

INTERPRETING CIVIC EDUCATION
IN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT FROM PROGRESSIVISM
THROUGH MULTICULTURALISM

A Dissertation

by

JEREMY KELTON WILLIAMS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2011

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

Interpreting Civic Education
in American Educational Thought from Progressivism Through
Multiculturalism

Copyright August 2011 Jeremy Kelton Williams

INTERPRETING CIVIC EDUCATION
IN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL THOUGHT FROM PROGRESSIVISM
THROUGH MULTICULTURALISM

A Dissertation

by

JEREMY KELTON WILLIAMS

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Lynn M. Burblaw
Committee Members,	Larry J. Kelly
	Carlos K. Blanton
	Walter D. Kamphoefner
Head of Department,	Dennie Smith

August 2011

Major Subject: Curriculum and Instruction

ABSTRACT

Interpreting Civic Education in American Educational Thought from Progressivism
Through Multiculturalism. (August 2011)

Jeremy Kelton Williams, B.A. Political Science, Emory & Henry College; M.Ed., Texas
A&M University

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Lynn M. Burlbaw

This dissertation is a historical examination of citizenship education in the United States, beginning in the late nineteenth century with the Progressive era, and extending into the 1970s with multiculturalism. It focuses on the thought of education scholars, historians, and political theorists throughout the twentieth century. It examines their efforts to define citizenship in the United States, and how that idea should be presented to students in the classroom. In doing so, this dissertation examines the manner in which the events of the twentieth century dramatically influenced the collective understanding of what being a “good citizen” means in the United States; and it considers the consequences of these changes in relationship to how children have been taught to engage in social and political life.

It begins with a discussion of civic learning under the educational philosophies of social pedagogy and social efficiency in the Progressive era. It continues with an examination of the consequences of World War I and the Great Depression on the thought of educational scholars concerning citizenship education. This is followed by an

analysis of the transition from Progressive education to Essentialist education in the middle of the century, and the consequences this had on civic education in the Cold War and Civil Rights Movement. This dissertation concludes by considering how the events of the twentieth century have influenced citizenship education in the era of standardization and globalization.

Ultimately, this study finds that our understanding of citizenship, as it is expressed in the school curriculum, is profoundly influenced by our collective understanding of civic ideals and the American identity. These ideals and this identity are an evolving construct that is, in turn, influenced by the ideas and events of the period. Therefore, what is often perceived as a decline in citizenship education in schools, is actually a shift in the values of citizenship.

DEDICATION

To my father, James Martin Williams (1936 – 2010)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank everyone who has offered input and made it possible for me to complete this dissertation.

First, I would like to thank the members of my committee, Dr. Lynn Burlbaw, Dr. Larry Kelly, Dr. Carlos Blanton, and Dr. Walter Kamphoefner. Thanks, especially, to Dr. Burlbaw for generously offering support and the opportunity to talk through ideas, as well as for the academic freedom to pursue my own research. I am also grateful to Dr. Kelly for the personal and professional support that he has provided throughout my graduate career. And I would like to thank Dr. Blanton for his generous offering of time and for providing invaluable feedback on my dissertation.

Among others to whom I owe a deep debt of gratitude, first and foremost is Dr. Christie Maloyed. Her many years of support and friendship, as well as her countless readings of drafts of these chapters have helped shape this dissertation. Thanks also to the many friends I have made in graduate school who have read drafts of chapters and provided feedback. I would also like to thank Dr. Joe Lane for encouraging me to pursue graduate school in the first place.

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my friends and family who have supported me throughout my life and educational career. First and foremost, thanks to my parents who have always offered love and support, and encouraged me to always set and strive for higher goals. Gratitude must go to my sister Katie, and her husband, Jared, as well as my brother, Daniel, for their love and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
DEDICATION	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW	1
Literature Review	14
Statements and Questions	32
Methodology	34
Outline	35
II SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP AND THE COMMUNITY CITIZEN	40
From Moral Education to Social Citizenship	49
Social Pedagogy and Social Citizenship	55
Progressivism and Social Citizenship	59
Community Civics	65
III SPLINTERED CITIZENSHIP	71
Progressive Responses to World War I	75
Americanization	80
Social Reconstruction and Progressive Responses to the Great Depression	93
IV TURNING THE PAGE FROM PROGRESSIVISM TO ESSENTIALISM	103
Essentialism	106
Essentialism and Anti-Intellectual Attacks	114
Essentialism and Cold War Citizenship	117

CHAPTER	Page
Social Studies Responds to the NDEA	126
Essentialist Implications for Multiculturalism	129
V CONCLUSION	137
Global Citizenship.....	138
Moral and Patriotic Citizenship Since the 1980s	141
Effects of Standards and High-Stakes Testing on Citizenship Education	144
Extra-Curricular Citizenship Education	147
Conclusion.....	150
BIBLIOGRAPHY	157
VITA	177

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The dramatic events of the twentieth century have produced a particularly dynamic social and political landscape in the United States. Subsequently the American educational system has struggled to keep up with the pace of change in meeting the needs of both students and society. With the expansion of our collective knowledge, scientific discoveries, and social theories the modern curriculum is vastly different than it was a century ago. Furthermore educators have adapted both the curriculum and instructional practices to meet more fully the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. Despite these changes, many of the fundamental characteristics of American public schools have remained the same. First and foremost the pursuit of democratic ends has remained the theoretical foundation upon which American public education is established. Therefore, a primary function of a democratic educational system is to prepare students to be effective and contributing democratic citizens. Interpreting the characteristics of good democratic citizenship and determining the civic purposes of schools in educating students for citizenship has served as the undercurrent in the debates among educators, scholars, and policy-makers seeking to reform the system.

The difficulty of conceptualizing citizenship is reflected in the numerous definitions that begin so many works on the subject. Most include an attachment to a

This dissertation follows the style of *History of Education Quarterly*.

national or cultural identity and the enjoyment of the rights, privileges, and protections that accompany that association. Others involve more Rousseauvian ideas about the relationship between a citizen and the state; while still others emphasize concepts like community and responsibility.¹ The difficulty in pinning down a firm definition of citizenship is because it is a moving target. Citizenship is a concept that simultaneously defines us and is defined by us. As we change the nature of our political and social engagement, either through technology, immigration, conflict, or negotiation, so too does our understanding of citizenship. Furthermore, it is an idea that means different things to different people, and it carries different rights and responsibilities in different political regimes. Qualifying the idea with a theoretical construct like democracy does little to make the task easier. Consequently the difficulty in defining citizenship makes it a complex concept to teach. Striking the right balance between promoting patriotic values, while building in students the skills to think critically about the world around them is a daunting task to say the least.

The challenge in this regard is due, in part, to the theoretical complexity of a democratic education system in which all education could be considered citizenship education. That is, in order for citizens to make informed decisions at the ballot box, participate in political discourse, or engage in civic life they must be able to read and

¹ Nel Noddings, "Global Citizenship: Promises and Problems," in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, ed. Nel Noddings (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005), 1-21; Michael Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Kathleen Knight Abowitz and Jason Harnish, "Contemporary Discourses on Citizenship," *Review of Education Research* 76, no. 4 (2006): 653-590; Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne, "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy," *American Educational Research Journal* 41, no. 2 (2004): 237-269.

write, have basic arithmetic skills, and an ability to think critically about ideas.² To put this in context of modern education, this was the accepted standard to which students were to be educated. As ideas of citizenship and suffrage expanded and became more pluralized throughout the twentieth century, this standard became increasingly difficult to attain. Amy Gutmann points out that the challenges of balancing pluralism, the common good, and individualism are why “the democratic ideal of citizenship is so educationally demanding.”³ The inability to balance these ideas, she argues, is why schools “fail to give all (educable) children an education adequate to take advantage of their political status as citizens.”⁴

In this context, all education becomes citizenship education. This idea was most profoundly espoused by Progressive educators at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵ In current debates, particularly in popular literature and political discourse, citizenship education does not serve as the focal point that it once did. Educators, politicians, and policy makers instead focus on ensuring that students have the skills necessary to compete with students in foreign countries so that the United States will remain competitive in an increasingly globalized economy. The obvious product of this movement is the implementation of the No Child Left Behind law passed in 2001, which

² Amy Gutmann, *Democratic Education* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987), 289; John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916), 100; Eamonn Callan, *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997).

³ Gutmann, *Democratic Education*, 281.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 288.

⁵ Ellwood P Cubberley, *Changing Conceptions of Education* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909), 55; John Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 3. Here Dewey begins by asserting that education in public schools and moral training are inseparable, and later establishes that moral education serves as a central cornerstone of citizenship education virtually.

gives far greater attention to reading, writing, and math. Furthermore, although education is often a priority presidents mention in their State of the Union addresses, from Lyndon Johnson, Ronald Reagan, and George W. Bush, they have consistently assumed similar positions, pushing for improvements in math, science, reading, and writing skills while mentioning nothing about teaching students the importance of citizenship and civic engagement. In fact since Lyndon Johnson took office, only Bill Clinton in his 1996 State of the Union calls for “schools to teach character education, to teach good values and good citizenship.”

Joseph Kahne and Joel Westheimer point out that a primary reason for this rhetorical ambivalence towards citizenship education is that scholars and politicians alike struggle to define what good citizenship is, or what good citizens do. They offer comparative approaches like Williams Bennett’s emphasis on character education, Paulo Freire’s focus on collective organization, and Benjamin Barber’s argument for civic engagement as competing examples for citizenship education in a democracy.⁶ The emphasis on skills at the expense of civic behaviors can be seen in the curriculum as well. For example, the state of Texas includes a list of learning objectives that directly address the nature of citizenship.⁷ These objectives, however, are not included on the

⁶ Joel Westheimer, and Joseph Kahne, “Educating the ‘Good’ Citizen: Political Choices and Pedagogical Goals,” *Politics & Political Science* 37 no 2 (2004): 241-248; Joel Westheimer, and Joseph Kahne, “What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for a Democracy,” *American Education Research Journal* 41 no 2 (2004): 237-269. See also, William J. Bennett, *Our Children and Our Country: Improving Americas Schools and Affirming the Common Culture* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1988); Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1970); Benjamin Barber, *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2003).

⁷ Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, Sections 113.24, 113.32, 113.35, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (1998); Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, Sections 113.32, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (1998); Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, Sections 113.35, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (1998).

state assessment and, given the high stakes attached to tested content, teachers have little incentive to address these objectives in class.⁸ But to paint the evolution of citizenship education in American public schools simply as a jeremiad is done without considering the full scope of the idea.

Certainly conservatives or traditionalists might decry the diminishing status of formal citizenship education as evidence of the deterioration of American social values. Many of William Bennett's works, for example, argue that America has lost its moral compass, and in large part he blames schools for failing to teach the values essential to the preservation of democracy.⁹ Such arguments, however, assume that values are static concepts like the laws of math or physics. The ideals referenced in these critiques often reach back to an era when public schools attempted to mold all students into a singular White, Protestant, democratic, model; and those that could not fit were segregated. As the recognition of citizenship expanded across an increasingly pluralistic population, the definition of a good citizen became increasingly harder to conceptualize.

Regardless of the difficulty in pinning down a specific definition of citizenship and civic education, there exists within textbooks, curriculums, and educational scholarship an idea of citizenship education that is different from other disciplines. That is to say that within the democratic nature of the American education system there exists

⁸ Other states that display a similar relationship between the state objectives and the state test include Illinois in which citizenship makes up only three percent of the state assessment, http://www.isbe.state.il.us/assessment/pdfs/IAF_Soc_Sci_9_2007.pdf; and California: California Department of Education, *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools*, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press, 2000).

⁹ William J. Bennett, *Our Children and Our Country*, 70; see also, William J. Bennett, *The Book of Virtues: A Treasury of Great Moral Stories*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993).

an idea that specific behaviors and skills are attached to good citizenship and that students must be educated in them in order to preserve the strength of American democracy.¹⁰ Although these skills and behaviors may be dependent upon concepts learned in other disciplines, they are still independent of them. The importance of voting, service to the greater good or the country, the emphasis on individual rights and the structure of government have remained relatively constant in American textbooks and curriculums. Beyond that, however, fundamental ideas have changed about what it means to be a good citizen. At times a good citizen was considered someone who was deliberative and civically engaged, at others it was defined as someone who was obedient and patriotic, and still at other times a good citizen was tolerant and open-minded. Understanding how these ideas of good citizenship have been communicated in schools, and how they have evolved is important because it helps to us to be more conscious of what models of good citizenship are being emphasized in today's classrooms.

It also provides a better understanding of the gap between the ideas of citizenship expressed by scholars and those found in curriculums and textbooks. For example, significant scholarship is devoted to the concept of globalized citizenship. Yet, it has enjoyed little traction in curriculums.¹¹ In contrast there was greater cohesion a hundred years ago among educators, administrators, politicians, and scholars as to the

¹⁰ William A. Galston, "Civic Education and Political Participation," *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37, no. 2 (2004): 263-266. Galston's article in particular offers an excellent discussion on just this point in context of contemporary schooling.

¹¹ John P. Myers, "Rethinking the Social Studies Curriculum in the Context of Globalization: Education for Global Citizenship in the U.S.," The entity from which ERIC acquires the content, including journal, organization, and conference names, or by means of online submission from the author. *Theory and*

civic purposes of education. Certainly there was debate over how students would be taught the values of good citizenship, or what subjects served best to convey these ideas, but few in the educational community significantly detracted from the basic concept of what defined a good citizen.

Ultimately the goal here is not to establish a Bennett-like jeremiad that harkens back to a golden age of citizenship education in which students were taught values and ideals that have since been lost. Such an approach would be based on a static definition of citizenship instead of an evolving concept that has been responsive to the events of the twentieth century. The purpose here is to examine the patterns of change in conceptualizing the ideals of good citizenship, and how those ideals have been taught in schools. Civic ideals, therefore, are not addressed nostalgically as virtues that must be regained in order for American democracy to survive, but as a reflection of the periods that have shaped the American identity.

Considering citizenship education in this manner effectively provides insight into the dynamics of the American social and political consciousness. Observing the shifts in the values and ideals that educators and scholars have argued should be taught to students in response to major national and world events offers insight as to the patterns with which the United States has responded to periods of great change, prosperity, and devastation. Furthermore, understanding these dynamics provides educators and policy

Research in Social Education 34, no. 3 (2006): 370 – 394; Christopher Corley and Jay Walsh, “Integrating Globalization into the Curriculum: Two Examples,” *World History Connected* 1, no. 2 (2004), <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/whc/1.2/corley.html>.

makers with a better knowledge of how to better craft legislation and write curriculums as the country faces similar challenges in the future.

In seeking to better understand the intellectual dynamics of citizenship education in American public schools, this dissertation has two primary aims. First, I consider the definitions of good citizenship in the progressive era, the period between World War I and World II, the Cold War, and the Civil Rights Movement. Second I examine the ideologies that influence these definitions and the manner in which they are articulated in schools.

The dominant ideologies that I consider in this study are liberalism, nationalism, collectivism, essentialism, and multiculturalism. Liberalism in this context refers to the philosophical tradition that emerges out of Enlightenment thought and was applied through the American political tradition in the eighteenth and nineteenth century.¹² Liberalism as it was applied particularly in the nineteenth century in the United States emphasized the importance of the individual in society, and this was expressed through the rise of capitalist principles in the American economy. Much of the educational thought in progressive education is either responding in favor to or against this liberal tradition.

For example the nationalist ideology, which is most influential in the years both surrounding World War I and later in the 1950s during the Red Scare, seeks largely to promote the liberal tradition as an expression of the American national identity.

¹² Diane Ravitch, *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973* (New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1974), 109; David Tyack and Elizabeth Hansot, *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1982), 7.

Although this nationalism is manifested differently in the curriculum and educational thought of each period, it is generally based on the premise that American ideals are grounded in the principles of individual rights, free-market capitalism, and White, middle-class, Protestant values.¹³ In the early twentieth century the presence of nationalist influence can be seen in the Americanization policies, and in the 1950s it is best observed in the calls for a restructuring of the curriculum as means of fighting the Cold War.

In contrast, emerging in 1920s and 1930s between World War I and the Cold War, the collectivist ideology as argued by Harold Rugg, George Counts, and Charles Beard, is a rejection of liberal values. In its place collectivism promotes sacrificing personal interest for the sake of the common good.¹⁴ Furthermore, in reaction to the financial corruption of the 1920s and economic devastation of the Great Depression, collectivism rejects capitalism and favors effectively a socialistic enterprise. Collectivist scholars formed the social reconstruction movement that called for extreme measures, including indoctrination of students, as a means of promoting their ideological ends.¹⁵

Essentialism refers to the pedagogical ideology that emerges in middle of the twentieth century that rejects the behavioral approach of progressive education and embraces a disciplinary and skill based educational model.¹⁶ In many respects

¹³ Lawrence Cremin, *Transformation of the Public Schools* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 74; Andrew Hartman, *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School* (New York: Palgrave, 2008).

¹⁴ George Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (New York, Arno Press, 1932), 45.

¹⁵ *Ibid*, 48.

¹⁶ Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 285.

essentialism is an attempt to move beyond the discussion of values. It is based on the idea that schools should focus on teaching students the basic academic skills necessary to be a successful and productive citizen. Multiculturalism is a product of the Civil Rights Movement and the pluralistic expansions in the 1950s and 1960s. It considers race and ethnicity as the primary factors of distinction between citizens in the United States.¹⁷ Education and curriculum development, therefore, must be understood through this lens.

This study begins with the progressive era in the late nineteenth century and follows through to the Civil Rights movement and the rise of multiculturalism in the 1960s and 1970s. I begin here because of the significance of the progressive era in American education history. The ideological shift towards democratic ideals in response to industrialization and population booms represents a shift from the more Jeffersonian republican values of the nineteenth century. In terms of school policy, this shift is evident through the attempt to use education to promote equality with the implementation of policies like compulsory attendance laws and the graded school movement.¹⁸

Furthermore, the progressive era represents a dramatic break in the curriculum, particularly as it pertains to citizenship. Despite Tocqueville's analysis that public discourse and political participation were central to the American genius, direct

¹⁷ Arthur Schlesinger Jr., *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York, 1991), 21.

¹⁸ Cremin, *Transformation of the Schools*, 9; Ravitch, *The Great School Wars*, 168.

instruction in civic engagement was rarely part of the curriculum.¹⁹ Normative social behaviors were taught either through moral instruction, historical example, or disciplinary measures.²⁰ Because of the progressive focus on direct instruction for citizenship and active civic engagement, and the effort to educate all citizens, this period serves as an effective starting point with which to begin a study of the approaches to political education in America.

The periods that I study have an overlapping but chronological progression, which begin with the progressive era of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Within this period, as education becomes more democratic, a model of good citizenship is established that is more social than the previous political models; that is, one that moves the informal responsibilities of citizenship beyond the more traditional understanding of attaching citizenship to political status, suffrage, rights, and government. The period between wars represents a rather fractured period as various groups respond differently to war and economic boom and bust. Extreme cases provide examples of out right racism and bigotry on one end and the promotion of communism on the other. Meanwhile those in the middle seek to find common ideals that define the American identity in a shifting cultural landscape. Finally the years surrounding World War II, and the decades that follow, represent a dramatic shift in the understanding of the civic purposes of schools. This was due largely to growing opposition to progressive education.

¹⁹ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (London: Penguin, 2003), 595.

²⁰ Karl Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780 – 1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 97.

In this study citizenship education refers to the pedagogical approach to teaching students the virtues and behaviors of citizenship in a democracy. Often citizenship education is paired with civics as the civics curriculum primarily focuses the institutions, behaviors, and mechanisms of government and its institutions. These two subjects overlap when the discussion turns towards understanding the desired behaviors of citizens engaging in political discourse. Nevertheless, there are some conceptual differences. Citizenship education focuses primarily on the skills and behaviors of actors. Civics, on the other hand, focuses on the structure and behavior of the environment in which actors engage. But to separate one from the other is folly in this case, as the ideas that influence the understanding of good citizenship stem from the events and environment with which they are perceived. Therefore, in this study, citizenship education and civic education are used interchangeably.

This dissertation is a study of the educational thought of prominent scholars and observers, not a study of pedagogical practice. It is not designed to explore the nuances of citizenship education as it was taught throughout the various school districts, schools, and classrooms in the twentieth century. This would be almost impossible to accomplish in a single study as each region of the country, and even each school district applies connecting themes of citizenship instruction to meet their cultural and political needs. Rather, this investigation is designed to examine the influence of liberalism, nationalism, collectivism, essentialism, and multiculturalism in education in promoting equality and democratic values in the works of those who have influenced educational practice and the curriculum.

Although there has been much work done on both social studies education and ideas of citizenship in education, this dissertation stresses the historical evolution of the citizenship curriculum and the ideological influences that have shaped those curriculums. Scholars, such as Diane Ravitch, have studied the expanse of education in the twentieth century, but looked primarily at reforms.²¹ There are also works that have examined some of these ideologies, most prominently the work of Lawrence Cremin, but have generally only looked at specific social movements.²² Most studies on citizenship are normative and within education focus mostly on promoting reforms to the current citizenship curriculum. The historical examinations of citizenship that do exist, such as the works of Ron Evans and David Saxe, trace the development of the social studies curriculum, while the history of citizenship education remains a peripheral subject in those works.²³ This study combines these ideas and offers new interpretations of the evolution of the citizenship curriculum by focusing on changes in political and social ideology throughout the twentieth century. It pulls citizenship away from the edges of the educational discourse and critically examines it as central to understanding the evolution of public education in the twentieth century. A full comprehension of how this interpretation relates to these ideas requires a closer look at the literature.

²¹ Ravitch, *The Great School Wars*; Ravitch, *Left Back*; Diane Ravitch. *The Death and Life of the Great American School System* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2010).

²² Cremin, *Transformation of the Public School*.

²³ Ron Evans, *Social Studies Wars: What Are We Going to Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004); David Saxe, *Social Studies in the Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991).

Literature Review

The issues involved with educating students for citizenship carry implications for research in several disciplines, including education, political science, philosophy, and history. Most works on citizenship education are normative studies that focus on critiquing the contemporary citizenship curriculum and offer arguments as to the type of civic behavior that schools should be teaching students. Such normative studies have been both empirical and theoretical in drawing their conclusions.²⁴ Frequently these normative assessments are derived from critiques of behaviors and values that are perceived to be absent in society.²⁵ Even when these studies are not explicit in their prescription for schools, scholars derive educational implications from their conclusions. For example, Robert Putnam argues in *Bowling Alone* that Americans organize and associate less frequently in civic organizations than they did a half-century ago.²⁶

²⁴ For empirical studies see Daniel Hart, Thomas M. Donnelly, James Youniss, and Robert Atkins, "High School Community Service as a Predictor of Adult Voting and Volunteering," *American Educational Research Journal* 44 (2007): 197 – 219; Carpini Delli, Michael X., and Scott Keeter, *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996); John J. Chiodo, John J. and Leisa A. Martin, "What Do Students Have to Say About Citizenship? An Analysis of the Concept of Citizenship among Secondary Education Students," *Journal of Social Studies Research* 29 (2005): 23 – 31. For theoretical examples see, R. Freeman Butts, *The Revival of Civic Learning: A Rationale for Citizenship Education in American Schools* (Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980); James A. Banks, "Citizenship Education for a Pluralistic Democratic Society," *The Social Studies* 81 (1990): 210 – 214. Two popularly cited edited volumes include: Lorraine M. McDonnell, P. Michael Timpone, and Roger Benjamin, eds., *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education* (Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press, 2000); and Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti, eds., *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001).

²⁵ This is particularly true for scholars at opposite ends of the relative conservative and liberal spectrum. For example Thomas Lickona argues the conservative side in making the case for the need for greater emphasis on including traditional values in the curriculum. See Thomas Lickona, *Educating for Character: How Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility* (New York: Bantam Books, 1989). Joel Spring represents the more liberal perspective in his advocacy for exploring new definitions of citizenship in the area of globalization. See Joel Spring, *Globalization of Education: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

²⁶ Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

Despite criticism to its premise, *Bowling Alone* is frequently cited among civic education scholars as providing the reasoning behind increased scholarship regarding civic participation in schools and programs like service learning.²⁷

As research on civic education has evolved, there have emerged qualities of democratic citizenship that both compete with and are complimentary to one another. One of the most dominant approaches to citizenship is the deliberative democratic model. Deliberative democratic citizenship requires that citizens be able to engage ideas and interpret events critically and be able to articulate them as a means of furthering the public discourse.²⁸ In the context of American education scholarship, this idea was most clearly articulated in the twentieth century by John Dewey.²⁹ The deliberative tradition has remained strong among education scholars since.³⁰ Participatory democratic citizenship is another model that has received significant attention. Participatory citizenship involves the engagement of citizens in a democracy through elections, activism, and discourse; and it is often discussed in conjunction with deliberative citizenship.³¹

²⁷ Diane Ravitch and Joseph Viteritti, "Introduction" *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 1; see also, Fred Barton, "Walking the Walk: Creating Engaged Citizens in English Class," *The English Journal* 94, no. 5 (2005): 75-79; Kenneth Frank, Yong Zoa, Kathryn Borman, "Social Capital and the Diffusion of Innovations within Organizations: The Case of Computer Technology in Schools," *Sociology of Education* 77, no. 2 (2004): 148-171; Joseph Kahne, Bernadette Chi, Ellen Middaugh, "Building Social Capital for Civic and Political Engagement: The Potential for High-School Civics Courses," *Canadian Journal of Education* 29, no. 2 (2006): 387-409.

²⁸ Joshua Cohen, "Procedure and Substance in Deliberative Democracy," in *Philosophy and Democracy*, ed. Thomas Christiano (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 17.

²⁹ John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (New York: Holt, 1927).

³⁰ Eamonn Callan, *Creating Citizens*; Amy Gutman, *Democratic Education*.

³¹ Benjamin Barber, *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong* (New York: Hill and Wang), 114.

In conjunction with deliberation and participation, there are several subsequent concepts that make up the qualities of democratic citizenship. These include morality, patriotism, political rights, and civic responsibility. As the twentieth century unfolded, the influences that events and circumstances had on reformers and educators can be observed by examining the priorities given to these concepts in the citizenship curriculum. Doing so offers insight into the perceived weaknesses of society at given points, as well as to the evolution of the ideals that have made up our collective American dream. As will be addressed in the following discussion of the literature on citizenship education, there is much scholarship on how citizenship is taught, and how it should be taught. There are also historical studies that provide a snap shot of how it has been taught. There is little research, however, exploring how citizenship education has evolved. This dissertation does so as a means of gaining greater insight into the relationship between education and the fluidity of the American identity.

Current Research on Citizenship Education

Current research on civic education is schizophrenic at best. This is due in part to the declining status of civics and citizenship education and the social studies in recent decades.³² The greater awareness of diverse student populations in the classroom brought about by the multiculturalism of the 1960s and 1970s has left educators and

³² Katherine A. Foster, Tina Heafner, and Eric Groce, "Advocating for Social Studies: Documenting the Decline and Doing Something About It," *Social Education* 71, no. 5 (2007): 255-260. Susie Burroughs, Eric C. Groce, and Mary L. Webeck, "Social Studies Education in the Age of Testing and Accountability," *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 24, no. 3 (2005): 13-20; Terrance Furin, "High-Stakes Testing: Death of Our Democracy?" *Social Studies and the Young Learner* 15, no. 4 (2003): 32.

scholars in the field largely uncertain as to how to educate students for citizenship without imposing normative values that may be inconsistent with their own.³³ At the same time the rise of standardization has given greater weight to more easily testable subjects like math, reading, writing, and a science.³⁴ Consequently, there seems to be a sense of desperation among civic educators and their supporters to remain relevant. For example, a recent article on the potential for using the popular online video game “World of Warcraft” to teach participatory civic education struggles for relevance, and comes across as more of an effort to capitalize on either the gimmick of video games or the popularity of “World of Warcraft.”³⁵

With some trends leaning towards globalization, there is increased pressure to educate students for globalized citizenship. But the definition of the concept is ambiguous, and few teachers, let alone students, understand what it means. Furthermore, at least within the United States, globalization can be considered a dirty word that conjures images of a singular world government.³⁶ Advocates insist that these fears are drawn from a misunderstanding of what globalized citizenship really means. Rather than associating citizenship with political status, patriotism, and attachment to the state, citizenship in the global sense refers to an ability to engage in the global discourse on economic, social, political, and environmental issues. It involves an ability to apply ideas

³³ Amy Gutman, “Civic Education and Social Diversity,” *Ethics* 105, no. 3 (1995): 556-580.

³⁴ Kenneth E. Vogler and David Virtue, ““Just the Facts, Ma'am”: Teaching Social Studies in the Era of Standards and High-Stakes Testing,” *The Social Studies* 98, no. 2 (2007): 54-58.

³⁵ Kristal Curry, “Warcraft and Civic Education: MMORPGs as Participatory Culture and How Teachers Can Use Them to Improve Civic Education,” *Social Studies* 101, no. 6 (2010): 250-253.

³⁶ Anatoli Rapoport, “We Cannot Teach What We Don’t Know: Indiana Teachers Talk About Global Citizenship Education,” *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice* 5, no. 3 (2010): 179 – 190; Carlos Alberto Torres, “Globalization, Education, and Citizenship: Solidarity versus Markets?” *American Education Research Journal* 39, no. 2 (2002): 363 – 378. Torres offers a more theoretical explanation of the fears expressed by some of the teachers in Rapoport’s study.

of toleration, compromise, and the analysis of ideas from multiple perspectives. Attached to globalization are ideas of social justice, and a desire for students to recognize intolerance, injustice, and hidden biases throughout the world.³⁷

Adding a layer of complexity and confusion to this idea is increased pressure to figure out how the Internet influences ideas of citizenship, and to better incorporate them in the classroom. The World of Warcraft example aside, deliberation and discourse are central components to democratic citizenship, and obviously the Internet offers immediate access to dialogue with people from around the world. Frequent stories of individuals using social networking on the Internet to raise awareness and money for charitable causes, as well as stories about cyber-bullying making the news cycle show that this instant access to communication and information can serve as an opportunity for individuals to become either contributing or detrimental citizens of the online community. Overlapping somewhat with globalization, several studies focus on the role of schools in educating students for online citizenship. Generally drawing similar conclusions, these studies argue that the Internet offers infinite possibilities for engagement with people from around the world, thereby offering students the opportunity to learn the concepts of deliberation and engagement as well as the values of multicultural awareness.³⁸

³⁷ Peggy McIntosh, "Gender Perspectives on Educating for Global Citizenship," in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, ed. Nel Noddings (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005): 22 – 39; Lynette Shultz, "Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings," *Alberta Journal of Education Research*, 53, no 3, (2007): 248 – 258.

³⁸ Roberto Muffoletto and Julie Horton, eds., *Multicultural Education, the Internet and the New Media* (Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press Inc.: 2007); Hugh Starkey, Nicola Savvides, "Learning for Citizenship Online: How Students Can Develop Intercultural Awareness and Construct Knowledge Together," *The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences*, 2, no. 3, (2009): 21 –

Philosophical Works

Much like the education researchers hoping to produce changes in the curriculum, philosophers examining civic education display the influences of their times. Their analyses of the ideal democratic citizen tends to draw from reflections of what they view as important traits of citizens that are missing or are in danger in the contemporary citizenry. Dewey's concept of the deliberative and participatory democratic citizen was influenced by industrialization and immigration at the dawn of twentieth century. Concerned by a number of social issues, particularly in urban areas, and fearing the fracturing of American society into ethnically divided communities, Dewey argued that educating students for deliberation and participation would promote cooperative efforts to solve common social problems.³⁹ Other educators have attached citizenship, not just to social issues, but to broader concerns about public morality. In the 1980s and 1990s, James Davidson Hunter, reacting against what he viewed was moral relativism brought about by the cultural revolution of the 1960s, became a strong advocate for promoting a stronger sense of morality in the curriculum.⁴⁰

As philosophers have examined the qualities of democratic citizenship, and subsequently those qualities that children must learn, they differ as to the level of priority they attach to each. The distinctions between scholars can roughly be divided

49; Linda Bennett, Julie Fessenden, "Citizenship Through Online Communication," *Social Education*, 70, no. 3 (2006): 144 – 146; Phillip J. VanFossen, "'The Electronic Republic:' Evidence on the Impact of the Internet on Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the U.S.," *The International Journal of Social Education*, 21, no. 1 (2006): 18 – 43.

