DOCTORAL DISSERTATION SERIES

TITLE THE LEGAL BASIS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN MICHIGAN

AUTHOR HOWARD KINGSBURY HOLLAND

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN DATE 1948

DEGREE Ph. D. PUBLICATION NO. 1108

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
ANN ARBOR · MICHIGAN

COPYRIGHTED

by

HOWARD KINGSBURY HOLLAND

1949

THE LEGAL BASIS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN MICHIGAN
1787 - 1948

by

Howard Kingsbury Holland

Committee in Charge:
Associate Professor Orlando W. Stephenson, Chairman
Professor Harold M. Dorr
Professor James B. Edmonson
Professor Lewis G. Vander Velde
Assistant Professor Claude Eggertsen

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, Michigan
August, 1948

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his grateful appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered by the many persons cooperating in this study. He is particularly indebted to Professor Orlando W. Stephenson, whose constant guidance and generous help convoyed the entire work to its completion. To Professor Claude Eggertsen the author is deeply indebted for helpful assistance in delineating the problem.

H.K.H.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		Page
I	THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE ..... Statement of the problem - Delimitations - Sources of data - Method of presenting data - Definition of terms - Need for the study	1
II	STATE CONGROL OF THE CURRICULUM..... The power of the state over education - The Superintendent of Public Instruction - The power of local bodies - The power of Michigan over education - The Superintendent of Public Instruction - The power of Michigan over the curriculum - The power of Michigan school districts over the curriculum - Summary	9
III	THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM IN MICHIGAN 1787 - 1834 ..... Beginning of centralized control - Authority over the common school system - Authority of school districts over the curriculum - Summary	27
IV	THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM IN MICHIGAN 1835 - 1860 ..... Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction - Authority over branches of the University - Authority over curriculums in graded schools - Authority of local inspectors - Authority over the curriculum through textbook control - Authority over the curriculum through teacher training - Summary	40

CHAPTER Page

V THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM 1861 - 1899 58
Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction - Local supervision and curriculum control - Authority in city districts - Position of textbooks in courses of study - Teacher certification and centralized control - Teacher training - Summary

VI THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM 1900 - 1948 77
Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction - Control of curriculums in city and graded districts - Control of instruction by means of eighth grade examinations - Control of instruction through certification of teachers - Control of instruction through teacher training - Curriculum control 1930 - 1948 - Summary .....

VII PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1787 - 1860 104
Social studies in the pre-prescription period - Prescriptions in city districts - Social studies prescriptions in colleges - Summary

VIII PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1861 - 1899 (Part I) 117
Prescriptions by the Superintendent of Public Instruction - Summary

IX PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1861 - 1899 (Part II) 142
Influences of geographical concepts upon prescription - Influences which affected history in the curriculum - Influences which affected civil government in the curriculum - Flag display as a method of teaching patriotism - Influences to include economics in the curriculum - Summary

CHAPTER Page

X PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1900 - 1930 157
Superintendents' prescriptions applying to the social studies - Legislative prescriptions in the social studies - Summary

XI PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1931 - 1948 183
Influences which affected social studies objectives - Suggestions applying to the social studies - Legislative prescription in the social studies - Summary

XII CONCLUSIONS 197

CASES CITED 209

BIBLIOGRAPHY 210

APPENDIX I

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table I	Number of City and Graded School Districts and Pupils in the Schools	69
Table II	Social Studies Taught in Union Schools, 1852	113
Table III	Social Studies Taught in Private Colleges, 1857	115
Table IV	Social Studies in the Course of Study for Graded Schools, 1861	118
Table V	Social Studies in the Course of Study for Common Schools, 1862	121
Table VI	Social Studies in the Course of Study for Graded Schools, 1876	123
Table VII	Social Studies in the Course of Study for Common Schools, 1881	127
Table VIII	Prescription of Time to be Allotted to the Social Studies in the Ungraded Schools, 1883	129
Table IX	Social Studies Claimed to be Taught in District Schools, 1886	131
Table X	Social Studies in the Course of Study for District Schools, 1890	133
Table XI	Social Studies in the Course of Study, 1897	135
Table XII	Circulars Affecting the Social Studies Distributed From 1897 to 1901	138
Table XIII	History Program Suggested by the Committee of Seven, 1898	160
Table XIV	Social Studies in the Course of Study for High Schools, 1905	162

Page

Table XV — Social Studies in the Course of Studies for Rural High Schools, 1907 163

Table XVI — Social Studies in the Course of Study for High Schools, 1914 165

Table XVII — Social Studies in the Course of Study for Elementary Schools, 1916 . 167

Table XVIII — Social Studies in the Course of Study for Elementary Schools, 1922 . 170

Table XIX — Social Studies in the Course of Study for Small High Schools, 1923 . 172

Table XX — State Course of Study in Geography, 1929 179

Number of Districts in which Social Studies Instruction was given ..... Appendix IV

Specimen Daily Programme for Country Schools, 1879 ..... Appendix VI

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SCOPE

The field of the social studies, dealing with human relationships in several different respects, is relatively new in the modern curriculum. However, the subject matter included in these studies has been part of formal learning since the days of Athens.

This study was undertaken in order better to understand the position these studies occupy in relation to education as a whole in the state of Michigan.

It was believed that it was important to trace the legal basis of the social studies in one of the American states, since this field of the curriculum is chiefly the one to which is delegated teaching about the state itself. It is the area of the curriculum wherein the total social heritage is passed from generation to generation in a more or less organized form. Moreover it is the part of the modern school program which emphasizes helping children to become socially moral. As far as we have been able to discover there have been no other studies relating directly to this subject.

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to trace The Legal Basis of the Social Studies in Michi-

gan from 1787 to 1948. It was necessary to discover, first, wherein lay the fundamental authority over the social studies, which are part of the total course of study or curriculum of the Michigan schools. Second, it was necessary to trace the historical development of the disposition of this authority. That is, it had to be determined, beginning in 1787, what agencies and boards had been given power over instruction, and insofar as possible, the reasons for such delegation of power by the fundamental authority.

Third, a definitive historical statement had to be made with respect to the nature of the prescriptions affecting the social studies. Within such a statement would be found precise requirements which would have to be met by Michigan schools and their teachers.

Delimitations. All essential prescriptions concerning the social studies which emanated from the Michigan legislature or from state-wide agencies created by it were included in this investigation. Requirements for social studies made by local bodies having power to determine curriculums were not included in this study except as they shed light on trends with respect to these studies.

During the early part of Michigan's history, one of the controls over what subject matter was to be taught was exercised through certain requirements for teacher certification and through the delineation of courses in teacher training schools and institutes. Evidence having to do

with such controls was included in this study.

During more recent years, control of subject matter taught was not an important function of teacher certification nor of prescribed curriculums in normal schools or teacher's institutes. Consequently, such requirements were excluded from this study. As for extra-legal controls over Michigan social studies, these were included only when they had a direct bearing upon legal controls.

Sources of data. It is evident from the context that the Session Laws of the Territory and the State, and the judicial decisions of the Michigan Supreme Court were relied upon for the data concerning the disposition of legal authority over the curriculum and direct legislative requirements pertaining to the social studies. Requirements pronounced by the Superintendent of Public Instruction were sought in Annual and Biennial Reports and in special directives emanating from his office. Legislative Journals, histories, newspapers, and periodicals were studied in order to account for the various prescriptions made. In addition to these sources, evidence was obtained from textbooks, bulletins, courses of study, and personal correspondence and interviews.

Method of presenting data. Chapter II discusses the location of ultimate authority over the social studies as an integral part of the total curriculum of Michigan schools. In Chapters III, IV, V, and VI, is an historical presenta-

tion of the disposition of control over the entire curriculum. Chapters VII to XI inclusive contain an account of the specific requirements for the social studies on a state-wide basis. Chapters VIII and IX both deal with specific requirements in the social studies during the period 1861 to 1899. The material is divided into two parts because of the extent of the relevent evidence and because of the importance of the period in the study.

The span of years covered by the several chapters was determined, in part, by political events significant to the study as a whole and in part by arbitrary limitation to facilitate the handling of material.[1]

Definition of terms. Since a good deal of confusion exists with respect to terminology used in the field of the social studies, definitions of the more important terms used are presented here.

Social studies represent a field, included within the total offerings of a school, which is predominately social in nature. It concentrates upon human relationships, and it is designed primarily for instructional purposes.[2]

---

[1] Topic headings used in the various chapters represent artificial divisions, since legal control over the social studies developed simultaneously with respect to the subjects presented. They were employed to facilitate the handling of data.

[2] Edgar Bruce Wesley, Teaching the Social Studies, Chap. I.

The content of the social studies is taken from the social sciences, which include knowledge relating to the origin, organization, and development of human society and the improvement of the social, economic, political, and cultural conditions under which man lives.[1] This content emphasizes the social sciences of history, political science, sociology, economics, and geography. Various social studies course titles are often synonymous with these.

Historically, the parts of the curriculums labeled history, general history, ancient history, and so forth; civics, state civics, civil government, and so forth; geography, home geography, and oral geography are considered social studies.

The term social studies appeared in 1905 as indicating a course which included economics, sociology, and civics. The term became widespread in 1916 when it was given official approval and wide currency in the report of the Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association.[2]

---

[1]Arthur C. Bining and David H. Bining, Teaching the Social Studies in the Secondary Schools, p. 1.

[2]Bining and Bining, op. cit., Chap. I.

Geography has been considered a social study in this paper except when evidence appeared that it was to be taught as a science. For the most part, courses of study delineated by the Superintendents of Public Instruction in Michigan have emphasized human geography as against physical geography, and they have indicated that a principal utility of the study lies in its contribution to the understanding of history.

Whereas history is commonly thought of as being the oldest of the social sciences as well as of the social studies, geography in the opinion of some experts is the youngest to ask admission into the social studies program, though its physical aspects antedate history in American schools.[1] Course descriptions, lectures to teachers, and publications concerning the content and methods of geography seem largely to contradict this as concerns the geography courses offered in the schools of Michigan.

The chief aim of the social studies is to train pupils for effective citizenship in a democracy. Traditional aims stressed moral and ethical values, whereas recent emphases have been on developing knowledge, understandings, skills, attitudes, ideals, appreciations, and interests which will equip young people to take their proper role in a democratic, interdependent society.

---

[1] Ibid.

Curriculum consists of the total school environment of the pupils. Traditionally it has been arranged in the form of courses which include those elements in the civilization that are considered most worthy of perpetuation, as well as most essential to the preservation of society.[1]

The elements of the curriculum are facts, knowledges, skills, techniques, attitudes, ideals, qualities and beliefs.

The curriculum reflects the desires of society, and within this framework, the specialized curriculum of the social studies is usually determined by the larger social objectives of society. Educators believe that the curriculum should be constantly improved. This implies not only constant change, but a recognition of the changing purposes of which society approves and an allignment of educational objectives which is consistent with the changes.[2]

Educational Objectives are statements of educators which define the desired ends of education. They change from time to time as indicated above. In general, they must have the approval of society, be capable of being achieved through instruction, be within the capacities of the school population, and be actually accepted and undertaken by the school. Socially approved purposes usually

---

[1]Wesley, op. cit., Chap. III.

[2]Ibid.

become educational objectives when they are such that they can no longer be expeditiously achieved by the home or other social agencies. The school, because it is publicly supported, seeks to accomplish the purposes for society.[1]

Need for the study. Since nothing has been written which discusses The Legal Basis of the Social Studies in Michigan, 1787 - 1948 on a state level, and since the sources of evidence have heretofore scarcely been tapped, it is hoped that this study will be a contribution to the educational history of Michigan in particular and to the history of the social studies in the United States in general. It should be of interest to educators, historians, and others interested in the pattern of the development of authority over an important area of school instruction.

---

[1] Wesley, op. cit., Chap. VI.

CHAPTER II

STATE CONTROL OF THE CURRICULUM

The power of the state over education. The Constitution of the United States did not delegate to the Federal Government control over education, nor did it prohibit this control to the states.[1] As a consequence, the right to establish and regulate systems of public schools is residual; it rests with the states.

