UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

The Nature and Purpose of the Teaching of History in the United States and Great Britain: A Comparison of the Views of American and English Teachers

D.N.L. Firth

1977

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

ABSTRACT

FACULTY OF EDUCATIONAL STUDIES

Master of Philosophy

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THE TEACHING OF HISTORY IN THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN: A COMPARISON OF THE VIEWS OF AMERICAN AND ENGLISH TEACHERS

by David Norman Lewis Firth

This study compares the nature and purpose of history teaching in the United States and Great Britain through an examination of the views of teachers in a selected area in each country. From a brief survey of the character and development of the education systems of the two countries a hypothesis is stated that American history education, which cannot be entirely separated from the wider concept of social studies, is primarily concerned with 'societal' objectives, and British history education primarily with 'humanistic' objectives. By societal objectives is meant a concern for contemporary social relevance, the development of the skills of practical decision making, and the production of citizens equipped to play a useful role in society. By humanistic objectives is meant a concern for the past for its own intrinsic worth, rather than for its contemporary relevance, for the transmission of a cultural heritage, and for the private and personal development of the individual.

This hypothesis is tested by means of interviews with two groups of history teachers, one in each country. The interviews were supported by a questionnaire distributed to a larger number. The American teachers were from the suburban area of the city of St. Louis, Missouri, and the English from the towns of mid and southern Hampshire. The views of these teachers were investigated in three areas, knowledge, values, and foreign perspectives. The purpose was first to discover the criteria by which the teachers selected the factual content of their teaching, second to examine attitudes towards selected controversial issues, and third to explore attitudes towards the relationship of the individual's own country to the wider world.

The conclusions are that, although many similarities were found between the American and English teachers, and although not all the differences could be related to the initial hypothesis, in general the hypothesis could be sustained.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to acknowledge the assistance of the following in the writing of this thesis:

My supervisor, Dr. H. Dudley Plunkett, of the School of Education, Southampton University. His careful and considered advice on the planning and execution of the research were invaluable.

Dr. Harold Berlak, of the Graduate School of Education, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. U.S.A. He gave me much valuable advice on the American aspects of the study, and was particularly helpful with the preparation of the questionnaire.

Dr. Fred Stopsky, Webster College, Webster Groves, St. Louis, Mo. U.S.A. His thoughtful comments on trends in British and American education provided a valuable stimulus.

The American and English teachers who agreed to be interviewed and complete questionnaires, and without whose co-operation this study would have been impossible.

My wife for her encouragement and advice throughout.

David N.L. Firth

NOTE ON DOCUMENTATION AND TERMINOLOGY

Documentation

By far the greater part of the material on which this study is based is in the form of transcripts of tape recorded interviews with teachers. These interviews were obtained on the understanding that they would be confidential and that the identity of the respondents would not be revealed. For this reason the quotations from the interviews are anonymous and the sources remain unidentified. The references which appear after the quotations refer to the writer's private reference system, and are for his personal convenience.

Terminology

The convention has been adopted that when the teachers interviewed during the course of the investigation are referred to, the terms 'American' and 'English' are used. The British interviews took place in southern England and it was felt that the term 'British' was unnecessarily ponderous in this context. However, when wider aspects of education in the two countries are referred to the terms 'United States', 'Great Britain' or 'Britain' may be used.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF APPENDICES

Chapter One - The Research Problem

It would scarcely be worthwhile to make a comparison of the teaching objectives of some subjects in the school curriculum. Mathematics, physics, and chemistry, for example, are concerned with principles and data of universal validity, independent of time and place. Archimedes' principle is as valid in twentieth century London as in third century B.C. Athens. Though the methods of teaching mathematics may vary from one country to another, the principles themselves remain the same. However, the area of the curriculum often known in Britain as the humanities, art, music, literature, religion, is an area where the nature of the subject matter and the reasons for teaching it are likely to be very different from one society to another. These are subjects which spring from the culture of a people, and their truths are subjective truths arising from the character, traditions, and spirit of a nation, and they vary greatly not only from society to society but from generation to generation.

It is worth comparing the purposes of teaching history in different countries because history is such a subject. Indeed, of all the traditional school subjects it is likely to be one of the least culture free. History is a mirror which a society can hold up to its face in which it can see its identity and most prominent features revealed, if it cares to look. It recounts the institutional development of a people, the machinery whereby it has governed itself, its judicial system, the principles on which its laws are based and how they have developed, its religious institutions and the relations between different religious groups. From history a society learns of its traditions, of the political, social, and religious values which hold it together, and of the customs and rituals which provide it with colour and excitement. From its historical heroes, its statesmen, soldiers, men of learning and the arts, its explorers, and inventors, may be learned the qualities that it admires. History tells much about the self perception of a people. From those moments and periods which it regards as glorious, as the peaks of national achievement, may be learned which achievements and accomplishments that society cherishes most; less perhaps will be learned about those episodes that it regards as dishonourable. From history also may be learned something of a society's perception of others.

History will tell us which people have been friends, which enemies, and for how long. It will tell us by whom people have been conquered, and whom they themselves have subdued, and the consequences of this experience.

In all these ways the history and culture of a people are interlinked, so that the history taught in any one country is likely to be unique and unlike that taught in any other. Conversely, the study of the way history is taught in a nation's schools may be expected to reveal much about that nation's character, culture, and nationality.

In many respects the character, culture, and nationality of the U.S.A. and the U.K. are similar. Both have grown up within the Judaeo-Christian tradition of western civilization and they share many common values. Both value freedom of speech, religion, and political association, both believe in the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary, and the right to trial by jury. Both believe in equality of opportunity, and the equality of every individual regardless of class, colour, creed, or sex. Both believe in universal adult suffrage, democratic institutions, and responsible government.

However, important though these similarities are, there are also major differences of historical experience between these two countries. Though the U.S.A. had its birth in Europe and the majority of its citizens are of European, though not of British, stock, the manner of the growth of American society has been fundamentally different. First, the U.S.A. is a post medieval, post reformation society, which has meant among other things that the nation developed without the medieval legacies of monarchy, feudalism (except in the South), and theocracy (except for a period in New England). Second, the U.S.A. is a post revolutionary society. This has meant that the nation has seen itself as founded for a certain purpose and is therefore particularly vulnerable to a sense of failure. As Gunnar Myrdal has expressed it,

> "America, compared to every other country in Western Civilization, large or small, has the MOST EXPLICITLY EXPRESSED system of general ideals in reference to human interrelations. This body of ideals is more widely understood and appreciated than similar ideals anywhere else." (1)

Third, the U.S.A. experienced a traumatic and divisive civil war which gave increased urgency to the ideal of national unity. The British

civil war, in addition to being two hundred years further away in the national folk memory, was more concerned with national, political, religious, and social differences than with regional issues and thus, it may be argued, was less threatening to the survival of the nation as a political entity. Fourth, there is the factor of the geographical expansion of the United States, in a period of little more than a century, from coast to coast of a large continent, and the accompanying enormous increase in population mainly brought about by massive immigration from Europe. American society, and not least the education system, became faced with the formidable problem of the assimilation of groups from many diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and their acculturation to the ideals on which the republic was founded.

The experience of the British nation has been in contrast to this in most respects. National unity has not been a problem, at least since the Norman Conquest. The American educationist, S.E. Frost writes:

> "Great Britain has known for generations a national unity rarely experienced elsewhere. Its history and ethos produced a oneness which reached into the farthest lands of the Empire, and caused the Englishman to dress for dinner and remain devoted to English customs and traditions. Consequently, the British of the twentieth century did not feel it necessary to develop a nationalist spirit through public schools, nor did they fear subversion as did less secure nations." (2)

Egalitarian ideals are of relatively recent growth in Britain and have had to be grafted on to a society that was for centuries static, traditional, hierarchic, and governed by an elaborate code of manners and social conventions. There was no frontier dimension in British history and democracy has been a political rather than a social concept.

The sheer length of European history provides another contrast. Dr. George Steiner, with the perspective of a French born American, makes this observation:

> "England has the enormous psychological problem of having 1,000 years of history behind it. The question is, what is there left to do? The past here has become so present that the great mood is looking back - sometimes it seems as if there is nothing on television every night but war films, all looking back, at any war - the Boer War, Crimea, you name it. What are the books that sell 10,000 copies? Mary Queen of Scots, Wellington. What are the hit television films? The six wives of Henry VIII, Lord Clark's Civilization. It's like a museum." (3)

It is reasonable to suggest that such differences in national experience may be reflected in the way each nation approaches the study of its past, and that of other nations. Also, that any such differences in the teaching of history may illuminate some of the characteristics of the culture and the education system which might otherwise remain unseen. This study is concerned to explore these differences at practising teacher level, through interviews with a group of English and a group of American teachers (the method by which the research was carried out is described in Chapter 2). It is not primarily concerned to analyse the policy of governments and educational administrators, or to compare the writings of curriculum theorists on both sides of the Atlantic, though these will be referred to on occasion. It is not concerned with the examination of textbooks, or works on the history and philosophy of education, but with the views of teachers actively engaged in the day to day business of teaching history. This is not to discount other sources, but it is suggested that a field study of this nature yields evidence of an original and first hand quality by which the evidence of these other sources may be verified.

During the investigation certain problems inherent in making this comparison became apparent which require some discussion at the outset. First there is the problem of separating the total aims of an education system from those of any particular subject within it. The differences in national character and experience referred to above, are reflected to a large extent in the organization of the school system as a whole, and these differences are bound to intrude into any discussion of individual aspects of it.

As early as 1835 de Tocqueville noted that,

> "in the United States politics are the end aim of education, in Europe its principal object is to fit men for private life." (4)

Whether or not it was true then, this judgment points to an important feature in the development of education in the two countries and still has a large measure of truth. In Britain the earliest schools were the endowed Grammar schools and the independent Public schools which provided a highly specialized form of academic education for the elite who were to occupy the leading positions in the state. These ancient foundations endowed the rigorously academic education with a particular prestige, so that when the state system of secondary education was

established in 1944, the new secondary modern schools often felt obliged to imitate the grammar schools or found it hard to win public confidence in new 'relevant' and practical curricula if they sought to develop them. Thus, British secondary education became stamped with a scholarly, academic character, especially for older pupils, which in practice meant that there was no point in a pupil's remaining at school after the school leaving age unless he were a potential entrant to the equally scholarly and academic university.

In the United States there was no such ancient tradition, at least away from the eastern seabord. The public High schools, whose numbers rose rapidly after 1860, originally followed an academic curriculum designed to develop the minds of the pupils, but as enrolments increased, and especially after about 1910, pressure mounted for curriculum reform. It was argued that the proper function of the High school was to train a responsible work force to meet the needs of an industrialized society, and a responsible voting force to meet the needs of national democracy at municipal, state, and federal level. The life adjustment movement of the late 1940's and 1950's gave further impetus to the policy of gearing the educational system more closely to the needs of the average and lower than average pupils. (5) Thus, like the early land grant colleges, the American High school developed in a manner more responsive to local social needs than did British secondary schools, and from its early stages was concerned to provide an education relevant to all pupils in a local community, not just the brightest. Moreover it had certain tasks arising particularly from the American experience, notably the need for the acculturation and Americanization of millions of immigrants from a diversity of European backgrounds, and the need to re-establish a sense of nationhood after the bitter divisions of the civil war. American High schools therefore, have long had a social as well as an academic purpose. As the American historian R.A. Billington wrote,

> "From the beginning, schools were viewed as practical devices rather than cultural assets." (6)

The differing aims of the school systems can also be seen in the procedures for administration and control. Although education in Britain is administered through local education authorities, they work within limits defined by the central government through the D.E.S., and education may be said to be a national service following a national policy.

In the United States there is no real equivalent of the D.E.S., the nearest being the U.S. Office of Education, in the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, since education is not amongst the powers of the Federal Government, listed in the Constitution, the Office of Education has no executive power, and, to a far greater extent than in Britain, education is a service locally administered and locally controlled. School boards in most parts of the United States are elected by parents, and they administer a much smaller area than the average British local education authority.

St. Louis County, the suburban area of the city of St. Louis, which is the area of the United States on which this study is centred, contained twenty six separate school districts. Each had its own school superintendent, school board, employed its own teachers, negotiated its own salaries, and planned its own curricula. Textbooks were usually chosen for the district as a whole by an individual or a committee of teachers charged with that responsibility. Districts varied greatly in size from the Hazlewood district which employed 1,131 teachers in 1970 to the Valley Park district which employed 55. (7) One result of this was that the teachers interviewed emphasised the district as a whole, rather than the individual school, in talking about educational objectives, whereas English teachers usually assume that their own school is autonomous. Also, the American teachers were conscious of the local community, the attitudes of parents, their expectations of the school and their reaction to curriculum innovations to a much greater extent than the English. In some cases this was felt to exert an inhibiting effect on the schools, and to discourage any departure from traditional objectives. In others, community support was felt to strengthen the school in its endeavours. In either event there were strong pressures on schools to act in the interests of the local community rather than to follow the requirements of the central government.

The structural differences between the American and English educational systems are further seen in the internal organization and curricula of schools. A major difference is in the system of examination and assessment. The English secondary system, at least after the age of 13, is dominated by external examinations, the General Certificate of Education taken at ordinary level at about 16, and at advanced level at about 18; and the Certificate of Secondary Education, taken at 16. Both these examinations, but particularly the G.C.E. are set and marked

anonymously by a group of examiners who may or may not be practising school teachers. The G.C.E. papers are prepared to satisfy academic criteria exclusively and the G.C.E. 'A' level courses are used as qualifications for university entrance. 'A' level courses, carried on in the "sixth form", are of a highly specialised academic nature, and pupils at this stage of their education usually study not more than three subjects, though they may have a selection of minority subjects which are studied in a much less intensive way. G.C.E. 'O' level and C.S.E. examinations are used as qualifications for entry to 'A' level courses, or for entry to certain forms of skilled employment or further training. A substantial proportion of British school pupils take neither the G.C.E., nor the C.S.E. examination and leave school without any formal recognition of the years they have spent there.

The G.C.E. examinations together with the fact that the school leaving age is 16, mean that the age of sixteen has an importance in the British education system quite unknown in the U.S.A. In England 16 is the normal terminal point for all but the academically able and ambitious, though non 'A' level sixth form courses are being developed.
The proportion of pupils who remain in formal education after the age of 16 is much smaller than in most parts of the U.S.A.

In the U.S.A. there is no such external examination, nor is there specialised study in the High school. Students who gain the required number of credits in a range of subjects determined by the local school board, following any state requirements that may exist, graduate with a High school diploma at the age of 18. In one typical High school the requirements for graduation were:

3 units of Language Arts (English)
3 units of Social Studies
1 unit of Mathematics
1 unit of Science
1 unit of Fine Arts
1 unit of Practical Arts
1 unit of Physical Education
6 units of Electives

Thus where an English 17 year old might be studying history, geography, and economics, for 'A' level, or, physics, chemistry, and biology, each with a few minority subjects, an American 17 year old in

his junior year in High school might be studying:

1 unit English
½ unit Driver's Education
½ unit Science
1 unit Geometry
1 unit American History
¼ unit Psychology
¼ unit Home Economics
¼ unit Government
¼ unit Physical Education
1 unit Spanish 111

Clearly there are difficulties in comparing the teaching objectives of any subject taught in such widely differing circumstances. In the British case the teacher is concerned to develop an understanding of the subject at an advanced academic level, possibly preparing the pupil to take a single subject honours degree in it on leaving school. In the American case the teacher is concerned to develop a general understanding of the subject consistent with an all round general education designed to equip the student for life in contemporary American society. He may continue to College in which case he will follow a broad course of study until his junior (3rd year of 4 year course) year, when he will settle on his 'major' or specialist subject.

The High school course normally lasts four years, from the age of 14 to 18 (grades 9-12), and there is often a transfer at the age of 14 from a two year Junior High school (grades 7-8) to the Senior High. Since the school leaving age in most states is 16, all pupils will have at least two years of High school, but they will have to complete the full four years in order to graduate, that is receive a diploma indicating that they have successfully completed the required High school courses. In practice, in most parts of the United States, far more stay on until the age of 18 than is the case in Britain. This may be partly due to economic differences between the two countries, greater affluence in the U.S.A. and fewer opportunities for those without at least a High school diploma. But a major factor is the difference in the organization of the school system and the nature of the curriculum. The "sixth form" in the traditional British sense is unknown in the U.S.A. and the final two years of the High school course are simply a continuation of the same broad curriculum as existed during the first two years. Thus the

age of 16 does not mark a point of any special significance as far as curriculum is concerned, and many pupils, who would leave school in Britain because they or their teachers felt that they were not bright enough to continue, stay on in the U.S.A. to graduate because of the kind of education that the school offers. Thus a major influence on the curriculum and the teaching objectives of any subject, in the final two years of High school, is the fact that, whatever the subject, the pupils studying it are not in any sense specializing in it, nor are they in many cases particularly able academically.

An illustration of the greater willingness of American pupils to stay on is provided by one of the High schools visited during the course of this investigation. It was an inner city High school, it could be described as a 'ghetto school', where the enrolment was 80% black and the drop out rate unusually high, 'drop out' meaning those who left before the age of 18 without graduating. Of the 500 or so freshmen who entered the school, between 200 and 250 were expected to graduate. Thus, even in a deprived area, about half the pupils stayed on until 18.

So far it is organizational differences at High school level that have been stressed, and this is where they are greatest. However, differences at primary level also make direct comparison of teaching objectives difficult. The Plowden type of primary school has become widespread in Britain, certainly in Hampshire, where this study was undertaken, and this meant that in the English primary schools it was difficult to identify separate subjects in the humanities area. Child centred education, on the other hand, had made few inroads into the St. Louis primary schools. Even in the single case where an open plan organizational framework was found to have been adopted, the curriculum remained relatively formal.

Thus, in the whole concept of the purpose of education there were great differences between the two countries, and these were at their greatest during the earliest and the latest years. Indeed the point at which the two systems are most alike ~~are~~ is the Junior High years 11-13, which correspond fairly closely in organization and purpose to the junior secondary, or middle school, years in Britain. In attempting to compare the teaching objectives of any one subject, the objectives of the system as a whole must constantly be borne in mind.

Another problem, and one which arises largely from the organizational and structural differences outlined above, was the fact that the English and American schools had differing concepts of the nature of history education itself. In most American schools history is included within a subject area known as social studies. This was certainly true in all schools visited in the present enquiry, and it was true at every level, Elementary, Junior, and Senior High. In the case of the High school used in the above example, which was new and had an adventurous outlook, the social studies offerings were classified into four subdivisions, from which the students made a selection:

American Studies - (included courses such as Frontier America, Colonial America, Indian Cultures, the U.S.A. and the Cold War)

World Studies - (included courses such as Ancient Civilizations, Twentieth Centry Russia, Africa, Renaissance and Reformation)

Political Science - (included courses such as The Presidency, Communism, Socialism, and Fascism; Urban Problems)

Behavioural Studies - (included courses such as Behavioural Disorders; Personality; The Sociology of Marriage; Consumer Economics)

A more conventional, and typical, social studies programme would be that followed by all the schools in one of the largest school districts as follows:

Elementary

Grade I - Individuals and families, locally and in the United States
Grade II - Individuals and families in selected parts of the world
Grade III - Communities locally and in parts of the world
Grade IV - Living in world communities and our state, county and city
Grade V - The United States today and yesterday
Grade VI - Selected countries

Junior High School

Grade VII - Problems and decisions in the United States today
Grade VIII - United States History and Government

Senior High School

Grade IX - Civics, the United States and Selected Societies
Grade X - World History
Grade XI - United States History
Grade XII - Electives (chosen from Sociology, Economics, International Relations)

A few of these may be 'pure' history courses but in many cases history is blended with the study of communities, cultures, civics, and social problems. Thus, history is classified in American education as part of the wider study of society as a whole, rather than as an independent study in its own right.

In the British system the position of history in the curriculum presents several contrasts. From the third year in the secondary school onwards, that is from the start of the external examination courses, history is usually a clearly separate discipline with an independent department within the school organization. For non examination candidates history is usually dropped altogether, but it may be absorbed into some form of general studies. It is usual for history departments to choose their syllabus and select periods or topics for study independently of other departments, especially for 'A' level, and there is little or no attempt to formulate a common philosophy between departments. In the junior secondary years, the 1st and 2nd years, there is a much greater tendency to combine or integrate history with other subjects into some form of social studies, or humanities, usually along with geography or religious education, but even at this stage independent history courses are common. Indeed, such independent history courses are not infrequently jealously guarded by history staff.

In the Primary school recognizable history courses have often disappeared altogether in favour of topic work or environmental studies, or some other form of combined work, in which history may be included. Few Primary schools follow a social studies or humanities curriculum structured as tightly as those of American Elementary schools.

The different approach to history in the two countries is not confined to administrative arrangements only, but exists also at the conceptual level. Not only are history courses in the U.S.A. interspersed with courses in psychology, sociology, politics, and economics in the school curriculum, but methods for the study and

teaching of history have become strongly influenced by the methodological approach of the social scientists. Social education theorists have argued that history should be seen essentially as a social science aiming to develop skills of inquiry and rational thinking. It should commence with the collection of data and continue through the stages of the recognition of a problem, the formation of a hypothesis, and the testing of the hypothesis against the data. The Americans Cox and Massialas are two such exponents of this view:

> "To be an adjunct to inquiry, history must rely heavily on modes of analysis better developed in the social and behavioural sciences. It must emphasize the generalizable uniformities in events, rather than their uniqueness, and must search for patterns and consistent relationships. It must reject simplistic narration and linear chronology for a deeper focus on crucial issues in the life of society and the individual." (8)

This view suggests that historians should become in effect social scientists of the past, seeking to discover fundamental laws of human behaviour, so that the subject may have a practical, utilitarian value, and contribute in a direct and immediate way towards a rational solution of society's problems. They should be engaged, in Robert Heilbroner's phrase, in the search for a usable past. The starting point for historical study should be the present, and historical material selected for study should bear directly upon the present and be evaluated in terms of the present. The implication is that the purpose of the study of history is to gain a greater understanding of human society in order, not only to know the past, but also to understand the present and control the future.

Some behaviourist social scientists, such as B.F. Skinner, would go further and regard descriptive history as a form of obscurantist superstition which impedes a true understanding of the present, and indeed reinforces irrational and out of date prejudices:

> "Nothing confuses our evaluation of the present more than a sense of history - unless it is a sense of destiny. Your Hitler's are the men who use history for real advantage. It's exactly what they need. It obfuscates every attempt to get a clear appreciation of the present. Race, family, ancestor worship - these are the handmaidens of history, and we should have learned to beware of them by now. What we give our young people in Walden Two is a grasp of the current forces which a culture must deal with. None of your myths, none of your heroes - no history, no destiny - simply the Now! The present is the thing. It's the only thing we can deal with, anyway, in a scientific way." (9)

An important part of the social science concept of education is the emphasis on behavioural objectives. It was found that the American schools took the whole matter of objectives and evaluation of their work far more seriously than did the English schools. Where the latter seemed content to work on the basis of instinct and intuition where objectives were concerned, the Americans were usually following an elaborate set of formalized objectives which had been carefully prepared by a committee of teachers and administrators after many hours of work. If asked for a syllabus, or statement of course objectives, the English teachers could sometimes find a duplicated pamphlet of a few pages describing the content of each year's work. The Americans would be likely to produce a volume of perhaps 200 pages or more. Sometimes these were complete teaching manuals describing objectives, concepts to emphasize, supplementary materials, suggested activities, and so on. Sometimes they had been produced by the district for use by all the schools in that district, both Elementary and High schools, so that social studies "Kindergarten through Grade 12", was a carefully rationalized and structured programme. Although teachers often admitted that they did not adhere scrupulously to these guides at all times, they could nearly always say exactly what they would be doing in a given lesson weeks ahead.

Objectives were an important part of such curriculum guides and they were often strongly influenced by Bloom's taxonomy (10). Most American teachers were familiar with Bloom and several of them explicitly acknowledged the influence of the taxonomy on the construction of social studies courses. Some teachers were regretful of this development, but they acknowledged it as fact. As one High school teacher said:

> "... more and more we are being almost catapulted into de-emphasizing history and focussing in on the behaviour of individuals and the behavioural approach, even our objectives are designed now from that stand point." (US 21)

An Elementary school principal also acknowledged the impact of behavioural objectives and the way he felt it had formalized his teaching:

"We used to talk in terms of having an understanding, or feeling for this - but you can't measure that, so you don't know whether you have achieved your objective or not. Now they ask in specified or measured behavioural terms, but there is a problem there, in that we have the whole area of the affective domain which it is difficult to measure objectively. It may be measured subjectively through observation, but the behaviourists are not willing to accept that." (US 272)

No English teacher, during the interviews in the course of this study, mentioned Bloom, or gave any indication that he had even heard of him. In particular, the attention given to the affective domain was something that distinguished the American from the British system. American teachers frequently spoke of the importance of the pupil's interaction with others, his relationship with his fellow students, and his ability to co-operate. They stressed the group context of study, the importance of discussion skills, and the formation of attitudes that would enable a student to fit easily into society. With many it was seen to be society and human behaviour rather than individuals that was the centre of their concern. Curriculum guides contained explicit objectives such as:

'develop essential attitudes which would motivate participation as a responsible citizen,'

'promotion of desirable behaviour towards others regardless of cultural or ethnic differences,' and

'assume responsibilities and duties, as well as rights and privileges of a democracy.'

Objectives of this kind have done much to shape a social concept of history teaching, whereby history is seen as a subject contributing to the proper social adjustment of the individual.

Social science concepts, inquiry skills, and behavioural objectives, have strongly affected the construction of social studies curricula in the United States. One such inquiry based High school course, whose influence was acknowledged by many of the American teachers interviewed, was that devised by Edwin Fenton of the Social Studies Curriculum Centre at Carnegie - Mellon University, Pittsburgh. There he developed a mode of inquiry approach to history teaching in which students were to work through four stages of inquiry in relation to each topic studied. First, they were to develop hypotheses, for example that nationalism caused the first world war, second formulate

the proper questions, third uncover the relevant data, and fourth validate or modify or reject the original hypothesis. Eventually a High school course was prepared employing these principles, entitled "Tradition and Change in Four Societies" (11). It commenced with the study of comparative political systems, in which the government of primitive tribes was compared with that of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. For each government, leadership, decision making, the role of the individual, and ideology were examined. The next stage was the study of comparative economic systems, in which a traditional economic system was compared with a system where most decisions are made in the market (the U.S.A.), and a system where most decisions are made by command (the Soviet Union). Finally, the course studied the non-western world organized around four units, China, India, The Union of South Africa, and Brazil. In each unit, students studied the culture before the impact of the West, examined the ways in which particular western ideas and institutions influenced the society, and analysed one major contemporary problem.

The widespread use of the Fenton type of course in the U.S.A. meant that it was difficult to isolate history, in the sense that most British teachers would use the term, from the rest of the social studies. Most teachers considered themselves to be social studies teachers rather than exclusively history teachers, and they often taught social problems courses, or civics courses, of one sort or another, as well as history. As one High school teacher said:

> "I don't like to use the word history anyway - social studies - the study of people and societies. If you can use what we call history, fine, use it, that's great." (US 85)

Thus, during interviews which were ostensibly concerned with history teaching, American teachers were frequently found referring to a range of social and urban problems, crime, drugs, pollution, race, ecology, and so on.

It should not be supposed that the social science concept of history is confined solely to the United States. There are English historians, like S.W.F. Holloway, who argue that history must become more rigorously scientific in its methods of study, and less impressionistic if it is to justify a reputation as a serious academic study:

"Academic history is an intellectually invertebrate affair: it has no explicit canon of interpretation. Its only rationale is the research methodology brought to perfection well over a hundred years ago by Leopold von Ranke and handed on virtually unchanged from generation to generation. The solution is simple but drastic, easy to recommend, difficult to carry out. History must become scientific both in aim and in method. In other words, history and sociology must become one. Such a union would be to the mutual benefit of both partners and exceedingly fruitful." (12)

In schools the move towards the use of documentary materials such as the MacMillan 'Exploring History' kits, is evidence of the growth of a skills of inquiry approach to history teaching in Britain, though it is slow to be adopted in practice.

Of the English secondary schools visited, only one had adopted an American type social studies course based on an analytical approach to the problems of contemporary society, and including an historical dimension. This, moreover, existed for the first two years only. Here, the course started with the study of early societies and traced the development from a simple society to a more complex form, selecting topics that showed important social developments.

Where history has been combined with other subjects, the resulting course seems to be more often described in Britain as 'humanities' rather than 'social studies', and such courses usually do not stress scientific thinking and modes of inquiry as their prime concern. Rather they focus on the range of material that the pupil will encounter, so that he will see connexions between hitherto separate disciplines. Also, it is claimed, he will gain fresh insights into relationships, which would escape him if he were confined to separate subjects. A recent example of this type of course is the Schools Council Integrated Studies Project, developed at Keele University from 1968-72, by David Bolam (13). A sequential secondary school course, this consists of 5 units, as follows:

Unit 1 - Exploration Man
Unit 2 - Communicating with others
Unit 3 - Living together
Unit 4 - Outgroups in society
Unit 5 - Man made man

Though influenced by social science concepts, the emphasis in this course is on knowledge and ideas rather than skills of inquiry.

In a few of the English schools visited integrated humanities courses existed, again during the first two years, but they usually had loosely formulated objectives such as, "to broaden the student's awareness and understanding of others, while at the same time preparing him for later study of the separate disciplines". They did not stress the skills of inquiry and critical thinking, which were claimed for the American social studies courses. One such humanities course was organized as follows:

Year One - Theme: The Family, the Home, the Community
Topics (selection from)
Cavemen
Life in Hot Deserts
The Palestinian House
Life in Equatorial Rain Forests
The Monastic Community
British Farming
(and others)

Year Two - Regional Studies (Africa, Asia, the Americas)
Man in Isolation (a study of the reactions of individuals or small groups to some form of separation from civilization).

Such courses were usually taught by teachers trained in one or other of the disciplines of history, geography, and religious knowledge, and tended to suggest a rather self conscious attempt to accommodate these different interests in more or less equal proportions. There was usually less emphasis on contemporary society as the starting point than with the American courses.

Thus some form of the social studies approach could also be found in some of the English schools visited. However most history teaching in Britain seems still rooted in the liberal arts tradition, the purpose of which has been to produce a cultured, well read, and civilized human being. It is a concept that stresses the differences between people rather than the similarities, intuitive insight rather than logical analysis, and emotional identification rather than rational understanding. It believes that the true aim of history education should be a more fully developed and enriched personality, rather than an individual prepared to meet the needs of society in a utilitarian manner.

It stresses the universality of knowledge, its intrinsic value, and its independence from time, rather than its practical relevance to the transitory needs of today.

Official statements of British educational administration illustrate the prevalence of this personal development view of history teaching. In 1952 the Ministry of Education pamphlet, 'Teaching History', stated that:

> "The final goal is to understand something, to appreciate something, just as the final goal of studying Greek is to appreciate Homer and Aeschylus, not merely the mental discipline involved. The pupil should leave school having made the acquaintance of people in history whose lives and achievements it is enlarging to the personality to have known, having studied movements whose rise and fall are not only thrilling to study, but worthy in their own right to be known. And normally as well he will have been introduced to that development or decay, which lies behind everything he sees, uses, or hears about, and behind the whole society he is entering." (14)

Fifteen years later the Department of Education and Science pamphlet, 'Towards World History', while arguing the need to broaden syllabuses in the direction of world history, re-iterates essentially the same criteria for selection of material - that it should be "enlarging to the personality," and of intrinsic value:

> "We believe that it (i.e. breadth of world history) will necessitate the ruthless selection of topics chosen for their intrinsic interest to the young, their novelty, and vivid qualities of landscape and scenery, their compelling characters, and their dramatic quality, as well as for their living significance in the world we have inherited from the past." (15)

An English teacher and writer on history education, Martin Booth, also describes the emphasis on personal development in British history teaching:

> "This notion of historical thinking as 'present thought' which lies behind Croce's philosophy and finds echoes in Collingwood's writings, gives history an immediacy and relevance which is of particular value to the teacher. If we see history as something which 'is', that is, 'has reality', then our task is not so much one of creating aims extrinsic to the subject but of introducing or initiating the pupil to history so that it impinges on his consciousness and is part of his experience, not in order that he may be a better citizen or more cosmopolitan in his outlook (though, indeed, these may be outcomes), but that he may become more truly himself; that he may establish a reflective relationship with the world of space, and man." (16)

The purpose of teaching history is described in the above extracts as an emotional response by the pupil to the material through feelings such as curiosity, wonder, and excitement. There is little concern here with how these are to be measured in behavioural terms. It should be noted however that behaviourism is on the horizon in Britain. Though not a statement of D.E.S. policy, the 1971 Historical Association pamphlet, 'Educational Objectives for the Study of History', outlines certain behavioural criteria by which objectives for the study of history may be assessed. However, the objectives themselves are the traditional ones of British history teaching, for example:

> "Describe an historical incident with signs of personal involvement"
>
> "Construct a story about a period in which characters are portrayed in the round"
>
> "Peoples an historic building with characters who are true in action and thought to the particular period." (197)

Much of the reason for the existence of this view of the purpose of history teaching, the personal enrichment view, is to be found in the historical circumstances of the evolution of British education, and in its structural and organizational features described above. Another reason lies in the nature of the education and training of British history teachers.

Most British sixth form teachers, and many of those teaching below that level, have taken a single subject honours degree in the subject, followed by a single year's postgraduate training. Most American High school history teachers have majored in history as part of a bachelor's degree which includes other subjects such as education. They may well have taken a Master's degree and perhaps another higher degree also. Those British teachers who are not university graduates have probably followed a course of training in which their main subject constituted about a third of their course. Thus most British history teachers, certainly the graduates, consider themselves to be history scholars to a greater extent than their American colleagues. It might be said that the average British graduate history teacher is an historian working in the field of education, whereas the average American history teacher is an educationist working in the field of history.