³⁹ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916), 7. John Dewey, and Evelyn Dewey, *Schools of Tomorrow* (New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1915), 229.

⁴⁰ John Davidson Hunter, *The Death of Character: Moral Education in an Age Without Good and Evil* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

into three schools, and they include deliberation and participation, morality and patriotism, and multiculturalism and toleration. Certainly advocates of each have readily acknowledged that these ideas are not mutually exclusive, as a good democratic citizen would most likely exude elements of each. The disagreement lies in the priority that is given to each concept in the curriculum, the extent to which they are endorsed, and the role that public schools should play in educating students in them.⁴¹ Understanding the nuances of the more abstract analyses of citizenship education is important because it provides the philosophical background necessary to understand how and why the citizenship curriculum evolved as it did since the progressive era.

Deliberative and Participatory Citizenship

Although the concepts associated with deliberative and participatory democracy draw from slightly different traditions they fit comfortably together when considering their relationship to educational thought. The former involves the engagement of ideas through reflection and public discourse, while the latter considers the nature and function of political engagement. Of course there is overlap as engagement in deliberative discourse is inherently participatory. Regardless, both are concerned with the social applications of learning, and in the educational context, those that advocate one tend to

⁴¹ Some of the more recent and notable examples include Amy Gutman, *Democratic Education*; E.D. Hirsch, *The Making of Americans: Democracy and Our Schools* (Hartford, CT: Yale University Press, 2009); and Diane Ravitch, "Education and Democracy," in *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*, ed. Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 15 – 29; Westheimer and Kahne, "What Kind of Citizen?"; R. Gilbert, "Identity, Culture, and Environment: Education for Citizenship in the 21st Century" in *Beyond Communitarianism: Citizenship, Politics, and Education*, eds. Jack Demaine and Harold Entwistle (London: Macmillan Press, 1996), 42 – 63.

be strong proponents of the other.

The importance of civic education in the deliberative and participatory democratic traditions is immeasurable because the broader vision of all education serving as citizenship education truly comes to light. In this case society rests on the ability of citizens to articulate their positions clearly, understand the issues of the day, and select representatives based on intelligent reasoning.⁴² This promotes the equal representation of citizens in both the social and the political spheres. Therefore in order for citizens to have an equal opportunity to participate they must have an education that provides them with the academic skills and political knowledge to do so. The concept of equal opportunity for citizens to participate in public discourse is not unique to the progressive era or the twentieth century. The emphasis on the opportunity for participation was a primary focus of Tocqueville's observations on American social and political culture in the nineteenth century.

It cannot be doubted that, in the United States, the instruction of the people powerfully contributes to the support of a democratic republic; and such must always be the case, I believe, where instruction which awakens the understanding is not separated from moral education which amends the heart. But I by no means exaggerate this benefit, and I am still further from thinking, as so many people do think in Europe, that men can be instantaneously made citizens by teaching them to read and write. True information is mainly derived from experience.⁴³

The emphasis on deliberation and participation were particularly apparent during the progressive era, and progressive educators were especially vocal in their belief that

⁴² William A. Galston, "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4 (2001): 217 – 234; Joshua Cohen, "Procedure and Substance in Deliberative Democracy," 18; see also James S. Fishkin, *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

⁴³ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, 356

schools must produce deliberative and participatory citizens.⁴⁴ Dewey's *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* serves as one of the seminal works in this tradition in the twentieth century. He emphasizes the important role that public schools play in promoting stability within a democracy by transmitting both cultural and utilitarian values.⁴⁵

A society which makes provision for participation in its good of all members on equal terms and which secures flexible readjustment of its institutions through interaction of the different forms of associated life is in so far democratic. Such a society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.⁴⁶

In this instance theory and practice coincided as textbooks contemporary to Dewey echoed his emphasis on deliberation and participation as a central component of citizenship. An early advocate for civics education, and contemporary of Dewey's, Arthur Dunn, published a series of textbooks that are particularly quotable on this issue. In connecting the roots of the American deliberative tradition to the colonial era and to his own time, Dunn argues that the purpose of education in America has always been the preparation for students to engage in the surrounding community.

Every citizen was educated on matters of public importance. This widespread information is important in a republic like ours. The love of meeting together to discuss public questions or to hear them discussed by well-informed person, is very striking in America.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Schudson, *The Good Citizen*, 182.

⁴⁵ John Dewey, *Democracy & Education*, 100.

⁴⁶ *Ibid*, 115.

⁴⁷ The community civics and frontiers of democracy courses developed by Arthur Dunn for *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* report encourage much of the same deliberation that Gutman advocates. The publishing of these two works on opposite ends of the twentieth century represents the continuity of arguments and debates that have existed in education.

Writing more recently, Amy Gutman grounds her argument for deliberative education in the pursuit of understanding the true nature of the good life.⁴⁸ More importantly students must be educated so as to develop the skills necessary to assess independently their own interests as well as the interests of society. Diane Ravitch argues a similar point in that democratic values of equal opportunity are achieved through the transmission of content knowledge and critical thinking skills so that students have the tools to make decisions and participate in society.⁴⁹

Moral and Patriotic Citizenship

Among the strongest critiques of the deliberative and participatory democratic traditions is that in the extreme they encourage a resistance to authority and tradition. For instance, one attack on Gutmann is that she goes so far as to say that children should deliberate on the values taught to them by their parents and come to independent conclusions.⁵⁰ Although there is some logical consistency in the argument of carrying a deliberative approach out to this extent, there are certainly numerous social and political forces that would obstruct such an application.

First and foremost the supporters of the moral and patriotic tradition have been consistently critical of any movement that poses a threat to the American cultural and political heritage. Driven less by philosophy and more by religion and politics, advocates for defining good citizenship by adherence to morals and expressions of patriotism tend

⁴⁸ Gutman, *Democratic Education*, 23.

⁴⁹ Diane Ravitch, "Education and Democracy," in *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*, eds. Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001), 15 – 29.

⁵⁰ Richard S. Ruderman and R. Kenneth Godwin, "Liberalism and Parental Control of Education," *The Review of Politics* 62, no. 3 (2000): 503.

to come from more conservative elements of society. Furthermore they have gained a stronger foothold in popular literature.⁵¹ Of course, this could be due, in part, to the relative ease with which morality can be explained in comparison to deliberative democracy.

Unlike the participatory or deliberative citizenship, there is a more distinguishable pattern in the moral and patriotic tradition. Periods of national crisis or awareness generally produce calls for a greater emphasis on values and patriotism. For instance the periods during and immediately following World War I, the onset of the Cold War, and the September 11th attacks, witnessed a spark in renewed calls for patriotism and American values to be emphasized in schools.⁵² Even during periods of relative calm the cry for greater attention to moral education carries a pattern. Thomas Lickona provides a quote from his book *Educating for Character: How Our Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility* that paraphrases the inherent fears driving the moral education movement:

Today there is a widespread, deeply unsettling sense that children are changing – in ways that tell us much about ourselves as a society. And these changes are reflected not just in the violent extremes of teenage behavior but in the everyday speech and actions of younger children as well.⁵³

The biggest problem with teaching moral and patriotic citizenship is that the values included have come mostly from the White middle-class, and they frequently

⁵¹ Aside from William Bennett's books already mentioned see John Davison Hunter, *The Death of Character: Moral Education in an Age Without Good or Evil* (New York: Basic Books, 2000); William Kilpatrick, *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong: And What We Can Do About It*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993).

⁵² Joel Westheimer, ed., *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

⁵³ Thomas Lickona, *Educating for Character*, 4.

carry Protestant religious undertones. Historically this has had serious consequences for religious, racial, and ethnic minorities. Particularly in the early twentieth century, such approaches to education were used as a justification for Americanization and segregation policies.⁵⁴ Inability to find common ground on the issue was one of the causes of the parochial school movement within the Catholic community during the nineteenth century. More recently, as educators have become aware and appreciative of pluralism in the classroom, there is increasing wariness to impose a moral or patriotic ideal upon students. Proponents, particularly of moral education, respond with resounding apathy to this critique, arguing that some sense of morality and values must be included in the curriculum. In an effort to address this concerns, scholars like Eamonn Callan, argue that students do not need to be taught specific values or morals. Rather they need to be presented with moral questions so that they may explore and develop their own sense of morality.⁵⁵ This represents a blending of the first and second traditions, as morality is not imposed; rather it is deliberated.

Tolerance & Multiculturalism

Emerging as an expression of the Civil Rights Movement, multiculturalism directly confronted the dominance of the White, Protestant morality present in the

⁵⁴ B. Edward McClellan, *Moral Education in American: Schools and the Shaping of Character from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 23; see also C. Van Woodward, *The Strange Career of Jim Crowe* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

⁵⁵ Eamonn Callan, "Tradition and Integrity in Moral Education," *American Journal of Education* 101, no. 1 (1992): 1-28.

curriculum.⁵⁶ In its place, multiculturalists argue that students should learn to respect other cultures, and that this respect can only be gained through examining cultures from multiple perspectives. A leading figure in multicultural education, James A. Banks, makes this point succinctly:

We can get a full view of our own background and behaviors only by viewing them from the perspectives of other racial and ethnic cultures. Just as fish are unable to appreciate the uniqueness of their aquatic environment, so are many American students unable to fully see and appreciate the uniqueness of their cultural characteristics. A key goal of multicultural education is to help individuals gain greater self-understanding by viewing themselves from the perspective of other cultures.⁵⁷

Certainly educators had been preaching tolerance and compassion for immigrant cultures, but this was done mostly as a means of promoting Americanization. Multiculturalism sought not to understand minority cultures in order to achieve a greater end, but rather to appreciate other cultures for their own sake.

Multicultural scholars generally dismiss previous efforts at educating youth for citizenship as assimilationist. This means that they reject the model of civic education that attempts to blend diverse ethnic groups into a single culture. This is because the identity of the minority cultures is marginalized in favor of the dominant culture. Instead, Multiculturalists argue for a model of citizenship not based on the social norms and morals of a dominant culture, but on the respect and equality for all cultures.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America: Culture Wars in the Public Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 111; Thomas J. La Belle and Christopher R. Ward, *Multiculturalism and Education: Diversity and Its Impact on Schools and Society* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994), 9.

⁵⁷ James A. Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002), 1.

⁵⁸ M.A. Gibson, "Approaches to Multicultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumption," *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 7, (1976): 7 – 18.

Moderate multicultural scholars argue that this fosters deliberation and participation as citizens from different backgrounds must engage one another in determining a mutually agreeable solution that respects the interests of each group equally while meeting the needs of society collectively. Therefore a multicultural education requires that students learn the skills necessary for deliberation and participation.⁵⁹

The emphasis on toleration of alternative cultures and moral systems has led to accusations of moral relativism in the multicultural tradition. Civic education must be based on a system of values if students are to learn how to serve as effective citizens.⁶⁰ Multiculturalists respond that what is perceived as moral relativism is actually a rejection of the traditional value system. In reality they argue that toleration and equality are the universal values imparted in a multicultural education.⁶¹

Certainly significant amounts of literature have been produced on all three of these traditions. The evolution of each individual tradition has been traced through political and educational thought. They have been compared as abstract philosophical concepts. And opponents of each have taken great pains to point out weaknesses and shortcomings. Little research exists exploring how these traditions have evolved with respect to education and with respect to one another. Addressing these ideas in the

⁵⁹ Michael Geyer, "Multiculturalism and the Politics of General Education," *Critical Inquiry* 19, no. 3 (1993): 499 – 533.

⁶⁰ Harold Bloom, *The American Religion: The Emergence of the Post-Christian Nation* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992); Allan Bloom, *Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988); Arthur Schlesinger Jr. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992); Dinesh D'Souza, *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society* (New York: Free Press, 1995).

⁶¹ James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," *Review of Research in Education* 19 (1993): 3-49; Geneva Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2000), 3 – 49.

historical context allows for a more complete understanding of the models of citizenship that are implemented in schools today.

Historiography

Much of the historical commentary and criticism on citizenship education can be found in histories of the social studies as they evolved through the twentieth century. These works are primarily concerned with the tensions between historians and social scientists involving debates over the curriculum. David Saxe's work focuses on the development of the social studies from the outset in the late nineteenth through the publication of the *Report on Social Studies* as part of *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education*. He contends that the arguments over the balance of history and social sciences in the curriculum were central to the origins of the social studies dating back to the Committee of Ten in 1894.⁶² Historians were concerned that the blending of history and social sciences would dilute the academic rigor of historical inquiry. Meanwhile social scientists and progressive educators wanted to develop a curriculum that allowed students to think through complex social issues of the day.⁶³

Ron Evans' study overlaps with Saxe's research, but he carries his examination of the evolution of social studies through the rest of the twentieth century. In particular he focuses on the challenges that social studies educators faced in trying to meet the academic and social needs of individuals, while also attempting to serve the interests of

⁶² David Saxe, *Social Studies in the Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991); see also E.D. Hirsch, *The Making of Americans: Democracy and Our Schools* (Hartford, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), 39.

⁶³ *Ibid*, 40.

society.⁶⁴ For Evans, the shifts in the curriculum were driven by tensions between competing interest groups including historians, social scientists, progressive educators, politicians, and business leaders.⁶⁵ Evans, however, offers little analysis on the ideological motivations of these interest groups, assuming instead that the social studies debates of the twentieth century were driven more by practical political motivations. Both Saxe and Evans do little to address citizenship outside the context of social studies. Furthermore, even within the discussion on the role of interest groups driving changes in the social curriculum, they leave citizenship on the fringes of the discussion, and have little to say on the role ideology played in the motivations of these interest groups.

Little historical commentary is aimed directly at citizenship education. Most of what exists is a peripheral analysis in a larger historical work. The studies that exist have considered occupational citizenship and have given little attention to ideologies of citizenship.⁶⁶ Frequently these assessments of citizenship in the early twentieth century tend to follow the development of the factory schools to draw the conclusion that schools were interested in producing industrial, factory-working citizens.⁶⁷ Similarly, works that focus on the 1950s point to the goals of the National Defense Education Act

⁶⁴ Ron Evans, *Social Studies Wars: What Are We Going to Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004). See also, Joseph Watras, "Historians and Social Science Educators, 1893 – 1998," in *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship*, ed. C. Woyshner, J. Watras, and M.S. Crocco (New York: Peter Lang, 2004): 192 – 210.

⁶⁵ Ibid, 175.

⁶⁶ George B. McClellan, *Moral Education in America: Schools and the Shaping of Character from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999); David L. Angus, and Jeffrey E. Mirel, *The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890 – 1995* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999).

⁶⁷ Herbert M. Kliebard, *Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876 – 1946* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999); Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America : Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*, (New York : Basic Books, 1976).

as the clearest statement of the aims of citizenship education in the period. Central to these goals is the production of students with the necessary skills, math, and science that would allow the United States to compete with the USSR in the Cold War. These works conclude that the civic duty of public schools in the late 1950s was to produce citizen soldiers and scientists.⁶⁸ On the other hand little is mentioned regarding whether the motivation for these goals stems from nationalistic, collectivist, or liberal interests.

There have been several broad educational histories whose scope include most of the twentieth century and extend back into the nineteenth century. These works, however, tend to follow the same basic narrative that revolves around the progressive education movement and its critics. The most famous of these is Cremin's *Transformation of the Public School: Progressivism in American Education 1876 – 1957*, which is representative of many works published in the 1950s and 1960s that criticize the progressive movement's focus on child-centered learning as anti-intellectual and lacking in academic rigor.⁶⁹ Scholars, such as Ravitch and E.D. Hirsch, continued their criticism of schools and weakness of the curriculum in the later decades of the twentieth century. The primary difference for this latter generation of scholars is that they are much more willing to attack directly both the method and philosophy of

⁶⁸ Joel Spring, *The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1945* (New York: McKay, 1976); Barbara Barksdale Clowse, *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981).

⁶⁹ Lawrence Cremin, *Transformation of the Public School: Progressivism in American Education 1876 – 1957* (New York: Knopf, 1961); Richard Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963); See also Arthur Bestor, Anti-intellectualism in the Schools, *New Republic* 128, no 3 (1953); Rudolf Flesch, *Why Johnny Can't Read, And What You Can Do About It*, (New York: Harper Brothers, 1955). Though to be clear, Cremin is not nearly as direct or confrontational as these other authors.

Dewey.⁷⁰

The scholars writing in the middle of the twentieth century, in comparison, focus less attention on Dewey and more on the distortion and manipulation of his ideas. I am concerned, however, with neither pedagogical philosophy nor its consequences for academic rigor; rather, I am more interested in examining the ways in which scholars directly or indirectly promoted citizenship based on national, individual, or communal interests as derived from varying political ideologies. For example, when looking at the Americanization movement I do not study the effectiveness of Dunn's *Community Civics* or *Problems of Democracy* curriculum in encouraging students to think through social problems. Instead, I consider the spirit of nativistic nationalism that existed in the United States in the years surrounding World War I as a means of encouraging civic vigilance against threats to social norms.

With this focus on ideological influences, I give considerably less attention to progressive education as a singular movement because I generally agree with Herbert Kliebard's assertion that the progressive era consisted of a jumbled amalgam of pedagogical approaches that lacked cohesion and philosophical unity.⁷¹ Nonetheless in terms of citizenship education, despite differences in ideology and method, I argue that there is a consistency to the progressive era that separates it from everything that follows. Progressive educators placed a greater emphasis on teaching students the

⁷⁰ Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 459; Diane Ravitch, *The Schools We Deserve: Reflection on the Educational Crises of Our Time* (New York: Basic Books, 1987); E.D. Hirsch, *The Making of Americans: Democracy and Our Schools* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2010).

⁷¹ Herbert M. Kliebard, *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 – 1958* (London: RoutledgeFalmer, 1986).

behaviors and the virtues of citizenship, whereas the approach in the second half of the twentieth century is much more concerned with ensuring that students have the skills necessary to compete in a globalized world.

Too often books about public schools in the United States include an apocalyptic tone and declarations that our educational system is in crisis.⁷² Although I certainly see a need for school reform and a revision of the current approach to citizenship education, I make no claim that citizenship education is dead. Recent trends have pushed citizenship education towards extracurricular organization. For example, service learning has gained popularity as a means of teaching students about both citizenship and civic engagement.⁷³ Other programs like the *Character Counts!* curriculum have also been widely adopted by schools as a means of teaching citizenship. Therefore the goal for this dissertation is not simply to outline a jeremiad, but to inform the current discussion as to the evolution and influences of citizenship education.

Statements and Questions

Clearly the history of public schools in the twentieth century has been addressed from several perspectives. Scholars have examined the successes, failures, and leaders of education reform movements.⁷⁴ Moreover, the origins and evolution of the social studies

⁷² Diane Ravitch, *Left Back* (2000); Angus and Mirel, *The Failed Promise of the American High School* (1999); David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Towards Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995); Jeffrey Mirel, "The Decline of Civic Education," *Daedalus* 131, no. 3 (2002): 49-55.

⁷³ Joseph Kahne, Joel Westheimer, and Bethany Rogera, "Service Learning and Citizenship: Directions for Research." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (2000), 42 – 51.

⁷⁴ Ravitch, *Left Back* (2000); Angus and Mirel, *The Failed Promise of the American High School* (1999); Tyack and Cuban, *Tinkering Towards Utopia* (1995).

have been addressed by Evans and Saxe.⁷⁵ These studies generally address questions regarding the tensions that exist in educational discourse; like the role of schools in teaching individuals, serving the needs of local communities, and promoting the nation's interests. At the same time there is much discussion over the importance of teaching citizenship in classrooms. Most of this research, however, is concerned with normative questions of how citizenship should be taught in a pluralized society to achieve democratic ends.⁷⁶

This dissertation offers an analysis of education in the twentieth century in terms of understanding how scholars and educators have conceived of citizenship in a democratic society, and the role that education has played in meeting those democratic ends. This requires a more complete examination of the major approaches to democratic citizenship, as well as a deeper understanding of when and why significant shifts took place. For example, the 1950s mark a significant turning point in citizenship education because the transition from progressivism to essentialism involves a shift from an approach that attempts to teach all students behaviors of democratic citizenship, to one that attempts to further democracy by ensuring that everyone is taught the same skills. Understanding these shifts is important because it provides a better understanding of how and why we have arrived at the current approach to the citizenship curriculum. Moreover, it puts many of the normative studies on citizenship education into a broader

⁷⁵ Evans, *The Social Studies Wars* (2004); Saxe, *Social Studies in the Schools* (1991).

⁷⁶ Dewey, *Democracy & Education* (1917), Gutman, *Democratic Education* (1987); Hirsch, *The Making of Americans* (2009); Ravitch, "Education and Democracy" (2001); Kahne and Westheimer, "What Kind of Citizen?" (2004); Gilbert, "Identity, Culture, and Environment" (1996).

historical context and can be used by future reformers to understand what reforms have already been attempted and how and why they either failed or succeeded.

Methodology

Given that this study examines the dynamics in the philosophical and pedagogical approach to citizenship throughout the twentieth century, I use an historical framework. I focus on the discussion among scholars regarding the models of citizenship that have been employed in public schools, as well as the extent to which various models of citizenship have been emphasized in the curriculum. This dissertation relies heavily on the ideas of education scholars, but since this topic overlaps with many fields in the social sciences and the humanities, I also draw largely from the thought of philosophers, political scientists, and historians.

Central to my interest in this subject is a desire to understand the discourse regarding the philosophical foundations through which students are educated to be citizens. Therefore I do not intend for this to be a comparison of educational practices at local, state, or regional levels. Rather this is a history of ideas that encompasses questions of democracy, and of the purpose of educating students for democratic citizenship in the context of educational movements like progressivism, essentialism, and standardization.

Outline

Chapter two examines the models of citizenship education associated with the progressive movement of the early twentieth century. Primarily it focuses on the development of a social model of citizenship, which is more deliberative and participatory than its predecessor in the nineteenth century. Social citizenship, as is more thoroughly defined later, was a profoundly progressive concept as it furthered both social pedagogy and social efficiency. These served as two of the most fundamental theories in the progressive educational agenda. Furthermore, it served as an effective model of citizenship for the Americanization movement. This is largely because the models of social citizenship, as articulated by scholars like Arthur Dunn, were concerned less with rights and national political identity, and more with social engagement and participation. The philosophical foundations of the Americanization citizenship curriculum emphasize individualism and civic virtue.

I argue that this approach is based on the nationalistic impulse to preserve nineteenth century liberal values. It emerges as part of the larger effort of conservative reforms designed to limit the ideological and cultural influences of immigration and industrialization. Included in this movement are efforts to replace bilingual education programs with English only curriculums.⁷⁷ It is also accompanied by broader efforts to reduce and restrict the flood of immigrants flowing into the United States from Eastern

⁷⁷ Carlos Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 61-62; William G. Ross, *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927* (Lincoln, NE: 1994), 203.

and Southern Europe, Mexico, and Asia.⁷⁸ Although this conservative reaction to immigration and industrialization gained popularity and enjoyed legislative success at the local, state, and national level, the effectiveness of these policies has been frequently questioned by historians.

Chapter three examines the combined reactions by educators to both World War I and the Great Depression. The former produced a pronounced nationalistic response that placed less interest on deliberation and patriotism and greater emphasis on patriotism and moral education. In doing so, the Americanization policies discussed in the previous chapter were pursued to a much more radical extent. The Great Depression produced a reexamination of public education. At its most extreme, this reexamination is represented by the Social Reconstruction movement. With roots stretching into the 1920s, it reached its peak of influence in the wake of the Great Depression. It is based on the thought of Harold Rugg, George S. Counts, and William Heard Kilpatrick, who rejected the liberal republican approach of Americanization. Instead, they embraced a collectivist model of citizenship. Their ideas are best expressed in Rugg's social studies textbooks and in the academic journal the *Social Frontier*. The years between these two events represent a period of confusion with regards to citizenship education. There was general agreement on the democratic purposes of education, and the need for schools to prepare students for citizenship, but what that model of citizenship encompassed varied in vast and overlapping terms.

⁷⁸ Alexander Keyssar, *The Right to Vote: The Contested History Democracy in the United States* (New York: Basic Books, 2000), 110; Robert Wiebe, *The Search for Order: 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), 288; William G Ross, *Forging New Freedoms*, (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press), 34.

Chapter four discusses the causes of the decline in progressive education, and the effects this had on citizenship education. The causes are not simple to distinguish, and involve combined ideas of the rise essentialism and academic traditionalism, Cold War fears of communist influences in schools, and the introduction of multiculturalism as a result of the Civil Rights movement. The primary consequence of this period is the shift in the citizenship curriculum from one that emphasizes behaviors and the role of the citizen in the community, to one that focuses on individualism and skills that citizens must possess. In particular, I argue that as recognition of citizenship became increasingly democratized as a result of the Civil Rights movement, older models of citizenship education based on White, middle-class values were no longer applicable as schools addressed issues of diversity and multiculturalism. To accommodate the new pluralized student bodies, citizenship education increasingly focused on democratic citizens who are concerned with individual rights rather than the collectivist behaviors of the progressive period.

This study concludes with the completion of the essentialist shift and the turn towards the standardization movement in the 1960s and 1970s. Certainly scholars have continued to propose new ideas about how to engage students in the concepts of citizenship. As previously discussed studies have emerged examining the prospects of globalized citizenship, and new technologies have changed the way that citizens deliberate and participate. But either due to preexisting fears of educators, or infrastructural limitations, little has changed in the actual conception of citizenship as it has been taught since the 1970s. That is, citizenship education is primarily relegated to

political participation and legal obligation. Citizens vote, have rights enumerated in the Constitution, and understand the nature of their government. Little is mentioned about the responsibilities of citizens in societies, the morality of citizenship, or the value of deliberation and social participation.

To the extent that a fuller concept of citizenship is addressed, it tends to be extra-curricular. That is, it comes from activities outside of class that not all students participate in. Programs like *Character Counts!* attempt to promote moral and ethical behaviors, although critics contend that it is a profoundly Protestant in its outlook. In the past fifteen years, service-learning projects have become increasingly popular. But again, these tend to be a function of after school and extracurricular programs. The concluding chapter does address some of these changes in the dialogue on citizenship; however, the more recent discussion on citizenship has had less influence over what models of citizenship were presented to students than in earlier decades of the twentieth century.

Understanding the civic and political purposes of education has intrigued philosophers and political theorists throughout human history. From Plato and Aristotle in antiquity to Locke, Rousseau, and Mill in more modern times, scholars have sought to devise a system of education that prepares the youth to best serve the interests of society while also fulfilling their personal or individual potential. The ideas of these philosophers have remained as intellectual exercises, however, and were never implemented as policies. Yet their study provides insight into the political and social values of their time and place. For example, much is derived from Plato's system of

education that effectively tracks students based on their potential to work as craftsmen, warriors, or philosopher kings.

Similar conclusions can be drawn about the values of the American culture since the progressive era when the country consciously began an effort to educate all citizens, even second-class citizens. In many ways the American experiment in public education represents an attempt to put the ideas of the great minds of history to the test, to see if the state can mold the populace into the type of citizens necessary to both preserve traditions and promote reform. Therefore, studying the ideals and the models of citizenship that educators and scholars have attempted to implement in American public schools can provide insight into the shifting values of the American society.

CHAPTER II

SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP AND THE COMMUNITY CITIZEN

The report on *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* published by the social studies subcommittee of the Committee to Reorganize Secondary Education (CRSE) in 1916 helped to formalize the social studies curriculum that is currently used in schools. This report was compiled mostly by leading education scholars of the day. Particularly influential members include civic educators like Arthur Dunn and Clarence Kingsley.⁷⁹ Consequently the report established that the “conscious and constant purpose” of the social studies is “the development of good citizenship.”⁸⁰ The focus on citizenship was not confined to the social studies report. It is also included as one of the seven cardinal principles in the larger report, *The Reorganization of Secondary Education*, published by the CRSE in 1918.⁸¹

The reports on *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* and *The Cardinal Principles in Secondary Education* represent a break from the previous approach to social studies instruction as articulated in the report compiled by the Committee of Ten in 1894, and its subcommittee on History, Political Economy and Civil Government. The Committee of Ten sought to establish standards for secondary education based on

⁷⁹ David Saxe, *The Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1991), 135; Ronald Evans, *Social Studies Wars: What Should We Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004), 21.

⁸⁰ National Education Association, *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1916), 9.

⁸¹ National Education Association, *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education* (Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1918), 7.

college admissions requirements. Although acknowledging some role for the social sciences in the secondary curriculum, the report compiled by the Committee of Ten placed a greater emphasis on history and historical inquiry. Furthermore, the history curriculum also served to preserve and transmit the American cultural heritage to the next generation.⁸² In a broader context this period also represents a shift towards educating students for more deliberative and participatory democratic citizenship. These concepts draw heavily from John Dewey and his focus on deliberative democracy as an application of social learning.⁸³ The changes in the approach to teaching citizenship from 1894 to 1916 can be understood as an attempt on the part of educators to adapt the role of schools and the curriculum to the needs of an industrialized democracy with an evolving understanding of citizenship.

The collision of industrial efficiency with increased layers of ethnic, racial, and religious pluralism produced an extended conversation regarding the relationship between citizenship and the shifting American identity. Of course racism and nativism were dominant in these debates, especially among Whites hoping to maintain the traditional social hierarchies. At the same time, increasing numbers of the growing White professional middle-class began to realize that the traditional social order produced corruption and divisiveness.⁸⁴ The attempt to address these problems through social and political reforms became known as the Progressive movement. Although still

⁸² Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools*, 40.

⁸³ William A. Galston, "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4 (2001): 217 – 34; Jason Kosnoski, "Artful Discussion: John Dewey's Classroom as a Model of Deliberative Association," *Political Theory* 33, no. 5 (2005): 654 – 677.

⁸⁴ Jon C. Teaford, *The Unheralded Triumph: City Government in America, 1870-1900* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984): 3.

containing strong threads of racism and anti-immigrant sentiment, Progressive reforms were based on a recognition that the country had crossed an industrial and social threshold from which it could not return. The middle class must re-create order out of social classes. Therefore, drawing on ideas of Social Darwinism, the evolution of the American identity from homogenous and agrarian to heterogeneous and industrial was necessary if American democracy was going to survive in the new environment.⁸⁵

Public education became a primary target of social reform as educators and scholars developed theories in which the classroom was the place to assimilate and socialize children into the new American reality. Consequently, the purpose of schools changed dramatically in the 1890s and the early decades of the twentieth century. For instance, compulsory education laws passed in states across the country in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries led to increased enrollment in secondary schools.⁸⁶ Therefore, high schools no longer served as college preparatory institutes as they had in the nineteenth century. By the publication of the 1916 report, the purpose of schools increasingly came to be understood as preparing students for life as productive contributors and citizens in a community. This requires that all students understand their formal and informal obligations as citizens.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order: 1870-1920* (New York: Hill & Wang: 1967), 144; see also, Teaford, *The Unheralded Triumph*, 5; William A. Link, *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism: 1880-1930* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992), 203; and Michael Schudson, *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 190.

⁸⁶ Diane Ravitch, *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973, A History of the Public Schools as Battlefield of Social Change* (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1974), 168.

⁸⁷ John Dewey, *Democracy & Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916); Lawrence Cremin, *Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), 93.

This chapter examines changing conceptions of citizenship education from the 1890s through the first two decades of the twentieth in terms of its relationship to the role of schools in society. Included is a consideration of the theoretical and historical trends that influenced the citizenship curriculum. Of particular interest is the shift towards social citizenship, which emphasizes the informal responsibilities that citizens have to one another in community. This is in comparison to what could be considered political citizenship that focuses on political engagement, rights, and governmental structures. Social citizenship, however, extends beyond the enumerated political obligations of voting and obedience to laws. To understand how this broad idea of social citizenship is applied requires examinations of the works and influence of John Dewey, the larger historical trends regarding the role of communities during the Progressive era, and the works of Arthur Dunn. A good place to begin, is the fundamental definition as provided by Dewey:

Citizenship, to most minds, means a distinctly political thing. It is defined in terms of relation to the government, not to society in its broader aspects. To be able to vote intelligently, to take such share as might be in the conduct of public legislation and administration – that has been the significance of the term. Now our community life has suddenly awakened and in awakening it has found that governmental institutions and affairs represent only a small part of the important purposes and difficult problems of life; and that even that fraction cannot be dealt with adequately except in the light of a wide range of domestic, economic, and scientific considerations quite excluded from the conception of the state of citizenship. ... The content of the term “citizenship” is broadening; it is coming to mean all the relationships of all sorts that are involved in membership in a community.⁸⁸

⁸⁸ John Dewey, “The School as Social Center,” *The Elementary School Teacher* 3, no. 2 (1902): 75-76.

