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This dissertation, An Analysis of the Structures of Social Foundations of Education, defines social foundations as a separate academic discipline found within a department of Educational Foundations. This view of social foundations is analytically supported and with it a concomitant program for implementing this field of study is provided. A new term, polyology, is introduced into the literature as a replacement for the present designation, social foundations, which is too imprecise a term to use as a label for the field.

Curriculum recommendations for implementing polyology are made. The recommendations include four divisions: 1. The School as a Societal Institution; 2. Education in a Pluralistic Society; 3. Education and Power, and 4. Education and Theories of Social Change. These divisions are consistent with the definition of polyology as a changing, dynamic field of study.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation will analyze the social foundations of education in order to determine its place and purpose in higher and in teacher education. Social foundations is traced historically from its inception as Education 200F at Teachers College, Columbia University, in 1934 to its present state. The main thrust of this dissertation is directed toward defining social foundations. The lack of an accepted definition has greatly hampered the study of social foundations.

It will be necessary to review two contrasting philosophical positions regarding education. The two positions are: the view of education as a mirror of the society; or, as an agent of change to create a better society. The chapter on the social responsibility of education will examine these two views and also consider the societal responsibility of social foundations. A determination of the proper place for social foundations as either an academic area of study or as a professional course is also made.
It is only after a study of these chapters is completed that an attempt is made to establish a definite meaning for the term, social foundations. A synthesis of various representative concepts, objectives and programs will facilitate establishing a broad definition of social foundations, which meets the criteria based on the historical, philosophical, professional and academic review of social foundations.

The final chapter deals with broad general areas that should be incorporated into a social foundations course. The curriculum proposals will be directly related to satisfying the conditions of the social foundations definition and deals with broad areas of study. No specific textbooks or readings are recommended.

The recommended definition and curriculum are flexibly structured to permit those alterations that are needed in specific programs of teacher education. These recommendations are to serve as the groundwork for defining social foundations as an area of study.
CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS

The first systematic approach to concretize an academic discipline that would examine the play of social forces upon modern education was started in the winter of 1928 at Teachers College, Columbia University.¹ The study was begun by a group of professors from the fields that would become the Department of Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education at Teachers College in the division of Foundations of Education in 1934.²

This informal study-dinner group was commonly referred to as the "Kilpatrick Discussion Group" and included Professors William H. Kilpatrick, Harold O. Rugg, George S. Counts, J. L. Childs, R. Bruce Raup, Goodwin Watson, Jesse H. Newlon, Edmund Brunner, Percival Symonds and F. Ernest Johnson.³ A member of this group, George S. Counts, was to place one of the ideas of


the discussion group before the public and begin the debate as to the future and purpose of American Education.

Professor Counts delivered a paper, "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" at the 1932 Progressive Education Association Convention that was to lead to a split in the progressive education movement. Counts severely criticized progressive education as having no purpose or social direction. He attributed this weakness to the relationship between progressive schools and the ruling upper and middle classes. This relationship had to be broken if the advances of science were to be used to create a better, more humane and just society. To achieve this goal it would be necessary to indoctrinate students with the belief that capitalism--and with it rugged individualism--were evils that needed to be exposed as oppressors. Until society became free of materialism it could not be fully able to pursue higher intellectual, moral and esthetic questions. The part of Counts' speech that was alarming to teachers was the term "indoctrination." Counts countered this alarm by pointing out that indoctrination was already taking place, and that teachers had the responsibility for indoctrinating their students with views that would counter the existent pro-capitalist orientation. Counts' conclusion was greeted by silence. Not the
silence of disapproval, but rather a silence of shock. Should teachers be so audacious as to seek power and use it for reconstructing society? The next day the prepared speeches were discarded, and the members of the PEA Convention discussed Counts' challenge.

Did this radical suggestion prompt teachers to take to the streets to demonstrate for the power they thought they should exercise? Did they immediately return to their schools to implement a social theory of reconstruction which would signal the start of an educational revolution? No, instead the delegates adopted a resolution by Nellie Seeds, director of Manumit School in Pawling, New York, that would provide for an Economics and Sociology section or Committee to study the problems confronting the world.¹

Appointed to the Committee on Social and Economic Problems by the board of directors of the Progressive Education Association were Counts, Watson and Newlon of the Kilpatrick Discussion Group, along with Merle Curti, Sidney Hook, Willard Beatty, John Gambs, Charles Easton and Frederick Redefer. This committee investigated the social and economic problems in the

1930's, and recommended a collective, democratic social order.\(^1\)

While this report was not embraced wholeheartedly by the Progressive Education Association, it did serve to establish a relationship between the Association and social reformation.

Other members of the discussion group were actively involved in a number of committees to examine the social implications of education during the 1930's. John Childs and Jesse Newlon served on the New Social and Economics Relationships Committee of the National Education Association. This committee's report was published in *Education and Social Change*, which further supported the thesis of society-centered rather than exclusively child-centered education. This active involvement of all members of the "discussion group" in American education supports the position of esteem and authority that the members maintained. This position must be borne in mind to understand the impact that these dinner meetings had on the organization of social foundations of education as both a course and an academic field of study at Columbia University's Teachers College.\(^2\)


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 71.
These bi-weekly meetings continued until 1941, and covered a broad spectrum of ideas dealing with culture and education. The discussants were not limited to any particular topics or areas, and they ranged the vast field of human experience. Harold Rugg stated, "Not only was the sky the limit, the uttermost reaches of man's changing culture of industrialism were too, and every new angle in the scholar's researches and interpretations in the sciences and arts."2

From the discussions of the Kilpatrick group came the consensus that the main purpose of the foundations fields of education--history of education, philosophy of education, comparative education, educational psychology, educational economics and educational sociology--was to provide educators, administrators and teachers at all levels with a foundation upon which their pedagogical specialities would rest. The foundations field then was to be the base for all educators.3 This purpose could thus best be served in a unified division within the college of education rather than course work in other academic departments.


3Cremin, History of Columbia, p. 145.
or divisions.

The proposal was made that these foundational areas would be covered in a unified course to be known as Education 200F, at Columbia. This kind of course came to be called Social Foundations of Education, or some derivative of it, at other universities in the United States. This integrative course would replace the study of the foundations courses in other departments in the university.

Social Foundations was not intended as a terminal experience in the foundations of education, but rather as a broad course that integrated the study of philosophy, history, psychology, economics, political science and sociology. Education 200F was patterned after a course at Columbia College required of all students called Contemporary Civilization, which offered an integrative approach to the study of western civilization by combining the separate courses in the social sciences into a course that benefitted all students. Neither Contemporary Civilization at Columbia nor Education 200F at Teachers College was an advanced course, but rather one that would educate all to a certain level. Those with an interest in one particular segment of the course would later enroll in those advanced courses of their own interests or majors. Liberal arts college began in the 1940's to
offer courses in "general education" patterned after the pioneering work in integrative courses done at Columbia.\(^1\) (2-145) A random comparison of college catalogues between the 1950's and 1960's shows a decline in broad courses such as Education 200F and a return to study of particular courses in various departments rather than a continuation of broad integrative courses.

Education 200F, Foundations of Education, was to be the introduction of American education to graduate students at Teachers College, and was to replace separate courses in history of education, philosophy of education, educational psychology, educational sociology, educational economics and comparative education.

The course was divided into two semesters covering a year's work, and granted eight hours of credit in the foundations of education to replace the eight hours credit given in the separate departments to complete the foundations requirements to receive a Masters degree at Teachers College. Education 200F then was to provide greater exposure to various disciplines which were unavailable in the previous eight hour foundations requirement. The faculty at Teachers College deemed it better to provide a greater background in all areas of foundations

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 145.
while admittedly sacrificing some of the depth of some areas of concentration. Their reasoning was that while a three hour course in economics of education would provide the student with greater competency in that area, the student might have little or no exposure to history of education or comparative education because of concentration on a limited number of fields within the foundations. Such course specialization would ultimately be to the disadvantage of the student, who might lack contact with areas of education needed to explore problems of contemporary education. This problem received considerable discussion before Education 200F began to correct the disadvantage of overspecialization.¹

Harold Rugg hailed the evolution of Education 200F as the major educational contribution of the Kilpatrick Discussion Group.² Rugg viewed the discussions as rediscovering "the art of disciplined conversation" in the building of an educational theory and a program of education in crisis. A key to understanding Education 200F is to realize that "crisis" permeates the writings of Rugg, Kilpatrick, Counts and other members of the discussion group during this period. The crisis that faced

¹Rugg, Readings, p. V.
America in the early 1930's was, of course, the great economic collapse, and with it the disintegration of the faith that many had in the semi-lassez-faire government. The Great Depression saw not only stocks crashing in value, but also a psychological erosion of confidence in the "American Way of Life." The population of the United States in 1930, according to the U. S. Bureau of the Census, was 123,202,624. Of this total approximately 74,000,000 were available in the total labor force. The nadir of the unemployment crises hit the U. S. in 1932, with twenty-five percent of the total labor force unemployed.¹ These 18,000,000 unemployed included the 15,000 World War I Veterans who marched on Washington, D. C. to pressure Congress to pass a Veteran's Bonus Bill. President Herbert Hoover opposed the Bill as financially unsound, and eventually employed Federal Troops to drive the veterans out of the capital. It is necessary to understand the economic conditions of misery, fear and helplessness that gripped much of American society to comprehend the "crises" conditions under which Counts, Rugg and others worked in founding social reconstructionism and its vehicle for implementation, social foundations of education.