This difference in training further accounts for the greater degree of separation of history from other subjects in Britain, than exists in the U.S.A.

Among those interviewed it was an English sixth form teacher who gave the most articulate exposition of the personal enrichment view of history teaching. His view presents a sharp distinction from the social science, skills of inquiry view, and its search for universal laws of human behaviour. He was first concerned to establish the primacy of the individual vis à vis the group:

> "I think that the unit of instruction, certainly at sixth form level, and hopefully at more junior levels, is really the individual rather than the form. But having said that, I am rather old fashioned in thinking that there has to be some sort of discipline from outside because I don't think it comes naturally ..... I would hope very much that this discipline would lead to self discipline, and the self discipline would lead to self knowledge, self expression, and self fulfilment. Really if I had to summarise my views on what is the purpose of education I would say these things again, self discipline, self knowledge, self expression, leading to self fulfilment." (UK 13)

He continued to stress the uniqueness of individuals and the value of history in developing human qualities in the individual, exactly the same point about "enlargement of the personality" made by the Ministry of Education pamphlet quoted above:

> "..... history is the humane study par excellence. It involves learning what it is to be the kind of human being I am, ... what I am uniquely .... and I would suggest that young children, middle school children, sixth formers, can get from history a sense of location in space and time. I think it helps in the search for an identity."

This stress on the uniqueness of the individual personality caused him to reject a social science concept of history teaching because he felt that a study of society was inclined to overlook individuals:

> "The study of things, of material, of phenomena, this is the concern of the scientist, of the archaeologist, of the sociologist, of the anthropologist. And history is not sociology, I feel, because it is concerned with people as individuals rather than with people as statistics, and for a long time I've had a completely unconscious opposition to history as part of social studies, or humanities, or sociology. And it was only since you talked to me that I went away and thought about this, and I suddenly became conscious of the fact that I felt history was concerned with individuals, with personalities, and sociology is concerned with social organization."

It was the stimulus that the study of history could afford to the imagination that he valued. It was as though he felt that real understanding came through an intuitive grasp of a situation, resulting from the capacity to identify with others rather than from a coldly rational collection of data. Therefore, history could not be an instrument of scientific inquiry. This was a negation of its true nature and a denial of its real value in education:

> "It goes back to your question about whether it helps individuals, or whether its any good as a social instrument, and I don't think it is quite honestly, I don't think it's any use at all, except helping to develop insight and imagination into the past, and into human behaviour, and by so doing help the development of imagination and self knowledge of the young person who is studying the history. It's for fun, that's all. And if one doesn't find history fun, then one should never do it."

On these criteria, history belongs in the same category as art, music, and literature, subjects which have a largely aesthetic appeal and whose primary function is to nurture the human spirit, rather than the faculty of reason. However this teacher claimed an intellectual quality for the subject also:

> "At an academic level it involves studying material, questions of accuracy, weighing evidence, looking for bias, the detection of falsehood. At the end, as a result of a history course, I would hope that a sceptical human being has been produced but not a cynical human being."

Scepticism he would consider to be a mark of a properly "enlarged" personality, and suggests some involvement, whereas cynicism represented frustration and was the attribute of an individual ill at ease with himself. Ultimately he felt there was no contradiction between the interests of the individual and those of society because the best guarantee of a stable society was to ensure that its individuals were well adjusted:

> "When I used earlier, self fulfilment and self expression, I have a belief that people who really achieve this do not turn anti-social. In other words, I think the people who are emotionally and intellectually self fulfilled are not the odd bods, the drug takers, the drop outs."

This is a full statement of the personal enrichment view of history teaching. Though the opinions of only one teacher, they have been quoted at length because they are a particularly lucid representation of this view, and, as the discussion of the structure and organization of

British education, and the excerpts from official pamphlets have shown, this has been the dominant concept of the purpose of teaching history in Britain over many years.

The personal enrichment view is identified more closely with the British system than with the American. Yet, just as the social science, skills of inquiry, view can be found in Britain, so can the personal enrichment view be found in the United States. They are not totally incompatible and it would be incorrect to suggest that they are associated exclusively with either of the two countries. The American historian Charles Beard, also active in the cause of history education, wrote in 1934:

> "The fundamental purpose of instruction in the social studies is the creation of rich, many sided personalities, equipped with practical knowledge and inspired by ideals so that they can make their way and fulfil their mission in a changing society which is part of a world complex." (18)

Beard's "rich many sided personalities" sounds remarkably like the "enlargement of the personality" of the Ministry of Education pamphlet, though his references to "the fulfilment of mission" do not. Later, (1959) R.A. Billington, argued the case for secure historical background and perspective as the most effective basis for social decision making:

> "It (the social studies course) is unsound because it is based on the assumption that knowledge should be acquired only incidentally as a means to a practical end; because it encourages the false belief that any modern problem can be comprehended without thorough familiarity with the long chain of historical events responsible for that problem; and because it encourages superficial thought and the formation of snap judgments that are false. The arrogance generated by the belief that logic alone can solve all the problems of human behaviour hardly equips today's youth for the decision making they will face in the future." (19)

Though Billington appears to accept the goals of the social science educationists, the preparation for effective decision making, and the finding of solutions to society's problems, he believes that a sound historical education is likely to achieve these ends more successfully. Thus he places his faith ultimately in experience rather than reason as the solution to society's problems. In this he is in sympathy with the traditional British view of history teaching.

However, as a broad generalization it is true to say that there are substantial differences between the British and American concepts of history teaching. These arise in part from the differences in the

evolution of the two systems, in part from the structural differences, and in part from the differences in curriculum organization. Essentially the difference is that in the United States, history is seen as one of the social sciences, concerned with discovering truths about human behaviour in general, and with the development of skills which are socially relevant and practically useful, and thus it is a subject which benefits society as a whole. This can be designated the 'societal' view of history teaching. In Britain, history is seen as one of the humanities whose aim is primarily the appreciation of the past for its own sake, rather than for its contemporary relevance, and with the personal and private development of the individual. This can be designated the 'humanistic' view of history teaching.

In practice it has been found impossible to confine the American aspects of this study exclusively to history. During the early stages of the inquiry it became clear that American educational thinking includes history within a broader concept of social education which includes the study of government, social behaviour, and elements of economics, and the purpose of which is the production of responsible citizens equipped to take an active and useful part in the life of their society. The past is included to serve the needs of the present. American teachers engaged in teaching about the past tend to see themselves as teachers of social studies first and history second.

In Britain, on the other hand, with the partial exception of the middle school years where combined studies courses are to be found sometimes called social studies, sometimes humanities, history tends to be taught either as a separate discipline or not at all. In the British Primary school, where a coherent philosophy of social education seems scarcely to exist, history has largely become absorbed either into environmental studies, or into interdisciplinary topic work of some kind, both of which derive from child centred philosophies of education quite different from American social studies. In the later secondary years, subject divisions become fairly sharply defined and those that would be incorporated into American social studies are separated into history, geography, sociology, psychology, and economics. History is an elective at this stage, and so British young people between the ages of say 14 and 18 have either abandoned the subject altogether or have opted for the study of a subject which is designed to satisfy independent scholarly and academic criteria, rather than those of social relevance.

Thus a comparison of history teaching in the two countries is complicated by the fact that like is not really being compared with like. Any attempt to make such a comparison inevitably involves taking account of the structure and aims of each system as a whole, and in particular of the inclusion in American education of history within the social studies.

The hypothesis that American history teaching is concerned mainly with 'societal' objectives, and British history teaching mainly with 'humanistic' objectives has been established by a brief examination of the history and development of education as a whole in the two countries, the views of some educational theorists and administrators, and some models of curriculum organization. It is not an original observation and has been noted by students of comparative history education such as Billington (20). The purpose of this study is to test this hypothesis at practising teacher level. It sets out to discover whether these historical, structural, and organizational differences are reflected in the attitudes of classroom teachers in two selected areas on each side of the Atlantic.

To this end, and bearing in mind the difficulty of isolating the discipline of history from social studies in the United States, certain concepts were selected for exploration in interviews with American and British teachers. These concepts were chosen because they are basic to the study of history, and, in the broader context, of social studies, and could be expected to reveal some of the major differences of approach between the two countries, if any existed. They were also closely related to the national cultural background of the two countries so that differences attributable to the historical or current experience of the two countries could be expected to emerge.

Initially, it was important to discover the criteria by which teachers selected the factual material for inclusion in their lessons. From an examination of these criteria it was expected that some conclusions could be reached about the reasons for the selection, and whether or not they were primarily societal or humanistic. Objectives in this area will be referred to as knowledge objectives.

The second area of concern was with the teacher's response to those aspects of knowledge which were politically or socially sensitive, either because of events in the past which had been of fundamental importance in shaping the nation's development, or because of recent or

contemporary events which had excited controversy. From an examination of the attitudes which the teacher adopted towards controversial issues, and his handling of them in the classroom, it was expected that it would be possible to draw conclusions about his purpose in teaching them. These will be referred to as objectives in the realm of values.

Finally, analysis was focussed on the teacher's approach to to study of the wider world. This aspect was included to add a fresh dimension to the study, and to combine certain features of knowledge objectives with certain features of values objectives. By discovering the extent to which foreign countries were included in the curriculum, and which countries in particular and why, it was expected that the teacher's concept of the relationship between his own country and the rest of the world would be illuminated. In so doing, it would also provide insight into the perception that the teacher had of his own nationality, since it would reveal the aspects of his own culture which distinguished it in his mind from other areas of the world. In this way it was hoped to explore his perception of the community or human group, to which he felt he ultimately belonged. The bounds which a people place on the area they select for historical study offer a valuable insight into the nature of the mental horizons of that people, and the kind of people they feel themselves to be, because a nation is in many ways defined by its history. At this point in the study therefore, the significance of the concept of nationality will be discussed, and it will be related to the issue of societal and humanistic objectives through a consideration of the criteria adopted for the selection of countries to be studied. This part of the study will be described as concerned with foreign perspectives.

A review has now been made of some of the general characteristics of the education systems of the United States and Great Britain, and their influence on the teaching of history. A general proposition has been stated, that in the United States history is taught as a social science and is therefore concerned primarily with contemporary relevance, meeting social needs, and the production of useful citizens, while in Britain it is taught primarily as one of the humanities, and is therefore concerned primarily with the cultural enrichment of the individual personality. The issue that this study seeks to explore is whether this proposition can be confirmed by the attitudes and opinions expressed by classroom teachers.

Chapter One - References

1. Myrdal, G., 'An American Dilemma' (1944), extract reprinted in, Shaver, J.P., and Berlak, H. (eds.), Democracy, Pluralism, and The Social Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968, p. 90.

2. Frost, S.E., Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc., 1966, p. 464.

3. Steiner, G., Time Magazine. March 12th, 1973, p. 52.

4. de Tocqueville, A., Democracy in America. 1st pub. 1835, Oxford University Press: World's Classics ed., 1946, p. 245.

5. This discussion of the differences between American and British education is drawn from two sources:

   Hofstadter, R., Anti-Intellectualism In American Life. London: Cape, 1964, Ch. 13.

   Billington, R.A. et al., The Historian's Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966, Ch. 2.

6. Billington, R.A. et al., Ibid. p. 28.

7. St. Louis Suburban Teachers' Association Public School Personnel Directory, 1970-71.

8. Cox, C.B. and Massialas, B.G., Social Studies in the United States. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World Inc., 1967, p. 78.

9. Skinner, B.F., Walden Two. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948, Macmillan Paperbacks ed., 1962, p. 239.

10. Bloom, B., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (Handbook I - The Cognitive Domain, Handbook II - The Affective Domain), London: Longmans, 1965.

11. Fenton, E., Tradition and Change in Four Societies. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

12. Holloway, S.W.F., 'What History Is and Ought To Be' reprinted in, Burston, W.H., and Thompson, D. (eds.), Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967, p. 154.

13. Schools Council Integrated Studies Project. Oxford University Press: 1972.

14. Ministry of Education, pamphlet No. 23, Teaching History. H.M.S.O.: 1952, p. 18.

15. Department of Education and Science, pamphlet No. 52, Towards World History. H.M.S.O.: 1967, p. 4.

16. Booth, M., History Betrayed. London: Longmans, 1969, pp. 86-87.

17. Coltham, J., and Fines, J., Educational Objectives for the Study of History, Historical Association, pamphlet TH35, Historical Association: 1971, p. 8.

18. Beard, C., 'The Intellectual Problem of Determining Objectives' (1934), reprinted in Shaver and Berlak (1968) op. cit., p. 13.

19. Billington, R.A., 'The Case for American History' (1959), reprinted in Shaver and Berlak (1968) op. cit., p. 171.

20. Billington, R.A. et al., The Historian's Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Chapter Two - The Research Design

The purpose of this study is to examine the thinking of American and English teachers about various aspects of history teaching. The manner in which the study was carried out will now be described, dealing first with the selection of the sample, and then with the nature of the instruments used in the investigation.

The opportunity for the study was provided by the year the writer spent as an exchange lecturer at a Community College in St. Louis, Missouri, U.S.A., from 1972-73. For this reason the teachers who assisted in the research all came from schools in the St. Louis area, and for the same reasons of accessibility, the English sample was drawn from schools in Hampshire within range of Winchester.

The aim was to make an evaluation of attitudes within the system as a whole, rather than at any one level. Only in this way, it was felt, would it be possible to gain the perspective, and an appreciation of the total picture, which would enable significant comparisons to be made. The objectives of any curriculum can only be properly considered with reference to the curriculum through the full age range, and the focussing of attention at any one point is likely to restrict a full understanding of its characteristics. This is particularly true where there are major differences of structure and organization, as already described. An investigation of too narrow a segment may mean that important aspects of the comparison may be overlooked, and misunderstanding may arise as a result. If this study had focussed, for example, on teachers of the 12-14 age group, an impression might have been created of a basic identity of approach in the two countries which would certainly not be justified when the whole picture is taken into account. Likewise, if it had been confined to the 16-18 group, or the ten year old group, it might have been concluded that the differences were greater than they actually were.

Accordingly, attention was directed towards a vertical cross section of the education system from the age of 10 to 18, which takes in schools catering for all ages except the very youngest, though the main emphasis has been on the secondary years. In the United States this includes both Senior and Junior High schools and the Elementary school,

and in Britain the Sixth Form College, the Comprehensive school, both 11-18 and 11-16 varieties, and the Primary school. In an attempt to make the comparison as direct as possible the sample schools were chosen from the publicly maintained sector alone, they were all non-selective, except in as far as British sixth forms are selective, and, with the exception of one English school, they were all co-educational. This excluded, in the United States mainly parochial schools, mostly Roman Catholic or Lutheran, and in Britain, mainly Independent and Grammar schools. Some English secondary schools were in the process of changing from Secondary Modern to Comprehensive, and in one case from Grammar to Comprehensive.

The original intention was to include an equal number of schools and teachers for each age level. It was judged that a significant and manageable sample from the United States would be three High schools, three Junior High schools, and three Elementary schools. In Britain, the fact that sixth form study in Hampshire is carried on in different types of institutions made such a neat pattern impossible. The objective therefore was to select three secondary schools where there was a sixth form, three where there was none, and three primary schools. Three teachers from each school were to be interviewed giving a total of twenty seven in each country.

In the event the number of teachers interviewed was slightly larger than this (see Appendix I at the end of the chapter). Practical considerations, notably the difficulty of securing sufficient questionnaire returns, meant that a larger number of American High schools (6), and English 11-16 Comprehensive schools (9), were visited than had originally been planned. The American interviews also included two with lecturers in a College concerned with teachers' training, one at secondary, one at primary level.

In each secondary school the original contact was made with the Head of the History Department or the nearest equivalent that could be found. In the American schools this was usually the Chairman of the Social Studies Division. The nature of the inquiry was explained to him in a letter, and he was requested to co-operate by consenting to be interviewed and inviting two or three colleagues to do the same. He was also requested as far as possible to enlist the co-operation of a cross section of teachers by age, sex, and any other relevant

considerations such as ethnic background and religion. This proved to be an ideal difficult to realize as there were practical difficulties of teacher availability and willingness to participate. In the end the number of teachers interviewed showed a preponderance of men, rather larger in the American sample than the English, and a preponderance of younger teachers, that is those who were within fifteen years of commencing their careers. However the distribution of teachers between the different schools was fairly close to that originally planned.

The American schools were mostly in the outer suburbs of the large city of St. Louis, and they drew from predominently affluent middle class catchment areas, spread over a total of 6 separate school districts. They were mostly larger than the English schools, a Junior High school of 2,000 pupils being not uncommon, and the largest High school consisting of some 6,000. Though most followed a more or less common pattern of grading, testing, and required credits for graduation, there was, in the case of the High schools, a variety in the internal organization of social studies departments and in teaching methods. Several High schools had abandoned the year long single course in world history, American history or civics in favour of what were termed quarter courses. In such schemes a course in for example American history would be divided into about ten 'mini-courses' each lasting a quarter of the year (about nine weeks, or half a semester), and earning one quarter of a unit's credit towards graduation. Subjects offered in these quarter courses would be some limited aspect of American history, of which students would have to complete a given number. Some examples were, the Civil War, the Twenties and Thirties, and Colonial America. In one Junior High school an eighth grade history course was taught by a team of 4 teachers who divided the course into 4 units each lasting 9 weeks. Each teacher taught his section four times a year, and to a different eighth grade class five times a day!

During the later stages of the inquiry in the United States, opportunities arose to visit one High school in an inner suburban area experiencing a rapid social transition with the movement of the black population out from the city, and another in a so called 'ghetto' area of the city where the students were 80% black. Both these schools provided an interesting contrast with the majority of those visited, in terms of student population, and to a lesser extent staff. They had

several black teachers one of whom was interviewed for this research.

The English schools in which interviews took place were more varied geographically. None was in a large metropolitan area. Some would be described as suburban or urban, others were in small towns, and two primary schools were in rural villages. They were therefore a less homogeneous category than the American schools. In certain cases the environment seemed to exercise some influence on the teacher's approach towards his teaching, as will be shown, but once the G.C.E. and C.S.E. courses had commenced, especially 'A' level, they did not vary a great deal from one another.

Having identified the teachers, the research was carried out by two instruments, the interview and a questionnaire. The interviews were tape recorded and later transcribed for analysis. About 90,000 words were obtained in this way from the American teachers and approximately 72,000 from the English. The interviews took place in the schools, were usually conducted with the teachers individually but sometimes in pairs where time was short, and they generally lasted from 15-20 minutes each. Occasionally they were longer than this. Sometimes they had to be held in less than ideal conditions, such as staff rooms during a free period or a lunch break or after school, and sometimes the teachers had only limited time at their disposal so the interviews tended to be rather hasty.

They followed a semi-structured pattern. The same points were raised for discussion with all those interviewed, but the intention was to encourage them to speak freely and informally on the topics raised, rather than to interrogate them with a series of precise and limiting questions. Digression was not discouraged within reason, and much of the most valuable material came from anecdotes, reminiscences, or asides of various kinds. Much of the content ranged over material relating to the organization of the school system as a whole, and, with the American teachers particularly, it proved impossible to limit the discussion to the context of history exclusively. Social issues of all kinds kept arising, and much background material, essential to an understanding of the American system, was gained in this way.

The interviews explored the concepts outlined at the end of the previous chapter, and followed the same pattern with both groups. Initially, knowledge objectives were raised. Teachers were asked how important they considered it for their pupils to have an outline of the

main constitutional and political events in their country's history. This point was raised at the outset because this is the traditional substance of history in schools and it afforded an opportunity to discover the priorities in the selection of material. It also raised the question of chronology which has been another dominant feature of traditional history. Next there was discussion of the place of historical heroes because it was expected that the attitude to such figures, and the examples selected for study, would reveal something about the personal qualities which were respected in the nation's history, and this in turn would reveal something of the values of contemporary society. The concept of the relevance of knowledge was then raised, in an attempt to discover whether the teachers expected historical knowledge to be useful and of practical assistance to living in modern society. As a contrast to relevance, the importance of pupil interest as a criterion for the selection of material was then introduced, in order to provide an opportunity for the expression of the 'humanistic' view of history teaching.

The interviews then proceeded to an exploration of the place of values in history teaching. The question was posed whether it should seek to re-inforce certain values and attitudes that the teacher or his society considered important. Certain issues were raised as being of fundamental importance to both societies, historically significant, and involving sufficient controversy to constitute a moral problem for the teacher of history. At first values were raised in general terms with questions on the teacher's attitude towards the teaching of concepts such as liberty, equality, and democracy. Then, to focus discussion more sharply, reveal contradictions if they existed, and pose a more acute personal dilemma, specific examples were raised which were likely to engage personal emotions. These were the issues of the place of minorities (especially blacks), dictatorship (especially fascism and communism), and war.

The third area to be explored was that of skills in relation to content as a teaching objective. This was intended to bring out and clarify if possible the teacher's concept of the nature of the discipline of history, whether he thought it was essentially one of the humanities or a social science. They were asked what skills specifically history could be expected to develop, hoping to elicit views on whether or not history could be an aid to practical problem solving and decision making.

The final area of investigation was the attitude of the teacher towards the study of the wider world. This was judged to be one of the most valuable aspects of a comparative study such as this, because it would help to reveal assumptions which the two nations were making about their relationship with the rest of the world. In so doing it would also reveal the perceptions that the teachers had of their own country and the nature of their own nationality.

This section of the interview began by inquiring what pupils' reaction was to the study of foreign countries. Were they interested, bored, intrigued, or merely indifferent? This question was asked partly to enable some assessment to be made of the attitude of the teacher himself towards the study of the wider world. Next they were asked which parts of the world were considered especially relevant for study and why. The intention here was to discover whether they stressed those countries which had contributed to the development of their own in the past, or those that were influencing it in the present and were likely to do so in the future. The former would correspond largely to humanistic criteria, the latter to societal. From these discussions it was expected that conclusions could be drawn about the teachers' perceptions of the relationship of their own country to the rest of the world. It would be shown whether they were aware of other countries in a marginal sense only, or whether they had any sense of international community. Finally they were asked whether they stressed any particular attitudes towards the rest of the world such as detachment, involvement, or obligation.

The second instrument by which teachers' attitudes were assessed was a questionnaire (see Appendix II). Thirty eight statements about the purpose of history teaching, covering the same aspects as the interviews, were prepared, and the recipients invited to respond on a four point scale, as follows:

1. I strongly agree
2. I agree
3. I disagree
4. I strongly disagree

It was decided to omit a 'don't know' category so as to oblige respondents to commit themselves to a definite statement of agreement or disagreement. In cases where respondents omitted to answer an item the result was recorded as 'no response', (see Appendix III).

The questionnaire proved to be a difficult instrument to employ satisfactorily. The intention was to secure about one hundred completed questionnaires from each country, in order to gain some quantifiable evidence. When the initial contact was made with a school, a number of copies were sent, depending on the size of school, with requests to the Head of Department to solicit the co-operation of his history staff. In a fair proportion of cases this was done, but many questionnaires were not returned. In an attempt to increase the number of respondents, copies with written requests for their completion were sent to some schools that were not visited for interviews. These gained a few more, but again many were not returned. Finally, 66 completed questionnaires were obtained from American teachers and 57 from English. Such samples are too small to be of any real significance, but they came from the same cross section of teachers as did the interviews (see Appendix IV). They showed approximately the same age and sex distribution, and approximately the same distribution of number of years teaching experience, (see Appendix V). They also revealed some interesting differences of educational qualification (Appendix VI), religious affiliation (Appendix VII), and ethnic origin (Appendix VIII). They represented the same age range in the schools as did the interviews, and they came in most cases from the same schools as the interviews. A large majority of the teachers interviewed also completed a questionnaire.

Although the sample was small the questionnaire was found to be of value. It provided the only quantifiable evidence, and where there was a high proportion of agreement or disagreement the results can be taken as significant. The findings were particularly useful in pointing up issues which could be more fully examined in the interview transcripts, and they were often used as starting points for the analysis. However the main evidence of the teachers' attitudes is the interviews, and it is they which provide the foundation of the ensuing study.

APPENDIX I

Table showing interview respondents

by country, type of school, and sex

	COLLEGE	6th FORM COLLEGE	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-18 COMPREHENSIVE	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-16 COMPREHENSIVE	ELEMENTARY	PRIMARY	TOTAL
SCHOOLS - G.B.	-	2	-	3	-	9	-	4	18
SCHOOLS - U.S.	1	-	6	-	3	-	3	-	13
TEACHERS - G.B.	-	3	-	9	-	17	-	4	33
TEACHERS - U.S.	2	-	14	-	9	-	11	-	36
TEACHERS (MALE) - G.B.	-	3	-	7	-	13	-	4	27
TEACHERS (MALE) - U.S.	1	-	10	-	7	-	7	-	25
TEACHERS (FEMALE) - G.B.	-	0	-	2	-	4	-	0	6
TEACHERS (FEMALE) - U.S.	1	-	4	-	2	-	4	-	11

APPENDIX II - THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire concerning the goals of history teaching biographical data

School Name _____

Type (Check one)
- Primary _____
- Middle _____
- Secondary Comprehensive _____
- Secondary Modern _____
- Secondary Grammar _____
- VIth Form College _____
- Maintained _____
- Independent _____
- College _____
- Other _____

Location (Check one)
- Urban (inner city) _____
- Suburban _____
- Rural _____

Personal details:
- Sex _____
- Number of Years Teaching Experience _____
- Religion _____
- Ethnic Origin _____
- Highest Qualification Obtained _____
- Place of Birth _____

School History texts that your classes use:

_____

_____

_____

_____

QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE GOALS OF HISTORY TEACHING

The following questionnaire is designed to assess various attitudes concerning the goals of history teaching. On the following pages you will be presented with a series of statements representing many different goals. After reading each question carefully, you are asked to respond with your own personal belief by marking each statement in the left margin with 1, 2, 3, or 4, according to the following scale.

1. I strongly agree
2. I agree
3. I disagree
4. I strongly disagree

1. _____ History should be studied to enable students to understand contemporary problems.

2. _____ The teaching of history should be regarded as a means of improving international understanding.

3. _____ My students should study for the mental skills they gain rather than for its content.

4. _____ All students should study history for the mental skills they gain rather than for its content.

5. _____ The concept of "relevance *to* the present" distorts a true understanding of history.

6. _____ My students should be taught history in such a way as to suggest that a democratic system of government is best.

7. _____ All students should be taught history in such a way as to suggest that a democratic system of government is best.

8. _____ Every student should know the main political and constitutional landmarks in the history of his own country.

9. _____ History should not be taught with any kind of moral purpose.

10. _____ My students should study history for its romance and adventure rather than as an intellectual discipline.

11. _____ All students should study history for its romance and adventure rather than as an intellectual discipline.

12. _____ It does not matter what history my students study as long as it interests them.

Please mark each statement in the left margin by writing 1, 2, 3, or 4, according to the following scale.

1. I strongly agree
2. I agree
3. I disagree
4. I strongly disagree

13. _____ The study of history should not lead people to believe that some ways of life are superior to others.

14. _____ The study of history should help students to live in the world of the future.

15. _____ The study of the history of foreign countries has little relevance for most of my students.

16. _____ History teaching should encourage my students to believe that all men are equal.

17. _____ The study of history has no practical relevance for most of my students.

18. _____ Most of my students do not find the history of their own country more relevant than that of foreign countries.

19. _____ History should be taught in such a way as to diminish awareness of national differences.

20. _____ The study of history should help students to solve social and political problems.

21. _____ It is more important for my students to know the history of their own country than that of foreign countries.

22. _____ History should not be taught in such a way as to suggest that war is always wrong.

23. _____ It is just as important too for my students to know something of the history of foreign countries as of their own.

24. _____ The most important foreign countries to study are those that are important in the world today.

25. _____ My students should learn about the history of ordinary people rather than about the famous.

26. _____ The study of history should encourage my students to feel a sense of loyalty to their own country.

27. _____ It is easier to get my students interested in the history of their own country than in that of foreign countries.

28. _____ The most important foreign countries to study are those which have strongly influenced the development of our own.

Please mark each statement in the left margin by writing 1, 2, 3, or 4, according to the following scale.

1. I strongly agree
2. I agree
3. I disagree
4. I strongly disagree

29. _____ My students find the history of foreign countries just as interesting as that of their own.

30. _____ My students gain more from history if it is approached through some form of inter-disciplinary study.

31. _____ One purpose of history teaching should be to make students aware of the underlying values upon which their society is based.

32. _____ History teaching should seek to blend different groups and regions within our country and promote greater national unity.

33. _____ History teaching should help students to become responsible democratic citizens.

34. _____ My students need to learn more of the cultural, ethnic, regional, and other minorities within their society.

35. _____ To promote understanding and toleration between the different peoples of the world may be desirable, but it is not a proper part of history teaching.

36. _____ It is more important for Americans to study the history of Europe than that of any other part of the world.

37. _____ It is more important that my students study immediate problems in their own country than the problems of other countries.

38. _____ My students will learn more tolerance and understanding through learning about different groups within their own society, than by studying foreign peoples.