Dunn's work on the community civics course most clearly articulates the relationship between citizenship, community, and education. Dunn's works are representative of thought on citizenship in the curriculum during the early twentieth century because he attempts to use civic education, as taught through the social pedagogy of John Dewey, to promote broader social and municipal reforms of the Progressive era.

Before serving on the Social Studies committee, Dunn was a well established scholar in civics education and had already published textbooks on community civics. Having studied sociology at the University of Chicago, he was highly influenced by John Dewey. The presence of Dewey's influence can be found in the social philosophy of pedagogy that dominates Dunn's approach to the civics curriculum. After completing his studies in Chicago, Dunn worked in the public school systems in Indiana, Ohio, and throughout the Northeast, and he served as a specialist in civics for the Bureau of Education.

Dunn published his first book on community civics in 1907. The premise of this work is that schools prepare students to be members of the community, are part of the community, and are a community in and of themselves.⁸⁹ To fully understand the concepts associated with social citizenship education, the definitions of terms like "community" and "good citizen" must first be considered. The 1916 report on the social studies equates good citizenship with "neighborliness;" and a good neighbor is a

⁸⁹ Arthur William Dunn, *The Community and the Citizen* (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co. 1907), iii.

“‘thoroughly efficient member’ of the neighborhood.”⁹⁰ Good citizenship is more thoroughly defined later in the document as a person who has a sense of obligation and loyalty to the community, and these ideas are expressed through politeness, industriousness, and civic engagement.⁹¹ Furthermore, citizens must have the ability to deliberate on important issues in order to ensure equal participation and representation in the public sphere.

The broadening of this definition of citizenship ran parallel to an expanded understanding of the purpose of civics. In a paper presented to the NEA conference in 1909, one of the future members of the social studies committee that compiled the 1916 report, J. Lynn Barnard, addresses the need to redefine civics:

The term “civics,” which the *Century Dictionary* inadequately defines as “the science of civil government” has come much into disrepute these latter days. And no wonder, when one thinks of the dry-as-dust stuff that has so long masqueraded under the name in public and private schools alike. The emphasis has usually been placed on the organization and legal powers of government, principally national, with no live discussion of what even the federal government really does, and still less as to state or local government. And was this utterly unpedagogical performance supposed to help make good citizens? Not at all!⁹²

Nicholas Murray Butler also presented a paper that same year concurring with Barnard. He emphatically argued that “it is a sorry travesty upon the serious business of training for citizenship that it should be thought that we can make citizens by teaching the

⁹⁰ NEA, *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, 9.

⁹¹ *Ibid*, 21.

⁹² J. Lynn Barnard, “The Teaching of Civics in Elementary and Secondary Schools,” *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings* vol. 52 (Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1909) 84.

external facts relating to the machinery of government alone.”⁹³ In this interpretation, civics did not simply involve learning about the machinations of governments. Instead it included studying the workings of community, and the obligations of its members. Therefore citizenship education and civics are virtually synonymous. With the emphasis on community, the new model of civics became known as community civics. The model of citizenship taught in this context can be called social citizenship because of the muted role of political engagement in community and the heightened role of social engagement.

As is examined in greater depth below, the key to understanding social citizenship is its relationship to patriotism. Traditional approaches to citizenship education were based on the idea that citizenship was a political status achieved by birth or naturalization and that good citizens expressed a patriotic spirit. Citizenship education, in turn, was designed to help citizens development that patriotic spirit.⁹⁴ In social citizenship education, patriotism is a product of mastering the values and skills of citizenship. Therefore students learn about their family, church, and the community in which they live before examining ideas of national identity and patriotism.⁹⁵ Through this process students learn that they are not simply citizens of a political society, but that they are also members of overlapping informal communities that range from their family and friends to the international community. Barnard defines community as

⁹³ Nicholas Murray Butler, “A Call to Citizenship” *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, vol. 48 (Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1909), 79.

⁹⁴ An interesting note on language here is that academic works and textbooks promoting community civics prefer to use the term “loyalty,” or “national loyalty” over patriotism. For example Roscoe Lewis Ashley, *The New Civics, A Textbook for Secondary Schools*, (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1917), 17; Howard Copeland Hill, *Community Life and Civic Problems* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1922), xix.

⁹⁵ NEA, *The Social Studies in Secondary Schools*, 24; Hill, *Community Life and Civic Problems*; Dunn, *The Community and the Citizen*; Ashley, *The New Civics*.

a group people bound together by common interests and subject to common rules or laws. And any person, young or old, who shares in community benefits and is subject to community responsibilities is a “citizen.” The home, the school, the church, the shop, the township, village, or city, the commonwealth, the nation – all are types of the community, and all who participate in the life of each community are its citizens.⁹⁶

Students, then, must learn to be good citizens in each of these communities through social and political engagement, taking pride in personal hygiene and civic beauty, and valuing property, work, and efficiency.

Full instruction in this expanded model of social citizenship requires that civics instruction also incorporate moral education. Here again, the premises of moral education as presented by the committee in 1916 shifts from those of the nineteenth century. Earlier attempts to promote moral education were based on the idea that morality extended from the values of Protestant Christianity, and that good moral citizens were people who obeyed God’s law.⁹⁷ The members of the Social Studies committee rejected the divine attachment to morality, and instead embraced a social construction of morality. That is, what is considered ethically good or bad is determined by the moral needs of society at the time.⁹⁸ Therefore, since morality is socially defined, it can only be learned through engagement in social activity. The curriculum as presented by the report was designed to produce the social environment necessary for students to develop into good social, political, and moral citizens.

⁹⁶ Barnard, “The Teaching of Civics in Elementary and Secondary Schools,” 84

⁹⁷ Carl F. Kaestle, *The Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780-1860* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983), 47; B. Edward McClellan, *Moral Education in America: Schools and the Shaping of Character from Colonial Times to the Present* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1999), 33.

⁹⁸ Joel Spring, *Wheels in the Head: Educational Philosophies of Authority, Freedom, and Culture from Socrates to Paulo Friere* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994), 23.

Certainly the 1916 report on social studies is influential to the social studies curriculum generally. Most of the courses in the report, and even the course sequences, are still in use in school districts throughout the country.⁹⁹ A course developed somewhat in conjunction with community civics by Arthur Dunn, *Problems of Democracy*, was also included in the 1916 report on the Social Studies. *Problems of Democracy* supplemented the deliberative approach by encouraging students to engage and discuss ideas and challenges that citizens living in a democracy encounter.¹⁰⁰ Yet the community civics curriculum and social citizenship enjoyed less application in the decades that followed.¹⁰¹

Despite the limited success of the community civics course, the model of social or community citizenship present through the 1916 report on the social studies and the Cardinal Principles is a product of educational theories and historical trends at the turn of the twentieth century, and less of the years that followed. Evidence of changes in the ideas on citizenship education can be seen through examination of practitioners' accounts, textbooks, and committee reports, as well as through the works of educational philosophers like John Dewey, and the broader historical trends of the period. Further evidence of the limited influence of the social citizenship model can be found in the ambivalent reaction to the community civics course, and the nationalistic curriculums produced in the wake of World War I.

⁹⁹ Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 21.

¹⁰⁰ These two courses are often discussed with relationship to one another, as they are both the brainchild of Arthur Dunn. Community civics will remain the focus here, however, as that is where the thesis of Dunn's approach to citizenship education lies.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid*, 29.

From Moral Education to Social Citizenship

Throughout most of the nineteenth century direct instruction on citizenship and civic behavior was relatively limited as most schools focused on teaching the three R's. Therefore, appropriate civic and moral behavior was usually taught either as a disciplinary response to misbehavior, or through historical parable and example.¹⁰² The most famous occurrence of this practice can be seen in the works of Parson Weems. Writing in the period just as the last of the giants of the Founding Era were dying off, Weems inserted American Revolutionary figures into stories to teach children the importance of values like hard work, frugality, and honesty. The most famous of these is the story of George Washington not being able to lie about chopping down his father's cherry tree.¹⁰³

In the formative years of American public education, attendance was, at best, inconsistent, and it varied greatly from region to region. Furthermore, the structure of common school education, which lumped students of various ages and abilities into a single room, made the analysis of abstract ideas like citizenship difficult to teach. Consequently learning basic skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic took precedence over attempting to teach complicated ideas like the structure of government or the philosophical constructs of citizenship.¹⁰⁴ The latter was generally left to advanced students in college prep schools or in higher education. These were the students who would have the greatest need for such an education, as they were the ones most likely to

¹⁰² Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 67.

¹⁰³ Mason Locke Weems, *The Life of George Washington: With Curious Anecdotes Equally Honorable to Himself and Exemplary to His Young Countrymen* (Philadelphia: Joseph Allen, 1837), 14.

¹⁰⁴ Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 14.

enter into careers in law or politics.¹⁰⁵ Citizenship, as it was taught at lower levels, focused mostly on political ideas of enfranchisement, obedience to laws, and the rights of citizens. Educators proclaimed that the purpose of education was the development of moral and virtuous citizens, but the sectarian quality of moral education indicated that a good citizen was synonymous with a good Christian. The inclusion of direct instruction in normative behaviors was largely a response to the growing population Catholic immigrants of the mid-nineteenth century, and Protestant leaders were hoping to Americanize the foreign population.¹⁰⁶

As the nineteenth century progressed, greater acceptance of a pluralistic, Protestant morality emerged in schools. General values of industriousness, frugality, humility, deference to those of a higher social class were considered to be shared ideals among Protestant denominations. Collectively known as the Social Gospel, schools could usually safely include these values in their lessons with limited fear of a backlash from the surrounding community. This is because the same values were taught in church; therefore, teachers were simply supplementing the lessons taught in Sunday School.¹⁰⁷

The extent to which communities had control over the curriculum, particularly in rural areas, produced huge inconsistencies in the content that students were taught. National organizations, like the National Education Association (NEA) and the

¹⁰⁵ James L. Leloudis, *Schooling the New South: Pedagogy, Self, and Society in North Carolina, 1880-1920* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 40-42.

¹⁰⁶ Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 97; McClellan, *Moral Education in America*, 34.

¹⁰⁷ McClellan, *Moral Education in America*, 33; Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic*, 95; and Charles A. Israel, *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education, and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 19.

American Historical Association (AHA) attempted to address this issue in the 1890s by forming a series of committees intended to study and standardize the curriculum. For instance, the NEA commissioned the previously mentioned Committee of Ten to examine the secondary curriculum, while the AHA commissioned the Committee of Five that published a study of the history curriculum in 1902.

These committees mentioned little about expanding the role of civic education to include a broader social morality. Although these reports had the backing of the NEA and the AHA, their recommendations did not enjoy universal support or application. Neither the national organization nor the committees had any real regulatory power. In fact, as William Link points out, in the South full enforcement of any educational policy was limited in rural districts as late as the 1920s.¹⁰⁸ The bureaucratic and infrastructural capacity of most states and school districts in the 1890s limited any opportunity to enforce curriculum standards. Therefore, school administrators and teachers were free to continue with their previous practices or experiment with new ideas as long as they did not disrupt their community's sensitivities.¹⁰⁹ Examples of teachers in rural districts, especially in the South, butting heads with local families and community leaders are copious. Usually the teacher lost these battles. James Leloudis offers several anecdotes of teachers in rural communities in the South being verbally, physically, and legally attacked by parents, students, and community leaders when they attempted to enforce discipline too strictly or include content that was inconsistent with community values.¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁸ Link, *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism*, 269.

¹⁰⁹ Leloudis, *Schooling in the New South*, 9; Israel, *Before Scopes*, 37.

¹¹⁰ Leloudis, *Schooling in the New South*, 16

If parents did not confront teachers directly, children were simply kept at home.

Teachers everywhere were not entirely subject to the will of their community.

Over a decade before the Committee of Ten published its report, Laura Donnan began teaching at Shortridge High School in Indianapolis. Advantaged by a more urban setting where the school district bureaucracy was strong enough to provide teachers some protection from the whims of community sentiment, Donnan began to experiment with different approaches to teaching citizenship and civics. Rather than teach citizenship in the formal political model that emphasizes enumerated rights and responsibilities, she broadened her curriculum to include the informal obligations that members of a community have to one another.¹¹¹

Among the strategies she employed were the creation of a student senate that deliberated ideas relevant to the school and the community, and the organization of the classroom as a community.¹¹² Donnan placed greater emphasis on deliberation than recitation, which was the usual method of instruction for the day. She focused on creating lessons based on student interests and abilities, rather than teacher led instruction. She was also concerned with the relationship between the student and the community, and she used weekly newspaper to foster discussion of community issues.¹¹³

Similar ideas appear in the community civics textbooks later in the twentieth century. Donnan worked at Shortridge High School for almost forty-five years, retiring

¹¹¹ Laura Sheenin Gaus, *Shortridge High School: 1864-1981, In Retrospect* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1985).

¹¹² Laura Donnan, "The High School and the Citizen," *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, vol. 28 (Topeka, KA: Kansas Publishing House, 1889), 517.

¹¹³ *Ibid*, 518

in 1924. During that time Dunn served there as the head of the Department of History and Civics from 1900 to 1910 and also produced a study of the district.¹¹⁴ She was a vocal member of the small faculty, and popular with students and the community, so to suggest that he was familiar with her work is not unreasonable. The exact nature of their relationship, or the precise influence she may have had on his thoughts on citizenship education are more difficult to determine. Regardless, her work at least provides evidence that educators were beginning to reexamine the relationship between education, community, and citizenship long before the *The Social Studies in Secondary Education* report was published in 1916.

Further evidence of the tide in educational thought shifting towards ideas of social citizenship can be seen in the Committee of Twelve's report on rural education published in 1898. This committee cites that the isolated nature of rural schools limits the students' opportunity to become fully socialized into a broader community; thus further limiting their ability to understand the qualities of good citizenship.¹¹⁵ This represents a subtle shift from the finding of the Committee of Ten's report published just four years prior. The Committee of Ten focused primarily upon the education of the individual in relationship to college entrance requirements. This distinction is due in part to the larger presence of historians on the Committee of Ten versus increased numbers of educators on the Committee of Twelve.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Julie A. Reuben, "Beyond Politics: Community Civics and the Redefinitions of Citizenship in the Progressive Era," *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (1997): 402.

¹¹⁵ National Education Association, "The Committee of Twelve Report on Rural Schools," in *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1896 – 1897* (Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1898), 881.

¹¹⁶ Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools*, 145-146.

Despite this critique, rural schools, especially in the South, were able to stave off the influences of bureaucratization longer and maintain stronger community control over education. This, of course, had both positive and negative consequences. It limited access to education, quality materials, and trained teachers. Consequently, school attendance was less consistent in rural schools, even after compulsory attendance laws were passed; and literacy rates were lower. Nonetheless, the community involvement over schools was at least more democratic, if at times chaotic. At the same time it provided students with the hands-on education of the immediate community that community civics advocates would later call for. This was not, however, the systematic approach of Dunn, it was simply the familiar custom of Southern and rural education.¹¹⁷

The earliest comprehensive argument for the expansion of citizenship education beyond the narrow confines of political citizenship, and into the realm of moral education can be found in the *Third Yearbook of the National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study on Teaching* published in 1897. The entire volume is devoted to moral education, and includes articles on the teaching of citizenship education as moral instruction. The most important contribution in the yearbook is Dewey's article "Ethical Principles Underlying Education."¹¹⁸ This article, and the volume as a whole, is important because it clearly articulates the idea that schools must assume a greater role in moral instruction:

¹¹⁷ Leloudis, *Schooling in the New South*, 13

¹¹⁸ John Dewey, "Ethical Principles Underlying Education," in *Third Yearbook of the National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching*, ed. Charles A. McMurry (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1897), 11.

The child who is educated there is a member of society and must be instructed and cared for as such a member. The moral responsibility of the school, and of those who conduct it, is to society. The school is fundamentally an institution erected by society to do a certain specific work – to exercise a certain specific function in maintaining the life and advancing the welfare of society. The educational system which does not recognize this fact as entailing upon it an ethical responsibility is derelict and a defaulter. It is not doing what it was called into existence to do. Hence the necessity of discussing the entire structure and the specific workings of the school system from the standpoint of its moral position and moral function to society.¹¹⁹

Dewey goes on to define a good citizen as a “thoroughly efficient member” of a community. The community, in turn, provides the laboratory for students to learn how to be good social citizens.¹²⁰ Dewey’s ideas about social learning and community informed the discussion on citizenship education as the community civics curriculum evolved in the twentieth century.

Social Pedagogy and Social Citizenship

As was the case with many Progressive reformers, Dewey developed his ideas in response to the problems he observed in the industrialized state. In particular he was concerned predominantly with the isolation of individuals in the work place, and students in the classroom. He drew a correlation between the individual work that students did in school, sitting in rows of desks, with the work that individuals did in factories. In both settings he recognized a disconnect between the larger purposes for the work being done, and the actual practice of doing the work itself.¹²¹ He argued that in

¹¹⁹ Ibid, 10.

¹²⁰ Ibid.

¹²¹ Dewey, “The School as Social Center,” 81; Spring, *Wheels in the Head*, 23.

order to sustain a democracy in an industrialized state, citizens must recognize the social connections that exist within a community. This includes awareness of the importance that any industry or occupation plays in a community. According to Dewey, in pre-industrial communities this awareness was more obvious as shopkeepers and craftspeople could see the effects of their work on their community on a daily basis. The same is not true for the unspecialized worker in a factory. Therefore public schools must provide the educational training for students to learn how work and citizenship are interconnected in an industrialized democracy.¹²²

For Dewey this was important for native-born Americans and immigrants alike. Unlike some of the staunchly nativistic educators of the time, Dewey envisioned a more inclusive model of education for citizenship. The inclusive approach to assimilating immigrant students into American culture has been dubbed additive Americanization.¹²³ Additive assimilation involves teaching foreign-born students to adapt American values and customs to their own, while encouraging ethnic communities to preserve their own culture. For instance, Dewey embraced the practice of bilingual education as a means of cultural assimilation. English-only pedagogy runs the risk of antagonizing immigrant students and forces them to make distinctions between home life and public life.¹²⁴ The premise behind Dewey's philosophy of preparing students for citizenship is that students are able to recognize the connections between all facets of life.

¹²² Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 97-102.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, 25-26

¹²⁴ Carlos Kevin Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 59; Guadalupe San Miguel Jr. and Richard R. Valencia, "From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The Educational Plight and Struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest," *Harvard Educational Review* 68, no. 3 (1998): 366

Dewey did share similar fears with his contemporaries that foreign communities would develop into insular islands. The additive approach to assimilation was intended to break down the cultural barriers, and help to redefine American identity. The goal was not only to help individual students assimilate, but to allow all communities to socialize without necessarily losing their unique ethnic qualities.¹²⁵

Other prominent educators of the time, like Jane Addams, advocated this additive approach. In speaking to the NEA in 1908, Addams argued against immigrant education that forced children to embrace an American identity at the expense of their native culture:

There is a certain indictment which may justly be brought, in that the public school too often separates the child from his parents and widens that old gulf between fathers and sons which is never so cruel and so wide as it is between the immigrants who to this country and their children who have to attend the public school and feel that they have learned it all. ...At present the Italian child goes back to his Italian home more or less disturbed and distracted by the contrast between the school and the home. ...Can we not say, perhaps, that the schools ought to do more to connect these children with the best things of the past, to make them realize something of the beauty and charm of the language, the history, and the traditions which their parents represent.¹²⁶

The acceptance of a malleable interpretation of American identity is due to an understanding of the social constructs of morality in the thought of Progressive educators. Unlike the dogmatic religious interpretations of the nineteenth century, Dewey saw morality as being socially constructed. This means that societies define morality based on their social and political needs. The absolutism that may be possible

¹²⁵ Dewey, "The School as Social Center," 75; J. Christopher Eisele, "John Dewey and the Immigrants," *History of Education Quarterly* 15, no 1 (1975), 67-85.

¹²⁶ Jane Addams, "The Public School and the Immigrant Child," *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association Annual Meeting* (1908), 99-100.

with a homogenous society becomes much more complex as social, cultural, and political pluralism increases. Therefore the learning environment must reflect the broader social environment, so that students may be better prepared to serve as productive citizens in a pluralistic community.¹²⁷ In effect, citizenship education is problematized as students must use critical thinking and problem solving skills in social settings to come to an agreeable solution.¹²⁸

Progressive educators examined these ideas through multiple applications. One of the most famous is William Heard Kilpatrick's project method. In this approach, students apply the learning skills from several disciplines through class projects. A classic example is the class garden. Students develop skills in math as they determine the size and shape of the plot and the yield, as well as biology and botany in figuring out what plants to include. They may also prepare the project by researching a history of gardening. Throughout the project students will work together, learn about the division of labor, and student leaders will emerge. Ultimately, through the social engagement of problem solving, students learn the strategies necessary to serve as efficient members of a community.¹²⁹

Evidence of educators attempting to apply Dewey's social pedagogical theories to civics can be seen before Dunn published his books on community civics. An article published in 1901, written by Gudren Thorne-Thomsen calls for the examination of

¹²⁷ Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, 98-99.

¹²⁸ Laurel N. Tanner, *Dewey's Laboratory School: Lessons for Today* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1997), 2.

¹²⁹ *Ibid*, 86; William Heard Kilpatrick, "The Project Method," *The Teachers College Record* 19, (1918): 319-335.

community life as a model for citizenship education. Thorne-Thomsen argues that students can observe the democratic spirit in action and the differentiation of work through study of the community. In doing so they can learn how to serve as an efficient member of society, engage socially and politically, and how to be a good neighbor. The school should be organized like a community so that students may gain experience in social participation. They will, therefore, be able to make the transition from student to citizen more easily.¹³⁰

Progressivism and Social Citizenship

The community civics and social citizenship education curriculums were not purely products of contemporary educational thought; they were also influenced by the broader historical trends of the Progressive movement. Progressives rejected the nepotism, corruption, and partisanship of ward and local politics. This allowed ethnic communities to create insular enclaves in both urban and rural areas, and limited the ability of ethnic groups to engage with one another or develop a sense of national loyalty.¹³¹ Any attachment to native customs by immigrant populations only fueled fears that ethnic communities served as incubators of ideological radicalism and satellites for their home countries.¹³²

¹³⁰ Gudrun Thorne-Thomsen, "Life as a Basis for a Course of Study," *The Course of Study* 1, no. 8 (April, 1901): 685-689.

¹³¹ Teaford, *The Unheralded Triumph*, 3

¹³² Ravitch, *Great School Wars*, 109; John Higham, *Strangers in the Land* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955), 87.

Similar concerns were raised in rural areas throughout the Midwest and the Southwest.¹³³ The lack of infrastructure in the South and West further isolated inhabitants of these regions, which Progressive reformers found troubling. Progressive reformers, heavily influenced by the industrial business model, placed a strong emphasis on efficiency. Nepotism, corruption, social isolation, and sectarian divisions were bad because they fostered social inefficiency. This in turn diminished economic and industrial efficiency. Greater efficiency could be achieved through the development of standardized regulations, stronger administrative bureaucracies, better infrastructure, and the development of a collective social consciousness. This movement was especially prominent among educators. Its influence can be observed in the emergence of factory schools and Americanization policies like English-only curriculums.¹³⁴

Competing ideas of the means and ends of efficiency divided Progressive thought. This division is traditionally understood as existing between administrative and pedagogical progressives. Administrative progressives were generally concerned with the broader concepts related to schooling. These included things like school environments and facilities, compulsory attendance laws, and the broader functions of the curriculum. Meanwhile pedagogical progressives focused more on individual learning, the practices of teachers, developing a subject specific curriculum, and the relationship between students and teachers. The assimilation of immigrants provides a good, and relevant, example of this division. In the late nineteenth century, St. Louis

¹³³ Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 61; Richard Jensen, *The Winning of The Midwest* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), 122-153.

¹³⁴ David Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 28.

maintained a large population of German-Americans. From 1868 to 1880, the early Progressive leader, William Torrey Harris served as the superintendent of schools in St. Louis. Harris endorsed bilingual education for German immigrants because it reduced the shock of the immigration process, and it allowed immigrants to become more efficient members of the community more quickly. Perhaps of even greater importance, bilingual education served as a means to draw German immigrants out of their parochial school enclaves and expose them to the larger community. Similar to Dewey, Harris recognized that immigrant cultures possess qualities from which America could benefit. Therefore, total social efficiency is best achieved by blending the best of both cultures.¹³⁵ Part of Harris's argument for bilingual education in St. Louis was based on the desire to break down the ethnic and cultural barriers that separated German-Americans from the native-born community in Saint Louis.¹³⁶

In pushing for greater cultural integration, Progressives searched for structural and social efficiency as a means of establishing a new homogenous industrialized American identity that held true to traditional American values.¹³⁷ Rather than have a multi-ethnic society with the various ethnic groups co-existing in their insular communities, Harris envisioned a society of blended ethnicity that shared a common culture. In this vein, his support for bilingual education was not everlasting. He intended

¹³⁵ Selwyn K. Troen, *The Public and the Schools: Shaping the St. Louis System, 1838-1920* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1975), 62.

¹³⁶ Ibid, 64

¹³⁷ Ibid, 62.

bilingual education to serve as a bridge to assimilation. Once the German-American community had been fully assimilated then it would not be necessary.¹³⁸

The additive approach to assimilation applied by Harris was more widely accepted in the nineteenth century. This is due, in part, to the rate of immigration and the regions from which immigrants were moving. The largest populations of immigrants during this period came from northern and western countries of Europe like Ireland, England, and Germany. Each of these groups had barriers to overcome in assimilation. The Irish were predominantly Catholic, and the English prejudices towards the Irish as being sub-human migrated with them. Many of the Germans were Catholic which carried a significant stigma in the mostly Protestant United States. And even those that were not suffered from the obvious language barrier. Yet by the twentieth century, the duration of immigration from these countries produced greater tolerance for these populations, particularly in contrast to new immigrant groups coming from Southern and Eastern Europe and Asia.¹³⁹ Furthermore, as a surge of nativism spread across the country, toleration for Mexican-Americans' effort to preserve their cultural heritage diminished.¹⁴⁰

Due to the provisions in the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, Mexicans were granted rights of citizenship when the United States assumed authority over western territories. Policies towards Mexican-Americans were much more inconsistent as there were wide gaps between policy and practice.¹⁴¹ Similar to freed slaves in the South,

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 88.

¹⁴⁰ Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 53.

¹⁴¹ Ibid.

political acknowledgment of enfranchisement did not equate to local recognition of the right to vote. Race and the ability to assimilate an immigrant population into the White, Protestant, middle-class played a major factor. For instance, despite prejudices and nativist sentiments of the period, German-Americans enjoyed greater freedom to practice bilingual education in the nineteenth century than they did in the years leading up to World War I. This is largely because recognition of German Whiteness protected their right to vote, which in turn limited the success of English-only referendums and ensured that German-American interests were represented at the local and state levels. Of course much of that changed as anti-German sentiment exploded after World War I.¹⁴²

The increased nativism at the turn of the twentieth century produced much more aggressive Americanization policies. Also referred to as subtractive Americanization, the aim of Americanization policies was to extract fully the influence of foreign cultures, and replace them with the ideals of White, middle-class, Protestant Americans.¹⁴³ Learning the customs of American hygiene and dress, American history, and the role of industry, work, and capitalism were all central to subtractive Americanization.

Ellwood Cubberley was a major academic figure in the administrative progressive movement. Aside from being credited as one of the first historians of education, he was also a strong proponent of Americanization. He offers this direct assessment as to the need for Americanization policies in the early twentieth century:

¹⁴² Ibid, 64; William G. Ross, *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

¹⁴³ Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 60; San Miguel and Valencia, "From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood," 366.

These southern and eastern Europeans are of a very different type from the north Europeans who preceded them. Illiterate, docile, lacking in self-reliance and initiative, and not possessing the Anglo-Teutonic conceptions of law, order, and government, their coming has served to dilute tremendously our national stock, and to corrupt our civic life. The great bulk of these people have settled in the cities of the North Atlantic and North Central states, and problems of proper housing and living, moral and sanitary conditions, honest and decent government, and proper education have everywhere been made more difficult by their presence. Everywhere these people tend to settle in groups or settlements, and to set up here their national manners, customs, and observances. Our task is to break up these groups or settlements, to assimilate and amalgamate these people as part of our American race, and to implant in their children, so far as can be done, the Anglo-Saxon conception of righteousness, law, and order and popular government, and to awaken in them a reverence for our democratic institutions and for those things in our national life which we as people hold to be of abiding worth.¹⁴⁴

This more nativistic vision of Americanization sought not to build upon the cultural strengths of immigrant populations in building a new American identity, but rather to weed native cultures out of immigrants and preserve a more traditional American identity.

Cubberley argues that to accommodate the “great numbers of aliens who yearly come to our shores and at once become a part of our industrial classes,”¹⁴⁵ schools must adapt the curriculum. The reforms should focus primarily on “preparation for increased social efficiency.”¹⁴⁶ Through Americanization policies, immigrants would become more efficient citizens developing a stronger sense of national loyalty, serving as better workers, and socially engaging with people outside their ethnic community. The fears expressed by Cubberley were common at the turn of the twentieth century, and as the

¹⁴⁴ Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Changing Conceptions of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1909), 15-16.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 55-56.

¹⁴⁶ *Ibid.*

country and the world moved closer to world war an intense nationalistic spirit produced a heightened attention to immigration and Americanization.

Dunn, for example, included some discussion on assimilation of immigrants into an American way of life:

It is necessary that every means be adopted to instruct those who come to our land in the ideals of American citizenship, and to make of them not merely partakers of our liberty, but contributors of our community welfare. The school performs an important service in this direction. It not only instructs the children of foreigners in the English language, United States history, and other subjects that acquaint them with American ideas, but by bringing them in constant association with American children the school hastens the adoption of American ways. Thus these children of foreigners are rapidly transformed into Americans.¹⁴⁷

Nothing in his works suggests, however, that he was as dogmatic as Cubberley, or favored subtractive assimilation. He did view citizenship education as a means of assimilation, but the curricular distinctions between preparing immigrant children for life as citizens and that for native-born children was virtually indistinguishable. Proponents of both additive and subtractive assimilation viewed schools as the primary agent through which to prepare socially efficient citizens. All students, native and immigrant, would learn the skills and behaviors necessary to serve the needs of their family, vocation, and community.

Community Civics

By World War I, the thought on citizenship education among most educators had clearly moved away from the ideas expressed by the Committee of Ten. Citizenship

¹⁴⁷ Arthur Dunn, *Civics: The Community and the Citizen*, (Boston: Kessinger Publishing, 1914), 39.

should not only be taught in history courses, rather instruction on the values and behaviors of good citizenship should be taught directly through civics courses. Aside from Dunn's textbooks published in 1907 and 1914, other works promoting citizenship education as preparation for community life appeared before the U.S. entry into World War I.¹⁴⁸ Dunn's community civics course, and subsequent textbooks gained increasing popularity through the first two decades of the twentieth century. The popularity of the course received national attention and was implemented in classrooms across the country between 1916 and 1921.¹⁴⁹

The proceedings of the NEA annual meetings also provide examples of works that recognize the broader purposes of education as the preparation of citizens, and the definition of good citizenship is determined by social, not political, engagement with surrounding communities.¹⁵⁰ The prevalence of school administrators speaking to the subject suggests that these ideas were not simply left to academic discussion but were actually being implemented in schools. For instance, a principal from Illinois spoke to the issue:

To inculcate a spirit of voluntary service for the good of the community or some public institution, without a thought of a money return and with no thought of reward other than

¹⁴⁸ Irving King, *Social Efficiency: A Study in Social Relations of Education* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1913); Paul Klapper, *Principles of Educational Practice* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912); W.W. Charters, *Methods of Teaching: Developed from a Functional Standpoint* (Chicago: Row, Peterson & Company, 1909); *The American Educational Review*, "What Educational People Are Doing and Saying," Vol. 31, no 1 (1909), 7.

