a CO-OP store to replace the local A&P? If the town is a "Gretna Green," do children learn how better to accommodate tourists or how to establish good family life? Someone's conception of what is "better" is going to influence choices.

At any one time a town may be faced with annexation by a neighboring metropolis, installation of more gas furnaces than the supply of gas warrants, destruction of roads by interstate trucking, a major strike, and an insect invasion. On which fronts do schools act upon their "integral relationship to the community"? What needs and interests can or should children in such a town feel? When these questions are not answered there would seem to be no real way of knowing what to teach.

8. Direct instruction in techniques and methods of work as needed

Systematic canvassing of needs of children for techniques and methods of work. Direct guidance and teaching when needs are evidenced in routine activities, in the broad experiences provided in the curriculum, and in out-of-school activities.

(Comparable to "Mastery of complex abilities and techniques, and relationships among them" in Democracy and the Curriculum.)

How can needs ever be determined until one envisions a particular result and, in measuring a child against it, sees the shortcomings? Implicit in the psychologists' claim that basic human needs are food, love, sex activity, et cetera, is the current conception of humanness which the newborn are expected to attain. A basic concept in subtraction is expressed by the simple question, "How much do I need?" But even with a well-known subtrahend there is no

clear determining of need until the minuend is known. As has been seen elsewhere, Caswell does not give a clear picture of his minuend, i.e., goal. Therefore a teacher might be confused in knowing where children were falling short of it. Conflicts could arise in deciding whether children need to learn to:

- a. Outline a textbook or read between the lines and evaluate it.
- b. Box the compass or get a feel for directions when outdoors.
- c. Obey the principal's rules or participate in making them and in carrying them out.
- d. Rise and address recitations to the teacher when called upon or join vigorously in round-table discussions.

Choice of skills to teach for use in out-of-school activities would likewise be difficult. Shall we teach newsboys to hit front porches instead of hedges, and baby sitters to fix formulas? Shall there be auto-driving, typing, shopping, social-dancing, essay-writing or street-peddling lessons? How are needs to be determined? What is the minuend in the curriculum-maker's mind?

Teach skills only when children can use them in meaningful situations, when they can be mastered with the greatest

Caswell does not say in any place that only those to be used in the immediate present are to be taught. Leaving this unsaid would seem to leave a

effectiveness. The worker must "view the child's experience broadly, being sensitive to the whole range of situations which are part of his experiential background. He must be equally ready to afford guidance for the development of skills which will enrich any phase of the child's living." (p. 180)

Skills should advance some purposes for the child, but "Assistance in gaining good comparative command of skills may open up new areas of purposing for children." (p. 174)

(See pp. 177-179, 214.)

9. Understandings and beliefs of educational workers and parents

"...procedures designed to foster the development of improved plans of curriculum organization must be based for success on the development of improved understanding and insight on the part of the educational staff." (p. 216)

"It matters little what is stated to be the basis of curriculum organization if teachers and parents believe otherwise." (p. 216)

loophole through which teachers in their sincere desire to meet needs might continue to teach square root to perfection, chromatic scales, and diagramming sentences. Opinions as to which techniques and methods of work will enrich one's living give promise of varying fully as much as do teachers' backgrounds, and probably in direct relation to them.

Shall children learn how to read Shakespeare effectively so as to open up new areas of purposing? Or shall they learn how to find perimeters of irregularly shaped figures? What subject matter could not be justified either to advance or to arouse purposes?

But what shall they understand and believe concerning selection of subject matter? Which direction is "improved understanding and insight" to take? When this is not made clear there would seem to be no assurance of a democratic program.

The American High School:
Its Responsibility and Opportunity¹

Caswell's Apparent Criteria,
i.e., Implied Controls Over
Subject Matter²

Comments and Questions

1. A program of such breadth as to meet needs of all American youth of whatever ability or whatever vocational destination

"... to meet needs..."
See p. 123, this chapter.

Have available for each young person those opportunities which will afford him well-rounded development.

(See pp. 135-137.)

Suitable enough for a broad policy, perhaps, but not for a basis for choice of appropriate subject matter at any one point in a student's career. What will best promote well-rounded development?

Picketing for a union?
Pamphleteering for the
W.C.T.U., the N.A.M.,
the V.F.W.?
Packing clothing for over-
seas relief?
Stretching the company's
rest period?
Making posters for an
M.V.A. and against the
Pick-Sloan Plan?
"Pulling strings"?

1 Hollis L. Caswell, Editor, The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity, Eighth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

2 Data chiefly from Chapter VIII, "Curriculum Proposals for the Future," pp. 135-157, by Caswell. The first three controls listed are policies which "are determinants of the types of educational opportunities which the high school should afford." (p. 135) The others are derived from the proposed program for high schools and the major types of opportunities to be provided. (p. 139)

2. Utilization of all available resources, with a balanced program for each person.

School does not attempt absolute independence and full responsibility for all educational opportunities, but assumes leadership among agencies, and maintains balance.

(See pp. 137-138.)

3. Articulation of program with elementary schools, colleges, technical and vocational schools.

(See pp. 138-139.)

4. A basic or core offering to provide a body of common, integrating experiences.

Based on significant personal and social problems which involve learnings of common concern to all youth. Canvass to be made of all experiences which youth should have in order to take their places in adult society. Should include:

Understanding and counsel on personal and educational problems

As we have asked before, what is balance taken to be?

Caswell admits that state and local "cooperation" is difficult to attain and does not say how it is to be accomplished.

A policy to heed, perhaps, but not to select subject matter. In no way does Caswell seem to mean that only that is to be taught in high school which grows from what has been learned already, or which is related to that which is to be learned. Progress is merely planned so that there are no major breaks or divisions.

Conceptions of adequate scope and sequence of experiences to meet the common needs of youth have not been agreed upon yet. It is small comfort to a teacher to be told, "One never fully gets 'the feel' of the core idea until the program is underway." (p. 144) How does a teacher know beforehand whether she wishes to subject her students to such a program?

Opportunities to aid students to meet common demands of civic participation

Opportunities to aid in maintaining physical and mental health

Experiences relating to family life

Common skills of communication and computation of general significance, learned to the extent of one's ability

Interrelationships of all learnings to be brought into review.

(See pp. 140-150.)

Is democratic adult life so clearly conceived in Boston, Birmingham, Peoria, Dallas, or Seattle that any professional group can discern how to prepare for it, in terms of particularized experiences? That seems overly hopeful, to say the least. Shall all eastern girls develop "appropriate attitudes toward the opposite sex, leading toward eventual mate selection," (p. 148) when they far outnumber available men? Can we anticipate necessary common learnings with any degree of accuracy?

Who is sufficiently informed in all fields of teaching to do this? How will a teacher decide whether to teach new facts, or to teach interrelationships among those already known?

5. Special services supplementary to the core program

Those needed because of marked individual differences and highly technical nature of some of the problems, including:

Guidance--behavior and personality problems; vocational guidance
Health
Language Development

All utilized "as required to meet the common needs of students who experience particular difficulties."
(p. 151)

To what extent is the school to take over full responsibility in these areas? What functions shall welfare agencies play? Is there any subject matter specifically the province of schools? If so, what is it, and how is it to be chosen?

Are there any indispensable services for which provision must be made? Is there any subject matter which must be learned and therefore must be made possible even if it calls for consolidation of schools or hiring new teachers? To determine this, one needs a basis for choosing subject matter which is more definitive than the one given here.

"Just what services could be provided in a specific high school would depend on several factors. Size would be a major determinant, and the competencies of the core teacher would be important." (p. 153)

(See pp. 150-153.)

6. Physical conditioning and recreation

"In the future the high school should contribute to a much greater extent than in the past to sound physical conditioning of our youth." (p. 153)

"The importance of physical recreation should be increasingly recognized." (p. 153)

Adjustments to be made in terms of needs of students, including correction of physical defects.

(See pp. 153-154.)

To what extent shall youths be conditioned "to undergo rigorous physical strain"? (p. 153) Shall their "one hour per day" be devoted to cross-country running, wrestling, or basketball?

How are conflicting needs to be reconciled?

7. Special-interest offerings

Every youth should be aided to develop special interests which go beyond the average.

Areas of interest should be socially constructive and valuable.

Areas should be of bona fide interest to youth, relating to past experience and present ability in such a way that activities can be undertaken with enthusiasm and meaning.

Which interests, of the many possible ones, shall be developed? Shall it depend upon teacher preparation, expense, equipment, local approval, or convenience in scheduling experiences? Or should these matters all be adjusted so as to permit interests to flourish?

(See pp. 154-156.)

8. School organization which illustrates democratic processes

Give students major responsibilities in school organizations and social activities.

As has been pointed out several times, until a teacher has a clear concept of democracy she cannot know what to teach in the way of democratic procedures.

(See pp. 156-157.)

9. Occupational preparation

Schools have a major responsibility to help people understand the problems involved in employment, prepare them to fill jobs, and develop good attitudes toward work.

The school cannot do entire job of preparing everyone but it can serve directly or be a coordinating agency with facilities in the community. School takes responsibility for planning and coordinating.

Does Caswell truly believe that schools can help people understand employment problems, or is he merely expecting the surface to be scratched? What are "good" attitudes toward work? Are they the same in Gary, Hollywood, Tampa, and Des Moines?

Shall subject matter depend upon what facilities are available and which employers are amenable to coordination? If not, are schools then obliged to provide facilities to give the desired preparation? How is the desired preparation to be ascertained?

(See pp. 158-182.)

10. Understanding of teachers

All steps taken to provide an educational program succeed or fail in terms of what teachers do when they work with pupils. Efforts to change the curriculum have generally failed except as they have led teachers to modify their points

What points of view shall be held? Which values are to be cherished?

"A conception such as civil liberties needs to be a living meaningful guide to the teacher, a value to be fostered through personal living and brought closer to full achievement through education."

of view, purposes, and procedures. The outward form can be legislated but the inner purposes and spirit can be brought into being only through group understanding.

(See pp. 183-184.)