If you feel that there are other goals of history teaching that have not been included in any of the above, would you please state them here:

APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - ITEMS RELATING TO KNOWLEDGE

%	AGREE		DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.
CONTEMPORARY RELEVANCE						
1. History should be studied to enable students to understand contemporary problems.	98	96	2	2	0	2
5. The concept of "relevance to the present" distorts a true understanding of history.	33	37	65	60	2	3
14. The study of history should help students to live in the world of the future.	89	93	11	7	0	0
17. The study of history has no practical relevance for most of my students.	17	28	82	65	1	7
20. The study of history should help students to solve social and political problems	94	81	6	16	0	3
INTEREST						
10. My students should study history for its romance and adventure rather than as an intellectual discipline.	11	28	86	60	3	12
11. All students should study history for its romance and adventure rather than as an intellectual discipline.	6	5	89	84	5	11
12. It does not matter what history my students study as long as it interests them.	17	40	80	54	3	6
TRADITIONAL COVERAGE						
8. Every student should know the main political and constitutional landmarks in the history of his own country.	91	75	9	25	0	0
THE HERO FIGURE						
25. My students should learn about the history of ordinary people rather than about the famous.	50	48	36	33	14	19
INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY						
30. My students gain more from history if it is approached through some form of interdisciplinary study	70	42	24	39	6	19

APPENDIX III (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - ITEMS RELATING TO KNOWLEDGE

%	AGREE		DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.
SKILLS AND CONTENT						
3. My students should study for the mental skills they gain rather for its content.	53	42	44	51	3	7
4. All students should study history for the mental skills they gain rather than for its content.	30	33	64	60	6	7

APPENDIX III (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - ITEMS RELATING TO VALUES

%	AGREE		DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.
MORAL PURPOSE IN HISTORY TEACHING						
9. History should not be taught with any kind of moral purpose.	24	40	74	56	2	4
13. The study of history should not lead people to believe that some ways of life are superior to others.	45	53	55	40	0	7
16. History teaching should encourage my students to believe that all men are equal.	73	37	24	54	3	9
31. One purpose of history teaching should be to make students aware of the underlying values upon which their society is based.	98	90	2	7	0	3
DEMOCRACY AND CITIZENSHIP						
6. My students should be taught history in such a way as to suggest that a democratic system of government is best.	32	28	64	67	4	5
7. All students should be taught history in such a way as to suggest that a democratic system of government is best.	27	18	70	75	3	7
26. The study of history should encourage my students to feel a sense of loyalty to their own country.	76	32	18	54	6	14
33. History teaching should help students to become responsible democratic citizens.	89	72	8	9	3	19
MINORITY GROUPS						
32. History teaching should seek to blend different groups and regions within our country and promote greater national unity.	73	42	23	40	4	18
34. My students need to learn more of the cultural, ethnic, regional, and other minorities within their society.	97	81	3	10	0	9
WAR						
22. History should not be taught in such a way as to suggest that war is always wrong.	56	70	38	26	6	4

APPENDIX III (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - ITEMS RELATING TO FOREIGN PERSPECTIVES

%	AGREE		DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.
HISTORY AND INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING						
2. The teaching of history should be regarded as a means of improving international understanding.	82	86	12	9	0	5
19. History should be taught in such a way as to diminish awareness of national differences.	21	23	76	67	3	10
35. To promote understanding and toleration between the different peoples of the world may be desirable, but it is not a proper part of history teaching.	6	28	94	65	0	7
37. It is more important that my students study immediate problems in their own country than the problems of other countries.	49	38	50	53	1	9
38. My students will learn more tolerance and understanding through learning about different groups within their own society, than by studying foreign peoples.	38	33	56	49	6	18
RELEVANCE						
15. The study of the history of foreign countries has little relevance for most of my students.	13	23	82	77	5	0
18. Most of my students do not find the history of their own country more relevant than that of foreign countries.	17	37	79	58	4	5
INTEREST						
27. It is easier to get my students interested in the history of their own country than in that of foreign countries.	60	54	35	44	5	2
29. My students find the history of foreign countries just as interesting as that of their own.	47	61	45	30	8	9

APPENDIX III (continued)

QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS - ITEMS RELATING TO FOREIGN PERSPECTIVES

%	AGREE		DISAGREE		NO RESPONSE	
	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.	U.S.	G.B.
IMPORTANCE						
21. It is more important for my students to know the history of their own country than that of foreign countries.	50	53	48	40	2	7
23. It is just as important for my students to know something of the history of foreign countries as of their own.	94	84	4	14	2	2
SPECIFIC COUNTRIES						
24. The most important foreign countries to study are those that are important in the world today.	35	38	62	58	3	4
28. The most important foreign countries to study are those which have strongly influenced the development of our own.	59	42	39	53	2	5
36. It is more important for Americans to study the history of Europe than that of any other part of the world.	20	30	79	54	1	16

APPENDIX IV

Table showing questionnaire respondents by country, type of school, and sex

	COLLEGE	6th FORM COLLEGE	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-18 COMPREHENSIVE	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-16 COMPREHENSIVE	ELEMENTARY	PRIMARY	TOTALS
SCHOOLS - G.B.	-	2	-	3	-	14	-	7	26
SCHOOLS - U.S.	2	-	6	-	3	-	3	-	14
TEACHERS - G.B.	-	3	-	13	-	34	-	7	57
TEACHERS - U.S.	6	-	34	-	16	-	10	-	66
TEACHERS (MALE) - G.B.	-	3	-	10	-	21	-	7	41
TEACHERS (MALE) - U.S.	4	-	20	-	10	-	6	-	40
TEACHERS (FEMALE) - G.B.	-	0	-	3	-	13	-	0	16
TEACHERS (FEMALE) - U.S.	2	-	11	-	6	-	4	-	23
NO RESPONSE (M/F) - G.B.	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	0
NO RESPONSE (M/F) - U.S.	0	-	3	-	0	-	0	-	3

APPENDIX V

Table showing questionnaire respondents

by number of years teaching experience

	COLLEGE	6th FORM COLLEGE	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-18 COMPREHENSIVE	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-16 COMPREHENSIVE	ELEMENTARY	PRIMARY	TOTAL G.B.	TOTAL U.S.
0-5 years	2	0	10	9	9	13	2	0	22	23
6-10 years	2	1	9	3	2	6	1	0	10	14
11-15 years	2	1	5	1	3	5	3	3	10	13
16-20 years	0	1	4	0	2	4	2	2	7	8
21-25 years	0	0	3	0	0	3	1	0	3	4
26-30 years	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	1
30+ years	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
TOTALS	6	3	34	13	16	34	10	7	57	66

APPENDIX VI

Table showing questionnaire respondents by qualifications

		COLLEGE	6th FORM COLLEGE	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-18 COMPREHENSIVE	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-16 COMPREHENSIVE	ELEMENTARY	PRIMARY	TOTAL G.B.	TOTAL U.S.
TEACHERS CERTIFICATE	G.B.	-	0	-	1	-	12	-	7	20	-
TEACHERS CERTIFICATE	U.S.	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0
B.A./B.Sc. ECON	G.B.	-	2	-	11	-	14	-	0	27	-
B.A./B.S.	U.S.	0	-	14	-	6	-	2	-	-	22
B.Ed.	G.B.	-	0	-	0	-	5	-	0	5	-
B.Ed.	U.S.	0	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	0
M.A.	G.B.	-	1	-	0	-	1	-	0	2	-
M.A.+	U.S.	6	-	20	-	9	-	7	-	-	42
Ph.D.	G.B.	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	0	1	-
Ph.D.	U.S.	0	-	0	-	1	-	0	-	-	1
NO RESPONSE	G.B.	-	0	-	0	-	2	-	0	2	-
NO RESPONSE	U.S.	0	-	0	-	0	-	1	-	-	1
TOTALS		6	3	34	13	16	34	10	7	57	66

APPENDIX VII

Table showing questionnaire respondents by religious affiliation

	COLLEGE	6th FORM COLLEGE	SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-18 COMPREHENSIVE	JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL	11-16 COMPREHENSIVE	ELEMENTARY	PRIMARY	TOTAL G.B.	TOTAL U.S.
AGNOSTIC	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
ANGLICAN	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0
ATHEIST	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
BAPTIST	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
CHRISTIAN	0	0	1	0	2	5	0	1	6	3
CHURCH OF ENGLAND	0	1	0	3	0	12	0	2	18	0
EPISCOPALIAN	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
JEWISH	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
LUTHERAN	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
METHODIST	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	3	1
NONCONFORMIST	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
PRESBYTERIAN	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	4
PROTESTANT	1	0	10	0	5	0	7	0	0	23
ROMAN CATHOLIC	1	0	12	0	5	6	1	0	6	19
UNITARIAN	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
NONE	1	1	1	6	0	2	0	1	10	2
NO RESPONSE	1	0	2	3	0	5	1	1	9	4
TOTALS	6	3	34	13	16	34	10	7	57	66

APPENDIX VIII

Table showing questionnaire respondents

by ethnic origin

	G.B.	U.S.
ANGLO/SAXON	0	4
AUSTRIAN	0	1
BRITISH	28	0
CAUCASIAN/WHITE	6	14
DUTCH/IRISH	0	1
ENGLISH	11	1
ENGLISH/FRENCH	0	1
ENGLISH/SCOTTISH	0	1
EURASIAN	0	1
EUROPEAN	2	0
FRENCH	0	1
FRENCH/CANADIAN	0	1
FRENCH/IRISH	0	1
GERMAN	0	8
GERMAN/ENGLISH	0	6
GERMAN/FRENCH	0	1
GERMAN/IRISH	0	3
GERMAN/ITALIAN	0	2
GERMAN/RUSSIAN	0	1
GERMAN/SCOTS	0	2
ITALIAN	0	1
JAPANESE	0	1
JEWISH	0	1
POLISH	0	1

APPENDIX VIII (continued)

Table showing questionnaire respondents

by ethnic origin

	G.B.	U.S.
SCOTTISH	0	1
SCOTTISH/IRISH	0	3
SCOTTISH/NORWEGIAN	0	1
WELSH	2	0
NO RESPONSE	7	7
TOTALS	57	66

Chapter Three - Knowledge

If objectives in the teaching of history are to be compared, one of the most obvious starting points is a straightforward comparison of the content of history courses. This chapter will be concerned to discover not so much what factual information the teachers in both groups wished their pupils to acquire, as to discover the criteria by which teachers selected the factual content of their courses. Through the identification of the men, events, movements, or other kinds of material, with which these teachers were concerned it is possible to infer conclusions about the kind of subject matter that they considered significant, and the reasons for the selection of that material.

In particular, it will help to reveal the teacher's basic philosophy of the subject in relation to the hypothesis that American history education is concerned with societal objectives and British with humanistic objectives. For example, if a teacher were found to favour teaching medieval monarchy as part of a course on the evolution of government, then he is likely to be interested primarily in the middle ages in relation to the present, a societal objective. If on the other hand he favours teaching it as part of a study of the twelfth century which included monasticism, church architecture, and the manorial system, it is likely that he is interested primarily in recreating the past for its own sake, a humanistic objective. The chapter will show that in general terms the initial hypothesis can be sustained.

Three aspects of knowledge objectives have been selected for analysis. First the concepts of relevance and interest will be examined. This will afford an opportunity in the initial stages of the discussion to explore the teacher's view of the underlying principles for the selection of historical material. It will inquire whether the selection was made primarily because of the bearing of the material upon the present, and because it contributed in some way to an understanding of contemporary society. If so, this would suggest that the teacher takes the present as his starting point in the study of the past, and that he expected it to have some utilitarian value. Alternatively, he may adopt another criterion, that of interest. In this case the teacher will select material because it holds some peculiar and personal interest,

either to him or to his pupils, which has no particular social significance, either in its own time necessarily, or in our own. Its justification is simply that it excited curiosity, or fired the imagination, or in some other way provided a pleasing emotional or intellectual stimulus.

Second, the principles underlying the selection of specific factual content will be examined. In particular the place of traditional coverage as opposed to a more selective approach to factual content will be discussed. Where traditional coverage is followed, the intention will be to establish the teacher's view of the key events in his nation's past, if the selective approach, then the reasons for that selection.

Third, attention will be focussed on the study of the hero figure in history as an aspect of factual knowledge of special interest. A nation's heroes provide a particularly valuable insight into the way a nation perceives its own past. They are monuments to its achievements, and they reveal the particular kinds of achievement of which a people are most proud. The individuals who are retained in a nation's memory are one of the best indicators of those events that a nation particularly wants to remember, and more important, the way it wants to remember them. Napoleon, for example, taught in British schools is a very different kind of person from Napoleon taught in French schools, and a history of Britain could be written around the changing reputation of Oliver Cromwell. Thus, the attitude that the people of one age take towards the leading figures of another tells us as much about the age itself, and the nation itself, as it does about the individual in question.

Relevance and Interest

Two reasons which the teachers of both groups often gave for the selection of material for study were those of relevance and interest. Though not necessarily mutually exclusive, they refer to essentially different criteria. The word 'relevant' was usually used to describe material which related directly to the contemporary world, and especially to the lives of pupils. Thus the study of the growth of cities and associated urban problems would be considered relevant to pupils in modern industrial countries, whereas the study of the medieval manor would not. This line of reasoning is usually followed by those who

favour the societal view of history teaching. Material from the past is selected because it relates directly and obviously to the present.

The word 'interest' on the other hand suggests a different set of criteria altogether. It suggests that the educational value of historical material lies in the appeal that it makes to one or other of the pupils' emotions, such as wonder, curiosity, or excitement. Its value is quite separate from any contribution it might make towards preparing the pupil for living in the contemporary world. On this criterion, it is possible that the medieval manor might be a preferable subject to the growth of cities.

It would appear that teachers favouring the criterion of relevance would be likely to incline towards a societal view of history teaching, while those favouring interest would incline towards a humanistic view. However, a broader interpretation may be placed upon relevance. It could be argued, as did the teacher quoted in Chapter 1, that the best way to prepare individuals for life in contemporary society is to ensure that they are well integrated and fulfilled personalities. Thus humanistic history teaching may also claim to be relevant to society's needs.

Evidence from the questionnaire clearly suggests that contemporary relevance was regarded by an overwhelming majority of the teachers in both groups as one of the main objectives for the study of history. Ninety eight per cent of the Americans and 96% of the English teachers agreed that, "History should be studied to enable students to understand contemporary problems," (Question No. 1) and 89% of the American and 93% of the English teachers agreed that, "The study of history should enable students to live in the world of the future." (Question 14) However, only by taking the broad interpretation of relevance to include personal fulfilment can these findings be reconciled with those from the interviews, for there the English teachers showed an appreciably greater tendency to value the past in its own terms rather than for its direct contemporary relevance.

The comments of the American teachers endorse the questionnaire item here, and reveal a sociological emphasis on the study of contemporary problems which is consistent with the placing of history within a wider social studies context already noted as characteristic of American education. Discussion about history teaching with American teachers frequently led

to discussion about social problems:

> "We study a unit on drugs, which is coming up next week, and we have a unit on minority groups, and race relations, and we have a unit on crime communities and the law, - how it affects them, and then in the future too. Right now we are doing a unit on housing - low rent housing, and types of housing that there are present in the inner cities. There is a unit on welfare, insurance, and cities throughout the world, and a geography unit in our half of the social studies curriculum." (Junior High US 183)

While such material would not normally be classified as history in an English curriculum, it was quite usual in an American social studies course and is conceived entirely from the point of view of contemporary relevance.

Interviews with the English teachers revealed less concern with a usable past, in a narrow utilitarian sense, and a greater emphasis on the humanistic or personal fulfilment interpretation of relevance:

> "I used to think a lot about history as a means of explaining the contemporary situation. I used to think of it too as a way of thinking and approaching problems, which was of value to any adult member of society, and which therefore you should build up during their education. But I think really as well there's an aspect that you don't always consider, and that is that it's a general enrichment of the child's life, which will provide many of them with an enduring interest in adult life, apart from the mere fact that it might alter the way in which they approach certain problems. It might deepen their understanding of certain contemporary situations." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 37)

In the response of the English teachers there often appeared a strong feeling for an almost organic quality in English history, a concern for roots, for growth, and for the need in pupils for a firm sense of attachment, which the study of history was felt to provide, and which was in contrast to the responses of the Americans:

> "What in fact makes me British is what has happened in my country to produce the kind of people that my ancestors have been, and that I in fact am. So that I think that without any kind of historical knowledge, children would be culturally deprived." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 38)

The English teachers revealed a feeling for stability, permanence, and continuity:

> "History helps the children to see their roots in the past. This is very important, especially in our sort of society where people are so mobile, and individuals tend to lose roots, and any connection with the past. I think this is where the importance of local history comes in. Even if the children are new to the locality, they see that that locality itself has a past, has a history, and goes back into the past. This helps psychological stability." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 131)

The comments of the American teachers revealed none of this sense of belonging, or feeling that the subject can contribute to psychological security, which is scarcely surprising when one considers in how many cases the ancestral past is outside the United States. Nationality in Britain seems in a large measure to be a compound of ancestral and tribal factors absent from the United States where their place, it will be argued later, (Chapter 5) is taken by a greater attachment to creed, ideals, and currently, ethnic origins.

Further illustration of the strength of the organic element in British history teaching is the frequent reference to locality and environment, the importance of a sense of place, and the feeling of inter-relationship between a community and its land and artefacts, especially buildings. The American historian C. Vann Woodward has observed that in the United States the South is the only part where time and place matter. Certainly in the responses of the American teachers there was little to indicate the regional context of the interview. Most made few references to the local environment, other than in extremely general terms such as 'suburbia', 'the city', or 'modern society', and in most cases the interviews could equally well have taken place in any other large city.

Of course there are ready explanations for these differences. Most Americans are recent immigrants compared with Europeans; in most parts of the United States, communities have only two or three generations' history, and there are not the abundant reminders of the past in the form of parish churches, iron age earthworks, tudor cottages and the like. It may also be that the English sample, taken from a more rural area than the American one, revealed a stronger environmental consciousness than a sample chosen from a large city would have done.

Nevertheless, these seem to be essentially English sentiments:

> "What both of us are keen to do now is to take the children out, because we have many facilities in this area; ancient monuments, Stonehenge, Avebury, places like this, plenty of samples of different styles of building which we both talk about I think, so we could use the visual angle quite a lot ... in fact, one of the things I want to do next term is to go into Stockbridge and do a field survey because there are so many different styles of houses in Stockbridge itself, just in the main street there, that I think it's a very useful thing for them to identify the different ages of houses." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 132)

The English teachers appeared generally more conscious of their place in a long generation chain, and of the process of evolution and development that a people have undergone collectively. Part of the value, or relevance, of history was that it could provide a perspective:

> "We talk about the third world, places like Iraq for example, being underdeveloped in comparison with the Western half, whereas if we went back 3,000 years, we'd see that the shoe was on the other foot, that we were the third world with our stone age warriors roaming about, and the Assyrians had a magnificent empire which was the marvel of the world." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 130).

Perspective again, and the sense of interconnectedness, are seen in this reply to the question, "Can you say in a nutshell what your objective in teaching history is?"

> "I think it would be to make everybody realize as clearly as Isaac Newton did, how much they owe to people who went before them. He said, 'I can see further than people before me because I'm standing on their shoulders.' And as getting a lively sense of their own unimportance." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 209)

Factual Content

In this section we shall consider the subject matter contained within history lessons, and views about the nature of material that is considered important. The questionnaire reveals strong agreement on the desirability, in general terms, of the pupils' becoming acquainted with the traditional outline of their country's history. Ninety one per cent of the American and 75% of the English teachers agreed that, "Every student should know the main political and constitutional landmarks in the history of his own country." (Question 8) Although three quarters

of the English teachers agreed with this question, the majority was less overwhelming than in the case of the U.S. sample. The responses to questions 10 and 12 also suggest a lesser commitment to traditional coverage, and a greater concern for pupil interest among the U.K. teachers. Eleven per cent of the American but 28% of the English sample agreed that, "My students should study history for its romance and adventure rather than as an intellectual discipline," (Question 10), and a wider difference was seen in the response to the proposition that, "It does not matter what history my students study, as long as it interests them," (Question 12), where 17% of the American but 40% of the English teachers agreed. However, it is clear that among both groups a majority believed that history teaching should have a concern for content beyond simply the following of student interest.

On a more specific level different emphases emerged from the interviews. The American teachers appeared more concerned with the subject as a vehicle for training in socially and politically useful attitudes, tending to view the history lesson as a form of political education, whereas the English teachers appeared more concerned with the development of insight into and understanding of the past.

Frequently, the American teachers referred to the central importance of concepts and issues rather than facts:

> "Well, there's a certain amount of knowledge that they should get, I guess, but I'm really more concerned with attitudes. But I do think they need to have some basic knowledge of the founding of the country, the principles on which the government was built, and some of the key people and events in the shaping of the character of our country. But in terms of extensive detailed knowledge, probably not, because unless they happen to be historically oriented they're going to forget it anyway. I would rather try to impress on most of them attitudes, concepts. I'd rather they be aware of ethnocentricism and the danger of it, and what it can lead to, and maybe even see it in themselves a little bit, and at least be aware that it exists, and have a more positive attitude toward the world in which we are just a part." (High School.) (US 53).

The age of Jackson is referred to because of its importance in establishing democratic principles;

> "This man was the first man in our country who felt the common man, or the poor man, should have a place in our society you see." (Junior High.) (US 199)

The same teacher acknowledged the importance of dealing with controversial issues, and also his societal objectives, where traditionally chronological narrative had been followed:

> "It seems that today's society is so controversial, and if our main goal is to prepare students to meet the demands of society today, they have to have training in dealing with these issues in school." (Junior High.) (US 199)

The use of history as material essentially for the exploration of social science concepts of contemporary relevance was found even in the Elementary school, as described by this lecturer in Elementary education:

> "There are questions in the minds of a lot of people as to what is the appropriate place for history. My thoughts - and they are thoughts I got from someone else that made sense to me - are that may be the place for history is for us to decide what issue, what concepts we want to deal with. Then we should look and find out from historians what is the period of time in which this was really reflected. We did a second unit for the 2nd grade and the fellow who was our consultant is a historian. We said to him, 'What is a really good time when we could deal with how a group handles deviant behaviour', so he said he thought the Salem witchcraft period. Another time was when the Puritans came over, that was a stable group, so we picked the Puritan group and tried to read ourselves, so we had a background knowledge. To me that is the place of history. You say what it is you want and find a period which really reflects that issue you want to deal with." (US 255)

However, the cultural heritage view of the value of history teaching was also expressed by some American teachers, though relatively rarely, and usually by teachers in Junior High or Elementary schools:

> "I think we have felt the need to downgrade the amount of knowledge that we've offered students because we have other battles to win in the area of curriculum. But I think the standpoint of, for the lack of a better expression I'd call it cultural metaphor - any intelligent, participating student in our society has to know certain kinds of things about our country's past just to be at ease in his culture." (Junior High.) (US 211)

This feeling was repeated by an Elementary school principal, re-inforced by patriotic and ancestral pride:

> "I think basically we have to feel that America's a great country and we have to give this background to the kids, that we do have ancestors that we can be proud of, and we can have inventors and presidents and what have you, that are people that gave us a heritage, so to speak." (Elementary School.) (US 308)

Another Elementary school principal also asserted the importance of some general background in American history seeing it as the repository of cultural identity, though again it is belief that he sees as the essential element in this identity:

> "I think it is very important that the values and the way we live, the things we believe in are all based upon historical development as it evolved through the years." (Elementary school.) (US 234)

One approach to Elementary school social studies teaching found in a number of school districts is the concentric circles approach, taking the child, his school, and neighbourhood as the starting point, and working out towards the state, nation, and the wider world. This was perhaps the closest resemblance observed to an English environmental studies, child centred, form of teaching, and also the point at which most attention was given to local history, but generally history does not appear to figure prominently in such schemes:

> "Since I've been in this district we have not stressed history in the Elementary school, it has been picked up at Junior High School, where they immediately start with some history courses. I have a personal bias, I think we need to do a little bit more in the area of history. I don't know whether we want to do any more formal studies, but I don't think you can really talk about Missouri without dealing with the history of Missouri. I think it's ingrained. You can't talk about St. Louis without talking about Pierre Chandeau and Laclede, and those people who started it, and why it started, and we can't visit the riverfront without bringing in the importance of the Mississippi River throughout the years." (Elementary) (US 234)

During a discussion on environmental studies, one Elementary school principal observed that in the United States it was a concept more identified with science and the physical world than the social studies:

> "We are still at a point of trying to get the kids to realize there are factors that influence man, but in a particular locality we go more through environmental science than through social studies - we are trying to develop an awareness of the world around us through the sciences more than we do in social studies. We divorce the two - a separate entity." (US 264)

Interviews with the English teachers reveal immediately the controlling influence of the structure and organisation of the educational system (see Chapter 1) in two ways. First, many pupils drop history altogether after year two in the secondary school, and for those

who continue it, the course is largely shaped by an external examining body at C.S.E., G.C.E. 'O' or 'A' level. This means that from secondary year three onwards, all pupils studying history are in some sense specialists which is not the case in the U.S.A., and this difference alone may be expected to be responsible for a difference of approach. Certainly from year three onwards most English teachers adopt an 'in depth', or topical approach, and frequently assert that this is determined by the exigencies of the examination syllabus. However, within these limits there is still considerable freedom for selection and emphasis of content that is judged to be important.

On the basis of the interviews obtained, there is clearly a wide range of personal preference as to the content of teaching material judged to be of importance, and some teachers would regard personal interest alone as sufficient reason for teaching any topic or period in history. Yet some broad constraints emerge which seem to be accepted in some measure as limiting the teacher's freedom of choice of content. Some of these were found to be present in the responses of the American teachers also, notably the need for pupils to acquire some sense of cultural background, but others appeared to be more characteristic of the English teachers. The most prominent of the latter appeared to be the desirability for pupils to grasp the considerable extent of change that has occurred throughout the length of history, and the need to gain some sense of perspective on time, the desirability of some insight into the character and feelings of ages distant from the present, and some awareness of underlying trends of significance. There seemed to be less attempt to use history to develop desirable attitudes or habits of mind, and less identification of the subject with the study of government and the promotion of social order.

We shall consider these constraints limiting the teacher's freedom of choice, in turn, beginning with the need for cultural background. There appeared to be in the minds of many of the English teachers still an attachment to the notion of history as a body of received information containing the essence of our national development, and contributing to a sense of national and cultural identity. The strong measure of agreement to Question 8, previously referred to, confirms this. Although teachers vary considerably in what they would consider essential, there was some unease at the thought of sacrificing the familiar milestones. The strength of the cultural heritage idea

is seen in this comment;

> "I used to say, as long as they got certain things out of it like interest and knowledge and skills, it didn't matter what they did, but I wonder. That integrated studies (previously referred to) makes me think, you know. For example, one of the topics they chose was a bushman of the Kalahari Desert. Well ... I mean ... you know ... I really do feel ... I'm sorry to sound so square about this, that Roman civilization has got something ... (Sixth Form College.) (UK 24)

This response is in the same vein:

> "My father looked at the syllabus and said to me, 'There's nothing on the Civil War!', I said, well you don't need to do that, what we're teaching them is understanding and using their analytical skills, so it doesn't matter what we teach. We can teach Buddhism, so long as it develops their historical skills. He said, 'Do you mean they come out of the schools .....?' It's as if one important segment that makes them up is missing. How do they relate? You know. I used to say it doesn't matter, just study, but personally I like to know about these things. Whether it's relevant to all children, I don't know, but it would certainly be my wish to know about these things." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 69)

In both these cases there lies an assumption of a body of orthodox historical knowledge, probably derived from a traditional specialist historical education, which the teachers had received, and which, it was felt, an educated Englishman ought to possess. When compared with the American teachers on the same subject, i.e. history as cultural heritage, it was noticeable that the English teachers appeared to adopt a more neutral standpoint when contemplating their own past, perceiving it as made up of an evolving pageant of light and shade with less tendency to seek reassurance about values, beliefs, and ways of life.

The next constraint commonly accepted by the English teachers in their selection of subject content, is that it should contribute to the pupils' understanding of the great extent of change that has occurred during the course of human history. Clearly, these teachers were more sensitive to the sheer quantity of historical material on their own country available for study, stretching back more than two thousand years. In the U.S.A., great though the changes have been, the time scale is naturally much shorter, and it appears that these American teachers were less sensitive to the evolutionary quality of history. In Britain, the element of contrast between one age and another is sharper, and

there are more ages in the time scale to start with, as seen in this comment, admittedly from an area where prehistory was particularly in evidence:

> "I like to compare this with a day in fact, where man has been here I think for one hour of 365 days. I like to bring in the dinosaurs, things like that. I find this is something which creates a lot of imagination in kids. Perhaps people who say it's not important to look at the Stone Age are ignoring the fact that children don't see things in that sense, they don't look at the Stone Age and think, 'O, you know, that's four thousand years ago, nothing to do with me.' Its just as every bit to do with them as something from their own century." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 126)

Medieval history, generally treated in a perfunctory manner in the U.S., is defended on the same grounds of the value of contrast, and stimulus to the imagination:

> "I think young people ought to know something of what life was like in the Middle Ages, and the changes that came about in the Seventeenth Century. There are some very exciting centuries from the point of view of the history of maths and science, and astronomy." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 18)

This teacher also stressed awareness of change and development as one of his objectives:

> "The purpose of doing things is really to get kids to set themselves in a time perspective. I would hope this would look forward as well as backward, that they would realise that one day they would be in the past in a particular century." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 126)

Associated with an awareness of change in history as a knowledge objective in the minds of the English teachers, is the value of insight into and understanding of the nature of a distant age, and an appreciation of the feelings of those who lived at that time:

> "It's not essential that they know about the Tudors and Stuarts, or the Middle Ages. What is important, I think, is that they should get ideas about how different people lived at different times, and get some insight into human nature which basically has never changed." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 63)

The same idea is expressed by another teacher in the same school:

"The thing I'm concerned with is first, their being able to understand other people's points of view through the fact that the past is different from the present and we need to reach the past and take on the role of peoples in the past. By that I mean they become much more tolerant of others' views." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 47)

The more distant periods of history are seen to have this particular attraction, which was not commented upon by the American teachers:

"Medieval history is so totally different from our own age that it may help to give them an insight into how people lived at a different time, with a totally different set of standards and values, which may in itself be useful." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 125)

The length of British history can help to promote a sense of insignificance in the present generation, as this Primary teacher noted:

"I always concentrate on human relationships I imagine, rather than events, trying to convey to the children a sense of humility perhaps, in that we're all here for such a fleeting time really." (Primary.) (UK 210)

The third constraint observed in the attitudes of the English teachers was the need for their pupils to be made aware of important and significant trends in the past, in general rather than in factual terms. This depends to a considerable extent on the teacher's own perception of what is important and significant, and there was a tendency for teachers to work backwards from the present in their assessment of what was significant in the past. Trends, in other words, tended to be selected in terms of contemporary relevance:

"Well, I think in the Nineteenth Century you learn exactly where our society was founded. Although you can stretch the tentacles way back, I think it's the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries that the clashes which are going on at the moment were really founded. It's in the period eighteen eighties to nineteen thirties that the clash between collectivism and individualism is fought out isn't it?" (Sixth Form College.) (UK 3)

A different selection of important items was made by a colleague at the same school:

"I think the Fifteenth Century, the period of discoveries, the late Elizabethan period, the Seventeenth Century, and then the industrialization of the Nineteenth Century and what I would call the inadvertant city of the Twentieth Century. This is the sort of Frankenstein's monster that is presenting great problems." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 18)

One teacher expressed satisfaction that, though facts had been forgotten the essentials of a period in terms of fundamental developments, had been remembered:

> "Many years ago we did Tudor and Stuart history in the second year because this is where it came chronologically in the coverage, and then we did Tudor and Stuart history for 'O' level. And I was rather shattered - I'm talking about quite bright classes now - at the amount of detail that they had forgotten between the second and the fourth year, but I was rather pleased that they had remembered the underlying trends." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 146)

Generally, and naturally enough, emphasis on themes seems characteristic of the more mature approach to teaching history associated with older pupils.

The Hero Figure

The place occupied by the hero figure in history teaching has been selected for analysis in this chapter on knowledge because of the hero's special importance in revealing the values and ideals of the society that acknowledges his heroic quality. If it is possible to discover individuals who are recognized as deserving of admiration, and perhaps emulation, then one may be entitled to deduce from the lives of these figures those qualities which that society seeks, through the teaching about its own past, to foster in each rising generation. Accordingly, one concern in both questionnaire and interview, was to discover the attitude of both groups of teachers to the place of the hero figure, or conversely, the villain, in their teaching. Further, the intention was to discover whether widely accepted hero figures did exist, and if so, whether they indicated any significant differences about the way each group perceived its own nationality and national experience.

The conclusion that can be stated with the greatest confidence here is that in both countries the hero is in demise. With the exception of a few Primary teachers, the general rule appeared to be a guarded and sceptical approach to the selection of any individuals for elevation to the status of hero, certainly in the sense of a figure deserving of universal admiration. Where such figures were acknowledged they tended to be explorers, military men, inventors, sportsmen, or adventurers of various kinds, people exhibiting qualities of bravery, courage, or

resourcefulness, and not raising controversial social, political, or religious issues. However, reformers were an exception to this. It is evidence of the egalitarian ideals of both countries that figures such as Lincoln, Shaftesbury, Martin Luther King Jr., and Florence Nightingale, are accepted as heroes because of their efforts on behalf of the weak and downtrodden against the strong and powerful.

The questionnaire reveals some disagreement among both groups about the importance to be attached to famous figures. In response to the question "My students should learn about the history of ordinary people rather than about the famous", 50% of the American teachers agreed, and 48% of the English teachers, with a fairly high proportion of non-respondents in both cases, 14% and 19% respectively. Such a response, even after allowing for the ambiguities of the words 'famous', and 'ordinary', suggests that both groups were almost equally divided amongst themselves about the importance of teaching about prominent figures.

Three aspects of this question of the hero figure will be discussed, commencing with the hero as romantic figure, the centre of drama and excitement. Consistent with the greater willingness of the U.K. teachers to accept interest alone as a valid criterion for historical study, referred to earlier in the chapter, the English teachers referred far more frequently during the interviews to the motivation value of the study of an exciting story, in fact there was not a single comment from an American which suggested this as the main reason for the study of individuals.

Many of the English teachers relished the appeal to their pupils, and one suspects to themselves, of "men that are bigger than life", (11-16 Comprehensive) (UK 147), this particular one acknowledging at the same time that there were, "an awful lot of people who are significant whom I hardly even mention, like Karl Marx, for instance." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 147). Even at sixth form level the romantic appeal of the famous individual was acknowledged:

> "What really appeals to me in history is the drama of human behaviour, the drive for power ... which was so important in periods where power rested with a very small handful of people. And within that context, I do find that historical personalities fascinate me." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 19)

The same teacher reflected upon the psychological aspects of the study of the hero:

"I think hero worship is very important because we all have heroes. The tremendous popularity of professional football today is based entirely on hero worship, the whole pop scene. The worship of the individual or the group is an intrinsic part of human nature." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 19).

Again;

"I don't think there's anything very much wrong with making history in lots of cases into a bit of a romance. I think when someone is older they can see beyond the romance of it, but I think quite often there's a place for it, and I think through the personalities you can convey quite a lot." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 53)

Perhaps one would expect that the romantic aspects of history would appeal most strongly to those teaching younger pupils, and here also the moral precepts associated with heros tend to be more apparent. As one primary teacher expressed it;

"We moralize a tremendous amount to children, and I think it not wrong to use the lives of famous people to illustrate the moral principles perhaps that we're trying to put over. And to that extent I don't think there's much wrong with looking at the traditional primary school subjects, Florence Nightingale, Churchill perhaps." (Primary.) (UK 216)

When asked what other individuals might be placed in this category, he continued;

"Well, the boys love to be stimulated by tales of heroes and though I often find it difficult to equate the valour of the Duke of Wellington with virtue when I find that he always operated miles behind the lines, I have a reluctance to tell them that kind of thing, although I do because I know they enjoy it. I think there is enjoyment in history, especially the blood and thunder aspect of it, for little boys." (Primary.) (UK 216)

None of the U.S. teachers, even in the elementary schools, spoke about the romantic aspect of the activity of individuals.

Several of the English teachers commented on the value of the hero figure in sustaining an exciting narrative, for example;

"I like to tell stories as vividly as possible and nothing makes for a better story than a really good hero or villain." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 40),

and;

"I like telling the story of the forty five rebellion for example, and the story of Mary Queen of Scots. Good stories like that, well told, have a certain fascination." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 182)

It was felt also by some that an individual provided a more natural focus of interest and attention than other forms of historical content, such as events or ideas:

> "By studying somebody, some sort of figure, they do retain some information and there seems to be some sort of understanding, not just a series of notes about concepts and events ... in fact I make up my own. If I have to deal with something like Sparta, I make up a figure and make him true to life. I don't know whether that's history or not!"(11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 71).