¹⁴⁹ William J. Reese, *Hoosier Schools: Past and Present* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998), 94.

¹⁵⁰ For examples see, Martin G. Brumbaugh, "The Relation of Urban Community to Its Public school system." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, vol. 51 (Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1909): 381-383; Milton C. Potter, "Social Organization in the High School," *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, vol 51, (Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1912), 181 – 185.

that that comes from a satisfaction of a piece of work well done, and that, too, for the public good, is a great lesson to teach and a great one to learn. Public amusements and playgrounds can be studied, and the work carried on where voluntary service has to supplement what the community can afford to pay through the help of some society in the school or by individuals there.¹⁵¹

Ultimately the NEA, which had originally commissioned the Committee of Ten Report in 1894, also was responsible for forming the Committee to Reorganize Secondary Education in 1913. Like the Committee of Ten, the CRSE consisted of subcommittee for each discipline. Among these was the Committee on Social Studies that published the report that included the community civics curriculum. In fact a report just on the community civics course was published in 1915, a year before the committee's full report on the social studies. The importance of the relationship between social citizenship, community life, and education extended beyond the Social Studies Committees report. Social citizenship in the community is also central to the CRSE's larger report on the Seven Cardinal Principles of Education. The introduction cites the need to develop a curriculum that better prepares students for citizenship as the primary impetus for the report:

Within the past few decades changes have taken place in American life profoundly affecting the activities of the individual. As a citizen, he must to a greater extent and in a more direct way cope with problems of community life, State and National Governments, and international relationships. As a worker, he must adjust himself to a more complex economic order. As a relatively independent personality, he has more leisure. The problems arising from these three dominant phases of life are closely interrelated and call for a degree of intelligence and efficiency on the part of every

¹⁵¹ F.D. Thomson, "Tangible Ways of Using a Community in Secondary Education," *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, vol. 52 (Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1913), 493.

citizen that can not be secured through elementary education alone, or even through secondary education unless the scope of that education is broadened.¹⁵²

The CRSE then identifies the ideal qualities of citizenship as “a many-sided interest in the welfare of the communities to which one belongs; loyalty to ideals of civic righteousness; practical knowledge of social agencies and institutions; good judgment as to means and methods that will promote one social end without defeating others; and as putting all these into effect, habits of cordial cooperation in social undertakings.”¹⁵³

The report on *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, compiled by the subcommittee on Social Studies goes into much greater detail on the relationship between citizenship, democracy, and community. The report states directly that the primary purpose of both social studies and secondary education generally is the promotion of good citizenship. It goes on to define a good citizenship based on the efficiency of membership in a neighborhood, city, state, and nation. This model of citizenship continues to emphasize the social engagement over political participation. “Neighborliness” is a reoccurring theme throughout the report, and the stated goal of the secondary social studies curriculum is to help students apply this idea from the local to the national level. The word “neighborliness” invokes emotions of intimacy, friendliness, and individual consideration, whereas citizenship carries a detached sentiment related to political engagement.

In definitions of social citizenship found in textbooks, reports, and other works,

¹⁵² NEA, “Cardinal Principles of Education,” 1.

¹⁵³ *Ibid.*, 7.

limited attention is given to patriotism. In a rhetorical shift, greater emphasis is placed on loyalty and obligation. This is due, in part, to the process through which the behaviors of citizenship are mastered. Since students first learn about the communities that they have most immediately experienced, like family, patriotism is not particularly applicable. In this instance, “loyalty” is a more relevant term because it does not carry the symbolic implications associated with “patriotism.” The concepts of loyalty and obligation are expanded as the number and size of the communities included increases. Ultimately once these ideas have been learned and applied to the informal and local communities of which students are members, then they can apply them to the patriotic spirit attached to national citizenship:

Community civics lays emphasis upon the local community because (1) it is the community which every citizen, especially the child, comes into most intimate relations, and which is always in the foreground of experience; (2) it is easier for the child, as for any citizen, to realize his membership in the community, to feel a sense of personal responsibility for it, and to enter into actual cooperation with it, than is the case with the national community.¹⁵⁴

The focus on localism over nationalism is different than traditional models of citizenship in which citizenship is a product of patriotism. In other words, students learn about the virtues of a shared American heritage, through which they develop a sense of national loyalty. Symbolic imagery and expressions are included to build a patriotic spirit within the student. Once this patriotism has been cultivated, then the student can appreciate the full measure of citizenship. In short, citizenship is a product of patriotism.

¹⁵⁴ NEA, *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*, 21.

In community civics, patriotism is a product of social citizenship, but it is not the primary goal.

The muted role of patriotism in the community civics curriculum and the 1916 report on the social studies was inconsistent with the sentiment of the country at the time. As U.S. entry into The Great War became increasingly likely, greater patriotic and nationalistic fervor swept across the country. Tolerance for immigrants and foreign cultures by the White social and political majority severely diminished. This patriotic and nativistic spirit continued after the war into the 1920s. Consequently Americanization curriculums became more formalized. At the same time, educators continued to push the boundaries in reinterpreting the ideals of the American identity. For instance, disciples of Dewey like George Counts, Harold Rugg, and Kilpatrick began critiquing American liberal capitalistic values and advocated for a more collectivist model of citizenship.

This splintering of thought on citizenship education was combined with what could be described as an apathetic response to community civics by academic organizations outside of education scholarship. Dewey's premise, that the primary purpose of education is the preparation for citizenship, remained. The definition of what it means to be a "good citizen," however, splintered. In this environment social citizenship continued as a pedagogical approach to teaching citizenship, but ceased to be the dominant model. The dramatic economic and political events of the next three decades produced conflicting ideas about the purposes of citizenship and the role of schools in training students to serve as citizens.

CHAPTER III

SPLINTERED CITIZENSHIP

World War I marks a significant turning point in the instruction of citizenship in public schools in the United States. The dramatic consequences of the war produced a fury of reactions from around the country that attempted to identify the causes of the war, means of preventing future wars, and methods of national preparation for future conflicts. In the process, few American social and political institutions escaped scrutiny. Furthermore, the period after the war witnessed significant changes to the civic landscape of the United States. For instance women gained the right to vote, while Americans lost the freedom to consume alcohol. Also with Europe in ruins, the United States enjoyed an economic and industrial boom. This period of prosperity, combined with the triumph of victory and fears of domestic infiltration by ideological radicals from Europe, produced a sense of nationalism grounded in a particular sense of the American political heritage: Protestant liberal values and capitalistic ideals. The dialog on civic education, consequently, was infused with a greater degree of patriotism and nationalism.

This shift produced not only a more nationalistic citizenship curriculum, but it also fueled movements in reaction that responded negatively to these ideas. In particular, a group of pedagogical Progressives responding to the inequalities they believed to be inherent in capitalism and the social ills they observed in industrialism began to publish textbooks and articles in the 1920s that articulated a more collectivist model of

citizenship. After the collapse of most American economic and social institutions during the Great Depression, this Progressive faction blossomed into the Social Reconstruction movement. Constrained mostly to academic circles, Social Reconstruction in the 1930s never enjoyed the popularity or influence that the nationalist movement had after World War I. Both movements, however, are important in the evolution of citizenship education in American public schools because of the influence they had on future reformers in the 1950s and 1960s.

This chapter examines the splintering approaches to citizenship education in response to World War I and the economic boom and bust of the 1920s and 1930s. In particular it focuses on the more extreme ideological approaches that emerged during this period, and the broader consequences for the citizenship curriculum that followed. These consequences include the radicalization of the Americanization movement in the 1920s and the ensuing ramifications for immigrant and minority children, as well as a discussion of the role intelligence quotient testing played as a standard for determining both the academic and civic potential of students. Secondly it focuses on the Social Reconstruction movement as led by George Counts and Earl Rugg. This movement emerged in response to concerns regarding industrialization and capitalism, and drew it from socialist education models to push for a collectivist approach to citizenship in the curriculum.

Before World War I, training for citizenship was considered a corner stone of public education. Progressive education scholars like John Dewey and Arthur Dunn argued that the purpose of the education system was the preparation of students for life

as citizens. The model of citizenship that they promoted was based on social and political engagement. In doing so they promoted both deliberation and participation as key components of good citizenship.¹⁵⁵ Before this Progressive shift towards citizenship as a central focus of the curriculum, the public education system had held vastly different goals. Instead of preparation for civic life, schools were intended to promote skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic that would assist students in their work and home. More importantly, rather than promoting citizenship, in the common school era, educators were more concerned with teaching morality. When citizenship was included in the curriculum it focused almost entirely on the political responsibilities of citizens. History courses provided a normative function by exposing students to famous historical heroes whose behavior they were encouraged to emulate.¹⁵⁶

As Progressives began to garner more influence over the administrative and curricular processes of schools, various academic organizations attempted to exert their authority over the curriculum. Most notably, in relationship to civic education, academic organizations like the American Historical Association, the American Political Science Association, and the American Economists Association debated the relationship between history and the social sciences in teaching citizenship. Historians argued that the lessons and dominant figures of history offered the best opportunity for education in citizenship. Meanwhile the social science organizations argued that social studies courses in

¹⁵⁵ Arthur William Dunn, *The Community and the Citizen* (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co. 1907); and John Dewey, *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: MacMillan and Co., 1916), 111.

¹⁵⁶ Karl Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780 – 1860* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1983), 96; Charle E. Bidwell, “The Moral Significance of the Common School,” *History of Education Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1966): 50-91.

government and economics provided students with the best practical knowledge to become productive citizens of a political society. Again these debates remained relatively within the confines of academic and professional circles.¹⁵⁷

After the war, however, special interest groups like the American Legion became more vocal and began to carry more influence on issues of education.¹⁵⁸ Furthermore, as research in education expanded, new ideas about the purposes of education and the models of citizenship entered this discourse. Therefore the 1920s and 1930s saw a splintering of approaches to citizenship education. The dichotomous division between the ideas of social citizenship versus political citizenship, or history and social studies, were obsolete. More extreme collectivist and nationalist ideologies emerged, as well as new ideas about the relationship between intelligence quotient testing and the quality of citizenship.

This shift towards more extreme ideas of citizenship is not important because of the influence these ideologies directly had on the curriculum or the experiences that students had in the classroom. In fact, historians generally agree that the application of these ideologies through the Social Reconstruction and Americanization movements, respectively, enjoyed limited success in the broader curriculum or influencing the behavior of students.¹⁵⁹ Where the social citizenship of the community civics

¹⁵⁷ Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 16; David Saxe, *Social Studies in Schools: A History of the Early Years* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1991).

¹⁵⁸ H.L. Chillaux, "The American Legion's Interest in Education The American Legion's Interest in Education," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* in special issue *Education for Social Control* 182 (1935).

¹⁵⁹ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955), 329; Michael Olneck, "Americanization and the Education of Immigrants, 1900 – 1925: An Analysis of Symbolic Action," *American Journal of Education* 87, no. 4 (1989): 389.

curriculums pushed for social conformity, the more extreme movements from the 1920s and 1930s pushed for social control. Although these changes had immediate effects on students and schools, the full consequences of these movements were not felt until decades later when activists and propagandists during the Civil Rights Movement and the Cold War cited these efforts as the reason school reform was necessary.

Progressive Responses to World War I

The extent of the social and political changes that occurred across the country and the world as a result of the devastation brought about by World War I are difficult to conceptualize. Aside from the emotional and physical consequences, the new awareness of the efficiency with which humans could destroy one another led to efforts to create a world without war. At the international level this utopian ideal was most clearly expressed in Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations. At a more individual level, some looked towards religion as a means of ending violence, while others believed that war could be avoided if schools could educate students for better moral and civic engagement.

For instance, drawing from the association of citizenship and neighborliness and the commandment that "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," Guy Potter Benson, in a speech before the NEA in 1920 echoed this religious response to the war. "We should know now, as we have never known before, that we cannot escape responsibility for the

Eileen H. Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 239; Carlos Kevin Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836 – 1981* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 59.

woes of other nations. Our clear duty to humanity of every hemisphere is to help when help is needed; to give relief when relief is required.”¹⁶⁰ He concludes with a powerful call for teachers to apply the lessons of the war to citizenship education in the classroom.

Men learned reverence for God in this war as they never knew it before... Surely the teachers of today and tomorrow have the challenge of the most glorious opportunity that has ever come to any profession. It is our duty to apply the lesson of the Great War for the training of citizenship by inspiring the oncoming generations with the lofty resolve to live so that tomorrow and the day after, the home, the school and the church may be exalted in neighborhood service the world around.¹⁶¹

Before considering the changes produced by World War I, it should be noted that some aspects of the discussion of civic education remained consistent. For the most part, the war seems to have produced little change in the pedagogical Progressive approach to both education generally, and citizenship specifically. Pedagogical Progressives before the war placed a much greater emphasis on social and economic factors in citizenship education, and this focus continued into the 1920s. Educating students to think critically about important ideas would be key in producing citizens who could deliberate over complex issues facing the world. This in turn would further the cause of resisting the ideological impulses that had swept across Europe.¹⁶²

Although the recommendations of the Social Studies Report of 1916 and the CRSE were met with ambivalence from academic and political organizations, the

¹⁶⁰ Guy Potter Benton, “What the War has Contributed toward teaching Citizenship,” *Addresses and Proceedings*, vol. 58 (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1920), 67; see also, John Herbert Phillips, “The Place of Religious Sanctions in Character Training,” *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting* vol. 59, (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921): 347 – 351.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 72.

¹⁶² Frances Fitzgerald, *History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1979), 53.

foundations of the curriculum and the courses were widely implemented across the country.¹⁶³ Several community civics textbooks were published after the war and a steady stream remained consistent at least into the 1920s.¹⁶⁴ The Progressive works continued to emphasize education in deliberative and participatory engagement, particularly at the local level.

Most importantly, the pedagogical Progressives were generally resistant to reactionary calls for greater emphasis on patriotism. This is in part due to the emphasis that pedagogical Progressives placed on social and economic issues rather than political ones. As Frances FitzGerald points out in her study of American history textbooks, these themes continued to receive the most attention in Progressive history textbooks throughout the height of the pedagogical Progressive influence from 1910 to 1930. Certainly responsive to calls of patriotism, pedagogical Progressives argued that patriotic citizenship involves more than just flag waving. It includes reflective and responsible civic engagement.¹⁶⁵ The relative consistency of pedagogical Progressives before and after World War I widened the ideological gulf between pedagogical and administrative Progressives.

¹⁶³ Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 29.

¹⁶⁴ Based on citations from the works of Julie Reuben, Ronald Evans, David Saxe, Michael Lybarger, and I texts that I have examined independently, I can safely put the number of textbooks published between 1917 and 1925 that directly apply the community civics curriculum in the 1916 *Report on the Social Studies*, or draw heavily from it, at at least thirty-two. Some examples include: Roscoe Lewis Ashley, *The New Civics* (New York: Macmillan Co, 1917); Arthur M. Dunn, *Community Civics and Rural Life* (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1920); Arthur M. Dunn, *Community Civics for City Schools* (Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1921); Edgar W. Ames and Arvie Eldred, *Community Civics* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1921); Henry Reed Burch and Patterson S. Howard, *American Social Problems* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1922); Ella Lyman Cabot, Fannie Fern Andrews; Fanny E. Cox; Mabel Hill, and Mary McSkinnon, *A Course in Citizenship* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924); William Bennett Munroe and Charles Eugene Ozanne, *Social Civics* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1925).

¹⁶⁵ Samuel Chester Parker, "Adapting Instruction to Differences in Capacity," *Elementary School Journal* 25, no. 1 (1924): 29.

Despite focuses on differing educational reforms and varying political ideologies, before the war both camps shared a general interest in promoting the social citizenship model. Instructing students in social citizenship promoted both social harmony and economic efficiency. They combined ideas of social citizenship with political citizenship to prepare students for a life as responsible and productive neighbors in a community and efficient workers in the factory.¹⁶⁶ This curriculum aligned both with the goals of social efficiency and social pedagogy as a means of streamlining the curriculum and bridging the gap between student-citizen and citizen-worker.

After the war, however, administrative Progressives were more responsive to issues of nationalism and Americanism.¹⁶⁷ For example, at NEA proceedings in the post-war years, several school principals and superintendants presented papers arguing for greater emphasis on American values and patriotism. One such principal maintained that instilling a greater sense of morality would help to prevent violence and war in the future.¹⁶⁸ Others were much more nationalistic in tone, arguing that a patriotic

¹⁶⁶ David Tyack is generally credited with the most comprehensive discussion of the relationship between administrative and pedagogical progressives. He points to the recognition of both groups to recognize the relationship between the school and the community as a unifying force. In doing so he argues that both groups were claiming philosophical roots to Dewey. See David Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974). See also: Larry Cuban, *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890 – 1980* (New York: Longman, 1984); Michael Katz, *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools* (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971). David Larabee offers a good analysis of the relationship between both the overlapping and competing goals of administrative and progressive education. He cites specifically the social studies and history curriculums in the CRSE as an example of pedagogical progressive ideas intersecting with administrative progressives. See: David Larabee, “Progressivism, Schools, and Education,” *Paedagogica Historica* 41, no. 1&2 (2005): 282.

¹⁶⁷ Tyack, *One Best System*, 334.

¹⁶⁸ Will C. Wood, “Citizenship Through Education,” *Addresses and Proceedings of the Sixty-First Annual Meeting*, vol. 62 (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1923), 208; John Herbert Spencer, “The Place of Religious Sanction in Character Training,” *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, vol. 59 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921), 347.

curriculum would help to teach native-born children about the glory of the American political and cultural heritage. Doing so would also help to further the loyalty of foreign-born students to the United States.¹⁶⁹ Further evidence of the nationalistic impulses in education can be seen in the increasing presence of the American Legion at NEA conferences. Speaking in 1921 Henry J. Ryan, representing the American Legion before the NEA decried “America is God’s last chance to save the world. ” He says, “The school is the foundation of the nation. If American schools fail, America fails.” He goes on to emphasize a patriotic model of citizenship grounded in American history and tradition.¹⁷⁰

Other groups like the Daughters of the American Revolution weighed in on the need for a patriotic curriculum. Fearing that the emphasis on localism in courses like community civics inhibited the development of a national identity. These groups, combined with the administrative Progressives argued that civic education should promote national loyalty and citizenship over community loyalty and citizenship. In other words, they defined good citizenship more by patriotism than neighborliness. This sense of loyalty and patriotism was, in turn fostered in students through exposure to national symbols and rituals, championing classic American historical heroes, and learning about the virtues of the American political and cultural heritage.

¹⁶⁹ *Current Opinion*, “How War Is Changing The Character Of The American People,” 64, no. 1 (1918), 44. This article summarizes the ideas of Professor Robert S. Woodridge, psychology professor at Columbia University.

¹⁷⁰ Henry J. Ryan, “Education and Americanization,” *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, vol. 59 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921), 38 – 42.

Americanization

Pedagogical Progressives were able to influence the citizenship curriculum through the development of the curriculum and textbooks. In comparison, one of the ways in which administrative Progressives exercised their greatest influence was through the implementation of district policies and advocacy of state laws. In doing so, one of the clearest expressions of the administrative Progressive nationalistic impulse can be observed through the implementation of Americanization laws and policies. Compared to the dialogue on Americanism before the war, during and after World War I nativist sentiments produced an explosion of anti-immigrant and Americanization sympathies among native-born Americans. This was fueled in part by the fear that the characteristics that made up the American identity were being eroded by the cultural influences of immigrant populations.

Equally important were fears that immigrants were transplanting the ideological radicalism that had served as the undercurrent in the lead up to the war, and had the produced the Russian Revolution.¹⁷¹ To combat the potential of these ideologies taking root in America, starting in 1917 states began to pass legislation promoting citizenship education and patriotism. Early pieces of legislation, like those passed in Vermont, Montana, and Arkansas, did little more than affirm a commitment to teaching patriotism through the teaching of American history and government courses. These laws became more specific and more aggressive after the war, as states began to require loyalty oaths from teachers, specific rituals, and an allotted amount of time devoted each day to

¹⁷¹ Bessie Louise Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States* (New York: Knopf, 1926), 72; Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 226.

patriotic activities. By 1924, nearly every state in the nation had passed laws requiring greater attention to citizenship training. In these laws, however, citizenship was measured less by social and political engagement, and more by expressions of patriotic symbolism.¹⁷²

A closer look at the laws previously discussed illustrates the extent of the Americanization impulse as it carried into the 1920s. These laws did not just concern students; they pertained to teachers as well. Among the most aggressive were laws that included fines for principals and teachers failing to provide the required daily instruction in citizenship. Loyalty oaths and laws preventing teachers and administrators from criticizing the government were common during this period as well.¹⁷³ In Oklahoma, educators violating this law could be subject to as much as a five-hundred dollar fine and six months in jail. In Washington D.C. a law was passed in 1925 that refused teachers or principals their salary if they taught “disrespect for the Holy Bible or that ours is an inferior form of government.”¹⁷⁴ These measures were intended to ensure that students were not only exposed to patriotic ideas, but that the teachers instructing students in this material were party to the cause, and at the very least, could be held accountable if they were to offer instruction in questionable subject matter.

The new focus on establishing national unity through citizenship education carried significant consequences for children of immigrants and ethnic minorities in public schools. The popular metaphor of the melting pot in which many cultures

¹⁷² Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States*.

¹⁷³ *Ibid*, 85 - 93.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid*, 90 – 91.

contributed to a dynamic American identity gave way to a rigid idea of what it meant to be a patriotic American, based on the liberal Protestant tradition. Earlier toleration for the remnants of unique cultural identities and languages faded as promoters of one hundred-percent Americanization pushed for a nationalistic citizenship curriculum and English-only pedagogy.¹⁷⁵ Immigrants were to prove their loyalty by abandoning any ties to their old countries and fully embracing American culture.

In 1920, the Daughters of the American Revolution held an essay contest for students to express their ideas about Americanization. The winning essay offers a telling depiction of the contradictory expectations that Americanizers had of immigrants, and the best aspirations for Americanization:

These foreigners do not understand us. They do not know that after they have arrived they must go ahead and make something of themselves instead of sitting and waiting in poverty until we come to their rescue. They are bribed by selfish politicians, they refuse to send their children to our schools and refuse to live our life while in the meantime, they are being cheated out of their property and money by those who were a few years ago, their own kinsmen. Our method of Americanizing these people is evidently not the proper way. We should give them higher schooling and teach them to appreciate our doctrine and love our flag as a full-fledge American should. We should teach him how to take care of himself that he may become healthy. If we treat these poor ignorant foreigners as a native citizen, they would soon become very valuable to us and would in our government instead of working in factories and living in poverty.¹⁷⁶

Skepticism was aimed at first generation immigrants and their ability to assimilate. Immigrant children and second-generation immigrants, however, were viewed as much more malleable to the influence of Americanization. William Munroe,

¹⁷⁵ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 247; Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas*, 63-65; Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity*.

¹⁷⁶ *Aberdeen Daily News*, "Young Students Write Americanization Essays," February 25, 1920.

who published a series of textbooks on civics and citizenship from the second decade of the twentieth century through the 1940s, argued

The adult alien of some European races, indeed, is almost impossible to Americanize, but this cannot be said of the second generation. The children of the immigrant learn the English language, obtain an education, and become imbued with the American spirit. Hence the public schools are the most effective of all our Americanizing agencies.¹⁷⁷

A full depiction of the consequences of Americanization policies on the civic education of immigrant children is difficult here. The extremity of Americanization policies aimed at immigrants in schools depended both on the native countries of the immigrant populations in the region, and on the region itself. The starkest examples of this comparison include the east coast and its absorption of immigrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, the Southwest and the influx of Mexicans, and the West Coast and its population of Asian Americans. Of course, in the period during and immediately following the war, German immigrants and German-Americans endured some of the harshest effects of Americanization. In Fort Morgan, Colorado, for example, fears of German influences through bilingual education reached such a fury that German language textbooks were burned in a public bonfire. A newspaper in Tucson described the event as a “patriotic gathering” and “a celebration.”¹⁷⁸

Each population experienced unique challenges by immigrating, as did each region in attempting to assimilate the new masses of people. For Mexican-Americans, Asian-Americans, African-Americans, and Native-Americans, Americanization not only meant English-only pedagogy, but education for second-class citizenship. Students were

¹⁷⁷ William Munroe, *Current Problems in Citizenship* (New York: Macmillan Co, 1924), 26

¹⁷⁸ *Tucson Daily Citizen*, “Bonfire of German Textbooks,” 95, no. 147, August, 30, 1918.

educated in the civic responsibilities of citizenship, just like their White peers, but they were taught not to expect the same rights and privileges. This was achieved through segregation, a dumbing-down of the curriculum, an emphasis on vocational education, and limited opportunities for education beyond secondary schools. In essence, students who could not be assimilated into White America were Americanized by learning their place in society relative to the White middle-class.¹⁷⁹

Certainly variations of Americanization policies had been in place stretching back long into the nineteenth century. World War I, however, marked a palpable shift in the treatment of immigrants. In the previous chapter, the additive and subtractive Americanization policies of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were examined. Additive Americanization involves the blending of native and foreign cultures in the assimilation process. Bilingual education is an example of additive Americanization because it allows immigrants and their children to preserve the language of their native culture, while also learning English. Subtractive Americanization involves entirely replacing the native culture with American culture. In contrast to bilingual education, English-only education is an example of subtractive Americanization policies.¹⁸⁰

Fears of foreign influence infiltrating American traditions and either weakening its resolve in the face of future conflicts, or producing the ideological divisiveness witnessed in Europe in the years before World War I led to an abandonment of additive

¹⁷⁹ George J. Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900 – 1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 105. Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 69; Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identities*, 61.

¹⁸⁰ Guadalupe San Miguel Jr. and Richard R. Valencia, “From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The Educational Plight and Struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest,” *Harvard Educational Review* 68, no. 3 (1998): 366; Blanton, *the Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 59.

Americanization policies and an almost wholesale embracing of subtractive Americanization by groups concerned with national security and immigration. There was a heightened concern regarding citizenship education, not just for children, but for adults going through the naturalization process as well. The premise behind this effort lay in the perceived need to create a patriotic attachment to the American tradition that supplanted any loyalty to foreign countries.¹⁸¹

One of the causes of this shift lies in context of the regions of the world that immigrants had been coming from since the 1890s, and interpretations of the American victory in World War I. That is, groups that promoted Americanization and patriotic citizenship education interpreted the conflicts during the war to be a matter of political ideology. In particular American democracy defeated European autocracy. So many immigrants preceding the war had come from regions that the United States had just fought against, while others had come from Mexico and Asia; regions that had little experience with democratic institutions. Therefore, education in social and political engagement would not suffice. If American democracy were to survive, attachments to the Old World, old cultures, and old political institutions needed to be educated out of them and replaced with love and loyalty for American government, capitalism, and culture.¹⁸²

Even some of the most ardent supporters of immigrants' rights embraced the more aggressive Americanization policies during and after the war. For example, before

¹⁸¹ Emory S. Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1920), 14.

¹⁸² *Ibid*

the war Frances Kellor worked with Jane Addams at Hull House in Chicago. She fought for the rights of immigrant women, particularly in the work place. During the war she published a book titled *Strait America*. Spurned by what she felt as betrayal by immigrants who came to the United States and then defended the policies of their native countries leading up to the war, Kellor writes:

We have marveled at the revelation that our own native-born sons and daughters of foreign-born parents could justify the *Lusitania* and defend the invasion of Belgium, and we have let it go at that, not realizing the acceptance of this portend for future America. America has neglected, even forgotten, its task of making Americans of the people that have come to its shores. Men may be workmen and voters and taxpayers and bosses, but the final question for this nation to answer is – are they loyal American citizens?¹⁸³

She continues by furthering the idea that foreign governments are actively seeking to destroy American democracy:

This we do know, that every government but our own has a national purpose which it is carrying out in America with its own subjects – naturalized or alien – through its representatives and agents, its publications, institutions, and business interests. America alone in its own territory has a negative procedure and is without a policy.¹⁸⁴

In an allusion to concerns regarding community civics, supporters of the Americanization and nationalistic citizenship curriculums feared that too much loyalty lay at the local and regional levels, and there was not enough of a sense of national unity. This only fueled concerns that foreign influence could divide the American populace. A more nationalistic citizenship curriculum would therefore promote a greater sense of

¹⁸³ Frances Kellor, *Strait America* (New York: Macmillan Co, 1916), 5

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid*, 6.

national loyalty among native-born students and strengthen the allegiance of immigrant students to their new home.

The ideas expressed in the nationalistic model of citizenship education were not the nuanced concepts of social and communal engagement articulated by Dunn. Rather they were much more political in nature and superficial in context. A good citizen knows the words to patriotic songs and can recite the pledge by heart, has memorized stories of American heroes like George Washington and Andrew Jackson, and understands the virtues of the political system of the United States. Discussion among music educators increasingly focused on including patriotic songs into the classroom as a means of promoting good citizenship.¹⁸⁵ Reverence for the flag was established as a premium standard of patriotism.¹⁸⁶

The emphasis on these highly symbolic ideas of citizenship is indicative of the distinction between the citizenship curriculums of the nineteenth century and early Progressive Eras, and the nationalistic ideas expressed in the curriculums emerging after World War I. Drawing heavily on eighteenth century Enlightenment ideas, civic education in common schools in the nineteenth taught dispassionate loyalty to logical

¹⁸⁵ France Elliot Clark, "Music Education" *Music Supervisors Journal* 5, no. 1 (1918): 14 – 18; Hollis Dann, "A State Program of Music Education," *Music Supervisors Journals* 10, no. 1 (1923): 38 – 47; Arthur L. Manchester, "Music Education, a Musical America, the American Composer, a Sequence," *The Musical Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (1924): 587 – 595;

¹⁸⁶ Pierce also includes a section on laws involving schools, the pledge, and desecration of the flag. Pierce, *Public Opinion and the Teach of History*, 93. Textbooks were published to emphasize the importance of the flag and Flag Day: Robert Haven Schauffler, ed. *Our Flag: In Verse and Prose* (New York: Moffat, Yard, and Company, 1917). These ideas were especially prevalent in Americanization literature as ways for immigrants to display their patriotism to native-born citizens. Among one of the more interesting works is a book on Americanization written from the immigrant perspective that advocates these patriotic displays as part of the assimilation process. Carol Aronovici, *Americanization* (St. Paul, MN: Keller Publishing Co, 1919). See also, Bogardus, *Essentials of Americanization*; Hanson Hart Webster, *Americanization and Citizenship: Lessons in Community and National Ideals for New Americans* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1919).

ideas and rational principles.¹⁸⁷ The American system of government as established through the Constitution represented the pentacle of logic and rationality in pursuit of the common good. Therefore civic education in the nineteenth century fostered dispassionate fidelity to Constitutional principles rather than the cultural goodness of American traditions.¹⁸⁸

Even the mythology surrounding many of the Founding Era heroes established during the nineteenth tended to glorify their intellect, cool reserve, and commitment to higher principles. The virtues valued amongst a culture's mythological and historical heroes are important because they reflect the virtues of the ideal citizen.¹⁸⁹ The Greeks, for example, glorified Achilles for his passion in battle. Moses was considered virtuous because he was a man of resolution, and unwavering faith, and he maintained an Old Testament dedication to divine justice.

As the country made the Progressive shift in the late nineteenth century, much of the dispassionate engagement remained in the civic education curriculum. Rather than draw from Enlightenment principles of rationality and logic to help students recognize the value of the common good and natural rights, civic educators drew from the emerging ideas of scientific objectivity. In doing so, students were taught to observe social and familial problems in their local communities and apply the scientific method in creating solutions.

¹⁸⁷ Kaestle, *Pillars of the American Republic*, 79.

¹⁸⁸ Julie Reuben, "Beyond Politics: Community Civics and the Redefinition of Citizenship in the Progressive Era," *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 4 (1997): 404.

¹⁸⁹ Although Allan Bloom's polemic, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987), has been criticized for its questionable premises, and drawing faulty conclusions, he provides a good analysis of this point. See pages 26 – 27.