The leading advocate of social reconstructionism and social foundations, George S. Counts, gave a series of lectures in 1932 which resulted in the booklet, Dare The School Build A New Social Order? Counts recalls the faith that Americans had in the educational system, and how the Great Depression and its concomitant social ills had shaken the faith Americans now (1932) had in the societal institution of education. Counts placed much of the blame on progressive educators whom he felt had over-emphasized the child and neglected the society which produced the child. This ignored the social and cultural adaptations required of the child when he left the confines of the school.

The ideal society could only come about as teachers formulated desirable societal goals, and then consciously sought to attain them by basically inculcating students with these views, so that upon leaving the schools the values taught would be transformed into the values of the society as a whole. The members of the Kilpatrick Discussion Group basically supported Social Foundations as the means to educate teachers. They, in turn, would educate the next generation, which would put the society-centered curriculum into everyday usage. The group's

1 Cremin, History of Columbia, p. 251.
plea for a study of the culture and a culture centered curriculum was their method of advancing a social reconstructionist plan for education. Kilpatrick states that the real topic facing educational method in 1930 was the effect of social factors upon the educational system and how these factors intentionally reinforced a life style approved by the inductor and thereby maintained the approved order. This maintenance of the status quo was viewed with alarm by Kilpatrick. Rather than perpetuating a static outlook, education should adopt a position that prepares the learner for changing, dynamic ways of life and civilization.  

Since the institution of education was conservative, how could teaching for a changing world be achieved? The answer Counts provided was to educate teachers to teach for a changing society. But in order to do this teachers had to be exposed to a wider variety of educational theories and methods than was the case in colleges of education at the time. To properly prepare teachers it was necessary for schools of education then to cultivate the entire field of education, rather than to specialize.

2Ibid., p. 488.
This school of education would "train the workers, study the methods and processes, and contribute to the development of the programs and philosophies of all major educational agencies." With this goal in mind it is easier to see that social foundations was meant to emerge as the cornerstone of the new education.\(^1\)

Social reconstructionism, as a philosophy of education, advocates continuous reexamination and reconstruction of society's beliefs and institutions. Reconstructionism is not a wholesale repudiation of cultural democratic American heritage, but a continuous preservation, extension and improvement of the existing social order. Social reconstructionism is conservative in that it wishes to return to the true democratic ideal in American society before that ideal was corrupted by scientific and technological revolutions which altered the traditional concepts of democracy.

Social reconstructionism does not mean that all beliefs and tenets of a particular society are to be changed, or that

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 649.

all prior views are so absolute that no action can be taken
against these views. Reexamination and reconstruction are only
demanded at points where serious problems and conflicts occur.
Democratic citizenship, in fact, demands a willingness and abil-
ity to correct abuses in the direction of consensus, where con-
sensus is possible, and in those cases where a consensus appears
impossible, to actively participate in social conflict on the
side indicated to be correct by analysis and intelligent evalua-
tion. Dedication to democratic ideals and processes does not
preclude a vigorous opposition to undemocratic policies and prac-
tices through debate and appropriate political action.

Reconstructionism is not conceived solely in abstract
intellectual terms, but also as implementation of theory. In
social crises certain aspects of societal institutions are not
functioning as they should function. This malfunctioning must be
remedied by deliberate and systematic social reconstruction. The
social reconstruction curriculum theory is based upon these four
beliefs: (1) in the American society the moral authority of the
teacher rests upon the democratic tradition which is concerned
with the growth and development of ideals, rather than with prop-
agating a fixed dogma; (2) since in a democratic society the
needs of the individual and society are essentially the same, the
ends of education are essentially the same; (3) the purpose of education is not perpetuation of the status quo, but rather a continuous renewal of ideas and institutions under the democratic heritage of our society; and (4) the basis of the public school curriculum should be a careful study of the significant social problems confronting society, ordered and arranged with due regard for the interests, abilities and needs of the children, and managed so that it results in the increased capacity of the learner to think, judge and act intelligently.¹

The movement to an integrated social foundations of education course which originated with the Kilpatrick Discussion Group at Teachers College of Columbia University was gradually extended to teacher education programs at other colleges and universities. As the graduates of Teachers College assumed positions of responsibility at other institutions, they incorporated revised and extended the ideas of their mentors. The Teachers College proponents of an integrated social foundations course emphasized their commitment that education has a definite social responsibility. Chapter Three will examine and will propose to define the social responsibility of education.

CHAPTER III

A DEFINITION OF THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF EDUCATION

A divergence between social foundations and other educational foundations, i.e., historical, philosophical or psychological, is created by the fact that social foundations of education must be viewed within the context of its place, form and current utility. These other disciplines of education tend to be more organized with reference to principles that are more intimately related to the parent disciplines of history, philosophy and psychology. Because of this relationship these areas are dependent on the parent methodology and are restricted to interpretations that are either historical, philosophical or psychological. They, then, in turn, lack the interdisciplinary breadth that social foundations possesses. The social foundations of education always must reflect the past and future of some living society which the institution of education serves. It must transcend the other foundations in order to understand the particular society it serves.¹

¹Harold Rugg, ed., Readings in the Foundations of Education (New York: Columbia University, 1941), p. XI.
Because education is guided, directed or dictated by a living society, it has no method or content of its own, but rather the form and shape that the society gives to it. Whether education teaches democracy, monarchy or anarchy is determined by the society in which a particular educational institution functions. This explains why education in comparison to other academic disciplines appears to be lacking concrete empirical sets of values, rules or ideals that can be universally applied to all men in all cultures at all times.\(^1\) Thus, education takes one form or pattern at one time, and another at a different time, without one or the other necessarily being of a higher value, but rather that which best suits a particular society at a given time.

All societies then, whether of an industrial, complex nature or a simple agrarian type, are concerned with the maintenance and transmission of that culture. While education as an institution is charged by the society with this function, it must be realized that it is only one of several institutions that exists in the society.\(^2\) All of these different institutions are

\(^{1}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. X.}\)

parts of an interrelated societal system. Decisions made by one institution will directly effect the operations of the other institutions which comprise the whole system known as society. Thus a decision by the political or governmental institution to conscript all fifteen-year-olds for a two-year tour of duty would directly affect the existing educational system. Likewise, the educational institution could affect the institution of the family by withholding continuation of formal schooling from those students who marry by simply refusing to enroll any student at any age who is married. This interrelationship is basic to understanding the position of education. It should be apparent, then, that those who are going to be entrusted with the future of the educational institution must be knowledgeable in the historical, philosophical, geographical, economic, political and psychological perspectives of that society. Included in these understandings must be a concern with the traditions, mores, cultural patterns, resources, potentialities, values and interests of that society and competing societies.

Most historical studies of educational systems limit themselves to the ideas of a few great educational theorists, when in actuality little if any of their thoughts were the mode of education in their own times. Some educational historians do
a disservice to the history of education by confusing an historical picture of education, with what is really the biographies of particular educational theorists.\textsuperscript{1} Without a complete study of other social institutions, it is virtually impossible to understand the educational institutions of any particular society.