A Primary school Head saw the attention to heroes as an extension of the child's search for a parent figure:

> "A parent sets a certain pattern if there's the right relationship between parent and family. And I think with prominent figures of the past, and the present incidentally too, children tend to want to have certain foundations that they can build their lives upon." (Primary.) (UK 224)

This leads to the second aspect of this subject to be discussed, which is the place of the hero as the repository of the ideals and aspirations of the society that recognizes his heroic quality. As already noted, among both groups there was a marked reluctance to stress the teaching of prominent individuals except among some of the English teachers, who appreciated their excitement value, and, where individuals were mentioned, a particular reluctance to ascribe to them heroic status. Among both groups there was a frequently expressed inclination to diminish traditional heroes, and to point out their human weaknesses:

> "There seems to be a craving for the anti-hero, and it's really amazing, they don't want to hear about George Washington, or Abraham Lincoln particularly." (Junior High.) (US 200)

George Washington especially, it seems, is not what he was.
An Elementary school principal commented that;

> "Washington had not much feeling for the common man. He was an aristocrat, he didn't believe in letting people vote unless they had a good deal of property." (Elementary.) (US 273)

Kennedy too is finding it difficult to maintain his charisma intact, even before the recent disclosures:

> "I think people look to Kennedy as being a hero, but then you get all the dirt like, 'did you really know that he did such and such?' So we kind of dirty our heroes as we put them up on the pedestal." (Junior High.) (US 120)

These feelings are clearly paralleled in the comments of the English teachers. A Comprehensive teacher said that she would deal with John Newton, Wilberforce and the slave trade, and also Shaftesbury:

> "At the same time, I would certainly tell them about Shaftesbury that Queen Victoria sniffed and said, 'He can't even look after his own children properly!' You know, I try to get a balanced view on things. I don't go in for, what's the fancy word - hagiography - saints on pedestals. I like them to try and see that people have got clay feet." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 103)

Another spoke in much the same vein about Richard the Lion Heart and King John:

> "Well, obviously if you study the Crusades you talk about Richard the Lion Heart, I mean this is where you talk about personalities, because personalities are interesting to children. But the idea of him being a great hero figure is a lot of immature eyewash really, he was a pretty nasty bit of work. Bring out some of the things he did and get them to work out their own conclusions. Or the bad King John idea, when basically there was very little difference in their personalities, and the sort of outlook they had." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 65)

The sophistication of children today was noted by a third Comprehensive teacher who commented on their ability to accept a hero whilst also recognizing his clay feet, "And then realizing that it's all shades of grey really." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 40). A Sixth Form College teacher felt that the achievements of individuals deserved recognition, but that historical heroes often exemplified unattractive qualities:

> "I select people because they exhibit certain qualities or did certain things. The superb engineering of the Nineteenth Century with Brunel, for example, or Edward IV because he pulled government together. But I don't find any people with heroism writ large as it were, because you see what makes heroes in the history books are often the qualities I don't like in human beings - militarism, aggression, cruelty, cunning. If you look back on so called historical heroes, they're a shocking lot aren't they?" (Sixth Form College.) (UK 20)

The word 'hero' implies admiration, and clearly an acknowledgement by a society of particular hero figures implies the widespread recognition by that society of the qualities which that figure is thought to exemplify. One reason for the demise of the hero would

therefore seem to be the lack of concensus in contemporary society, in both the U.S.A. and Great Britain, about values and ideals which are widely regarded as deserving of assent. It is true that there may be concensus on the level of basic, and individual, qualities of physical courage, endurance, and so on, which probably accounts for the continued recognition of explorers and adventurers in both groups. However, when one moves into the realm of religion or politics this concensus is more difficult to find. There would appear to be a general egalitarian ethos prevailing in both countries, which permits major social reformers like Shaftesbury or Jane Addams to be granted a certain respect, despite their clay feet, but the gods in each national pantheon are many fewer and smaller than they used to be, even if, indeed, they exist at all. Military heroes seem more ambiguous than they were, and political figures like Oliver Cromwell, Lloyd George, Abraham Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt, are too controversial to be universally accepted.

An English teacher of Classical history observed;

> "It's probably easier with ancient personages than modern ones, because they (the pupils) have no preconceived ideas, probably they've never even heard of them before, and so if you approach it in a low key way, and avoid bulling somebody up as being 'a great man', or 'the worst thing that ever happened to the Mediterranean area', you can be fairly dispassionate." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 206)

With reference to more modern figures, this comment of an American Elementary teacher seems relevant to both countries;

> "If you asked a sixth grade kid about heroes you won't get the heroes we once had - their heroes are Bobby Orr, Bob Gibson, football figures, Neil Armstrong - your space figures - the whole idea of heroes has changed from the historical, political hero." (Elementary.) (US 273)

Among the American teachers the divisions in society were more explicitly acknowledged than among the English. There seems little doubt that recent events in American public life, which have stressed local, cultural, and ethnic bonds at the expense of the sense of national community, have had their impact on the educational system. The problem is present in both countries but it appears to take different forms in each. In the U.S. divisions appear to be mainly along cultural, ethnic, and to some extent, regional, lines, whereas in Britain they appear to be more along class, and ideological, lines with regional differences not clearly discernible in the sample studied. Possibly a sample drawn from Scotland or Wales would create a wholly different impression.

The American dilemma is here stated at its simplest;

> "Being a public school we have the problem all the time that there are groups in our society that have different conceptions of who these people ought to be that we hold up for people to emulate, but we do try to look at as many of them as possible." (Junior High.) (US 213)

The same point is made here;

> "Frequently we do a unit on heroes and villains. We deal with both historical and current heroes and villains, and the problem is that some people see heroes as villains and some people see villains as heroes. I don't think it is the teacher's place to say ... it is the teacher's position to help the student discover for himself what his values are, so he can evaluate the acts and positions." (Junior High.) (US 144)

Another Junior High school teacher makes the same point:

> "I think in certain cultures there are new heroes, such as Martin Luther King among the blacks. There are certain Chicanos that have become famous, certain Indians such as those at Wounded Knee, that are current heroes ... I think we have our sports heroes ... but as for past historical heroes, I don't think the kids have too much sympathy with them at all." (Junior High.) (US 169)

A High school teacher suggested looking for specific qualities, rather than individuals;

> "I don't think we set up a person as the universal man. But I do think we look for qualities in many people that are qualities worthy of consideration for emulation. I don't think we pick out one or two people and everyone should model themselves after this pattern. But through a variety of people - Mahatma Gandhi for example - there are values, human values, to emulate in him." (High School.) (US 58)

Among the English teachers, this problem of the ambiguous nature of the hero was not as widely recognized, though there was the familiar disclaimer of any moral purpose behind the teaching about individuals which, in practice, makes the title 'hero' impossible to apply:

> "It may well be that they do sort of come to some conclusion of figures as hero or villain, but that should be as a result of their own consideration of the evidence." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 76)

Some also recognized the values implicit in the vocabulary used to describe individuals, which can often indicate more effectively than any teacher's comments, the moral status of the person in question, particularly where

words like 'dictator' or 'tyrant' are used. The absence of dictators in English history, as taught by English teachers, is striking, the word clearly being reserved for our enemies:

> "Roosevelt was by no means a dictator, but we sort of come out strongly that he might well have been a Socialist, and if you can show me a textbook which says that Roosevelt was a Socialist I would be pleased to see it." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 206)

Significantly, perhaps, the comment of an English teacher. The provisional nature of such judgments of individuals was also noted:

> "It's going to be interesting to see, shall we say in ten years time, to what extent people like Mao Tse Tung and Ho Chi Minh are regarded as heroes." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 203)

The third aspect of the study of the hero figure is one which arises from differing perceptions of the nature of history itself. A long running argument in historiography is the men versus movements argument, between those who see events as shaped essentially by individuals of particular stature, the 'great man' school, and those who, usually influenced by Marxist interpretation, see underlying, impersonal forces, especially economic forces, as the major causes of change. The concern of the Twentieth Century for the common man has combined with the 'movements' school to further contribute to the decline of the hero, who is obviously closely identified with the 'great man' interpretation. Many remarks in the interviews with the English teachers reveal a concern for the masses, and for society, as a more significant subject for historical study than selected individuals, who are often identified with an older, and more elitist, view of the subject.

It might be considered surprising, in view of the self consciously egalitarian traditions of the U.S.A., that this feeling was not expressed nearly as frequently by the American teachers. Perhaps the explanation lies in the intensely individual, as well as egalitarian, ideal, and the failure of Marxist, determinist, attitudes to gain a significant foothold in that society. Two English sixth form teachers expressed the philosophical aspects of this collective, mass, approach. When asked whether he dealt largely with major figures in the past,

the first replied;

> "No, not really. It seems to me that when you teach history, you're showing how a society moves along a certain road, and at all sorts of points it has a fork in the road, and because of where it has come from, it takes one fork rather than another, and that means its future choices are governed by the choices it has made in the past, and I tend to see it in these terms. I find my teaching is very influenced by my reading of Hegel." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 4)

That comment allows society a large degree of choice in shaping its destiny, while a more determinist outlook is seen in the next reply;

> "I'm working on Oliver Cromwell at the moment, and discussing his strengths and weaknesses, this kind of thing. But at the same time I do go for the school where more impersonal forces control history and destiny, I must say ..... I do tend to stress movements like the price revolution, or like the religious problem, rather than individuals. I mean individuals come into the story, but I do tend to stress what I call these imprisoning factors." (Sixth Form College.) (UK 28)

In selecting individuals for study, some English teachers chose representative figures who stood for a whole class or category of people in society:

> "I would like to see the study of type personalities, I mean things like, say, a nobleman, because they can see differences much more clearly between persons .... I would like to study individuals as representative personalities, that's something which they can grasp." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 48)

The feeling that children need an individual to relate to, but that the individual is really of significance only because of his membership of a wider group, is expressed again here:

> "I find that they are just as interested in finding out about Mr. Anybody, a medieval merchant, as they are about Florence Nightingale. You know, the anonymous figures seem to mean just as much to them as the actual personalities, with the exception of people who stick out like Hitler, and Napoleon." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 128)

These words of the lecturer in American Elementary education may be allowed to sum up the current attitudes towards the hero among these teachers in both countries:

"I was reading an elementary curriculum recently, where the critic said there were no heroes - that the only hero was the common man - and this fellow wrote back to the man who had written it and said how delighted he was by the critic. That was who he wanted the hero to be." (US 256)

More frequent were the comments which suggested an impersonal concern with social groups or classes:

"I try to exclude it, [the study of individuals], almost totally from the industrial revolution course in the third year. There are four thousand people working in this factory, and I am more concerned with them at this stage than I am with a parliamentary figure or something, except when someone almost too important - William the Conqueror you just cannot ignore." (11-18 Comprehensive.) (UK 62)

Similarly;

"We're doing a lot more getting down to how the ordinary person lived - Then and There are pretty good - life in a particular village, which the kids like and we go down to the basics of pastimes, life of, and we do try and get it down to actual people if we possibly can." (11-16 Comprehensive.) (UK 157)

A very different approach to the study of groups can be seen in the remarks of the lecturer quoted above. Instead of an appreciation of the lives of ordinary people, their living conditions, pastimes, and so on, she was concerned even at 2nd grade level with a study of how society operated:

"The 2nd grade theme was the functioning of groups. The unit we wrote was entitled 'How Groups Function'. We created a group and different concepts, sociological concepts we were trying to develop around membership and role conflict that involved roles of various people. We created a group that were going off to Venus - a futuristic model, ...
Our overall goal was to have the 2nd graders develop a more knowledgeable concept of a functioning group, secondly, of the kind of conflict that can occur within a group. .....
One of the characters was a doctor, one was a scientist wanting to get specific research information. The conflict occurred when the doctor said the health of the people was being affected by the project. That is our primary goal. We spend a number of lessons establishing the characters, what their goal was, so that before a teacher would move to the next activity she would have been able to observe the behaviour of the learner which would have told her whether or not he was ready for the next stage." (US 252)

A further example of the behavioural approach to the study of man in the American schools, the stress on mankind collectively, and on

an almost anthropological approach to the study of society, rather than of individuals within it, is the social studies programme, "Man: A Course of Study". (1) This was developed as an exploration of the nature of modern man, and was produced by an American team directed by Peter B. Dow, who worked closely with Jerome S. Bruner and others. Its working was described by an Elementary teacher who was using the materials:

> "It proposed to answer three questions. What is human about man? How did he get that way? How can he be made more so? Now to do this they compare the life cycles of four organisms, salmon, herring gulls, baboons, and the Netsilik Eskimos .... It starts off with the salmon and talks about the life cycle, then it compares the life cycle of the salmon with that of the herring gull, and all the time moving up the evolutionary chain, because of course the herring gull is a more complex animal and also has a more structured family group than the salmon did, because of course the salmon has none at all. Then it moves on to baboons which have a highly structured troop organization and family interdependence, and the fact that the young of the baboon are dependent on the adults for quite a long period of time. And then of course it moves on the Netsilik Eskimos where the young have quite a lengthy dependency period. I think that's probably the basic assumption of the course, the fact that there are these differences, and it goes into the things that do make a man human, and how he is different from these other animals." (US 220)

Approaches such as these are concerned with the common elements within societies and with the features of mankind that are shared by all groups, including sometimes animal species. They stress the universal characteristics of man, and his collective behaviour in response to conditioning and environment. They suggest a different concept of education, and of the nature of man from a course which places emphasis upon the importance of individual human achievement.

This survey of knowledge objectives of the two groups of teachers has shown certain significant differences in the way they approach history teaching. The English teachers were much more inclined to stress imaginative appeal, and the qualities of drama, adventure, and excitement which they felt a study of history could and should provide.

They valued pupil interest highly as a criterion for the selection of content, and did not see this as incompatible with teaching children to understand contemporary society. They stressed contrast and awareness of change as the most valuable contributions history could make towards an understanding of the present. The Americans were more inclined to stress attitudes, concepts, and useful information. Though some English teachers found the study of individuals useful as a means of stimulating interest, neither group was inclined to rate the study of heroes highly, preferring to place the emphasis on ordinary people and men in the mass. The English teachers placed a heavier stress on locality and environment and found this also a useful stimulus to the pupils' imagination. However, they were not, as a group, inclined to follow the personal interest criterion exclusively. They were concerned that pupils should develop an awareness of the time scale of history and the extent of the historical change that had taken place so that the present could be seen in its proper perspective.

When these knowledge objectives are related to the original hypothesis, it can be seen that the English teachers showed strong concern for history as imaginative personal experience, which is consistent with humanistic objectives. There were no comments from the American teachers to support that view of history, but there were a good number in favour of history for contemporary relevance, which is consistent with societal objectives. This study of knowledge objectives therefore tends to confirm the hypothesis.

Chapter Three - References

1. Man: A Course of Study. Cambridge Mass: Educational Development Centre, 1968.

Chapter Four - Values

> "America relative to all other branches of Western civilization, is moralistic, and 'moral conscious.' The ordinary American is the opposite of a cynic. He is on the average more of a believer and a defender of the faith in humanity than the rest of the occidentals. It is a relatively important matter to him to be true to his own ideals and to carry them out in actual life. We recognize the American wherever we meet him as a practical idealist." (1)

So wrote Gunnar Myrdal in The American Dilemma in 1944. This chapter will investigate the role of values in the teaching of the two sets of teachers in an attempt to discover whether the American history teacher is a "practical idealist" in the classroom, and how he compares with his English counterpart in this respect. It will inquire whether the teachers sought to shape their pupils' attitudes and behaviour, and if so in what direction. It will seek to discover the extent to which their teaching was influenced by controversial issues, and the extent to which it was detached from them. This will provide further insight into the teacher's ultimate purpose, and be additional indication of whether he is following essentially societal or humanistic objectives.

It will be shown that although both groups claimed to be teaching from a standpoint of moral neutrality, the Americans showed a greater tendency to abandon this ideal in practice on issues where they felt their society to be particularly threatened. It will therefore provide further confirmation of the hypothesis that American history teaching is concerned with social relevance, or societal objectives, and English history teaching with personal development, or humanistic objectives.

The values with which we are presently concerned are essentially those relating to social behaviour, the relationships between one individual and another, between groups in society, and between the individual and the government. A convenient concept on which to focus discussion of these issues is that of citizenship. Though this was a word not greatly used by the English teachers, it includes topics such as the working of the political and legal system, and some reference to

social problems, which sometimes come within history courses. In the U.S.A. citizenship has been an important element in social studies teaching for many years. The ideal of responsible democratic citizenship as an objective for history teaching was accepted by both groups. Eighty nine per cent of the American and 72% of the English teachers agreed that, "History should help students to become responsible democratic citizens." (Question No 33)

However "responsible democratic citizenship" is a concept that has undergone considerable change over the years. One Elementary school teacher said that it used to mean a secure grounding in the belief that America was best. Thus it appears that in the United States citizenship varies according to the needs of the hour. Fundamentally, to the American teachers of the nineteen seventies, it appeared to be concerned with the problem of reconciling conflicting ethnic groups, political views, religious beliefs, and economic interests into a single society in which none could feel themselves to be oppressed. Instead of an attempt to mould all these different elements into a homogeneous whole, with a single resulting set of orthodox ideas and beliefs, the emphasis appeared to be on the attempt to accommodate all the differences in a united but diverse society. These problems have contributed to a feeling among teachers in the United States that there are no absolutes where social and political issues are concerned, and that the task of the social studies teacher should be to foster tolerance and understanding of every kind of difference.

It was much less easy to determine key issues of citizenship in the minds of the English teachers. This may reflect the fact that British society in recent years has experienced fewer tensions and divisions than American. However, when the disputes over comprehensive education, industrial relations, immigration restriction, the common market, and nationalization are recalled this seems to be an unlikely explanation. It appears more likely that English history teachers do not take account of such things as a formal, integral, part of their teaching. Instead, teaching in the area loosely described as citizenship was more likely to take the form of descriptive accounts of the working of the political system mostly at national level but perhaps with some

reference to local government. Issues such as pollution, the housing shortage, and urban crime would not normally be dealt with by history staff.

One American social studies educationist who has been concerned with the problem of teaching values in a plural society, and whose influence could be seen in social studies High school courses, was Donald W. Oliver of the Graduate School of Education at Harvard. Oliver advocates a 'social conflict' approach to the problem of the selection of content in social studies, arguing that in modern, pluralistic, American society, conflict is inevitable, and that the control of conflict is the basic problem that such a multi-value society faces. He asserts (2) that in such a society we cannot define with certainty the way to either 'truth' or 'happiness' for all men, and therefore he rejects an ideology of 'the good life', based on love and harmony as 'either overtly or covertly' an objective of the education system. Instead he argues for a study of 'immediate and future conflict situations', in order that the value positions of the contending parties may be brought out and made explicit, and the conflict more readily contained within the bounds of a rational, ordered, society. Thus the objective of a course becomes value clarification, rather than value imposition. This ninth grade teacher described the operation of such a course:

> "We give them a case study and they begin by recognizing what the problem is, stating the issue, asking the questions, and then deciding for themselves what they think the answer to the question is. They are usually questions which have a value conflict underlying them. The students come to recognize what this value conflict is and to verbalize it. One of the more controversial ones, because of the Vietnamese war has been in the booklet called Religious Freedom, and the students are faced with a problem. They are asked to put themselves in the place of a Roman governor, senator, or what have you, and decide what to do about these Christians, because here is a group within their confines which refuses to be drafted, refuses to fight. They don't believe in fighting because they don't believe in killing. At the same time Rome is under attack from the Parthians in the east, the barbarians in the north etc. What do you do with these people? Then you come to the United States today and ask the same question. A lot of people say that the United States, the free world etc. are all in jeopardy, and here are these people who again refuse to fight because they don't believe in killing. What do we do with them? Well, we find that when we are discussing it within the conflict of the Christians and the Roman Empire, the sympathy is all on the side of the Christians, regardless of the fact

> of whether or not the Roman Empire was at stake. They have no vested interest in it, they don't care if it survives or not. But when you come to the present time, instead of being on the side of religious freedom where they were before, they are on the side of national security today. There is something inconsistent there though the principle is the same. Why were they on the side of religious freedom 2,000 years ago and national security today? Thus they are caught off guard. This is how the curriculum works. They have come to recognize that they value both religious freedom and national security, and they are in the process of constructing a hierarchy, of recognizing that one of these values is going to give way when it is in conflict with another value. We are helping them to clarify their values, clarify their thinking, recognize their inconsistency, and to deal with it, and accept it at face value." (US 139)

There have, of course, been British curriculum development projects concerned with some of these issues. The Schools Council Humanities Curriculum Project (3), developed by Lawrence Stenhouse, is one. This is also concerned with value clarification, and casts the teacher in the role of neutral chairman, while the pupils, supposedly fifth year secondary leavers, undertake an enquiry into controversial but relevant topics such as work, education, the family, relations between the sexes, war, and race relations. The teacher's function is to provide the pupils with evidence on which to base their decisions, and assist them towards reaching a rational conclusion without intruding values of his own.

Whether or not they were consciously following any curriculum model, training in rational thinking in a classroom atmosphere of moral and ideological neutrality was accepted by most teachers in both groups as one of their primary objectives. Most of the interviews suggest a belief that the history teacher should train his pupils in the process of reasoned argument, making judgements based upon evidence, thinking for themselves, and that he should avoid any attempt to influence their thinking in any direction, which was seen as indoctrination. There are many comments from both groups which illustrate this view:

> "We feel that the students' attitudes should not be the result of emotional feelings, but that the attitudes he assumes should be based on a learning system that analyses, evaluates, and assesses what the facts are, and eliminates the emotion as much as possible." (High School) (US 33)

"I think it's no part of my role to impose any values whatsoever. Obviously, I have my own personal biasses, and I am in favour of people willingly accepting these qualities. So I would hope that as a result of being as objective as I can in the presentation of the material, they will come to their own conclusions that democracy, for example, is a good thing - you know, that given the evidence we have, a democratic way of life is superior to others. But I don't see it as any part of my role to tell them." (11-18 Comprehensive) (UK 77)

"We concentrate on getting the individual to make a decision based on something besides emotion. And we do this all year long in tenth grade, and it's very difficult because people like to make decisions based upon emotion." (High School) (US 90)

"I must admit that on any subject that is controversial in the modern world, I much prefer the children to make up their own minds. They often ask me for instance at election time, how I vote. I will never tell them. I'll tell them what I think are the good points of the political parties, and say to them, 'make up your own minds'." (Comprehensive) (UK 149)

Behind all these comments there is the assumption that the teacher's role should be that of a provider of factual information, and an overseer of the reasoning process, but that he should rigidly exclude his own point of view, and any form of moral or emotional colouring of issues. Emotion appears to be equated with prejudice, and indeed, one English teacher said that he consciously attacked what he called "The Alf Garnett attitude to things" since, "many children are Alf Garnetts". (UK 121). Clearly, Alf Garnett, with his violently emotional assertions of unsubstantiated and crudely articulated opinion, was regarded as the antithesis of an educated man. Though no American teacher referred to Archie Bunker, Garnett's U.S. equivalent, the impression was created that there also, it was this kind of prejudiced emotionalism that it was one of the main purposes of education to remove.

Thus among the teachers of both countries an important general principle applying to the teaching of all controversial issues under the general heading of citizenship was the principle of neutral inquiry, based upon evidence, so as to allow pupils to make up their minds in an informed way. Attitudes to specific issues will now be examined to see how far the principle of neutrality extends to these, in practice, and in order to do this, three aspects of the concept of citizenship will be considered.

First, and briefly, personal and individual aspects will be explored in order to discover the values which teachers expect to develop as the basis of their pupils' personal behaviour. Second, social aspects of citizenship will be discussed, those that pertain more to the relationships between large numbers of individuals and groups. Attention here will be focussed on the phrase, 'the democratic way of life', the limits to freedom within it, and the position of minority groups, especially racial minorities. Finally, political aspects of citizenship will be considered, those pertaining to the relationship between individuals and their government. Here attention will be focussed on attitudes towards the subject of democratic government vis à vis dictatorship, and towards war, which brings an individual up against the authority of his government in a direct and immediate way. These topics have been selected because they raise issues of fundamental importance to democratic societies, and have caused considerable public controversy in both countries in recent years. Therefore they may be expected to be subjects upon which teachers have definite views and which are likely to be a good test of their classroom neutrality.

Once again the questionnaire provides a useful starting point. Relevant to personal aspects of citizenship is item 16, 'History teaching should encourage my students to believe that all men are equal'. The responses to this question show a significant difference between the two groups and suggest that the neutral standpoint, so often proclaimed as the ideal, is in practice easily abandoned. Seventy three per cent of the American, but only 37% of the English teachers agreed that history teachers should encourage their students to believe that all men are equal. This was the second greatest margin of difference. Item 9 also showed the American teachers to be more in favour of using history to influence values, though the difference was not as great as with the previous question. Question 9 suggested that, 'History should not be taught with any kind of moral purpose'. This proposition was decisively rejected by a majority of Americans; only 24% agreed, while the English were more evenly divided, 40% agreeing. It may also be relevant here to refer to Appendix VII which shows that the Americans were more inclined to acknowledge a religious affiliation than the English. It is perhaps dangerous to infer a belief in moral purpose in history teaching from admitted religious affiliation, but it is to be noted that 10 English respondents recorded 'None' against the item

'religion' on the personal data sheet, whereas only 2 Americans did so. Also, 9 English teachers, but only 4 Americans made no response to this item, which suggests a greater indifference to religion on the part of the English.

This evidence would seem to suggest clearly that Myrdal is right and that the American teachers had a stronger tendency to use history to inculcate moral values than the English, despite the frequent assertions of value free inquiry, value clarification, and the like. It suggests a marked willingness on the part of the Americans to use history teaching as a vehicle for moral education, for instruction in the American creed of freedom and equality in particular, whilst claiming that it was done in an atomosphere of neutral inquiry. As will be shown, the interviews largely support this conclusion, though on certain issues the neutral stance was upheld more clearly than on others. The English teachers were more divided about whether moral purpose was desirable. About half the respondents to Question 9 were prepared to say that it was, but, as will be shown later, more of them than the Americans were prepared to acknowledge during the interviews that a value base existed and accept that it was desirable. It may be that the English teachers were less inclined to delude themselves that value free teaching was possible.

In discussing the personal aspects of citizenship, some of the American teachers showed a degree of confusion about the distinction between a good citizen and a good man. One High school teacher said, "Of course I see everything as promoting citizenship. Who was it, Socrates or Aristotle, or one of the Greeks, who said that the ideal of education was to make the good man?" (US 11), while another was at pains to point out that, "The Missouri curriculum guide states very clearly that we are to make good citizens. Now the word didn't say good people, it said good citizens, O.K.?" (US 167). In practice the distinction between personal virtue and civic virtue is difficult to make. Cheating was described by one teacher as an offence against society as well as the individual, while drug taking might be said to be a personal matter because the individual himself suffers the consequences of his own acts, or it might be said to be a social matter because it may lead to crime, claims upon the state's social security system, and so on. Certainly the latter was an issue which concerned

the American teachers frequently, and kept intruding into discussions on the objectives of social studies teaching. It was an issue also on which they felt justified in abandoning the principle of neutral inquiry. As one Junior High teacher said;

> "I think they need the opportunity to make up their own minds. I do think, however, that in something as dangerous as drugs, that you should maybe use a little of your influence if you have any on them." (US 188)

Generally it was personal behaviour, only insofar as it affected others, that these teachers expressed a concern for, and the most commonly expressed ideal, on the personal level of citizenship, was that all their students should have a respect for the dignity of the individual, a tolerance and respect for others, and a feeling of interdependence, as expressed by this Junior High teacher:

> "I'm really concerned with responsibility, probably more than anything, and of course respect for your fellow man. If the kids can learn this I feel that they come out of my class better people. If I had to say what is my major objective it's that the student comes out a better person than he went in. Then someone pins you down and says, what do you mean by a better person? I would have to say, one who assumes responsibility, one who respects the rights of his classmates, things of this nature." (US 203)

The emphasis on society, the individual as a social being, and the concern of American education with societal objectives, are again seen in this comment. The individual is seen in relation to others, and becoming a better person means becoming more respectful of the interests of others. The objective of the system is to produce individuals who fit well into the pattern of society and have a regard for the rights of others so that their own rights may be regarded. The ideal personality type is the tolerant personality, or democratic personality, as opposed to an authoritarian or leader type, or a subversive who seeks to change society. Another High School teacher re-iterates these points:

> "We in the social studies department are very concerned about our young citizens really understanding what it means to live in a democratic form of government. The kinds of responsibilities that the student will have when he becomes an active member of communities in our society. We also feel that they must understand our system, and our way of life adequately enough that they will be able to build upon what we have and perpetuate the free democratic society." (US 18)

The English teachers were largely silent on this subject, and there is no positive evidence that they thought very differently. However, all teachers had the same opportunities to discuss the issues, and the lack of discussion of this question, together with evidence elsewhere, may be taken to support the view of British education as more concerned with the private, mental development of the individual, and less with the production of good citizens.

We shall now continue to examine the wider, social aspects of citizenship, those aspects concerned with the relationships between individuals and groups, and here also we shall show that neutrality of values is illusory, and that in practice a particular value position is implicit in the attitudes of both groups, despite frequent claims to the contrary. Question 13, "The study of history should not lead people to believe that some ways of life are superior to others", produced an ambiguous response. Both groups showed themselves to be fairly evenly divided, 45% of the American and 53% of the English teachers agreed, suggesting that roughly half in each case were prepared to accept that pupils should be influenced to believe in the superiority of certain ways of life, at least when described in these vague and non specific terms.

Many American teachers acknowledged that they were basically approving of democratic principles and the democratic way of life, which they took to include such features as freedom of religion, freedom of speech and the press, and the rights of the common man, though this did not extend necessarily to approval of particular institutions. A High school teacher accepted that, "This is probably our major objective in our social studies department, and that is to perpetuate our democracy," (US 19) and a Junior High teacher agreed that, "part of our course is based on this idea that there is a rather loosely, commonly held set of values like tolerance, freedom, respect for private property, this kind of thing," but he continued to assert the Oliver, value clarification, orthodoxy, by saying;

> "We place the most emphasis where we can help a kid develop a criterion by which he might choose when these things are in conflict with one another, in any kind of sense, whether it's in historical perspective, or contemporary. We have found though, that with today's student and with society the way it is, that to try and indoctrinate a kid in to any one of these attitudes is not very productive." (US 214)

He also referred to, "a commitment to the democratic processes that we try to use in this country, a commitment to try to upgrade society", showing again the optimism about the socially ameliorative effects of education which many American teachers felt.

On this point the English teachers spoke in much the same terms. Without employing overt indoctrination, which was seen to be counter productive, many of them agreed that their teaching tended to support the prevailing system of democratic values:

> "I fall into a liberal bourgeois explanation of most things, that tends to be the thing I follow. It seems to be safest, I take a sort of humanitarian line if you like, that's what it seems to be, all peace and love and all that ... so in a sense I'm backing the general sort of morality that goes on." (UK 72)

This Comprehensive teacher's sentiments are much the same as those quoted from the Americans, though there are some interesting variations of vocabulary. 'Bourgeois', is not a term that rests easily on American tongues, and perhaps it is significant that this teacher looked specifically to the bourgeois system of values as providing the norm, rather than to the norms of society in general, which he may have felt did not exist in any uniform sense. He also used the words, 'humanitarian', and 'morality', rather than more overtly political words such as, 'freedom', 'democracy', and 'rights', which the Americans tended to use. There is a further suggestion here that the English look to custom and tradition where the Americans look to a creed.

Another Comprehensive teacher thought that his concern was with, "a social awareness, perhaps, rather than democracy, participation, that sort of thing", (UK 184) and a third said, "we don't actually say the democratic way of life is best, but I think its implicit." (UK 196) This lady made no apology for her attempt to influence her pupils' thinking in the right direction:

> "I say quite blatantly with the third years, this last week when we've been doing the welfare state and so on, I've jolly well pushed my point of view about being responsible and appreciating, and how we are as a community, and what things were like in the past, and it doesn't hurt them being a jolly bit grateful." (UK 107)

The relationship between freedom and law proved to be a particularly sensitive area to the American teachers, and especially

the question of the limits to legitimate means for promoting social change. There was a general feeling that respect for the law was an important element of citizenship, yet also a feeling that injustice should not be tolerated and that, in a participatory democracy, individuals, and especially minority groups, had the right to assert and defend their interests. It appears that the experiences of the sixties, the civil rights movement, the campus unrest, the anti-Vietnam war protest, have all left deep marks on the curriculum of most schools and the minds of most teachers.

Minorities

Not surprisingly, it was teachers from the minority groups who were most exercised about this problem. A Jewish Junior High school teacher spoke of the dilemma he felt when questions arose in which acceptance of the laws and leadership of the country involved a violation of conscience, such as the issue of slavery, or the problem of the German people who accepted Nazi measures because they were the law of the land. Despite his sympathy for the right of conscience to make its stand, he finally came out in his teaching on the side of law:

> "We deal with this all the time, and I'm influenced by it because I'm part of a minority group, and I do have feelings that this is a very important thing, and personally I like to think - let conscience dictate, but I really don't think I bring this out in class. I don't outweigh one over the other, I try not to, but you never know. I am also, however, a stickler for 'by the law', and I find trouble myself when we teach in these areas, because I definitely believe that you've got to go by the laws and bring about change in a peaceful way." (US 203)

A black High school teacher took the same line in defence of obedience to the law. He believed that freedom had become debased in the minds of many of his students into license, because of the experiences of the past decade, where resistance to law had been legitimized in the name of civil disobedience, and where any form of individual self assertiveness was justified in the name of freedom:

"I think freedom's an important idea as long as it's taught right, and you can get on to some shaky ground as to what is right, because the way kids are interpreting it right now is that freedom means I can do anything I want to ... 'Doing his thing' represents freedom to him right now, like getting up and walking out of class when he feels like it, or using narcotics that are specifically against the law, or rebelling against parents, not coming home when you are supposed to. What they are saying is, 'I'm an individual, and I have the right to do this because I'm free' ... Part of it, I think, is due to our society, because in the last ten years I don't think we have been hearing anything else but freedom, rights, and so on ... Here I think it makes no difference what colour you are. Kids have looked at the last thirteen years and they see the civil rights movements that have included blacks, indians, whites, religious groups, you name it. And they cannot distinguish between civil disobedience and breaking the law. So they come and say, 'Well, Mr. X suspended a black kid, let's break all his windows out.' That's breaking the law, that's nothing to do with civil disobedience." (US 127)

The whole issue of racial and religious groups within a plural society, and the problems of regulating the relationship between them in a just and peaceful manner within the framework of an ordered society was the major problem that concerned the American teachers in discussing social aspects of citizenship. Though the English teachers agreed that society ought to be organized with justice for all, it was clearly not the urgent matter that the Americans perceived it to be. The questionnaire reinforces this assertion.