(p. 187, in italics)

In view of the number of civil-liberties cases before the Supreme Court,¹ one must doubt that there is any one "conception such as civil liberties" for a teacher to procure and use as a "living, meaningful guide." Conceptions at present range from those of McCarthy to William Douglas and perhaps beyond. What is appropriate for teachers in a democracy? Caswell does not say.

1 "The discretionary authority granted the states resulted in such uneven acceptance of responsibility toward all citizens that the civil rights of citizens are still found to vary as among the several communities and even within a single community." "Civil Rights," Social Work Yearbook, New York: American Association of Social Workers, 1951, p. 109.

Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems¹

Implied Controls Over
Subject Matter²

Comments and Questions

1. The democratic ideal
(basic guide for
developing curriculum)

Provide for definition
and continuous refine-
ment of the conception
of democratic goals
held by the staff.

(See pp. 38, 99.)

"It is difficult, of course,
to develop a sufficiently
clear conception of the broad
goals implied by democracy to
apply this test to specific
curriculum proposals." (p. 38)
Yet educational workers are
to do it anyway, with nothing
in the way of help from
Caswell but vague generalities.

2. Development of the
curriculum, as a whole,
with various parts
interrelated so as to
supplement one another

Curriculum to be
guided by common
purposes and should
include broad areas
of experience agreed
upon as essential to
sound education.

How is the overall conception
of the local curriculum to be
achieved? What part has the
state department in it? the
central office staff? teachers?
pupils? Prolonged discussion
does not always result in

-
- 1 Hollis L. Caswell and Associates, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.
- 2 Data from Caswell's "Background Material for Evaluating Programs of Curriculum Development," pp. 1-101, but chiefly from Chapter V, "Evaluation of Curriculum Programs," pp. 98-101, and "Bases for Evaluating Demands for Curriculum Change," pp. 38-40. Among the material for evaluating curriculum proposals are the following which seem not to have bearing upon the choice of subject matter: provision of trained leadership, responsibility for curriculum services assigned to a single administrative officer, resource specialists provided, supervision functioning as a means of curriculum improvement.

Much local control over content and organization. Individual school the operational and planning unit. Program comprehensive-- dealing with all aspects of educational need.

agreement unless someone overpowers the others. What is done in case of disagreement? The basis for interrelationship of parts is not shown.

Participation of pupils to optimum extent (pp. 101, 382-383)

(See pp. 65, 70, 99-101.)

3. Needs, purposes, abilities of children

What is included must relate to lives of pupils so as to be meaningful and useful. Avoid too great emphasis upon social problems for which there are no ready solutions, or subject matter that is unduly disturbing.

By what measure are such expressions "too great emphasis" and "unduly disturbing" to be applied?

(See pp. 39, 101.)

4. Needs of society which schools can reasonably be expected to meet

Not all proposals to be acted upon

Sometimes another agency is best suited to assume responsibility. Sometimes a cooperative program is indicated.

To withstand pressures growing out of these very needs of society, teachers desperately need a functional criterion for choosing the content for which schools shall assume responsibility, but they do not have a basis for choice.

(See p. 38.)

5. Support and understanding of the community

Proposed changes should have or will gain the support of public-spirited leaders in the community.

(See p. 39.)

When differentiating between satisfying pressure groups with narrow interests, and worthy supporters, it would seem highly important to have a criterion for choice which could openly be announced and which would command respect of thoughtful persons. This criterion is lacking.

6. Participation of pupils in curriculum planning to optimum extent

In an example given of curriculum planning in Florida, pupils filled out questionnaires "designed to discover what kind of curricular experiences the pupils wanted..." (p. 382) Caswell does not indicate, however, that children are to be taught precisely what they want. In what way, and by what criteria shall pupils participate in that part of curriculum planning having to do with selection of subject matter?

7. Teacher growth considered primary avenue of curriculum improvement

"They must have a conviction that change is desirable and will result in improvement and must learn how to guide the new curriculum as proposed."
(p. 49)

(See p. 100.)

As a practical consideration, i.e., for selling the ideas to teachers, this may be entirely true. The direction of growth or the end to be achieved in respect to subject matter selection is, unfortunately, not indicated.

In examining Caswell's suggested bases for choice of subject matter in his three most recent books we seem to find, as in his first two, no clear test for knowing whether to include or exclude any particular bit of subject matter from a curriculum. The bases which he does mention can be interpreted in a number of ways. If they were to be put into use, nearly any subject matter which a curriculum worker or teacher wished to employ could be justified. The proposals, then, in each of his books could mean almost anything in practice.

Such looseness in a suggested program, coupled with the fact that concern is expressed about the teachers' understanding, poses an interesting question. Is this to be taken to mean that teachers should be thoroughly imbued with the curriculum-designers' mode of thinking before the "guides" can be adequately followed? The idea of consensus seems to be operating here--all get together and talk about these matters sufficiently. Soon we shall agree; then we shall get somewhere.¹ This writer remains to be convinced

1 If there be any doubt that there is this emphasis in Caswell's work, one needs only to look at his leadership during the war emergency. At Teachers College, on December 9 and 10, 1942, the Department of Curriculum and Teaching, of which Caswell was the head, sponsored a conference entitled, "The Present Educational Program and the War Situation." In it, Caswell endorsed the procedure of canvassing the needs of society (and, by inference, needs of children) then planning on a local level to meet those needs. At most, he suggested that a

that discussion by a school staff necessarily results in agreement or that democratic methods of reaching agreement are necessarily employed. To assure a democratic program it would seem mandatory for Caswell to state bases for selecting needs to meet (or subject matter to teach) which can function as true criteria. This he does not seem to do.

Caswell holds a position of leadership in the field of curriculum and has written a considerable amount of material that seems to have bearing upon the selection of subject matter. The question might well be raised; "If Caswell's suggested and implied bases for choice of subject matter are not true criteria, what are they?" For purposes of review and comparison, a tabulation has been made of criteria which have been found in each of his books. It appears on the next page.

The "criteria" have been rearranged so that similar bases for choice are side by side. Blank spaces indicate that this writer found so little material related to a particular criterion that she could not safely infer its presence either in the stated curriculum program or in

school staff confer together until they agreed on valid needs, and then agree on which needs they were in position to act upon. Inasmuch as bases for agreements are unstated, one must conclude that in Caswell's program each group was free to decide on needs (and consequently, on subject matter) in any manner it chose. See Florence Stratemeyer, "The Educational Program in a World at War," Teachers College Record, v. 44: 227-297, January, 1943.

1935 Curriculum Development (From a section entitled "Bases of Selecting Subject Matter" and from comments throughout the book)	1939 Democracy and the Curriculum (Derived from "Recommendations which should be operative in the evolution of a more satisfactory curriculum design")	1942 Education in the Elementary School (Derived from "Characteristics of a Good Elementary School Program," "Organizing the Curriculum" and summary chapter, "Looking Forward")	1946 The American High School (Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are "...policies..." which are the determinants of the types of educational opportunities which the school should afford." Others derived from proposed program)	1950 Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems (Derived from "Background Material for Evaluating Programs of Curriculum Development")
1. The democratic ideal		4. Program to contribute to understanding of and appreciation for democratic values and achievements	(Not mentioned as a basis for selection of subject matter but strongly implied throughout book as influencing secondary educational program)	1. The democratic ideal. No clear examples. Not clearly defined. Consensus does not insure democracy
2. Generalized controls of conduct leading to realization and interpretation of democratic ideals	4. Democratic organization and direction of the school community (for experience in democratic procedures)	3. Democratic organization of the life of the school	8. School organization which illustrates democratic processes	Mentioned as a theory being advanced by some workers and an area to be studied (pp. 31-33)
3. Consecutive, cumulative movement through curriculum	1. Curriculum an emerging whole with experiences leading into later stages of development	1. Program conceived and operated as a whole--continuous and cumulative throughout twelve years	3. Articulation of program with elementary schools, colleges, technical and vocational schools	2. Development of curriculum as a whole with various parts interrelated; program comprehensive basis for interrelationship not shown
4. Children's capacities and abilities	2a. Children's physical development	5c. Capacities of children	1. Program of such breadth as to meet needs of all American youth of whatever ability or vocational destination	3. Needs, purposes, abilities of children
5. Aspects of social life in which children must participate	7. Guidance in discovering work interest and training for life work 8. Creative and recreational opportunities	6. Experiences in all areas which characterize normal social organization	6. Physical conditioning and recreation 9. Occupational preparation	2b. Program comprehensive--dealing with all aspects of educational need
6. Core organization to guarantee integration of subject matter	5. As a core, understanding of persistent and long-important problems of contemporary living	1. See above. Broad and integrating experience	4. A basic or core offering to provide a body of common, integrating experience	See 2 and 2b.
7. Significance to an organized field of knowledge	Apparently included in No. 8.			
8. Significance to understanding contemporary life	5. See above.	6. Breadth of experience, with experiences in all areas of living 4. Understanding of democratic tradition	4. See above and below. Core based on problems which involve learnings of common concern to all youth	4. Needs of society which schools can reasonably be expected to meet
9. Adult use	Apparently included in No. 8.	Apparently included in Nos. 8 and 6.	Apparently included in Nos. 1 and 4.	Apparently included in No. 2.
10. Child interest and use	2b. Children's ever-changing interests and purposes	5a and 5b. Needs and interests of children	7. Special interest offerings 5. Special services supplementary to core program	Apparently included in No. 3.
11. Pupil purposes developed from interests	2b. See above.	Apparently included in No. 5b. (See p. 58, Education in the Elementary School, also p. 8.)	Apparently included in Nos. 4 and 7. (Needs and interests seem to replace purpose)	3b. See above.
12. Pupil needs for logically organized subject matter	8. Mastery of complex abilities and techniques, and relationships among them according to individual needs	8. Direct instruction in techniques and methods of work	4. See above. Interrelationships of all learnings to be brought into review	Briefly mentioned. See p. 79
13. Children's interests in one among several activities approved by teachers		5. Children help in planning		6. Participation of pupils to optimum extent
	3. Balance in each child's total (daily) program of living	2. Rounded educational program--balance of in-and-out of school activities	2. Utilization of all available resources with a balanced program for each person	Perhaps assumed in "needs"
	9. The understanding of teachers	9. Understandings and beliefs of educational workers and parents	10. Understanding of teachers - p. 185	7. Teacher growth considered primary avenue of curriculum improvement, p. 100
		7. Integral relationship of school and community		5. Support and understanding of community

Caswell's thinking. Of necessity, the material in the tabulation is highly condensed. An attempt has been made, however, to preserve Caswell's apparent meaning and to place in parallel position only those items which are substantially parallel in meaning regardless of terms used.