Rather than solely examine the thoughts of educational theorists, it would be a better method to examine the practices and patterns existent in the educational system and to form principles or generalizations from these practices.\textsuperscript{2}

Acceptance of the interrelatedness of education to other institutions is essential to the belief that education maintains and transmits the mature culture to the youngest members of the group. Education then facilitates the entrance of the immature into full participation in the society.\textsuperscript{3} Man, at birth, is confronted with two worlds, the physiosphere and the sociosphere. The physiosphere is composed of the earth, air water, plant life and animals that preceded man and were not created by him. The

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{1}George S. Counts, \textit{The American Road to Culture} (New York: John Day Company, 1930), p. 4.
  \item \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 3.
\end{itemize}
sociosphere contains those mentifacts and artifacts that man created to help him function optimally in the physiosphere. To function optimally man, of course, had to deal with climatic and topographical diversities which explains to some extent the variations of culture that man created.¹

The earliest forms of education or inculcation of cultural values and norms were probably nothing more than a woman explaining things to a young girl, or a man discussing the method of flint chipping to a boy. This informal situation was common to all preliterate societies. When a society became more complex it became necessary to more formalize education. Certain groups, i.e., priests, nobles and monks were entrusted with the task of socializing a select few of the immature members of the society with certain knowledge, values and rituals.² This limitation of knowledge, of course, served a two-pronged purpose. First the art, history and general culture of the society would be transmitted to the young while careful selection of those to be instructed helped the self-perpetuation of the ruling group.³ For the masses there was neither time nor reason for education.

²Clark, Expert Society, p. 12.
³Ibid., p. 13.
These largely illiterate peasants were too busy with the mundane task of eking out a living to be concerned with formal education. What education these peasants did receive was informal and basically concerned with the necessities of life. Therefore, a boy of this strata of society found animal trapping more educationally beneficial than a study of art or history. These patterns of an educated elite are found throughout much of man's recorded history, with the masses largely left uneducated in the formal sense.¹ These patterns were found even in the first settlements in Colonial America, where school was for the elite, with informal training in the practical arts of life left to the masses or lowest stratum of Colonial America. The New England colonists perpetuated this form of education by establishing Latin Grammar Schools which were attended by the sons of the social, political and religious elite of New England.²

Formal schooling became a necessity when it was found that informal education was ineffective in socializing the young for a mature role in the society.³ As education is one of the

¹Ibid., p. 14.
interrelated parts of the whole of society, an occurrence outside the existing structures of education forced the educational institution to broaden its approaches and to sharply increase the number of young who were to be socialized formally by the schools. In western society the events that lead to this change in the educational institutions were the advances in technology during the Industrial Revolution, and with it a concomitant change in the family structure.¹ No longer was the nuclear family the self-sufficient economic unit it had been.

The technological advances of the Industrial Revolution so rapidly increased man's technical knowledge that it was no longer possible for any one man to possess all the world's knowledge, as was supposedly the case with Leonardo da Vinco. As an individual man only knew a part of the total of man's technology it was necessary to train specialists to effectively transmit complicated and advancing techniques.² The worker needed longer and more systematic formal instruction in order to cope with the increased explosion of knowledge. At this stage the simplest form of reading, writing and arithmetic being taught to the

¹Ibid., p. 15.
²Goslin, Contemporary Society, p. 3.
lower stratum of society was a major breakthrough in ultimate education of the working class.

The means of production changed from cottage industry to factory, and with it came a change in the family structure which also had an effect on the educational structures. The worker spent his working time at a centralized location, with the result that initiation of the immature into the larger society no longer was possible by mere observation of the work patterns in the home, nor was it practical or efficient to bring the young to the factories to observe the work done there by their parents.¹ Also, specialization caused men's jobs to vary so markedly from factory to factory that there was no guarantee that what the immature observed was of any transfer value in the work he ultimately did in society.²

There clearly was a breakdown in responsibility that education owed to society. In order for any institution to endure it must serve a vital function within any given responsibility; it either alters its present course of action or becomes a vestigial part that ultimately is removed from any functioning

¹Ibid., p. 3.
²Clark, Expert Society, p. 15.
within the larger society. As it becomes a vestigial part, it undergoes a process of greater formalization and abstraction from social realities. It grows irrelevant to social concerns and gradually becomes obsolete. The institution of education during the Industrial Revolution experienced a number of shocks that altered its basic structure.¹ First, education of an elite no longer served the needs of society. It was necessary to have a large segment of the society literate in order to continue transmission of proliferated technology that was added to the culture. In addition to an increase in the number of educated people, it was also imperative that education assume the role of cultural transmitter in a formal educational program as opposed to the informal education that existed. To fulfill the social responsibility education moved into what is commonly referred to as the "American system" of education, wherein both the elite and the masses are to receive similar educations.² If the social responsibility of the educational institution served the society, it was hardly surprising that it developed a uniquely American system. Less could have been expected. Education would not have

²Ibid., p. 524.
served its primary purpose had it developed a Russian or Arabian educational system. At this point it appears that society led and education blindly followed it in order to fulfill its responsibility to the living society. From this information a synthesis can be formed that utilizes the raw data in a practical and useful manner.¹ This synthesis then determines what the responsibility is and how it is to be executed. The definition of the social responsibility of education can only be found in a study of a wide range of disciplines and societal expectations.²

The acceptance of the hypothesis that the role of education is to serve as a specialized agency of the whole living society is assumed at this point. The methods or techniques by which the educational responsibility to society is fulfilled is then determined by the philosophy of the society in which it is operating. Two distinct philosophies are apparent in the societal role of education with a third alternative being a modification of these two opposites. The first position holds that the educational institution should mirror the society in which it exists. This philosophy holds that the schools should transmit and reflect those ideas, values and goals that are operating in

¹Rugg, Readings, p. XI.
²Ibid., p. X.
the larger society. This view has traditionally held pre-eminence in American educational structures. The earliest settlers supported educational policies that reinforced the status quo.

An example of this was "The Old Deluder Satan" laws which provided for education so that the child would be able to read the Holy Scriptures and keep the faith, which in this case was Christian-Protestant. Education was basically of a religious nature until almost the beginning of the American Revolution. The control of education was left in the hands of the power elite, which was basically interested in perpetuation and maintenance of the status quo. Later changes in the educational institution including pauper schools and the Free School System of New York--while admittedly enlarging the literate population of the country--did little except to mirror the economic needs of society which called for a larger literate population to deal with the increased technology of the time. The public school movement was in reality nothing more than an extension of the needs of society as deter-

---

1 Gutek, Historical Introduction, p. 12.
mined by a few government and economic leaders. While paying tribute to the need for an informed electorate there is little evidence to refute the idea that these "good intentions" were not merely extensions to exploit the masses for the good--political and economic--of a select few in the United States.

The role of the educational institution as a means to propagate the status quo is well documented in American educational history.\(^1\) This type of philosophy, regarding the social responsibility of education, obviously worked in controlling the masses. Instead of bread and circuses the entrenched oligarchy in the United States provided a few scraps of education to the masses, who in turn were inculcated with the belief that this was the best, most just, humane society that could exist anywhere short of heaven.

The status quo goal of education in America is dominant as children are induced to accept adult standards and processes.\(^2\) An examination of the components of the educational institution today finds that the schools are largely controlled by


\(^2\) Ibid., p. 487.
politicians in the case of local or state schools, members of the hierarchy of religious orders in denominational schools, and in most other cases by lay trustees who are basically concerned with keeping control of the institutions. Almost all of these educational "leaders" espouse participatory democracy and certainly want it taught in the schools, but when it comes to actual control of the schools these same leaders insist that control remain with them. Very few board members, trustees or church officials are willing to give up control or even share it equally with other groups such as faculties and students. Education, as a mirror of society, certainly suits their purposes and not necessarily the purposes of the large mass of people who have little or no power to control or change the institution to better serve the people rather than a power elite.¹

A more radical philosophy holds the view that the educational institution should be an agency of change and in actuality lead the society. The schools should aggressively assert their independence and striving to purify the society and execute programs that will provide for the good of the whole society rather

¹Ibid., p. 489.
than the good of a ruling elite.¹

The philosophy of education which supports most strongly the position of the school as an agent of change is social reconstructionism. The social reconstructionists advocate that teachers should deliberately reach for power and use this power without hesitation to positively influence the social attitudes, values and ideals of the immature members of society.² Social reconstructionists include scientists, scholars and teachers at all levels as teachers. After seizing power teachers would be in a position to bridge the gap between school and society, and serve as the force for social regeneration.