Question 34, "My students need to learn more of the cultural, ethnic, regional, and other minorities within their society", received strong assent from both groups, indeed overwhelming assent from the Americans. Ninety seven per cent of the Americans and 81% of the English teachers agreed, the third highest proportion of agreement of all the American respondents to all questions. Moreover, exactly half the American responses were in the 'strongly agree' category, whereas only about one sixth of the English teachers strongly agreed. This clearly suggests an intensity of feeling among the American teachers on this subject, which was not present among the English group. When the question was sharpened so as to suggest practical policy rather than abstract principle, the two groups diverged markedly. Question 32 suggested that, "History teaching should seek to blend different groups and regions within our country, and promote greater national unity", and 73% of the Americans but only 42% of the English

teachers indicated agreement, with a high proportion of the English sample 18%, making no response. These two questions prompt the conclusion that while both groups agreed that this was a problem which the education system needed to take note of, the English teachers viewed it more on the congnitive, intellectual, level, but the American teachers hoped that their teaching in this area would lead to some practical outcome in the form of modified behaviour by their students in society. This is fresh confirmation of the thesis that American education is more concerned with societal objectives, and also suggests that the American teachers were more responsive to social circumstances than were the English. The latter, we have argued, tend to see the education system as contributing to personal development of the individual in a long term perspective, rather than as adjusting to meet the day to day, and perhaps ephemeral, pressures and needs of contemporary society.

It was in this area of minority rights, especially black rights, that the American teachers showed themselves most willing to abandon the neutral stance. Teachers who said they would not commit themselves to an unequivocal statement that Hitler's treatment of the Jews was wrong, because of the need to allow students to make up their own minds according to evidence, came off the neutrality fence on the black/white issue, in favour of the removal of racial prejudice. No doubt this illustrates a general principle that it is easier to maintain neutrality on an issue distant in time and place, than on one of contemporary, and pressing, domestic importance, where the luxury of academic detachment cannot be afforded.

Some teachers doubted the ability of the school to influence values, even if it wished to do so, in the face of parental opposition, such as this Junior High school teacher:

> "If daddy says, 'Boy, if that nigger ever says anything to you, just sock him in the mouth', well, what are they going to do? Are they going to do what dad says, or what the teacher says? They do what the teacher says and they're going to be in trouble with their old man, and they know it. So they're going to do what their father says, right? So I don't know that we can change attitudes. We can certainly try to influence, but as far as changing attitudes or values - I don't know that we can." (US 178)

However, the first step, in most teachers' opinion, was to try to use reason to argue a student out of a prejudiced position, rather than declare a judgment ex cathedra, no matter how distasteful the student's opinion, as seen in this Junior High teacher's statement:

> "I don't think we could tolerate any student taking a hard and fast position that the Jews had to coming to them, for example, and this was necessary to the furtherance of Hitler's plans and the Third Reich. There are limits to which we will go with this neutrality stand - although I don't think we would go all the way and tell the students they are wrong - that is not going to succeed either. What we have to do is, muster the best argument we can against his position, and hope that if he has come to understand the right for progress at all, that his position is rather irrational." (US 139)

Thus a student is irrational, but not wrong. The same view is taken by another teacher in the same school:

> "I simply come back to this position, and I find this is the most effective, rather than for me to form a judgment on what you say, to put the load on the other guy and let him find evidence to support his position. If he does, then fine. You take a position, you support it with evidence, and you challenge it." (US 145)

Again, this Junior High teacher clearly expressed the hope that students would change their attitudes, but as a result of reason, rather than exhortation:

> "We used to teach that to be racially prejudiced was wrong, and that you should do something contrary to that. But we found that the students who didn't agree with our position simply turned us off, because they saw us in the role of being an indoctrinator. I think we are able now to affect kids to the point that many of them do change their position, and it's not because we have told them that this is the correct position to hold, but that by keeping an open mind they are able to bring about the change themselves." (US 216)

Yet, other teachers were not content to rely on reason to do its work. They felt that additional forms of persuasion and influence were justified. One Elementary school principal said that he would certainly see it as the school's responsibility to attempt to change attitudes if he found students in the school were anti-black,

> "because regardless of whether you are white or black, you have two groups having a misunderstanding, you want both groups to learn to live with each other, and you can't help but moving off centre. I think you have to move in some direction, you can't stand there and do nothing." (US 267)

An older High school teacher said that she also would feel obliged to go beyond neutrality in this case:

> "I provide the evidence, but then I think through the way I live, and the way I behave toward them, I've got to show them that there is something more than facts. If they made up their minds differently from mine, then I would not say that was wrong. But I would be disappointed if, after having lived with me for a year, they didn't feel like their fellow man was worth something, that democracy was worth something." (US 14)

This statement of the purely personal aspects of a teacher's influence, based upon character, and the regard she had earned from her pupils, was unusual in the comments of the American teachers. Perhaps because of the large size of the American High schools, perhaps because of certain features of school organization, the American teachers tended to discuss education in largely impersonal terms of curriculum guides, school district objectives, and the views of curriculum theorists, rather than in terms of the personal rapport established between a teacher and a group of pupils.

In some schools, courses were organized with the deliberate purpose of removing prejudice, which is scarcely compatible with neutral, reason based enquiry. Courses in subjects such as 'American Minorities', 'Black History', 'Black Culture', and so on, usually have this purpose as these High school teachers acknowledged:

> "That's the very reason for the existence of the course - to point up the problems of prejudice and bias, and discrimination." (US 56)

> "Hopefully, we help them to see that there is really no rational reason for having some of these prejudices, that one group is not biologically inferior to another group. The facts may not change their attitudes, but at least you try to present material for them to reflect on. If you can give them new data to look at, they may change their attitudes." (US 56)

The black High school teacher interviewed also gave this as the reason for the course in black studies that his school ran, and looked forward to the day when it would no longer be necessary:

> "It's sort of like over compensation for what was not taught, let's say twenty years ago. The more educators of College students introduce black history integrated with normal history, in ten, twenty years from now there'll be no need for black history. It'll just be a regular part of history." (US 119)

Some teachers felt that the most successful form of course in the affective domain was the role play, or simulation exercise. The basic pattern was to set up a community in which there was a race problem, and require the participants to draw for roles. Some would be black, some white, and the game consisted in actively working through some of the problems resulting from this situation, lack of employment opportunities, housing, crime, and so on. The purpose of such games was to present factual information on how blacks were treated, but also to engage the participants' emotions by placing them in situations in which blacks commonly found themselves, in the hope that they would therefore appreciate how blacks felt and identify with them. In some cases, such exercises were monitored with pre and post tests, to see if attitude change had taken place. Several teachers thought that such devices did help to bring about intellectual change, but were less sure that it extended to attitudinal change.

An Elementary school principal described such a game that had been developed for younger students, called 'brown eyes and blue eyes':

> "What you do is, on a given day, announce that all the children with blue eyes get all the privileges, and if they have brown eyes or some other colour, they don't get anything. If it is time for a drink, all the blue eyed ones get their drinks and the others have to wait. It gives those with brown eyes a feeling of what it is like to have prejudice directed against you." (US 268)

However the area in which the American teachers showed most clearly their rejection of neutrality on the racial issue was that of general classroom manners and etiquette, or the hidden curriculum. Clear conventions of classroom speech were expected by most teachers, and their spontaneous reactions when these were transgressed were clear indications to their students of the teacher's value position, however much they might claim to be neutral in the more formal aspects of their teaching. Several teachers recognized this:

> "In talking about race relations, I find it very difficult, when someone comes up with a derogatory slang word, for someone not to say anything, and I usually do say something, and so my feelings are known." (US 188)

This High school teacher makes a distinction between an act which might require correction because it disrupted class control, but also included words which had racial overtones which she would feel obliged to correct:

"If a kid came in a class and said, 'Hey nigger, get out of my chair', the teacher would first of all correct him for, you know, disturbing the class. But then probably that teacher would also say, 'and we don't call these black people niggers'. It's kind of a generally accepted thing that we don't do that now, at least we don't do it here. Now in the South they still do it. So we have things that are generally accepted." (US 179)

One Junior High school teacher used the diminished frequency of racist statements by his students as an index of the success of his teaching in this area, which incidentally points up once again the American teachers' stress on societal and behavioural objectives:

"Effective evaluation is to notice the reduction in statement, and you could measure the frequency of prejudice or anti-racial, anti-Jewish, anti-religious statements by the frequency with which they occur in the classroom, and I find they are almost non-existent. I always feel good at the end of the year because I can see this tremendous change." (US 145)

In addition to speech, classroom behaviour patterns were seen to be of great importance in influencing student attitudes. This Elementary school principal describes his own stereotypes as a result of his childhood, and the importance of his students' having the sort of experiences that will lead to the tolerant attitudes that he was hoping to encourage:

"When I grew up, the black person was the labourer. In the St. Louis area we had ashpits, and he was the guy who drove his horse and cart around and picked up the scraps. That's not really a true picture, yet it's the picture I have. I think a good way is that when you have black children, that the children realize from associating with them that they are really no different ... I happen to like Chrysler product cars, it's based on my experiences, and the more these children have experiences that prove to them that all people are alike, colour or skin don't make any difference, the less and less prejudice there'll be." (US 237)

Of course this is the whole point of integrated schooling, though sometimes it can achieve the opposite results to those intended, as the bussing controversy has shown. The black teacher, previously quoted, had some interesting observations in this subject from the black point of view. In his opinion the problem was gradually diminishing as integration became more a part of American society (his school was about sixty per cent white and forty per cent black), but

this was being obscured by the fact that both sides had now made a game out of it:

> "The first thing I say when Mr. Smith gives me an F is, 'You're prejudiced!' You don't call him a bum or a rotten teacher but, 'You're prejudiced!' That's a good game because I can go home and tell my parents. Or the first time I kick a white kid out of my class, he doesn't like black teachers. So it's a little game, and around school they even play it to a large extent. We talk about it in class, the games people play, there's a very good book written, and one of the things in there he says is a thing called 'scare me'. You know, people like to scare themselves, and one of the things he says is like when you're a small kid it's very, very easy to do, you go by the yard that has the bad dog in it, and you throw a rock at him and you run, you're really scared. You pay 75 cents and you go to the movies and you watch Frankenstein, he scares you. You pay a quarter and you ride the roller coaster, and you get frightened. But the older you get, the more complicated you have to make the game in order to obtain the same thrill. So what you do in school is, you walk past a bunch of whites and you say, 'move honkies!', and basically all you're doing is saying, 'scare me', you know, call me some names, take me down the hall, and vice versa. And I think basically that's what's happening, it's degenerated into a game, everybody wants to play it." (US 131)

Turning to the attitudes of the English teachers on the subject of race relations, the first point that emerges is that in those schools where these interviews were made, the problem did not exist in the immediate, practical sense, and therefore it was not the burning issue that it was to the American teachers. Few of the English teachers had experienced working in a genuinely multi-racial situation, and discussions on this subject took place with reference rather to topics like the slave trade, British imperialism, or the contemporary problem in some other region or country.

A number of English teachers accepted some responsibility to attempt to change pupil attitudes in the direction of toleration and understanding, and admitted that their own particular feelings on the subject entered into their teaching. Sometimes it was in a fairly detached way, approaching the subject, again, on a cognitive, rather than affective level, like the Sixth Form College teacher who, "did point out to them that to inflame racial hatred in this country is actually illegal. So I did feel I was somewhat justified in being on the side of the negro." (UK 31). At other times, a slightly more

emotional note appeared, "Yes, I feel I have a responsibility to counter crude racialism, of which there is still a great deal among children," spoken by Comprehensive teacher (UK 120). Another admitted, "Yes, I think in the slave trade we do tend to come out against it. We probably are biassed in our opinion on slavery, and I think you can't but be biassed when you start telling some of the facts - the attitudes of the slavers, the inhumanity of the owners in the South." (UK 197). Still another said, "Probably on the spur of the moment, I'd react very violently," (UK 54) to a pupil who expressed approval of the treatment of slaves.

Some English teachers felt that on an issue like the slave trade the facts spoke for themselves, and therefore the desired outcome, in terms of moral attitudes, would take place without the need for any overt moralizing by the teacher. This Comprehensive school teacher described how she approached the question of the slave trade and racial equality:

> "We get the charter of human rights and we discuss human rights generally, and then we look at slavery specifically. And really, in a case like slavery one doesn't have to instil attitudes, the children see it for what it is themselves. It's far more difficult when you are dealing with things that aren't quite so clear cut ... Say we were to look at the situation of the gypsies in this country ... that is far more difficult than something like slavery which is obviously so black. When there is an area which is really grey, then this is more difficult." (UK 93)

There were several comments on the extent of prejudice among children and the difficulty of dealing with this in any effective way. However, the teachers mentioning this point usually felt that they had some kind of obligation to remove, or reduce the prejudice as far as possible. There was the appeal to reason initially, as with the Americans, but the same scepticism about whether it would be effective in the face of parental conditioning, and the same reluctance to condemn outright. This comment from a Comprehensive teacher could equally well have come from one of the Americans:

> "It's not so much the Jews as coloured people who come in for this kind of thing. No matter what you say to a child, you can't argue him out of this. What I would do - I wouldn't say to a child, what you think is wrong, - I would say, 'Why do you dislike Jews, why do you feel like this?', or, 'Why don't you like black people?', and

very often when it comes down to rational argument, they don't know. They say, 'Oh well, because my dad says so,' or, 'because there was a black person living upstairs who kicked my granny downstairs', or something. And I say, 'Well, that could just as easily have been a while person'. But I don't say boldly, 'What you say is wrong.' (UK 66)

The strongest expressions of prejudice among pupils were noted by two teachers in a rural school. Both attempted to approach the problem through reason, attributing the pupils' sentiments to parental attitudes, but both found little success:

"I think this is a little surprising too, because there are several coloured children in the school. But the children still refer to coloured people as 'wogs' for instance in a derogatory way, and when I attempted to correct this attitude, they believed themselves to be entirely right. They think of coloured people as being inferior and as coming here and taking jobs. They tend to be very biassed against minorities, against coloured people, and homosexuals." (UK 141)

From the point of view of classroom manners it is worth noting here that there appears to have been no reaction on the teacher's part to the word 'wog', of the kind that the word 'nigger' tended to produce in American teachers. Also, the teacher himself used 'coloured' quite unselfconsciously, which no American did. The taboos attaching to racial epithets appear to be considerably stronger in the U.S.A.

The second teacher in this school was baffled also by the irrationality of the rural children on this subject:

"If I've tried to bring a sense of reason to the argument I get totally unreasonable and prejudiced comments, even more so than I had when I lived in Birmingham in some cases. I lived among coloured people there, and there is a lot of prejudice, but it's a different kind prejudice, and I think one can understand it more if they are among them so to speak. But to find them out here with this prejudice, I find it totally incomprehensible." (UK 141)

Such comments as these, considered along with the American teachers' remarks, may be taken to indicate that integrated schooling can achieve some of the goals of greater understanding and tolerance, whatever the difficulties associated with it.

Although most English teachers expressed disapproval of racial prejudice and some made certain efforts to combat it, we have already noted that this issue appeared to be a peripheral one in their

minds, and the subject usually arose, during the interviews, in response to a direct question, whereas it was difficult to keep it out of the conversation with the Americans. It seems true to say that most of the English teachers had little real interest in this subject, and did not consider it to be of major educational importance, within the history syllabus or outside it. One Sixth Form College teacher said that he talked a little about the emergent African nations, why there wasn't an opposition, how the failures were reported rather than the successes, but concluded, "I wouldn't have said I came across race relations at all. Nor is it something that I'm particularly interested in." (UK 7) This Comprehensive teacher spoke in much the same way:

> "I don't find myself referring very much to this, no. I find that certain topics obviously - dealing with the slave trade, or if one is dealing with certain aspects of British imperial history. Inevitably when kids find out, for example how the British treated other races, I hope they come to some sort of conclusion about this treatment. But again, it doesn't become a part of the lesson as such." (UK 79)

Other English teachers tended to stress the relativity of values when dealing with this subject in a historical context. One repeated the old cliché that, while Wilberforce showed great sympathy for the sufferings of the slaves, he ignored the plight of the victims of the industrial revolution in his own country. Another observed that the slave trade appeared less heinous to contemporaries than it does today:

> "I'm not trying to justify the slave trade in any way, but on the other hand, one tends to forget the peasantry in Russia and Poland and eastern Europe at the same time, enjoying conditions which were inferior to those of the negro slaves on the plantations. So these anomalies crop up, and it's very difficult to criticize the British Empire too much, because although it was wrong in what it did, and we're looking at it now with hindsight of course, it was still in advance of eastern European nations in the sense that they were treating their own people worse than we were treating the negro slaves." (UK 140)

One teacher wished to point out that it would be very difficult for people to act outside the value system of their own times, and suggested that there were arguments in favour of imperialism, since African peoples might not be moving towards independence and nationhood if it had not been for the intervention of white Europeans. (UK 120)

Another used the analogy of the murder of the princes in the tower to illustrate the error of judging one age by the values of another, saying that during Richard III's time, childhood was considered to end at the age of about ten or twelve, and therefore the murder of the princes, though a bad deed, would not have had the particularly odious associations of child murder.

What conclusions can be drawn from this comparative study of attitudes to the teaching of race relations? As we have already said, the subject is clearly of much greater concern to the American teachers, and an obvious reason for this is that the immediate problem is much more acute in the U.S.A. than in Britain. However, an additional explanation may lie in the differing natures of the educational systems. We have argued that British education is more concerned with individual mental development on a cognitive level, and less with influencing pupils towards the formation of desirable social attitudes, and meeting the needs of society for well adjusted citizens. This study of the teaching of race relations tends to confirm this. The English teachers' comparative unconcern with the question of race relations generally, and in Britain in particular, may be due to the smaller scale of the problem in reality, or it may be due to the failure to perceive a problem and regard it as the function of the education system to attempt a solution to it.

We shall now examine the political aspects of citizenship, those which pertain to the functioning of society on the formal, institutional, level. Here again we shall argue that, despite the claims made by both groups to be teaching from a position of value free neutrality, there were a number of issues where clear underlying value assumptions could be discerned.

Question number 26 provides a useful starting point, which asked whether, "The study of history should encourage my students to feel a sense of loyalty to their own country." With this, 76% of the American but only 32% of the English teachers agreed. Thus there was an important difference between the two groups on this point, in fact it was the widest measure of difference of all the questions. Three quarters of the Americans but barely a third of the English teachers accepted loyalty to the country as a teaching objective.

Clearly patriotism is a much stronger force among the American teachers than among the English, and it is difficult to reconcile this with claims for teaching based on neutral, value free, inquiry.

The interviews further support this conclusion. No English teacher showed any form of emotional attachment to his country in the political sense, in the manner of this Junior High school teacher:

> "I think I do wave the flag now and then, either subtly or not so subtly. I was raised in a family where, Oh, how can I put it - I'm not a John Bircher by any means - but I was taught respect for the law and respect for our leaders, and I think my personal background has instilled in me a tremendous love of this country, and I do, every chance I get, try to tell the kids that, you know, we've got an awful lot of problems in this country and there's an awful lot of things wrong, but it's still the best in my mind, so I do ... I haven't been to Europe, China, and Russia and so forth, but I do know for a fact that if you have brains and you have initiative in this country, you can do just about whatever you want. You can make money, or gain respect, or be successful, and in not too many countries do you have the right to say the things that you do in this country." (US 204)

Significantly perhaps, these comments were made by the Jewish teacher previously quoted as sympathising with the rights of conscienscious dissent from the laws of society (page 87). Clearly he felt that the U.S.A. was a good country in which to be a member of a minority group. Another Junior High teacher regretted what she saw as the decline of patriotic feeling resulting from the Vietnam war:

> "One thing I feel we have lost, is we have lost some of our national spirit, and it caused us problems with supporting the Vietnam war - whether it should have been supported or not is irrelevant. But the national spirit of our going to war and supporting our boys and so forth - well, as you read in the papers, it caused us a lot of problems. We don't have as much national spirit as, say, my parents that were my age during World War II. And once again, if you go back to history, when the Greeks got to the age of less national spirit, more luxury, this kind of thing, this was the beginning of the decline, and I hope our nation is not going into this decline." (US 163)

When asked to define 'national spirit' further, she replied:

"O.K. Like the flag. Twenty years ago no one would have burned a flag. Pledging the flag - done in the Elementary schools, but not in the Secondary or Colleges. A feeling of trust with the government ... Sometimes I think by our curriculum, where we've taught children to question, that maybe there should be certain things where we say, 'We don't question these things. These things we hold sacred.' But we don't do that ... I don't go round humming the national anthem, but, you know, I feel as though I am a patriotic person, and I get very vehement with people that say, 'Well, let's run away to Canada and avoid the draft.' We have certain obligations and responsibilities." (US 164)

A third teacher spoke of his willingness to accept military service in answer to his country's needs:

"Although I've been in two wars, I'm definitely opposed to war. I dare say though that if we were attacked, I would respond once again. I'm not a draft evader, or a deserter, or anything like that. I was called up for duty during the Korean controversy, and I was in the midst of a graduate programme at the time and I was not really eager to go, but I felt there was a principle involved." (US 48)

It cannot be claimed that the strength of these feelings was typical of all the American teachers, but, taken with the evidence of Question 26, they do show the greater strength of patriotic feeling among this group, and bear out Myrdal's assertion that the American is the opposite of a cynic.

Dictatorship and Democracy

The strong spirit of patriotism which is evident in the attitudes of the American teachers should not, however, be taken as implying equal enthusiasm for the institutions of democratic government as practised in the U.S.A. today. Question 6 asked whether, "My students should be taught history in such a way as to suggest that a democratic system of government is best." In contrast to questions 9, 16, and 26, which showed the American teachers to be markedly more inclined to accept moralistic teaching, the response to this question showed both groups more or less equally balanced in their rejection of the proposition. Sixty four per cent of the American and 67% of the English teachers disagreed. Thus it appears that although the Americans were clearly more prepared to accept the teaching of general egalitarian principles to their students, they were equally as disposed as the

English to reject the more specific objective of 'a democratic system of government'. The American teachers seem to perceive a greater gap between the cultural ideal and the practice than the English, who seem to have a weaker ideal of egalitarianism anyway.

The interviews showed in fact a considerable degree of scepticism among the American teachers about democratic government, and a reluctance to condemn dictatorship out of hand. Here at least, it seems, the ideal of nautrality goes some way towards being honoured in practice as well as precept. Although the patriotic teacher, quoted earlier, showed her predilections in favour of democratic government, "No, we don't say to the kids, 'dictatorship is bad', but we kind of smile I guess when we say it," most High school teachers advocated a guarded, non-committal approach to the study of dictatorship:

> "I think most of us would analyse dictatorships, what kind of dictatorship was it, and what seemed to be the purpose of that dictatorship? I don't think many of us would say, per se, that dictatorships are bad. We would want to analyse the circumstances, and we would want the students to analyse it." (US 55)

> "I would hope that what they would do is develop an attitude that you have to look at a situation in the context of what the whole period is, or what the whole situation is around it. For instance I would not want my kids to, you know, take the attitude that Communism is bad in every instance. How do we know?" (US 15)

Several teachers clearly felt themselves to be much more objective and 'liberal' on the subject of Socialism and even Communism than their students or the community at large. This High school teacher was quite prepared to acknowledge the shortcomings of the American private enterprise system:

> "We've been so brain washed against the idea of Socialism and Communism - I'm not in favour of Communism, but people sort of draw back in horror when they hear the word 'Socialism' - and I think there are things we can learn from these different economic systems. We were so far behind Europe in terms of providing social benefits for the people. Bismarck had provided this in the 1880's, the British, I think, introduced social benefits for the people before we came in with social security in 1936, so we were late on the scene. I think there were people who had great economic power and controlled the government, who had not developed a social conscience, and it took the great depression and so on to bring this to the forefront." (US 45)

He was also concerned with the misuse of political power, such as that shown by Hitler against the Jews, and Stalin against the kulaks, and ready to find it in his own supposedly free, democratic society:

> "It's frightening, because we talk about this great power, and the use of power against people, and yet we had our concentration camps during World War II - the incarceration of the Japanese Americans without due process, without full constitutional rights, and this must be brought out. At the same time as you're looking at Hitler and the abuse of power, here is Roosevelt and the abuse of power." (US 46)

A curriculum adviser pointed out the fact that that since World War II, it was not dictatorship as such that U.S. governments had opposed, but only those sympathetic to communism:

> "We see dictatorships all over the world - Spain, Portugal, Taiwan, Indonesia, Afghanistan - you could go on and on naming dictatorships we support, not counting the Latin American republics. At the same time a lot of people are saying that the left wing dictatorships are wrong. I don't quite understand that." (US 271)

The black High school teacher described the irrational reaction of his students to communism, an attitude which he thought had been transmitted from parents who had been frightened by the anti-communism of the immediate post war period, and which he found rather ludicrous:

> "They think of communism, not as a political system, but as a social disease. We had an exchange student from Yugoslavia, he was a communist. They met the kid, talked with him for 20 to 30 minutes, and they really liked him - till he told them he was a communist. It was just like he said, 'I've got contagious V.D. right here on my hands!'." (US 125)

Some teachers felt confident that facts and reason together would point the students towards the right conclusion, without the need for help from the teacher, at least as far as a dictator like Hitler was concerned:

> "Now hopefully, if the teachers in the schools are enhancing democratic values and ideals, and the parents are doing the same thing, when confronted with a figure who burned people alive, who took the skin off people and made lampshades with them, who didn't allow protests, who gave orders in an authoritarian manner, they will see that everything this man did was directly opposed to what a democratic society stands for. Therefore, by my values, or by the ideals of the society I live in, this man was wrong, and I won't have to tell them he's wrong." (US 205)

A number of American teachers were particularly reluctant to suggest that democratic forms of government were applicable to all peoples at all times, especially where economic conditions and literacy were not well advanced. This High school teacher is clearly under the influence of the Vietnam experience:

> "When talking about Vietnam for instance - you could get into trouble on this - but I would talk about the conditions of the time, the background of the people, again providing various readings so that the students have a grasp of the problems of a particular country, and then have them come to a conclusion - would democracy work? Or have them decide what kind of government they would have in that country, and bring out the fact that you have a large population of illiterate people, poor transportation - they're going to come to the conclusion that maybe democracy wouldn't work. Not that that isn't good, but that it isn't practicable at this particular time." (US 105)

The same point is made by another High school teacher, with reference to democracy in Africa:

> "I'm teaching Africa right now, where democracy has not functioned too successfully so far, and we look at the conditions and see that the conditions for successful democracy are not too well developed there now, and that even though there are inherent dangers in a military or civilian dictatorship, there are also stable factors which may allow the preconditions for democracy's success to develop. Which doesn't guarantee the transition will be made, but you're not going to have a democracy work until basic economic stability and literacy and other factors are brought in." (US 55)

Thus, the most these teachers are prepared to say about democratic government in developing territories is that it may be finally desirable at the end of an evolutionary process, during which a sound infrastructure of economic and social conditions will have to be laid.

These remarks were by no means untypical and, though it might cause Senator Joseph McCarthy to turn in his grave, it would be fair to say that these American teachers in the nineteen seventies showed no special phobia of communist dictatorship, or of any other type of totalitarian regime as such. Their concern seemed to be far more to explain the failure, or absence of democracy, rather than to condemn it, and to examine the uses to which power was put, rather than

to make judgments about the nature and sources of that power. No doubt the Vietnam experience is largely responsible for this, for it showed so unmistakably the perils of trying to export democracy. This experience, plus the other traumas of the sixties, seems to have shattered the complacency of the fifties and caused these teachers to be extremely cautious in their statements about the institutions of democratic government, as distinct from the values of 'the democratic way of life'. If this speculation is correct, then it is further support for the thesis that curriculum in the U.S.A. is more responsive to changing social circumstances.

The attitude of the English teachers towards democratic and non-democratic institutions of government was not greatly different from that of the Americans, as question number 6 would suggest. That is, although their comments during the interviews were usually approving of democratic government and disapproving of dictatorships, there was no blanket condemnation of the latter. It was not a subject which appeared to excite any depth of feeling and the ethic of neutrality and independent, evidence based, decision making, was again quoted. There was a general feeling that democratic institutions existed in Britain, were desirable, but need not necessarily be imitated by others. A mildly self congratualtory tone can be seen in the remark of the Comprehensive teacher who liked:

> "To look at the civil war as the English Revolution, because it was really, wasn't it? Just like the French Revolution. It finished arbitrary despotism in this country. James II tried to re-establish it, but it was very short lived and they didn't need to fight over it again." (UK 135)

Another followed the Rousseauist, perfectibility of man, theory that the facts, plus reason, would of themselves lead to the right conclusion:

> "I would hope myself that the very nature of history as a subject is open to interpretation, and where many views are possible, based on evidence, that in fact they would tend to adopt a tolerant viewpoint towards others, which would tend to make most people reject the idea of dictatorship, which is the antithesis of tolerance." (UK 80)

Neither did he feel that, as a teacher, he should be troubled at the thought of his pupils' espousing communism or fascism provided that it was the result of honest intellectual processes:

"It would bother me as a private individual, but I wouldn't feel that I would therefore have to try to give a stronger bias to my history teaching. Provided they had come to this conclusion as a result of the consideration of the evidence, and these are their moral biases, then they are entitled to that view. It would disappoint me, but I wouldn't be able to say that I must change my history teaching as a result." (UK 78)

The classical studies teacher found it easier to be judgmental in his teaching because of the nature of his subject:

"I certainly tell people what I think about the personalities and the political movements. Again, in an ancient context it's easier because no one really cares whether Tiberias Gracchus was a sod or not, because he's been dead a long time and it doesn't really matter, you know, this is a luxury I can allow myself!" (UK 207)

Another Comprehensive teacher saw the problem of government in the wider terms of power and its use in society in general, and saw a threat, not from individual dictators at the top but from subgroups within society, which was a view that no American advanced:

"I think democracy is important. I think our kids have gradually got to understand some of the problems ... the problems of power and its use. I think at the present time we can all be worried about the difficulty the country is meeting where in fact small groups, in our kind of society, are making demands which, when added up, become incompatible with the continuance of a satisfactory society." (UK 116)

Some, like the Americans, were concerned to argue that dictatorship was not necessarily bad, and this Comprehensive teacher thought that democracy should not be thrust on people unwillingly:

"I'm not totally opposed to all forms of despotism. For example, the kind that was exercised in Europe in the Eighteenth Century, the enlightened despots as they were called, seem to me at that time to have been rather humanitarian ... I have on occasions tried to show form 1 in particular, that I may try to justify democracy but we must also look at the other side. For example, the treaty of Versailles is a classic example of democracy being forced down someone's throat. You parcel people up into little independent states and give them democratic constitutions, and within the space of ten years they're all dictatorships. I think this is a case of democracy being forced on somebody in a despotic manner, which is supposed to be alien to democratic regimes." (UK 137)

This teacher also thought that there were times when dictatorships were acceptable, if not preferable to a democratic system:

> "I think one of the mistakes of British democracy is that it imagines that this kind of system can be exported willy nilly to another place and will function well, and this isn't necessarily so. Very rarely are we in a position to choose the ideal. We haven't got the ideal democracy and it may be that there are occasions where a dictator in a given situation seems to be the only answer. If one presupposes a war for example, one can only say that in a sense, Mr. Churchill was as near a dictator as you would want. But a dictator by consent I feel, all dictators must have a measure of support. I tell the children quite frankly that if I were a Chinaman I would be a supporter of Mao-Tse-Tung today. I'd much prefer to live under Mao-Tse-Tung, from what I've seen of it, than I would the previous anarchistic system with war lords running around, all of them venting their own particular spites." (UK 119)

Thus, on the subject of democratic government, it may be said of both the American and the English teachers, that personal attitudes, values, and emotions, did not appear to intrude obviously into the discussions about the teaching of the topic. Both groups appeared to teach from a position of reasonable neutrality, without consciously or unconsciously seeking to influence their pupils with their own particular views.

War

Another of the political, or national, aspects of citizenship that was discussed was the matter of war, again with the purpose of discovering the extent to which the ideal of neutrality was followed. The conclusion here is that the teachers in both countries were substantially in agreement, and that although a few discussed the teaching of this subject in moderately dispassionate tones, the comments of both groups were marked by a fairly strong note of hostility to war, which they felt no compunction about including within the scope of their teaching. Thus, on this topic, the ideal of neutral, value free inquiry, was not observed by either group.

Question number 22 asked whether, "History should not be taught in such a way as to suggest that war is always wrong." Seventy per cent of the American and 56% of the English teachers

agreed that it should not. Putting it another way, although a majority of both groups did not feel that history should be used to teach that war was wrong, a substantially higher proportion of English teachers did not wish to do so. More American than English thought that history could be used to teach that war was wrong, though, in both groups they were in an overall minority. It is likely that Vietnam again is the reason for this difference.

The interviews revealed three broad categories of response, which applied more or less equally to both groups, although comments from an individual teacher can sometimes be found in more than one of these categories. First there was the view that war should be approached from the point of view of detached analysis. These teachers thought that war had to be accepted as an historical phenomenon that occurred from time to time, and that it should be studied and explained like any other historical phenomenon and that lessons should be learnt from such a study wherever possible. One High school teacher wished to distinguish between war and the causes of war, wanting to see if universal causes of war could be found:

> "We try to go at it on a comparative basis ... One group of teachers had a particular unit on this, they called it nationalism and war, and it's really a comparison. They'll take three or four different instances, compare them, and see if you can draw any overall conclusions as to the general causes of war." (US 115)

This Comprehensive teacher followed essentially the same approach in the study of World War I. His concern was to get his pupils to think about the nature of human behaviour, to understand how such an event could come about:

> "You must ask yourself, well, why do you tell them about the first World War? I want the children not merely to accept it, twenty million dead, calmly, but what kind of animal is this that engaged in the war? How is it that human beings with their intelligence can do this sort of thing? To get out of the way of just accepting facts if you like, to question them, to wonder about the nature of the human being and his behaviour." (UK 118)

Although he himself was opposed to the Vietnam war, this Junior High teacher tried to analyse dispassionately with his students, the reasons for opposition to the war:

"Kids in my class were very much opposed to the war, and were allowed to speak their minds, but again I said, 'Why are you so opposed to war?' and if they've been opposed for some reason that - well, heck, I don't want to fight for *my* country - well, we might get into a lenthy discussion on, is that a justification for not fighting a war? Perhaps the whole country is threatened, you perhaps are scared. Do we give up a whole country because some people are personally scared?" (US 206)

One Primary school Head teacher raised the philosophical issue of the nature of peace, whether peace was justified if it meant the tacit approval of all that was wrong (US 225), and another secondary teacher pointed out that certain aspects of war led to "What we call progress, things like radar, jet propulsion, things of that kind. They definitely came out of war." (UK 138) All these teachers tried to approach the study of war in a neutral objective manner, seeking to analyse and explain, rather than express any particular attitude.