From the foregoing tabulation it seems fairly clear that a general pattern of criteria for choosing subject matter runs throughout Caswell's major works. Between five and thirteen criteria were found in each work, never just one or two. There are more items of comparable nature recurring than not, despite the fact that only the first set is a direct listing of criteria and is identified as such.

For the most part, omissions in any one list seem inconsequential--more a shifting of ideas or a regrouping of them than a genuine change. "Significance to an organized field of knowledge" is the one item to be most fully dropped out. So far as this writer could find, Caswell has neither identified nor explained any shifts which he may have made in ideas or in terminology. Furthermore, whether he intended or not, he seems to have said just about the same thing about selecting subject matter for eighteen years:

1. Take into consideration children's needs, abilities, interests, purposes.
2. Give consideration to the democratic ideal or democratic values.
3. Provide experience in democratic procedures.
4. Conceive and operate the program as a whole and organize it about a core of experiences commonly needed by all who are to take their places in society.
5. Take care that the program is broad, encompassing anticipated needs balanced for each child each day.
6. Teach the techniques, abilities, and inter-relationships among them which children will need now and as adults.
7. Involve parents, pupils, teachers, community representatives, and curriculum specialists in the planning.
8. Above all, be sure that teachers are developing the needed insight and understanding to work out such programs in their classrooms, because what the curriculum turns out to be depends directly on how the teacher understands it.

As we have seen in previous chapters, the above statements can scarcely be used as true criteria for subject-matter selection. That is to say, they cannot serve to distinguish clearly what a teacher who plans to follow Caswell's program should or should not include in a curriculum. They seem to this writer not dependable for steering a straight course toward a democratic program.

The question has been raised, "If Caswell's suggested and implied bases for choices of subject matter

are not true criteria, what are they?" We can but answer, "They are injunctions, admonitions, or directives which, if followed, call upon a teacher to employ some unstated criterion or criteria for subject-matter selection."

Inasmuch as the criterion or criteria are unstated, and any criteria ranging from ultra-authoritarian to ultra-laissez-faire might be used,¹ we must conclude that in bases for choice of content Caswell's proposals are not necessarily appropriate for democratic education.

-
- 1 Examples: Select subject matter to fill any need which
- (a) the New York Times points out
 - (b) the children happen to mention
 - (c) a Congressional committee "uncovers"
 - (d) standard tests of the superintendent's choosing reveal
 - (e) a survey from the nearest university suggests
 - (f) teachers happen to be able to fill easily.

Chapter VI

CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY J. PAUL LEONARD IN DEVELOPING THE SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM AND IN OTHER WORKS

The writings of J. Paul Leonard in the field of curriculum may be less familiar than those of Caswell yet they merit consideration here. With a career curiously similar to that of Caswell,¹ Leonard has been in position to exert great influence in curriculum matters. It should be of interest in this study to note how he differs from Caswell in his suggestions for selection of subject matter.

We turn first to his major work, Developing the Secondary School Curriculum.² In it, Leonard examines

1 Born in the same year, Caswell and Leonard went to college and had their first teaching experience in neighboring mid-western states. At Columbia University they received the A.M. degree in 1927 and the Ph.D. in 1929. Both went south for college teaching--Caswell to Peabody, Leonard to the College of William and Mary. During the thirties, each helped with curriculum in Florida, Virginia, and Mississippi, and each had experience in directing school surveys in various cities. In 1937, when Caswell went north to Teachers College, Leonard went west to Stanford and each continued to work closely with school systems in his own area. Leonard's acceptance of an administrative position (President of San Francisco State College) was followed the very next year by Caswell's appointment as Associate Dean (later, Dean) of Teachers College. It is not surprising that they have both been leaders in some of the same national, professional organizations--National Education Association, John Dewey Society, and Educational Research Association.

Data from Jaques Cattell and E. E. Ross, Leaders in Education, Third Edition, Lancaster, Pa.: The Science Press, 1948.

2 J. Paul Leonard, Developing the Secondary School Curriculum,

curriculum history seeking "to bring out the relation between the program of the secondary school and the social problems of each major period in our history, to trace the significant changes in the curriculum, and to point out the deficiencies of the secondary school in its attempt to educate modern youth with traditional curricula."¹ Then he reviews various conflicting theories and practices, and concludes with a chapter which brings together suggestions for curriculum revision which had been made or implied throughout the book.²

When Leonard writes of conflicting curriculum theories, he does not always identify his own position or express direct approval of particular ideas. Great care must be exercised when lifting his sentences from their context lest the views therein be wrongly credited to him. It is believed that the following excerpts represent him fairly, inasmuch as they are in harmony with his expressed position as found in the preface, on page 285, and in the last chapter.

New York: Rinehart and Company, 1946. 560 p. In 1953, after this investigation was completed, a revised edition was published. No significant differences in criteria for selection of subject matter have been found by this writer. Some minor differences between the two books have been noted elsewhere in this chapter.

1 Ibid., p. viii.

2 The revised edition adds many illustrations of current practice, cites material from recent studies, and gives consideration to some new topics not of particular interest to us in this inquiry.

... learning is...the process of changing the behavior of the individual as he adjusts himself to basic organic disturbances ... This process of the interaction of a man and his environment is known as experience, and out of it a man gains knowledge for the redirection of continued experience... This point of view regarding learning requires a different school program--a program originating in the basic needs of the individual.¹

The selection of materials...must proceed on the basis of the level of growth of the individual, his own designed purposes, the need he sees or can be brought to feel, and the necessary pressures of the social mores around him at his own level of growth. He builds and grows with what he can incorporate into his own experience. All other materials will be superfluous or unused.²

The one remaining criterion for selecting subject matter is the behavior desired of the individual--the aims of education in a democratic society. If we want individuals to have certain attitudes, knowledge, skill for social participation, it is necessary that we plan our materials of instruction so that the desired behavior patterns will have opportunity to develop. Careful study needs to be made of individual and social needs and of the multiplicity of activities necessary to secure adequate practice in satisfying these needs.³

Leonard's bases for selecting subject matter, judging from the foregoing statements, are five: maturation level of the pupil, pupil purposes, needs manifested, social pressures, and behavior desired in a democracy.

1 Ibid., pp. 90-91.

2 Ibid., p. 113. Underscoring not in original.

3 Ibid., p. 114. Underscoring not in original.

The question before us is, "If the selection of learning materials proceeds on the above bases, can a democratic educational program thereby be assured?" We shall consider each basis, as we did in examining Caswell's program.

1. Maturation level of the pupil

Leonard warns against taking all material from the adult world, disregarding the maturation level of the learner, presenting him with the materials as problems which are not his own and have no meaning or significance for him. Yet he also decries excessive concern over the immediate experience or knowledge of the individual. He does not want teachers to ignore the necessity for adult guidance in the development of youth. Beyond these warnings, however, he does not seem to go. There is no way suggested for a teacher to strike a desirable balance between teaching what a child is ready for and teaching what an adult thinks he should have, i.e., giving him "adult guidance." Leonard merely says, in effect, consider the level of growth of the individual.

Even if we were to take this criterion of maturation level at face value we could scarcely use it alone as a base for choosing content. Of all the possible experiences which children might have, there are surely many for which at any one time they are prepared. Fifth

graders, for instance, are sufficiently mature to participate in a spelling bee, write every word in the lesson twenty times, compose a sentence using each word, or even write each one backwards and upside down. Which shall it be? There is nothing here to tell us. Again, shall the subject matter in a unit on animals be reproduction, conservation, diseases, or extermination of animals? Pupils are conceivably mature enough for any one of these. Pupil maturity as a basis for choice of subject matter apparently cannot stand alone, unless the one who suggests it specifies that any topic whatsoever for which they are ready is acceptable. We are sure that Leonard does not intend that. Pupil maturity, then, as Leonard uses it, does not serve as a true criterion; its selectivity is only very general.

2. Pupil purposes

Pupil purposes are recognized by Leonard as central to individual development. They are said to direct behavior, thus determining what is learned.¹ When pupil purposes serve as basis for selecting subject matter does it mean that whatever helps children satisfy their own purposes becomes the subject matter of the school? Not quite, for pupils

1 Ibid., p. 103.

...must set their own purposes in so far as is possible, but where they may not voluntarily choose to act in acceptable ways, they must be led to accept willingly those purposes which the teacher deems desirable... On the other hand, care must be exercised that choosing another's purpose does not become a habit...¹

Purposes must be in harmony with the nature of the democratic society which we desire, in harmony with the most desirable goals of the individual, and must be developed in such a way as to provide for continuity in the process.²

It seems readily apparent that just any pupil purposes cannot be used to select subject matter. Only purposes which meet the three criteria just mentioned are to be employed. If a pupil does not give evidence of such purposes a teacher must lead him to accept those which she considers desirable. And just what, in Leonard's program, will they be? He says that, first, pupil purposes must be in harmony with the nature of the democratic society which we desire. To evaluate pupil purposes then, a teacher should know Leonard's ideas of the significant characteristics of democracy.

Scattered throughout the book are references to democracy.³ Among the most pertinent are:

1 Ibid., p. 103.

2 Loc. cit.

3 There are sixty-eight page entries in the Index under the heading "Democracy" but no subtitle "Democracy - definition."