Mere repetition of past experiences is no longer adequate preparation for the young in American society. Education must take a new road to be able to face a changing life and civilization.³

By what reasoning can teachers justify controlling the educational institution? First, the present educational experience does not adequately deal with the social problems. This

leads to the assumption that those who have been controlling education have failed to fulfill their social responsibility. What large group, as a whole, is better educated and socially concerned than classroom teachers?\(^1\) Certainly the people at the grass roots understand the problems of society, and what the educational institution can do to solve the problems found in society. Given this assumption it follows then that classroom teachers at all levels would be better prepared and equipped to deal with the problems of society than school boards, their ilk and certainly the elitists' tools of the status quo, administrators. One of the suggestions to purify the educational institutions themselves would be the election of all administrators by the faculty. These teacher-administrators would serve for a specified term and then have to stand for re-election or rejection by their peers which in this case are the teachers. An argument against this system is that administrators would serve at the caprice of teachers. That is exactly the point. Better that the administrators serve at the whim of the teachers than vice versa which is the case now. To help administrators better understand the society which they serve, all of them should devote at least fifty percent of their time to actual classroom teaching. Without this provision there

\(^1\) Counts, *Dare the Schools*, p. 28.
would be little guarantee that the new administrators would not become as insensitive or isolated as the present group of bureaucrats. Those that are unable to fulfill this requirement are hardly able to lead an institution which is dedicated to excellence in teaching. Amid the desire for change there exist those vested interests which seek to hide from change or at least to soften the changes that these interests view as adverse to a continuation of their method of operation or place in society.¹

An ambivalence on the part of some educators towards education's roles as a stabilizer of society, or a bridge to future action, is apparent in the curriculum where courses are offered in both academic areas and supposedly utilitarian offerings such as American problems or home economics.² These "life adjustment" courses can be used either to inculcate present values and role expectations or to provoke students into investigating new solutions and methods of action.¹ The determining factor probably will be the philosophy of the instructor of the various course offerings.

The choices of implementing the social responsibility of education, then, are determined by the philosophy of education

²Inlow, Education, p. 37.
existing in particular schools within the educational institution. The society has not set absolute limits on the methods to be used to allow education to fulfill its responsibility to society. A sharp demarcation exists between those whose orientation is towards the past and those who view the responsibility of education to be towards the future. These extreme views allow for a middle ground of educators who take the eclectic, as they see it, way out of this conflict. An awareness of the philosophy of educators is required to best evaluate the method and structures they advocate for the implementation of the responsibility of education to the society.
CHAPTER IV

THE PROFESSIONAL AND ACADEMIC APPROACHES TO
SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

In the examination of social foundations of education a
determination must be made whether the field of social foundations
is an academic field or a professional field. To facilitate the
understandings of these two alternatives a working definition of
terms will be outlined and followed throughout this chapter. An
academic field or discipline is studied for intrinsic value re­
gardless of any extrinsic or utilitarian value.¹ This does not
imply that an academic field is non-utilitarian or entirely
ethereal. The usage or non-usage of knowledge learned in an ac­
ademic field is left entirely in the hands of the person studying
that particular discipline. The acquisition of this knowledge
presumes that the student will be able to make his own practical
application of the field. The study of a professional field,
i.e., law, business and medicine, indicates training that will

¹Merle L. Borrowman, The Liberal and Technical in Teacher
Education (New York: Bureau of Publication-Columbia University,
1956), p. 22.
allow the student to enter a particular vocation by providing him with the tools, knowledge, and possibly practice in that occupation. Academic fields are those which provide a general background for all, and advanced courses for those wishing to pursue the field in greater depth without regard to its future utility. Most college course offerings then are fairly easy to categorize as either academic study or professional training.

Most course offerings in a school of education, or a department of education, are clearly vocational or professional preparation. Courses in administration, methodology or student teaching are clearly courses of a professional nature. Foundations courses are generally in a twilight zone with regards to their placement in academic or professional training fields. Complicating the process of differentiation of foundations as academic or professional studies are state certification laws which require some foundations courses as prerequisites for certification.¹ These courses at that juncture are clearly professional, because they are necessary to qualify for entrance into the teaching profession. For example, while courses in educational psychology, American education and philosophy of education.

tion are generally taught in foundations departments, they are also usually needed for certification, and so, in that instance, are professional courses taught in an academic department. Historically the notion has been that theory is superior to practice, and that "pure" knowledge is superior to practical or utilitarian knowledge.¹

Is teaching—which usually is the ultimate goal of education courses—a profession? The United States Census classifies teaching as a professional field, but does society accord professional status to elementary and secondary teachers? Ernest Greenwood, in "Attributes of a Profession," isolated five characteristics which can be used to determine the professionalism of an occupation. The five characteristics are a systematic body of theory, professional authority, sanction of the community, regulative code of ethics and a professional culture which includes organizations which serve clients, and the existence of educational and research centers.

A systematic body of theory does exist in education. There has been extensive research in the philosophical, historical, sociological and psychological areas which serve as a base

for formulating a systematic approach to the profession of teaching. Education then clearly qualifies as a profession in the sense that it possesses systematic body of theory. Many teachers may be unaware of the theoretical assumptions that underlie teaching. The ignorance of teachers does not negate the fact that this body of theoretical knowledge exists. This body of knowledge is generally viewed as impractical, as it does not directly effect "how to teach." While the theory does not teach how to teach, it does serve to explain why particular areas are taught. Perhaps professors of education are derelict in explaining the necessity of theoretical systems and their place in the utilization of theory in practice. This view of a systematic theoretical body of knowledge supports categorizing foundations of education as an academic discipline, rather than as professional training.

A weakness of the foundations of education lies in the fact that many classroom teachers are not cognizant of current research and theory. This failure to keep abreast of the latest theoretical assumptions is a shortcoming of the individual teacher rather than the shortcoming of the foundations of education. Teachers could be informed of the latest theoretical assumptions by attending in-service training, participation in
professional organizations, attending universities at night or summers, or reading professional journals in education.

Professional authority is determined by the control a profession has over the policies of the profession. Schools generally belong "to the people." Leadership is generally shared between the professional teachers and the public. While teachers are not granted complete autonomy in the schools, they determine to what extent or degree the broad policy set by the public sector of education shall be implemented. Teachers have a large measure of autonomy in selections of materials and certainly in the choice of methodology in each classroom. This point tends then to support education as a profession.

One of the weaknesses of professionalism for teachers is the lack of control over entrance requirements to the profession. No professional group determines the qualifications for teachers. This lack of standards is undoubtedly a factor in the belief that anyone can teach. Complicating a desire for codification of standards are college professors who generally lack any professional training to teach but nevertheless are allowed to teach, while lacking even minimal qualification for state certification. A paradox exists in the sense that a gifted person may be able to learn without benefit of formal education, and be able to
practice law, medicine or teaching competently. Entrance requirements are established for the majority of cases rather than the rare exceptions. Clearly this majority benefits from the formal education, but exceptions should be made for equivalent work in lieu of specific requirements.

A regulative code of ethics for all of education does not exist. A semi-official code of ethics has been established by the National Education Association. A code of ethics is not a series of laws, but rather a statement of principles generally accepted by the profession at large. This code serves as a guide for the teaching profession that is elastic enough, and broad enough, to meet almost any situation that may arise and apply to all teachers--elementary, secondary and collegiate.

The first principle of the code defines the primary goal of teaching as guiding children, youth and adults in the pursuit of knowledge and skills, the ways of democracy, and to help them to be happy, useful self-supporting citizens. The code outlines six ways of fulfilling this obligation. The second principle recognizes the need for teachers and parents to work together to guide the child towards behavior that is socially acceptable. It stresses the many methods of teaching that will result in cooperative relationships with the home. The third principle
enunciates the unique place the teacher has in the societal scheme. It defines the obligations the teacher has to the community with respect to personal conduct and community involvement. The fourth and fifth principles deal with the obligations teachers have with respect to employment and professional relationships among all teachers.  

Adherence to the provisions of the code is entirely voluntary, with no provision made for punishment or exclusion from the profession of anyone who entirely rejects the code or only pays it cursory attention. Expulsion from the National Education Association is in itself of meaningless value, as over half the teachers in the United States are not members. As long as joining the professional organization is voluntary, sanctions employed by the association to discipline errant members is of dubious value.  

A professional subculture probably does exist, although it is difficult to determine what folkways exist and are followed throughout the subculture. Some of the characteristics classified as part of this subculture are that teachers tend to socialize


almost exclusively with other teachers, and discuss teaching and related areas. This may contribute to a reduction of personality, which may cause some teachers who originally had a wide range of interests in life to develop tunnel vision, in that they live teaching, eat teaching, breathe teaching, dream teaching and limit their social and intellectual contacts to other teachers.¹

Teaching, then, qualifies as a profession definitely in only one of the areas--that of a theoretical set of knowledge. Education also qualifies in development of a professional subculture, but this is of dubious value to the individual who wishes to broaden his experiences. In the other three areas the evidence is of a negative nature. At this point it can be argued that education as a field of study is neither academic nor professional, but rather a hybrid that, like Topsy, "just grewed!" Rather than attempt to codify education it is necessary to arbitrarily dichotomize education into two distinct fields--academic or foundations and pedagogical or professional training.