Into the second category of response on the subject of war, came those teachers, again from both countries, who took the view that a moderate justification of certain kinds of war was possible. These teachers felt that defensive wars fought to repel aggression, or wars fought in the name of just principles were permissible. This High school teacher puts the former view:

"We like to look upon our wars as being defensive wars, although that's not always necessarily been true, but I think we tend to approach it more from that angle. We tend to be critical of our wars where we find that we've been aggressive, and I feel that it comes across in the classroom in this way, and we tend to glorify more our wars where we feel that it's been defensive. So we are probably, overall, stressing the anti-war position, whether we like it or not." (US 116)

He is fully aware of the problem of perception involved in deciding which wars are defensive and which aggressive, and he shows a balanced and critical approach to the wars in which his own country has engaged, ready to approve some and disapprove of others.

An English Primary teacher also took the view that the purpose of a war decided whether or not it was justified, but clearly thought that just wars were possible:

"Like so many human actions, it depends upon the motive, doesn't it? If the motive is greed, aggrandisement, extension of power, and if it's something that's subservient to all human frailties, then it is wrong. But there is a time, as I see it, when war can be justified, or at least not war as such, but defence. There is a confusion here between aggressive war and peaceful defence." (UK 226)

One Secondary teacher felt that World War II was a topic worth teaching, not so that his pupils should appreciate heroism or glory, or so that they should appreciate the true meaning of the suffering to families who lost half their members, which he felt was beyond their grasp, but so that they might gain some understanding of concepts such as freedom and liberty:

"I tried to put the point that, you know, America, England, the goodies if you like, were fighting for freedom, and you tried to explore what that meant. What it meant to be able to choose your own government and way of life, as opposed to having one superimposed on you." (UK 174)

One young Secondary teacher gratefully turned to wars in the syllabus as a sure means of interesting troublesome classes. For her, the macabre excitement alone justified teaching the subject and outweighed any moral considerations:

"Wherever possible I do talk about war because it's something they enjoy. We did the first and second World Wars in the third year this year, because of interest. They asked if they could do it and so I said yes, O.K., we'll spend next term on a project on that and they thoroughly enjoy it ... I think they have a natural interest in anything gory or a little bit revolting. But I think by the time we have finished, particularly the first World War, I'm sure a lot of them were rather sickened actually." (UK 173)

These teachers all found some justification in certain kinds of war from the teaching point of view, and felt justified in portraying war as a legitimate form of state and private activity in certain circumstances.

The third category of response on the question of war consisted of those teachers in both groups who expressed outright condemnation of war, and felt justified in making this attitude explicit in their teaching. Some felt that they ought to preserve a position of neutrality, but failed to do so, others felt that on this subject neutrality was inappropriate. This Junior High school teacher felt

that, like the danger of drugs, war was too important a subject to be afforded the luxury of neutral treatment, and that the implications of the topic for the welfare of her country, society, and her pupils individually, required her to use what moral influence she had, though she had stated earlier that her political views would be something that she would attempt to conceal:

> "My personal opinion is that there is no good war. There have been wars that have been inevitable, and that serve a good purpose along with a bad purpose, but that still doesn't justify them and I'm afraid this is brought out in my teaching too. It is not something I try to conceal. I feel that the horrible aspects of war are more important than my political views." (US 189)

A similar revulsion for war was expressed by these English Secondary teachers:

> "I personally hate teaching war. I have a great loathing for teaching warfare, particularly modern warfare ... (because) I think people, textbooks in particular, tend to gloat. And although it's important to mention it, I don't really see that we need to spend so much time dealing with something that's involved in destruction. Because I don't think it necessarily means that people reject it. On the contrary, many boys want to do more war." (UK 138)

> "I stress very greatly the first World War as being the prototype of the fact that wars are hideous and no longer necessary, and it should have been the war to end all wars by it's very nature. I try to stress that." (UK 186)

This Primary teacher takes the same view:

> "Teachers always hope to induce attitudes that enable a child to come to conclusions for himself, but I would like to portray war as almost the ultimate evil." (UK 219)

This High school teacher was concerned that the organization of the curriculum itself could condition students towards an interest in and acceptance of, war and violence as a normal feature of life:

> "When we prepared the summaries on our quarter courses for the last semester, I was looking over the course offerings and it suddenly dawned on me that we teach sort of from war to war. For example, one topic was 'The Global Conflict', another one was 'Between The Wars', 'From Czars to Commissars', or 'Revolutions', and it suddenly dawned on us, my goodness, no wonder these young people are thinking in terms of war and conflict. What are we really teaching them? So then,

observing that, we went back into a meeting and we decided that we were going to retitle the courses, and refocus our objectives." (US 32)

Among these teachers there was clearly a strong antipathy to war which extended into their classroom teaching. Their use of emotive words like "horrible", "hideous", and "evil", makes clear the depth of their feeling on this subject. Even the more guarded comments in the earlier categories of response conveyed a feeling of hostility towards war. It can be said with confidence that war is a topic on which many of the teachers in both groups felt justified in going beyond the classroom ideal of neutral inquiry, admitting that, in some cases reluctantly, they did seek to influence their pupils' thinking towards the view that war was wrong.

In this chapter we have now shown that although the teachers in both countries professed to be teaching controversial issues from a position of neutral value free inquiry, in fact there was, on a number of issues among the teachers in both groups, a conscious inclination towards a particular point of view, varying according to what their conception of responsible citizenship was. We have discussed several of these issues where a value position of some sort was consciously recognized by these teachers, and we shall now examine some of the ways in which the principle of neutral enquiry was limited by means of which many of the teachers of both groups ~~were~~ seemed unaware.

The first way was through the selection of teaching materials, usually books, but including films and other forms of audio-visual aid. This is the source of bias which is the easiest to recognise and several teachers in both groups were aware of this. One Secondary teacher considered that history textbooks distorted controversial issues by seeking to put forward a balanced concensus position which implied that truth was to be found half way between two extremes:

"I often think there's a bias, facts are presented in a certain way in textbooks which tends to be, I would say tends to be, towards the middle, and I think sometimes there are certain other facts that could be presented as well. The fact of dealing with the 1844 miners' strike and talking about blacklegs, is different than what virtually any textbook seems to present about it. Well, to me it seems relevant that in 1844 there was a miners' strike, it followed two years after the most important first mines act, and it's stressing the activity

of workers in the mines as distinct from the activity of people in parliament, or sympathetic landowners and things like that." (UK 59)

Two High school teachers spoke of the difficulty of presenting impartial facts about Hitler:

"We try to avoid propagandizing, yet our media and the material we have is obviously slanted. So we get things like, "The Twisted Cross", the movie on Nazi Germany which is definitely an anti-Hitler type thing and most of the material available is anti-Hitler. So in a sense we are propagandizing here, and at the same time we feel that we don't have to sit up there and preach ourselves, our own materials are going to take care of that." (US 104)

"Kids love to listen about Hitler. We show a movie called "Night in the Fog", which is really a blood curdling experience to watch, showing clips of the inhuman activities that went on in concentration camps, and the kids are interested, they watch, they observe, and they ask questions. And with the kind of material we use it's almost impossible to remain neutral, you see." (US 28)

A College professor engaged in the training of teachers was sceptical also about the impartiality, even of the materials prepared specifically for value clarification courses:

"I was raised in a very strange part of America. It really was unusual. It was the only place in America where the Republican party was the fourth party, we were very socialistic in outlook. My father came originally from Russia and my mother from Poland, but we lived in what is called the 21st district of the Bronx, New York City. The Democrats were the number one party, then the American Labour party, then the Liberal party, then the Republicans usually just beat out the Communists, so we were accustomed to living in an area where people talked about socialism and argued about it in schools. I went to the most unusual High school in America, over half the teachers in the social studies department were dedicated socialists, so we had a conception of history that was quite different. And when I read people like Fenton, Oliver, - they are capitalists the way they look at life. They don't know how to look at it with a Marxist interpretation. What they'll do is say things like, 'and Marx would say', but they don't know how Marx would view it, and they are very ill trained in Marxism." (US 260)

An area where bias is more difficult to admit, but where at the same time it is extremely likely to occur, is in the selection of problems for study. Teachers constantly said that they were trying to get pupils to solve problems, but they were presenting them with certain

problems that they thought ought to be solved, and therefore deciding in advance what questions were worthy of study. It is even debatable sometimes, what is a problem and what is not. Women's rights, or black rights, for example, might be regarded as a problem by some people at a certain period in history, but not by others at a different period. Thus, a glance down a list of course titles is likely to reveal a great deal about the value assumptions of the teacher or school that offers those courses. Even Fenton himself wrote:

> "The selection by a teacher of the contemporary problems he wants to emphasize, reflects his personal value system, but there is no escape from this dilemma. Any curricular decision must reflect the values of the decision maker." (4)

Only three teachers, two English and one American, referred explicitly to this form of bias, and it seems likely that most teachers in both groups were unaware of it and believed themselves to be teaching in a neutral, open minded way, when in fact they were unconsciously making some important value assumptions. The difficulty is stated simply by this sixth form teacher:

> "What worries me is that you can be biassed in ways that you're not conscious of. I got this world affairs course going here. Well, I mean one of my topics on that list is the Labour Party 1945-51. Now why is that? Is it because it's an important thing, or is it because I think it's important? Well, I don't know." (UK 30)

A Secondary teacher described how he taught the slave trade, telling the pupils the facts as he saw them, including colourful details, putting the argument of the traders of Bristol and Liverpool, and the opposing arguments of the evangelicals, and said that he felt that the topic could be dealt with fairly that way. But he recognized that, "bias comes through far more in the things you select to tell them, and the way in which you build up syllabuses and so forth." (UK 42) An American Junior High teacher develops the point:

> "I would like to say we maintain neutrality, but that's not true. Just by the very fact that we choose certain people in history to be read about, we choose this document and not that one, by the way we reward students on test. We are implicitly I think presenting our own value system to them." (US 125)

He continued to say that the teacher's value system could extend beyond the selection of materials to his willingness to allow a range of conclusions to exist, arising from that material:

> "I know that one of the problems that I have kids coming back from the High school telling me about is that, in the early years of the implementation of Fenton's world history materials, is that the kids felt too restricted. That sometimes the interpretation they got from reading a primary source was different from those that the teacher would accept. And what this tended to do was to create a feeling in the kids that there were expected outcomes. It wasn't so much that they material was supposed to create it, but that the teacher had determined what the outcome was in advance, and that the material might be only loosely connected with that outcome, and they felt that this was somewhat of a fraud. So there has to be this willingness on the part of the teacher to let things go where they go." (US 217)

In this comment we have the shallowness of the neutral, value clarification position further exposed. Even if genuinely value free source materials can be provided, the teacher can filter out, perhaps unconsciously those conclusions which do not fit his scheme of values.

The third and most insidious area where unconscious values intrude into teaching is in the matter of vocabulary and phraseology. No matter how neutral and objective the history teacher, or even the historian, seeks to be, he must employ language to describe, to explain, and to analyse. Words have shades of meaning which can add a decisive interpretation to the most innocent 'fact'. Ann Low Beer makes this point well:

> "Even very ordinary words ... can insinuate a moral tone though they may be correct descriptions of events, 'devious negotiations', 'sinister moves', 'tolerant policy', or 'wise statesmanship'. In the description of character or group actions, imputations of 'irresponsibility', 'fanaticism', 'prejudice', 'justice', 'honesty', 'wisdom' or 'enterprise', easily suggest moral judgements. Such a list can be extended almost indefinitely, showing words containing moral evaluations as well as being descriptive." (5)

Among both groups of teachers, and in the books commonly in use in the U.S.A. and Great Britain can be found many instances of words which state a clear value position. Book titles like, "America, the Story of a Free People", "The Epic of America", and "The Promise of America", all make assumptions about the character and beliefs of the society they describe. British textbooks, on the whole, seem to

adopt more neutral titles, though labels such as "The Reformation", "The Middle Ages", "The Whig Reforms", are widely used, which imply values. However, titles such as "Nineteenth Century Britain", "The Tudors and Stuarts", or "The Age of Chaucer", are more common.

The interviews contained many examples of such value assumptions made quite unconsciously, especially the assumption that the U.S.A. since the revolution has always been a free society. For example, "we got our freedom", "then we have the establishment of the free nation", "in the late eighteenth century in this country they were very radical at that time". Even such a basic historical word as "discover" is loaded with the historical perspective of the people who do the discovering, rather than the people who are discovered. With contemporary affairs, one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter. This Comprehensive teacher uses "progress", and "reactionary", as though they were objective descriptive terms in contrast to "good" and "bad":

> "Perhaps my favourite period of history is the Stuart period, and I don't try for example to create goodies and baddies. I stress particularly the Civil War, Charles I and so on, that it was simply a matter of progress meeting up against a reactionary. According to Seventeenth Century beliefs, and to his own beliefs, Charles I was a conscientious religious man. But progress would come, and there are no goodies and baddies, just progress." (UK 184)

In the vocabulary of both groups of teachers there are some strong value assumptions. "Good" is equated with peace, toleration, equality, freedom and reason, and "bad" with violence, bigotry, caste, oppression, and prejudice, though these themselves are value laden terms. In both groups, teachers tended to perceive their own country as having made during its history, "progress", from "bad" to "good". It cannot be claimed that teaching is based on the ideal of neutral, value free enquiry, when the vocabulary in day to day classroom use makes these assumptions.

We have now shown that although the ideal of neutrality was widely claimed as the starting point for the teaching of history in both countries, in practice this ideal was not realized. Before concluding this chapter, however, it is necessary to acknowledge

the views of the small number of, mainly English, teachers who rejected the neutral standpoint altogether, and asserted positively the inevitability of teaching from an openly admitted value position.

It was argued by two sixth form teachers in the same institution, though quite independently of each other, that neutrality was impossible to achieve, and that all teaching had to start from a value base of some sort:

> "After all, what is total freedom except a form of indoctrination! ... Most of the people in the teaching profession are gutless! They swing to and fro on the winds of fashion and they don't want to be caught in any sort of posture that might rebound on them later." (UK 9)

He claimed that the goal of rational thinking was equally spurious:

> "You pick certain skills that you think are valuable and you say, 'My, my, my, I'm not indoctrinating you, bloody go and do them' ... and you then say to somebody, 'I'm not disagreeing with you because you're wrong but because you're irrational' ... But it means the same thing in practice." (UK 9)

The impossibility of neutrality is stressed by the second one also:

> "I think all education is propaganda. One doesn't have to be proud of this, but surely, any training, any education, is propaganda for or against something, and the argument would be whether it was towards good or bad ends. I think there is a justification for pointing out what has been good in the past of one's own country, just as one should point out what has been bad. I think there's no harm in stressing the existence of procedure according to common law, rather than procedure according to proclamation, shall we say. I'm very happy to live in a country where I think it unlikely that enabling laws could be passed giving total power to somebody." (UK 15)

A Comprehensive teacher expressed his distrust of pure reason and his reluctance to place the stress in his teaching on the process of arriving at a conclusion, rather on the conclusion itself. For this teacher, sound instincts were often a better guide than cold reason:

> "A friend of mine used to say that all education does is to give you better and better reasons for believing what you want to ... No, I'm a little bit worried about the conclusion I'm afraid. You see, logic can get you into some queer situations. The idea that logic is an infallible guide is quite wrong, logic can lead you into the most terrible atrocities." (UK 22)

In addition to the view that neutrality was impossible to attain in practice, there was the feeling that morally based teaching was positively desirable. These teachers were worried that value free teaching could be unsatisfactory because issues were left unresolved, pupils would be left with a feeling of incompleteness, and, worse, the impression might be created that these issues were not important enough to be worth making up their minds about at all, and that commitment itself was not important. Shaver and Berlak describe this dilemma:

> "Let us say the teacher chooses to avoid making or soliciting value judgments as to whether or not genocide should be condemned on moral grounds. In this case, his students will be studying probably one of the most systematic, bestial, killings of all time without having their attention focussed on the moral issues involved. Even though the teacher is attempting to avoid values, the student may be learning an evaluative orientation to human affairs. In this case, the orientation can probably be characterized as moral disengagement from the crises of our society." (6)

This High school teacher mentions his fears on this score:

> "I see a real problem in the approach in which there is no such thing as right or wrong answers - part of the society in our country is saying there are no answers to anything. Personally, I think this can be damaging to youngsters. If you can say, 'Here is the evidence, now draw your own conclusions, be logical about it etc.' - well, there are some things which have no answers. But if you take a youngster to the point where there are no answers, this is frustrating. For some things there ought to be an answer." (US 150)

It was also felt that neutrality could appear weakness in the pupils' eyes, and that it was desirable for the teacher to portray strength and conviction. One Comprehensive teacher said that he didn't think children respected you, "if you were too wishy washy", and another said he felt fully justified in telling his classes that Hitler was evil because, "if you forgo all judgments, you become a bit of an intellectual eunuch." (UK 150)

These teachers felt that to be worth anything, education should have a clear purpose and that this required a commitment by the teacher to values of some sort which he should attempt to develop in his pupils. One of the sixth form teachers claimed to be, "an unashamed indoctinator". He argued that parents spent a lot of their

time training their children to act in a socially acceptable fashion, and he saw no reason why teachers should not do the same. The classical studies teacher also supported the committed view:

> "A point was made by a Marxist ancient historian that I've heard lecturing. He said that so far from history not being taught with a moral purpose, it should. In fact, if you don't care quite strongly about what you're teaching, then you have no right to be teaching it, and, if you can avoid indoctrinating people, it's not only necessary but desirable that you should leave people in no doubt as to what your position is. It's probably more honest to do so." (UK 207)

An American Elementary school teacher thought that commitment by the students to something was important, and the teacher could only show this by example:

> "I have always felt that the Vietnam war was morally wrong. This came out very strongly in my classes. I didn't try to impose my views upon the students, but I wanted them to be sure to know where I stood. You can't expect students to commit themselves, expose themselves in any way, unless you as the teacher do so." (US 268)

The "indoctrinating" sixthform teacher wished to go further than this:

> "I think there are times when one has to force the ideology, whether it's consistent with the evidence or not. I suppose this is very bad history teaching. I've always got a great respect for Newman and the tractarians, you know, Tract 90 entitled, 'On Reserve in Communicating Religious Knowledge'. The idea being that if someone is about to become a Catholic and you think there are some things that might shake him at this point, well, you don't tell him. Wait until he's a Catholic and he's got a secure foundation, and then he can slot things in later. I've never been able to see quite what's wrong with that." (UK 2)

It is perhaps no coincidence that two authorities referred to by those upholding the value commitment position should be Marx and Cardinal Newman. Both Marxism and Roman Catholicism are authoritarian value systems, starting from a position of revealed truth, rather than discovered truth, and demanding total allegiance from their followers. It is unlikely that adherents to either system could easily accept a neutral inquiry approach to the teaching of history, the interpretation of which is crucial to their whole philosophy. Indeed it is arguable that the whole value free inquiry position, the cult of neutrality,

and the stress on toleration really derives from an apathetic society that has no values which it considers important enough to make an integral part of the education of its youth. Though the number of teachers who advocated the value commitment position was small, they included some of the most thoughtful and articulate, and they would be subjectively rated among the most effective of those interviewed.

This chapter has shown that, although among both groups of teachers the ideal of neutrality and rational decision making were accepted as underlying values of central importance in the teaching of history, there were issues on which the ideal was abandoned in practice. The American teachers proclaimed the ideal of neutrality more strongly in theory, yet abandoned it more readily in practice, especially on the issues of racial tolerance, patriotism, and war. Though a small number of English teachers argued more strongly than any American for the abandonment of neutrality in theory, most showed a greater degree of moral detachment in practice. Generally the American teachers showed themselves to be more responsive to the changing circumstances of the society in which they lived than the English teachers whose teaching was more unrelated to their own social context.

Chapter Four - References

1. Myrdal, G., 'An American Dilemma', (1944), extract reprinted in Shaver and Berlak, (1968) op. cit. p. 87.

2. Oliver, D.W., 'The Selection of Content in the Social Sciences', Harvard Educational Review (1957), Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 299-300.

3. Schools Council/Nuffield Humanities Project. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd., 1970.

4. Fenton, E., The New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967, p. 21.

5. Low Beer, A., 'Moral Judgments in History Teaching', reprinted in Burston and Thompson, (1967) op. cit. p. 141.

6. Shaver and Berlak (1968), op. cit. p. 62.

Chapter Five - Foreign Perspectives

"I am first a Christian, then I am a Saxon, then I am an American, and when I get to heaven I expect to register from Evanston." The diversity of claims to the allegiance of the individual in society are neatly described by the American temperance reformer Frances Willard. Four concepts are distinguished here; religion, ethnicity, nationality, and locality. Religion, universal, all embracing, and stressing the common features of mankind is, of these concepts, the one which differentiates between human beings the least, however individual religions may do so in practice. Ethnicity is both a biological and a cultural concept. It distinguishes between men primarily on the grounds of physical appearance and ancestry, and thus, though it is one of the largest categories into which humanity is divided it is more exclusive than religion. Men may change their religion but not their race.

Nationality is a sub-division of humanity smaller than religion or ethnicity and much more difficult to define. Both religion and ethnicity may be elements of nationality, but it includes more than these. Culture, language, and territory are additional elements of nationality, but perhaps it is political organization that today defines a nation above all else. The members of a nation are those who are subject to its government. Some nations are ancient, having deep historical roots and a strong sense of cultural identity such as most of the European nations. Others are much more recent, have no historical foundation, and include a culturally heterogeneous population such as the United States and the new nations of Africa and Asia. Nations are essentially man made entities and as such are capable of infinite variations of population, geographical size, and ethnic composition. The general assembly of the United Nations is made up of nations occupying thousands of square miles and including many millions of people, and others with a population of little more than a large city.

By 'locality' is meant that community in which an individual has his residence, where he carries on his daily life, and where the environment and the people are familiar to him. It is the community where he feels a personal sense of belonging and which he thinks of as

home. It is a community whose spatial limits are usually confined to an area which can be experienced personally and frequently through visits and direct social contacts of various kinds.

Every individual belongs to all these groups simultaneously whether he likes it or not, and according to circumstances he chooses which of these groups he wishes to emphasize. Rarely are history courses centred round a religious grouping of mankind; no course in, 'The history of the Christian people', was encountered during the current inquiry. Courses centring on a racial grouping have been equally uncommon in Britain, but in the United States the rise of ethnic consciousness has led to the growth of courses in Black studies, Indian culture, Chicano studies and other studies of minority groups which are essentially ethnic in character. Courses in local history have again been uncommon, although, as noted in Chapter 2 there was a marked tendency among the English teachers to stress the local environment in their teaching. However, in both countries the human group that provided the central frame of reference for the study of the past, and the present also for that matter, was the nation. Most school history courses classify mankind politically and into nations. Our own nation's affairs are described as 'domestic', those of others are 'foreign', and it is the nation that is usually the focus whether the course is political, social, or economic.

The Harvard sociologist Nathan Glazer has used the phrase 'terminal loyalty' (1) to describe that loyalty which overrides the claims of both greater and lesser communities with which it may compete for the ultimate allegiance of the individual. This chapter will suggest that although the nation is the 'terminal loyalty' to which the teachers of both countries normally direct their pupils, the differences in the nature of the nationality of the two countries, together with the different emphasis of the social studies curriculum, were such as to cause the American teachers to show a greater awareness of the wider world.

Nationality in Britain has a strong ethnic character. Indeed, 'British' is in many ways an inappropriate word to describe the nationality of the people living in the British Isles. 'Great Britain' is a political and geographical term rather than an ethnic one. It has none of the warmth and tribal associations of the much older cultural groupings, Wales, Scotland, Ireland and England. However, for the

purposes of this chapter the terms 'England' and 'English' would be too narrow and restrictive for general use, and 'British' will be retained since the distinctions to be drawn are essentially between the inhabitants of Great Britain as a whole and those of the wider world. Despite the many strains that went to make up the British people, Romans, Saxons, Jutes, Vikings, and Normans to name but a few, the period of invasions ended with the Norman Conquest. Though the British also went through a 'melting pot' stage it was several hundred years ago, and since the time of Chaucer they have been a largely homogeneous people.
Most British people are descended from families who have lived in Britain for centuries and their grandparents and greatgrandparents were British. The bonds which unite them are primarily those of ancestry, memory, and locality. British nationality is further characterised by codes of ritual, ceremony, and convention, weaker no doubt than they used to be and probably becoming weaker, but none the less still strong. There are conventions of dress, behaviour, and speech, which can properly be acquired only through upbringing and which quickly reveal the presence of an outsider.

The strength of the ethnic and cultural bonds which unite the British can be seen in the slowness of the British people to accept recently arrived groups within their midst as part of the national community. Chapter 3 drew attention to the extent to which the presence of groups of Asian or Caribbean origin was ignored by the English teachers and had scarcely any impact upon the history curriculum. An explanation of this may well lie in the perceptions of these teachers of the nature of the national community which receives their 'terminal loyalty', and the feeling that those groups which lack British ancestry are 'immigrants' and thus not within the scope of the cultural heritage which provides the main frame of reference for the construction of history syllabuses.
Even the children of immigrants are slow to be labelled British, being more commonly described as 'second generation immigrants'. This chapter will suggest that the English teachers perceived a sharper distinction between their own nationality and the rest of the world than did the Americans, and that this distinction strongly influenced their attitudes towards their teaching about the wider world.

The concept of nationality in the United States presents a number of contrasts. The most obvious one is that the U.S.A. is a new country which was created, rather than an old one which evolved in the

manner of European nations. It did not grow out of earlier tribal, linguistic, and ethnic groups into a relatively homogeneous nation on the European model. Instead the 'melting pot' analogy has frequently been used to describe the process of blending of numerous cultures and ethnic backgrounds which was supposed to take place to produce a new and distinct American nationality. Whereas the factors of ancestry and descent are uniting forces in the case of European countries, they are divisive in the case of the United States. In a great many cases the grandparents of Americans living today came from England, Ireland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Italy, Russia, or from China, Japan, Mexico, Puerto Rico or some other non-European country. The variety of ethnic origins listed on the questionnaire by the Americans makes this abundantly clear (see Appendix 8). Thus there is a wide diversity of cultural, linguistic, and ethnic background in each individual American, and thus the characteristics which distinguish Americans from other nationalities are not made up of those ancestral factors which characterise European nationality.

This is not to say that an American nationality does not exist. It is however to say that the nature of American nationality is different from British or other European nationality. One does not have to be born an American in order truly to become one. A nation made up of such a diversity of peoples, given a deceptive veneer of unity by a common language, must find its unity in factors other than memory and descent. The factor that provides the American people with a sense of nationhood is above all, as Myrdal suggested, (2) the existence of a universally recognized creed and set of ideals, enshrined in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. It is this fact which accounts for the prominence of ideological patriotism among the American teachers, referred to in Chapter 4. It is of great importance for the American education system to school the young in the principles of the American way of life and the elements of democratic citizenship, since it is these, rather than cultural heritage, that provide the unifying force and sense of nationality that the European nations have acquired by descent.

Herman Melville wrote of the American people, "We are not a narrow tribe of men ... No, our blood is as the flood of the Amazon, made up of a thousand noble currents all pouring into one. We are not a nation so much as a world." The American teachers, during the interviews,

were keenly sensitive to the multi-cultural character of their society. They were aware of the diversity of the background of the people, and of the need for the different groups to understand one another if a peaceful society were to be maintained. There was a feeling that many of the problems that the nation faced arose from the fact that it was a pluralistic society and an understanding of this involved knowing about the origins of the groups, the experiences that they had had, and the attitudes which they held. A High school teacher expressed it this way:

> "We have a diverse population within the United States, the so-called salad bowl, and we have various minority groups, ethnic groups and so on, and I think this is still very strong regardless of what people say, the old melting pot concept and so on, and it is still very much in evidence in the St. Louis area. For example, there is Hilday, where the Italians do their thing, there is the Badenfest where the Germans are doing their thing, and there might be the Strassenfest over in Illinois, ... and of course St. Louis has a very strong background and tradition, and I think this is good. We should be aware of the origins of our people, not all people came from England or Scandinavia, although you hear about the White Anglo-Saxon Protestants and so on. So I think it is pretty important that they do know about other people and other customs if we are going to function in a world community." (US 51)

His use of the salad bowl image implies a significant development from the melting pot. The ideal is no longer a blend of all the ingredients into a mixture in which all the individual characteristics are lost in the production of the final, unified and distinct American brew, but rather a mixture in which each element retains its separate identity but contributes its own special flavour, thus enhancing the quality of the dish. The individual elements are to be recognised as contributing something unique, which will enrich the whole, and are to be welcomed. It is an important change and one which bears out Melville's view of America as "not so much a nation but a whole world." In this chapter we shall argue that the American history teachers showed a much greater awareness of the world outside the United States in their teaching, and that this stems in large measure from the character of the American nation as a pluralistic, multi-ethnic society and from its geographical size. This helps to explain why the approach of these teachers to their history teaching showed a broader international perspective than did the teaching of the English teachers.

Another reason for this can be found in the differing concepts of the history syllabus. As already noted on numerous occasions, history teaching in the USA takes place as part of the wider programme of social studies in which the purpose is to analyse the problems of contemporary society and to prepare students to play a constructive and responsible role within it. In Britain history is more often taught as an independent subject, the purpose of which is to transmit the national heritage, develop the individual's intellectual powers and enrich his personality. If the problem centred, social studies approach is adopted, it is less likely that subject matter will be confined to the pupil's own country, for 'society' is a concept that cannot easily be confined within national or political limits, whereas history in the 'pure' sense, we have suggested, is more likely to be taught with reference to political boundaries between peoples.

Several American teachers' comments refer to the problem centred approach which they were seeking to follow, and which often involved comparative study. This Junior High teacher stressed that his concern was with problems and issues rather than factual information about the United States, and said that he did not wish to make a distinction between the world inside the United States and that outside:

> "What we want to do is shed light on present problems, and we will go looking for analagous situations and we will do that regardless of when or where they occur. (We are not out to teach the students anything about the Roman Empire as such, we do want them to know that the Christians found themselves in the same position vis à vis the Roman Empire as the conscientious objectors, draft dodgers, etc. find themselves in today vis à vis the U.S. government.) ... If what is happening in England is going to shed light on a problem we have rather than selecting an example from the past in the U.S., we'll move to a consideration of what is happening today in England." (US 141)

The same point is made by one of the Elementary school principals:

> "We're teaching for concepts, so it really doesn't matter, the area that you teach, as long as you get the concepts of people, and why they live in a particular way, the cultural and historical background." (US 240)

Another High school teacher referred to the Fenton approach which he followed, making a comparative study of underdeveloped parts of the world because he felt that American provincialism had led to a great number of mistakes in dealing with other areas:

> "We try to take the idea of tradition and change and show how these traditional societies are trying to come into the modern world ... We have seven different areas that we give the kids a choice on - pick four different areas to study for one semester, we try to pick countries like - well, Latin America is one, and China, India, and even Japan this time, even though Japan is pretty modern." (US 94)

The comparative approach was also followed in a Junior High school which had developed a unit on cities throughout the world, again emphasizing the fact that societies throughout the world had the element of urban life and its problems in common:

> "The main purpose of this type of course is to study the development of these cities in Europe, Asia, Africa, the U.S. and South America, in order to relate them to how problems have developed in modern society in all these areas ... to compare the different problems of Calcutta and Bangkok, to, say, Chicago or New York, and yet show that there are some similarities in the development of these cities." (US 195)

Among the English teachers it was noticeable that the problem centred approach could be found where the school had adopted a social studies, or humanities, curriculum, or some kind of integrated studies, but not where a formal history course was followed. In this connection it is worth referring again to the questionnaire which showed the American teachers to be very much more in favour of interdisciplinary study. Seventy per cent of the American, but only 42% of the English teachers agreed that, "My students gain more from history if it is approached through some form of inter-disciplinary study." (Question 30) It was one of the largest margins of difference. The social studies type of course was found during the first two years of the secondary curriculum, but not later than that. One of the major contrasts between the British and American systems was in the fact that curriculum innovation and experimentation were to be found during the High school years, 14 plus, at an age when British pupils were engaged in formal examination studies. Several English teachers said they thought that integrated work would make it easier to include other countries, one referred to a first year course on China which had been successfully taught in this way, and this Comprehensive teacher described the structure of a social studies course in her school:

"We've got a sort of concentric syllabus. We start off with the individual school environment, then the city. Then by the second year we're dealing more with Britain, and by the third year we're looking more outside our own country and looking at a world perspective. So in fact we've got two concurrent themes, we've got the idea of progress to a more complex society, and also, really, probably for our own convenience to some extent, we've also got this concentric, geographical situation as well." (UK 96)

Asked how far the final concentric circle extended she replied:

"In the third year we also do a few weeks on exploration, ... after that we deal with problems of food, third world, underdevelopment, pollution and then with more personal things like prejudice, violence, things that aren't really limited in any particular sort of country, you know, more general themes." (UK 96)

It seems clear that a social studies type of curriculum, being concerned with society in general, is more responsive to the study of foreign lands than a traditional history curriculum which is normally concerned with the study of a particular nation, and perhaps with its relations with other nations. 'Society', being concerned with modes of life, customs, relationships between individuals and groups, is more a horizontal categorization of people than 'nation', which is more a vertical grouping, defined rather as a group sharing certain cultural characteristics, subject to a particular government, and confined within political boundaries. Therefore a curriculum which is concerned mainly with the former, embraces far more naturally the study of foreign regions than one which is concerned mainly with the latter. Moreover, at least one year of world history is a standard requirement in most American High schools, however superficial this may be in practice. Thus the curriculum patterns employed in the two countries are likely to dispose American history teachers more readily towards the study of foreign regions than English teachers.