On the surface the nationalistic curriculum appears to be a return to the nineteenth century civic education curriculums. There is, after all, a greater emphasis on national government structures and American heroes. The difference is that the dispassionate fidelity to rational political ideas is replaced with passionate loyalty to the American cultural and political heritage. In the educational context, these passions were expressed in a variety of ways through textbooks and curriculums, as well as education laws, policies, and research. For example, the attachment to English as a second language as a central component of the American attracted special attention. A good American citizen speaks English. Bilingual education for immigrants had come under attack in the decade prior to the War, but the years following witnessed some of the most aggressive efforts to secure English-only pedagogy.¹⁹⁰

Another expression of Americanization applied by administrative Progressives educators came through intelligence quotient testing. From its beginnings IQ testing was controversial, with many arguing that testing intelligence was impossible. Yet the entrance of the United States into World War I afforded psychologists Robert Yerkes

¹⁹⁰ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*; 204. Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education*, 62 – 63, argues that in Texas the focus of post-war English-only policies was on Mexican-Americans. This trend seems consistent in states across the southwest. See; Susan M. Dorsey, “How Citizenship is Taught in the Schools of Los Angeles,” *Address and Proceedings of the Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting* vol. 58 (Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1920), 67; Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American*, 95; Lynn Marie Getz, *Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850 – 1940* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1997). William G. Ross, *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), argues that in other areas of the country English-only policies were mostly targeted at German-Americans. And Tamura, *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity*, 147, argues that the same was true for Japanese immigrants living on Hawaii. The varying focuses of English-only as a consequence of Americanization based on region can be attributed to the ethnic groups that native-born Americans in each region viewed as the greatest threat to American identity. In the American Southwest, it was Mexicans-Americans; in the Midwest it was German-Americans; and in Hawaii, it was Japanese Americans.

and Lewis Terman the opportunity to test its effectiveness. The aptitude of soldiers was tested as a means of more efficiently identifying soldiers of superior intellect for the officer corps and other special assignments.¹⁹¹ After the war intelligence testing was adopted by educational psychologists and administrative Progressives as part of the social efficiency movement. Similar to the army, the goal was to more efficiently identify the aptitudes of students. IQ testing would allow for a more streamlined process determining whether students were better suited for programs like vocational training or college prep.

A major criticism of IQ testing throughout its entire existence has been that the tests are undemocratic and draw heavily from a cultural bias. This bias has favored the White educated classes at the expense of immigrant populations, and racial and ethnic minorities.¹⁹² Given that American democracy had recently triumphed over Prussian autocracy, such a charge might suggest that IQ testing ran counter to the spirit of the time.¹⁹³ Nonetheless, its implementation in school districts expanded throughout the 1920s and remained a standard policy for the identification of students' aptitudes for decades.

On the surface, IQ testing would not appear to relate to citizenship. Educators,

¹⁹¹ Daniel J. Kevles, "Testing the Army's Intelligence: Psychologists and the Military in World War I," *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (1968): 568

¹⁹² Percy E. Davidson, "The Social Significance of the Army Intelligence Findings," *Scientific Monthly*, 16 (1923): 185-186; Carlos Kevin Blanton, "From Intellectual Deficiency to Cultural Deficiency: Mexican Americans, Testing, and Public School Policy in the American Southwest, 1920-1940," *The Pacific Historical Review* 72, no. 1 (2003): 39 - 62; Paula Fass, "The IQ: A Cultural and Historical Framework," *American Journal of Education* 88, no. 4 (1980): 431 - 458.

¹⁹³ William C. Bagley, *Determinism in Education* (Baltimore, MY: Warwick & York, Inc, 1925). The charges of being undemocratic, although certainly implicit in the arguments of cultural bias, have not held up as well as critiques of cultural and racial bias.

however, did not simply examine IQ tests in the contexts of individuals; they drew conclusions about entire populations. In particular, immigrant populations were determined intellectually inferior because they tended to score lower on IQ tests than native students. Such results were used to justify the need for Americanization policies and pushing immigrant students into vocational education programs rather than college prep programs.

Of greater importance, consistently lower scores on IQ tests provided justification for school segregation. Educators argued that segregation was better for the educational needs of populations that had lower IQs. It allowed for the development of unique curricula specifically designed for each population. In other words, since the lower test scores were interpreted as a measure of groups like Mexican-Americans, African-Americans, and Native-Americans, rather than a measure of the assessment itself, educators felt justified in creating curricula that effectively “dumbed-down” the curriculum.¹⁹⁴ The dumbing-down of the curriculum is what future critics of Progressive education, like Richard Hofstadter and Arthur Bestor, would use to label the movement as anti-intellectual.¹⁹⁵

The interpretation of IQ tests of immigrant and segregated populations had ramifications for students in these groups. First and foremost, it justified, not just segregation but treatment as second-class citizens. Further supporting the conclusions drawn from IQ tests, were studies of civic aptitudes in relationship to intelligence. Not surprisingly, students that scored higher on IQ tests also scored higher on civic aptitude

¹⁹⁴ Sanchez, *Becoming Mexican American*, 105.

¹⁹⁵ Hofstadter, *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 337.

tests. In fact one study cited that “on the general average, the more stupid the pupils were, the more they stole, cheated, and lied; the more intelligent they were, the higher were their average scores for honesty.”¹⁹⁶ This perceived correlation between intellectual and civic aptitude served to justify conclusions that ethnic and racial minorities should be educated to be able to understand appropriate social behavior and responsibilities of the White majority, but not to expect the same rights. In other words, ethnic groups that could not be Whitenized were expected to express a patriotic spirit and fulfill the responsibilities of social citizenship, without enjoying the protections and rights of political citizenship.

By the mid-1920s the intensity of Americanization fervor diminished. The boundaries of Americanization policies had been politically in the passing of the Johnson-Reed Immigration Act in 1924. This law built off of a series of efforts to restrict immigration. It eliminated immigration from Asia, and severely cut back on immigration from Europe.¹⁹⁷ Americanizers and supporters of English-only policies had also been given legal restraints through a series of Supreme Court cases involving bi-lingual education.¹⁹⁸ With these limitations in place, proponents of Americanization were forced to recognize the failure of the movement, especially in the pursuit to achieve one-hundred percent Americanization. For populations that could be assimilated into the White mainstream culture, like European immigrants from Germany and Italy,

¹⁹⁶ Dewey Stabler, “The Relationship Between the Civic Information Possessed by Ninth-Grade Pupils and Their Practices in Citizenship,” *School Review* 37 (1929): 701; O. F. Fowler, “The Civic Attitudes of High School Sophomores,” *School Review* 36 (1928): 25 – 37.

¹⁹⁷ Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, 324.

¹⁹⁸ Ross, *Forging New Freedoms*, 115.

immigration represented a period of struggle and endurance. Groups like Mexican-Americans suffered from longer lasting effects as Americanization justified segregation.

The nationalistic impulses and the push for Americanization were more prominent among the administrative Progressives. A stronger sense of national identity, and a more assimilated immigrant population were both key components of a socially efficient society, and it served American interests in promoting national security against infiltration by radical ideological influences. As the 1920s unfolded, the gulf between administrative and pedagogical Progressive widened. Citizenship remained a central component of education for pedagogical Progressives, but their ideas of what it meant to be a good citizen shifted dramatically from the administrative Progressive position.

Social Reconstruction and Progressive Responses to the Great Depression

Although assimilation, nationalism, and social efficiency consumed much of the discussion relating to citizenship education heading into the 1920s, a growing faction among the pedagogical Progressives began to question the consequences of industrialization and the new modern society. In essence they challenged precisely what the more conservative administrative Progressives hoped to protect. Although known more for his contributions to historical scholarship than education, one of the earliest scholars to articulate these ideas was Charles Beard. Among the chief concerns was the social and economic inequality produced by the American capitalistic system and liberal values. He and his wife Mary published a series of textbooks that attempted to address

these social and economic concerns.¹⁹⁹ By the 1920's some Progressive educators and social observers were disturbed by the inequalities produced by industrialization. Earlier Progressives viewed schools as one of many tools through which social reforms could be accomplished. Social Reconstructionists took this idea to the extreme by arguing that schools were the institution through which society could be reconstructed in order to eliminate social ills and eliminate the inequalities produced by industrialization and liberal-capitalism.

Much like the Americanizers who recognized the potential for schools to serve as an agent to assimilate young immigrants into American society, Social Reconstructionists saw schools as the best vehicle for building a social system. Unlike earlier efforts to reform citizenship education, however, Social Reconstructionists did not seek compromised solutions. Rather, they sought to create a entirely new society by imposing on students a new model of citizenship driven by civic responsibility and collective enterprise. In fact, a continuous thread in Social Reconstructionist thought is the rejection of traditional liberal values of individualism, patriotic symbolism, and its imposition on foreign and native students alike. The positive social reconstructive position strived to create a community that “will have a unity of background and a unity of approach that will not need external threats in order to preserve the necessary state of inner cohesion.”²⁰⁰

¹⁹⁹ Charles A. Beard and Mary Ritter Beard. *American Citizenship*. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921).

²⁰⁰ Lewis Mumford, “Survey and Plan as Communal Education,” *The Social Frontier*, 4, no. 31 (1938): 109.

Although these ideas achieved their greatest influence in the 1930's as most Americans were suffering the effects of the Great Depression, the roots of this movement can be traced to first half of the 1920's. For example, as early as 1923 Harold Rugg recognized the potential dangers of contemporary economic practices to both citizens and the political and economic system:

After more than a century of democracy, there are signs of serious import that we are facing a near impasse in citizenship. The impasse, if it such it is, is undoubtedly the natural outgrowth of our spectacular conquest of vast material wealth; of our reception into the country of thirty-three millions of people of diverse races, nationalities, practices, and beliefs, and of the amassing of human beings in cities at a rate of which we had hitherto not dreamed.²⁰¹

Rugg, who is most notable for the authorship of what became controversial textbooks, recognized the role of schools in solving in the social ills that he perceived:

To relieve this impasse, we must substitute critical judgment for impulsive response as the basis for deciding our social and political issues. The thorough going reconstruction of the school curriculum is a necessary first step in the process, for the reason that the public school is our most potent agency for social regeneration.²⁰²

Disillusionment with the American social, political, and economic institutions spread among several educators and scholars throughout the decade, and led many to question whether the American liberal-capitalistic system was still effective.²⁰³ At the center of much of the criticism was the belief that the emphasis on individualism in American society eroded the value of community and social experiences. In *The Public and Its*

²⁰¹ Harold Rugg, *Town and City Life: The Social Science Pamphlets*, (New York: Harold Rugg, 1923), v.

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ George Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* (New York, Arno Press, 1932). 48.

Problems Dewey railed against the consequences of excess individualism witnessed in the early twentieth century.²⁰⁴ Instead he argued,

A good citizen finds his conduct as a member of a political group enriching and enriched by his participation in family life, industry, scientific, and artistic associations. There is a free give-and-take: fullness of integrated personality is therefore possible of achievement, since the pulls and responses of different groups reinforce one another and their values accord.²⁰⁵

The stock market crash of 1929 and the suffering of the Great Depression only served to bolster the claims of Social Reconstructionists and their argument that individualism and liberal-capitalism had run their course.²⁰⁶ One of the most vocal leaders of Social Reconstruction in the early 1930's, George S. Counts, argued that the Great Depression afforded educators the opportunity to use schools to establish a democratic collectivist society in a manner that promoted and preserved liberty and equality:

If property rights are to be diffused in an industrial society, natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned. ...This clearly means that, if democracy is to survive in the United States, it must abandon its individualistic affiliations in the sphere of economics. ...Within these limits, as I see it, our democratic tradition must of necessity evolve and gradually assume an essentially collectivistic pattern. The only conceivable alternative is the abandonment of the last vestige of democracy and the frank adoption of some modern form of feudalism.²⁰⁷

The introduction of “supreme imposition” into schools was necessary according to Counts in order to create an America that is “immeasurably more just and noble and

²⁰⁴ John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems*, (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1927).

²⁰⁵ *Ibid*, 148.

²⁰⁶ Counts, *Dare the Schools*, 45.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid*, 46.

beautiful than the America of today.”²⁰⁸ He saw the Soviet Union as offering a potential model to emulate and subsequently made efforts to study ways to implement Soviet models of education in the United States. Counts’ most famous work of the period, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* was based on speeches that he had given to the Progressive Education Association the previous year.²⁰⁹ In it he openly challenged teachers to use education to reconstruct society, and claimed that success would only be achieved through the imposition of new models of citizenship and public morality that had not been taught before.²¹⁰ The stunned, silent response of the crowd has been famously reported in several accounts.²¹¹ The new model of citizenship was less concerned with teaching patriotic symbols and governmental structures than it was in teaching students to understand their duties as citizens to their community, and in preserving equality and liberty in society. Obviously conservative critics rejected calls for Social Reconstruction, but many Progressive educators were drawn to it with fervor.

The same year that Counts released *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* William Heard Kilpatrick published *Education and the Social Crisis*. Although Kilpatrick’s rhetoric was much less inflammatory, he embraced the same basic goals that educators “must then openly assume our social responsibility. We must mean to help society, old as well as young, to move along the most defensible lines to the ever

²⁰⁸ Ibid, 55.

²⁰⁹ Evans, *Social Studies Wars*, 50-51.

²¹⁰ Counts, *Dare the Schools*, 26.

²¹¹ Evans, *This Happened in America*, 108; Gerald L. Gutek, *George S. Counts and American Civilization*, (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1978), 26.

emerging best social goals.”²¹² The role of schools in achieving these social goals would come through making “social aim and responsibility” the basis of the “whole school content and procedure.”²¹³ Kilpatrick would later go on to assume the editorship of the new journal *The Social Frontier*, which served as a forum for scholars to attack directly the evils they saw in society and to debate the ideas surrounding a Social Reconstructionist agenda.²¹⁴ Contributors to *The Social Frontier* included Counts, Harold Rugg, Kilpatrick, Boyd Bode, and the elder statesman Dewey.

As can be seen in contributions to the journal, the Social Reconstruction movement expanded the earlier Progressive model of citizens’ obligations to the community to encompass larger civic responsibilities to society. J.S. Woodward argued that the education had only served to promote “individualism and inertia of great numbers of our people,” and “that it failed to develop a sense of social responsibility.”²¹⁵ His larger contention, which is a prevalent theme in many of the articles and editorials in the *Social Frontier*, is that a change in the curriculum and the pedagogical approach of teachers that reflects the value of responsibility and collectivism will lead to greater social change.

Counts especially advocated this approach, even to the extent that he encouraged a greater imposition of moral education upon students. He drew from his studies on

²¹² William Heard Kilpatrick, *Education and the Social Crisis* (New York: Liveright Inc. Publishers, 1932), 48

²¹³ *Ibid*, 47.

²¹⁴ By 1938 the journal struggled for readership and was taken over by the Progressive Education Association in 1939 and renamed *Frontiers of Democracy*. Despite support from the PEA the journal folded in 1944. But to avoid confusion here, the journal will generally be referred to as the *The Social Frontier*.

²¹⁵ J. S. Woodward, “Public Education and Social Change,” *Social Frontier* 4, no. 34 (1938): 216 – 217.

Soviet education to encourage citizens to submit their self-interest to the greater societal good.²¹⁶ In his uncritical assessment, Counts reports that students are taught to “sacrifice the luxuries” in pursuit of the national collectivist goals.²¹⁷ Similarly Harold Rugg famously published textbooks that sought to instill greater value of social sacrifice and civic responsibility in students. Rugg’s textbooks encouraged students to be critical of a capitalistic system as well as the perceived rampant individualism that it produced.²¹⁸

By the end of the 1930’s, Social Reconstruction had amassed a collection of critics on both the right and the left. Critics on the left mainly scoffed at what they perceived at a naïve attempt to achieve idealistically sweeping reforms.²¹⁹ Conservative critics, however, were both more vocal and more organized in their opposition.²²⁰ The Social Reconstructionists argued that they had only encouraged students to think critically about American political and economic institutions that emphasized individualism and self-interest over the public good; but their ideas were branded as un-American by business leaders.²²¹ Conservatives, mostly driven by the “Red Scare,” feared that Social Reconstruction was an attempt to impose communist ideology on students.

²¹⁶ George Counts, “Education and the Five-Year Plan of Soviet Russia,” *Journal of Education Sociology* 4, no. 1 (1930): 27.

²¹⁷ Ibid.

²¹⁸ N. D. Bagenstos, “Social Reconstruction: The Controversy Over the Textbooks of Harold Rugg,” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA. New York, 1977; Evans, *This Happened in America*. Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 312 – 313.

²¹⁹ Evans, *This Happened in America*, 133.

²²⁰ Ibid.

²²¹ S. Alexander Rippe, “The Textbook Controversy and the Free Enterprise Campaign: 1940 – 1941,” *History of Education Journal* 9, no. 3 (1958): 50; and Bagenstos, “Social Reconstruction,” (1977); and Evans, *This Happened in America*, 148.

One of the most vocal opponents, the media mogul William Randolph Hearst, had been at war with the Social Reconstruction movement for years, but by the late 1930s pressure also began to build from conservative groups like the American Legion as well as pro-business groups like the Advertising Federation.²²² Rugg in particular bore the brunt of the backlash, as his books were banned in many communities, and the town of Bradner, Ohio went so far as to burn his textbooks.²²³ Momentum in the citizenship curriculum began to swing back in the direction of the classic liberal tradition. Ultimately the Social Reconstruction effort failed to remake a democratic collective society with civically responsible citizens. Perhaps the nail in the coffin could be considered the demise of *The Frontiers of Democracy*, although most of its contributors continued to have successful and lengthy careers. There is general agreement among historians and educators that the Social Reconstruction ideology had a limited influence on classroom instruction.²²⁴ Ultimately the citizenship curriculum that highlighted self-reliance, liberty, and individual rights as the best weapons to combat the overreach of government remained prominent in classrooms across the country.

The inter-war years marked an intense period of transition in American history. The country wrestled to understand its new role as an international super power following World War I. Cultural tensions produced by heightened masses of immigrants from many different countries living in expanding urban areas had led most native-born Americans to believe that the melting pot was boiling over, resulting in the closing of the

²²² Evans, *This Happened in America*, 148.

²²³ Rippa, "The Textbook Controversy," 49; Evans, *This Happened in America*, 196; and Ravitch, *Left Back*, 313 – 314.

²²⁴ Evans, *This Happened in America*, 134.

gates in the 1920s. The country was transitioning from a rural nation to an industrial nation as in 1924, for the first time, more people lived in cities than in the rural areas. The prosperity of the 1920s produced celebrations of American culture and values through expressions of patriotism in civic life and in schools. Yet the poverty of the 1930s gave voice to dissident groups that had begun to question the American foundations in Protestant liberalism and capitalism.

Such an amalgam of events and shifting ideas made it difficult for educators to interpret the values of American citizenship that needed to be taught to students. The social volatility of the period led educators to adopt extreme positions regarding citizenship. On the one hand schools adopted an assimilationist model that attempted to squeeze students of various cultural backgrounds into a singular mold. Those that did not fit that model were segregated. Segregation, in turn, failed to live up to the democratic standards of education by not providing segregated students with an equal learning opportunities. On the other hand, reactionaries to the Great Depression advocated a curriculum of collectivism and social indoctrination. Arguing that such a curriculum of citizenship education was necessary order to rebuild society, it was based on a model participatory citizenship and was stripped of the deliberative qualities so highly valued by earlier Progressives.

Educators in coming decades pointed to both of these extremes as sources of the problems in American education. Future reformers argued that schools should be not be engaged in trying to manipulate or indoctrinate students. Rather they should focus on educating students in the academic skills necessary to function effectively in civic life.

As will be discussed, this too has had significant consequences in interpreting the American identity and the civic purposes of schools.

CHAPTER IV

TURNING THE PAGE FROM PROGRESSIVISM TO ESSENTIALISM

Until the 1930s educators, scholars, and social observers debated the models of citizenship taught in schools, but the broader purpose of educating students for democratic citizenship as a principal function of public education was rarely questioned. By the mid-1930s and early 1940s Progressive education was increasingly attacked for lacking in academic rigor and for incorporating sympathetic attitudes towards socialism into the curriculum. During this period the arguments of critics like William Bagley and special interest groups like the National Association of Machinists began to gain more traction in both scholarly and popular publications.²²⁵ Without completely rejecting the civic purposes of schools, or the value that the social experience has in the learning process, their primary argument was that instruction in essential and traditional academic skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic is necessary for students to become productive citizens. Because of the emphasis on highlighting essential skills in the curriculum, this approach became known as “Essentialism.” These critiques gained momentum in the coming years, and by the 1950s the stronghold had Progressive education on American schools system had been cracked.²²⁶ Given the central role of citizenship training in the

²²⁵ Ron Evans, *The Social Studies Wars: What Are We Going to Teach the Children?* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004), 49; Ron Evans, *This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and the Censure of Social Studies* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007), 205; Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000), 290.

²²⁶ Lawrence Cremin, *Transformation of the Public School: Progressivism in Education, 1876 - 1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), vii.

Progressive educational philosophy, the collapse of Progressive education also led to a significant shift in the role of citizenship in the curriculum.

The launch of Sputnik shifted the focus of education away from citizenship towards the production of students with skills in math and science so as to make the United States more competitive with the U.S.S.R. in the arms race and the space race. New attitudes towards citizenship education in the curriculum, however, were not purely a function of a conservative reaction to the Cold War. They were also a consequence of the growing Civil Rights and multicultural movements. The attachment to issues of social control and social conformity to civic education through Americanization and segregation policies led educators to reexamine the purposes of citizenship education in a pluralistic society.

The citizenship education of the first half of the twentieth century was based on developing a sense of collective civic and national identity, which required that schools serve as institutions responsible for assimilating students from multiple ethnicities into a singular American culture.²²⁷ By mid-century, educators became increasingly concerned with individual and cultural identity. As greater awareness of social and cultural difference in the United States became apparent during the social unrest of the 1960s, however, the difficulty of determining a singular set of unifying cultural norms and civic behaviors increased. This difficulty was a product of the shift in the primacy of values from Protestant liberal ideals of industry, hard work, and individual responsibility to tolerance, justice, equality, and respect.

²²⁷ James A. Banks, "Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice," *Review of Research in Education* 19 (1993), 17.

This chapter follows the trends in educational thought on citizenship in the United States from the rise of Essentialism in the 1930s and 1940s and the rejection by conservative groups of the Progressive model of citizenship education in favor of skills based instruction. First the transition from Progressive educational thought to Essentialism is considered in the context of both academic attacks on Progressive education and fears of a growing Communist threat during the McCarthy Era, the launch of Sputnik, and the subsequent passing of the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA). Second, the rise of the New Social Studies movement is examined as an attempt on the part of social studies educators to remain relevant in the post-Sputnik era. Here, even in the social studies where civic education was expressly identified by Progressive educators as its origin and primary purpose, debates between historians and social scientists produced an approach to teaching social studies that focused on teaching students research, and they rejected the Progressive social and experiential approach to instruction in education.

The chapter concludes by addressing the shifts in civic values taught in schools as a result of the multicultural movement. Despite existing on opposite ends of the American political spectrum, multicultural educators were just as eager as their more conservative counterparts in the 1950s to abandon the comprehensive approach to citizenship education that existed under Progressive education. Given the prominence of activism in the 1960s, participatory citizenship would intuitively seem to have driven the curriculum. Educators in the multicultural movement, however, were more concerned with teaching students to think critically about how to interact in a diverse environment.

Considering the consequences of these events on citizenship education is important because it helps to explain the current status of citizenship in curriculums across the country. Awareness exists of the abstract purposes of citizenship in education, and history textbooks have supplements on civic learning, but the opportunities for direct instruction in civic education have diminished. For example, most states have objectives that address the behavioral components of citizenship, like the importance of civic virtue and engagement in local, state, and national politics. But these objectives are rarely included on the state assessments.²²⁸ Therefore teachers spend significantly less time, if any time at all, on teaching the virtues of citizenship beyond the importance of voting, and those rights protected by the Bill of Rights.²²⁹

Essentialism

During the late 1950s and 1960s American public schools, much like the rest of the country, experienced dramatic changes. The general positions of educators, politicians, and scholars regarding the purpose of education in society shifted significantly. Fueled by the Cold War and the Civil Rights movement, educators were forced to recognize the institutional changes in the public school system as well as changes in the demographics of the student body. An area that has been overlooked in

²²⁸ For example, see Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (1998); California Department of Education, *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools*, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press, 2000).

²²⁹ Kenneth E. Vogler, Impact of an Accountability Examination on Tennessee Social Studies Teachers' Instructional Practices, *Research in the Schools* 12, no. 2 (2005); 41 – 55; S. G. Grant ; Alison Derme-Insinna; Jill M. Gradwell; Lynn Pullano; Ann Marie Lauricella; Kathryn Tzezo, “When Increasing States Need Not Mean Increasing Standards: The Case of New York State Global History and Geography Exam,” *Theory and Research in Social Education* 30, no. 4 (2002); 488 – 515.

this period is the effect that the Cold War and the Civil Rights Movement had on citizenship education.

Philosophically the roots of this educational transition lay in the Essentialist movement, which can be traced to the late 1930s. In particular, William Bagley and Michael Demiashkevich are credited as the founders of Essentialist education. Until the 1930s dissenters to the philosophical premises of Progressive Education were frequently written off as antiquated traditionalists wanting to return American education to the dark ages of the nineteenth century. This changed in the 1930s as Bagley, educational scholar and long time critic of Progressive education policies, collected a following of like-minded scholars around the concept of a democratic educational model that emphasized academic standards over child-centered curriculums, and mastery of academic skills rather than socialization.²³⁰ As early as 1907 he criticized the inconsistency of Progressive education and the chaos and confusion that educational reforms produced in the classroom.²³¹ In the 1920s he was a firm opponent of IQ testing due to its anti-democratic consequences.²³² Throughout much of his career he argued for a national curriculum based on the core subjects and basic skills. In 1938, Bagley formed the

²³⁰ Michael Demiashkevich, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* (New York: American Book Company, 1935), 137; William C. Bagley, *Education and the Emergent Man: A Theory of Education with Particular Application to Public Education in the United States* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934); Ravitch, *Left Back*, 293.

²³¹ Ravitch, *Left Back*, 285.

²³² William C. Bagley, *Determinism in Education; A Series of Papers on the Relative Influence of Inherited and Acquired Traits in Determining Intelligence, Achievement, and Character* (Baltimore, MY: Warwick, 1925); William C. Bagley, "The Army Tests and Pro-Nordic Propaganda," in *Forgotten Heroes of American Education: The Great Tradition of Teaching Teachers*, eds J. Wesley Null and Diane Ravitch (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006).

Essentialist Committee for the Advancement of American Education with Demiashkevich and five other scholars.²³³

Demiashkevich was a Russian born scholar who, like Bagley, made his career criticizing the anti-intellectualism of Progressive education. In fact it is Demiashkevich who is credited with applying the term “Essentialism” to education. In his book *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* he sets apart Essentialism as the methodical approach to teaching content from the behaviorist and child-centered approach of Progressive education.²³⁴ Demiashkevich’s contribution remained largely philosophical, however, as in 1938 he committed suicide at his vacation home in Maine. It was Bagley who went on to serve as the most active and vocal proponent of Essentialism until his death in 1946.²³⁵

By the 1950s, historians like Richard Hofstadter and Arthur Bestor picked up these arguments, criticizing educators along similar lines, and advocating for greater academic rigor in the curriculum. The basic Essentialist argument that was consistent through out the works of each of these scholars is that the child-centered and experiential pedagogical models of Progressive education lacked intellectual value. The roots of these arguments can be traced back to the dawn of the Progressive education movement. As Progressive education reforms gained momentum through association with the broader goals of Progressivism, early dissenters failed to gain traction with the merits of

²³³ William C. Bagley, “The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory, *The Classical Journal* 34, no. 6 (1939), 327; Ravitch, *Left Back*, 295; Gurney Chambers, “Michael John Demiashkevich and the Essentialist Committee for the Advancement of American Education,” 48.

²³⁴ Ravitch, *Left Back*, 294.

²³⁵ *Ibid*, 298

their arguments. Critics of Progressive reforms were painted as old fashioned, and wanting to throw American education back to nineteenth century. Bagley cites the efforts to resist Progressive reforms as like trying to “sweep back the sea.”²³⁶

What separates Bagley’s critiques is that along with Demiashkevich, he established a theoretical construct to support his arguments for skill-based education. This extended much farther than a simple attack on Progressive pedagogical practices. Bagley mounted a direct assault on the entire Progressive philosophy of education. He argued that the premise upon which the Progressive education philosophy was built was inherently flawed. He did not challenge the Progressive assertion of the civic purposes of education; rather he challenged the standards by which good citizenship is measured, and the theory upon which that standard is determined.

The historical foundation for his entire theory stems from the movement towards universal education in the nineteenth century. Bagley declared that as the pressures for reforms mounted and the movement towards universal education appeared inevitable, Progressive educators either explicitly or implicitly understood that educating the entire population to the standards of secondary education as they existed in the nineteenth century was not possible. Therefore, the simplest answer was to relax the standards of secondary education.²³⁷ The aggregate effect of increasing the duration with which children were exposed to academic skills and civic ideals in schools would improve the quality of the national citizenry from the bottom up. Citing increased crime rates since

²³⁶ Bagley, “The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory,” 330

²³⁷ William C. Bagley, “The Essentialist’s Platform for the Advancement of American Education,” *The Education Digest* 4, no. 2 (1938): 1. Identical versions and pieces of this article were also published that same year in *Education Administration and Supervision* and *Time*, respectively.

the decades of Progressive dominance, Bagley countered by asserting that decreasing academic standards to the lowest common denominator had the same effect on the standards of good citizenship.

The focus on the skills that Essentialists emphasized requires a little more attention. The term “The R’s,” which refers to reading, writing, and arithmetic, is frequently used to represent the basic academic skills that Essentialists valued.²³⁸ Yet this slogan does not encapsulate the complexity of the Essentialist curriculum, or explain the reasoning behind the values they included. The importance of reading and writing for citizens in a democracy should require little explanation. Aside from the necessity of reading and writing to be able to function in daily life, education in these skills ensures that citizens have the skills to both interpret and articulate ideas. Math skills carry a similar function of daily necessity, but they also foster logical processes that promote critical and deliberative thinking.

Further separating Bagley and the Essentialists from simple traditionalists is the focus placed on scientific skills. The skills derived from scientific processes require logic similar to math, and instruction in the scientific method teaches students how to work through ideas systematically. Bagley was a strong proponent of including foreign languages as a means of furthering the cultural transmission of ideas as well as improving the communicative and deliberative skills of students.²³⁹ Finally, education in

²³⁸ R. Mosier, “Essentialism in Education,” *Progressive Education* 29, no. 4 (February, 1952): 150; see also Ravitch, *Left Back*, 296; and Thomas A. Kessinger, “Efforts toward National Educational Reform: An Essentialist Political Agenda,” *Midwestern Educational Researchers* 20, no. 2 (2007): 16-23.

²³⁹ Bagley, *Education and the Emergent Man*, 90. His emphasis on learning foreign languages is reiterated in William C. Bagley, “The Essentialist’s Platform for the Advancement of American Education,” 2; and Bagley, “The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory,” 341.

the classics of literature and philosophy were seen as the primary agent through which students would engage with the cultural and moral ideas whose depth and value had survived the test of time.²⁴⁰

What is absent from this curriculum is social science. Bagley argued that there are no skills unique to the social sciences that could not be obtained through a more intense study of other disciplines. He then held up the social studies as the hallmark of the flawed Progressive theory. If education in the Progressive philosophy was founded on the experiences of students and not, as he advocated, in the collective wisdom of society, then the lessons of good citizenship that students learn in social studies courses will only be drawn from the experiences of social engagement with other undeveloped minds. Expecting students to learn from such engagement without first developing in them the ability and mental discipline with which to reflect on the value and meaning of that engagement limits the learning potential of the activity.²⁴¹

Extending this into the consequences for citizenship education, Bagley argued that the Progressive mantra of “Education for citizenship” was an empty shirt. The Progressive practices were democratic in so far as they promoted democratic participation, but a participatory democracy is hollow if the citizens lack the deliberative skills with which to consider relevant issues.²⁴² An important point to make here is that

²⁴⁰ Ibid.

²⁴¹ Bagley, “The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory,” 340; and Bagley, “The Essentialist’s Platform for the Advancement of American Education,” 3.