A study of Hippocrates may be of interest to future medical doctors, but it really is of little value in learning to perform open-heart surgery. A comparison may be made with the

study of Pestalozzi, which undoubtedly broadens the background of an educator, but it probably does not increase his effectiveness in teaching number facts. It is using the criteria of broadening one's own knowledge without regard to practicality that assigns most foundations courses to the academic branch of education. This is in contrast to some educators who wish foundations to be a combination of academic research of a scholarly nature and participatory in implementing the practical aspects of foundations courses.¹

Social foundations as a course of study can be properly categorized as an academic discipline in that while the knowledge acquired may be used for determining educational policy, the results of such a study do not necessarily furnish all of the requirements for effective policy formulation and/or evaluation.² Using this criteria of utility or non-utility, social foundations qualifies as an academic field.

Other tests to determine proper placement of social foundations into either professional training or academic fields of study are specialist versus generalist, and whether or not

¹Anderson, Theoretical Foundations, p. V.
²Ibid., p. V.
social foundations exists as an independent field of study. A specialist will develop knowledge and appreciations of a rather limited number of areas of study. Usually to carry this to a logical end a specialist will attempt to narrow his area of concentration to that in which he will conduct investigative research. This research should add new knowledge to his specialty or area of concentration. A specialist will generally pursue a Ph.D. rather than an M.D. or Ed.D. degree which are generalist degrees. A medical doctor may refute this contention as a generalist, but this is really the case. In medical school the future M.D. will generally be taught by a Ph.D degree-holder in such areas as pharmacology, microbiology or medical sociology. His specialty usually develops after the M.D. degree when he specializes in one area of medicine. Therefore, the Ph.D. must be a specialist in a particular area without necessarily being able to function as a generalist. Students in foundations of education at the graduate level are specialists and pursue the Ph.D. rather than generalists who have a broader background but not the depth. The Ed.D. candidate will study foundations only to the extent that it prepares him for administration, teaching or supervision. A word of caution is needed at this point. Because a person is a specialist in social foundations, history of
education or philosophy of education, some will tend to view him as a specialist across the board, which is not the case.¹ A good historian is just that and no more. He is a specialist in that area, but really has no special competencies in chemistry, literature or theatre. This view must be kept in mind when dealing with specialists. Education is especially vulnerable to outside specialists who may or may not be specialists in education. The furor caused by Admiral Hyman G. Rickover is a classic example.

Admiral Rickover's specific criticisms of education include the overall philosophy of education in America. Rickover believes that education should only be concerned with developing the fullest academic potential of students, and not to be concerned with social and developmental growth of the student. In training for "academic limits" there should be a broad terminal education for the average and below average, and separate classes for the academically talented and gifted. The curriculum according to Rickover is cluttered with rubbish and trivia, with the result that the emphasis is on "know-how" subjects rather than academic areas. Teachers colleges are at fault also in the sense that too much time is spent on professional courses rather than on a

¹Jose Ortega Y Gasset, The Revolt of the Masses (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1932), pp. 120-125.
thorough and deep knowledge of subject matter.\textsuperscript{1} Rickover does not acknowledge the need for, or the place for, any philosophy of education, history of education, or any of the other academic foundations areas. He singles out John Dewey and William Heard Kilpatrick as being destroyers of traditional education by promoting an experimentalist philosophy of education.

For Rickover the educational process is one of simply collecting factual knowledge to the limit of the student's absorptive capacity. Rickover sees no value in educating man to deal completely and fully with the physical, biological and social environments.\textsuperscript{2} Rickover proposes a demonstration school for the academically talented, which would insure a broad background for those specially selected students. He dismisses the argument that this is less than democratic with the comment that the idea that this will lead to an educational elite is absurd. He also proposes a national agency to evaluate school curricula and teacher qualifications. This agency will replace all present accrediting associations and only it will certify the high school diploma and competency of teachers. This federal agency is to be


staffed by a "council of scholars." Rickover does not mention which agency will appoint this council, nor does he reveal the criteria to be used for the selection of these scholar-accreditors.\(^1\) The Admiral may have known how to build atomic submarines, but it is questionable whether this specialty is transferable to an educational situation. This point helps to explain why foundations areas are separate disciplines. A history department indeed includes specialists in particular areas of history, but that does not imply that an American historian will adequately deal with American education, especially if his interest lies in military history, or some other area of specialization. A historian of education is teaching a specialty which his students wish to know more about. Military battles are incidental, except in that case in which they directly influence the educational system. The areas of foundations need to be recognized as specialities which are in fact academic fields. Foundations is to methodology as sociology is to social work. They are related, but they are not the same. The same analogy can be applied to social foundations and sociology. They are both related academic areas, but they are not the same.

Social foundations as an academic field of study has been debated since the 1930's, when Columbia University inaugurated Education 200F as the area of study that would provide a synthesis for incorporating history of education, philosophy of education, educational psychology, economics, sociology of education and a variety of other areas of study into one discipline that would serve as a foundation for further study.  

Social foundations has come to have two distinct definitions. The term "Social Foundations of Education" is sometimes used as an encompassing term for the whole of the foundations of education discipline. When used in this context it covers a department that generally includes philosophy of education, history of education, educational psychology, sociology of education and any other area of study that specific universities categorize as social foundations. This term then is used to denote those areas of education which deal in some respect with society and societal views of education. Generally excluded from this area are strictly professional segments of education, i.e., administration, methodology and supervision.


2Anderson, Theoretical Foundations, pp. IV-VI.
The second definition implies a field within a department of educational foundations. In this definition social foundations is viewed as a concrete entity enjoying the same value as philosophy of education, educational psychology and history of education, for example. For the purposes of this paper the latter definition viewing foundations as a separate area of study will be used. A problem exists in semantics about the usage of the term "Social Foundations." Further complicating the definition is the fact that specialists in social foundations view the other foundations of education as supportive of social foundations, and as part of the domain of social foundations without being the whole of the area studied. Social foundations is floundering more from a lack of proper terminology than from lack of material to be studied. Social foundations, then, as a field of study, incorporates those aspects and problems of society which need to be examined to determine educational policy regarding the social concerns of the school.  

1

The major weakness of social foundations is that it lacks an exact definition, and this lack causes social foundations to be a dubious field of independent worth. An exactness of

definition will, of course, cause people to view social foundations more objectively. Until a definition is developed, and with it a concomitant program of implementing the definition, social foundations will continue to be viewed as a nebulous field of study without purpose or structures.
CHAPTER V
A PROPOSED DEFINITION OF SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS
OF EDUCATION

The first step in formulating a definition of social foundations is to decide on a name for this field which is unique to the field and cannot be confused with any other field of study. The need for a unique name is obvious in the sense that the term social foundations is variously used to describe all of the educational foundations fields and also one specific area within the foundations of education department. Rather than insist that the term social foundations be reserved exclusively for a particular field within foundations, it is easier to allow this term to be used for the whole of foundations, and develop a new word that describes that particular area formerly known as social foundations or some derivative thereof. For the purpose of this paper, then, the term polyology will be used exclusively for that particular area or academic field of study.

The previous chapters were devoted to showing the diverse opinions concerning educational history, educational philosophy
and a description of educational foundations as professional
training or an academic area of study. Using this base it is now
appropriate to define polyology. Categorizing the area as an
academic branch has been established in previous chapters.

The study of polyology should deal with an examination of
the problems and trends confronting a society at the present
time.¹ The stress must be placed on those parts of the society
that are current and relevant and that need to be faced now.
Polyology, as a field, is concerned with the current problems of
society that need to be studied to provide background for deter-
mining educational policies and practices.²

Polyology is a study of the relationship of man and so-
ciety, and whether or not man can utilize the rapidity of change
in social customs, ecological, emotional and intellectual envi-
ronments to build a new and better world, or be so frightened of
the accelerating pace of change that he will resort to measures
calculated to stop or slow down the changes in his various envi-

¹Harold Rugg and William Wathers, Social Foundations of

²The Theoretical Foundations of Education, Archibald W.
Anderson, Chairman (Urbana, Illinois" University of Illinois,
1951), p. IV.
Whether the effects of change are desirable or undesirable will depend largely on man's attitude toward change, and his ability to deal with these new problems with knowledge and intelligence. Education in our society is the instrument which is responsible for providing man with the knowledge for shaping individual lives, economic development and political socialization. In order to prepare educators for such an important place in the societal arrangement it is necessary to discover those sets of factors that have brought society to the issues and problems faced today.