Democracy involves the acceptance of the principle that all members of society have equal rights and an equal voice in the determination of societal policies.¹

People are different in many ways, and democratic society needs those differences. ... All must work together collectively to develop the resources of the country and to pool their best thinking for the type of institutions which shall be operative in society.²

If we want a democracy where each person is to think his way through life situations and where his solution is to have the respect of other men...³

We look elsewhere to see whether we have the whole of his concept and find allusions to "democratic ideals and practices"⁴ and "principles of democracy."⁵ But he also mentions "the ideal of democracy"⁶ and "the democratic concept."⁷ Here we find confusion in terms similar to that in Caswell. (See p. 71, Chapter 3, this study.)

We look for some clarification in Leonard's concluding chapter, where he most clearly outlines what he expects teachers to do. When he predicts the eight

1 Ibid., pp. 278-279.

2 Loc. cit. Underscoring originally in italics.

3 Ibid., p. 112.

4 Ibid., p. 121. Underscoring not in original.

5 Ibid., p. 537. See also p. 349.

6 Ibid., p. 42.

7 Ibid., p. 349.

curriculum changes most likely to be effected he says first,

We must build a program to teach the meaning of democracy... The "meaning of democracy" as we have used the term, implies several things. First, it implies the meaning of the two basic concepts of democracy--respect for individual personality, and freedom of action... We need also to develop the meaning of family life and its implications for the building of individual character and personalities, the stabilizing of emotions, the inducting of children into the manners and customs of civilization, and the rearing of a family... The school should develop an understanding of the necessity for utilizing our natural and human resources wisely... If we are going to develop the full meaning of democracy we must make boys and girls intelligent about economics and politics... Many other phases of democratic living should be discussed... The teacher, however, should make a careful study of all the social problems which impinge upon the community before making final decisions as to the scope of the program which teaches the meaning of democracy.¹

The above passages which seem on first reading to give promise of an explanation of the meaning of democracy become, on perusal, a catalog of content by which to help youth arrive at its meaning. For our purpose, they reveal at most the concepts which Leonard considers basic in democracy. These two concepts, fortified by his other statements, suggest (1) a social order based on respect for personality (individual differences are developed and

1 Ibid., pp. 544-546.

utilized; members have equal rights) and (2) freedom of action (independent thought is encouraged; all members work together in directing society). Whether this comprises the whole of Leonard's outlook on democracy we cannot say. It is as much of a definition as the writer could honestly construct from Leonard's apparent commitments in Developing the Secondary School Curriculum.¹

The above idea of democracy seems loose; suggestive but not definitive. His concepts may indicate in rough outline a teacher's decisions as to whether to permit or replace pupil purposes but would not help much in the actual selection. Particularly is this true when controversial topics were in question. In one school system a teacher could accept a pupil's purpose to learn how to curtail powers of corporations operating farms so as to promote family life of farm laborers. In another, such a purpose would be considered out of harmony with the nature of democratic society in which there is "freedom of action" and respect for individual personality (of corporation members, to be sure.) In order to judge pupil purposes a teacher needs a knife-sharp definition of democracy, not platitudes.

1 In the 1953 edition Leonard devotes a paragraph to "The Political Character of Our Society." (p. 49) The beliefs which are listed (only the "chief among them" are given), and his explanation of them, seem to confirm what was found in the earlier book.

Leonard says next that purposes must be in harmony with the most desirable goals of the particular individual.¹ But the reader does not find what the author deems desirable and so would not know when to accept a pupil's own purpose and when to get him to accept one of hers. Teachers are urged not to set the purposes for youth so often as to form a habit,² yet with no standard for judgment that is probably precisely what they will do.

Finally, pupil purposes are to be developed in such a way as to provide for a continuity in the process.³ Sequential learning in a series of grades is to be planned cooperatively by teachers. There is even to be "orderly development of basic understandings and skills."⁴ Although this sequence is said to be not the conventional sequence of history or mathematics, it is to be certain ideas of major importance, agreed upon in advance by teachers. Nevertheless, such an agreement (curriculum) is to be only suggestive and "eventual selection of actual subject matter will rest with the teacher and the pupils at the time of learning."⁵ When to follow and when to depart from the

1 Ibid., p. 103.

2 Loc. cit.

3 Loc. cit.

4 Loc. cit.

5 Ibid., p. 114.

sequence is not specified.

To this reader, the teacher who attempts to follow such a program is truly in a predicament. She is to use pupil purposes to select subject matter but modify those purposes if they are not in harmony with democracy (however her own group defines it); if she thinks the purposes are not in harmony with the pupil's most desirable goals (whatever may be desirable); and if purposes do not provide continuity. (Her fellow-teachers have a plan for orderly development of basic understandings and skills.) Sometimes follow the planned sequence; sometimes not. She must decide. With such latitude there is grave doubt whether teachers will consistently guide pupils in a democratic manner. Traditional subject-matter concerns and personal biases loom too large in the thinking of many teachers. A highly authoritarian pattern could develop. It is conceivable, perhaps, that a group of well-educated and highly conscientious teachers could deal with pupil purposes in democratic fashion. If they did so, it would be under self-imposed limitations of freedom, not Leonard's, for his program seems to provide no safeguards to assure democratic treatment of pupil purposes.

3. Needs manifested

In selecting materials of instruction teachers are to be guided by the needs pupils see or can be brought

to feel. Such a "guide" merely confronts a teacher with more choices. When does she use the needs pupils feel and when bring them to feel the needs she thinks they should? If a child sees the need for improving his manuscript writing so as to excel in something but a teacher can bring him to feel the need for cursive writing instead of manuscript, should she? If a youth sees need for comprehending a pinball machine but his teacher can bring him to feel need for fathoming a typewriter, which should he study? Leonard does not indicate how a teacher is to decide.

Nor does he specifically define a need. He mentions how others use the term (shortage as seen by adults, physiological drive, psychological want) and points out the limitations of each definition.¹ Then he says needs "arise from a growing, acting personality and are the results of adolescents undergoing tensions and conflicts."² Moreover, they can be discovered by studying growth and development, analyzing the culture and interviewing youth in school and out.³ Apparently needs are, for him, both personal and social in nature, are of several kinds and teachers will know them when they see them. As the writer

1 Ibid., pp. 92-94.

2 Ibid., p. 93.

3 Ibid., p. 95.

pointed out in regard to Caswell's suggestion of "needs" as a criterion for choice of subject matter, teachers require more than vague, undefined guides in order to decide for or against particular items of subject matter. They also need some means of reconciling conflicts among several needs experienced by an individual at any one time.

4. Social pressures

Although, in his bases on which selection of material is to proceed, Leonard includes "the necessary pressures of the social mores around him [pupil] at his own level of growth,"¹ there seems to be little further comment on the social pressures apart from discussion of needs and purposes.² It may be assumed, perhaps, that Leonard mentions social pressures in order to make sure that readers will be aware of needs arising both from personal and from social conditions and of purposes which social pressures generate. No special consideration of this criterion seems needful.

5. Behavior desired of the individual--the aims of education in a democratic society

In selecting subject matter, curriculum workers are to have "a new central focus in mind, the focus of the

1 Ibid., p. 113.

2 See p. 103.

emerging democratic citizen."¹ They are to determine which behavior patterns are desired, then plan their content accordingly.

Throughout his book Leonard refers frequently to the aims of education in a democratic society. With one exception, which we shall note later, he does not state his. Nor does he delineate the "emerging democratic citizen" toward which to focus. He seems, rather, to place this responsibility upon those who wish to follow his ideas. By discussion and compromise teachers are to arrive at a list of general aims of education stated in terms of behavior desired of children and youth. They are then to select subject matter which will produce the behavior patterns.²

As we have seen before, it is not enough to tell teachers to study and arrive at consensus if we wish them to perform democratically. There are too many possibilities of subtle pressure exerted by special-interest groups or by individuals with strong influence and limited vision.

In his concluding chapter Leonard does give a "brief summary" of "some...major social goals" and says that the summary "will suggest the direction toward which

1 Ibid., p. 114.

2 This task is admittedly difficult. (See p. 350 in Leonard.) But teachers are to do it anyway, making a "scope and sequence...a two-dimensional blueprint of desirable experiences from kindergarten through secondary school."

our secondary schools might move."¹ The goals are:

1. ...citizens competent and willing to make every needed sacrifice to make democracy work for all men.
2. ...a consuming desire for that kind of public behavior toward other nations which produces peaceful international relationships.
3. ...a realization that we have adequate resources to meet the economic and social needs of all our people and that these resources must be used for this purpose.
4. ...consciousness of the fact that successful living depends upon adequate personal and public health, upon physical fitness for employment and upon satisfying social and family relations.
5. ...understanding that America's traditional economic system of private enterprise must serve the public good and that, if necessary, it must be regulated by government.
6. ...learning that all men must work to produce for individual and group welfare and that opportunities for work must always be available.
7. ...knowledge...he youth needs to improve his social and economic status to the limit of his capacities.

It is to be noted, first, that these are only some of the goals of democratic society. Then what are the others?

1 Ibid., p. 541. Underscoring not in original.

2 Ibid., pp. 541-543.

Does it matter which goals any one group decides upon? Or in which direction it moves? Leonard does not commit himself on these matters. Can we depend upon a group to be democratic, merely if they discuss and compromise? This writer's experience leads her to think not.

Next we look at the goals themselves. It should be remembered that these goals are to be the basis for subject-matter selection. The first, second, and seventh point toward abilities, attitudes, and knowledge to be acquired. The others supply the generalizations actually to be apprehended. The assumption seems to be that with any one of them the subject matter to use in achieving them would be derived by teachers through study. Let us test the first to see whether this be true.

What behaviors do we expect of "citizens competent and willing to make democracy work for all men?" Shall competence include knowledge of legal enactments which prevent democracy working for all--or how to get around laws without arousing one's constituency? How to run a propaganda campaign--or how to run someone out of office? How to break a strike--or how to conduct one in order to secure better conditions? Would saturating pupils with history of such changes make pupils more competent? Or demanding high achievement in oral persuasion? What about a "good dose" of the literature of democracy--or, for contrast, of the literature of totalitarianism? Briefly,

shall competence and willingness to make every needed sacrifice be of the McCarthy brand or that of Justice William Douglas? Leonard does not seem to take into account the divergence of views which might preclude agreement on choice of content.