The Internationalist Ideal

The approaches of the two groups of teachers towards the specifically international aspects of their teaching will now be considered. Two items from the questionnaire suggest that a large majority of the teachers in both groups were convinced of the importance of the international dimension to their work. Ninety four per cent of the

American and 84% of the English teachers agreed that, "It is just as important for my students to know something of the history of foreign countries as of their own," (Question 23), and 88% of the American and 86% of the English agreed that, "The teaching of history should be regarded as a means of improving international understanding." (Question 2) In the latter case, roughly one half of the Americans indicated strong agreement, whereas only about one fifth of the British did so, confirming further the greater tendency of the Americans to moralize in history teaching. The response to Question 21, "It is more important for my students to know the history of their own country than that of foreign countries," can also be taken as evidence of support for the internationalist ideal. It would be reasonable to expect that such a statement would be fairly heavily endorsed but both groups were very evenly divided, 50% of the American and 53% of the English agreeing. However, continuing regard for the value of national history is shown in the response to Question 19, "History should be taught in such a way as to diminish awareness of national differences", which was firmly rejected by a majority of both groups; only 21% of Americans and 23% of the English agreeing.

Although such responses indicate that both groups were fairly well in agreement that an international perspective was highly desirable in the teaching of the history of their own country, this concurrance is not borne out by the interviews. The latter indicate that the American teachers held an appreciably stronger belief in the interdependence of the world's peoples and the need to recognize this in their teaching. Further support for this conclusion can be found in the fact that only 6% of the American but 28% of the English agreed that, "To promote understanding and tolerance between the different peoples of the world may be desirable but it is not a proper part of history teaching." (Question 35)

Three aspects of the American teachers' concern for interdependence could be discerned. They were first a largely self interested concern with security and survival, second a belief in the necessity for understanding foreign attitudes to enable the nations of the world to co-exist peacefully, and finally a belief in an international community of mankind of which all nations, including the United States, were simply a part.

Some teachers such as this High School teacher saw the need for international understanding in cold war, balance of power, terms, believing that particular attention should be paid to those areas that represented military or economic strength:

> "We've been through the cold war period, we all realize that we must bridge the gap between the communist and non-communist world, and most Americans, and I believe most social studies teachers believe great emphasis must be placed on China, Russia, Japan, and Western Europe. By all means these particular areas ... these are the power centres of the world, and what goes on there very much affects the rest of the world. Now we do have interest in Asia, but I think we do have to be particularly concerned about the power centres of Asia. It's a practical approach." (US 61)

More widespread was the view that the nations of the world had to co-exist together and that social studies teaching ought to contribute to an increased understanding of the ways of life, customs, and attitudes of different peoples so that this co-existence could take place. Teachers felt that, whether the country liked it or not, interdependence was a reality and their students should be prepared for it:

> "We have elected to follow the road of international co-operation, and it's no longer possible for the U.S. to remain in isolation. So a knowledge of other people, other customs and so on, is extremely important if you're going to understand why these people are doing certain things, why they are acting in a certain way." (US 50)

One of the Elementary school principals too stressed interdependence, pointing out that his country also gained from it:

> "I don't think there's a single country in the world that I can think of that's self-sufficient, and certainly we are interdependent, not only for physical things, but also for ideas, and values." (US 229)

A Junior High school teacher stressed the need for an understanding of the culture and attitudes of alien peoples if true understanding, rather than merely factual information about a people, was to be gained:

> "We like to think, as educators, and especially as historians, that understanding your fellow men ... can help you to understand the things he does ... not make you agree with him, but at least understand why he's doing what he's doing, and perhaps prevent a war or harsh feelings when you don't really understand ... We don't understand why China does many of the things they do, or

the Japanese, or the Indians, we don't understand their attitudes about, for instance letting cows roam the streets in India, and we need to try and find out about these people, because we're all in one - what do they say, community of nations or something like that? I guess I'll go along with that." (US 209)

The third aspect of interdependence that some teachers put forward was the stronger view that, not only did the nations of the world form a community whose members must learn to co-exist, but that in a sense mankind itself was a community entitled to the 'terminal loyalty' of all individuals, and that nations were only sub units within this community. Although it was recognized that nationalism had an extremely strong hold on most of the world's peoples and any idea of an effective institutionalized world community in their lifetime was naive, these teachers thought that the wholeness of mankind was an important concept. One High school teacher spoke of his school's realization of the need to become more outward looking:

"One of the criticisms of this school and our curriculum in social sciences has been that we have been too inwardly oriented - 'Crime, Courts, and Prisons', 'Death of the American City', 'The American Dream', 'Election Special', 'Psychology and Social Psychology', which deals with the American citizen and his relationships and psychological problems, and we really haven't looked out towards the rest of the world, and in a world that's growing smaller and smaller all the time, and so next year we are adding anthropology and the humanities course, comparative political systems is being changed in its emphasis. Next year we are offering an Asian studies course." (US 73)

Asked why he considered it necessary to look outwards, he spoke of his view that the study of the United States alone would leave the student deprived:

"I feel that in social science, looking at just American problems or sociology, that aspect of America, gives the student a warped view of the total social sciences and the world. And if we don't offer him the exposure to other aspects of the world he becomes very inward himself. He tends to think only of the United States and he doesn't think of the rest of the world, so if we don't have courses offered about the rest of the world, and about area studies, about problems in other areas of the world also, then we are intentionally warping his view, I feel, of the world ... I think if you only expose somebody to one half of the total picture you are intentionally warping his view." (US 74)

This view of the United States as only part of the total picture was expressed by several others. "How can you possibly learn

about mankind if you're only learning about one part of mankind?" enquired one. "I don't want to make it sound ethnocentric," said another, and an Elementary teacher stressed the common basis of humanity that united peoples throughout the world:

> "There is a feeling that peoples are essentially the same all over the world, they have the same basic needs but go about getting them in a different way. The feeling of interdependence is emphasized also. In second grade they study Japan, India, Switzerland. This is a marked change from the past where second grade was a community helpers type of thing." (US 274)

However, those taking this world community view were usually careful to disclaim any sense of obligation towards others, particularly those in poorer countries, or feeling that the United States should intervene to suggest solutions to their problems. One High school teacher wished to alert his students to the threat that unequal living posed to world stability:

> "In our courses that deal with the third world countries, or the under-developed countries, whatever you want to call them, we do deal with their standard of living, and it might be a little bit selfish but we strongly point out the dangers of hunger and overpopulation, that this can lead to a chaotic situation which might affect our well being or security, as well as other nations of the world." (US 62)

Yet he did not wish to suggest that his students should feel motivated towards actions which might relieve the hunger or curb the overpopulation. Another teacher stated that his teaching about poverty stricken countries was specifically to prevent feelings of sympathy which could lead to misguided actions:

> "One reason we do this is so they won't be moved to some form of obligation. That is maybe a wrong decision on their part. Who's to say whether it's good for India - the poor starving people - who's to say it wouldn't be just as good if they were left alone ... We try to deal with this idea of technology, right now, see, we're using 40% of the world's resources with 6% of the world's population. Before we say that the rest of the world should live like we live and keep the communists out, and do things like this, I think we ought to look at this to see if everybody can even do it." (US 95)

Once again the Vietnam experience seems to have been of major importance in influencing attitudes towards the wider world, especially

poor peasant peoples. It seems to have led to a caution and a questioning of motives and values which made most American teachers extremely reluctant to suggest that the country should act to solve the third world's problems in any particular way. Some hoped that their pupils would respond to appeals for help for Vietnam orphans for example, or would feel some responsibility for the rebuilding of North Vietnam, but this should be the result of an individual's private decision, and was not part of their teaching aims. Thus the interest of the American teachers in the wider world may be said to include information, and awareness, but not obligation.

By contrast, the English teachers showed on the whole a good deal less interest in the rest of the world. Although the replies to the questionnaire suggest that there was strong support for the internationalist ideal, the interviews show that fewer of them than the Americans attempted to follow it in their teaching.

It must be acknowledged first that a few did express enthusiasm for world history, or for history taught from a world perspective, and there were in existence a number of world affairs courses. One 11-18 Comprehensive teacher spoke of his re-organisation of the syllabus towards this end:

> "A very important criterion for our syllabus is that there should be a world perspective in it, it's very important. We've had to make some concessions, the practical question of the books which we have, which tend to be mainly British history and so on - but things which we think are of world importance." (UK 84)

He was not particularly concerned with the problem of whether or not the children could identify with people in distant parts, which was something that troubled other English teachers:

> "I think that human nature, the basic sort of drives of human nature, don't change that radically from society to society, so I think the process of identification isn't so difficult. It is more difficult for example getting kids to feel, say, the importance of religion at certain times when they themselves aren't religious ... But this is worth attempting I think because if they can make that leap they've gained an awful lot in being able to understand other societies which I think is an important value of history." (UK 85)

Another Comprehensive teacher said that the syllabus in his school was constructed from a world perspective:

"It's essentially world history, I think, that we study all the way through. We study important civilizations, Ancient Egypt, Ancient Greece, Rome, say the Renaissance in Italy, Holland, the Dutch Republic, America at the time of the wild west." (UK 198)

He added, "It's a myth that children like local history, they like something that's colourful." We may note in these comments once again the English teachers' fondness for drama and imagination in their history, and, in their stress on civilization, concern for the intellectual and the aesthetic which has previously been mentioned as characteristic of their approach.

Generally, non-British history of the earlier periods tended to be the study of civilizations, whereas twentieth century courses were studies of politics and international affairs, as this Comprehensive teacher observed:

"They are interested in twentieth century world history. From my experience elsewhere they are not very interested in the eighteenth, seventeenth, and sixteenth centuries, in fact they're not at all interested ... in the third form, for the last two terms we'll be concerned with twentieth century world history because I feel it's important, particularly in the twentieth century, to know more about the world. I say particularly in the twentieth century because Britain has always been rather more insular in the past it seems to me, apart from the Empire of course, whereas nowadays she is very much part of Europe and the world and can't escape from it." (UK 143)

The Empire, though it did not appear to assume any great prominence in the minds of these teachers, was probably the main focus of teaching about the wider world in the years between the ending of the middle ages and the twentieth century, and this Primary teacher had a certain nostalgia for it:

"One could argue that the British Empire, which was such a potent thing at the turn of the century and earlier, was worth studying, one couldn't for example ignore Clive and India, this sort of thing. Yes, I would perhaps concentrate a little on the sphere of influence that we had when we were an empire, and the countries that we embraced." (UK 221)

In fact, it is likely that more lessons are to be found in British schools still on Clive than on Gandhi, more on the old empire than on the new commonwealth, yet it cannot be said that most of the English teachers were greatly concerned with either. Also, the American teachers might have been surprised to know how little time relatively seems to be spent

in British schools on the American revolution. When it comes to American history, manifest destiny and the wild west seem to win most times.

Thus some English teachers expressed an interest in world history, or at least some non-British history, but on the whole it appeared to be regarded as something of a special case advanced by an evangelical few, rather than as a routine part of the history curriculum which it appeared to be in the American schools. A more common reaction among the English teachers was an expression of scepticism about the practicability of teaching such material, about whether their pupils could grasp it satisfactorily, and of the feeling that there were higher priorities in the syllabus. Fairly typical of the attitude to non-British, relative to British, history is the comment of this Comprehensive teacher who managed to fit in a week or two's work on it when the important part of the course had been covered:

> "It's the kind of think I often leave until the end of the year to see if there's enough time left. At the end of the first year for instance if there are a few spare weeks, we go back and deal with the civilization of the Indus valley, and the early civilization of China that there's usually very little time for. It's more an odd interest lesson than in any kind of sense a programme of study." (UK 151)

When teachers talk about time they usually mean priority, and clearly in this case the ancient civilization of China came low on the list.

Another teacher felt that the study of world history was less likely to kindle the interest of his pupils than that of their own country:

> "Some schools teach world history, or they are particularly fond of teaching about Russia and China, but for a variety of reasons, I definitely feel, know your own first, and I think that if you can leave some little spark in children, they'll learn afterward." (UK 192)

Others said that they taught foreign history only as it impinged upon British history, and in practice this tended to be in relation to wars. The Napoleonic wars would require some attention to France, George III would require a look at the loss of the American colonies. For some the peculiarities of place names and people's names made foreign history difficult for their pupils to manage.
One Comprehensive teacher saw a danger that the study of remoter peoples

might lead to the establishing of false stereotypes which could be harmful, rather than to greater understanding. Speaking of his pupils' reaction to some work on China he said:

> "They seemed to find if a little bit exotic rather than anything else ... and I think there's a danger in exoticism. It's the idea of the noble savage which I don't find particularly attractive. I think there is a big role (for it), but I don't go head over heels over the world history lark ... it ignores the history of the community which they're living in, quite often." (UK 61)

It is interpretation of community that seems to provide the essential clue to an understanding of the concept of history teaching held by many of these English teachers. They thought of community in the cultural sense, and also in the physical sense of the localities, the territory, the buildings, and other physical landmarks which visibly define the historical dimension of a community. There was a sense of inter-relationship between a people and their homeland where their ancestors had lived for centuries. For many of these teachers history was essentially something to be experienced, partly, as W.G. Hoskins said, through the soles of one's feet, partly through the eyes, and partly through the touch of the hand. It was primarily a matter of linking individuals to their past in an immediate and first hand kind of way. For these teachers some kind of close first hand contact with the material was required if it was to mean anything to the pupils. The spatial dimension was of major importance, and anything that was out of reach physically was likely to be thought too difficult for most pupils to comprehend. All this is far removed from the stress the Americans placed on concepts, on reasoning, and on awareness of the problems of society.

Several comments illustrate the value placed by the English teachers on the need for a child to be culturally in touch with his material for it to be comprehensible. A Ceylonese Comprehensive teacher, whom one might have expected to favour the internationalist ideal, in fact spoke against it:

> "I would have to oppose this view and the reason why I do not want to do this is not because I do not want to impose my views on others, but I cannot see how I can teach this (i.e. history of the wider world). With the child being central to the process of learning there is a high degree

> of child participation, it is difficult for me to pick out a child from European society who has no contact with other cultures except those related to European cultures, and then teach him other cultures ... I don't think we have the materials by which the child can really make this translation to this other culture, because again this other culture would need more conceptual understanding." (UK 50)

The key phrases here are, "the child being central to the process of learning" and "no contact with other cultures". They show this teacher's concern that material taught should be something within the child's grasp, rather than something that he ought to know, and the importance of personal experience in aiding comprehension. Several others stress the importance of a close relationship between the child and his environment, the absence of which was held to inhibit true understanding of the wider world:

> "I know that this (world history) is very much in vogue at the moment, but I think if you spend too much time on this, it becomes very difficult for children. English history has a sort of meaning to them - I mean you can broaden out from English history, but it has an anchor for them that creates a kind of security and familiarity." (UK 68) (Comprehensive)

The anchor metaphor employed here reinforces observations made in Chapter 2 about the belief of the English teachers that history could contribute to the child's psychological stability. It also corresponds to the word 'contact' in the previous quote and illustrates the strength of the feeling that close psychological and physical identification with the subject matter was necessary for effective learning. The theme recurs again in the comment of the teacher of the 'concentric syllabus' social studies course referred to earlier. In spite of her sympathy for a wider perspective she still felt that the emphasis had to be on the European experience in the first two years:

> "Until the third year when we try to get a world perspective it is mainly European man. And I think this is deliberate in a way, because history can contribute to self identification. And part of this is your past and your tradition, and I think this is another aim that we would like to try and achieve if possible, to teach the children about the development of their own country, and really this is far more easily done dealing with European civilization." (UK 95)

Numerous random comments can be cited in addition to show the English teachers' belief in the importance of their pupils' feeling a sense of personal identification with their material for true learning

to take place. One sixth form teacher spoke of the difficulty of getting pupils to relate to their own cultural background, let alone that of sixteenth century China, doubting whether he himself could. A Comprehensive teacher felt that his pupils could more easily identify with people in northern England than in France because of the common language and attitudes, although the latter were geographically closer. A Primary teacher found that when he had been teaching classes which included immigrants it had been easier to deal with different cultures and linguistic groups, but in his present, unmixed, situation any experience his children had of other lands was second hand and therefore such teaching was less successful.

Not only was cultural contact and cultural identification important, but territorial and spatial contact was considered by some of the English teachers to be essential to real historical understanding. The nearer the subject in space, the more readily could it be comprehended, as this Primary teacher noted:

> "Young children particularly are fond of things they can hold and touch and see, and so much of British history - one can take them out into Winchester and point to a bit of Roman wall and it becomes meaningful to them." (UK 221)

The belief in the necessity for first hand experience was not confined to primary teachers. A Comprehensive teacher said that he was particularly gratified when pupils came to him to describe visits to historical sites that they had made during the school holidays, and clearly this was one of his main criteria of successful teaching. He also stressed the importance of sight and touch in historical understanding:

> "... as I was saying about the middle ages, they can relate to something that they can go and see, things that they can touch." (UK 152)

The idea recurs again in another Comprehensive teacher's opinion that:

> "If I wanted to make history meaningful to *many* children, the best thing I could do is to go up to the Meon Valley here and look at some Norman churches, very orthodox, or the forts at the top of Portsdown Hill. This is real to them. It's all very well talking to them about Siamese history, but Siamese history means very little to children, or even Chinese history." (UK124)

Thus it is clear that a strong feeling existed among many of the English teachers that for history to be accessible to children, it

had to be within range of what could be experienced personally, either through community living and family background, or through the senses of sight and touch. This stress on the importance of first hand experience and the interaction between individuals and their immediate physical environment was something that was not found in the interviews with the American teachers. Although the latter, as has been said, laid great stress on education as preparation for citizenship, and for participation in the life of the community, there was comparatively little reference to the physical environment, and little sense of the importance of locality. It was community in terms of the people who formed it and the ideals which it cherished that they were concerned with. Where the environment was referred to it was more in terms of nature, of unspoiled wilderness, and the threat which was man was posing, conservation, pollution, and so on, than of the human impact. There was little of the English teachers' stress on buildings and artefacts, or on the interaction between man and environment.

It might be argued that there are no Roman walls or Norman churches in the U.S.A. and therefore the man made physical evidence of the past is less obtrusive. Undoubtedly, this is true, and yet the absence of man made historical landmarks in the U.S. can be exaggerated. In some parts, physical and tangible remains exist which go back three hundred years or more. Spanish missions and governors' palaces in the south west, eighteenth century churches, mansions and monuments in New England and Virginia. The city of St. Louis is an old city as American cities go, founded in 1764, and though nothing remains of the original settlement, there was an eighteenth century cathedral, the basilica of St. Louis, the first church west of the Mississippi, and numerous nineteenth century buildings. Not far away across the river were the ancient Cahokia Indian burial mounds. All these received scant mention in the interviews with the American teachers, and it is tempting to seek other explanations for their comparative lack of interest in the local environment.

One reason, as has been suggested, is the different concept of social studies education. We have argued throughout that the English teachers were more interested in humanistic aims - personal, intellectual, aesthetic, and cultural development of the individual, whereas the Americans were more interested in societal aims - the preparation of their students for a role in society. This could help

to explain the greater interest of the English teachers in fostering as vivid an awareness of the past as possible, and the Americans in the development of useful skills and knowledge.

Another reason however may be found in the differing natures of the nationality of the two countries. One of the few discussions about physical manifestations of the past in the United States occurred during an interview with three Elementary school teachers. The discussion hinged on whether or not the children were more likely to be interested in the Washington Monument than in the Leaning Tower of Pisa. One said that they would because:

> "I think just the physical - the fact that it's within the United States, within grasp, within reach of the children in their family group. I think this would be enough to say that they would be more interested in this (the Monument). (US 245)

The interesting point to note here is that St. Louis is approximately the same distance from Washington D.C. as Southampton is from Pisa, about 700 miles. An English teacher would be unlikely to consider that the Leaning Tower of Pisa could possibly come within the category of those things that a pupil could normally "go and see and touch", yet the Washington Monument was considered to be accessible to the children of St. Louis, and something with which they could be expected to indentify.

This discussion went a stage further when one of the other teachers disagreed:

> "Except that the elementary child, the young elementary child, has not developed a real understanding or a concept of distance, and a child who lives in St. Louis and perhaps comes from less affluent parents, so that he has not seen much of the United States - I think he's going to look at the Washington Monument and the Golden Gate Bridge with no different feeling from the Arc de Triomphe." (US 246)

These words point up a major difference in the nature of the nationality of the two countries, and in the approach of school teachers and children to the teaching about it. In the view of the first teacher, the St. Louis child could identify with the Washington Monument because it was accessible, it was within the United States. This implies more than physical accessibility. The monument honours one of the leading figures in American history, is situated in the nation's capital, is a national tourist attraction, and thus forms part of the cultural

frame of reference of every American child. The second teacher believed that in practice the monument was not all that physically accessible to many American children, and that in reality they would not make much distinction between the monument and the Arc de Triomphe. This is not to diminish the importance of the Washington Monument but rather to increase that of the Arc de Triomphe. She felt that the elementary child had not developed, "a real understanding or a concept of distance" so what she is saying is that American teachers did not expect that their children's cultural allegiance should be limited to what can be easily reached, or seen, or touched, at least not to the same extent that the English teachers did. If an American child can be taught about the Washington Monument or the Golden Gate Bridge, which may well be out of range physically, then there are no insuperable conceptual barriers to his being taught about the Arc de Triomphe or indeed the Taj Mahal, or the temples of Bankok, or anywhere else. If he can be taught to feel some sort of involvement and identification with a community as large as the United States, the greater part of which he will never see, even in a full lifetime, then there is no logical reason why he cannot comprehend communities even further afield.

Thus American nationality is a cultural and ideological concept rather than an ancestral and territorial one, and this difference does much to explain why the American teachers found it easier to teach even young children about regions and lands much further from home than most of the English teachers were prepared to do. The geographical extent of the United States alone makes the range of cultural identification considered possible for the American child wider than that considered possible for the English child.

These differing perspectives on nationality and cultural allegiance can also be seen in the attitude of the two groups towards particular regions of the world. These will now be considered, dealing first with attitudes towards Europe, and then the non-western world.

Europe

In considering attitudes to Europe the influence of the differences in national background and character are again apparent, and the main conclusion is that to the Americans Europe appeared to be to a far greater extent a unity, as the ancestral homeland, whereas to

the English it appeared still as a distant continent fragmented into separate and often strange groups.

Where the American teachers were concerned with cultural roots and heritage it was largely to Europe that they looked for it. In the words of one Junior High teacher, "You can't teach American history without teaching the derivation of most of the people who came here." (US 82) All the American schools visited appeared to include some study of Europe in their history courses, and several American teachers admitted that courses entitled world history were often mostly European history. Thus the study of Europe is important to American history teachers, indeed pre-eighteenth century European history appears to be seen as an earlier phase of American history. The contintent appeared to be studied as a whole rather than divided into separate national groups. Europe in fact, seems to stand in much the same relationship to the United States that ancient Greece and Rome do to Europe.

However, the new ethnic consciousness appears to have had its effect on the American teachers' attitudes to Europe also. Just as non-European ethnic minorities are searching for cultural roots, so too are the smaller European ethnic minorities claiming due attention to their cultural heritage. One High school teacher said that in reality it was usually only certain parts of Europe that were studied:

> "We know very little about Hungary and Bulgaria, Poland, this area of the world, even frankly about Russia, because the focus has been upon England, France, Spain, Italy - Western Europe." (US 102)

Thus ethnic pressures from within appear to be influencing the perceptions which the American teachers have of the rest of the world, and of their own past. It is still true that the majority of foreign history courses are European courses, but they appear to be under pressure from courses relating to other parts of the world, or from comparative courses of the Fenton type. Only twenty per cent of American teachers agreed that, "It is more important for Americans to study the history of Europe than that of any other part of the world." (Question 36)

To most of the English teachers it appeared that Europe was the normal antithesis to Britain. On numerous occasions a question such as, "Do you study mostly British history in this school?" would be

met by the reply, "No, we do some European history as well." Foreign history was seen to mean largely European history, 'abroad' usually meant Europe. Moreover, although an occasional concept like the Renaissance emerged which might be studied as a general European movement, the continent was usually perceived as made up of extremely diverse groups, each of which required separate study, or which were too remote for British children to comprehend at all. Thus the English teachers for the most part, taught Europe in a manner which stressed the differences rather than the similarities of the European peoples. Little attempt was being made, so far as could be judged from the interviews, to encourage the British child to develop a sense of 'terminal loyalty' to Europe rather than to Britain. Some teachers thought that as, politically, the country moved closer to the European community, it would be reflected in the school syllabus and that the broadening of the syllabus into European studies would be desirable. But this Comprehensive teacher implies that to do this would be to fly in face of the facts:

> "When you're teaching history you've got to realize that England, Britain, was a separate entity, and therefore to talk generally in European terms is not possible as an historian because centuries ago they were at war, they were the enemy. So one can't twist the truths of the past to fit in with the developments of today." (UK 95)

Another was also suspicious of this development, feeling that it would emasculate the history of different countries, removing much colour and excitement:

> "I think it is a good thing, but there are inbuilt dangers as well - the very thing that you started off by saying, that you have a cultural heritage, and history is the main link we have with our cultural heritage, what's gone before - you know, we are in danger of losing a certain amount of this. I see this committee somewhere that's put up the suggestion that in future there is no more British history, French history, there is European history. And to my way of thinking anyway, I think that will take a lot of the interest out of the subject because I think history should have a certain bias, I think this is the fun of unravelling it." (UK 43)

A third rejected the concept of European history altogether, saying that it would not be feasible to teach European history in any meaningful way to British pupils:

"One thing I find extremely comical is the emphasis that a lot of senior education advisers, for want of a better word, are placing on European history in secondary schools, because I think it's absolute nonsense. There's no such thing as European history! There's a history of several hundred different countries which gradually emerged into a dozen or so large countries, most of whom were fighting each other, a lot of whom had different ethnic origins - they have different cultural backgrounds and yet people talk about European history as if it's an entity ... I don't think we can adequately cover British history, and until they've got that background, I don't see that the history of Europe has any relevance ... I'm thinking of, for instance, trying to teach the history of Czechoslovakia. I would find that almost impossible to get real interest with the children, because there is just no contact whatsoever with Czechoslovakia, which was Bohemia, which was so and so. ..." (UK 152)

It seems that to British children, as to Neville Chamberlain in 1938, Czechoslovakia is still a 'far away country of which we know nothing'. Yet it is no farther away from the children of Southampton than the Golden Gate Bridge is from the children of St. Louis, and this quotation is further illustration of the way factors affecting the ability of children to identify with and feel loyalty towards a people or a place are affected by cultural and psychological considerations rather than physical distance. This English teacher stressed the importance of contact before his children could comprehend, but no American teacher said that his students would be unable to cover American history adequately until they had got a background in the history of their own state, and this quote makes very clear the difference in the English and American teachers' perception of their own nationality. The American nation has been created by men and men can make themselves Americans; the British nation along with other European nations, has grown of itself, albeit with human help from time to time, and the true Briton must be grown, not made.

The Non-Western World

We shall now turn to a consideration of attitudes towards the non-western world, by which is meant mainly Asia and Africa, with some reference to South America. The conclusion here is that the American teachers on the whole showed a greater interest in these regions than the English, but that both groups revealed a stronger awareness of and interest in Asia than they did in Africa or South America.

Among both groups there were frequent expressions of regret at the shortage of materials for the study of these regions, and also the lack of time in which to cover them. Opinions differed as to the level of interest that their pupils showed in such studies. Six items from the questionnaire attempted to distinguish the concepts of relevance, importance, and interest in relation to these regions. They were items 18, 23, 24, 27, 28 and 29.

The response to Question 18, "Most of my students do not find the history of their own country more relevant than that of foreign countries", showed a substantial difference between the two groups. Seventy nine per cent of the American, but 58% of the English teachers disagreed thus indicating that a large majority of the Americans with a small majority of the English thought that their pupils found the study of foreign countries to be as relevant as the history of their own.

Support in both groups for the study of third world countries may be deduced from the responses to Question 24 which read, "The most important foreign countries to study are those that are important in the world today", depending upon how "important" is interpreted. Only 35% of the American and 38% of the English teachers agreed. Thus the two groups were largely in accord. However, there was some divergence in Question 28, "The most important foreign countries to study are those which have strongly influenced the development of our own," which showed 59% of the American, but 42% of the English in agreement, suggesting a slightly greater concern of the Americans for countries thought to be closely involved with their own. Both groups strongly endorsed the importance of the study of foreign countries in general in responding to Question 23. Ninety four per cent of the American and 84% of the English agreed that, "It is just as important for my students to know something of the history of foreign countries as of their own."

Questions 27 and 29 were concerned with interest, and as the results of these two are contradictory the safest conclusion seems to be that both groups were fairly evenly divided amongst themselves as to whether their pupils were more interested in their own than in foreign countries. Question 27 read, "It is easier to get my students interested in the history of their own country than in that of foreign countries."

Sixty per cent and 54% of American and English respectively agreed. With Question 29, however, which stated the same question in reverse, the result was also reversed. It asked whether, "My students find the history of foreign countries just as interesting as that of their own." This time 47% of the American but 61% of the English teachers agreed, which contradicted their earlier assertions.

The general conclusion from this section of the questionnaire seems to be that the American teachers were somewhat more prepared to undertake the teaching of foreign countries, feeling them to be relevant and important, even though they were not all convinced that their pupils were more interested in them. However, substantial numbers of teachers in both groups indicated a belief in the value of studying foreign countries. As usual it is to the interviews that we must look for the subtleties.

One of the features of the discussions on the study of the non-western world with the American teachers was their stress on the future. Consistent with the social studies approach generally, most American teachers felt that these regions deserved attention because of the increasingly significant role they were likely to play in world affairs in the years to come. There were many comments of an apologetic nature, implying that there ought to be more attention to the non-western world than there had been and that the schools were negligent in not making more provision for this. Such comments are further evidence of the way in which the American teachers thought the social studies curriculum should respond to changing social circumstances and seek to mitigate the problems of society.

In particular it was Asia that these American teachers thought should be the subject of greater attention, as this High school teacher makes clear:

> "I think we are extremely weak in what we do. There is so little that we know about the non-western world. Our ties are with Western Europe so consequently we tend to emphasize that, and I think that is a terrible mistake on our part, a tragic mistake, thinking in terms of where the great mass of people live, India, China, 800 million people. Thinking in terms of the future, the centres of power and so on. I think it is extremely important that we know more about the Orientals, the non-western people." (US 51)

The same idea of a changing perspective, of a hitherto European centred view of world affairs being changed by the rise of the Asian powers,

is seen in this High school teacher's comment:

> "I think it's so obvious that most of the people in the U.S. came from Europe, or Eurasia, and most of our political dealings in the last two hundred years have been with Europe, that this area gets a lot more emphasis. It's just in the last 20-30 years or so that the Asian countries have really started to play a large part, and I think that, as the world continues to expand, other areas of the world come into prominence in history." (US 123)

Almost identical sentiments are expressed by a third, Junior High, teacher:

> "... so much of the democratic ideals came from Western Europe ... you have to look at the values and ideals held by Western European people. However, I think there is a more definite urge right now, or need I'd say, to study Asia. Now we do have an Asian programme going in one of our High schools, but there's not nearly enough study of Asia, and certainly the country of the twentieth century is China, no question about it." (US 208)

The significance and potential threat of Asia as one of the power centres of the world, and as rival to the United States was felt by this High school teacher to be one of the main reasons for studying Asia:

> "You would be very wrong if you didn't bring in and make them understand the importance of Asia in the world today, because it is becoming an important continent, and we try to stress the fact that one of our biggest rivals is going to be Japan. It has advanced so far, and we have to recognize and appreciate, and not underestimate them. Very important." (US 82)

The comments of the English teachers on the subject of Asia show that a few, the world history devotees, expressed an enthusiasm for the subject and a conviction of its importance, but for the majority it was of somewhat marginal interest. It was an optional extra in world affairs courses for older pupils, and enterprising teachers had sometimes offered topics or projects, usually on China, to younger pupils, frequently interdisciplinary in character. Often the non-western world was included when it impinged on British history, but rarely for its own sake. This 11-18 Comprehensive teacher gave one of the few enthusiastic justifications for the study of an Asian topic, and even this arose from an aspect of British history:

"We have one theme, expansion of the British Empire, which I think is of world importance, and it's also partly a concession too to the fact that we have textbooks. I mean other empires have been important too, but it's a question of books. There are various themes within that topic and one is India - to take certain patches and to take it down to the present day, and India we do consider important. One of our criteria of importance is choosing topics of world interest. You could argue perhaps a democratic criterion, sheer size of population, that people are important, and that where you have masses of people, that is clearly important. I mean the history of kings and queens scarcely figures in our syllabus." (UK 85)

Another Comprehensive teacher spoke of a project on China, whose success seemed to surprise him:

"We do China in the first year, we do quite a big integrated project in the first year with China, among all departments. We try to get places that aren't necessarily European, and China funnily enough works quite well." (UK 161)

A third showed an unusual perspective on British history, setting it in a much wider context of world significance than was seen in most comments:

"At the moment I'm doing the crusades with the second year, which involves having a look at Islam and the Byzantine empire, and other things which are nothing to do with British history. And trying to show that at that time England was very much a barbaric country on the edge of civilization really." (UK 67)

However, for the most part the English teachers' references to Asia were perfunctory:

"I do in fact deal with the Sino-Soviet split - I'd like to do it all, the reason for the selection is simply time." (Sixth Form College - UK 35)

"We've run experiments ... we did China in the third year once, quite successfully." (11-18 Comprehensive - UK 48)

"We went to the Chinese treasures and talked about ancient China, and there was interest so we followed that through and talked about the present situation, they wanted to know about that." (Comprehensive - UK 177)

These teachers show some awareness of Asia, particularly of China; Japan was mentioned much less frequently than by the Americans. However, with most of them it was not of central importance. Where China had been attempted, these comments show that the teachers were often surprised at its success, and at the interested response of the children. It is noticeable again how success tends to be judged in terms of pupil

interest. This suggests that whatever obstacles there may be to the study of the non-western world do not lie in the lack of motivation on the part of the pupils.