The roots of state control undoubtedly lie in the Protestant Reformation. Therein was born the idea that the education of all redounds to the well-being of the state; and therefore the state may define and require such education by appropriate legislation.[2]

During early colonial days education was looked upon as necessary for the welfare of the religious state, so schooling was required by the Massachusetts laws of 1642 and 1647. The idea of the right of the state to make education compulsory in order to advance the welfare of the state, in time, became fixed in the New England colonies,

---

[1] Amendment X, United States Constitution.

[2] Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, p. 448.

Rhode Island excepted. From these colonies it gradually spread by migration over all the northeastern quarter of the United States.[1]

As state constitutions were formed, the requirements providing for education were, on the whole, no more than statements directing the legislatures to "establish and regulate systems of education."[2] As a consequence, state legislatures had virtually plenary power, limited only by constitutions.[3] This has remained true, legally, to the present time. The legislature's control of the school system, included the power to provide for curriculums.[4]

Limitation upon the power of the states to prescribe courses of study is in the Federal Constitution. For the most part this limitation is embodied in Amendment Fourteen; "...No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal pro-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Victor Brudney, "Legislative Regulation of the Social Studies in Secondary Schools," Ninth Yearbook of School Law, 1941, p. 141.

[3] Ibid., p. 168; Otto Templar Hamilton, The Courts and the Curriculum. Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 250, p. 151.

[4] Hamilton, op. cit., p. 34.

tection of the laws."

In 1940 the Supreme Court of the United States held that a local school district, whose authority over the curriculum was delegated by the Pennsylvania legislature, had the right to prescribe a salute to the flag as part of the daily school exercises. The Gobitis children, who were affiliated with "Jehovah's Witnesses" and who refused to participate in the salute, were not allowed to attend the public schools without compliance with the rule.[1]

This holding was overruled in 1943. The State Board of Education of West Virginia adopted a rule that all children in the public schools must salute the flag and pledge allegiance. In this case, the facts of which were substantially analagous to the Gobitis case in Pennsylvania, the court ruled that the action of the State in making it compulsory for children in the public schools to salute the flag and pledge allegiance violates the first and fourteenth amendments. Further, it was stated that under the Federal Constitution, compulsion as here employed is not a permissible means of achieving "national unity."[2]

It is a principle of law that legislatures cannot del-

---

[1] Minersville School District v. Gobitis, 310 U.S. 586; 60 S.Ct. 1010.

[2] West Virginia State Board of Education et al. v. Barnette et al., 319 U.S. 624; 63 S. Ct. 1178.

egate legislative authority. They can, however, create administrative bodies and clothe them with powers involving the exercise of discretion.[1] They can delegate powers of supervision and control to state and local officers.[2] In their exercise of control of education, they can delegate whatever part of their power over the curriculum and the public schools they may see fit to bestow.[3]

The Superintendent of Public Instruction. In most of the American states, the chief educational officer to whom power is granted is the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Almost uniformly, this officer has power to control the content of the curriculum, the aims of education, and the attitudes to be encouraged.[4] Courts have held that such officers may make reasonable rules and regulations for the operation of state school systems, but what rules are reasonable are questions of fact to be determined in each case as it arises.[5]

---

[1]Lee O. Garber, Education as a Function of the State: Its Legal Implications. Educational Monograph No. 3, p. 26.

[2]Willard Walter Patty, Legal Basis of the Public Secondary Education Program of the United States, p. 120.

[3]Hamilton, op. cit., p. 151.

[4]Brudney, op. cit., p. 171.

[5]Robert R. Hamilton and Paul R. Mort, The Law and Public Education, p. 60.

Legislatures, on the other hand, have confined their control principally to the general framework of the machinery of education, with units of administration and support, sources of school money and general schemes for the distribution thereof, school attendance, and general functions of local and state officers.[1]

The nature of the prescriptions regulating the social studies emanating from State Superintendents or the Departments of Education under their direction consist largely in the requirement of minimum social science cores and optional requirements.[2]

Enforcement of state administrative control of the social studies curriculum is exercised to a large extent by specifying requirements for graduation and the withholding of state aid or accrediting in case of non-compliance with administrative prescriptions.[3]

The power of local bodies. Local control of educational matters is usually delegated to local boards of education. Their powers are granted by legislative action and must be exercised within bounds of the grants.[4] Operating within

---

[1] National Survey of Education, Bulletin No. 17, Monograph No. 9, p. 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 94.

[3] Brudney, op. cit., p. 157.

[4] Hamilton and Mort, op. cit., p. 94.

single school districts, the boards are legally designated as quasi-corporations. This designation is employed because, first, school districts are restricted to educational functions; second, legislatures retain practically unlimited control over them.[1] They are State agencies created by legislative prerogative, and as such are dependent upon the authority that created them for their own legal authority.[2]

On the whole, local school corporations are invested with power sufficient to make all reasonable rules and regulations necessary to carry out the obligations and duties laid upon them by the states, and also, with all incidental powers essential to the discharge of their main functions.[3]

In the sphere of the curriculum, legal issues have arisen concerning the extent of power of local school authorities. In general, local authorities have been given full power by the courts to grade the curriculum and classify pupils.[4] In the absence of express statutory authority, they have been allowed to prescribe the course of study and to include subjects other than those prescribed by law.[5]

---

[1] National Survey of Education, op. cit., p. 23.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Hamilton, op. cit., p. 67.

[4] Ibid., p. 70.

[5] Edwards, op. cit., p. 556; Brudney, op. cit., p. 23.

There is some conflict among the courts as to whether a school board may require a child to pursue a particular subject against the wishes of his parents. Both Edwards and Hamilton claim that the weight of judicial authority favors the principle that a parent may make a reasonable selection of studies for his child to pursue from such studies as are taught in the school.[1] However, citing a Colorado case as precedent, Edwards states that a school board cannot require a pupil to receive instruction not essential to good citizenship.[2] The implication is that school boards can require pupils to receive instruction essential to good citizenship. This presumably would include the various areas covered by the term social studies.

The power of Michigan over education. The State of Michigan assumed its responsibilities in relation to education with the adoption of its first Constitution in 1835:

> The legislature shall encourage, by all suitable means, the promotion of intellectual, scientifical, and agricultural improvement.... The governor shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Legislature, in joint vote, shall appoint a Superintendent of Public Instruction, who shall hold his office for two years, and whose duties shall be prescribed by law.[3]

By 1838 the legislature had passed three distinct acts providing for the control of education; one to provide for

---

[1] Edwards, ad loc.; Hamilton, op. cit., p. 69.

[2] Ibid., p. 610. People v. Stanley, 81 Colo. 276; 255 Pac. 610.

[3] Constitution of 1835, Art. X, Sec. 1-2.

the disposition of the university and primary school lands, and for other purposes; one for the organization and government of the University with its branches; and one for the establishment and support of primary schools.[1]

The Constitution of 1850 expanded the directives concerning education by charging the legislature to provide for a system of primary schools, within five years, which would be free from tuition at least three months in every year in each school district in the State and for education to be conducted in the English language.[2] The State Board of Education was empowered to supervise the State Normal School and to carry out further duties prescribed by the legislature.[3] At this time the office of State Superintendent of education was changed from an appointive to an elective office.

As early as 1885 the Supreme Court of Michigan had sustained the power of the legislature in controlling school affairs. It was stated that the Constitution is the organic law of the State and controls the actions of the legislature. The legislature does not, however, look to the Constitution for an enumeration of the powers conferred upon it. Instead it looks there only for restraints upon its

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1838, pp. 37-38.

[2] Constitution of 1850, Art. XIII, Sec. 4.

[3] Ibid., Sec. 9.

power.[1]

In the Constitution of 1908 the language of the Ordinance of 1787 was repeated. It may be that this action was in the nature of a demonstration to encourage education in the State. Judicially it was held, in 1942, that this clause conferred on the legislature broad powers in establishing both common schools and institutions of higher learning.[2]

Since 1908, the Court, in several instances, has emphasized the power which the legislature holds over schools. It stated that the legislative control over the schools is entire, subject only to the Constitution.[3] In the case of Robinson v. Washtenaw Circuit Judge, the decision stated that the Constitution recognizes education as a subject of governmental concern and activity.[4]

The Court, in the case of Attorney General, ex. rel. Zacharias v. Board of Education of the City of Detroit, held that "The Constitution of Michigan turns the whole subject of education over to the legislature and the subject is no part of local self government inherant in townships and

---

[1] Attorney General v. Preston, 56 Mich. 177; 22 N. W. 261.

[2] Dasziewicz v. Board of Education of Detroit, 301 Mich. 212; 3 N. W. 2nd. 71.

[3] Child Welfare Society of Flint v. Kennedy School District, 220 Mich. 290; 189 N. W. 1002.

[4] 228 Mich. 225.

municipalities, except so far as the legislature may choose to make it such."[1] In 1917 it was held that education is not a local concern but belongs to the state at large.[2] Within a twelvemonth this principle was repeated judicially.[3]

Four years later (1922) the Court again held that the legislature has entire control over the schools of the State subject only to the provisions of the Constitution relating thereto.[4] The principle was repeated in 1929.[5] In less than a decade (1938) the Court ruled that regulation and control of educational policy is vested in the State Legislature to the exclusion of local governmental agencies, except so far as the legislature may delegate power to such agencies over operation of public schools and means of education.[6]

The Superintendent of Public Instruction. The office of Superintendent of Public Instruction dates from the year 1829. Provision was made for the appointment of an official

---

[1] 154 Mich. 584; 118 N. W. 606.

[2] Collins v. Detroit, 195 Mich. 330; 161 N. W. 905.

[3] Common Council of Detroit v. Engel, 202 Mich. 536; 168 N. W. 462.

[4] Van Fleet v. Oltman, 224 Mich. 241.

[5] Public Schools of the City of Battle Creek v. Kennedy, 245 Mich. 585.

[6] In re School District No. 6, Paris and Wyoming Townships, Kent County, 284 Mich. 132.

to be called the Superintendent of Common Schools. His duties were "to report annually to the Legislative Council the condition of the school lands,...the amount of scholars taught, and whatever else may appear to him necessary concerning the said lands and the condition of the schools in the territory."[1] The Superintendent was to be appointed by the governor.

Probably the plans for an establishment of a school system which included the beginnings of a State Department of Education came from Governor Cass. The plans were in advance of any school systems existing in any part of the country.[2] Prior to the passage of the law, the Governor strongly urged the establishment of schools to be supported by taxation. His plan, territorial in scope, provided for the rudiments of a system of education. The Superintendent was to be a sort of educational secretary to the Legislative Council.[3]

When the provisions for education were established (1835) under the new Constitution, the duties of a Superintendent were somewhat augmented. He was to report annually to the Legislative Council the number of scholars taught,

---

[1] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 769-777.

[2] Thomas McIntyre Cooley, Michigan, p. 314.

[3] Ibid.

"and whatever may appear to him necessary and proper for the advancement of education and interest of the school fund generally."[1]

The Constitution of 1850 gave the Superintendent of Public Instruction more power, however, than had the Constitution of 1835.[2] His authority thereafter included "general supervision of education."[3] His authority was increased, also, by provisions of the Constitution of 1908. According to these the Superintendent of Public Instruction was to "hold office for a period of two years ...have general supervision of public instruction in the state...be a member and secretary of the State Board of Education... (and) his duties shall be prescribed by law."[4]

The power of Michigan over the curriculum. There have been no cases in Michigan emphasizing the power of the legislature over the social studies curriculum as such. Nevertheless the principle was established by statute in 1817 that the State may control courses offered in the schools.[5] Statutes drawn by officers of the Territorial legislature listed the subjects to be taught in the primary schools and

---

[1] Acts Passed at the Extra and Second Session of the Sixth Legislative Council of the Territory of Michigan, 1835, p. 116.

[2] The 1835 Constitutional provisions for the Superintendent of Public Instruction are Supra, p. 15.

[3] Constitution of 1850, Art. XIII, sec. 1.

[4] Constitution of 1908, Art. XIII, sec. 5.

[5] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 104-106.

classical academies.[1]

The Legislature continued to list the subjects of the curriculum to be taught until 1829 when the practice was abandoned.[2] Indeed, it was not until 1921 that they passed a law which made teaching certain social studies mandatory.[3]

There is no question about the right of the Legislature to prescribe curriculums for Michigan schools, within the limits of Constitutional guarantees, whenever it sees fit to do so. It follows, therefore, that the Superintendent of Public Instruction has the authority to prescribe courses whenever such power has been delegated to him.