Time does not permit like scrutiny of each of the other goals. Perhaps one question about each will serve to show whether any can be used to select subject matter.

2. Pupils are to have "a consuming desire for that kind of public behavior toward other nations which produces peaceful international relationships." To get that desire shall they study statistics of war casualties, the Quaker faith, the life and work of Owen Lattimore, or the history of tariffs?

3. Pupils are to realize "that we have adequate resources to meet the economic and social needs of all our people and that these resources must be used for this purpose." In order to arrive at this realization do they study T.V.A., "natural" migration from the dustbowl, group dynamics, social service, or revival of Victory gardens?

4. Pupils are to become "conscious of the fact that successful living depends upon adequate personal and public health, upon physical fitness for employment and upon

satisfying social and family relations." Will this consciousness stem from the teacher's saying that it is so, from reading biographies of the ancients, from community surveys, or from examining the causes and results of mental illness?

5. Pupils are to "understand that America's traditional economic system of private enterprise must serve the public good and that, if necessary, it must be regulated by government." To understand this, do pupils study the life of Carnegie, Communist criticisms of private enterprise, or the "basic error" of the Republican Party?

6. Pupils are to "learn that all men must work to produce for individual and group welfare and that opportunities for work must always be available." Does this call for a study of the New Deal, the rise of industrialism in England, or the sinfulness of India's holy men who "only beg"?

7. Finally, youth is to acquire the "knowledge... he needs to improve his social and economic status to the limit of his capacities." Will this knowledge include study of foreign language, problems of home ownership, how to give book reviews, development of markets for native handcrafts, or automobile financing?

To describe goals of education in terms of "desired behavior patterns" does not seem necessarily to indicate what subject matter will achieve the goals, i.e., produce the behavior. The interpretation of each goal seems to depend upon one's concept of democracy.

A teacher who wishes to use the goals of education as a criterion for selection of content finds that she and her colleagues must first delineate an "emerging democratic citizen" on which to focus. Some, but not all, of the behavior traits desired in that individual are suggested. What the others are she is not told. Even the ones mentioned will not point toward some subject matter and away from all other. As with Leonard's second criterion--pupil purposes--his fifth, which we have just examined, needs a clear-cut definition of democracy. With it a teacher could know what direction she would be taking if she chose to follow Leonard.

We have now considered all of Leonard's bases for choice of subject matter. In each we seem to have found loosely fashioned directives: Consider pupil maturation but give adult guidance. Use pupil purposes but overrule some. Formulate a sequential list of major ideas to be taught but do not always follow it. Meet pupils' felt needs but at times bring them to feel some which you see. Finally, select subject matter in line with the aims of education in a democracy but first decide what they are. By placing so

many decisions in the hands of curriculum workers and failing to give explicit definitions of democracy and educational purposes within democracy by which to test their conclusions, the field is left wide open for them to be either highly authoritarian or grossly laissez-faire. There appears to be no "Ellis Island" to screen out the undesirable. The program, then, has nothing which commends it for democratic education and that alone.

The technique of proposing a curriculum program in very broad outline and charging teachers with responsibility for finding their own way, by study and consensus, has a familiar ring. It is what we have found throughout Caswell's writings. Does it also prevail in Leonard's work?

Leonard was co-editor of An Evaluation of Modern Education¹ and wrote the first chapter entitled, "What is Modern Education?" His position on subject-matter selection might be summarized thus. The focus of selection is the learner himself and the nature of his problems. Consider who the learner is--the kind of person,² his goals in life, the social conditions surrounding him, problems (disturbances)

1 J. Paul Leonard and Alvin C. Eurich, et al., An Evaluation of Modern Education, Report sponsored by The Society for Curriculum Study, New York: D. Appleton Century Co., 1942.

2 The one specific personality trait mentioned is maturity. See p. 19. The writer takes "the kind of person" to mean general personality as well as maturity.

he encounters, and needs he manifests in attempting to restore balance in behavior. Base education on personal and group problems (disturbances) determined by a study of individuals and the culture in which they live.¹

In a few respects this position is similar to that found in Developing the Secondary School Curriculum. Maturity, pupil purposes, social pressures, and manifest needs are all to be considered. There is an important difference, however, in each of these items. They seem to stand on their own merits; there are no qualifying phrases such as "give adult guidance," "lead them to accept willingly purposes which the teacher deems desirable," or "select needs children see or can be brought to feel." Furthermore, aims of education or the behavior desired in a democracy are omitted. If Leonard meant to say that any subject matter which would help learners solve problems actually encountered was to constitute the curriculum, we would have something quite different from what we found in his later book. He came very close to it in the assertion,

As the teacher guides each individual through the analysis of himself and through the selection of materials and techniques that help that individual restore balance and develop insight, he must do this in an organization which itself is characteristic of exploration. The answer is not known; it isn't in the

1 Ibid., pp. 7-9.

book or in the mind of the teacher; it isn't in the acceptance of the judgment of another; it is in the process of individual pursuit.¹

Only the needs of the learner, in terms of personal and group problems encountered, seem to be the criterion for selection.

Yet, when Leonard gave illustrations of the "most promising" educational programs, he used five frequently mentioned favorably in Developing the Secondary School Curriculum.² They all happen to list analyses of needs anticipated and not of problems encountered. Moreover, he concluded his remarks about them by saying,

All of the areas of human needs... illustrate a feeling for developing behavior consistent with democratic living.³

In the writer's judgment there is a genuine difference between selecting subject matter which helps individuals restore balance and develop insight and subject matter which meets needs anticipated because a certain type of social order is desired. Since Leonard himself participated in the making of the Santa Barbara County program used as one

1 Ibid., p. 18.

2 Ibid., p. 10.

3 Ibid., p. 17.

illustration, we must conclude that, despite his stated theory, he intends the study of culture and of the individual to result in a list of needs to be met, not problems to be encountered. He seems to mean, further, that those needs exist or will exist because we desire a particular type of democratic society which we may define as we choose.

In 1950, Educational Leadership published three brief articles under the heading "What are Life Needs?"¹ The editor introduced the articles by saying,

To say that instructional programs should be designed to help students meet their needs is to be guilty of a truism. Just what these needs are is not always clearly stated. The authors...present their points of view as to the meaning of the term "life needs."²

Curiously enough, Leonard points out how life needs are defined by psychologists, sociologists, and subject teachers; then says there is no one way to define them.

...but whatever definition (usually a classification of experience) is accepted, it should be useful in the selection of instructional material which will be effective in producing the desired results. It should be specific enough to help in making a

1 Harry Bard, "Individual and Community Needs"; J. Paul Leonard, "School and Life Needs"; and Henry Harap, "Essentials of Good Living", Educational Leadership, 7:354-359, March, 1950.

2 Loc. cit.

choice among curriculum materials. The classifications should be few in number, not a major listing of specific goals to be achieved, and the classifications should be closely related to human experience so that a need is at once apparent.¹

The "principal life needs that the school should strive to meet" are given only "by way of illustration." They are four: learning to behave the way your peers expect you to behave, getting and holding a job, personal growth and development, and developing a successful home life. "All other phases of needs can be subsumed clearly under these four."²

These needs also may serve as a framework of organization, and will, if adopted, tend to focus attention upon behavior and the selection of materials to establish certain behavioral patterns.³

The import of this article is unmistakable: the needs of society rather than the problems of learners are primary in Leonard's considerations; Leonard is granting freedom to curriculum workers to choose the classifications of experience to be considered areas of "needs," to ascertain the desired behavioral patterns, to select with

1 Ibid., p. 356.

2 Ibid., pp. 356-357.

3 Loc. cit. Underscoring not in original.

no further guidance the subject matter to develop those patterns. By neglecting to provide otherwise for it, he appears to expect them to define democracy as they will. Great faith is placed in curriculum workers' insight into democracy and ability to arrive at consensus by group study and discussion, apparently, but there is no clear assurance that any one group will ipso facto create a program indisputably democratic.

In 1951 Leonard gave a brief address on "General Education--Bases for Determination of Content and Method."¹ He counselled educators to consider the cultural heritage (forces dominant in our lives), needs of society, and needs of individuals. Goals of general education, he proposed, should be stated in behavioral terms; then debated by each faculty until common understanding and general agreement are reached. Broadly speaking, general education is to "seek to make known to youth the values which promote a society of free men" and the goals are to be specific enough "to be determinants in choosing from among human experience that most likely to achieve the goal of a free man [undefined.]"² The author's examples

1 J. Paul Leonard, "General Education--Bases for Determination of Content and Method", pp. 173-177 in R. C. Maul, Editor, Addresses on Current Issues in Higher Education, April 2-4, 1951, Sixth Annual Conference on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Higher Education, 1951. 202 p.

2 Ibid., pp. 174-175.

of goals sound much like those in Developing the Secondary School Curriculum--"a code of individual and public behavior consistent with a good society," "a common understanding and agreement upon certain values which they will observe and protect,"¹ et cetera.

If the needs of society (as diagnosed by a faculty) and the needs of individuals conflict, no way is provided for harmonizing the two; there is not really a criterion of selection. Once more, teachers are to study individuals and the culture (note that it is not individuals in the culture) and if they decide to promote values which are scarcely democratic, what is to prevent them?

Leonard's other works² reveal no significant differences in his ideas of subject-matter selection. In each case his program turns out to be essentially a study of the individual and of society, with curriculum workers³ to

1 Ibid., p. 174.

2 See especially: J. Paul Leonard, "Some Reflections on the Meaning of Sequence" in V. E. Herrick and R. W. Tyler, Toward Improved Curriculum Theory, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Department of Education, Supplementary Education Monographs No. 71, 1950. J. Paul Leonard, "Meeting the Imperative Needs of Youth," School and Community, 33:35-36, January, 1947. J. Paul Leonard, "Organizing the Curriculum to Meet Youth Needs," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 34: 228-234, April, 1950. Thomas Henry Briggs, J. Paul Leonard and Joseph Justman, Secondary Education, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950, Revised Edition. 468 p.