One of the premises for studying polyology then is time utility. Any problem that is viewed as current and germane to a particular society at the present time is a proper area of study for polyology, in the sense that only through knowledge of the roots of the problems will intelligent choices be made in dealing with the problems. This statement deliberately rules out choices that are made intuitively or gained by divine revelation.

---

2 Ibid., p. 9.
deliberate study must include the history, the contemporary conditions and an analysis of the problems. This deliberate study of the problems should afford man the opportunity for making those choices that are good for the individual and society. Harold Rugg views the whole of the universe as the domain of study of the social foundations of education. While this is certainly a lofty aspiration it does not help to concretize or systematize social foundations (polyology) as an area of study, when its parameters are so loose as to include the sum total of all man's knowledge and experience.

Instead of an open-ended, infinite area of study, polyology must provide a structure for working with the problems of today. Polyology will be the area in which a synthesis of the other areas of educational foundations, i.e., history, psychology, etc., will be made. The background for the study of polyology will be the total body of knowledge in the foundations of education fields.¹ This background will provide for the academic study of education as a fundamental societal force. Polyology will not be the introductory course in the study of education, but rather a culminating activity that allows for a synthesis to

be formed to deal with the current problems of the society. It would be difficult if not impossible to study this field without a thorough knowledge of the history of education, philosophy of education and sociology of education. These are the cornerstones upon which polyology is to be built.

While using these as the foundation for the study of polyology, it is not to be assumed that other areas of education are to be excluded from study, but rather that these three are vital. A comprehensive undergraduate introductory course in the foundations of education titled "Social Foundations" is espoused by John Laska, but the problems of agreement as to what should be taught, and variance of course content from university to university suggests that probably a beneficial introductory integrative course cannot be taught. A better plan would be to offer either history of education or philosophy of education as the introductory course. Also, it appears rather pointless to offer courses in methodology before the undergraduate has had some exposure to the academic areas of education.

How do schools of education expect a student to determine what methods, approaches or techniques he will use unless he has sufficient background to understand what led educational practices to this present point in the American experience? Before
a student can synthesize his own approaches to education he must have some tools or knowledge that give him a foundation to teach. Professional education courses then should be offered only after a study of the foundations of education. Only after the basic foundations courses and basic professional training courses are completed should the student pursue polyology.

The study of polyology is predicated on the thesis that man must have an understanding of the dynamics of the environmental dimensions of education in order to effectively deal with societal changes and what effect these dynamic changes have on the schools, and what effect the schools have on the changing environments of man.¹

Two views regarding change are dominant in the world today. The Western, or technological, view is of a dynamic philosophy of change which holds that change is the way forward, and that change and progress are synonymous. This view tends to hold that all change is beneficial, because only change allows for continued growth and progress. The Eastern, or non-technological philosophy, adopts a static philosophy that life will continue as

it has, and that tomorrow will be as today.¹

Not even in the most advanced technological society, the United States, is change always readily accepted. People generally feel personal stress with each technological or scientific breakthrough. Can the individual stand the rapid shift of culture, adjustment to machines, new philosophies, new societal arrangements of marriage and of family life? Can the individual survive the cultural lag? Is the burden of civilization too much to endure for some?²

That mores and folkways are resistant to change is one of the fundamental generalizations of sociology. Equally true is it that in the American society education is considered to be the most efficient instrument for modifying mores and folkways.³

Education as a societal instrument works primarily with the young of the society, and through education the leaders of one generation can create new norms for the following generation. Education

²For a detailed treatment see W. F. Ogburn, Social Change (New York: Viking Press, 1923), part V.
is also the tool for remodeling or rebuilding the culture in that it blends technical progress with the historical sense of positive values of the society to provide the new leadership generation with the skills it must have to further advance the society.¹

This then is the sociological thesis for schools to attempt to handle the rapidly increasing changes in the society. It is the inability to deal with change rather than the change itself that causes stress on the society, and ultimately on the individual.

A comprehensive plan of education has two foci, the child and the society. This view of education was advanced by the social reconstructionists with George S. Counts, Harold O. Rugg and William Heard Kilpatrick as the most notable advocates of a society-centered educational institution.² American society thus must come to depend on the educational institution to build the attitudes that will help man to develop broad outlines of social goals that ultimately will become the social policy of the culture. The task of the educational institution is to advance an educational philosophy today that will become the socio-political policy of tomorrow's leadership.

¹Ibid., p. 513.
Ideas propagated today will be the actual policy of the society in the future. Education teaches man to challenge, to think and to synthesize. If this view of education in the American societal arrangement is true, then somewhere teachers must be aware of the awesome burden and power they possess. Polyology will be an examination of past societal positions to provide an understanding of the problems of today, and to synthesize the dynamics to remodel the society. The methodology of polyology will be basically the methodology of the social sciences with sociological methods of research as the cornerstone of polyogical research.

While the tools of the sociologist will be used extensively, other methods of research, i.e., historical methods, will be utilized when those methods are deemed expedient for conducting research in polyology. This review of sociological methodology will provide the conceptual theoretical framework from which a more complete systematic paradigm will be erected for dealing particularly with sociology of education. There is no one single perspective in sociological research, but rather opportunities for researchers to define and refine methods in sociological analyses that can contribute to the solution of problems facing the educational institution.
There are three areas of research in education: (1) the substantive, (2) the methodological, and (3) the logistical. The substantive area deals with the basic concerns which will be researched. This provides the researcher with a context for inquiry which includes the scene, the phenomena of interest, telling questions, principles of evidence, key concepts, conceptual systems, basic assumptions and presuppositions. The scene primarily determines which areas will be researched and why some areas of research are neglected. It is impossible to separate the interests of researchers in the social sciences from the society in which they are conducting their research. This definition of scene helps to explain the concentration of research on some specific areas while neglecting others.

A persuasive concept for viewing the scene for research in education is the notion that education should provide the student with upward social mobility, and should provide all children with equal opportunity to achieve. This scene of research helps to explain the extensive research done recently in higher and compensatory education. From the general background or scene emerges the phenomena of interest, or the specific domain to be researched.
The "telling question" is one which facilitates inquiry and research by converting an enigma into a specific aspect that can be studied. From the telling question comes the key concepts, generative ideas and conceptual systems. A concept is defined as a linguistic symbol that points to a commonality in different events, and will elicit from the users of the term a stability of definition. Understanding of the scene and phenomena of interest is essential to comprehension of the social forces which play upon educational method in the United States.¹

The "social aspects" of education are generally concerned with: (1) social inputs including background characteristics of school personnel, i.e., students, faculty, administrators and others involved in support of the academic area of the school; (2) the institutional context, including the sociology of the classroom and the larger institution; (3) the social setting of the school.²

Social inputs include research on the backgrounds of students, the socio-economic values held by the professional staff, and what effect on school programs these similarities or dissimilarities have on the efficacy of the programs offered by the school. Institutional research generally investigates the impact of classroom situations on the learning situation. Investigations include the student-peer group relationships and their impact on a student as he moves through his experience in a particular educational institution. The social setting research includes the wealth, education, occupational level, tax base, urbanization of the community and other factors which affect the adaptability of the school program.¹ All of these research areas help to support the thesis that educational research is determined by the question, "Which knowledge is of most value?" The value of educational research is generally extrinsically derived in the sense that the research is expected to produce some practical results for implementing an educational philosophy or policy.² The principal method employed will be analytical in an attempt to ascertain causes for the phenomena. The domains of

¹Ibid., p. 103.
interests in sociological research in education are generally thus derived.