If these centralized controls over the curriculum were not exercised, however, local districts were allowed to establish courses of study.[4]

From the year 1829, control over courses of study in the schools of Michigan was exercised in part by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and, in part, by local districts.[5]

The power of Michigan school districts over the curriculum. In Michigan the district school system began

---

[1] Ibid.; Territorial Laws II, pp. 472-477.

[2] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 768-777.

[3] Public Acts, 1921, No. 209.

[4] Stuart v. School District No. 1 of Kalamazoo, 30 Mich. 69.

[5] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 768-777

in 1829. At that time it was made mandatory that each township should elect five commissioners whose duty it was to "lay off" the townships into districts.[1] It has been noted that the Courts in the Wolverine State have held that school districts have no rights or powers not conferred upon them by the Constitution and laws of the State.

The authority of the local districts over the curriculum was emphasized in 1874 in the famous "Kalamazoo Case."[2] After this decision was stated, there remained little question as to the right of the authorities of union and city school districts to decide what subjects should be included in the union and city school curriculums.

According to Dr. Eugene B. Elliott, State Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1935 to 1948, this case was the beginning of an extraordinarily strong local control over the curriculum in city districts which still remains.[3]

In 1887 the Michigan Supreme Court again held that local districts were authorized to prescribe courses of studies to

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Stuart v. School District No. 1 of Kalamazoo, 30 Mich. 69. This was noted also by Superintendent Daniel P. Briggs in his Annual Report, 1873, pp. 401-402.

[3] Statement by Eugene B. Elliott, Superintendent of Public Instruction, personal interview, June 18, 1948.

be pursued. This was stated in the decision upon a case in which the plaintiff claimed the local board of education did not have the authority to cause music to be taught as part of the curriculum of the public schools and to tax the public for a piano. But Justice Chamberlin ruled that the local district had power to determine the curriculum, that music was a proper study, and that taxing the people for a piano was legal.[1]

The Court held in 1889 that the authority granted by the Constitution to the Legislature to establish a common primary system carried with it the authority to prescribe what officers should be chosen to conduct the affairs of the school district, to define their powers and duties, their term of office, and how and by whom they should be chosen.[2]

The power of the local school district was judicially defined again in 1902. "A school district is a state agency of legislative creation, provided for in obedience to a Constitutional requirement. It is a quasi-corporation and performs such functions as may be imposed upon it by the state, and the legislature has power to add or take away from them such functions."[3] In the case of McRae v. Thomp-

---

[1] Knabe et al. v. Board of Education of West Bay City, 67 Mich. 262; 34 N. W. 568.

[2] Belles v. Burr, 76 Mich. 1.

[3] Attorney General ex rel Kies et al. v. Lowrey et al., 131 Mich. 639; 92 N. W. 289.

son (1921), the Court held that the State might impose its power by establishing new governmental agencies whose sole purpose was to administer education within their own boundaries.[1]

The most recent definition of the power of local control was given in 1916. The Court's ruling was that the "Provision for and control of the public school system is a state matter delegated to and lodged in the state legislature by the Constitution, and the general policy of the state has been to retain control of the school system to be administered throughout the state under state laws by local agencies organized with plenary powers independent of the local government."[2]

It has been the Legislative policy in Michigan to turn over virtually complete authority over curriculums of city schools to city school districts. This policy was applied in 1833 and again in 1842. The Board of Education of Detroit was given full power and authority to regulate schools, the books used therein, and to do "anything whatever that may advance the interest of education, the good government and prosperity of common schools in said city, and the welfare of the public concerning the same."[3] In

---

[1] 168 Mich. 511; 134 N. W. 722.

[2] MacQueen v. Port Huron City Commission, 194 Mich. 328; 160 N. W. 627.

[3] Territorial Laws, III, p. 1238. Public Acts, 1842, No. 70, sec. 9.

1855 the Board was given power to appoint a Superintendent of Schools for the City.[1]

---

[1] Public Acts, 1855, No. 3.

Summary. In the preceeding pages evidence has been presented which can be summarized as follows:

1. In the United States, control over education resides in the states. This state control is guaranteed by the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution, and it is limited only in case states or bodies created by them make curricular provisions which deprive individuals of Constitutionally guaranteed rights.

2. Specific power over curriculums is delegated by State Legislatures to Superintendents of Public Instruction and to local quasi-corporations.

3. The office of Superintendent of Public Instruction predates the admission of Michigan into the Union.

4. In each of its three Constitutions, Michigan has encouraged education and provided for a measure of control over instruction by the Superintendents of Public Instruction.

5. State prescription of the curriculums of Michigan schools began as early as 1817.

6. Beginning in 1829, the school district became the unit of administration for state education. It has been recognized consistently by the Michigan Court that the legal powers of school districts are derived from the State. However, in the absence of express statutory prescription, powers of local units to prescribe courses of study have been practically plenary.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM IN MICHIGAN 1787 - 1834

Early in 1787 a committee, under the chairmanship of Nathan Dane of Massachusetts, revised the bill of 1785, which reserved section sixteen of the Northwest townships from public sale and for the maintenance of public schools.[1] The initial reservation of land for educational purposes (1785), marks the beginning of the policy that has since been followed concerning the attitude of the Federal Government toward the encouragement of education. The revision of the bill (1787) became law on July 13, and was called the Northwest Ordinance.[2] Though it was a long step from the granting of lands on the part of the Federal Government to state controlled school systems, the attitude of the Federal Government set the policy for the Territory when it enacted that "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."[3]

---

[1] Sister Mary Rosalita, I.H.A., Education in Detroit Prior to 1850, p. 116.

[2] Ibid., p. 114.

[3] Laws of the Territory of the United States North-West of the Ohio, p. 128.

Common schools were being taught in Michigan before the Revolution.[1] They were private, restricted in curriculum, and operated under no legal authority of Federal or local nature. Their existence may be inferred from ledgers and account books which are part of the papers of families who settled in Michigan in early days. The nature of the subjects taught still remains unknown.

Beginning of centralized control. Although Michigan's school system began in 1787, Territorial legislation providing for the system was not enacted until after the beginning of the nineteenth century.[2] In 1802 there was a request before Congress for aid in establishing common schools in the Territory.[3] But not until February 26th, 1809, did the governor and judges of the Michigan Territory frame "An Act Concerning Schools," providing for the division of poor districts into school districts.[4] This act is interesting as a step in the direction of creating a school system rather than because it brought about any immediate results.[5]

The real beginning of the State control of education in Michigan is found in the power and activity of a small group

---

[1] Thomas McIntyre Cooley, Michigan, p. 307.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1855, p. 28.

[3] Andrew C. McLaughlin, History of Higher Education in Michigan, p. 17.

[4] Territorial Laws, II, p. vii.

[5] Rosalita, op. cit., p. 120.

of men, none of whom were indigenous to the Michigan Territory. These were Reverend John Monteith, Reverend Gabrielle Richard, General Lewis Cass, and Judge Augustus Woodward.

Father Richard, who was sent to Michigan in 1798, established several schools in Detroit and exercised a powerful influence on the legislature of the Michigan Territory in favor of educational legislation.[1]

General Cass also greatly influenced such legislation. In two important messages to the Legislature he gave expression to his ideas for the need of a well organized school system in the Territory.[2]

The law of 1817, which was an enactment of Judge Woodward's plan for a Catholepistemiad, provided for a completely centralized educational system, extending from the primary schools through the University. The law provided that thirteen professors were "to establish colleges, academies, and schools and were to appoint officers, instructors, and instructi, among, and throughout the various counties, cities, towns, townships, and other geographical divisions of Michigan."[3] The system was centralized so as to give the governor power to appoint the President and the faculty, who, in turn, were to set up the lower schools. Cooley describes the plan

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 64 f.

[2] Journal of the Legislative Council, 1824, p. 12; 1826, p. 5.

[3] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 104-106.

as follows:

> The plan was crude and pedantic, but its author had grasped certain principles which were of the very highest importance, and which from this time became incorporated in the policy of the Territory, and subsequently of the State also. In every state, as he believed, the education of the people is important to the state itself, and should be assumed as a state duty.[1]

Educational historians claim for the most part that the basis of the law of 1817 was French. Professor Moehlman holds this to be the case, as does Sister Rosalita and Andrew Ten Brook.[2] The latter claims that the influence on Woodward was from Thomas Jefferson, who knew French school legislation, and who sent Woodward, a Virginian, to Michigan.[3] Possibly the influence was from Father Richard, a Catholic Priest and Vicar Apostolic in Detroit who had wide knowledge of the schools in France.[4] William Jenks, writing in the Michigan Alumnus, states, however, that the idea was from Woodward's own mind, since he had spent many years in studying the educational needs of the Territory.[5]

Proof that a change was needed in the 1817 law came from University authorities who passed a resolution (1821) to form a committee from their own body to draft a petition

---

[1]Cooley, op. cit., p. 310.

[2]Arthur B. Moehlman, Public Education in Detroit, p. 28; Rosalita, op. cit., pp. 128-129; Andrew Ten Brook, American State Universities, p. 98.

[3]Ten Brook, loc. cit.

[4]Michigan Historical Collection, XXXVI, p. 507.

[5]William L. Jenks in The Michigan Alumnus, Feb. 22, 1923, p. 565. Quoted in Rosalita, loc. cit.

repealing the existant act and to form some other law "adopted either from the laws of the State of New York or Massachusetts or from both."[1]

The Territorial Legislature passed such a law.[2] It revised the Catholepistemiad legislation and provided for the establishment of a University under the control of twenty-one trustees, one of whom would be the governor of the Territory. These trustees were to establish secondary schools dependent upon the University, to examine such institutions, and make a yearly report to the Legislature concerning their condition, to make laws for their government to appoint all presidents, professors and instructors, to fix their compensation and to remove them at will.[3] This law remained extant until 1837.

A measure was drawn in 1825 which would greatly have improved the older law. However it did not reach the Legislature. According to this document, the University was to be governed by a president and a board of twelve regents. The governor was to be on this board. The powers of the regents were to have been extensive: to form secondary schools, regulate the curriculums in them, set standards of scholarship, and employ teachers.[4]

---

[1] Charles Trowbridge papers, 1821. Quoted in Rosalita, Ibid., p. 136.

[2] Territorial Laws, I, p. 879.

[3] Ibid.

[4] University of Michigan, Act of 1825. Quoted in Rosalita, Ibid., p. 137.

It should be noted that instruction in the Catholepistemiad and the University equalled about that of a secondary school.[1] The secondary schools of the time were in the nature of preparatory institutions, whose students were to be trained in the classical tradition necessary for higher education.

Authority over the common school system. By the time the Michigan Territory was separated from the Indiana Territory in 1805, the population had increased largely as a result of the migration of Easterners. In 1800 the Michigan Territory numbered 3,206 people, while in 1810, the population was 4706, 1650 of whom lived in Detroit.[2] Michigan was definitely "eastern" in outlook and its population more homogeneous than that of other states in the Northwest, since the greatest number of settlers came from Massachusetts and New York.[3] By the 1820's the population of Michigan was increasing more rapidly than before, due to the opening of the Erie canal and steamboat navigation on Lake Erie.[4] By 1825 there were nine villages, and by 1835 there were twenty-six.[5]

Education was encouraged in the charter that estab-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] George L. Jackson, The Development of State Control of Public Instruction in Michigan, p. 9.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

lished Detroit as a city on September 13th, 1806.[1] The City Council was authorized to make provision "for the education of youths," though in the years following no city wide effort was made to accomplish this end.[2]

There was interest, however, in the issue of state control of education, for in 1819 the Detroit Gazette announced a debate in the Detroit Lyceum on the topic: "Is it the duty of Republican Governments to enact such laws as shall provide for the education of children of all classes?"[3]

The legal foundation of the common schools became more secure in Michigan when the Legislative Council passed (1827) an "Act for the Establishment of Common Schools."[4] This enactment directed the townships numbering fifty householders or families to provide a school for six months in which reading, writing, arithmetic, spelling, and "decent behavior" should be taught. Townships of 100 householders were required to maintain a school giving this instruction for the entire year. Townships of 150 householders were required to maintain a school giving the instruction for six months and an advanced English school for the year. Townships of 200 or more, in addition to the requirements

---

[1] Common Council of Detroit, 1813, p. 237.