Africa was a region that seemed to baffle both groups. For some Americans the race relations issue in South Africa had an obvious bearing upon contemporary domestic problems in the United States which made that aspect of African history relevant, but usually they stressed the difficulties of finding adequate materials, and teachers with the necessary background. One High school teacher admitted;

> "Africa is the weak area. South Africa is covered because of its apartheid policy. We talked earlier about teachers' lack of preparation, I would say African studies is a relatively new area at university level." (US 101)

Another agreed that Africa and South America did not have a great deal of importance:

> "Africa in a way more so than South America, because of the Negro population in the U.S. (but) Africa is changing so rapidly that it's hard for any type of curriculum to stay up to date on that. It still should be in there but not so much as some other foreign countries." (US 197)

A third said that he found little interest in modern Africa among his students except at times of trouble:

> "There is a lot of interest in ancient civilizations, but not in the current Africa, except around crisis oriented things, for instance Egypt and the Israelis, Sudan, and the hi-jackers. It seems things have to be crisis oriented." (US 62)

The English teachers showed even less interest in Africa. Some said that questions on Africa appeared on some exam papers but they were rarely taught or answered:

> "The C.S.E. syllabus involves Africa, China, and so on, so I'm afraid they tend to get done. I've got to do Africa so to speak because it's on the syllabus." (Comprehensive - UK 144)

A wide variety of obstacles to the study of Africa were cited. The pupils were not interested said some:

> "There are certain areas that come into the syllabus - we do some on America, and a little bit on the empire, but very little outside that. I would have thought that they would have wanted to know about Africa but they're not very interested." (Comprehensive - UK 178)

Some stressed the unfamiliarity of the geography and the difficulty of place names:

> "All that I'm saying is that there's a bewildering change of names of states, of personalities, they change like you change your underwear. It's impractical as simple as that." (Comprehensive - UK 208)

Others gave lack of time as the main reason:

> "You're coming up against the time factor for 'O' level. Topics like Africa and Japan, which one would dearly love to teach the children, one just doesn't have time in actual fact." (Comprehensive - UK 208)

One thought that the cultural gap was too wide to enable serious study to take place, and therefore the third world was best left to R.E.:

> "Third world history as a whole doesn't seem to be taught very much does it? It all depends rather on R.E. - the underdeveloped world. Perhaps it's a transcultural thing. You've got so much groundwork to do, the gulf is so great that it is impossible to attack African history, Latin American history, in qualitatively the same way as European." (Comprehensive - UK 208)

Like Czechoslovakia, Africa was judged to be outside the grasp of most British children.

Where African history was taught it was very much the activity of a few enthusiasts, and it did not have an accepted place as a normal part of history courses. Two of the teachers interviewed had themselves taught in Africa, and one of these found that children could be interested in Africa easily enough if the teacher himself was interested:

> "I think if you go into a class and you don't like it you'll put it across that way. I'm a convinced believer that a history teacher must be a bit of an actor. I might be old fashioned, but you've got to go in there and sell yourself to the kids. You've got to show that you're interested, that you're enjoying it, that you think it's important, and 90% of the kids respond." (Comprehensive - UK 162)

This remark suggests that most of the impediments to the teaching of Africa lay in the minds of the teachers rather than in the nature of the subject, the source materials, or the pupils' interests.

However, low as Africa came on the list of the regional priorities of both groups, the lowest of all was South America. Perhaps it was not surprising in the case of the English since Britain has

no historical connections with that region, neither is it of great influence on the world stage, nor geographically close to the British Isles. In the case of the Americans, however, it is surprising that a region which is in the same hemisphere and is in relatively close proximity to the United States, should receive such scant attention. As one Junior High school teacher said:

> "I don't even think about it, and it's wrong, because they're in the world too, and they should be studied. But it's really interesting, I, as a typical teacher, don't even consider the study of South America, and I can't tell you why." (US 210)

Another stated that American pupils were bored by Latin America, but felt, as the British African enthusiast did, that this might be the fault of the teacher:

> "I don't know why the American student is bored with Latin American history and culture, maybe it's a reflection of the teacher's attitude, I don't know." (High School - US 62)

Perhaps the real reason was given by the Junior High teacher who implied that South America was not powerful enough to command attention:

> "South America should be mentioned, but I do not feel that it is as much an influence one way or the other on the U.S. as some of the other countries." (US 197)

The English teachers usually mentioned South America only in answer to a direct question, and there was only one comment of any substance. Yet it represents the general feeling that it was not a region worth bothering with:

> "As I said the other day, you just cannot do anything in South America really and truly, because it's not, percentage wise, a good thing to do. The chances of a question coming up on the South American country that you pick are so remote." (11-18 Comprehensive - UK 46)

It has been argued in this chapter that there are significant differences in the way the American and English teachers perceive their own nationalities and those of the wider world. It has been argued that these differences stem from the character, historical development, and size of the two countries, and that the nature of the nationality of each country affects the way it approaches the study of others.

In the case of the English teachers the 'terminal loyalty' that they assume in their history lessons, and around which most history curricula are constructed, is to the land and the people of Britain and

to the concepts of territory and kinship. Perhaps John of Gaunt's paean of praise for "This other Eden, demi-paradise" is overstating it, but attention has been drawn several times to the importance in the approach of these English teachers, of the interaction of men and the land. It accounts for the greater feeling for local history, although none of the schools visited were studying local history as more than a part of the history of the nation. It may be that the fact of Britain's being geographically an island, "a jewel set in a silver sea," contributes to the strong identification of these English teachers with the physical limits of Britain, but it is not a subject that was explored during these interviews. Whatever the explanation, the English teachers appeared to have a strong sense of "home" and "abroad". "Foreign" meant something outside the territorial limits of the British Isles.

As far as ancestry, the other major element in British nationality is concerned, it has been suggested that there is a strong ethnic element to the British people. Glazer has pointed out the expectation in European thinking, especially the nationalism of the nineteenth century, that ethnic and state boundaries should co-incide (3). In particular, this was the principle of the 1918 Versailles settlement; Czechoslovakia for the Czechs; Yugoslavia for the Slavs and so on. Likewise, at least since the fifteenth century, there has been a strong ethnic character to the British people.

The fact that the British people have this strongly defined sense of their own unique identity, characterized essentially by kinship and territory, does much to explain the sharper sense of home and abroad that the English teachers showed. British history teaching on the evidence of this study, assumes a separateness and a distinction between the different peoples of the world, and places its terminal loyalty firmly in the British nation.

In the case of the Americans, terminal loyalty is a more ambiguous concept. The pluralistic, salad bowl, character of the American nation has been described, which makes a diversity of demands upon the loyalties of its people, the one unifying factor being the American creed. When, on the one hand, the individual's allegiance is claimed by a variety of sub groups within the nation, and on the other by a set of ideals, it is easier for a people to feel that events outside

its borders are of relevance to them. Even more so when the national borders themselves are so wide. Whether an incident occurs in Berlin, or Beirut, Soweto, or Belfast, there will be some group in the U.S. that feels personally concerned.

It is this universalism of the United States that is the main explanation of the greater readiness of the American teachers to embrace the study of other lands. When so much of one's own land is "foreign" it is easier to feel an interest in foreign peoples. The U.S.A. in Melville's phrase, is not only a world rather than a nation, but is also for the world. It feels its ideals to be of universal validity, and anyone who accepts them can in some sense become an American. As Glazer observes, one may become an American by "achievement", whereas European groups are groups by "ascription." (4)

It would be incorrect to claim that these American teachers were putting forward the ideal of a world society, as the proper recipient of the 'terminal loyalty' of their students. But it is suggested that in a country where there is such a multiplicity of allegiances, and such a large geographical area, it is easier to feel some identification with regions outside its territorial limits, and that this is an explanation of the greater awareness of the wider world that they showed in their teaching.

Chapter Five - References

1. Glazer, N., 'The Universalization of Ethnicity', Encounter (1975), Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 11.

2. Myrdal, G., 'An American Dilemma', (1944), extract reprinted in Shaver and Berlak (1968), op. cit. p. 90.

3. Glazer, N., (1975), op. cit. p. 10.

4. Glazer, N., (1975), ibid. p. 9.

Chapter Six - Conclusions

A survey has now been made of the views of the American and English teachers over the full range of topics selected for discussion. The samples were neither large nor representative, but they were drawn from a cross section of typical teachers practising in typical schools and it seems likely that their views can provide a broad indication of what may be distinctive characteristics of American and British education. A final and brief summary will now be made of the main conclusions, followed by a short appraisal of a suitable role history in British education today.

The principal differences between the two groups of teachers can be classified under three headings; views on the nature of the subject, views on the nature of the pupils, and views on the role of the teacher.

Considering views on the nature of the subject first, it can be stated that the evidence from these interviews confirms the hypothesis that American history teaching is concerned mainly with societal objectives, whereas British history teaching is concerned mainly with humanistic objectives. It must be repeated that a comparison confined exclusively to history teaching is not possible because of the close identification of history with the broader concept of social studies in the curriculum of the American schools. History courses alternate with those in government, social psychology, civics, sociology, and similar subjects in a student's social studies programme, and deal with largely the same concepts. These include politics and the principles of government, citizenship and social behaviour, and the interaction of culture and economic environment. American history teaching, on the evidence of this study, commences from the standpoint of the present and stresses those aspects of the past which relate to contemporary society. It aims to use history to illuminate the present and to make a contribution towards solving the problems of the future. This social science-based approach to the teaching of the past encourages the selection of representative, rather than unique, events for attention and a concern for comparative study. Because of its greater utilitarian concerns, it may be responsible for

a slightly greater tendency to moralize, despite assertions of neutrality, especially where contemporary social problems are involved.

In Britain, history teaching is more concerned with an academic understanding of the past on its own terms and in its own right, with the cultural development of the individual, and the enrichment of the personality that this is alleged to bring. Although the social science view of history was found among British history teachers and gains strength from the tendency towards integrated studies, history is seen more as a civilizing agency than as a social instrument. The stress is on the uniquesness of peoples, institutions and events rather than on their similarities. It is likely that these differences can be explained largely in terms of the historical evolution of the education system in the two countries. British education evolved over a far longer period for much of which time the emphasis was on the production of a small cultured elite to fill the top positions in society and the state. The American system evolved much later and more rapidly, with a greater emphasis on social as opposed to academic purpose. One of the main tasks of American education, and it became the responsibility of the social studies curriculum in particular, was to transform a heterogeneous population in a large land into good American citizens. Hence the greater emphasis on utilitarian value in American history teaching.

Because the concern is not primarily with the present, British history teaching appears to be more detached from current social and political issues and day to day events. It would be possible to deduce many contemporary problems from an American social studies curriculum guide, whereas it would not usually be possible to do so from a British history syllabus. The Americans seemed more willing to tackle social problems as an integral part of social studies teaching than the British with whom they were treated somewhat peripherally. This was especially noticeable with older secondary classes, those whose students were aged between 16 and 18. Few British sixth formers have to take account of contemporary social problems as a formal part of their 'A' level work in history. As a general principle, it would appear that the brighter the student, the less socially relevant did his curriculum appear to be, and social problems courses often seemed to be the preserve of the early leavers. American High school students in their Junior and Senior year also seemed to encounter a wider range

of global topics, in both general social studies and 'pure' history courses than do British sixth form history students, although British teachers would probably consider the American courses to be of a superficial nature.

The second set of conclusions relates to the differing views of the two groups on the nature of their pupils, particularly the younger ones. The British curriculum generally, in which history is included, appears to take a greater account of the nature of the pupil, his stage of intellectual development particularly, than does the American. There seemed to be a greater concern with matching the course to the pupil, and teaching only what could be successfully learned. British education appeared to be more child centred at all levels. The American system had a greater tendency to select course content according to what it was considered the pupils ought to know in terms of society's expectations of them. Here again the societal aims are apparent. There was a greater optimism about what the pupils could comprehend, and this is one explanation for the greater degree of standardization of courses which are taken by all students, and the smaller degree of selection of particular students for particular courses.

The results are seen most clearly at both ends of the educational scale. In the United States approaches to the curriculum were not seen to vary significantly from the Elementary to the High school years. Indeed, Bruner's dictum that "any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development," (1) might have been taken as the guiding principle. The level of work became progressively more demanding but the concept of the subject seemed to remain the same. American students often studied the same period of American history three times, once in Elementary once in Junior High, and once in Senior High school. Moreover, the American Elementary school teachers were found discussing the need to deal with concepts, develop skills of rational thinking, and handle evidence in much the same way that High school teachers did. The Elementary children did not seem to be taught differently, it was just that the material was simpler. Perhaps the American practice of referring to school children from first grade onwards as 'students' is further indication of this point.

At the High school end of the scale the instrumental concept of the subject meant that some history was being studied by all pupils, whether or not they liked it or showed any aptitude for it. (This is true of College freshmen and sophomores also for that matter.) It was considered desirable for them to have studied it. This attitude also helps to account for the greater willingness of American teachers to tackle world affairs that were considered important and relevant, but which British teachers were more likely to consider beyond the grasp of the pupils.

In Britain, the content of history courses for Junior Secondary, and especially Primary pupils, was governed to a much greater extent by pupil interest. Not infrequently work was initiated by the pupils themselves, and there was strong emphasis in the comments of the British teachers on the need for material that the child could relate to. There was much emphasis on the need for pupils to be able to identify with their subject matter and to feel personally in contact with it. This helps to explain both the greater importance of environmental studies in British history teaching and the smaller importance of world affairs.

The final set of conclusions relates to the differing views on the role of the teacher. It could be said that in the American schools education consisted of the course and the books, whereas in the British schools it consisted of the teacher. The prevalence of voluminous curriculum guides, statements of course objectives and textbooks complete with teacher's manuals almost suggests that many American courses could function without a teacher, provided there was someone who could follow the instructions. It appeared that some school districts were designing courses that were as nearly as possible teacher proof, so little room for manoeuvre did they seem to leave them. It seemed that the American teachers needed to rely far less on their own resourcefulness and preparation if they chose, for much had been done for them by the district.

The English teachers on the other hand followed what was by comparison a far more haphazard and unstructured approach. This was both a strength and a weakness of the system. Where there was more opportunity for an inspired and creative teacher, there was also less of a safety net for the weak and lazy. In the British system there

was comparatively little reliance on written statements of course objectives and syllabus requirements, at least until the external examinations imposed themselves. One noticeable difference between the two systems lay in the fact that in the United States, curriculum innovations of the Fenton and Oliver type were to be found in active use within the schools, whereas British curriculum development models such as the Stenhouse materials, were not encountered in the schools visited. Much curriculum debate in Britain appears to be of a largely artificial nature, confined to theorists in Colleges and Universities without really touching the work of the schools, certainly at secondary level. Instead there was a greater reliance on the personality of the teacher, a greater degree of spontaneity, and a greater willingness, especially with younger pupils, to depart from the formal syllabus in pursuit of an aspect of the subject that had fired the pupils' imagination. Objectives were felt intuitively and instinctively by many teachers, and they did not feel the need for a formal set of written guidelines. No American teacher stated that history ought to be fun for his pupils, whereas this was an important objective for the English.

It is easy to look at each system through the eyes of the other. Americans may see the British system as casual, even slovenly, leaving too much to chance, and at the later secondary stage, cramped, archaic, and pre-occupied with remote and irrelevant academic specialism. The British may see the American as superficial, lacking in rigour, concerned with too many ephemeral trivialities, and stifled beneath a suffocating cloak of imposed regulations. An attempt will now be made to evaluate the two approaches towards the teaching of history in order to arrive at a reasonable rationale for the subject within the school curriculum.

As was noted in Chapter 1 it is not possible totally to isolate the teaching objectives of any single subject from those of the education system as a whole. The observation was made that the American system has a much greater instrumental character in which schools were developed as devices for social control, whereas the British system laid greater stress on the development of the individual, with less regard for socially useful ends. In Britain there has traditionally been a sharp distinction between 'education', seen as academic and theoretical, and 'training', seen essentially as vocational and practical.

It will now be argued that the health of any education system requires a rapprochement between these two concepts, and that a satisfactory place for history in the curriculum depends on a proper balance being found between them.

The academic purists might argue that a subject such as history is by its very nature associated with the realm of the mind and totally removed from the practical world. The concern of the subject is with the past, with people no longer living, and with ideas and practices no longer in current usage. Therefore the subject can have no practical significance. Its value can only lie in the mental stimulus it provides, in the promotion of a greater self awareness, and in the cultural enrichment of the individual.

Yet even humanistic history has always had something of a practical purpose, and historians need to see the development of their subject itself in proper historical perspective. Curriculum is, and has always been, constantly evolving and the discipline of history as a subject within the educational system belongs to a Nineteenth century categorization of knowledge. It was not part of the medieval trivium and quadrivium, neither did it figure in the curriculum of pre-nineteenth century Grammar and Public schools. The school of modern history was not established separately from Law at Oxford until 1872, and the Cambridge History tripos dates from the same year (2). When history did become part of the curriculum of Grammar schools and Universities its character was shaped by the vocational needs of those who studied it. At a time when most of those reading history at University were likely to form a mandarin class of politicians, members of parliament, lawyers, diplomats, civil servants, and senior members of other professions, it was not coincidence that the concern of the subject was with the activities of statesmen and other leading public figures, the evolution of the constitution, and the enactment and administration of laws. Neither was it surprising that when this kind of history was studied by undergraduates, this kind of history was taught by teachers. The rise of social and economic history has been largely due to the fact that the background and future occupations of history students, both at university and at school level, have become much more diverse, and accordingly the history curriculum has been diversified also. Thus even humanistic history has always had a certain vocational relevance.

As pressure on the curriculum mounts from new disciplines such as sociology, psychology, integrated studies, environmental studies, ecology, and others, traditional subjects must justify themselves convincingly in order to survive. Such justification should not take the form of a retreat to an entrenched position and a reassertion of goals and philosophies that might have had validity in the past. It must not become merely a defence of vested interests. Rather it should be an appraisal of the value of the subject in contemporary terms and an assessment of the contribution it can make to a relevant curriculum in modern society. What can be justified in accordance with explicitly acknowledged rational criteria must be retained, and what cannot must be sacrificed. History in the school curriculum must be prepared to evolve if it is not to atrophy and ultimately face attenuation or exclusion in the manner of Latin and Greek.

The problem thus becomes that of the formulation of satisfactory criteria of relevance. There are few terms in the educational lexicon that are used more glibly than relevance, and without a clear understanding of its meaning it is more a confusion than a help to the discussion of educational objectives. It is impossible to state that a subject, or a curriculum, should be relevant to the needs of the individual or to the needs of contemporary society unless there is a clear vision of what are the needs of the individual and society, and of the proper relationship between the two.

It might be assumed that the proper function of education is to prepare individuals for a useful role in society; it has been suggested that this is the primary purpose of American education. Yet such an aim makes little sense unless we know what assumptions are being made about the nature of the society and the individuals within it. The Bantu Education Act in South Africa provides an entirely justified and relevant form of education if the underlying assumptions are accepted. If it is accepted that certain sections of the community will aspire only to the menial roles in society then it is logical to provide an education that prepares for these roles. Anything outside this will be 'irrelevant' and perhaps harmful because it may cause dissatisfaction in pupils who will be encouraged, as Dr. Verweord said, "To look upon pastures where they may never graze.". Likewise it is possible for a 'relevant' curriculum in Britain or the United States

to make certain judgements and predictions about the role in society appropriate to the individuals who study it. It may be assumed, for example, that because certain individuals are going to be employed as unskilled factory workers they require a curriculum appropriate to factory workers which might be considered to consist of basic literacy and numeracy at most. Or again, if more than the purely economic needs of society are taken into account, a relevant curriculum might be said to be that which produced loyal party members, church members, olympic gold medallists, atomic physicists or whatever kind of individual appeared desirable to those in control. Education based on social relevance alone has its dangers. It is a saving grace of American education that enshrined within the code of values on which society rests, and in the documents upon which the governmental system is explicitly based, is a clear recognition of the dignity and worth of the individual. Although the lapses may have been frequent, there has always been that explicitly acknowledged set of ideals to which Myrdal referred and to which the nation can be recalled.

On the other hand a curriculum devoted to the development of the individual alone can be equally unsatisfactory. Whatever else man may be he is a social animal, he must exist within society and interact with others, and a curriculum that ignores this becomes as 'irrelevant' as one devoted exclusively to the needs of society, because it fails to take account of the true nature of man and exalts knowledge and learning above their human context. At the highest levels of scholarship it may be true that there should be no limits to the inquiry of the human mind, that ancient sanskrit and the disputes of the medieval schoolmen are both perfectly valid areas for study which deserve recognition. However, a school curriculum in which these studies were prominently featured would receive the just censure of pupils and public alike. Schools are unavoidably social institutions of one sort of another, and society must be allowed some claims on what takes place in them. Indeed it is arguable that in British education over many years society has not been allowed a sufficient claim upon the education system. Schools and Universities between them have produced on the one hand, a caste of cultured ornaments who lack skills and the understanding to contribute on a practical level to the functioning of industrial society, and on the other hand a 'lumpenproletariat' of workers insensitive to all but the most immediate and material of their needs.

The current problems of the British nation may be due in no small measure to the indulgence which the education system has afforded to the individual to seek his own private fulfilment along whatever paths he may choose, or to opt out of education altogether, to the neglect of the needs of the society of which he forms a part.

Thus a crucial issue in the formulation of satisfactory curriculum criteria is a reconciliation of the just claim of both individual and society. This is clearly a matter which involves highly subjective judgements, but in curriculum decisions these cannot be avoided. One of the greatest dilemmas facing a publicly maintained education system is the establishment of a satisfactory value base on which to construct a curriculum. A private school does not face this dilemma in such an acute form. A Catholic school for example, may quite legitimately construct its curriculum and organize its life around the principles of the Catholic faith, while a publicly maintained school is expected to refrain from indoctrination in the values or beliefs of any sect or subgroup within society, and instead to seek a common denominator for them all.

As has been shown, in both Britain and in the United States a resolution of this dilemma has been sought in the principle of neutrality. Both curriculum theorists like Oliver and Stenhouse, and classroom teachers, have urged that the proper function of the school is to promote a rational clarification rather than to advance specific values of any kind. This study has attempted to show that even where this ideal is proclaimed in theory, it is not followed in practice. It is here argued that, not only is a neutral standpoint impossible to achieve, but also that it is an abdication of responsibility and a rejection of all that is implied in the word 'education' if it is to mean anything more than random fact gathering. All education, including history, if it is to be worth anything must begin from a clearly acknowledged vision of the nature of the individual and the nature of society. This may be a personal vision and it may be open to the charge of indoctrination, but without it education is a barren technical excercise.

It remains for the writer to state his personal criteria for the construction of a relevant history curriculum. They are based essentially on certain premises about the nature of the individual and

of society which derive partly from experience and partly from belief, and in the final analysis they are not capable of justification in exclusively rational terms. It is contended that ultimately this must be the basis for all curriculum decisions. The first criterion for a history curriculum which is to meet the needs both of the individual and of society is that it should be based on a certain scepticism, but not cynicism, about the value of the study of the past as a usable instrument. For younger pupils especially, but for older ones also, this lies in its imaginative appeal, and it appeared that much of the history taught by the American teachers lacked this important dimension. However, history ought not to be presented simply as imaginative description. The function of the historian, and that includes the history teacher, should be interpretation and illumination rather than mere description. He should seek to explain the past to the present. This requires an acceptance of the past for its own intrinsic worth, but also the study of the past from the standpoint of the present. It requires the drawing of frequent parallels and contrasts with the present, and more comparative history than is common in British schools, so that the present may be better understood, but the idea that history can be used as a social science to discover underlying principles of human behaviour is simplistic. History deals with the behaviour of human beings which is erratic and unpredictable, and any attempt to reduce it to fundamental principles is unrealistic. A degree of intuition and instinct is inseparable from even the most scientific history and it is experience that provides the best analogy with historical study. Just as in private life, it is impossible fully to know and understand a person until one has some knowledge of the experiences that he has undergone, so it is with a people collectively. The study of the historical experience of a nation or a society enhances the understanding of that nation today.

The second requirement for a relevant history curriculum is that it should recognize the worth of the human individual. A disturbing aspect of the interviews with both American and English teachers was the decline of the individual as a focus for study in favour of man in the mass, of groups, and of an impersonal society. This was seen in the discussions of the place of the hero figure, and also in the use of courses such as Man a Course of Study. It is at this point that the classification of history as one of the humanities or one of the social

sciences becomes of central importance. If it is to be a social science then the emphasis is laid upon society, upon the behaviour of mankind in the mass, and it implies the subordination of the individual to society. It favours a deterministic outlook and a stress on an interpretation of history that emphasises environmental and impersonal forces rather than human will as the main agencies of historical change. It is argued here that this is a denial of the value of human achievement, and potentially a diminution of the value of the human individual. Clearly proper account must be taken of economic circumstances and other impersonal forces such as natural disasters, climatic factors, scientific discoveries and so on. However, an outlook that minimizes the role of human will and achievement is potentially an outlook that removes from the individual a responsibility for his actions. It is inherent in the social studies approach to history teaching that the significance of the individual in human society is reduced, and it is a matter for regret that the study of history today, even surprisingly in the United States, appears to be casting human individuals increasingly in the role of victims rather than masters of their destiny. It is argued here that a relevant curriculum in a so-called free society, and a history curriculum in particular, which is after all concerned with the record of human experience, should be an affirmation, not only of human rights but also of human ideals, energy, inventiveness, and potential.

Any approach to the study of history, especially in schools, is largely subjective. It may choose to see the past as Voltaire saw it as "The story of human crimes and miseries" or it may see it as a tribute to the qualities of the human spirit. It is to be hoped that a school history curriculum, while obviously seeking to avoid distortion of the truth, would incline towards the optimism of the latter and include the study of individuals capable of providing some challenge and inspiration.

The third criterion, which follows from the second, is that a curriculum should make a firm and explicit affirmation of its value base. This need not mean, and should not mean, that a teacher and a school ought to impose values in an ostentatious and doctrinaire manner. Such a practice would be counter-productive even if it were desirable, but it does mean that principles and ideals should be openly stated with an invitation to debate. There seems little doubt that the ideal of neutral, value free inquiry is an illusion, and it is more likely to

lead to deceit and self deception than anything else. Only on issues where the teacher does not care very strongly is neutrality possible, and the most likely result of the neutrality stance, as one of the respondents quoted in Chapter 4 observed, is that pupils will learn that commitment is unimportant and the issues not worth bothering about. One of the more healthy aspects of the picture of American education, derived from this study, was the greater willingness of American teachers to involve themselves in controversial issues of relevance to society, and to invite their pupils to seek solutions, even though they professed, usually unrealistically, to be doing so from a neutral standpoint. This is a clear advantage of a social science based approach to history.

In contrast much British history teaching appeared aloof and remote from the contemporary world and its problems. Too often it appeared to be taking place in an ivory tower, which may be explained partly perhaps by the fact that it was concerned with periods and events remote in time from the present, but also because of a feeling that history education is less concerned with the present. To make history a truly valuable part of the curriculum it needs to be firmly related to aspects of contemporary society, where the relevance lies in the vigorous discussion of live issues. Real discussion of this kind is likely to take place only if a clear and genuine statement of opinion is made by the teacher. As was asserted at the commencement of the study, history is not a culture free subject, and a large part of its educational value lies in its reconciliation of current problems and controversies with the cultural background and traditions of a people.

Ideally a society ought to be sufficiently certain and confident of its values for them to be placed at the centre of its education. The pluralist nature of modern western society is often assumed to mean that a publicly maintained school cannot take a clear cut stand on controversial issues, for fear of offending a special interest of some sort or other. However, all too often, it is here contended, neutrality is a synonym for apathy and may represent a disengagement from contemporary problems. Indeed, it may even be a symptom of decadence for where no concensus exists on basic issues such as freedom under the law, the dignity of all individuals and the need for the peaceful resolution of conflict, it is doubtful whether society, in the sense of a community of people bound together by mutual interest

and for mutual support, can be said to exist any longer. Where a school as a whole cannot or will not make its values plain, it is incumbent upon the individual teacher to do so, for only thus will inquiry be real and challenging, and pupils encouraged to adopt and internalize values of their own, rather than ignore them or treat them as matters for merely academic debate.

The final criterion for the construction of a relevant history curriculum is that it should be outward looking in its approach to other subjects, and more open ended in its concept of 'terminal loyalty'. The evidence of this study seems to suggest that a more flexible and experimental approach is found where history is taught within a social studies framework. In these circumstances history teachers are forced to consider the aims of their subject in relation to those of others and to engage in dialogue with colleagues which helps to ensure that aims are made more explicit, are kept under review, and that the subject evolves in line with a wider philosophy of education. Such developments are not necessarily excluded from a humanistic categorization of history, but the evidence assembled for this study suggests that the most creative area of British history teaching is in the first two years of the secondary school where the subject is increasingly finding itself linked, often unwillingly, with others in combined studies programmes of either social studies or humanities. Once the public examination courses have started, history usually returns to its autonomous state where it is inclined to be more static and introverted, and less susceptible to pressures for self-examination and development.

Not all British history teachers would agree that a social studies framework is in the best interests, either of their subject or of the education of their pupils. Also revealed in the interviews conducted in pursuit of this study is the tension within the British education system, reflected here in the debate between the academic, humanistic, historians, still probably in the majority, and the social studies historians. The fear of the former is that standards and the integrity of the subject will be compromised by an association with other subjects. Such a debate corresponds in turn to the old argument between elitists and egalitarians not really present in American schools which are inclined generally to emphasize opportunities more than standards. Among many British history teachers there appears to be a feeling that social studies courses will be less rigorous, less demanding,

and less academically respectable. Yet is is likely that they will provide the stimulus that may be required to save the subject from eclipse, at least in the early secondary years.

There would seem to be little doubt also that traditional, and humanistic, history teaching is fairly firmly rooted in the concept of the nation state, and that if wider horizons of loyalty are desirable, and in the contemporary world it must be argued that they are, then a social studies approach to the subject is more likely to achieve them. As suggested in Chapter 5, when the concern is with international society, with urban problems, with the problems of population growth, food supply, the principles of government and leadership, the causes of war, or the nature of prejudice, then the nation state loses much of its relevance as the central frame of reference for study. If a sense of the interdependence of the world's peoples is desirable, then a social studies type of curriculum is more likely to contribute to it than a traditional humanistic history curriculum.

A satisfying and relevant history curriculum should take account of all these criteria. The particular strengths of British history teaching seem to lie in the greater sensitivity to the imaginative value of studying the past, a sharper sense of historical perspective, and greater opportunities, not always taken advantage of, for enjoyment of the subject. The particular strengths of American history teaching seem to lie in its more outward looking aspect, its greater susceptibility to innovation and experiment, and its greater responsiveness to social needs. The final judgment of this study is that the interests of historical education would be best served through a combination of these qualities. In practice this is likely to require the inclusion of history in a wider grouping of subjects, which would stimulate thought about the nature of the subject and the lines along which it should develop. However, it would be with the hope and intention that the character of history as a subject concerned with the reality and worth of the past would be preserved so that social studies would be truly human studies.

Chapter Six - References

1. Bruner, J.S., The Process of Education. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1960, p. 33.

2. Adamson, J.W., English Education 1789-1902. Cambridge University Press: 1964, p. 425.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamson, J.W., English Education 1789-1902. Cambridge University Press: 1964.

Billington, R.A. et. al., The Historian's Contribution to Anglo-American Misunderstanding. London: Routledge, and Kegan Paul, 1966.

Booth, M., History Betrayed. London: Longmans, 1969.

Bruner, J.S., The Process of Education. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Burston, W.H. and Thompson, D. (eds.), Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

Coltham, J. and Fines, J., Educational Objectives for the Study of History. Historical Association pamphlet TH 35, Historical Association: 1971.

Cox, C.B. and Massialas, B.G., Social Studies in the United States. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.: 1967.

Department of Education and Science, Towards World History. Pamphlet No. 52, H.M.S.O.: 1967.

Fenton, E., The New Social Studies. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.

Fenton, E., Tradition and Change in Four Societies. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Frost, S.E., Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc., 1966.

Glazer, N., 'The Universalization of Ethnicity', Encounter (1975). Vol. 14, No. 2.

Hofstadter, R., Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. London: Cape, 1964.

Hyman, H. et. al., Interviewing in Social Research. University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Lawton, D. and Dufour, B., The New Social Studies. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1973.

Ministry of Education, Teaching History. Pamphlet No. 23, H.M.S.O., 1952.

Oliver, D.W., 'The Selection of Content in the Social Sciences', Harvard Educational Review (1957), Vol. 27, No. 4.

Shaver, J.P. and Berlak, H. (eds.), Democracy, Pluralism, and the Social Studies. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1968.

Skinner, B.F., Walden Two. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948, Macmillan Paperbacks edition, 1962.

Tocqueville, A. de, Democracy in America. 1st pub. 1835, Oxford University Press: World's Classics edition, 1946.

Travers, R.M.W., An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1958, 2nd ed., 1964.