3 In the 1953 edition of Developing the Secondary School

determine the needs of both, however they see them. Then they are to select subject matter to meet the needs so that the desired behavior (by their own definition) can be produced. To the extent that curriculum workers formulate functional and accurate definitions of democracy and democratic behavior, to that extent will their curriculum be fit for our social order. But the reverse is also true. There seems to be little in Leonard's writing to insure action uniquely democratic. We feel obliged to conclude that his program is not necessarily appropriate for education in our democracy.

Curriculum Leonard stresses that ultimate selection of subject matter is to be made by individual teachers.

Chapter VII

CRITERIA SUGGESTED BY STRATEMEYER, FORKNER, MCKIM, ET AL.,
IN DEVELOPING A CURRICULUM FOR MODERN LIVING

The Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation was formed in 1946 to do research in curriculum in public-school systems. Members of the Institute staff saw need for more adequate direction of curriculum programs.¹ In an attempt "to develop an approach to the curriculum which relates the best we know about children and youth growing up in society in terms of the democratic values of that society,"² the Childhood-Youth Education Committee of the Institute produced the book, Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living. It is characterized by the Committee as a "reasoned theory of a curriculum."³ The criteria for selection of subject matter are to be found in the following:

... the content of the curriculum consists of the everyday problems of learners seen in the light of the persistent life situations of which they are a part. These situations...take the place of subjects...⁴

1 F. B. Stratemeyer, H. L. Forkner, M. G. McKim, et al., Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947, p. v.

2 Ibid., p. viii.

3 Ibid., p. v.

4 Ibid., p. 74.

The problem or the situation is the determiner of the particular content to be discovered.¹ The learner's real curriculum emerges through the teaching-learning process, as teacher and learner work together on problems which have meaning for them.²

The range and variety of persistent life situations with which all persons inevitably deal and in which all need to develop competence serve as the criterion against which balanced or rounded development is evaluated.³

... it is possible to make an analysis of the nature and range of persistent life situations, the recurring situations with which persons living in our society are dealing and those which will become part of their living as we move toward the more complete realization of democratic values. In addition, through extended study of children and youth, it is possible to indicate a number of typical situations of daily living in which learners of various maturity levels are most likely to face these persistent life situations.⁴

With such an analysis as a guide, it becomes the responsibility of each teacher to study his learners and to identify those persistent life situations with which they have had little or no contact and in which they lack needed understanding and competence. In so doing, he must look at the total growth of the learners, appraise the learnings

1. Ibid., p. 90.

2. Ibid., p. 72.

3. Ibid., p. 83. Underscoring not in original.

4. Ibid., p. 84. Underscoring not in original.

coming through experiences in the home and...community, and must plan to supplement and expand these experiences so that balanced growth results.¹

... Teachers guide the learner in dealing with his experiences in such a way as to develop values, understandings, and ways of behaving which give him bases for meeting new aspects of these situations.²

Briefly, individual and group concerns or problems of learners, seen in the light of persistent life situations which are common to everyone and in which all need competence, are said to determine curriculum content. Curriculum workers make a guide for teachers by analyzing the nature and range of persistent life situations which exist now and which will come to be in the future "as we move toward more complete realization of democratic values." Teachers look at pupils and at the analysis, identify situations in which experience is thought to be needed, and proceed to set up such situations with pupils in the classrooms. Then they help pupils to arrive at the basic understandings and competencies needed to deal adequately with experiences of present and future daily living.

1 Loc. cit. See also pp. 311-321 where numerous criteria for identifying specific situations at a given time are summarized.

2 Ibid., p. 86.

Essentially, this program is one of meeting needs which educators see and foresee. Examples given of sources for life situations are five aspects of living--home, work, community, leisure time, and spiritual activities.¹ The life situations seem in every way comparable to the results of Caswell's and Leonard's analyses of the needs of society and of learners. In fact, Stratemeyer and her co-authors seem almost to equate "needs" with major situations when they designate, in the Preface, the nature of society and the needs of children as "the two major guides to curriculum development,"² then proceed to discuss life situations as curriculum guides.

Curriculum workers and teachers apparently are to use two criteria for selection of persistent life situations which, in turn, select subject matter. The criteria are (1) situations with which all persons inevitably deal and (2) situations in which all need to develop competence as we move toward the realization of democratic values. Both of these "criteria" seem useful only as general indicators of content, not as genuine tests for specific subject matter. The first brings into focus possible situations to be faced somehow, sometime, by all

1 Ibid., p. 100.

2 Ibid., p. viii.

learners, but not to be used as specific educational goals or objectives.¹ The second criterion depends upon the democratic values we hold. Additional criteria are listed for teachers' use but, like Caswell's long list of "criteria" in his first book,² they seem merely to narrow the field of "needs" without truly delineating subject matter to be taught.

What, then, are the actual bases upon which persons are to choose subject matter? Throughout Stratemeyer's book, as we have found in other works where "meeting needs" is central, it seems to be assumed that certain learnings are to be acquired,³ and that any educator who cherishes democratic values can, by studying society, discover what the learnings are. Shortcomings in this view have been mentioned in earlier chapters. There is one difference in Stratemeyer's proposal, however. Curriculum workers are not asked to study society and formulate a

1 Ibid., p. 105.

2 See pp. 89-90 of this inquiry.

3 The learnings are variously referred to as "values, understandings, and ways of behaving" (p. 86), "understandings and competence" (p. 258), "basic understandings and skills" (p. 377), "basic generalizations and understandings" (p. 357), and "understandings and generalizations" (p. 397). According to a statement on page 89, understandings and generalizations are equivalent. Despite the shift in terms, with resultant confusion for the careful reader, the authors seem to intend no difference in meaning.

definition of democracy. The authors indicate early in the book their conception of the nature of our society which, presumably, must be accepted by anyone who wishes to follow their plan.¹ Democracy, for them, seems to be a "way of life" in which "each individual strive/s/ to assure the maintenance of democratic values, ...each take/s/ responsibility for helping to establish conditions under which material abundance and power will be used for the maximum development of all."² The values cited by the authors are four:

1. Belief in the worth and dignity of the individual,
2. Belief that decision and action should be based on the scientific approach to the study of problems,
3. Faith in cooperative intelligence as a means of improving life,
4. Commitment to the translation of democratic values into action.³

To the extent that these values are acted upon in every aspect of daily living, to that extent is society said to be growing in the direction of democracy.⁴ It is

1 For further analysis the authors suggest a companion volume, Education and the Promise of America, by George S. Counts, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944. (Mimeographed.) See Stratemeyer, et al., op. cit., p. 26.

2 Stratemeyer, et al., op. cit., p. 43.

3 Ibid., pp. 44-47. Not quoted exactly.

4 Ibid., pp. 43-44.

interesting to notice that the values referred to by Stratemeyer and her co-authors are to be found listed together, that they are discussed at length, and that the same values, easily recognizable, are mentioned throughout the text. To this reader, they are considerably more certain than values alluded to in some curriculum writings. But the question remains, "Can democratic values as listed in Developing a Curriculum serve as adequate basis for choice of subject matter?"

The vagueness and consequent inadequacy of the concept within the first value--respect for the unique worth of individuals--has been pointed out elsewhere.¹

The third value likewise seems unclear. The authors did not say, "Teach children to be intelligent and to use democratic processes when the interests of individuals and/or groups conflict." They suggested that we "help the individual meet his needs through channels making for the greatest social contribution."² But who can presume to judge in advance what "the social good" is? Does realization of this value call for subject matter to produce more technicians or more social scientists? The authors do not seem to intimate. What the third value means, in terms of subject matter beyond a personal

1 See Chapter III, p. 73 of this inquiry.

2 Stratemeyer, et al., op. cit., p. 46.

commitment to social welfare (and even which subject matter is thought to be efficacious in bringing about such commitment) this reader does not quite know.

If, by the second value, the authors were proposing a program in which the curriculum would be constituted of any subject matter whatsoever needed in scientific handling of problems currently confronted by children, teachers might have a dependable test for choice of subject matter. But the authors do not make such a statement. They indicate that learners are to be made willing and able to use the scientific approach to problems.¹ No particular subject matter seems to be implied by this value. Apparently the authors believe that teachers can utilize any experience to teach children to use the scientific method.

The fourth value depends upon the other three. If they are unclear, and they seem to be, subject matter to foster commitment to democratic values can scarcely be clearly determined.

To the extent that democratic values as given by the proponents of this plan are vague, to that extent

1 Ibid., p. 45. It may be through a slip of the pen that the authors' summary ends with the phrase, "able to make reasoned decisions based on the values they hold." (Italicized in original.) On the previous page they had just said, "coming to reasoned conclusions on the basis of careful study of all available data."

teachers cannot be sure what to choose as subject matter, i.e., as situations in which competence is said to be needed as we move toward realization of the values. Moreover, teachers are urged to strive toward the ideals or values, yet nowhere has this reader found suggestions for resolving differences of opinion when groups of curriculum workers are "striving."

We can be glad that Stratemeyer and her co-authors attempted to identify all criteria operative in subject matter selection, that they saw fit to give detailed explanations and illustrations, and that they presented their own definition of democracy. Such features are helpful to those who try to evaluate curriculum proposals.

Weaknesses in their plan for subject matter selection, however, are apparent. Judgments are to be made by using a set of values which are confusing when we try to apply them. Educators must hazard guesses on "needs" in the uncertain future. Certain learnings seemingly are to be acquired but it is difficult to know just what they are supposed to be. In other words, choice of subject matter is apparently to be made from among those aspects of human knowledge which teachers believe that pupils need in order to strive toward whatever teachers understand Stratemeyer's values to mean. The inconclusiveness of this situation permits personal bias to sway many decisions.

For that reason we must conclude that, so far as selection of subject matter is concerned, the plan proposed in Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living has nothing in it to make it distinctively appropriate for democratic education.