In summation, the definition of polyology is a study of those current problems found in society that education can reasonably expect to influence for the betterment of both the individual and the general society. The betterment is directly influenced by the ethos that surrounds any particular society at a given time. In polyology, of course, the time element is the present, with an eye to the future. Methodology for research in polyology is in existence with sociology of education research providing the skeletal framework. This allows for the use of methodology of other disciplines and also for the possibility for development of methodology that may be indigenous to polyology. This definition deliberately does not include specifics to be studied, because that will be determined largely by the conditions found in the society in which polyology is being studied. Specific curriculum recommendations will be viewed within the framework of this broad definition of polyology, with special emphasis on those in the context of the American society.
CHAPTER VI
CURRICULUM RECOMMENDATIONS

The first steps in implementing social foundations as an academic area are to build a new program and a new curriculum out of the problems, issues and characteristics of a changing society. The central concepts which epitomize the society shall be the skeleton of the program. The concept most basic to the American society which is to serve as the core of the new curriculum is democracy. All problems and issues confronting the society shall be viewed within the concept of democracy and how the corruption of that concept has contributed greatly to the problems confronting the society today. The democracy described is biased toward a cultural-oriented approach to education. A cultural approach emphasizing democratic principles is a relatively platitudinous expression which in itself explains almost nothing of the concrete structures that are needed to either study or teach polyology. The embarkation point of a culturally-oriented policy of education must, of necessity, begin with the training of teachers, because ultimately the teachers are the agents who will present a cultural or social reconstructionist plan to society. The
Seventies are probably the years attuned to change, so it is easier at this time to inaugurate a theory of education that calls for action. The era of social action in the schools follows the pendulum theory of education. The thesis of this theory is that as a pendulum swings, tick-tock, back and forth, so does relevancy in education. The 1930's and 1940's brought about an emphasis on the affective, while the 1950's placed the stress on the cognitive...and the 1970's brought it back to the affective.

This swinging movement of education has been explored in earlier chapters, so let it suffice that education serves that function that the society generally decides it will serve. This is pointed out to allow readers to know that whatever is written in this dissertation is only valid for now (time utility). The specifics outlined in no way corrupt the definition of polyology, but--on the contrary--support the premise that the study of this area must at all times be current to be a valid area of study.

The American definition of democracy is twofold, as it clearly encompasses the importance and dignity of the human personality and recognizes that the individual lives in an interdependent social world. In educating the individual towards
self-actualization it must be paramount that we are educating for a "socialized self" and not for a "selfish self." The democratic ideal must be made clear to each new generation by developing a knowledge of the past, the philosophy of the culture, and the areas where improvement in the society is needed. This arrangement falls within the framework of polyology as an area that can only be studied after a background is acquired by the student in the other areas previously described as foundations of education.

After a study of polyology by the classroom teacher, that teacher should be able to better place emphasis in the schools on education for citizenship, on the social unifying aspects of the schools, on the schools as instruments of democracy, on the recognition of individual differences, and on the need for practical courses as well as traditionally academic subject matter. In teaching teachers it is assumed that all university instructors in a school, college or department of education are themselves


first and foremost excellent classroom teachers. It is a rather ludicrous position for schools of education to have on their staffs teachers who plainly are incompetent as classroom teachers. The quality and production of scholarly research is negated when these researchers are unable to handle a classroom situation. The credibility of professional education is lost when the "teachers of teachers" can not teach. All of the theory, philosophy, history, values and ethics of education are made into a mockery when schools of education have incompetents. This need is so obvious that it may appear redundant to even mention it, but the assumption is that the curriculum proposed will be taught only by those who can truly teach the material so that it will have value to the students.

The two basic contentions for polyology are, first--to be committed philosophically to democracy as defined, and second--to be excellent classroom teachers. It is with these generalizations as guides that the specific curriculum recommendations are made.

Introductory polyology is to provide the student with the rudiments of the social-cultural background to be able to synthesize a plan of action for teaching in the classroom. The divisions of the curriculum are based on a survey of textbooks that by title or definition of author are viewed as social founda-
tions texts and contributions to the professional literature which deal directly or indirectly with social foundations of education. No assessment, either negative or positive, will be made of any particular textbook or article. Some contributions were, of course, of greater value to the success of this paper. The bibliography provides the reader with the sources consulted, with no value attached to any of the works listed.

The first division to be studied will be a study of the School as a Societal Institution. This section will deal with the role that education plays in a number of different cultures including both the informal role as found in various preliterate societies and the formal role structures that surround education in advanced technological societies. This will necessitate a brief study of comparative education to better understand the relationship the educational institution has to a particular society.

It is incumbent upon the polyologist to review both the physical, topographical and demographical composition of the society so that this information can be used to identify the variants in the culture and also to help in designing education for the future. After this preliminary study the student should be able to examine the structure of the American society and
determine the historical trends, and hopefully be able to synthesize a plan for the future. This plan calls for education to take a more active role in society, and if not to directly lead the society, then at least to strongly guide the society towards the fulfillment of the goals of a democracy.

The next broad area of study should be the specifics of dealing societally with a pluralistic society as it exists in the United States. The study of Education in a Pluralistic Society will enable the student to examine those groups composing subcultures that are found in the common or general culture. The subcultures found in American society are probably greater than found in those older, more homogenous cultures in the world. Whereas most societies are composed of singular or relatively few racial, nationality or religious groups, the United States is composed of multi-religious, racial, national and political groups that more or less have been assimilated into a larger culture called the "American Way of Life." This realization of a pluralistic society is needed to understand why certain groups are considered more troublesome than others, and why these groups may need special help in being assimilated into the larger culture. These elements of a subculture which operate on the fringes of the common culture are viewed as being in disharmony with the
consensus of values formed in the society. The educator, when dealing with these subcultures, must have an understanding of these groups, so that he is able to deal with the subculture's goals and ideals more than superficially. Now, when there is direct conflict between the prevailing consensus and minority groups in the culture, the educator must be able to analyze what is wrong with the consensus, and how—in the light of democratic ideals—the consensus can be changed to accommodate the minority and thus remove one of the areas of conflict existing in the society. If the conflict is not so constructed as to destroy the democratic society, some method or course of action is open to the society to remedy the conflict. When a society is so inflexible that it can not accommodate these changes, that society is subject to revolution to eradicate the consensus or repression on the part of the majority to eliminate the subculture's goals and ideals. These, of course, are the extremes of dealing with social conflict and should not be necessary in a society that abides by a democratic system. An example of dealing with the problems of a pluralistic society is the present crises in urban education. Part of the problem, of course, is caused by educating the members of a subculture by the use of an educational consensus that is geared for maximum achievement for white, middle-class
children. The conflict, in order to be resolved, must include some restructuring of the basic curriculum of the common schools to accommodate the children that were forgotten when the consensus curriculum was established. Society is moving to meet this conflict by incorporating into the curriculum parts of the subculture, while retaining those parts that a minority needs in order to live and work in the larger culture. This area of study in polyology is deliberately labelled Education and the Pluralistic Society, and not Education and Urban Problems, etc., because a study of pluralism is essential to understanding the American society...while a study of urban education is a problem now, but probably will not be a problem at some time in the future. When the cultural conflict involving urban life is resolved, that area will more appropriately be studied as background for a future problem, or merely as a history of education subtopic. The major areas of the polylogical curriculum must remain current; care must be exercised in not structuring a program so tightly that conflicts which need attention are excluded because an authority ten or twenty years ago decided a subject was of value for study.

Education and Power will deal with the power structure involved in the educational institution. In order to implement
change it is necessary for teachers to have at least a basic understanding of the power structure that directly or indirectly affects educational decisions. In the United States an examination of federal, state and local decisions will be necessary to enable the student to determine what institutions exert pressure on education.

The United States Constitution does not directly deal with federal control or influence upon education. But since 1789 when the present Constitution was ratified, the federal government has passed a series of laws which have influenced education directly. Examples of federal influence are the Morrill Act (1862) which provided that:

1. each state receive 30,000 acres of public land for each senator and representative in Congress according the apportionment of 1860;

2. the income from this land be used to support at least one college, whose primary educational goal was agriculture and mechanical instruction;

3. states lacking federal lands be given script worth the value of the land that was to be sold with the proceeds used for an agricultural and mechanical college.
It is significant to note that this was direct involvement of the federal government in educational affairs. The second Morrill Act (1890) provided for a direct federal government payment of cash for the support of these land grant colleges and universities. The Smith-Lever Act (1914) and the Smith-Hughes Act (1917) both were attempts by the federal government to influence curriculum offerings to include courses in vocational training. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act (1944) provided educational benefits to returning veterans of World War II. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 served as a catalyst for the increase in academic preparation in science, languages and mathematics. The National Defense Act of 1958 supported guidance counseling programs, student financial aids, testing and research programs and vocational programs.¹ These examples are offered as guidelines or precedents of federal power in education. They are not to be misconstrued as all inclusive, but to be taken as guides to understanding the extent of the federal government's power to influence education.

The judiciary system in a series of decisions has also exercised considerable influence upon education. The Dartmouth

Decision (1819) established the university as a legal entity whose rights were comparable to the rights of an individual.