²⁴² These conclusions appear to be drawn more from the Social Reconstructionist turn in the 1930s in which there is ample rhetoric promoting indoctrination and collective engagement. Evidence for this comes from *The Essentialist Platform for the Advancement of Education*, in which his analysis of the failures of the social studies is immediately succeeded by a direct attack on Social Reconstructionism. In both sections he comes to largely the same conclusion. Furthermore, even a cursory reading of

Bagley persistently refused to envelope Dewey into his criticisms of Progressive education. Primarily, he suggests, because the concepts of child-centered and experiential learning that Dewey articulated are conceptually different than the ways in which Progressive educators applied them. He believed that Dewey did not intend for the whims of childish interests and experience to dictate the curriculum. Instead, students would further their academic understanding by learning how to apply what they learned in the classroom to their own interest and experiences. Educators and scholars who carried the banner of Progressive education either confused or perverted his ideas as a means of legitimizing their own pedagogical theories.²⁴³

Understanding this distinction in Bagley's thought is important to understand the civic implications in Essentialist education philosophy. Essentialists give particular attention to critical thinking and "mental discipline" and offer very little with regards to engagement. Having recently witnessed the success of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin in exploiting the uncritical civic participation their people, grounding the American educational system in academic skills that promote reflection and deliberation offers a check against the threat that a charismatic demagogue poses to a democracy. Furthermore, promoting deliberation in political engagement is central to Dewey's

earlier Progressive works on the social studies presents a clear interest in promoting both participation and deliberation. The surest example on this can be found in the *Report on the Social Studies* from 1916, and skimming through the course that designed for seniors, *Problems of Democracy*. The sole purpose of this course, as is outlined in the introduction to the curriculum, is fostering the deliberative skills of students.

²⁴³ William C. Bagley, "Are Essentialists the True Progressives?" in *Forgotten Heroes of American Education: The Great Tradition of Teaching Teachers*, eds. J. Wesley Null and Diane Ravitch (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006).

educational and political thought.²⁴⁴ Creating a distinction between Dewey and Progressive education allows Bagley, therefore, to present Essentialism as the true decedent of Dewey's thought. This, subsequently, is important because it allows Essentialism to be presented as more than simply a conservative call for the antiquated pedagogy of the nineteenth century. Instead Essentialists argued that it is a comprehensive educational philosophy that builds off of the ideas of the greatest American philosopher of twentieth century, and seeks to promote democratic citizenship by educating students in the skills necessary to purposefully address the challenges facing the modern American democracy.²⁴⁵

²⁴⁴ There is a jargon barrier between the fields of education and political theory that needs to be clarified. In addressing pedagogical practices, education scholars refer to concepts like "critical thinking," "problem-based learning," and "problematization." These terms relate to pedagogical practices that require higher orders of thinking like analysis and evaluation. Since Progressives and Essentialists agree on the broader purposes of education in promoting democracy and citizenship, then the application of critical thinking and problem-based learning (or lack there of) carries implications for the values of citizenship that educators intend to foster in their students. In turn, deliberative democracy refers to a democratic regime in which the quality of citizens is based on the ability to make political and electoral decisions based through analysis, reflection, and enlightened discourse on issues of the day. The ability to think critically and work systematically through intellectual problems is a necessary skill for citizens to learn for deliberative democratic citizens. Therefore when educators express a preference for critical thinking or problem-based learning, they are expressing, at least implicitly, a desire to promote the deliberative qualities of citizenship in their students. Critical thinking and problem solving are not inherent qualities of participatory democratic citizenship. The classic example that supports this is, of course, the mass mobilization among German citizens in support of the Nazi regime. Although this example may appear cliché in the modern context, it was an event that Bagley observed while developing his Essentialist theories. Furthermore, his colleague and fellow Essentialist, Michael Demiashkevich, experienced the consequences of similar circumstances in the rise of Soviet Russia. Given the historical context of the period, it should not be surprising that Essentialists would prefer to focus on critical thinking in schools in order to promote a deliberative citizenry that is slow to respond, rather than a participatory citizenry that is manipulated by tyrants. In this context, the Essentialist criticism of experiential learning, especially as applied through social engagement, can be tied to fears of encouraging uncritical participation. The relationship between these political and educational ideas should be kept mind as the traditions of deliberative democracy and participatory democracy traced through to the 1970s, and are discussed in context of critical thinking, problem-based, social, and experiential learning practices.

²⁴⁵ Bagley, "Are Essentialists the True Progressives?"

Essentialism and Anti-Intellectual Attacks

Historian Richard Hofstadter reiterated Bagley's distinction between Dewey and Progressive educators. He accepted Dewey's premise that "if a democratic society is truly to serve all its members, it must devise schools in which, at the germinal point in childhood, these members will be able to cultivate their capacities and, instead of simply reproducing the qualities of the larger society, will learn how to improve. It was in this sense that he (Dewey) saw education as a major force in Social Reconstruction."²⁴⁶

Hofstadter continued to echo Bagley's point by arguing that Dewey's educational philosophy of learning by doing offered great promise when taught in conjunction with traditional approaches.²⁴⁷ He was critical of George Counts and William Heard Kilpatrick and their attempt to establish a new social order through the manipulation of the public school curriculum. Far from a lone voice on this point, the divorce between Dewey's educational philosophy and Progressive education was even present in the popular media:

Thinking begins, says Mr. Dewey, in an interest or a concern. Therefore, said the educator, our problem is to interest students, and this interpretation passed over easily into the distortion of amusing and entertaining them . . . Dewey is really saying that thinking begins in maladjustment to the environment and continues as an active, tough and difficult process . . . This was misunderstood by certain professional educators, whose influence exceeded their wisdom, to mean that the end of the educational process is the adjustment of our youngsters to their environment with no particular concern or activity on their part. For example, grades were eliminated so that the young person might not suffer the frustration of feeling inferior to others . . . This enormous sensitivity

²⁴⁶ Hofstadter, *Anti-intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), 363.

²⁴⁷ Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, 362; see also Ravitch, *Left Back*, 289.

and tenderness for the sense of security and adaptation of the child is a frightful travesty upon Dewey's thinking. His was a rigorous mind . . .²⁴⁸

Although Essentialism carried significant implications for citizenship education, scholars like Hofstadter, and his contemporary Arthur Bestor, focused their attacks on the academic integrity of the broader Progressive curriculum. Bestor famously argued that Progressive education had “lowered the aims of the American public schools.”²⁴⁹ He continued that the goals of schools were too trivial and the curriculum was divorced from “disciplines of science and scholarship.”²⁵⁰ Hofstadter mocked the moral impunity with which Progressive educators lowered the standards in public schools:

When they see a chance to introduce a new course in family living or home economics, they begin to tune the fiddles of their idealism. When they feel they are about to establish the school janitor's right to be treated with respect, they grow starry-eyed and increase their tempo. And when they are trying to assure that the location of the school toilets will be so clearly marked that the dullest child can find them, they grow dizzy with exaltation and launch into wild cadenzas about democracy and self-realization.²⁵¹

For Hofstadter anti-intellectualism in the curriculum was epitomized by the *Life Adjustment* course. This course attempted to blend elements of social engagement and citizenship with functions of daily life. It was intended to serve as the course that helped young teens make the social transition into high school. Hofstadter characterized the ridiculousness of this course by citing questions given on an eighth grade true-false test: “Just girls need to use deodorants.” “Cake soap can be used for shampooing.”²⁵²

²⁴⁸ Lawrence A. Kimpton, “Education: What’s Wrong,” *Time*, September 11, 1957.

²⁴⁹ Arthur E. Bestor. *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953), 8.

²⁵⁰ *Ibid*, 10.

²⁵¹ Hofstadter, *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*, 340.

²⁵² *Ibid*, 357.

During the 1950s a host of books attacking the quality of education appeared both for academic and popular consumption. Aside from Bestor and Hofstadter other popular books published during this period included Albert Lynd's *Quackery in the Public Schools*, Robert Hutchins's *The Conflict in Education in a Democratic Society*, and Paul Woodring's *Let's Talk Sense About Our Public Schools*. Perhaps the most popular and famous of these books is Rudolf Flesch's *Why Johnny Can't Read*. This manual instructed parents and teachers on how to teach children to read in a more traditional manner rather than the experimental techniques of Progressive education.²⁵³

One of the most frequent and consistent venues for critics of Progressive educational intellectual shortcomings was the *National Review*. Following up on Flesch's assertions, Isabel Paterson published an article in the *National Review* titled "Learning to Read: Child's Play." Her basic argument was that Progressive teachers stymied intellectual curiosity because they relied on methods that were void of common sense.²⁵⁴ A monthly column written by Russell Kirk called "From the Academy" offered general criticism of American education. Aside from frequent attacks on the liberalism and elitism of university professors, its vitriol was often aimed at the poor quality of Progressive education.²⁵⁵

Each of these works argues the same basic premise from different perspectives: Progressive education gave children too much freedom in determining what and how

²⁵³ Rudolph Flesch, *Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It* (New York: Harper Brothers).

²⁵⁴ Isabel Paterson, "Learning to Read: Child's Play," *National Review* 4, no. 21 November 30, 1957, 489.

²⁵⁵ Russell Kirk, "From the Academy: Who Accredits the Accreditors?" *National Review* 5, no. 12, March 22, 1958, 496; Russell Kirk, "From the Academy: The Accreditors Smitten," *National Review* 5, no. 21 May 24, 1958, 496; Russell Kirk, "Federal Education," *National Review* 4, no. 25 December 28, 1957, 592.

they wanted to learn, and in doing so it strayed away from its roots and diminished the quality of learning opportunities for American children. Furthermore the model of citizenship taught in classrooms was suspect due to earlier communist influences in the Progressive movement. As heightened sensitivity to the prospect of schools serving as institutions of communist indoctrination exploded in the early 1950s, the tide had turned as it was then the remaining Progressive voices found themselves trying to sweep back the sea. As fears of Soviet insurgency heightened with the onset of the Cold War, the emphasis on the skills promoted through Essentialism offered an attractive philosophical alternative to the social Progressive approach that had been associated with indoctrination and stained by the stigma of communism.

Essentialism and Cold War Citizenship

The association between communism and Progressivism is derived mostly from the 1930s when many Progressive educators openly expressed communist sympathies and a desire to push American education in the direction of the Soviet model.²⁵⁶ This transition in citizenship education included a shift away from the Progressive values expressed through social engagement to the Essentialist value of individual reflection. Again having just endured the consequences of manipulation by powerful figures of the masses of socially engaged people, Cold War critics of Progressive education were leery

²⁵⁶ A more thorough examination of this connection would show that these roots actually stretch much farther back into earlier decades of the twentieth century, but the authors of the attacks on Progressive educators in the 1950s seem content to simply attach it to manifestations of socialism and communism in the 1930s.

of allowing a teacher too much leeway in educating students in civic values through social interaction. In essence, the teacher could become a demagogue in the classroom.

As Cold War fears of subversive communist influence in schools reduced the influence of Progressive pedagogical principles, there existed a heightened drive for nationalism in the citizenship curriculum. One of the most distinguishing aspects of Cold War citizenship education is the nature of the patriotic symbolism and rhetoric, which was distinct from nationalistic patriotism expressed after World War I. After the first world war patriotism was overwhelmingly identified with Americanism: expressing American values, knowing patriotic songs, and showing reverence for the American flag. In the 1950s, however, patriotism was more closely identified with being anti-communist. Certainly elements of both existed during both periods, but the emphasis shifted from the 1920s to the 1950s.

One explanation for this shift could be the difference in the perceived threats. After World War I defenders of traditional American values feared that American security and identity were under threat from a plurality of sources. The pluralism produced by immigrants from several countries around the world that brought competing ideologies and multiple religions produced a need to establish a definition of Americanism into which these groups could be assimilated. After World War II, Russian communism was viewed as the greatest singular threat to the American way of life. This produced a myopic focus on making distinctions between American democratic values and Russian communist values. Put more abstractly, establishing an identity in a pluralistic context requires a more precise definition than is necessary when doing so in

relationship to only one other point of comparison. The latter requires simply that the identity being established is defined by the characteristics which make it not like the other.

For example the words “under God” were added to the pledge of allegiance in order to further emphasize the distinctions between the God-fearing Americans and the atheistic Russians. Without referencing the Soviet Union directly, a speech given by President Dwight Eisenhower in 1954 after the addition of the line to the *Pledge of Allegiance* makes this point clear:

We know that only the spirit and mind of man, dedicated to justice and right, can in the long term enable us to live in the confident tranquility that should be every man's heritage . . . Today the campaign for a just and lasting peace desperately needs the lifting and transforming power that comes from men and women, the world over, responding to their highest allegiances and to their best motives. . . It would change things, because it would change men. [It would serve as] a reminder to each of us that the cause of peace needs God.²⁵⁷

As Cold War fears mounted, increased attention was placed on educating children to understand communism and recognize evidence of communist behavior. Therefore students would be able to recognize if someone were a communist, and to avoid becoming a communist themselves. Manuals and textbooks published during the period even alerted students to signs that their teacher was imposing a communist agenda in the classroom.²⁵⁸ At the forefront of this battle were conservative groups like the American Legion and the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution. A 1952 article in *Time* cites Irene Corbully Kuhn whose editorial published from the American Legion

²⁵⁷ “THE NATION: Under God,” *Time Magazine*, August 30, 1954.

²⁵⁸ Lewis Paul Todd, “Editor’s Page: Teaching About Communism,” *Social Education* 16, no. 2 (1952): 51 - 52.

monthly magazine was titled “Your Child is Their Target.”²⁵⁹ Kuhn warns that schools are falling victim to “subversive textbooks, lack of discipline, failure to concentrate on the three R’s.”²⁶⁰ Kuhn continues by arguing that “all Progressive education has been a deliberate, calculated action by a small but powerful group of educators ... to change the character of American education radically . . . usurp parental authority and so nullify moral and spiritual influences.”²⁶¹

To some extent these accusations are not entirely without foundation. Recall George Counts address given to the Progressive Education Association in 1931 calling for greater imposition of collectivist values on students through citizenship education.²⁶² Furthermore articles published in the journal *Frontiers of Democracy* called for similar action:

Teachers are still bound too much by the myth of neutrality. The political education all members of the profession is, therefore, a first essential. And it must be remembered that civic behavior will be the only valid test of this education. Here is the challenge to the Progressive Education Association, for only a profession that has the courage to assume its social and political responsibilities can in the future be called truly progressive. It means that each individual must actively support the forces working pragmatically for the realization of economic democracy.²⁶³

But just as communist paranoia produced fear mongering aimed at academics as well as Hollywood actors, directors, and producers; so too was the attachment of a larger hidden communist agenda to the entire Progressive education movement largely unfounded. By the 1950s those who had actively pushed for a socialist citizenship

²⁵⁹ “Truce By Compromise,” *Time Magazine*, July 14, 1952.

²⁶⁰ Ibid.

²⁶¹ Ibid.

²⁶² George Counts, *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?*, 45.

²⁶³ Jesse H. Newlon, “Teacher and Politics – 1940,” *Frontiers of Democracy* 7, no. 55 (1940): 23.

education curriculum had either retired or been pushed to the margins. The *Frontiers of Democracy* folded in the 1940s. The charges of subversive textbooks were mostly drawn from the events surrounding Earl Rugg who began publishing textbooks in the 1920s that were attacked for their subtle endorsement of communism. Again, however, by the 1940s these books had fallen out of favor and were no longer in print. Regardless the association of Progressive education with communism persisted.

Progressive educators attempted to maintain relevance by publishing articles that articulated the Progressive position while placating communist paranoia. *Social Education* was a journal devoted to social studies education, and it was heavily influenced by the Progressive philosophy. Several articles articulate the importance of helping students to build a stronger relationship with the community. This is a profoundly Progressive idea.²⁶⁴ And an issue published in 1955 praised the career and influence of Charles Beard.²⁶⁵ At the same time a book review in an earlier volume published in 1952 strikes a similar chord as the American Legion. The editor, Lewis Paul Todd, commends the authors for their book *How You Can Teach About Communism*:

Forceful though they are in their presentation, Professors Crary and Steibel keep their balance as they strike their blows for freedom. "If Communism constituted a threat in ideas only," they write, "we could readily assume that our confidence in the free market of ideas would suffice. But the Communist teacher is a cog in a great power machine,

²⁶⁴ Frederic L. Ayer and Bernard C. Corman, "Citizenship Concepts Are Developed by Laboratory Practices," *Social Education* 16, no. 5 (1952): 215.

²⁶⁵ Samuel Steinberg, "Charles A. Beard: The Man and His Works," *Social Education* 19, no. 3 (1955): 101-103.

poised and possibly ready for aggressive action. The problem of the Communist teacher can hardly be divorced from the realities of the world situation.²⁶⁶

Unfortunately for Progressive educators hoping to maintain relevance, these articles did little to delay the inevitable. Those attacking Progressive education found a voice in many popular magazines. *Time* continued to run articles attacking public schools and Progressive education and offered positive reviews of books like *Why Johnny Can't Read* that were critical of Progressive methods.²⁶⁷ *Time* was not alone; *Atlantic Monthly* also frequently ran articles critical of Progressive education.²⁶⁸ *National Review* piled on criticism with sardonic wit. An editorial by, Allan Roland Rysking, titled "Why Johnny Shouldn't Read" criticized both public and higher education. Rysking argued that perhaps the failure of schools to teach reading actually saved students from having to read the socialist texts assigned by college professors.²⁶⁹ This article kills two birds with one stone by attacking the educational system for being both anti-intellectual and communist at the same time. Meanwhile supporters of Progressive education were relegated to academic journals like *Social Education* and *Progressive Education*.

Although this distinction between an academia that leans to the left and an American public with conservative inclinations is exceptionally pronounced during the 1950s, its roots, again, are tied to the events of the 1920s and 1930s. The scholars influencing the contributors to *Social Education* and *Progressive Education* in the 1950s

²⁶⁶ Lewis Paul Todd, "Editor's Page: Teaching About Communism," 51.

²⁶⁷ "Why Johnny Can't Read," *Time Magazine*, March 14, 1955.

²⁶⁸ For example see Oscar Handlin, "Textbooks That Don't Teach," *Atlantic*, 200 no. 6, 1957; see also Paul Cruikshank, "Wasting Our Young People," *Atlantic*, 202 no. 1, (July, 1958), 195.

²⁶⁹ Allan Rolland Ryskind "Why Johnny Shouldn't Read: A Defense of Progressive Education," *National Review* 4, no. 11 (September 21, 1957), 253.

were the Social Reconstructionists of the 1930s. Aside from the emergence of Essentialism in the 1930s, business leaders also reacted negatively to the Social Reconstruction message. Conservative organizations that promoted traditional capitalistic and Protestant values, like the National Association of Manufacturing, the Advertising Federation of America, or the New York State Economic Council were able to garner the attention of the *New York Times*.²⁷⁰ These groups, in particular, were successful in using popular media to convey their message that Social Reconstructionists were plotting to covertly corrupt the mind of American youth by planting the seeds of communist sympathy.²⁷¹ Yet support for the Social Reconstructionist position was limited to academic roundtables or journals like the *Frontiers of Democracy*.

After the launch of Sputnik in 1957 education assumed a new role in the fight against communism. Two years earlier, the Progressive Education Association, which had been founded in 1919, and its journal *Progressive Education*, established in 1924, both folded. Lawrence Cremin later dubbed this the official death of the Progressive education movement.²⁷² As education turned the page in the latter half of the decade, the Essentialist philosophy was widely embraced by politicians and bureaucrats. Public schools became the means through which students would acquire the necessary skills in math and science to fight communists. Specifically, the skills learned in school would prepare students for careers in engineering and the military so that the United States would be able to win the arms race, the space race, and the Cold War. The role that the

²⁷⁰ Ron W. Evans, *This Happened in America: Harold Rugg and the Censure of Social Studies*, 205.

²⁷¹ *Ibid*, 211.

²⁷² Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, vii.

launch of Sputnik played in this shift cannot be over emphasized. Within a year of its launch Congress passed the National Defense of Education Act (NDEA). The goals of the NDEA were effectively to co-opt public schools for national security purposes, and in doing so they effectively implemented the Essentialist philosophy.²⁷³

The NDEA had several broad implications for education. First and foremost public education had largely been an issue of state and local concern through its development. The NDEA represented the largest appropriation of funds for public schools from the federal government to that point. Although provisions in the bill prevented federal control over the curriculum or personnel, the implications of federal funding for the math, science, and foreign language programs influenced curricular decision-making. Despite a dramatic increase in federal spending for education there was no money appropriated for citizenship education or even civic education programs. The only stipulation regarding citizenship was a requirement on a student loan application that students sign a loyalty oath and sign a sworn statement that they had never supported attempts to overthrow the government.²⁷⁴

The years surrounding the passage of the NDEA provide a focused dialog on education generally and the role of public education in the new Cold War world. The education section in *Time* effectively sums up the discussion: “In three major U.S. cities last week there were further signs that the nation is pretty well fed up with the philosophy of education that has dominated the public schools for the last three decades. The theme in all three: the growing need to stress not the social but the intellectual in

²⁷³ Kessinger, “Efforts toward National Educational Reform: An Essentialist Political Agenda,” 8.

²⁷⁴ National Defense Education Act of 1958, [20 U.S.C. 401 et seq.], 45.

education.”²⁷⁵ The academic of the curriculum discussion was clearly focused on math and science education. In 1959 the Woods Hole Conference organized new curriculums for math and science that were designed to develop critical thinking skills through in depth research of specific subjects rather than broad survey courses that covered lots of material.²⁷⁶ The behavioral components of education, like social studies and the citizenship curriculum that were so popular under Progressive education, were left without serious direction.²⁷⁷

In some regards the anti-communist concerns continued, but by the early 1960s the McCarthy Era fervor had diminished and more educators began to recognize the need not to shy away from communism in the classroom but to confront it directly. For example, in February of 1964, *Social Education* devoted an entire edition to strategies and sources for teaching communism to American students. As one article in this issue points out, however, the objective of school boards in including communism in the curriculum was to ensure that students view it as a threat to the American way of life.²⁷⁸ Furthermore conservative groups continued to apply pressure on local school boards to promote non-deliberative expressions of patriotism:

Booklets and units have been produced hurriedly by school districts fearful of getting caught without “something to show” on patriotism. The names of national heroes and the dates of battles and other events long overlooked or forgotten have been exhumed so more days could be spotlights on school calendars and underlined through the reading of

²⁷⁵ “New Mood,” *Time Magazine*, March 3, 1958.

²⁷⁶ Jerome Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965), i.

²⁷⁷ Elizabeth Yeager Washington, and Robert L. Dahlgren, ““The Quest for Relevancy:” Allen Kownslar and Historical Inquiry in the New Social Studies Movement,” in *The New Social Studies: People Projects, & Perspectives*, eds. Barbara Slater Stern. (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009), 96.

²⁷⁸ Gray, Roland F. “Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives,” *Social Education* 28, no. 2 (1964), 71.

stories and speeches, singing of songs, arranging of bulletin boards, and the like. In response to suggestions, appeals, and outright directives emanating from editorials, public addresses, large assemblies, and forums, etc., schools have held patriotic assemblies for young people during the day and programs for parents and other adults at night which have been devoted entirely to patriotism or embossed generally with patriotic elements.²⁷⁹

The shifts that occurred in the 1950s and the passing of the NDEA effectively ended the efforts to apply Progressive civic ideals in schools. The broader social ideas of citizenship were stripped away and the citizenship curriculum returned to the political model. As will be discussed with the shift towards multiculturalism, however, indirect instruction produced a significant change in the values presented to students.

Social Studies Responds to the NDEA

Even within the social studies, where its presence is most directly observed in the curriculum, direct instruction in citizenship received significantly less attention in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Since the inception of the social studies in 1916, social scientists and historians battled for influence and control. Throughout the period of Progressive education social scientists carried greater weight in the curriculum. But just as sentiments among educators and scholars swung towards Essentialism and intellectualism in the 1950s, by the 1960s the social studies educators followed suit. The power of social scientists declined in favor of greater influence by historians.²⁸⁰ Much like math and science educators before them, historians developed a curriculum that

²⁷⁹ Raymond H. Muessegger and Vincent R. Rogers, "Teaching Patriotism at Higher Conceptual Levels," *Social Education* 28, no. 5 (1964), 267.

²⁸⁰ Mark Krug, *History and the Social Sciences: New Approaches to the Teaching Social Studies* (Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967), 137.

abandoned broad survey courses in favor of focused studies that taught critical thinking through research. This new historical approach to social studies was much more copasetic to the goals of the NDEA, and in turn much more consistent with Essentialist philosophy. The movement towards a research and discipline centered model became known as “New Social Studies.” In fact Edward Fenton’s opening lines to his book *Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools*, published in 1966, makes this point perfectly:

About a decade ago a wave of reform in the teaching of mathematics, the natural sciences, and foreign languages began to reach tranquil secondary school classrooms. Reinforced by Sputnik and supported by generous grants from the National Science Foundation and private philanthropic groups, these reforms have had a profound impact upon American education. In about 1960, scholars in the fields of English and the social studies joined the reform movement.²⁸¹

This new approach to teaching social studies was less of a concerted effort and more the coincidental product of a series of grants on instruction in social studies provided by the National Science Foundation (NSF). Scholars agree that its popularity peaked in 1967 and then slowly dwindled in influence through 1974.²⁸² At its height the New Social Studies consisted of over forty project curriculums in which students were expected to develop both content knowledge and research skills through exploration and dialogue. For example one project titled “Life in a Johannesburg Slum Yard,” expects students to learn about the social and political challenges facing Africa, as well the

²⁸¹ Edwin Fenton, *Teaching the new Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*, (New York: Holt Rinehard and Winston, 1966). 1

²⁸² Ron Evans, “National Security Trumps Social Progress,” in *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives* ed. Barbara Slater Stern (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2010), 13.

consequences of urbanization through examining materials related to a slum known as Rooiyard in Johannesburg, South Africa.²⁸³

In the decades since the decline of the New Social Studies, many studies have attempted to assess the success and overall consequences of the movement. There is general agreement that the New Social Studies were largely unsuccessful because this research-based model was developed by professional scholars and ignored the intellectual maturity of both teachers and students.²⁸⁴ Its relevance to this discussion lies in the type of projects that were undertaken. Although there were over forty projects that received funding, only one, the Harvard Project, related to citizenship education. Ron Evans points out that the Harvard Project stands out as the least compatible among the all of the New Social Studies projects because it did not comply with the “discipline-based mentality” of the movement.²⁸⁵

Despite the weaknesses that scholars point out, in retrospect, the New Social Studies projects were popular because they served both conservative and liberal needs. Certainly they helped to promote the research skills desired by Cold War educators, but they were easily adapted to address the concerns of the more liberal, pro-Civil Rights educators. In particular the New Social Studies held great potential for the other movement emerging in education: multiculturalism.²⁸⁶

²⁸³ Fenton, *Teaching the new Social Studies in Secondary Schools*, 389.

²⁸⁴ Evans, *The Social Studies Wars*, 129.

²⁸⁵ Evans, National Security Trumps Social Progress, 13.

²⁸⁶ Gloria Contreras, “The New Social Studies and the Ethos of Multiculturalism.” in *The New Social Studies: People Projects, & Perspectives*, eds. Barbara Slater Stern. (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009), 380.

Essentialist Implications for Multiculturalism

Among the strengths of Essentialism is its philosophical flexibility. That is, unlike Progressive education, its application is not constrained by social and political circumstance. Progressive education was founded on efforts to reform perceived social ills, and inherent in these reforms were desires to promote specific normative social and political behaviors. Consequently, Progressive educators were dependent upon the acceptance of the norms with which they hoped to assimilate the rest of society. Essentialist philosophy does not involve explicit normative prescriptions. Therefore the core curriculum, theoretically, can remain relatively consistent as social values and civic ideals evolve. This flexibility is what allowed Essentialism to gain popularity during the Cold War and continue to thrive during the cultural revolutions of the 1960s, despite the dramatic differences between the two eras.

Traditionally citizenship education had involved teaching positive behaviors and values based on social norms and national identity.²⁸⁷ This assumes that members of the professional, academic, and local communities agree on the behaviors that should be taught. In homogenous societies these challenges might be manageable, but as layers of pluralism build in a society these challenges are more pronounced. Critics argue that in response to these challenges, multicultural educators abandoned efforts to identify unifying cultural and civic values and instead embraced cultural relativism. Proponents of multiculturalism respond that *only* the blind acceptance of White, Protestant, liberal

²⁸⁷ Mary A. Hepburn, "Concepts of Pluralism and the Consequences for Citizenship Education," *The Social Studies* 84, no. 1 (1993), 21.

values was abandoned. These values were then replaced with new ideas of tolerance, respect, and equality.

Supporters of multiculturalism viewed the Progressive movement as a response to the forced assimilation of minority groups into the dominant Anglo-Saxon culture.²⁸⁸ The Americanization and segregation policies applied to schools in the twentieth century served as the mechanism of assimilation. Immigrants from eastern and southern Europe were Americanized, and they developed hyphenated national and cultural identities. Meanwhile Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians who were considered to be unconformable to this Anglo-Saxon society were simply segregated.²⁸⁹ Therefore the goal of multiculturalism was not to assimilate groups into a single culture but to recognize the value inherent each. In comparison to the melting pot metaphor that was popular during the early twentieth century, the mosaic metaphor has often been applied to this approach.²⁹⁰

Educational critics of multiculturalism argue that this movement led to a fracture of national identity that had irrevocable consequences for education. Diane Ravitch goes so far as to call it the “Great Melt Down.”²⁹¹ Perhaps the clearest critique of multiculturalism comes from Arthur Schlesinger Jr. who argued that the excesses of multiculturalism in the 1960s produced an overemphasis on ethnic and cultural distinctions thereby furthering the social tensions that multiculturalism was intended to

²⁸⁸ Ibid.

²⁸⁹ Milton Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race Religion and National Origins* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 164.

²⁹⁰ Hepburn, “Concepts of Pluralism and the Consequences for Citizenship Education,” 20.

²⁹¹ Ravitch, *Left Back*, 322.

reduce. As he pithily puts it, multiculturalism “belittles *unum* and glorifies *pluribus*.”²⁹² He is clear to acknowledge the racism inherent in the pedagogical approach to assimilation in citizenship education. It marginalizes cultures that are not Anglo-Saxon, and excludes those that cannot be adapted to the dominant culture.²⁹³ Furthermore he adamantly supports including a multicultural perspective in the curriculum. His concern is that much as Marxist historians tend to ascribe class tensions to all that cannot be explained, multiculturalists overly structuralize history by ethnic distinctions at the expense of consideration for individual contributions. In making this point Schlesinger emphasizes the unique quality of American national identity as based on connections from shared experiences of molding a pluralistic society. He argues,

The new ethnic gospel rejects the unifying vision of individuals from all nations melted into a new race. Its underlying philosophy is that America is not a nation of individuals at all but a nation of groups, that ethnic ties are permanent and indelible, and that division into ethnic communities establishes the basic structure of American society and the basic meaning of history.²⁹⁴

Inherent in the multicultural movement of the 1960s was a desire to challenge the status quo of the general curriculum that promotes the Anglo-Saxon perspective.²⁹⁵ This placed multiculturalism directly at odds with the citizenship curriculums of both Progressive education and the early Cold War, as both derived their ideas of good citizenship from White, Protestant, liberalism. The willingness on the part of

²⁹² Arthur Schlesinger, *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company), 21.

²⁹³ *Ibid*, 58.

²⁹⁴ *Ibid*, 20.