CHAPTER VIII

REVIEW OF THE INQUIRY, CONCLUSIONS, FURTHER COMMENTS

A. Review of the Inquiry

At this point in our study of new-type curriculum programs we seem to be repeating ourselves. One after another of the proposals which we have examined seems to be not necessarily appropriate for democratic education-- and for somewhat the same, if not identical, reasons. Let us look backward, over the trail which we have taken in this inquiry, to see whether the pattern, which seems to be taking shape, actually is discernible.

We started with recognition that more than a quarter century ago there was some slight movement toward development of new-type curriculum programs, characterized chiefly by cutting across traditional subject-matter boundaries. We noted that the authors of the Twenty-Sixth Yearbook for the National Society for the Study of Education saw fit to encourage the movement. Since then numerous curriculum proposals of this type have appeared. Almost without exception the proponents have registered or implied a desire to offer an educational program suitable for our democracy.

The question we raised was, "Are these new-type programs necessarily appropriate for democratic education,

as regards their criteria for selection of subject matter?"¹

Detailed examination has been made of the works of two leaders in the field, Hollis L. Caswell and J. Paul Leonard. Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living by Stratemeyer, Forkner, McKim and their associates has also been examined, but in briefer fashion.

The study has been conducted throughout as a bona fide inquiry, not as the report of one nor as a record of the process of making one. All along the way problems have been raised, data have been collected and tested by following out their implications in writing, and tentative conclusions have been formed. We pause now to survey our work only as one further check on our data and what they seem to suggest.

B. Conclusions

In our search through new-type programs we seem to have found rather extensive lists of what might be termed

1 Numerous aspects of new-type programs might have been evaluated. We have chosen only one--criteria for subject matter selection. From a study of three widely known and broadly representative educational programs we have concluded that most, if not all, programs have such criteria. They may be expressed, implied, or completely overlooked but exist, nonetheless, and function importantly. For this reason we felt it valid to inquire into criteria for choice of content as one measure of the appropriateness of new-type programs for democratic education.

criteria for selection of subject matter. In some instances the criteria were designated as such by the authors; more often they were not. Caswell devoted a chapter to them in his first book and scarcely mentioned them by name in other works. By diligent perusal the writer found as many as thirteen expressed or implied controls over subject matter scattered throughout one book, although its author listed only four.

No uniformity in expressing or utilizing criteria was apparent, even in the works of a single writer. From book to book there seemed to be a shifting of ideas or a regrouping of thoughts, albeit no significant changes in the point of view of the author were noted.

In several cases when criteria were listed, authors acknowledged them to be inadequate when taken separately but "a valuable check" when all were employed. Yet no additional strength was found by this writer when she considered the given criteria as a group, rather than individually.

Most important, the so-called criteria for choice of subject matter have turned out to be something other than true criteria. Time and again when the writer has attempted to apply them in situations calling for choice of content by a curriculum worker or a teacher, the "criteria" failed to function. That is to say, they did not help the writer

distinguish between what should be included in the proposed curriculum and what should not. Choices logically deduced from these proposals varied so much as to be preposterous. Anyone who attempted to follow a given proposal would be faced with the necessity of making decisions with no stated basis for choice and little inkling as to what the choice might supposedly be.¹ Under such conditions teachers could carry out a program with conscious or unconscious bias. If competent, conscientious teachers were actually to achieve democratic procedures in selecting subject matter (and the writer concedes that it is possible), they would do so not by fulfilling the provisions of new-type programs but by going beyond those provisions.

The question arose, "If the suggested criteria are not criteria at all, in the sense of being functioning standards for judgment, what are they?" For the most part, the so-called criteria seem to be factors which may be taken into account when choosing subject matter but are not bases for choice. Balance, maturation, children's interests and purposes, manifest needs, sequence, social pressures, and the like appear repeatedly for teachers' consideration. These factors, in and of themselves, have

1 Stratemeyer and her co-authors give more examples (in the form of persistent life situations) than anyone else, yet do not provide adequate criteria for subject matter actually to be used.

no particularized signification by which choices can be clearly outlined and made. Moreover, teachers are not told what the desired end is to be when they use these "criteria," nor how the end is to be achieved. They cannot, therefore, use them as true bases for choice of content.

In addition to the factors supposed to be taken into account, there are certain "criteria" of slightly different nature. They seem to be central in all programs (except Stratemeyer's) and influential in considerations given to the factors mentioned above. Curriculum workers, including teachers, are to study society and children, formulate a concept of democracy, and discover its implications for aims of education. In one way or another, the findings (usually in terms of a definition of democracy and a statement of aims)¹ become the chief determinants of what is to be taught.

Here we have two criteria--concept of democracy and educational purposes--which might at first seem to be functional. But such is not the case in the programs which

1 Stratemeyer and her associates would have teachers identify persistent life situations or needs from the study of society and of learners. Recognition of such situations depends, however, on their view of democracy which hinges upon four values to be upheld in all aspects of living. Upon inspection, the values prove to be too vague to serve as the criteria for choice of content.

we have examined. None of the authors proposed a definition of democracy which is sufficiently clear to delineate desirable from undesirable subject matter. The examples given of democratic ideals are too vague to follow. Both Caswell and Leonard speak of "the democratic ideal" and "democratic ideals" within the same work with no apparent regard for the confusion evoked in a reader. The aims of education, if given at all, have not been found to indicate what subject matter is to be learned in order to achieve the goals.

Furthermore, the plan for discovering concepts of democracy and aims of education, one which all of the authors except Stratemeyer propose in some form, has nothing in it which will ensure a democratic program. The assumption seems to be that groups of workers will, by studying society and learners, formulate workable and completely acceptable definitions of democracy and statements of purpose. There is no assurance that their concept of democracy will truly fit our social order or that the goals they set will be appropriate. Neither is provision made for groups of workers to reach agreement. Through discussion and compromise they are expected to arrive at consensus. There is no guarantee that they will, or that they will do it democratically. The loudest voice or the most powerful interest can exert undue influence upon

decisions reached by consensus. Ultra-authoritarian or ultra-laissez-faire tendencies can prevail under this arrangement, provided only that the members of the group agree among themselves and that the community accepts their leadership.

The concepts of democracy and the purposes of education, then, as suggested in new-type curricula, are not binding enough to serve as criteria for choice of subject matter.¹ As was the case with factors to be considered, the proponents of new-type curricula seem to be admonishing teachers to take action without clarifying how they are to do so, or what may be expected as a result. Inasmuch as we have found no true criteria for selection of subject matter in the new-type programs which we have examined and inasmuch as selection may be legitimately made based on viewpoints either highly authoritarian or highly anarchistic, we cannot escape the conclusion that the proposals in question are not dependably appropriate for democratic education in respect to their criteria for choice of subject matter.

C. Further Comments

Certain other ideas have persistently arisen in the course of this inquiry. Space does not permit extended treatment of each, but it may be worthwhile to give them very limited consideration.

1 See footnotes, p. 12 of this study.

With the exception of Stratemeyer and her associates, each writer whose work we have examined affirms that we must re-educate teachers if we wish to change curricula. Is this a natural consequence of the loose system to be employed in choice of subject matter? Teachers are to study society and learners. From their study they are to formulate their own concepts of democracy and of educational purposes. Yet they are provided no satisfactory method by which to reach agreement either in what they find or in what it signifies. Can it be that similar viewpoints are to be assured only by cultivating in teachers a particular outlook on society?

Another, and related, issue comes to mind. On the basis of their own concepts of democracy and of educational purposes, curriculum workers are to decide what learners "need." The needs are not simply obvious ones, in the very real present. Nor are they just deep, internal tensions or drives in the sense in which many psychologists define needs (although both of the types mentioned are often included in lists of needs). Many are future needs which curriculum workers presume to anticipate. All too often the "needs" include particularized understandings and skills which are justified solely as "those which everyone should know."

As soon as educators start to list needs of learners in a democracy on the basis of their own beliefs,

they catalog what they want or expect democracy to be, disregarding what all of us, working together, might make it become. Their listing of needs--in terms of behavior traits, experiences, persistent life situations, and such--becomes a new body of subject matter to be covered. It differs from traditional subject matter only in being more difficult to itemize and to check-off when "learned."¹ By constructing teaching programs to meet "needs," in the manner which new-type curriculum programs advise, educators tend to promote whatever kind of society they themselves happen to envision.

It is to be remembered that the historic work of George Counts--Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?--was severely criticized for suggesting that educators should determine the direction of our society. Americans demonstrated vociferously that they wished to be self-directed; that they would delegate to no single group the responsibility for determining what our democracy should become. In view of the strong reaction against Counts' theory, it is a bit surprising that new-type curricula win

1 There are doubtless many who would dispute this claim. The writer quickly acknowledges that teachers are warned over and over that lists of needs, persistent life situations, and so forth are considered by the proposers as merely suggestive. But when no clear method of choice is given and when certain "needs" crop up in every list, what would a conscientious and dutiful teacher do if not "cover the list"?

any favor in America. Implicit in these programs is the requirement of unqualified and unquestioning faith in the good judgment and the clairvoyance of educators.

In apparent effort to avoid Counts' pitfall, it has been suggested in several programs that teachers and administrators enlarge their curriculum-planning groups to include representative laymen, parents, and children. To propose that "all concerned" pool their judgments scarcely obviates the objectionable feature in teaching to meet anticipated "needs." One school, one community, one county, one state, or even one group of states that ventured to determine in advance what our society shall be, and to educate vigorously toward that end, would be subject to the same criticism that was heaped upon Professor Counts. Ours is a planning society, not a pre-planned one. We do not delegate to groups of citizens, even to widely representative groups, the responsibility to envision the whole of our society.

In the light of our findings in this inquiry, it would seem only natural to raise one additional point. Do all new-type curriculum programs fall into the same error as those examined here? Are they, too, not necessarily appropriate for democratic education insofar as criteria for subject-matter selection are concerned?

To inquire carefully into all new-type curriculum programs would seem to fall beyond the scope of this study.