[2] Rosalita, loc. cit.

[3] Detroit Gazette, February 26, 1819.

[4] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 472-477.

above, were to employ a grammar school master. Township trustees were to certify teachers within the township and to inspect the schools.[1]

Herein lies further proof of the disposition to centralize early education, for although the township system was imposed for purposes of administration, evidently in the interests of unity the Legislature specified the curricular requirements. Unfortunately the law was weakened by an inclusion which provided that if two-thirds of the voters in a township were not in sympathy with the law, they need not comply with its provisions.[2]

It seems clear that the provisions of this law showed a New England influence, since it embodied the fundamental principles of the Massachusetts law of 1789 and the earlier law of 1647.

On November 5th, 1829, the Legislative Council repealed the law of 1827 and substituted another which provided for the election of five township commissioners for a three year period to divide townships into districts and to "take charge" of common schools.[3] A group of five township inspectors was to be elected whose duty it was to examine the schools es-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Territorial Laws, II, pp. 768-777.

tablished under this act and examine and certificate applicants for teaching positions.[1] The enactment contained no directions as to subjects which were to be taught in the schools.[2] Control of instruction evidently was left to the township commissioners and inspectors. Detroit was specifically exempted from provisions of the law.[3] This exemption was an interesting recognition of local power which had been delegated when the city was chartered.

Acting-Governor Stevens T. Mason, in a message delivered to the Fifth Legislative Council sitting at Detroit in 1832, gave an indication of the effectiveness of the several educational laws:

> Laws have successively, for several years, been passed, for the encouragement and support of common schools. From causes by no means insurmountable, they have not been carried into effect in such a manner as to realize the benefits which their enactment was designed to impart to the youthful generation of the present and of future times.... To no object, therefore, can the public funds...be more...advantageously applied, than the establishment and support of common free schools....[4]

Authority of school districts over the curriculum. The 1829 law, passed only two years after the law had been enacted which provided for a strongly centralized school system, laid the foundation for a long and consistent history of local control of the curriculums in Michigan schools. Probably the

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Journal of the Legislative Council, 1832, p. 7.

strong hold which the district system had in Massachusetts influenced the Michigan legislators to provide for the same kind of local school control. Moreover, in the early nineteenth century, there was growing in the West a decided antipathy to an office holding class and a belief that any upstanding man was capable of holding any office. Duties connected with any office, it was believed, should be so simplified that anyone could perform them successfully.[1]

After the extreme centralization of the earlier period, the principle of local control over common schools became firmly established. When this had been accomplished the local district became the real unit of school administration. It hired teachers, set what school standards there were, and prescribed the detailed curriculums. Schools operated under this home rule, subject only to regulation by the Legislature. In the area of the curriculum there were no legislative prescriptions.

On April 30th, 1833, the Legislative Council gave sanction to the forerunner of the independent city school district of today. It passed "An Act to Provide for Common Schools of Detroit."[2] The Common Council of the city was given the power to call an election at which six men to be known as Commissioners of the Common Schools would be elected.

---

[1] Jackson, op. cit., p. 328.

[2] Territorial Laws, III, p. 1238.

The city was to be divided into school districts by the commissioners. They were to choose school house sites, estimate the costs of buildings, and present these to the voters. None but certified teachers would be employed in the common schools, and teacher certification was to be given by one of six persons elected as inspectors. The subjects in which a candidate for certification was to be examined were listed in the law. They were spelling, reading, writing, common arithmetic, English grammar, geography, and book-keeping.[1]

Specific content of the curriculum of the Detroit schools was based upon textbooks, and authority over these was delegated to a school committee made up of the elected commissioners, six elected directors, and the elected inspectors. This committee was given the right to make general rules respecting the textbooks to be used.[2]

Sister Rosalita points out that in 1834 Detroit was acting upon the principle that while the state could "best oversee the whole system," Detroit could "best take care of its own interests."[3]

Summary. 1) There is no evidence of central or local control over the subjects taught in the schools of Michigan Territory before 1817.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Rosalita, op. cit., p. 244.

2) At that time the Catholepistemiad was established. It provided for a system of schools which was completely centralized. This centralization was emphasized in the University law of 1821.

3) Territorial authority, over the school system, including the curriculum, was manifest in the law of 1827. Therein was legislative prescription of the subjects which schools were to teach. However, supervision of schools and teacher examination was to be done on the local level by township officers.

4) Local control of schools and their courses of study was assumed by township officers (1829), such control being subject only to Constitutional and legislative restrictions.

5) The 1829 law included no provisions which prescribed courses the schools should teach.

6) The fact that this enactment directed township commissioners to divide townships into school districts establishes the law as the foundation of the State's school district system. In time these districts assumed almost complete control over their respective curriculums.

7) The early provision for common schools in Detroit is a cogent example of dual and complementary control of studies. The local committee was given the right to designate the subjects which would be taught by means of delegation to it of the power to select textbooks. Standards

for teachers, however, another means of instructional control, were named by the Legislative Council. These standards listed proficiency in geography as a necessary qualification for teachers. It may be assumed, therefore, that the Council wished the subject to be taught in the schools of Detroit.

CHAPTER IV

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM IN MICHIGAN 1835-1860

When formulating the educational policy for the State of Michigan, the Committee of the Constitutional Convention (1835) whose duty it was to draft an article on education seems to have been influenced by three factors: 1) the educational system the Territorial government had initiated, 2) the state educational systems adopted by surrounding, older states, and 3) the ideas of General Isaac Crary, the chairman of the Committee.

The first of these influences has already been discussed (Chapter III). As for the influence of surrounding states, those older than Michigan, for the most part, had established systems which included a State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This was true of New York, whose Superintendent took office in 1812, of Illinois (1825) where the Secretary of State collected and apportioned the school fund, of Louisiana (1833) where the Secretary of State was made ex-officio Superintendent of Public Instruction, of Tennessee (1836) where the Superintendent of Public Instruction was enjoined to organize the system of common schools, and of Pennsylvania (1834) where the Secretary of the Commonwealth

devised plans for improving the schools.[1]

It should be noted, however, that these state authorities had little real power over the curriculums other than exercised through exhortation and attempts to influence the legislatures through reports of school conditions.[2]

Of the three influences affecting the Convention Committee, the most important was the ideas of General Crary. Authorities agree that General Crary got his opinions concerning centralized control of education from a report on Prussian education written by Victor Cousin.[3] General Crary and John D. Pierce, his neighbor in Marshall, Michigan, are known to have read the volume and discussed its contents while they formulated plans for a system of schools in Michigan.[4]

Cousin's Report was an evaluation of Prussian education made for the French Government and was translated into English and printed in New York City in 1835.[5] In it he wrote that Prussia had, in 1819, organized a special department of administration for the purpose of general control of education. The department head, a minister, had

---

[1] George L. Jackson, The Development of State Control of Public Instruction in Michigan, pp. 11-14.

[2] Ibid., p. 17.

[3] Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, pp. 273-274; Jackson, op. cit., pp. 31-32; Cornelius A. Gower, "State Supervision," Annual Report, 1880, p. 146; Thomas McIntyre Cooley, Michigan, p. 320.

[4] Cubberley, loc. cit.

[5] Ibid.

rank equal to the other governmental ministers. The ministry embraced everything that related to education, yet it did not prescribe the minute details for governing local instruction. It was informed as to the results of education by means of extensive reports, and it directed the system by instructions emanating from the ministry. The result was national unity.[1]

Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Governor Mason, on the recommendation of General Crary, nominated John D. Pierce for the position of State Superintendent of Public Instruction.[2] The duties of the Superintendent were to be prescribed by law.[3]

The legislature provided (1836) that the Superintendent should prepare and digest a system for the organization and establishment of common schools and a University and its branches.[4] Moreover he was to require all school district directors to report to him concerning the courses taught.[5]

Superintendent Pierce presented his plan in January, 1837. It contained three provisions: 1) a method of organizing and financing primary schools, 2) a reorganization of

---

[1]Victor Cousin, Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia, pp. 4-21 passim.

[2]Jackson, Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[3]Constitution of 1835, Art. X, Sec. 1.

[4]Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan Passed at the First and Extra Sessions of 1835 and 1836, p. 50.

[5]Ibid.

the University, and 3) a plan for the proper care and disposition of the funds of both.[1] The suggestions were practical and provided for the needs of the times. They were based upon Pierce's study and discussions with General Crary and Eastern educational leaders and upon his observations of methods of state control existing in the East.[2]

Superintendent Pierce argued the necessity of a state system of schools in virtually the same terms as had Governor Cass. In order to "preserve inviolate the sound principles of liberty" and educate the total population with respect to their rights and duties as citizens," he said, "the government must encourage schools and assume the direction of them."[3] "It is merely providing for the safety of the state, for its health, happiness, and vigorous growth."[4]

Governor Mason, in his message to the legislature in 1837 also emphasized the importance of education. His suggestions related to courses and their uniformity through textbooks. His words leave no doubt of his views:

> Let me also suggest that you adopt a permanent and uniform standard of works to be used in the schools, and that in the studies selected, they may, to as great extent as practicable embrace the useful and practical information of life. Let your youth be taught the first principles in morals, in science and in government, commencing their studies

---

[1] Michigan Historical Collection, I, p. 41.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1837, pp. 4-19.

[4] Ibid.

in the primary schools, elevating its grades as you approach the distinct seminary, and continue its progress till you arrive at the University. By this system your children will acquire practical knowledge for after life, and have instilled in their minds at an early date, their duties as citizens....[1]

During the same year the Superintendent of Public Instruction was directed to prepare suitable forms for reporting local school affairs and to transmit these to the local officers.[2] Along with these he was to send "such instructions as he may deem proper for the organization and government of the public schools, with such directions as to the course of study as he may judge advisable...."[3]

It is obvious then that the exercise of specific control over the course of study was not desired by the central authorities at this time. Control was exercised only in its broadest sense, since no local officers existed who efficiently could supervise the execution of any state-wide prescriptions. Not a single person of any grade directly connected with the programs of the schools was appointed by the Superintendent, nor was there any school officer over whom he had direct control. Through letters, reports and visitations he might bring about a modicum of uniformity and promulgate his educational thinking, but there was practically no compulsion

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan Passed at the Annual Session of 1837, No. CIV, sec. 18.

[3] Ibid.

possible.

The control over incorporated institutions which was given to the Superintendent was limited to requiring yearly reports from them.[1] Each report was supposed to list the studies pursued in the school, the textbooks used, and the courses of instruction.[2] Francis W. Shearman, State Superintendent in 1852, noted that few private schools even complied with these simple requests.[3]

Following the adoption of the Constitution of 1850, the legal authority of the Superintendent was slightly increased. However, the inefficiency of the schools during the entire period from 1835 to 1860 was such that it was quite impossible to carry out a program of control. Schools were very primitive with but few trained teachers even during the latter part of the period.[4] What progress was made, occurred in Detroit. Even in this city there was negligence in the raising of taxes, or rate bills, and continued shrinkage of receipts from the primary school fund which caused some regression of the progress that had been made. Most of the schools, those of Detroit included, were ungraded and instruction consisted of reading, writing and arithmetic.[5]

---

[1] Annual Report, 1852, p. 8.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Cooley, op. cit., p. 315.

[5] Arthur B. Moehlman, Public Education in Detroit, pp. 69-70.

Authority of local districts over the curriculum. The further development of authority within the districts accompanied the growth of urban centers in Michigan. The largest and most important of these, of course, was Detroit. A special act was passed for this city (1842) making it virtually an independent school district.[1]

Upon the advice of a committee appointed to plan a more perfect school system for the city, it was enacted that primary and middle schools be established in each ward and that the City Council be empowered to levy a direct tax to raise a school fund, that a Board of Education be elected, having powers to organize districts, appoint teachers, and have general control of education.[2] Moreover, the Board had full power to make by-laws and pass ordinances relative to textbooks and "relative to any thing whatever that may advance the interest of education...."[3]

A year later (1843) an "enabling act" was passed.[4] This allowed township boards to form single districts from any two or more districts in a city or village. The powers conferred upon such districts were all of those conferred upon school districts in general, plus specific authority

---

[1] Public Acts, 1842, No. 70.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Public Acts, 1843, No. 50.

to hire teachers and adopt courses of study.[1]

Besides Detroit, city districts were formed in Jonesville in 1844, in Ypsilanti in 1848, in Grand Rapids, Adrian, Ann Arbor, Port Huron, Flint and Kalamazoo by 1850, and in the Saginaws and Bay City by 1860.[2]

Authority over branches of the University.[3] The original organization of the State school system included the primary schools, the branches, and the University. The branches were conceived of as being preparatory schools for the University and for teacher training.[4] They were not primary or common schools whose function was analagous to the high schools which came later. Each branch was under the direction of a principal, and The State Superintendent appointed inspectors of the University and the branches.[5]

Though there was almost immediate pressure, emanating from the Board of Regents, to break away from the control of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, a report of the Committee of the House of Representatives which considered

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, 1890, p. xvi.