Probably the best known of court decisions regarding education is Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka (1954). The Brown decision overthrew the Plessy vs. Ferguson decision of 1896, which held that separate but equal facilities for blacks and whites were constitutional. In reversing this decision in the Brown case, the Supreme Court opened the door for equal educational opportunities for Americans regardless of color. A more recent ruling issued by Federal Judge James B. Parsons held that all dress codes for students were unconstitutional. Prior to the Parson's ruling it had been the custom for individual school districts to establish dress codes and provide for enforcement and punishment at the district's discretion. Clearly, then, the judiciary is a power broker in education.

The state governments exercise direct influence on schools by establishing certification requirements for teachers, attendance laws, and direct monetary aid to districts that meet the standards set by the state.

Local boards of education are generally elected and are, theoretically, a cross-section of the population of the district that elects them. This, of course, is not always the case.
fact, board members are generally the better educated, more affluent members of the district. Appointive boards generally are composed of representatives of various power groups in the school district. For example, one member will probably represent organized labor, another will represent the interest of the business community, while a third may represent an ethnic or racial group. While this method does provide balance, it may also work to destroy the effectiveness of the board if each member is voting for positions that support a particular faction in education, rather than programs that are good for the total educational situation.

Newer power groups that are attempting to directly influence educational policies and practices are the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Their militancy is expressed in strikes for more money and smaller class sizes, and for other issues the organizations view as being within their domain of concern.

The other bastion of power within the school structure would be the administrators. The power of this group flows directly from the boards of education in the respective districts. The power that the administrators wield is in direct ratio to
the relationship they have with the board. In some districts the superintendent will exercise vast power, and in other districts relatively little. A generalization on the power flow would be that the board makes broad policy, and the administrators carry out this policy.

The groups mentioned previously are largely visible domains of power. There exist other power elements that need to be identified. These sometimes invisible members of the power structure are known as "influentials." These influential sometimes exercise a disproportionate share of power. A community leader or religious leader may influence the educational decisions within a given community covertly. The influential may be the man behind the scene, or one who has "the ear" of a person who is in a position to make decisions.¹

The final broad area to be covered in introductory poli­
ology would be Education and Social Change. The three areas previously covered should provide the background for the problems that need to be corrected, while the last area will provide some of the tools and knowledge to facilitate change. A fundamental characteristic of culture is that it does change over time and

¹Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, editors, Designing Education for the Future No. 3 (New York: Citation Press, 1967), pp. 117-118.
from place to place. This change in social behavior is one of the most striking differences between man and other species. An animal culture basically remains the same from century to century and place to place. In less than one million years man has emerged from a primitive savage culture to an advanced scientific culture.

By what process does culture change? Whenever social behavior in the culture persistently deviates from the established cultural habits in any direction, it results in modifications first in social expectations, and then in customs, beliefs and rules. Ultimately the collective habits are altered, and the culture comes into accord with the new norms of actual behavior. The changes in the social behavior usually have their origin in the life conditions of the culture. The events that are especially influential in producing social change are population changes, changes in the geographical environment, migration, contacts with other cultures, natural and social catastrophes such as floods, crop failures, epidemics, wars, depressions, accidental discoveries, technological advances, and biographical events such as death or rise to power of a new political leader.

An historical approach describes changes in relationship to times, places and events. The scientific approach to change
answers the question how. Both approaches are valid and completely complementary. An historian commonly will discuss particular traits of a culture, while a sociologist will examine the processes by which these traits entered the culture. These processes are grouped under the terms innovation, social acceptance, selective elimination and integration.

The formation of a new habit by an individual, which subsequently is accepted or learned by other members of the society, is called innovation. There are four variants of innovation. These are variation, invention, tentation and cultural borrowing.

A variation is a slight modification of habitual behavior under the pressures of changing circumstances. Variation occurs in all societies at all times. The changes may be so slight as to be almost imperceptible, but their cumulative effect over the years may be immense. A variation in education would be the length of a college class period. There is no logical reason why a credit hour is fifty minutes long. Classes probably at some time were twenty minutes, or even one hundred minutes. The important thing is that some unknown individual started using a fifty-minute credit hour, and gradually enough people conducted fifty minute classes which then became the accepted standard for
college classes. The point is that what the original fifty-minute man started has, over the long haul, had an effect on millions of students over the years.

Invention involves the transfer of habitual behavior from one situational context to another, or their combination into a new synthesis. A concomitant component is that a degree of creativeness is always present. The airplane did not spring unaided from the minds of Orville and Wilbur Wright. The Wright Brothers built upon a knowledge of gliders, internal combustion engines and an adaptation of a ship's propeller. Their synthesis became known as the Kitty Hawk. Inventions are also of a non-material nature. A transfer of techniques from one context to another is an invention. Motion pictures were developed for entertainment purposes. Someone realized that motion pictures could be used in a classroom and became the inventor of a new teaching method or technique. An invention always involves a new synthesis of old habits, thus it is dependent on the existing content of the culture. It is for this reason that parallel inventions so rarely occur among unconnected peoples of differing cultures. Among people of the same or related cultures parallel inventions are common.
A third form of innovation is tentation. Whereas variation and invention modified or restructured existing elements in the culture, tentation may give rise to elements that show little or no continuity with elements already present in the culture. This form is similar to a "trial and error" method in psychology. Tentation occurs when a situation develops that cannot be solved by the established habits. Periods of crises are particularly conducive to tentation. In a famine people may experiment with variations in their diet, that they ultimately may incorporate into their eating patterns even after the famine is over. Alfred Packer practiced tentation when he and his party were trapped by snow in Donner Pass. After a period of experimentation with a snow diet, which proved to be of inadequate nutritional value, Packer settled upon the idea of eating the other members of his party. Whether this habit would have become an established norm is difficult to judge, as Packer was hanged for cannibalism before he could lead a national crusade.

The fourth type of innovation is cultural borrowing or diffusion. In this case the innovator is not the originator of the new custom or habit, but its introducer. The custom has been a part of another culture, and the innovator is merely the first person of his social group to use it. Of all forms of innovation
diffusion is the most common. Cultural borrowing has apparent advantages over other forms of innovations. First, it has been found to be a solution to the problem in another culture, so less time is needed to test it. Cultural borrowing is dependent upon contact with other societies. This contact does not have to be face to face, but can take place through the use of written communication. American education is replete with examples of cultural borrowing, i.e., our language comes from England, our alphabet from the Phoenicians, our numerical systems from the Arabs, and our paper and printing from China. The kindergarten was a German idea, while the university system was borrowed from England and Germany. Examples of cultural borrowing in education alone would fill several volumes.

The second major process in cultural change is the acceptance by the society of the innovation. The degree of cultural saturation determines an innovation's acceptance in the culture. The more practitioners or believers in the innovation, the more acceptance it will have in the culture. The learning theory involved in social acceptance is imitation. A factor of importance in social acceptance is the status of the innovator. If the social status value of the innovator and his first imitators is high, the more likely it is that the innovation
will be accepted. Many innovations in education are accepted readily because certain "influentials" deem them desirable. When James B. Conant made his recommendations for improving the high schools, many boards became believers because of the prestige of Conant of Harvard University.

Selective elimination is the process whereby certain practices in the culture are discontinued. This elimination is largely limited to cultural elements that are least adaptive to the society. More beliefs, customs and mental attitudes are eliminated from the culture than are scientific or technological achievements. Burning witches at the stake has been eliminated from the American culture, but the technical knowledge of fire has not been.

The fourth process of cultural change is integration. The habits of a culture become progressively adapted to one another with the result that an integrated society is created. Each innovation must be shaped and adapted, so that it is integrated into the whole of society. An acceptance of a particular habit may take years, or even generations, to be accepted and integrated into the culture. In the interim other innovations have been introduced and must be integrated also. Integration of a society is always incomplete. No matter what a society is
today, it definitely will not be the same tomorrow. The period from inception of an innovation to its integration is called cultural lag. During this period the society attempts to modify the old habits so as to be consistent with the new.

The effect of processes of cultural change is to adapt the collective habits of a society progressively over time to the changing conditions of existence.¹

In each of the four areas outlined it will be necessary to research various texts and the professional literature so that a cross-section of views concerning the areas can be presented to the students. All sides of the issues must be studied for the democratic principle inherent to polyology to be effective. Presenting only one view flagrantly corrupts the definition, and with it the responsibility of polyology. Teachers of polyology will be expected to be flexible in the materials used to fulfill the polyological requirement of time utility. Materials selected must be constantly updated, so that this criterion is met.

The curriculum recommendations meet the requirements of the definition and await only their implementation by American teachers.
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