The writer might say, however, that she has examined several other proposals with more than casual interest and care.¹ Over a period of three years she has had occasion to deal closely with curriculum writings for both elementary school and college. She has found repeatedly that criteria for choice of subject matter are not considered forthrightly; that, even when they are mentioned, not all controls over subject-matter selection are necessarily included; that confusion in use of terms is common; and that whatever can be taken to be criteria in these programs do not truly distinguish between subject matter to include in a curriculum and subject matter to be excluded. Teachers are admonished to make certain considerations, but what the considerations are to lead to and how they are to be conducted is anyone's guess.

It might seem reasonable to expect that one who has made careful inquiry into criteria employed in several programs would have developed discernment which would aid in quickly locating and evaluating criteria in other programs. The writer wishes that this were true. Thus

1 Harold Alberty, Reorganizing the High-School Curriculum, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Youth, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944. Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Children, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1948.

far she has found such inquiries marked with tedium. This may reflect her own lack of perception. On the other hand, it may reflect the failure of curriculum writers to deal directly and thoroughly with criteria for subject matter selection. Or again, it may indicate regrettable disorder in curriculum theory. One is led to suspect that, until teachers and other curriculum workers do inquire into new-type curriculum programs and demand of their authors clearly expressed and truly functional criteria for choice of subject matter, we shall continue to be bombarded with "new" curricula, none of which will turn out to be satisfactory.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alberty, Harold, "Progress in Curriculum Organization," Educational Leadership, 8:257-259, January, 1951.
- _____, Reorganizing the High School Curriculum, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1948. 458 p.
- American Association of Social Workers, "Civil Rights," pp. 109-115, Social Work Yearbook, New York: The Association, 1951. 696 p.
- American Historical Association, Commission on the Social Studies in the Schools, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission (Report, pt. 16), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. 168 p.
- Bard, Harry, "Individual and Community Needs," Educational Leadership, 7:354-356, March, 1950.
- Berkson, I. B., Education Faces the Future, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1943. 345 p.
- Bobbitt, Franklin, The Curriculum, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1918. 419 p.
- _____, How to Make a Curriculum, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1924. 292 p.
- _____, "Questionable Recommendations of the Commission on the Social Studies," School and Society, 40:201-208, August 18, 1934.
- Bode, Boyd H., Modern Educational Theories, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927. 351 p.
- Briggs, Thomas Henry, Leonard, J. Paul, and Justman, Joseph, Secondary Education, New York: The Macmillan Company, Rev. Ed., 1950. 468 p.
- Butts, R. Freeman, A Cultural History of Education, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1947. 726 p.
- Caswell, Hollis L., Education in the Elementary School, New York: The American Book Company, 1942. 321 p.

- Caswell, Hollis L., "Postwar Trends in Curriculum Development," Journal of the National Education Association, 41:93-95, February, 1952.
- _____ and Associates, Curriculum Improvement in Public School Systems, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950. 462 p.
- _____ and Campbell, Doak S., Curriculum Development, New York: The American Book Company, 1935. 600 p.
- _____, Editor, The American High School: Its Responsibility and Opportunity, Eighth Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946. 264 p.
- Cattell, Jaques and Ross, E. E., Leaders in Education, Lancaster, Pa.: The Science Press, Third Edition, 1948. 1208 p.
- Douglass, Harl R., Otto, Henry J., and Romine, Stephen, "Curriculum: Status and Description," Review of Educational Research, 18:231-248, June, 1948.
- Duggan, Stephen, A Student's Textbook in the History of Education, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1936. 485 p.
- Eby, Frederick and Arrowood, Charles Flinn, The Development of Modern Education, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1934. 922 p.
- The Education Index, New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1932--
- Educational Policies Commission, Education for All American Children, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1948. 292 p.
- _____, Education for All American Youth, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, 1944. 421 p.
- Graves, Frank P., A History of Education in Modern Times, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913. 410 p.

- Harap, Henry, "Essentials of Good Living," Educational Leadership, 7:358-359, March, 1950.
- _____, Chairman, Joint Committee on Curriculum of the Department of Supervisors and Directors of Instruction of the National Education Association and the Society for Curriculum Study, The Changing Curriculum, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1937. 351 p.
- Kallen, Horace M., Patterns of Progress, New York: Columbia University Press, 1950. 87 p.
- Leonard, J. Paul, Developing the Secondary School Curriculum, New York: Rinehart and Company, 1946. 552 p.
- _____, "General Education--Bases for Determination of Content and Method," pp. 173-177 in Maul, R. C., Editor, Addresses on Current Issues in Higher Education, April 2-4, 1951, Sixth Annual Conference on Higher Education, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, Department of Higher Education, 1951. 202 p.
- _____, "Meeting the Imperative Needs of Youth," School and Community, 33:35-36, January, 1947.
- _____, "Organizing the Curriculum to Meet Youth Needs," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 34:228-234, April, 1950.
- _____, "School and Life Needs," Educational Leadership, 7:356-357, March, 1950.
- _____, "Some Reflections on the Meaning of Sequence" in Herrick, V. E. and Tyler, R. W., Toward Improved Curriculum Theory, Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Education, Supplementary Education Monograph No. 71, 1950. 124 p.
- _____, and Eurich, Alvin C., et al., An Evaluation of Modern Education, Report sponsored by The Society for Curriculum Study, New York: D. Appleton Century Co., 1942. 299 p.
- Meyer, Adolph E., The Development of Education in the Twentieth Century, New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1939. 406 p.
- Misawa, Tadasu, Modern Educators and Their Ideals, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1909. 304 p.

- Monroe, Paul, A Textbook in the History of Education, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909. 772 p.
- Morrison, Henry Clinton, Basic Principles in Education, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934. 452 p.
- _____, The Curriculum of the Common School, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1940. 681 p.
- _____, The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Rev. Ed., 1931. 688 p.
- _____, School and Commonwealth, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1937. 238 p.
- Mulhern, James, A History of Education, New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1946. 647 p.
- National Society for the Study of Education, The Twenty-Sixth Yearbook, Part I, Curriculum-Making Past and Present; Part II, The Foundations of Curriculum-Making, Bloomington, Illinois: Public School Publishing Company, 1926. 475; 210 p.
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques, Emile, translated by Barbara Foxley, New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1911. Everyman's Library Edition. 444 p.
- Rugg, Harold, Editor, Democracy and the Curriculum: The Life and Program of the American School, Third Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1939. 536 p.
- Shane, Harold G., "Curriculum Practices in Educationally Interesting Schools," Nation's Schools, 50:41-42, August, 1952.
- Spears, Harold, Experiences in Building a Curriculum, New York: The American Book Company, 1937. 196 p.
- Stratemeyer, Florence B., "The Educational Program in a World at War," Teachers College Record, 44: 227-229, January, 1943.
- _____, Forkner, H. L., McKim, M. G., et al., Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1947. 558 p.

- Strayer, G. D., Fraser, G. W., and Armentrout, W. D.,
Principles of Teaching, New York: The American
Book Company, 1936. 295 p.
- Toulouse, Robert B., "Curriculum Development Survey,"
School Executive, 68:32-33, August, 1949.
- U. S. Office of Education, Division of Elementary and
Secondary Schools, Core Curriculum in Public
High Schools, an Inquiry into Practices, 1949.
Bull. 1950, No. 5. 32 p.
- Weiss, N. J., "Concerning Professor Bobbitt's Criticism,"
School and Society, 40:446-449, October 6, 1934.
- Wilds, Elmer Harrison, The Foundations of Modern Education,
New York: Rinehart and Company, 1936. 634 p.
- Wilson, G. M., A Survey of the Social and Business Usage
of Arithmetic, New York: Teachers College,
Columbia University, 1919. 62 p.

ABSTRACT

AN INQUIRY INTO THE CHOICE OF SUBJECT MATTER IN CERTAIN REPRESENTATIVE, NEW-TYPE CURRICULUM PROGRAMS

The problem which was considered in this study was: Are new-type curriculum programs, characterized chiefly by cutting across traditional subject matter boundaries, necessarily appropriate for democratic education as regards their criteria for selection of subject matter? The purpose of the study was to evaluate one aspect of new-type curricula in terms of its appropriateness for democratic education.

In conducting the study (a bona fide inquiry, not the report of one nor a record of the process of making one) a problem-raising, problem-solving procedure was employed.

The basic assumption that criteria for choice of subject matter are present and function importantly in most, if not all, curricula was validated at the outset by examination of three diverse and representative proposals, namely, Jean J. Rousseau's, Franklin Bobbitt's, and Henry C. Morrison's.

In the main body of the study, detailed examination was made of the works of Hollis L. Caswell and J. Paul Leonard. Developing a Curriculum for Modern Living

by Stratemeyer, Forkner, McKim and their associates was examined more briefly.

Rather extensive lists of so-called criteria were found. They included balance, maturation, children's interests and purposes, manifest and anticipated needs, sequence, social pressures and the like. In addition, concepts of democracy and purposes of democratic education were suggested and implied as determinants of what is to be taught. Some authors proposed plans for "discovering" concepts of democracy and purposes of education; others attempted to define democracy and to state the purposes of education.

In some cases the criteria were designated by the authors; more often they were not. No uniformity in expressing or utilizing criteria was apparent even in the works of a single writer. Confusion in use of terms was common. Most importantly, the "criteria" seemed to be factors to be taken into account rather than true criteria. They were found to have no particularized signification by which choices could be clearly made. When this writer attempted to apply them in situations calling for choice of content the "criteria" failed to function. They did not serve to distinguish between what should be included in the proposed curriculum and what should not. Choices logically deduced from these proposals varied so much as

to be preposterous. It appeared to the writer that teachers were expected to take action without having it made clear how they were to do so (particularly how they were to arrive at agreement) or what might have been expected in result. It seemed evident that under such conditions teachers could carry out a program with conscious or unconscious bias. If competent, conscientious teachers were actually to achieve democratic procedures in selecting subject matter (and the writer concedes that it is possible), they would do so not by fulfilling the provisions of new-type programs but by going beyond those provisions.

Inasmuch as no true criteria were found in the new-type programs and inasmuch as it was found that selection of content could legitimately be based upon viewpoints either highly anarchistic or highly authoritarian, the conclusion was reached that the proposals in question are not dependably appropriate for democratic education in respect to their criteria for choice of subject matter.