[3] Although a study of State control over the University of Michigan is not included as part of this investigation, the control over branches is pertinent to the thesis, since the branches offered prescribed courses upon a secondary school level, and they were under the control of central authority.

[4] Jackson, op. cit., p. xvi.

[5] Annual Report, 1838, p. 20.

such a petition (1840), stated that the Superintendent was "as much a Superintendent of the University and its branches as he was of the primary schools," and no action was taken on the petition.[1]

The branches outside of Detroit were rudimentary.[2] The Detroit Branch included three departments (1840): teachers, classical, and English. All departments together enrolled forty-eight students.[3] In 1849 the branches were closed, after a recommendation to that effect by the Regents.[4] They felt hampered in providing for the University in Ann Arbor because of having to support the subordinate schools in various parts of the State.[5]

Authority over curriculums in graded schools. The importance of the subject matter presented in the schools, and the control over it, was shown in certain schools as they expanded their courses of instruction and requested the right to divide pupils according to grades. Grading began in Detroit after 1842, and the general "enabling law" tacitly gave legislative permission to organize "union" or graded

---

[1] Quoted in Jackson, op. cit., p. 35.

[2] Annual Report, 1840, p. 94.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Andrew C. McLaughlin, History of Higher Education in Michigan, p. 37.

[5] Ibid. The Board of Regents also asserted that it was beyond the power of the Legislature to authorize funds for intermediate schools which were granted by Congress for the support of a seminary of learning.

schools in which different grades could be instructed separately.[1] The idea of the union school came westward from Geneva New York where a successful school of such organization was established in 1840.[2]

However, the first direct legislative recognition of gradation in schools in Michigan was in 1850, at which time district boards were permitted to graduate rate bills if scholars were classified according to the studies they pursued.[3]

Detroit led Michigan districts by having two union schools within the city limits (1851).[4] But the schools were not successful, according to J. F. Nichols, City Superintendent, for there was absence of proper classification and lack of a uniform course of study.[5]

The establishment of the public high schools in the State began about the time of the decline of the branches of the University.[6] They were an outgrowth of the union

---

[1] W. L. Smith, Education in Michigan, p. 36.

[2] Annual Report, 1890, p. xiii.

[3] Public Acts, 1850, No. 25.

[4] Sister Mary Rosalita, I.H.A., Education in Detroit Prior to 1850, p. 243.

[5] Moehlman, op. cit., pp. 93-94.

[6] Annual Report, 1852, p. 345.

schools. Trustees in graded or contiguous districts were allowed to establish such high schools.[1] These local authorities were empowered to employ teachers, prescribe textbooks, and determine what subjects would be taught in the schools.[2]

Authority of local inspectors. In the beginning of statehood, important school officers who had authority over district schools were the township inspectors. The school law of 1837 provided for these inspectors.[3] They were to visit all schools in their townships at least twice a year, inquire into school conditions, examine all pupils and give such advice to teachers as they deemed proper.[4] They were also given power to examine teachers and to grant certificates to teach.[5] The only statutory limitations upon certification were that each teacher must be of good moral character, "be learned" and have "the ability to teach "school."[6] This power to certify, in essence, remained with the township inspectors until 1867. Six years later (1843), further requirements were imposed for certification. At this time it was ruled that licensed teachers had to have a thorough and accurate knowledge of "the several branches usually taught in common schools."[7] Except for a brief period prior to 1843,

---

[1] Public Acts, 1859, No. 161.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan Passed at the Annual Session of 1837, No. IV, sec. 29, p. 123.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Public Acts, 1843, No. 50., sec., 35.

township inspectors held authority over the instruction offered in district schools because of this licensing right and because of their power to advise the teacher relative to any matter of school concern.

As a general practice, however, inspectors did not visit the schools often and seldom made suggestions to the teachers.[1] Many inspectors could not read or write and apparently were conscious of their limitations.[2] Their negligence of the schools and their lack of ability caused certain suggestions to the State Superintendent that the special qualifications of teachers be enumerated more explicitely in law.[3] This enumeration, however, was not accomplished immediately. As late as 1859 State Superintendent John M. Gregory reported that the township examination of teachers and inspection of schools was the most unsatisfactory part of the school system.[4]

Authority over the curriculum through textbook control. Traditionally, the expression "courses of study" has merely meant the content of textbooks. The school law of 1837 made scant mention of books; it provided only that each district director was to make a list of the textbooks in use in his district and report this to the Superintendent of Public

---

[1] Annual Report, 1841, p. 15.

[2] Jackson, op. cit., p. 287.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Michigan Journal of Education, 1859, III. 284.

Instruction.[1] But not everyone in the State was satisfied with the type of textbooks in common use. In 1838 "sundry inhabitants of the County of Calhoun" petitioned the House of Representatives to enact a law which would bring about the examining and approving of textbooks for use in the public schools.[2] The House Committee on Education reported favorably. The law was put on the statute books in 1839.[3] It made the Superintendent responsible for publishing a list of school books which were recommended by him for district use. Another list was to be published which recommended suitable books for district libraries. Moreover, the Superintendent was to suggest ways and means of insuring a sufficient supply of the books recommended to each school district.[4] Though the law was repealed a year later, it was re-enacted in 1843.[5] In this new law he was directed to publish the lists annually.

The principle object of these laws seems to have been to relieve the district boards of education from the duty of prescribing textbooks. Certainly one object was to facilitate examinations and another, to provide unity within schools.[6]

---

[1] Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan Passed at the Annual Session of 1837, No. LXIII, sec. 16, p. 120.

[2] Journal of the House of Representatives, 1838, p. 144.

[3] Public Acts, 1839, no. 17.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Public Acts, 1843, No. 52.

[6] Annual Report, 1850, p. 97.

An amount of uniformity was probably achieved through the law of 1843 because of its provision that each district director was to draw from the district library the proportion of books his district was entitled to and to distribute these to the children of proper age within the district.[1] The statute was reenacted in substance in 1851[2] and again in 1859.[3]

Probably in the interest of protecting the taxpayers, a law of 1861 specified that the board in each district would have power to prescribe the textbooks to be used in the school, but such books once adopted were not to be changed within two years, except by the consent of the majority of regular voters at some regular meeting.[4]

Authority over the curriculum through teacher training. The State Superintendents could control the subject matter taught in the schools by means of directing the training of teachers, and various State Superintendents have used this means of control. However, they have been forced to fight public opinion in so doing, for the early settlers believed that anyone could teach school, that the schools did not include advanced scholars, that Michigan was decidedly an

---

[1] Public Acts, 1843, No. 52.

[2] Ibid., 1851, No. 99.

[3] Ibid., 1859, No. 208.

[4] Ibid., 1861, No. 176.

agricultural state and that the demands upon teachers were therefore simple.[1]

In 1848 a House of Representatives resolution instructed the Committee on Education to investigate the propriety of establishing by law a separate department of the State University for the education of teachers.[2] No bill was reported. Also, two petitions to the House asking for the passage of a bill to provide for a state normal school were tabled.[3]

A year later the Legislature established the State Normal School at Ypsilanti.[4] John D. Pierce, Franklin Sawyer and Oliver C. Comstock, the first three State Superintendents had favored the establishment of such a school.[5] During the years 1845 - 1849, little progress was made in this direction, Ira Mayhew, Superintendent during the period, having used his influence against the establishment of a normal school in favor of teacher's institutes. When Superintendent Mayhew went out of office, Mr. Comstock, who was then chairman of the House Committee on Education, guided

---

[1] Annual Report, 1873, p. 12.

[2] Journal of the House of Representatives, 1848, pp. 57, 594.

[3] Ibid., pp. 659, 676.

[4] Public Acts, 1849, No. 138.

[5] McLaughlin, op. cit., p. 100.

the bill for establishing the Normal School through the Legislature.[1]

The State Board of Education was created by the act. It was a body of three persons appointed by the governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.[2] The latter was an ex-officio member of the Board. The Board's power over the teacher training school was complete: it appointed teachers, assigned studies, and prescribed textbooks. It was allowed to certificate persons who had successfully passed examinations in the subjects required.[3]

The Constitution of 1850 made provision for a four member board, one of whom was the State Superintendent, the other three of whom were elected.[4] The nature of control over the instruction of teachers remained unchanged.

Teacher training through institutes affected more teachers than the Normal School, although the training given each teacher was for a considerably shorter period. Ira Mayhew is given credit for initiating institutes in Michigan.[5]

Their importance in the area of curricular control lies

---

[1] Jackson, op. cit., p. 158.

[2] Public Acts, 1849, No. 138.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Constitution of 1850, Art. XIII, sec. 9.

[5] Annual Report, 1852, p. 113; 1901, pp. 43-44.

in the fact that they carried directly to the participating teachers the subject matter and methods of instruction the State Superintendent wished to have incorporated in the public school system.

Institutes were recognized legally in 1855 when the Legislature enacted a law encouraging them and providing $1800.00 a year for their support.[1]

Summary. 1) During the period 1836 - 1860 there were no direct legislative enactments which defined subject matter the schools should teach.

2) Control over the course of studies given to the Superintendent of Public Instruction was stated in broad terms: he could give such directions concerning the course of study as he deemed proper.

3) The city district of Detroit was given complete control over subjects to be taught in the schools and over the selection of textbooks.

4) The boards of contiguous districts, which combined to establish schools, were given full power to determine the courses to be taught in the schools.

5) Although the Board of Regents prescribed the courses which were taught in the branches of the University, the State Superintendent exercised a measure of control over such courses by means of his right to inspect the branches.

6) The boards of local districts which had been given the right to establish high schools were also given the

---

[1] Public Acts, 1855, No. 70.

right to determine the courses pursued therein.

7) Legislative provision for uniformity of instruction throughout the State was made only by directing township inspectors to grant teaching licenses to persons who passed satisfactory examinations in "the branches usually taught in the common schools."

8) The authority of the State Superintendent over the textbooks used in district schools was weak. He could suggest books to be used by means of a preferred list which district authorities could follow or not, as they pleased.

9) Centralized control of teacher training was provided in the establishment of the State Normal School. The curriculum of the school was determined by the State Board of Education, on which the State Superintendent was a member.

10) Control of teacher training in the institutes was entirely vested in the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CHAPTER V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM 1861 - 1899

During the latter half of the nineteenth century there was continual effort expended on the part of the Superintendents of Public Instruction to make centralized control over the Michigan curriculum more effective. Inefficiency existed in the schools, and lack of adequate local supervision prevented the Superintendents from carrying out their programs of centralized control. With this situation in mind, Superintendent Gregory stated in 1861 that the reason patriotic sentiment was not better taught in the schools was due to the fact that the State did not exercise its full right of public control over teaching it.[1] A quarter of a century later (1886) the reason assigned for "our chaotic country schools" was that there was no State control exercised over the manner in which these schools affected citizenship.[2]

Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. John M. Gregory was the

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1861, p. 10.