²⁹⁵ Theodore Kaltounis, “Multicultural Education and Citizenship Education at a Crossroads,” *The Social Studies* 88, no. 1 (1997): 20.

multicultural educators to embrace alternative values and perspectives led to accusations of moral relativism. Multiculturalists responded that tolerance and equality are universal values that are necessary for democratic citizenship in a pluralistic society. As James A. Banks argues:

Multicultural education assumes that race, ethnicity, culture, and social class are salient parts of U.S. society. It also assumes that ethnic and cultural diversity enriches the nation and increases the ways in which citizens can perceive and solve personal and public problems. This diversity also enriches a society by providing all citizens with more opportunities to experience other cultures and thus to become more fulfilled as human beings. When individuals are able to participate in a variety of ethnic cultures, they are more able to benefit from the total of human experience.²⁹⁶

Evidence that these multicultural values were influencing the civic understanding of American students can be seen in the trends displayed in the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP). Starting in 1969, the Education Commission annually surveyed the knowledge of both children and adults based on ten criteria. These criteria consisted of the subjects included in the Essentialist curriculum on social studies and citizenship. With regards to the influence of multicultural values on the national level, children's recognition of the importance of diversity and tolerance of people of other races, cultures, and religions increased over the next decade. For instance in 1970, when asked whether the government should protect the rights and freedoms of all people, 81% of respondents provided an affirmative response. When asked similar questions in 1976, the affirmative response humped to 96%.²⁹⁷ Along with evidence of heightened

²⁹⁶ James A. Banks, *An Introduction to Multicultural Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002), 1.

²⁹⁷ Education Commission of the United States, *National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1970 Citizenship: Group Results for Sex, Region, and Size of Community*, (Washington D.C.: Office of Education, 1971), C-14; Education Commission of the United States, *Education for Citizenship: A*

multicultural influences there also existed evidence of the effects of Essentialist thought on education. For instance, comprehension of content in the social studies and affirmative responses to political participation declined dramatically over the same time period.²⁹⁸

As American education transitioned through the Cold War and the multiculturalism movement, both had a profound influence on the perceived role of public schools and the manner in which students are prepared for entrance into society. Previously, Progressive educators who represented a very liberal perspective viewed preparing students for citizenship as the central function of the school. This included a social approach through which students were assimilated into the dominant culture and taught the behaviors that good citizens possess. Conservative groups, fearing that the dominant culture that Progressives were promoting contained elements of communism, responded by remodeling the school curriculum to one that focused on teaching students the skills that citizens need to be successful rather than particular values and behaviors.

As multiculturalism emerged and challenged the White Protestant dominance in the school curriculum, conservative groups responded again by arguing that citizenship education represented the front through which traditional American values would be preserved. Therefore in this dynamic and transitional period in American history, citizenship education moved from an expression of American political liberalism to American political conservatism. The unspoken compromise that both groups were able

Bicentennial Survey, Citizenship/Social Studies Report (Washington D.C.: Office of Education, 1976), 26.

²⁹⁸ R. Freeman Butts, *The Revival of Civic Learning: A Rationale for Citizenship Education in American Schools*, (Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1980), 77.

to agree upon involved a simplified model of citizenship education in which students are encouraged to vote, serve on juries, abstractly engage in public service, and know their rights; but little was expected beyond that. Since the 1960s there has been little movement in the citizenship curriculum to either return to a more behaviorist approach or to seek new normative values and behaviors that should be taught in school. Politicians, scholars, and educators have all made appeals for a reassessment of citizenship education in the curriculum. Nonetheless this model of the citizenship education remains in most state curriculums across the country.

Teaching students the virtues of citizenship presents unique challenges that do not exist in the reading, writing, and arithmetic curriculums. Citizenship education requires teaching behaviors and values based on social norms and national identity. This assumes that members of the professional, academic, and local communities agree on the behaviors in the curriculum. In homogenous societies these challenges might be manageable, but in a politically, religiously, and culturally pluralistic society these challenges are immense. Progressive educators attempted to meet these challenges by developing their own set of behaviors and norms and constructing the curriculum around it. In the early decades of the twentieth century this meant teaching behaviors that were openly patriotic and consistent with Protestant and liberal values. At the same time it ignored the values of immigrants and minorities.

As economic and political institutions collapsed during the Great Depression, a new generation of Progressive educators wanted to impose their ideas of citizenship based on collectivist models of education. Although these ideas appealed to populations

that had otherwise been neglected by previous civic educators, the values and virtues of Protestantism liberalism, and capitalism were ignored. Since these were also the values of the White middle-class who held political influence at the time, a citizenship curriculum running counter to those interests was destined to fail.

The 1950s marked the beginning of the push by the federal government for greater control of public schools. The Essentialist curriculum was much more attractive because of its emphasis on skills over behaviors. Gaining a consensus on a set of skills that students should learn is easier than finding agreement on behaviors, especially when developing a curriculum for a pluralistic society. Consequently the approach of Progressive education based social experiences became increasingly irrelevant. Furthermore, with the centralization of education came a movement to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum. Here again the assessment of skills offered a much easier measure than the assessment of behaviors. As a result the role of citizenship education has diminished as the standardized assessment of skills has become a central focus of public education.

It is easier to assess a student's knowledge and abilities than it is to assess behavior. Therefore the emphasis placed on math, reading, and science in the curriculum over social studies and citizenship in the 1950s paved the way for the standardization of assessment and curriculum possible in the 1970s and 1980s. This later influenced the pedagogical theory from which the "No Child Left Behind Act" emerged, which places a premium on standardized test scores.²⁹⁹ Currently most state curriculums offer lip

²⁹⁹ Kessinger, "Efforts toward National Educational Reform: An Essentialist Political Agenda," 3

service to citizenship education, yet the teaching objectives associated with citizenship are rarely, if ever, tested.³⁰⁰ Even a quick glance at the learning objectives for the state of Texas offers a glimpse at the continued influence of Essentialist philosophy in education, known as the *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills*. In the current environment of standardized assessment, those objectives absent from the state test are not taught in the classroom.

³⁰⁰ See Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills* (1998); California Department of Education, *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools*, (Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press, 2000).

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

What ultimately appears to be at work in the evolution of American citizenship education since the Progressive Era is a tension between the need to preserve culture and tradition, and the requirements of democratic citizens to critically examine the society in which they live. On the one hand there exists an interpretation of the American identity that is attached to language, and cultural and political heritage. Within this pursuit to preserve this American identity is an evolving effort to define it. These definitions include attempts to articulate the common values, experiences, and aspirations that define an American citizen existing in a pluralistic society. In the American historical context, a primary function of education, broadly conceived, has served as a means of transmitting the values and collective cultural knowledge from one generation to the next since the Colonial Era. Therefore students have been taught the virtue of citizenship through the lens of uniquely American ideals.

On the other hand, there simultaneously exists a desire to cultivate the American democratic spirit, which requires politically socializing students to engage critically in social and political spheres. In doing so students must be able to think critically about the system in which they are entering so as to understand the issues of the day, recognize the need for reform where necessary, and identify quality representatives who can express their interests in government. Full implementation of this idea, however, requires that students challenge the ideals that define the American identity. As our

educational system has become increasingly democratic, schools exist at the crossroads of engendering national loyalty and challenging the status quo.

Arthur Dunn attempted to strike this balance in the community civics curriculums by encouraging students to focus their deliberation and participation at the local level while maintaining their national loyalty. The pressures of World War I, however, fractured this balance as the fervor for patriotic ideals took root. Dewey and most pedagogical Progressives continued to push the deliberative and participatory ideas of citizenship into the 1920s, even as conservative groups continued to advocate for greater preservation of traditional ideals of American citizenship. Social Reconstructionists confronted those traditional ideals directly. In the second half of the twentieth century, educators have attempted to ease these tensions by focusing less on teaching students the behaviors of citizenship, and more on the essential academic skills that all citizens need in order to be contributing and competitive members of society.

Global Citizenship

The formal citizenship curriculum has remained relatively static since the 1970s, focusing mostly on the structures of government and the political rights and responsibilities of students. Scholarly thought on citizenship education, however, has continued to evolve. For instance, in education research, the multicultural movement of the 1970s and 1980s gave way to the globalization movement in the 1990s. Emerging out of the economic rhetoric of the 1980s, education scholars in the 1990s began to reexamine the purposes of education in an interconnected world and evangelize the

fundamental ideas of multiculturalism on the global theater.³⁰¹ Multiculturalism focuses on teaching students to be tolerant and embrace people of diverse backgrounds within the national context. This involves challenging students to consider American culture, identity, and history, not just from the White perspective, but from the perspective of the many ethnic and religious groups that fill the American populace.³⁰² Global citizenship takes that idea a step further by challenging students to consider their civic roles at the international level. In short, the distinction lies in the difference between an intrinsic reflection of identity and perspective and an extrinsic examination of relative place, responsibility, and interdependence.³⁰³

Central civic values of globalization include promoting equality, social justice, peace, and tolerance, while fighting oppression and efforts to impose a universal social order.³⁰⁴ Despite the rejection of universalism, critics and skeptics still associate globalization with implications of socialization and associations with a singular world government. Prevalence of this view, particularly within in the United States, provides a partial explanation as to why global citizenship has had difficulty finding a place in the curriculum, despite indications that few scholars oppose its core values.³⁰⁵

³⁰¹ Joseph Watras, "Globalization and Philosophy of Education," *Philosophical Studies in Education*, 41 (2010), 83.

³⁰² Thomas J. La Belle and Christopher R. Ward, *Multiculturalism and Education: Diversity and Its Impact on Schools and Society* (Albany, NY: State University of Albany Press, 1994), 31.

³⁰³ James Lynch, *Multicultural Education in a Global Society* (London: The Falmer Press, 1989), 43; Nel Noddings, "Place-Based Education to Preserve the Earth and its People," in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, eds. Nel Noddings (New York: Teachers College Press, 2005), 57.

³⁰⁴ Elise Boulding, *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988), 75.

³⁰⁵ Anatoli Rapoport, "We Cannot Teach What We Don't Know: Indiana Teachers Talk About Global Citizenship Education," *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice* 5, no. 3 (2010): 179 – 190; Merry M. Merryfield and Masataka Kasai, "How Are Teachers Responding to Globalization?" *Social Education* 68, no. 5 (2004): 342 – 379.

The gap between educational practice and scholarship on this issue could be interpreted in several ways. First, scholars pushing for globalization and global citizenship are out of touch with challenges facing teachers and students. That is, teachers, let alone students, struggle to understand the concepts of democracy and citizenship necessary to engage even at the local level. Consequently, there is little likelihood that students would be able to grasp the nuances of global interconnectedness and engagement.³⁰⁶ On the other hand, the argument could be made that the citizenship curriculum provides an outdated model of civic and political engagement that lacks relevance. It is based on industrial models of citizenship in the nation-state, rather than in a world in which people have increasing abilities to connect with and destroy one another through the use of technology. In other words, a model of citizenship based on political status and national identity lacks meaning if the traditional understanding of the nation-state is stripped away.³⁰⁷

Of course as is the case with most complicated ideas, the question is not actually binary. Rather both options contain elements of reality and exaggeration. On this point, however, global citizenship serves as an excellent example as to how the dialogue on citizenship has diverged from its instruction. Furthermore, the challenges of inserting globalism into the citizenship curriculum are not entirely internal. Instead it competes

³⁰⁶ Ibid

³⁰⁷ This idea is most famously articulated in Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996). The desire to prevent Huntington's hypothesis from becoming a reality serves as the premise behind several educators who advocate for education for globalization. For examples see: Carlos Alberto Torres, "Globalization, Education, and Citizenship: Solidarity Versus Markets?" *American Education Research Journal* 39, no. 2 (2002); Joel Spring, *Globalization and Educational Rights: An Intercivilizational Analysis* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001).

both with alternative views of citizenship education and with bureaucratic trends that have emerged in contemporary periods. First and foremost these include a resurgence of moral education, the rise of standards and high-stakes testing, and the popularity of extra-curricular programs promoting citizenship.

Moral and Patriotic Citizenship since the 1980s

Since the rise of the Moral Majority and the social conservative movement in 1970s, calls for increased attention to moral education, character education, and patriotic values have remained constant. The rhetoric of moral education at the end of the twentieth century is eerily similar to that at its beginning. Bill Bennett's declaration that America has lost its moral compass as a result of urban expansion, cultural revolution, and technological explosion reads like a modern translation of Ellwood Cubberley's fears that the pressures of industrialization were corroding the American family and its value system.³⁰⁸ Furthermore moral citizenship advocates for an attempt to express tolerance of immigrants and diverse populations, while continuing to draw a line in the sand. Unlike a century ago, however, when populations from around the world were discriminated against through various manifestations of Americanization policies, in the modern environment Hispanic immigrants bear the brunt of the nativist attacks. Continued English-only policies in schools and calls for laws declaring English as the

³⁰⁸ William J. Bennett, *Our Children and Our Country: Improving Americas Schools and Affirming the Common Culture* (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1988), 69; Ellwood P. Cubberley, *Changing Conceptions of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909), 50.

national language reflect the residual attachment to English as the language of American citizenship.³⁰⁹

To be fair, holding up extremes as examples of the whole is easy but does not depict accurately the evolution and the nuances within moral and patriotic citizenship relative to earlier periods. The clearest evidence of change can be seen in the response towards Muslim-Americans in the wake of the September 11th Attacks. Despite a growing and disturbing anti-Muslim sentiment expressed in several media outlets in recent years, in the immediate aftermath of the attacks calls for mourning were coupled with calls for tolerance. There was neither a national policy of internment of Muslims, nor did congressional committees interrogate those they believed to have Muslim extremist sympathies. With regards to citizenship education, there were no calls to Americanize Muslims or segregate them as second-class citizens. If anything, there was a greater push for education about the Muslim faith. This shows that although there were individuals and private organizations who espoused nativist and racist ideologies, they have been pushed to the fringes where once they were considered socially acceptable in mainstream political discourse.³¹⁰

The entrenchment of multicultural values in the American education ethos has made it difficult for advocates of traditional values to make significant in-roads in the

³⁰⁹ Carlos K. Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 141.

³¹⁰ Once again, the recent revisions to the social studies curriculums offer a counter point to this general trend. Among the criticisms of social studies textbooks used in Texas classrooms is that they overcompensated, and since the 9/11 attacks have provided a pro-Islam bias.

curriculum.³¹¹ Such difficulties led to what James Davidson Hunter referred to in the title of his book as “culture wars.”³¹² Moral citizenship proponents attack multicultural education as having fostered cultural relativism in the curriculum.³¹³ Meanwhile defenders of multiculturalism argue that tolerance and equality are universal values that promote an inviting learning environment without imposing the ideals of the dominant culture on minority populations.³¹⁴ Yet awareness of the value of examining moral ideas has produced a school of thought focused on deliberative moral inquiry. Rather than simply instruct students in good and bad moral and civic behaviors, students reflect on moral questions and deliberate on ethical scenarios.³¹⁵ The irony is that pluralism is a consistent value among each of these models of civic education, but pluralistic competition limits the opportunity to form a consensus as to which model should be implemented in the curriculum. Further complicating the matter is that a citizenship curriculum that is not based on political and moral absolutes is difficult to assess in the era of high-stakes testing.

³¹¹ Certainly the recent revisions to the social studies curriculum in Texas offer a counter to this point, but the hardened reaction from both teachers and educators from around the state and the country reflect a limited tolerance for such reforms. For example, one of the orchestrators of the curriculum reforms, Greg McElroy of College Station lost his bid for reelection to the State Board of Education in the Republican primary campaign.

³¹² James Davidson Hunter, *Culture Wars: The Struggle To Control The Family, Art, Education, Law, And Politics In America* (New York: Basic Books, 1992).

³¹³ *Ibid.*, 113. See also Bill Honig, *Last Chance for Our Children: How You Can Help Save Our Schools* (Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1985); William Kilpatrick, *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right from Wrong* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992); Kathleen M. Gow, *Yes Virginia, There is Right and Wrong!* (Ontario: John Wiley and Sons Canada Ltd., 1980).

³¹⁴ Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America: Culture Wars in the Public Schools* (Cambridge, MA: 2002), 215.

³¹⁵ Most recently this has been fleshed out in the work of Lawrence Kohlberg. See Lawrence Kohlberg, *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice* (New York: Harper & Row, 1981). For further analysis see, F. Clark Power, Ann Higgins, and Lawrence Kohlberg, *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).

Effects of Standards and High-Stakes Testing on Citizenship Education

Among the more talked about and controversial shifts in education is the emergence of the standardization of the curriculum since the 1980s. With origins tied most famously to the 1983 report on the American education system *A Nation at Risk*,³¹⁶ promoters of standardization have been driven by the fear that American security is at risk because test scores suggest that American schools are falling farther behind other developed countries in Europe and Asia.³¹⁷ The solution, therefore, is to promote consistency and accountability in the curriculum. In the process, the gulf between the priority that is given to science, math, reading, and writing and the social studies has widened even further than during the Cold War. This has produced less opportunity for direct instruction on the concepts of citizenship and civics in the classroom.³¹⁸

This movement, however, has neither been monolithic nor linear in its application. In the early 1990s President George H. W. Bush promoted the *America2000* program, and it was signed by governors from all fifty states. The support of the governors was important as the authority in enforcing education policy at the time remained with the states. This was not a comprehensive standardization of the curriculum, but it did lay out six broad objectives that all schools were expected to meet.

³¹⁶ Laura Lefkowitz and Kristen Miller, Fulfilling the Promise of the Standards Movement, *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 5 (2006), 403 – 407.

³¹⁷ *A Nation at Risk* at least represents a catalyst for the movement in education that has ultimately produced the No Child Left Behind policy. Efforts to standardize student learning and knowledge can be traced back at least to Progressive Era reforms. In one of his last published articles, Harold Rugg identifies the education psychologists of the Progressive Era as the founders of the effort to standardize learning and knowledge. Harold Rugg, “Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Education Since 1910,” *Curriculum Theory* 4, no. 4 (1975): 295 – 308.

³¹⁸ Kathleen Kennedy Manzo, “Social Studies Losing Out to Reading, Math,” *Education Week* 24, no. 27 (2005): 1 – 17.

Among these six objectives, the third and the fifth address the civic purposes of education. Included in the third objective is the phrase “every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship.”³¹⁹ The fifth objective then follows with “Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.”³²⁰ Of course, no description or definition of “responsible citizenship” or the “responsibilities of citizenship” is provided in the document. Much more attention is given to the fourth objective, which is also much more explicit: “U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.”³²¹ The document was largely rhetorical and offered little in the way of enforcement. Consequently, these objectives received little in the way of implementation.

Nonetheless, the march of standardization gained momentum. States developed more specific content objectives for each grade and each subject; and state education agencies began to pour millions of dollars into the development of state assessments. In an attempt to reestablish relevance, social studies educators across the country supported the Center for Civic Education’s “National Standards for Civics and Government.”³²² These standards offer a relatively comprehensive examination of citizenship. They encourage both an understanding of government, and they promote ideas that have been

³¹⁹ U.S. Department of Education, *America2000: An Educational Strategy* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1991), 19.

³²⁰ *Ibid*

³²¹ *Ibid*

³²² Sandra Stotsky, “The National Standards for Civics: A Backbone for School Curricula?” *Journal of Education* 176, no. 3 (1994), 29.

present in the citizenship curriculum throughout the twentieth century. They promote morality, but place the instruction of morals in the context of those consistent with social norms and democratic interests. They do promote instruction in specific behaviors like patriotism, courage, compassion, honesty, and open-mindedness. The argument is that these behaviors do not necessarily make a person moral, but rather they are necessary for citizens to be able to deliberate ideas and participate in a democratic society.³²³ Again, as there was no government enforcement behind them, these standards also gained little traction in terms of their implementation in schools.

A major challenge in the development of standardization policies is the issue of enforcement. The catch-22 facing policy-makers is that the main method of enforcement is to cut funding for schools that are not performing. This in turn reduces the resources that schools and teachers have to help students learn. By 2001, however, a collaboration of policy-makers, educators, and politicians developed the No Child Left Behind policy. Once again math, reading, writing, and science received priority. Social studies, which is where citizenship is most frequently and directly taught, is not included as the one of the assessed subjects. Despite the absence of inclusion in the federal policy, most states do assess social studies as part of the core curriculum.

Inclusion in the assessed core represents a double-edged sword for social studies, and subsequently citizenship education. On the one side, social studies remains a relevant subject in the curriculum. On the other, because of the nature of state assessments and the culture of accountability, limited opportunity is available to reflect

³²³ Center for Civic Education, *National Standards for Civics and Government* (Calabas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1994), 215.

on civic morality or to practice the behaviors of citizenship. Studies suggest that in this environment teachers tend to fall victim to the teaching-to-the-test syndrome.³²⁴ The tests are generally multiple-choice tests that assess students' knowledge of facts and ability to interpret data in maps and charts.³²⁵ Therefore the instructional emphasis is on memorization of historical facts and concepts.³²⁶ This makes the content less relevant and applicable in the lives of students, and social studies courses seem more like training for Jeopardy or Trivial Pursuit, not citizenship.

Extra-Curricular Citizenship Education

But as mentioned in the beginning, this story of citizenship education since the Progressive Era is not a jeremiad. Citizenship education is not dead, nor does it appear to be dying. The ideals of democratic citizenship have shifted, and the role of citizenship education has changed, but America's youth continue to learn and pursue civic ideals. Each generation produces millions of young people who join the military out of a sense of national duty, engage in civic activism to support causes they believe in, and pursue careers of public service. The most recent example is the spike in young people voting for the first time in the 2008 presidential election. Political scientists and social commentators explain this as a consequence of Barack Obama being the first African-

³²⁴ Kenneth Vogler, "Impact of a High School Graduation Examination on Mississippi Social Studies Teachers' Instructional Practices." in *Measuring History: Cases of State-level Testing Across the United States*, ed. S. G. Grant, (Greenwich, CT: Information Age, 2006), 273 – 302; Kenneth Vogler, "Impact of an Accountability Examination on Tennessee Social Studies Teachers' Instructional Practices." *Research in the Schools* 12, no. 2 (2005): 41–55.

³²⁵ Some states, like New York, include document based questioning exercises on their assessments, but these are still just test a variation of data interpretation, not civic mindedness.

³²⁶ Kenneth E. Vogler and David Virtue, "'Just the Facts, Ma'am: Teaching Social Studies in the Era of Standards and High-Stakes Testing," *Social Studies*, 98 no. 2 (2007): 54 – 58.

American candidate to be endorsed by either political party. This does not explain, however, why many college students and young adults have also been active in the populist Tea Party Movement. This begs the question, from whom are students learning about citizenship and civic engagement? Certainly traditional familial and religious institutions deserve some credit. The inherent individual initiative of some, and the experiences that accompany living in a society do as well.

Even though civic education in the classroom may leave much to be desired, schools do provide instruction in citizenship through extra-curricular activities. In terms of promoting moral virtues, coaches around the country promote the values of hard work, respect, and cooperation to their athletes. The *Character Counts!* program encourages and rewards students for displaying values consistent with good character and citizenship.³²⁷ Other organizations like the Center for Civic Education and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning (CIRCLE) are both heavily funded and frequently endorsed by politicians on both sides of the aisle. They also produce extra-curricular programs, civics curriculums, and supplementary materials that promote citizenship education. These programs tend to focus more on concepts attached to political citizenship. This includes educating students on the structures of government, deliberation of public policy and political issues, and the nature of representative democracy.

³²⁷ Michael S. Josephson, *Making Ethical Decisions* (Los Angeles: Josephson Institute, 2002). This book is posted on the *Character Counts!* website as the official manual of the program. The program receives considerable criticism for effectively imposing a Protestant value system when fully implemented. The purpose here, however, is not to endorse a particular program or a particular approach, but simply to combat the argument that citizenship education is dead in the public schools. Right or wrong, the popularity of this program at least serves as a piece of evidence supporting the argument that it is not.

Perhaps fueled by recent scholarship on civic engagement and social capital, as well studies that have shown the decreasing numbers of the youngest generations of Americans citizens voting, participatory citizenship has enjoyed growing popularity over the past decade.³²⁸ Programs that focus on participation tend to be less concerned with political engagement and more with social activism. For instance, the *Citizen Schools* program, based in Boston, offers an after school curriculum in which students are taught vocational skills which are then translated into causes that promote civic interests. Since 1995 this program has expanded to cities in seven states including New York, Houston, Austin, and the Bay area in California.³²⁹

Among the most popular movements to promote participatory citizenship can be found in the service learning curriculums. In what may sound eerily similar to Arthur Dunn's community civics curriculum, service learning generally involves having students examine problems they observe in their communities and engage in community service projects to solve them. A significant difference, however, is that Dunn intended for such projects to be incorporated as part of the actual curriculum. Creative teachers across the country certainly find ways to incorporate service learning as part of the classroom experience. As often as not, however, service-learning projects are done through extracurricular organizations.

One critique of service learning projects, as Joseph Kahne and Susan E. Sporte point out, is that frequently service-learning activities are really just community service

³²⁸ Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).

³²⁹ Citizen Schools, <http://www.citizenschools.org/>; see also, Andrea Ford, How to Help If You're a Working Adult, *Time*, Thursday, September 23, 2010.

projects. The primary difference, they argue, is that service-learning involves the meta-cognitive awareness of and reflection upon civic behaviors before, during, and after the project.³³⁰ In other words, simply organizing an opportunity for students to work at a homeless shelter, or on a beautification project in and of itself is not a service-learning project. Service learning involves activities that challenge students to reflect on the nature of the project ahead, and then on their experiences afterwards. Ideally service learning becomes a laboratory through which students can practice the skills of citizenship and consider opportunities for growth and improvement.

Conclusion

The obvious question lingers as to how, with the vast array of social, institutional, and ideological challenges, should students be educated to be good citizens? Citizenship education that promotes traditional values and patriotism does so to the benefit of the dominant culture and at the expense of minority populations. Citizenship education that promotes deliberation and critical thinking poses threats to national identity. The citizenship curriculums of the early twentieth century that provided instruction in normative social and political behaviors produced high levels of civic engagement, but again at the expense of non-White and non-Protestant cultures. Meanwhile, multicultural citizenship education offered greater balance to students of

³³⁰ Joseph E. Kahne and Susan E. Spote, "Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students' Commitment to Civic Participation," *American Educational Researcher*, 45 (2005), 738 – 766; see also, S. Billig, S. Root, and D. Jesse, *The Impact of Participation in Service Learning on High School Students' Civic Engagement* (Washington, DC: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2005).

diverse backgrounds, but it appears at the expense of political and civic engagement. Prescribing a curriculum that threads these needles and instructs students in a model of citizenship that balances tolerance, engagement, tradition, and critical thinking is beyond the scope of this project.

It is valuable to take a moment to challenge the collective approaches that scholars take in critiquing citizenship education and prescribing their own reforms. Most works on citizenship education assert the necessity of paying greater attention to the civic education of America's youth. These calls frequently involve a renewal of civic ideals, or patriotism, or morality. Others seek to turn a new page in our understanding of citizenship and civic engagement. More often than not, these calls for renewal and new understanding offer less insight as to the shortfalls of society, and serve more as a reflection of the authors themselves: whether this involves William Bennett decrying the collapse of American morality, or Joel Spring proselytizing the virtues of social justice and globalization. Both approach citizenship education through the reformist's lens of diagnosing America's academic and social ills. Bennett, of course, is much more content oriented in his concern for emphasizing the continuation of the American tradition and values. This approach focuses more on the transmission of content than the development of skills. Spring represents a blending of both process and content oriented learning. As articulated by Spring, education in global citizenship requires both an declarative understanding of the international arena, and an ability to engage individuals with differing and multiple perspectives.³³¹

³³¹ Spring, *Globalization and Educational Rights*, 154.

These calls for citizenship education reform are frequently accompanied by apocalyptic rhetoric declaring that if we do not restore our sense of civic virtue, or adopt new civic ideals then American democracy will cease to exist. Imbedded in these arguments are fears of Visigoths and Nazis. If we lose our political and cultural identities, the argument goes, we will have corroded the foundation that unites us against our external enemies. But if we are mindlessly accepting of tradition, then we will cease to reach for the hands of our better angels and fall victim to the seduction of the domestic demagogue. Absent in these warnings of our impending doom is much attention given to the efforts of young people already trying to engage and influence the world around them.

For example, for all of the anecdotes of cyber-bullying and irresponsible behavior online, there are countless examples of teenagers positively engaging in social and political causes through the Internet. The TeenActivist.org is an entrepreneurial organization, created by high school students that encourages other young people to become actively involved regardless of their cultural backgrounds or political persuasion. Their website provides links to other organizations affiliated with both the Democratic and Republican parties, Christian, Muslim, and Jewish activist groups, as well as several special interest organizations.³³² Yet drawing from works like Putnam's

³³² Of course one of the most dramatic examples on the international stage of teenagers using non-traditional methods of social and political organization can be seen in the recent democratic protests in the Middle East. The fluidity and mobility of the protests as being due to the teenagers organizing meeting through Twitter and Facebook has been frequently commented on in the media. See Kareem Fahim and Liam Stack, "Protesters in Egypt Defy Ban as Government Cracks Down," *New York Times*, January 26, 2011; Martha Raddatz, "Social Media Fuels Protests in Iran, Bahrain and Yemen," www.abnews.com, February 15, 2011.

Bowling Alone and studies showing decreased voter turnout among young people, the current conventional wisdom is that America's youth are disengaged. Consequently students must not be receiving a good enough education in the virtues of civic engagement. Such arguments are based on the assumption that if young adults and students are engaged in a manner that is inconsistent with the experiences of their parents or grandparents then they must not be engaged at all.

Simple psychological reasoning would suggest that encouraging and expanding upon pre-existing positive behaviors is more effective than chastising and eliminating negative behavior. And as anyone who has ever worked with teenagers knows, an imposed list of behaviors that are considered good will be ignored, while a list of bad behaviors only represents an opportunity to challenge authority. Therefore telling students that good citizens vote or bad citizens do not vote does little but offer one more opportunity to resist the imposed institutional authority of the public schools.

This is not to suggest that simply because *World of Warcraft* is a popular game that we should produce contrived studies that fit civic lessons into a video game. That is exactly the approach to child-centered education that Essentialists rightly rejected in the 1940s. Rather serious studies of existing student engagement are needed so that scholars and educators can better understand how those behaviors and values exist within established theories of democratic citizenship. This would allow for the cultivation of civic ideals within students that are neither contrived nor imposed.

There is a final point to make about citizenship education that applies regardless of the theory that dominates the curriculum. Although there are aspects of citizenship,

like the learning of government structures, that are easily adapted to learning in the traditional classroom environment, the skills and behaviors of social and political engagement must be practiced. This is a point that Progressive educators of the early twentieth century, despite their shortcomings, seemed to grasp; and we have since forgotten. Providing opportunities for students to practice civic engagement were at the heart of Dewey's research at the Laboratory School, Dunn's community civics course, and Kilpatrick's project method. It is also one that has been lost on most modern educators. Students practice reading, writing, and doing arithmetic by sitting at a desk and reading, writing, and doing arithmetic. Students learn the principles of science by practicing the concepts of the scientific method and experimentation in science labs. In fact, every subject, including electives like music, art, or typing, are learned mostly by practicing the skills and principles of the discipline.

There seems to be a break down in pedagogical thinking to suggest that with this one subject, citizenship education, students will be able to learn and apply the concepts of democratic citizenship by reading about them and having a teacher tell them. Students read about great historical figures in their history books, and teachers tell them why they are important or virtuous. Students also read about good citizenship, usually in the citizenship excerpt of their textbook, or in their government class. They may be given handouts or tests that ask them to conceptualize good citizenship. And then they graduate and either go to college or enter the workforce, and we mock them for their lack of civic initiative.

This is like having students read a book about how to hit a baseball, and then put them in a game with a pitcher who can throw a fastball, a curveball, and a change up. Fundamental mechanics of the swing must be taught and practiced by free swinging and hitting off of a tee, and then practicing through a series of progressions until the student can hit off a live pitcher. If we want students to graduate high school with greater civic awareness, we must give them an opportunity to practice consciously the desired civic behaviors and stop fooling ourselves that they will spontaneously associate the principles of democratic citizenship as taught in history class with their social encounters in the hall way or the cafeteria.

The purpose of this study has been to examine the efforts of scholars and educators to conceptualize the evolving interpretations of democratic citizenship. The civic ideals and the theories from which they were derived that were explored and debated were recycled and reformulated for new generations enduring new challenges. Despite these efforts we still lament the civic failures we see in our young people and our society.

Most of the ideas about civic education that have been expressed since the Progressive era contain some merit, and most contain significant problems when applied to the extreme. To suggest that we must strike a balance is both falsely utopian and overly simplistic. Hopefully we can learn from the events of the twentieth century to limit the extremes in this regard. As previously mentioned, the measured response to the 9/11 attacks provides some hope in this regard. Nonetheless, some degree of flocculation in the characteristics of citizenship that we choose to emphasize in the curriculum will

occur as our knowledge expands, and as we react to the events of the coming years.