[2] S. G. Burkhead, Superintendent of Schools, Saginaw City, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1886, p. 213.

first Superintendent of Public Instruction to try actively to control the subject matter taught in district schools. In 1862 he reported to the Legislature that there never had been a regular course of study for Michigan schools.[1] What was taught,he said, had appeared "accidentally, doubtless from some dimly recognized wants of the people."[2] He went on to say that the only real control existant on the part of the State Superintendent lay in his right to suggest a basis for graduation.[3] He constructed a course of studies and urged its use, writing to the district boards that they were "fully authorized to adopt such a course."[4] Moreover, he instructed them that it was their duty to prescribe textbooks and that his list of recommended books was in their hands.[5]

Superintendent Gregory informed boards of graded and high schools that they had the power to classify and grade students and prescribe courses of study.[6] He included the

---

[1] Annual Report, 1862, p. 17.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, School Laws of Michigan, 1864, introduction.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 111.

course recommended for their use with his booklet of school laws and urged them to adopt it.[1] However, Superintendent Oramel Hosford pointed out (1865) that the only teachers who observed the State Course of Study were those who had graduated from the University, private colleges, or the Normal School.[2]

In 1867 the legislature provided for county supervisors.[3] Ten years after their creation, Superintendent Tarbell asked them to compile a course of study for the State.[4] Thereafter he informed each superintendent that he wanted "no deviation from the course."[5]

Another State Course was published by Superintendent Cochran (1881). He admonished both county and township officers to aid in giving it force and effect in the schools under their supervision.[6] His suggestion for accomplishing this was to base county wide examinations upon the Course.[7]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, 1865, p. 5.

[3] Ante. p.

[4] Annual Report, 1877, p. xi.

[5] Ibid., p. xxii.

[6] R. A. Culver, Secretary Calhoun County, "The History of Grading School Districts," Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teacher's Association, 1889, p. 173.

[7] Annual Report, 1881, p. 179 f.

Apparently his suggestions were not heeded, for the Course was said to have "died" during the administration of Superintendent Gass (1883-1885) because there was no effective authority over teachers.[1]

County authorities, as well as the Superintendents of Public Instruction, during the latter half of the nineteenth century were continually urging that the schools regulate their instruction according to the State Courses of Study.[2] Legislative approval was finally given (1899). A bill was passed which stated that the Superintendent "may prepare and have published for the district schools a state course of study."[3] He could also prepare and publish institute outlines and educational bulletins as he deemed necessary.[4]

Local supervision and curriculum control. In 1862 the great mass of Michigan pupils were educated in the primary district schools.[5] Although consolidation and the establishment of union or graded districts was constantly urged in behalf of improved instruction and unification, the

---

[1] R. A. Culver, Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Public Acts, 1899, No. 44.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Annual Report, 1862, p. 15.

predominately rural population of the State militated against it, being adverse to giving up local power.[1] Superintendent John Gregory urged the establishment of the township as the unit for school administration.[2] Superintendents Oramel Hosford, Daniel Briggs, Cornelius Gower and Herschel Gass did the same.[3] The principal advance provided for legally occurred in 1891 when the Legislature permitted townships in the Upper Peninsula to organize on a township basis.[4] The advantage of the township over the district system was said to be that the former would allow unity in instruction and ease in supervision.[5]

Suggestions were also made that supervision of the district system should be done on the county basis.[6] The State Teacher's Association went on record as early as 1855 as favoring such supervision.[7] Superintendent Gregory supported the plan, stating that the administrative unit in Michigan should be the township, and the supervisory unit

---

[1] Ibid., 1895, p. 11.

[2] Ibid., 1887, p. xvi; 1888, p. iii.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Public Acts, 1891, No. 176.

[5] Annual Report, ad. loc.

[6] Ibid., 1841, pp. 18-20.

[7] Michigan Journal of Education, Proceedings of the State Teacher's Association, 1855, IV. 366 f.

the county.[1] He emphasized the failure of township supervision, in his report to the Legislature (1863), stating that only 54% of the township inspectors visited schools in their respective townships.[2] Superintendent Hosford agreed with Gregory and proposed, to the Legislature, also, that county superintendents should be elected.[3]

The Legislature passed such a law in 1867.[4] It provided that county superintendents should be elected and that their authority should include the examination of teachers.[5] The act specified that such superintendents could not license teachers who were not "deemed qualified in good moral character" or who did not pass a satisfactory examination in orthography, reading, writing, grammar, geography, and arithmetic.[6] The county superintendent was enjoined to visit each school in the county once a year to counsel concerning the course of studies, to promote teachers institutes, to receive the annual reports of township

---

[1] Annual Report, 1860, p. 22.

[2] Ibid., 1863, pp. 15, 41.

[3] Ibid., 1866, pp. 5 f.

[4] Public Acts, 1867, No. 55.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid.

inspectors, to report annually to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and to be subject to such rules and regulations as the State Superintendent might, from time to time, prescribe.[1] City districts were exempted from the Act.

The line of the State's authority over the curriculum was now clearly drawn. Control over instruction in district schools passed from the Legislature through the State Superintendent to the county superintendents. These latter were in contact with the teachers and could exercise control only by means of advice and counsel. Curriculum prescription on the local level remained with the local boards.

Unfortunately for the proponants of the office, county superintendents did not fulfill expectations. In 1871 the House of Representatives considered a request to abolish the office because of its political nature and because of the inability of the officers to visit within one year, all of the schools in their counties.[2] However, in deference to the opinions of educators, the county superintendents were retained for four more years. In 1875 the office was abolished.[3] In its stead provision was made for township superintendents. Their power was advisory in relation to the subjects taught in the schools.[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Journal of the House of Representatives, 1871, II. 950 f.

[3] Public Acts, 1875, No. 47.

[4] Ibid.

Superintendent Tarbell, hoping to regain a measure of county unity and centralized control, suggested to the Legislature (1877) that they enact a law providing for county school examiners to act in cooperation with the township inspectors.[1] In 1881 the suggestion was enacted into law.[2] There was to be a three-man, county board of inspectors in each county, one member of which was to serve as secretary and executive officer of the board.[3] To the county board was transferred the duty of certificating teachers, and one member of the board was to be selected to examine schools whenever there was a request to do so from the township board of school inspectors.[4]

This plan, as well as the former one, seemed doomed to failure. Complaints against the system emphasized the lack of cooperation between the township and county officers.[5] A resolution was passed by the State Teacher's Association in 1886 in which it was urged that the law be so changed that county supervision would be made more efficient.[6]

---

[1] Annual Report, 1877, pp. xxv f.

[2] Public Acts, 1881, No. 164.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teacher's Association, 1886, p. 196.

[6] Ibid.

The next year a law was passed which augmented the powers of the secretary of the county board.[1] He was given authority to examine teacher candidates and visit the schools of the county.[2] He was to grant teaching licenses only after teachers successfully passed examinations in all of the subjects commonly taught in schools. Included in the list were geography, United States history and civil government.[3] This specification that teacher candidates had to pass satisfactory examinations in certain subjects found precedence in the law of 1867 which prescribed the duties of county superintendents. Such specification probably is evidence of the intent of the Legislature to have the subjects named taught in the schools of the State.

The secretaries, themselves, seemed anxious to increase their authority over the courses of studies being pursued in the district schools. R. A. Culver, Secretary of Calhoun County, speaking before a meeting of county secretaries, (1889) pointed out that the county officers consistently were trying to unify the instruction offered.[4] The

---

[1] Public Acts, 1887, No. 266.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] R. A. Culver, loc. cit.

fact that district boards had the right to specify the subjects taught was said to be the greatest obstacle in the way of increasing the effectiveness of schools.[1]

Immediately upon creation of the office of county secretary, Superintendent Joseph Estrabrook, working through it, sought to impose the State Course of Study upon all pupils. His instructions in 1890 were that the secretaries should name textbooks for the districts and direct the pages therein to be studied each fall, winter, and spring in each subject.[2]

In 1891 the Legislature changed the title of the county secretaries to County Commissioners of Schools.[3] The enactment specified that commissioners were to visit schools and examine the mode of instruction, the textbooks used, the progress and proficiency of the pupils, and the skill and efficiency of the teacher. It was their duty, also, "to counsel with teachers and school boards as to the course of study to be adopted and pursued, and as to any improvement in the ... instruction... of the school...."[4] The law remains in effect today.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manual and Course of Study for District Schools, 1890, p. 40.

[3] Public Acts, 1891, No. 147, sec. 6.

[4] Ibid., sec. 7.

[5] C.S.L., 1946, (15.804), sec. 8.

Authority in City districts. City schools continued to lead all others in range of subject matter taught. Leadership within the city districts was gradually assumed by the superintendents appointed by the city school boards. In 1897 the attention of the Michigan State Teacher's Association was turned to the fact that the city superintendents exercised this leadership yet were anomalous legally.[1] It was stated that they had assumed responsibility for preparing courses of study and selecting textbooks.[2] Superintendent Jason E. Hammond (1898) urged the city Boards to give superintendents full management and responsibility for the city systems.[3]

The number of city districts grew rapidly during the latter half of the century, and the number of pupils receiving instruction in cities increased to over 140,000, a fact which is clearly brought out by the following table.

[1] George W. Loomis, Superintendent of Schools, St. Joseph, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teacher's Association, 1897, p. 58.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, City School Organization, 1898.

TABLE I

Number of City and Graded School Districts and Pupils in the Schools[1]

Year	No. Districts	Pupils Attending	Year	No. Districts.	Pupils Attending
1859	58	25,832	1870	248	91,692
1860	85	30,670	1871	266	102,399
1861	75	38,450	1872	300	110,096
1862	106	44,774	1873	311	113,433
1863	119	48968	1874	327	121,919
1864	123	49,934	1875	295	124,467
1865	147	54,092	1876	303	125,849
1866	148	59,298	1877	338	122,814
1867	179	71,235	1878	350	131,868
1868	208	79,867	1879	353	134,137
1869	235	85,098	1880	389	141,153

[1]From Annual Reports of the years listed.

Position of textbooks in courses of study. An 1861 law, which provided for prescription of textbooks by the district boards, apparently was not observed except in rare cases. Superintendent Tarbell stated in 1877 that the failure was due to the fear of local boards to use their authority.[1] The idea seemed to be prevelent among the population that any book in any subject was satisfactory. Superintendent Gregory, in an effort to counteract the belief, stated (1864) that the district boards "must" prescribe textbooks, and that no pupil could claim to have received instruction in any book other than those prescribed.[2]

In 1889 the Legislature granted districts the right to vote on the matter of free textbooks.[3] When a district favored free books, boards of education were directed by the enactment to purchase textbooks in orthography, spelling, writing, reading, geography, arithmetic, grammar, national and state civil government and phsiology and hygiene.[4]

By 1890 issues involving textbooks centered around means of supply and free books. Persons interested in the nature of the subject matter taught concentrated their attention upon the State Course of Study.

---

[1] Annual Report, 1877, p. xxiii.

[2] School Laws of Michigan, 1864, p. 75.

[3] Public Acts, 1889, No. 147.

[4] Ibid.

Teacher certification and centralized control. Before the decade of the sixties had ended it was recognized both by the Legislature and the Superintendents of Public Instruction that one of the most effective means of elevating the level of instruction as well as unifying the instruction within the State was by means of regulating the requirements for teacher's certificates. The method of examination by township inspectors in the early days of the state had been unsuccessful.[1] With the enactment of the law of 1867, which placed some examining authority in the hands of the county superintendents, it was provided that certain types of teacher certificates could be issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.[2] These were valid in any primary or graded school in the State.

Superintendent Tarbell suggested to the Legislature (1878) that they allow the State Board of Education certain certificating power.[3] An enactment followed which directed the Board to prepare questions suitable for each grade of certificate.[4] These were to be distributed to the township superintendents. However, there was no provision compelling the township examining authorities to use the questions furnished.

---

[1] Supra, p. 51.

[2] Public Acts, 1867, No. 55; Annual Report, 1862, pp. 16-17.

[3] Ibid., 1878, p. xiii.

[4] Public Acts, 1878, No. 231.

In 1877 and 1880, Superintendents Tarbell and Gower urged that the certificating power be removed entirely from the township authorities and placed on the county level.[1] This was done in 1881 when the Legislature provided for county inspectors.[2]

The State Board of Education lost to the State Superintendent the authority to prepare county examination questions (1887).[3] However, the Board retained the right to certify grade one and grade two teachers of the State. At this time, the faculty of the Normal School could issue life certificates, the boards of education of schools under special charters could issue limited certificates, and the boards of examiners of the several counties, under the direction of the State Superintendent could also issue limited certificates. More than nine-tenths of the qualified teachers of Michigan were certified by the county examiners.[4]

The trend had been toward centralizing control of teacher certification. In the interest of furthering this centralization, Will H. Brunson, Secretary of the Board of Examiners of Clinton County, suggested before the State Teacher's Association (1882) that county examiners should use the examinations for the purpose of insuring that cer-

---

[1] Annual Report, 1877, p. xxv; 1880, p. 38.

[2] Public Acts, 1881, No. 164.

[3] Public Acts, 1887, No. 266.

[4] Annual Report, 1887, p. xi.

tain desired subject matter be included in the curriculums.[1] Secretary Shurtz of Eaton County advocated (1889) that the teacher examination questions composed by the State Superintendent should include questions on the State Course of Study.[2] The reason for this as given was to increase efficiency of supervision and unity of instruction. Superintendent Estabrook gave standing to these suggestions in 1890 when he published a statement that teacher's examination questions would be based upon the Manual and Course of Study in order to determine whether it was being followed and whether the teachers were doing "satisfactory work."[3]

In the case of city school districts, certification had been put into the hands of the city school boards. However, in 1891, an enactment specified that the boards and the city superintendents cooperatively should examine teachers.[4] Moreover, they were to examine "at such times and in such form" as the State Superintendent should prescribe.[5] Violators forfeited a percentage of State money.

Teacher training. Various State Superintendents sought to increase the number of adequately trained teachers by

---

[1] Annual Report, 1888, p. 243.

[2] Ibid., 1889, p. 146.

[3] Ibid., 1890, p. 48.

[4] Public Acts, 1891, No. 147.

[5] Ibid.

means of promoting teacher training institutions, normal departments in union and high schools and through teacher institutes. In 1863 a House of Representatives' bill to establish teacher's classes in all graded schools failed to pass.[1]

On the college level, the University, the State Normal School, and nearly all of the denominational colleges had established departments of normal instruction.[2] None the less, the bulk of teacher training was done in teacher's institutes, since most of the teachers, even in 1890, had no more than a high school education.[3] All teachers were encouraged to attend the institutes, the Legislature having directed districts not to withhold salaries for time so spent.[4]

Institute programs were in complete control of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and there was considerable pressure from the State Teachers Association both to lengthen the period of instruction, and increase the instruction given in subject matter and teaching methods.[5]

---

[1] Journal of the House of Representatives, 1863, I. 701, 1283, 1291.

[2] Annual Report, 1880, p. 405.

[3] State Board of Education, Annual Report, 1890, p. 8.

[4] Public Acts, 1883, No. 112.

[5] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1880, p. 134.

There were no results from this pressure.

Summary. 1) The first State Course of Study was prescribed by Superintendent Gregory in 1861. Although there existed no means by which the adoption of the Course could be enforced in district or graded schools, the Superintendent urged all schools to pattern their instruction after the State directions.

2) By 1881 Superintendent Cochran sought to enforce the adoption of the State plan of instruction by urging county and township officers to base county examinations upon the Course. However, the schools did not adopt the State prescriptions, the reason apparently being that there was inadequate supervision over the local districts.

3) The State Superintendent was given legislative permission (1889) to prepare a course of study for district schools. However, it was not specified that the schools should follow the course.

4) During the latter half of the nineteenth century there existed continued pressure to make the townships units for school administration and the counties units for school supervision.

5) Successive legislative enactments created (1891) the office of county commissioner. Although the legal power of this officer over the course of studies in district schools was limited, his advisory power was such that the State Superintendents could work through him to achieve a measure of uniformity of instruction.

6) During the period discussed, the responsibility for compiling and prescribing courses of study for city schools was assumed by city superintendents.

7) The authority of the State Superintendent to specify textbooks was not increased. When districts voted to supply pupils with free textbooks, however, legislative requirements specified for which subjects textbooks should be provided (1869).

8) The authority to certificate teachers was removed from township officers and was gradually centralized. During the latter part of the century the majority of Michigan teachers were certified by county examiners who acted under directions from the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

9) When power was given to county authorities to examine and license teachers, the Legislature specified in which subjects the teacher candidates should be examined. In the area of the social studies, county superintendents were directed to examine teachers for proficiency in geography (1867). Twenty years later county secretaries were directed to examine teachers in geography, United States history and civil government. This specification of subjects probably shows the intent of the Legislature to have the courses named taught in the schools of the State.

10) Teachers institutes were encouraged by the Legislature. Control over the training given teachers in the institutes remained with the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CHAPTER VI

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITY OVER THE CURRICULUM 1900 - 1948

The twentieth century brought with it marked changes in the methods of exercising control over the courses of study in Michigan schools. During the early years of the century the State Superintendent continued his efforts to make centralized control over the curriculum more effective. Precedent allowed him to urge the observance of his suggestions and to work through county commissioners toward accomplishing unity of instruction within the schools.

Authority over the curriculum exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction. In the interest of drawing attention to the necessity for increasing authority in the office of the State Superintendent, Jason E. Hammond (1901) quoted from the report of the Committee of Twelve of the National Education Association which had considered problems of the office. He said that the Michigan Superintendent must stimulate and guide teachers, create public opinion and "be a politician to the extent of being able to secure proper legislative enactments."[1]

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1901, p. 2.

One of the reasons for the desire for more specific and better defined power over the curriculum was that evidence seemed conclusive that schools were not following the State Course of Study.[1] The reason assigned for this by Superintendent Wright (1907) was that there was lack of adequate supervision over the district schools.[2] He claimed that the powers of the State Superintendent should be enlarged so as to enable him directly to inspect high schools and rural schools.[3]

Superintendent Wright endeavored to increase the effectiveness of State supervision by inaugurating county meetings of the officers of school districts, wherein he could instruct local officers directly as to their legal duties and educational problems.[4] Eight such meetings were called in 1907.[5]

That there existed need for such instruction of officers is evident from the fact that meetings were held annually. Apparently they served to provide the much needed cooperation between the State Department of Public Instruction and the local units of administration. Legislative encouragement

---

[1] Ibid., 1907, p. 7.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 4.

[5] Ibid.

was given in 1917 at which time local officers were reimbursed for their expenses and given a per diem.[1]

In 1913 the authority of the State Superintendent over courses of study was made specific and definite. The State officer was directed "to prepare and have printed a course of study for the district schools of the state, which shall be pursued in all district schools in the state, except districts of the first, second, and third class...."[2] This enactment is still in force (1948).[3]

The authority of the Superintendent was extended (1921) to include supervision of all private, denominational and parochial schools of Michigan.[4] Courses of study and the qualifications of teachers were to be of the same standard as provided by the general school laws of the State.[5]

A question might be raised as to the effectiveness of the State curriculum prescriptions, for as late as 1928 Superintendent Webster Pearce urged teachers to pattern their instruction after the State Course.[6] He wrote to them that "education should not be, as it is, so much a matter of local option. Educated youth are the assets of the ...state."[7]

---

[1] Ibid., 1917, p. 27.

[2] Public Acts, 1913, No. 323.

[3] G. S. L., 1946, (15.349).

[4] Public Acts, 1921, No. 302.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Michigan Education Journal, Letter to teachers, VI, (Oct., 1928), 117; (Nov. 1928), 185.

[7] Ibid.

The growth in the number of administrative duties of the State Superintendent during these years necessitated a departmentalized office. By 1927, the State Department included a Deputy Superintendent who directed supervision and inspection of high schools in cooperation with the University and who organized and conducted county conferences.[1] There was a division of Private and Parochial Schools which had inspected some 300 such institutions between the years 1921 and 1927.[2] The Editorial Division compiled or wrote and edited course of study bulletins and examined all books submitted for the preferred library or high school library list.[3] The Division of Rural Education supervised the course of study or rural agricultural schools, directed teacher training in county normal schools, supervised the granting of teacher certificates by county boards of school examiners, supervised county examination of all seventh and eighth grade pupils, and conducted teacher institutes.[4]

One of the forces which tended to centralize control over instruction was the right of the Superintendent to approve high schools which received tuition for enrolled pupils who resided in districts not maintaining such schools.[5]

---

[1] Annual Report, 1927, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 11.

[3] Ibid., p. 14.

[4] Ibid., p. 11.

[5] Ibid., 1918, p. 17.

In 1918 there were a total of 598 high schools in the State, 318 of which were accredited by the University of Michigan.[1] The remaining schools were in need of direction for improvement, and it was felt that the State Superintendent could best give such direction.[2] In order that the State Departmental inspectors would not duplicate the work of the University, a joint plan of inspection was devised whereby the two groups of inspectors visited schools alternately and met in conference once a month to discuss standards and findings.[3] The standard set by the Department was that any approved high school must include: all qualified teachers, four units per year of high school work, including a total of three units of English, two of mathematics, one of American history and civics, and one of a laboratory science.[4] These requirements were identical with those established by the University at the time, with the exception that the University required a faculty of not less than three for the

---

[1] Ibid., 1918, pp. 17-18. Accrediting by the University has been one of the principal means of unifying and raising the level of high school instruction. It began in 1870 after a rule passed by the Board of Regents allowed students to enter the University without examination, provided they had received a diploma from a preparatory school "conducted by a sufficient number of competent instructors." The University faculty inspected schools on request and accredited them if their faculty and academic standards were acceptable.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., pp. 18-19.

four years of work beyond the eighth grade, and no instructor could teach more than six recitations a day.[1]

The State Superintendent used "approval" to control both high school and pre-high school courses of study. All districts were notified that elementary courses of study would be investigated to determine whether the instructional material in them was consistent with the State Course of Study.[2] Elementary schools were informed that the State would not pay high school tuition for eighth grade graduates of schools whose courses did not conform to the State standards.[3]

Control of curriculums in city and graded districts. By 1905, graded and city districts had been given power to grade their schools, to establish a high school when so directed by the voters, to specify studies to be pursued, to fix the course of study, and to adopt textbooks.[4] However, efforts were made to convince authorities over graded districts to use the State course of study. Superintendent Keeler (1914) told such district boards to "use the State Course" but to adapt it to local needs.[5]

---

[1] Ibid., 1918, pp. 18-19.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manual and Course of Study, 1928, p. 11.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Annual Report, 1905, p. 24.

[5] Ibid., 1914, p. 8.

The State Superintendent sought directly to influence instruction in city districts in 1911 by calling meetings of local city school boards for the purpose of discussing courses of study.[1] Though there was little legal basis for so doing, State Department supervisors were sent by Luther Wright to counsel directly with many city boards.[2] However, no legal compulsion to adopt the State course was possible.

Control of instruction by means of eighth grade examinations. The county commissioners, having been directed by the law establishing their office to examine the progress of pupils, had generally (1900) prepared county wide examinations for the seventh and eighth grade pupils. These were used to establish a basis on which diplomas were granted.[3]

There arose a demand from the county commissioners for the State Superintendent to unify their efforts by means of determining days on which examinations should be administered throughout the state.[4] By 1909 the examination questions as well as the regulations governing the examinations were made by the State officer.[5] Although legislation did not

---

[1] Annual Report, 1911-12, p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 10.

[3] Ibid., 1908, p. 35.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Examination Form No. 8, 1909.

provide for such centralized control, it was defended as being "according to the expressed wish of the commissioners and as providing for exact justice."[1]

Superintendent Wright asked the Legislature (1909) for legal endorsement of the examination program.[2] Specific approval was not given. But the eighth grade tuition law was amended (1911) to the extent that pupils eligible to have tuition paid for them must hold county diplomas granted by county boards of examiners under rules and regulations prescribed by the State Department.[3] County officers were thereby able to control effectively the subject matter studied by the children in all but the city and private schools of Michigan. An example of the use of this authority occurred in 1917 when Superintendent Keeler prescribed that all children in Michigan schools should study the "War Message" of President Wilson. The message was printed with suitable teaching aids and distributed to administrators and teachers with the directions that eighth grade examinations in June, 1918, would include questions covering the materials.[4]

In 1928 Superintendent Pearce recommended a unified marking system for the schools in the State. This was to

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, 1909-10, p. 3.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, County Teacher Examinations and Eighth Grade Examinations, Bulletin No. 16, 1911, p. 7.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, The War Message, Bulletin No. 14, 1917, foreword.

be based upon the examinations covering material in the Manual and Course of Study.[1] The control was specific to the extent that in 1932 a part of the announcement of the seventh and eighth grade examinations stated that "Selections From Tales of Courage, Real Life Stories," by Theisen and Leonard, would constitute the material to be read for enjoyment. The examination would cover pages 1-126 and 198-260.[2]

Control of instruction through certification of teachers. The legal power given the state superintendent to cooperate with city boards in the examination and licensing of teachers diminished in practice to the extent that the sole responsibility the state officer exercised was to furnish printed certificates to the city authorities.[3]

However, control over the certificating of county teachers increased. By 1905 the State Department announced in advance the various topics on which certificate candidates would be examined.[4] Ten years later an enactment was passed which specified that any person desiring a teaching certificate must have completed at least six weeks of professional training.[5]

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, High School Manual and Course of Study, Bulletin No. 12, 1928, pp. 36-37.