Establishing a clearer picture of the types of citizens we need to meet those challenges, and developing a curriculum that allows students to practice those skills will be imperative if we expect schools to prepare students to those challenges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aberdeen Daily News*. "Young Students Write Americanization Essays." February 25, 1920.
- Abowitz, Kathleen Knight, and Jason Harnish. "Contemporary Discourses on Citizenship." *Review of Education Research* 76, no. 4 (2006): 653-690.
- Addams, Jane. "The Public School and the Immigrant Child." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 47. Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Agency, 1908, 99-100.
- American Educational Review*. "What Educational People Are Doing and Saying." 31, no 1 (1909): 3-22.
- Ames, Edgar W., and Arvie Eldred. *Community Civics*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1921.
- Angus, David L., and Jeffrey E. Mirel. *The Failed Promise of the American High School, 1890 – 1995*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999.
- Aronovici, Carol. *Americanization*. St. Paul, MN: Keller Publishing Co, 1919.
- Ashley, Roscoe Lewis. *The New Civics, A Textbook for Secondary Schools*. New York: Macmillan and Company, 1917.
- Ayer, Frederic L., and Bernard C. Corman. "Citizenship Concepts Are Developed by Laboratory Practices." *Social Education* 16, no. 5 (1952): 215.
- Bagenstos, N. D. "Social Reconstruction: The Controversy Over the Textbooks of Harold Rugg." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, New York, 1977.
- Bagley, William C. *Determinism in Education: A Series of Papers on the Relative Influence of Inherited and Acquired Traits in Determining Intelligence, Achievement, and Character*. Baltimore, MY: Warwick & York, Inc, 1925.
- . *Education and the Emergent Man: A Theory of Education with Particular Application to Public Education in the United States*. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1934.

- . “The Essentialist’s Platform for the Advancement of American Education.” *The Education Digest* 4, no. 2 (1938): 1.
- . “The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory.” *The Classical Journal* 34, no. 6 (1939): 326 – 344.
- . “The Army Tests and Pro-Nordic Propaganda.” In *Forgotten Heroes of American Education: The Great Tradition of Teaching Teachers*, edited by J. Wesley Null and Diane Ravitch, 145 – 158. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006.
- . “Are Essentialists the True Progressives?” In *Forgotten Heroes of American Education: The Great Tradition of Teaching Teachers*, edited by J. Wesley Null and Diane Ravitch, 235 – 244. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006.
- Banks, James A. “Citizenship Education for a Pluralistic Democratic Society.” *The Social Studies* 81 (1990): 210 – 214.
- Banks, James A. “Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice.” *Review of Research in Education* 19 (1993): 3-49.
- Banks, James A. *An Introduction to Multicultural Education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.
- Barber, Benjamin. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 2003.
- . *A Place for Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1998.
- Barnard, J. Lynn, “The Teaching of Civics in Elementary and Secondary Schools,” *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 52. Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, July 5 – 11, 1913, 84 – 90.
- Barton, Fred. “Walking the Walk: Creating Engaged Citizens in English Class.” *The English Journal* 94, no. 5 (2005): 75-79.
- Beard, Charles A. and Mary Ritter Beard. *American Citizenship*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.
- Bennett, Linda, Julie Fessenden. “Citizenship Through Online Communication.” *Social Education* 70, no. 3 (2006): 144 – 146.

- Bennett, William J. *Our Children and Our Country: Improving Americas Schools and Affirming the Common Culture*. New York: Simon & Shuster, 1988.
- . *The Book of Virtues: A Treasury of Great Moral Stories*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.
- Benton, Guy Potter. "What the War has Contributed toward teaching Citizenship," *Addresses and Proceeding*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 58, Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1920), 68 – 72.
- Bestor, Arthur. "Anti-intellectualism in the Schools." *New Republic* 128, no 3 (1953).
- . *Educational Wastelands: The Retreat from Learning in Our Public Schools*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1953.
- Bidwell, Charle E. "The Moral Significance of the Common School." *History of Education Quarterly* 6, no. 3 (1966), 50-91.
- Billig, S., S. Root, and D. Jesse. *The Impact of Participation in Service Learning on High School Students' Civic Engagement*. Washington, DC: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, 2005.
- Blanton, Carlos Kevin, "From Intellectual Deficiency to Cultural Deficiency: Mexican Americans, Testing, and Public School Policy in the American Southwest, 1920-1940," *The Pacific Historical Review* 72, no. 1 (2003): 39 – 62.
- . *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Bloom, Allan. *Closing of the American Mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1988.
- Bloom, Harold. *The American Religion: The Emergence of the Post-Christian Nation*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
- Bogardus, Emory S. *Essentials of Americanization*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press, 1920.
- Boulding, Elise. *Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1988.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

- Brumbaugh, Martin G. "The Relation of Urban Community to Its Public school system." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 51. Ann Arbor, MI: The National Education Association, 1912, 381 – 383.
- Bruner, Jerome. *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Burch, Henry Reed, and Patterson S. Howard. *American Social Problems*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1922.
- Burroughs, Susie, Eric C. Groce, and Mary L. Webeck. "Social Studies Education in the Age of Testing and Accountability." *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice* 24, no. 3 (2005): 13-20.
- Butler, Nicholas Murray, "A Call to Citizenship." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 48. Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1909, 75 – 82.
- Butts, R. Freeman. *The Revival of Civic Learning: A Rationale for Citizenship Education in American Schools*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.
- Cabot, Ella Lyman, Fannie Fern Andrews, Fanny E. Cox, Mabel Hill, and Mary McSkinnon. *A Course in Citizenship*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1924.
- California Department of Education. *History-Social Science Content Standards for California Public Schools*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Education Press, 2000.
- Callan, Eamonn. "Tradition and Integrity in Moral Education." *American Journal of Education* 101, no. 1 (1992): 1-28.
- . *Creating Citizens: Political Education and Liberal Democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
- Center for Civic Education. *National Standards for Civics and Government*. Calabas, CA: Center for Civic Education, 1994.
- Chambers, Gurney. "Michael John Demiashkevich and the Essentialist Committee for the Advancement of American Education." *History of Education Quarterly* 9, no. 1 (1969): 46 – 56.
- Charters, W.W. *Methods of Teaching: Developed from a Functional Standpoint*. Chicago: Row, Peterson & Company, 1909.

- Chillaux, H.L. "The American Legion's Interest in Education The American Legion's Interest in Education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science in special issue Education for Social Control* 182, (1935).
- Chiodo, John J., and Leisa A. Martin. "What Do Students Have to Say About Citizenship? An Analysis of the Concept of Citizenship among Secondary Education Students." *Journal of Social Studies Research* 29 (2005): 23 – 31.
- Clark, France Elliot. "Music Education." *Music Supervisors Journal* 5, no. 1 (1918): 14 –18.
- Clowse, Barbara Barksdale. *Brainpower for the Cold War: The Sputnik Crisis and the National Defense Education Act of 1958*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981.
- Contreras, Gloria. "The New Social Studies and the Ethos of Multiculturalism." In *The New Social Studies: People Projects, & Perspectives*, eds. Barbara Slater Stern, 379-406. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009.
- Corley, Christopher, and Jay Walsh. "Integrating Globalization into the Curriculum: Two Examples." *World History Connected* 1, no. 2 (2004): <http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/whc/1.2/corley.html> (March 15, 2004).
- Cremin, Lawrence. *Transformation of the Public Schools*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.
- Cohen, Joshua. "Procedure and Substance in Deliberative Democracy." In *Philosophy and Democracy*, edited by Thomas Christiano, 17 - 38. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Counts, George. "Education and the Five-Year Plan of Soviet Russia." *Journal of Education Sociology* 4, no. 1 (1930): 27.
- . *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* New York: Arno Press, 1932.
- Cuban, Larry. *How Teachers Taught: Constancy and Change in American Classrooms, 1890 – 1980*. New York: Longman, 1984.
- Cubberley, Ellwood P. *Changing Conceptions of Education*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909.
- Current Opinion*. "How War Is Changing The Character Of The American People." 64, no. 1 (1918): 44.

- Curry, Kristal. "Warcraft and Civic Education: MMORPGs as Participatory Culture and How Teachers Can Use Them to Improve Civic Education." *Social Studies* 101, no. 6 (2010): 250-253.
- Cruikshank, Paul. "Wasting Our Young People." *Atlantic* 202, no. 1 (July, 1958): 195.
- D'Souza, Dinesh. *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*. New York: Free Press, 1995.
- Dann, Hollis. "A State Program of Music Education." *Music Supervisors Journals* 10, no. 1 (1923): 38-47.
- Davidson, Percy E. "The Social Significance of the Army Intelligence Findings." *Scientific Monthly* 16 (1923): 185-186.
- Delli, Carpini, Michael X., and Scott Keeter. *What Americans Know About Politics and Why It Matters?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Demiashkevich, Michael. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York: American Book Company, 1935.
- Dewey, John. "Ethical Principles Underlying Education." In *Third Yearbook of the National Herbart Society for the Scientific Study of Teaching*, edited by Charles A. McMurry. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1897.
- Dewey, John. "The School as Social Center." *The Elementary School Teacher* 3, no. 2 (1902): 73 – 86.
- . *Moral Principles in Education*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1909.
- . and Evelyn Dewey. *Schools of Tomorrow*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co., 1915.
- . *Democracy and Education*. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1916.
- . *The Public and Its Problems*. New York: Holt, 1927.
- Donnan, Laura. "The High School and the Citizen." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 28. Topeka: KA, Kansas Publishing House, 1889, 512 - 520.
- Dorsey, Susan M. "How Citizenship is Taught in the Schools of Los Angeles." *Address and Proceedings of the Fifty-Eighth Annual Meeting*, Vol. 58, Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1920, 66 – 68.

- Dunn, Arthur William. *The Community and the Citizen*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co. 1907.
- . *Civics: The Community and the Citizen*. Boston: Kessinger Publishing, 1914.
- . *Community Civics and Rural Life*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1920.
- . *Community Civics for City Schools*. Boston: D.C. Heath & Co., 1921.
- Eisele, J. Christopher. "John Dewey and the Immigrants." *History of Education Quarterly* 15, no 1 (1975).
- Education Commission of the United States. *National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1970 Citizenship: Group Results for Sex, Region, and Size of Community*. Washington D.C.: Office of Education, 1971.
- . *Education for Citizenship: A Bicentennial Survey, Citizenship/Social Studies Report*. Washington D.C.: Office of Education, 1976.
- Evans, Ron. *Social Studies Wars: What Are We Going to Teach the Children?* New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.
- . *This Happened In America*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2008.
- . "National Security Trumps Social Progress." In *The New Social Studies: People, Projects, and Perspectives* ed. Barbara Slater Stern, 1-40. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2010.
- Fahim, Kareem and Liam Stack. "Protesters in Egypt Defy Ban as Government Cracks Down." *New York Times*, January 26, 2011.
- Fass, Paula. "The IQ: A Cultural and Historical Framework." *American Journal of Education* 88, no. 4 (1980): 431 – 458.
- Fenton, Edwin. *Teaching the new Social Studies in Secondary Schools: An Inductive Approach*. New York: Holt Rinehard and Winston, 1966.
- Fishkin, James S. *Democracy and Deliberation: New Directions for Democratic Reform*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993.
- Fitzgerald, Frances. *History Schoolbooks in the Twentieth Century*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1979.
- Flesch, Rudolf. *Why Johnny Can't Read, And What You Can Do About It*. New York: Harper Brothers, 1955.

- Foster, Katherine A., Tina Heafner, and Eric Groce. "Advocating for Social Studies: Documenting the Decline and Doing Something About It." *Social Education* 71, no. 5 (2007): 255-260.
- Fowler, O. F. "The Civic Attitudes of High School Sophomores." *School Review* 36 (1928): 25 – 37.
- Ford, Andrea. "How to Help If You're a Working Adult." *Time*, Thursday, September 23, 2010.
- Frank, Kenneth, Yong Zoa, Kathryn Borman. "Social Capital and the Diffusion of Innovations within Organizations: The Case of Computer Technology in Schools." *Sociology of Education* 77, no. 2 (2004): 148-171.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1970.
- Furin, Terrance. "High-Stakes Testing: Death of Our Democracy?" *Social Studies and the Young Learner* 15, no. 4 (2003): 32.
- Galston, William A. "Political Knowledge, Political Engagement, and Civic Education." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (2001): 217 – 234.
- . "Civic Education and Political Participation." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 37, no. 2 (2004): 263-266.
- Gaus, Laura Sheenin. *Shortridge High School: 1864-1981, In Retrospect*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1985.
- Gay, Geneva. *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2000.
- Getz, Lynn Marie. *Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850 – 1940*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Geyer, Michael. "Multiculturalism and the Politics of General Education." *Critical Inquiry* 19, no. 3 (1993): 499 – 533.
- Gibson, M.A. "Approaches to Multicultural Education in the United States: Some Concepts and Assumption." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 7 (1976): 7 – 18.
- Gilbert, R. "Identity, Culture, and Environment: Education for Citizenship in the 21st Century." In *Beyond Communitarianism: Citizenship, Politics, and Education*,

- edited by Jack Demaine and Harold Entwistle, 42 – 63. London: Macmillan Press, 1996.
- Gow, Kathleen M. *Yes Virginia, There is Right and Wrong!* Ontario: John Wiley and Sons Canada Ltd., 1980.
- Grant, S. G., Alison Derme-Insinna, Jill M. Gradwell, Lynn Pullano, Ann Marie Lauricella, and Kathryn Tzezo, “When Increasing States Need Not Mean Increasing Standards: The Case of New York State Global History and Geography Exam,” *Theory and Research in Social Education* 30, no. 4 (2002): 488 – 515.
- Gray, Roland F. “Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives.” *Social Education* 28, no. 2 (1964): 71 – 72.
- Gutek, Gerald L. *George S. Counts and American Civilization*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1978.
- Gutmann, Amy. *Democratic Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- . “Civic Education and Social Diversity.” *Ethics* 105, no. 3 (1995): 556-580.
- Handlin, Oscar. “Textbooks That Don’t Teach.” *The Atlantic Monthly* 200, no. 6 (1957): 110-113.
- Hart, Daniel, Thomas M. Donnelly, James Youniss, and Robert Atkins, “High School Community Service as a Predictor of Adult Voting and Volunteering.” *American Educational Research Journal* 44 (2007): 197 – 219.
- Hartman, Andrew. *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School*. New York: Palgrave, 2008.
- Hepburn, Mary A. “Concepts of Pluralism and the Consequences for Citizenship Education.” *The Social Studies* 84, no. 1 (1993), 21.
- Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1955.
- Hill, Howard Copeland. *Community Life and Civic Problems*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1922.
- Hirsch, E.D. *The Making of Americans: Democracy and Our Schools*. Hartford, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.

- Hofstadter, Richard. *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Honig, Bill. *Last Chance for Our Children: How You Can Help Save Our Schools*. Reading MA: Addison-Wesley, 1985.
- Hunter, James Davidson. *Culture Wars: The Struggle To Control The Family, Art, Education, Law, And Politics In America*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.
- . *The Death of Character: Moral Education in an Age Without Good and Evil*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Huntington, Samuel P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
- Israel, Charles A. *Before Scopes: Evangelicalism, Education, and Evolution in Tennessee, 1870-1925*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004.
- Jensen, Richard. *The Winning of The Midwest*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971).
- Josephson, Michael S. *Making Ethical Decisions*. Los Angeles: Josephson Institute, 2002.
- Kaestle, Karl. *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780 – 1860*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.
- Kahne, Joseph, Bernadette Chi, and Ellen Middaugh. “Building Social Capital for Civic and Political Engagement: The Potential for High-School Civics Courses.” *Canadian Journal of Education* 29, no. 2 (2006): 387-409.
- Kahne, Joseph E., and Susan E. Spote. “Developing Citizens: The Impact of Civic Learning Opportunities on Students’ Commitment to Civic Participation.” *American Educational Researcher*, 45 (2005): 738 – 766.
- Kahne, Joseph, Joel Westheimer, and Bethany Rogera, “Service learning and citizenship: Directions for research.” *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* (2000): 42 – 51.
- Kaltounis, Theodore. “Multicultural Education and Citizenship Education at a Crossroads.” *The Social Studies* 88, no. 1 (1997): 20.
- Katz, Michael. *Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

- Kellor, Frances. *Strait America*. New York: Macmillan Co, 1916.
- Kessinger, Thomas A. "Efforts toward National Educational Reform: An Essentialist Political Agenda." *Midwestern Educational Researchers* 20, no. 2 (2007): 16-23.
- Kevles, Daniel J. "Testing the Army's Intelligence: Psychologists and the Military in World War I." *The Journal of American History* 55, no. 3 (1968).
- Keyssar, Alexander. *The Right to Vote: The Contested History Democracy in the United States*. New York: Basic Books, 2000.
- Kilpatrick, William. *Why Johnny Can't Tell Right From Wrong: And What We Can Do About It*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.
- Kilpatrick, William Heard. "The Project Method." *The Teachers College Record* 19, (1918): 319-335.
- . *Education and the Social Crisis*. New York: Liveright Inc. Publishers, 1932.
- Kimpton, Lawrence A. "Education: What's Wrong." *Time*, September 11, 1957.
- King, Irving. *Social Efficiency: A Study in Social Relations of Education*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1913.
- Kirk, Russell. "Federal Education." *National Review* 4, no. 25 (December 28, 1957): 592.
- . "From the Academy: The Accreditors Smitten." *National Review* 5, no. 21 (May 24, 1958): 496.
- . "From the Academy: Who Accredits the Accreditors?" *National Review* 5, no. 12 (March 22, 1958): 489.
- Klapper, Paul. *Principles of Educational Practice*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1912.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893 – 1958*. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 1986.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. *Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876 – 1946*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. *The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. New York: Harper & Row, 1981.

- Kosnoski, Jason. "Artful Discussion: John Dewey's Classroom as a Model of Deliberative Association." *Political Theory* 33, no. 5 (2005): 654 – 677.
- Krug, Mark. *History and the Social Sciences: New Approaches to the Teaching Social Studies*. Waltham, MA: Blaisdell Publishing Company, 1967.
- La Belle, Thomas J., and Christopher R. Ward. *Multiculturalism and Education: Diversity and Its Impact on Schools and Society*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.
- Larabee, David. "Progressivism, Schools, and Education." *Paedagogica Historica* 41, no. 1&2 (2005), 275 – 288.
- Lefkowitz, Laura, and Kristen Miller. "Fulfilling the Promise of the Standards Movement." *Phi Delta Kappan* 87, no. 5 (2006): 403 – 407.
- Leloudis, James L. *Schooling the New South: Pedagogy, Self, and Society in North Carolina, 1880-1920*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Lickona, Thomas. *Educating for Character: How Schools Can Teach Respect and Responsibility*. New York: Bantam Books, 1989.
- Link, William A. *The Paradox of Southern Progressivism: 1880-1930*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
- Lynch, James. *Multicultural Education in a Global Society*. London: The Falmer Press, 1989.
- McClellan, B. Edward. *Moral Education in American: Schools and the Shaping of Character from Colonial Times to the Present*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1999.
- McDonnell, Lorraine M., P. Michael Timpane, and Roger Benjamin, eds. *Rediscovering the Democratic Purposes of Education*. Lawrence, KA: University of Kansas Press, 2000.
- McIntosh, Peggy. "Gender Perspectives on Educating for Global Citizenship," in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, edited by Nel Noddings. 22 – 39. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005.
- Manchester, Arthur L. "Music Education, a Musical America, the American Composer, a Sequence." *The Musical Quarterly* 10, no. 4 (1924): 587 – 595.

- Manzo, Kathleen Kennedy. "Social Studies Losing Out to Reading and Math." *Education Week* 24, no. 27 (2005): 1 – 17.
- Merryfield, Merry M. and Masataka Kasai. "How Are Teachers Responding to Globalization?" *Social Education* 68, no. 5 (2004): 342 – 379.
- Milton, Gordon. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Mirel, Jeffrey. "The Decline of Civic Education." *Daedalus* 131, no. 3 (2002): 49-55.
- Mosier, R. "Essentialism in Education." *Progressive Education* 29, no. 4 (1952): 150;
- Muesssig, Raymond H., and Vincent R. Rogers. "Teaching Patriotism at Higher Conceptual Levels." *Social Education* 28, no. 5 (1964): 267.
- Muffoletto, Roberto and Julie Horton, eds. *Multicultural Education, the Internet and the New Media*. Cresskill, New Jersey: Hampton Press Inc., 2007.
- Mumford, Lewis. "Survey and Plan as Communal Education," *The Social Frontier* 4, no. 31 (1938): 107.
- Munroe, William Bennett. *Current Problems in Citizenship*. New York: Macmillan Co, 1924.
- Munroe, William Bennett and Charles Eugene Ozanne. *Social Civics*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1925.
- Myers, John P. "Rethinking the Social Studies Curriculum in the Context of Globalization: Education for Global Citizenship in the U.S." *Theory and Research in Social Education* 34, no. 3, (2006): 370 – 394.
- National Defense Education Act of 1958, [20 U.S.C. 401 et seq.].
- National Education Association. "The Committee of Twelve Report on Rural Schools." In *Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1896 – 1897*. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1898.
- . *The Social Studies in Secondary Education*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1916.
- . *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, 1918.

- Newlon, Jesse H. "Teacher and Politics." *Frontiers of Democracy* 7, no. 55 (1940): 23.
- Noddings, Nel. "Global Citizenship: Promises and Problems." In *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, edited by Nel Noddings, 1-21. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005.
- . "Place-Based Education to Preserve the Earth and its People." in *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness*, edited by Nel Noddings, 57-68. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005.
- Olneck, Michael. "Americanization and the Education of Immigrants, 1900 – 1925: An Analysis of Symbolic Action." *American Journal of Education* 87, no. 4 (1989): 398 – 423.
- Parker, Samuel Chester. "Adapting Instruction to Differences in Capacity." *Elementary School Journal* 25, no. 1 (1924): 20-30.
- Paterson, Isabel. "Learning to Read: Child's Play." *National Review* 4, no. 21 (November 30, 1957): 489.
- Phillips, John Herbert. "The Place of Religious Sanctions in Character Training," *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual*, vol. 60, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921, 347 – 351.
- Pierce, Bessie Louise. *Public Opinion and the Teaching of History in the United States*. New York: Knopf, 1926.
- Potter, Milton C. "Social Organization in the High School." *The Journal of Addresses and Proceedings*, National Education Association Annual Meeting 51. Ann Arbor, MI: The National Education Association, 1912, 181 - 185.
- Power, F. Clark, Ann Higgins, and Lawrence Kohlberg. *Lawrence Kohlberg's Approach to Moral Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.
- Putnam, Robert. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of the American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Raddatz, Martha. "Social Media Fuels Protests in Iran, Bahrain and Yemen." www.abcnews.com, February 15, 2011.
- Rapoport, Anatoli. "We Cannot Teach What We Don't Know: Indiana Teachers Talk About Global Citizenship Education." *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice* 5, no. 3 (2010): 179 – 190.

- Ravitch, Diane. *The Great School Wars: New York City, 1805-1973*. New York: Basic Books, Inc, 1974.
- . *The Schools We Deserve: Reflection on the Educational Crises of Our Time*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.
- . *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- . “Education and Democracy.” In *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*, edited by Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti 15 - 29. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- . *The Death and Life of the Great American School System*. New York, NY: Basic Books, 2010.
- Ravitch, Diane and Joseph Viteritti. “Introduction.” In *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*, edited by Diane Ravitch and Joseph Viteritti, 1-21. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- , eds. *Making Good Citizens: Education and Civil Society*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2001.
- Reese, William J. *Hoosier Schools: Past and Present*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1998.
- Reuben, Julie A. “Beyond Politics: Community Civics and the Redefinitions of Citizenship in the Progressive Era.” *History of Education Quarterly* 37, no. 4. (1997): 399 – 420.
- Rippa, S. Alexander. “The Textbook Controversy and the Free Enterprise Campaign: 1940 – 1941.” *History of Education Journal* 9, no. 3 (1958). 49-58.
- Ross, William G. *Forging New Freedoms: Nativism, Education, and the Constitution, 1917-1927*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.
- Rugg, Harold. *Town and City Life: The Social Science Pamphlets*. New York: Harold Rugg, 1923.
- . “Curriculum-Making and the Scientific Study of Education Since 1910.” *Curriculum Theory* 4, no. 4 (1975): 295 – 308.

- Ruderman, Richard S., and R. Kenneth Godwin. "Liberalism and Parental Control of Education." *The Review of Politics* 62, no. 3 (2000): 503.
- Ryan, Henry J. "Education and Americanization," *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, vol. 59, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921, 38 – 42.
- Ryskind, Allan Rolland. "Why Johnny Shouldn't Read: A Defense of Progressive Education." *National Review* 4, no. 11 (September 21, 1957): 253.
- Sanchez, George J. *Becoming Mexican American: Ethnicity, Culture, and Identity in Chicano Los Angeles, 1900 – 1945*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- San Miguel, Guadalupe, Jr. and Richard R. Valencia. "From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The Educational Plight and Struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest." *Harvard Educational Review* 68, no. 3 (1998): 353-412.
- Saxe, David. *The Social Studies in the Schools: A History of the Early Years*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991.
- Schauffler, Robert Haven, ed. *Our Flag: In Verse and Prose*. New York: Moffat, Yard, and Company, 1917.
- Schlesinger, Arthur Jr. *The Disuniting of America: Reflections on a Multicultural Society*. New York, 1991.
- Schudson, Michael. *The Good Citizen: A History of American Civic Life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Shultz, Lynette. "Educating for Global Citizenship: Conflicting Agendas and Understandings." *Alberta Journal of Education Research* 53, no 3, (2007): 248 – 258.
- Spencer, John Herbert, "The Place of Religious Sanction in Character Training," *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Meeting*, vol. 59, Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1921.
- Spring, Joel. *The Sorting Machine: National Education Policy Since 1945*. New York: McKay, 1976.
- . *Wheels in the Head: Educational Philosophies of Authority, Freedom, and Culture from Socrates to Paulo Friere*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1994.

- . *Globalization and Educational Rights: An Intercivilizational Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates, 2001.
- . *Globalization of Education: An Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Stabler, Dewey. "The Relationship Between the Civic Information Possessed by Ninth-Grade Pupils and Their Practices in Citizenship." *School Review* 37 (1929): 697-706.
- Starkey, Hugh, Nicola Savvides. "Learning for Citizenship Online: How Students Can Develop Intercultural Awareness and Construct Knowledge Together." *The International Journal of Higher Education in the Social Sciences* 2, no. 3 (2009): 21 – 49 .
- Steinberg, Samuel. "Charles A. Beard: The Man and His Works." *Social Education* 19, no. 3 (1955): 101-103.
- Stotsky, Sandra. "The National Standards for Civics: A Backbone for School Curricula?" *Journal of Education* 176, no. 3 (1994): 29-38.
- Tamura, Eileen H. *Americanization, Acculturation, and Ethnic Identity*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994.
- Tanner, Laurel N. *Dewey's Laboratory School: Lessons for Today*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1997.
- Teaford, Jon C. *The Unheralded Triumph: City Government in America, 1870-1900*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1984.
- Texas Administrative Code, *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills*, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, sections 113.24, (1998).
- . *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills*, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, sections 113.32, (1998).
- . *Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills*, Title 19, Part II, Chapter 13, sections 113.35, (1998).
- Time Magazine*. "Truce By Compromise." July 14, 1952.
- . "THE NATION: Under God." August 30, 1954.
- . "Why Johnny Can't Read." March 14, 1955.

—. “New Mood.” March 3, 1958.

Thomson, F.D. “Tangible Ways of Using a Community in Secondary Education.” *The Journal of Addresses*, vol. 52, Ann Arbor, MI: National Education Association, 1913, 492 – 494.

Thorne-Thomsen, Gudrun. “Life as a Basis for a Course of Study.” *The Course of Study* 1, no. 8 (1901): 685-689.

Tocqueville Alexis de. *Democracy in America*. London: Penguin, 2003.

Todd, Lewis Paul. “Editor’s Page: Teaching About Communism.” *Social Education* 16, no. 2 (1952): 51 - 52.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. “Globalization, Education, and Citizenship: Solidarity versus Markets?” *American Education Research Journal* 39, no. 2 (2002): 363 – 378.

Troen, Selwyn K. *The Public and the Schools: Shaping the St. Louis System, 1838-1920*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1975.

Tucson Daily Citizen. “Bonfire of German Textbooks.” August 30, 1918, Vol. XCV, no. 147.

Tyack, David. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Tyack, David, and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Towards Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Tyack, David, and Elizabeth Hansot. *Managers of Virtue: Public School Leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books, 1982.

U.S. Department of Education. *America2000: An Educational Strategy*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1991.

VanFossen, Phillip J. “‘The Electronic Republic’ Evidence on the Impact of the Internet on Citizenship and Civic Engagement in the U.S.” *The International Journal of Social Education* 21, no. 1 (2006): 18 – 43.

Vogler, Kenneth E. “Impact of an Accountability Examination on Tennessee Social Studies Teachers’ Instructional Practices.” *Research in the Schools* 12, no. 2 (2005): 41 – 55.

—. “Impact of a High School Graduation Examination on Mississippi

- Social Studies Teachers' Instructional Practices." In *Measuring History: Cases of State-level Testing Across the United States*, edited by S. G. Grant, 273 – 30. Greenwich, CT: Information Age, 2006.
- Vogler, Kenneth E., and David Virtue. "'Just the Facts, Ma'am': Teaching Social Studies in the Era of Standards and High-Stakes Testing." *The Social Studies* 98, no. 2 (2007): 54-58.
- Washington, Elizabeth Yeager, and Robert L. Dahlgren. "The Quest for Relevancy: Allen Kownslar and Historical Inquiry in the New Social Studies Movement." in *The New Social Studies: People Projects, & Perspectives*, edited by Barbara Slater Stern, 95-110. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2009.
- Watras, Joseph. "Historians and Social Science Educators, 1893 – 1998." In *Social Education in the Twentieth Century: Curriculum and Context for Citizenship*, edited by C. Woyshner, J. Watras, and M.S. Crocco, 192 – 210. New York: Peter Lang, 2004.
- . "Globalization and Philosophy of Education." *Philosophical Studies in Education*, 41 (2010): 83-94.
- Webster, Hanson Hart. *Americanization and Citizenship: Lessons in Community and National Ideals for New Americans*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1919.
- Weems, Mason Locke. *The Life of George Washington: With Curious Anecdotes Equally Honorable to Himself and Exemplary to His Young Countrymen*. Philadelphia: Joseph Allen, 1837.
- Westheimer, Joel, ed. *Pledging Allegiance: The Politics of Patriotism in America's Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2007.
- Westheimer, Joel, and Joseph Kahne. "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy." *American Educational Research Journal* 41, no. 2, (2004): 237-269.
- . "Educating the 'Good' Citizen: Political Choices and Pedagogical Goals." *Politics & Political Science* 37, no 2 (2004): 241-248.
- Wiebe, Robert. *The Search for Order: 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wood, Will C. "Citizenship Through Education." *Addresses and Proceedings of the Sixty-First Annual Meeting*, vol. 62, Washington D.C.: National Education Association, 1923, 208 – 213.

Woodward, C. Van. *The Strange Career of Jim Crowe*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Woodward, J. S. "Public Education and Social Change." *Social Frontier* 4, no. 34 (1938): 216 – 217.

Zimmerman, Jonathan. *Whose America: Culture Wars in the Public Schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.

VITA

Jeremy Kelton Williams received his Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from Emory & Henry College in Emory, VA in 2004. He entered the Secondary Graduate Certification program at Texas A&M University in June 2006 and received his Master of Education degree in Curriculum and Instruction in August 2007. Kelton taught in the Texas public school system from 2006 through 2010. He has recently accepted a position as an Assistant Professor in the Education Studies Department at Knox College, in Galesburg, IL, beginning in the fall of 2011. His research interests include historical studies of educational thought, the intersection of politics and education, and education policy. He plans to develop this dissertation for publication as a book, focusing on the evolution of civic educational thought in American history.

Mr. Williams may be reached at 4232 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843. His email address is jwilliams@cehd.tamu.edu.