[2] Michigan Education Journal, Letter to teachers, vol. 9, (Feb., 1932), 937.

[3] Annual Report, 1902, p. 21.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Examinations, 1908.

[5] Public Acts, 1914, No. 7.

Through the 1920's the centralizing tendency continued. The function of certification was removed from local examining boards, county school commissioners and, finally, from city boards and superintendents. By 1933 five agencies had power to license teachers: 1) the State Board of Education, 2) the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 3) the University Board of Regents, 4) the State Board of Vacational Education, and 5) County Normal Boards.[1] In 1935, as a result of continued suggestions by Superintendents, the Legislature placed all power to certify in the hands of the State Board of Education.[2]

Control of instruction through teacher training. During the early 1900's the teacher's institutes reached their greatest popularity as instruments for professional training. It has been noted that the Superintendent had entire authority over which subjects should be presented at the institutes. Beginning in 1903 a more professional education was made possible for rural teachers in county training schools.[3] The State Superintendent was allowed to establish a county normal school in practically any county which requested one. He, the County Commissioner, and the

---

[1] Annual Report, 1933, pp. 38-39.

[2] Public Acts, 1935, No. 55.

[3] Public Acts, 1903, No. 241.

Superintendent of Schools of the district where the class was to be organized constituted a County Normal Board, whose duty it was to arrange the one year course of study.[1]

By 1930 the county normal schools had started to decline in number.[2] Superintendent Voelker (1933) reported that in two years time the number of county normals had decreased by twenty and the enrollments had been cut in half.[3] The decline was occasioned by the opinion held by many teachers that one year was insufficient training.[4]

Curriculum control 1930 - 1948. In 1928 Superintendent Pearce reported to the Legislature that control over instruction in Michigan schools was maintained by an extensive public relations program, letters, personal contacts, bulletins, speeches, the Journal of the Michigan Education Association, newspapers and magazines, school conferences, school officers meetings, news letters, and biennial reports.[5] This seemed to be an honest recognition of the fact that legal authority over the curriculum was not, in itself, enough to assure compliance with Departmental directives. Moreover it gives evidence of the increasing disposition of state authorities to influence in-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, 1933, p. 40.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., 1928, p. 9.

struction on the level of the teachers in classrooms rather than to depend exclusively upon local supervision over such instruction.

Serious retrenchments in the activities of the State Department of Education, necessitated by the depression in the early 1930's, caused concentrated effort to be made to change the nature of control exercised over instruction.[1] The State Superintendent remained responsible legally for the curriculums in all but city schools. His modus operandi changed, however.

Superintendent Paul F. Voelker made the first major step in 1933 when he formed the Michigan Educational Planning Commission. This was a group, most of whom were not educators, which was given the responsibility of analyzing governmental and social problems in order to re-formulate the educational objectives for Michigan schools.[2] This is evidence which shows first, a belief in the principle that the aims of the curriculum must be determined by society at large, and second, that society, itself, and not educators should determine those ends. A Bureau of Curriculum and Guidance was established to determine ways and means by which instruction could accomplish the goals.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., 1933, p. 23.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 28.

The representation on the Planning Commission included the Michigan Grange, the Board of Education, Principals of schools, the Michigan Council on Education, the American Association of University Women, County Treasurers, School Superintendents, the State Federation of Women's Clubs, The Detroit Federation of Labor, the Farm Bureau, the Tax Committee of the Detroit Chamber of Commerce, the State Federation of Teacher's Clubs, the Michigan Education Association, the Michigan Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Michigan Manufacturing Association, the Michigan Federation of Labor, and the Michigan Real Estate Association.[1] The Bureau of Curriculum and Guidance was made up of professional educators.[2]

The goals of public education formulated by the Planning Commission and officially approved by them on June 22, 1933, were nine in number and effectively demonstrate the important part the group expected education to play in preparing children for worthy living in a democratic society. The emphasis of the goals seems to have been put on that part of the curriculum embodied in the social studies. Goal one was "To cultivate a deep regard for democracy and an intelligent appreciation of democratic institutions;" goal two: "To develop those qualities of character which are of special significance in a democracy;" goal three: "To develop

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 25-26.

[2] Ibid.

the willingness and ability to cooperate effectively in a democratic society;" goal four: "To develop the ability to use the most effective and reliable methods in searching for truth as a basis for the discovery and solution of problems;" goal five: "To develop the effective use of the fundamental knowledge and skills required by all;" goal six: "To insure an abundant social and individual life in accordance with each individual's capacity and ambition;" goal seven: "To provide training in the specialized and professional services which are requisite for society;" goal eight: "To provide for the enrichment of adult life;" goal nine: "To plan for the continuous appraisal and readjustment of the educational program to fit changing conditions."[1]

The Bureau of Curriculum and Guidance was to cooperate with the Planning Commission by preparing and publishing materials of an instructional nature, to offer schools an advisory service, and to promote conferences in order to be of immediate service to the schools.[2]

On October 1, 1935, Eugene B. Elliott became Superintendent of Public Instruction. He was convinced of the soundness of the approach to the revision of curriculums in Michigan schools started in 1933 and continued working to

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools, 1936, pp. 9-13.

[2] Annual Report, 1933, p. 28.

accomplish the same ends. His reasons for exercising state control of the curriculums by means of advising and guiding rather than strict supervising of the localities were 1) political in character. Dr. Elliott stated that the long tradition of local control of instruction in Michigan schools militated against effective control being exercised by a central authority, that the city systems, especially, were strong and would brook no State Department interference. 2) He reasoned further that the chief value resulting from curriculum construction in certain Southern states came principally to the curriculum makers and not to the teachers for whom the curriculums were designed. 3) He also held that inasmuch as the State Superintendent had no effective authority over textbooks used in the schools, he could not influence the courses of study which were actually being taught by teachers in classrooms.[1]

A new body, the Michigan Advisory Commission on Education, was formed as the spiritual successor of the Michigan Educational Planning Commission and the Curriculum Steering Committee superceded the Bureau of Curriculum and Guidance.[2] The goals of education in Michigan were officially adopted as the State educational objectives.[3] In

---

[1] Statement by Eugene B. Elliott, Superintendent of Public Instruction, personal interview, June 18, 1948.

[2] Annual Report, 1939, p. 19.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michigan Curriculum Revision, unpaged.

addition, the Advisory Commission formulated six principles which were to define the function of education in Michigan. These were: 1) that the social and economic conditions of the State required adjustment in school district organization, 2) that such organization should follow the general principles observed by the founders of the State, in which they emphasized districts, neighborhoods, and communities of people having like interests, exercising democratic control over the operation of their schools in cooperation with the State Department, 3) that the educational problem in any community consisted of an adaptation of an improved educational program which would satisfy both the desires of the citizens and the legal requirements of the State, 4) that it was the responsibility of the citizens of each community to determine how far the educational program should go beyond the mandatory requirements of the State, 5) that local decree should determine the character and nature of the educational program, and 6) that the local districts could look to the State for assistance in maintaining the mandatory program and for advice and cooperation in establishing an enlarged instructional program.[1] In the biennial report, Dr. Elliott informed the Legislature that in 1935 control of the curriculum was "given back to the localities."[2]

---

[1] Annual Report, 1935, p. 20.

[2] Ibid.

The departmentalization of the State office broadened in respect to instructional services offered. In 1935 it included assistants to conduct the biennial school officer's meetings in each county as required by law. The Research Division experimented with methods of evaluation and appraisal and provided statements of results to statewide committee groups. The Instruction Division was responsible for the inspection and supervision of instruction and for approval of the secondary schools of the State.[1]

A statement concerning the philosophy of curriculum reconstruction was issued by the State Superintendent in 1935 and is quoted here in part:

> The Michigan Department of Public Instruction is actively engaged on a program of curriculum reconstruction for the state. It has been eight years since the Department issued the last general revision of the entire state course of study. This course of study is now out of print and so are many of the supplementary instructional bulletins that were prepared for use in Michigan schools. Yet the legal obligation of the State Department of Public Instruction to provide a state course of study still holds. Furthermore, it is recognized that conditions of social life in America in general and Michigan in particular are changing and that these changing conditions carry with them new implications for the educational process....
>
> The present state curriculum program assumes that the real curriculum is what actually goes on in the classroom rather than what is written in the state course of study. For this reason, the teacher is expected to occupy a large place in curriculum reconstruction. The Department is undertaking to make available to teachers throughout the state materials to aid teachers in thinking through curriculum problems and in planning the curriculum for their own classes better than before. The course of study which is finally to be effective in influencing classroom experiences of teachers must be one to which many teachers, princi-

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26.

pals, supervisors, superintendents and commissioners have contributed.

> The Department and the Steering Committee recognize that the curriculum program must have both immediate and long-time aspects.... Michigan needs a thoroughly revised and reconstructed curriculum. Accordingly, the general plans provide for the preparation not only of a number of immediate publications, but also a series of cooperative studies by Michigan teachers which may lead ultimately to a completely rewritten course of study for Michigan schools.[1]

In 1936 the Department published "Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools." It was offered not as an expression of final and authoritarian doctrine, but principally as the first of a series of steps in the program of curriculum development.[2] The point of view and practice was definitely established that State control should be expressed by improving curricular materials and encouraging local teachers and administrators to form their own course requirements.

In 1937 the State Department of Public Instruction began a twelve year study entitled "The Michigan Study of the Secondary School Curriculum."[3] It was designed to demonstrate the best curricular practices in the secondary schools of fifty-one school districts and to study the existing programs in these schools. Each community and student body of the selected districts was studied, and curricular changes

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Bulletin 305, 1936.

[2] Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools, 1936.

[3] Annual Report, 1939, p. 60.

were made upon the basis of the findings. These findings in the early years of the study were largely that instructional methods and materials needed to be made more meaningful to pupils.[1]

After four years of the revised policy of curriculum control (1938) 202 schools reported that major curriculum changes had been made; 234 schools planned to make curricular changes.[2]

The philosophy of loose control of instruction seemed to be repeated within city school districts. An example is in the Saginaw Curriculum Program which was revised in 1938. It was stated in the introduction to the city course of study that "It cannot be too strongly urged that the description of any unit given here is not a pattern to be followed. It merely tells how one teacher, working with a group of children having a particular background of experiences, carried on her work and gives additional suggestions from a number of other teachers."[3]

A statement describing the extent to which control over instruction had, in practice, been given to localities was made to the Legislature in 1939. It was stated that the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 60-63.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, A Partial Appraisal of the Michigan Curriculum Program, pp. 3-5.

[3] Teachers of Social Science in the Saginaw City Schools, Social Science Materials to Try Out and Revise, Grades 7-9, August, 1938, p. 1.

responsibility for the development and operation of local educational programs to meet the changing conditions of the State rested primarily within the local communities, whereas the responsibility of the Department of Public Instruction was to stimulate, guide, and appraise local efforts.[1] In the same report, the Superintendent asked for legislation increasing the power of the county commissioners. It was claimed that local districts would not lose their identity if the county commissioners were given authority in the selection and retention of teachers and in the enforcing of general State Department recommendations.[2] Such legislation was said to be necessary if the program of the State Department of Public Instruction was to function adequately, for under the system then existing, teachers could not be reached by suggestions which came from the State Department.[3]

It should be noted also that the Department (1939) was interested in strengthening citizenship education in all of the schools of Michigan.[4] There seemed to be nothing inconsistent between the philosophy of local curriculum control and efforts of the central office to guarantee certain outcomes in all local curriculums, provided such outcomes were

---

[1] Annual Report, 1939, p. 46.

[2] Ibid., p. 53.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., p. 35.

generally accepted national objectives. The State Superintendent stated that it was not desirable to have a state course of study, but that the State Department of Public Instruction would indicate desirable trends and emphases for the planning of curriculums for local units.[1]

Beginning in 1939, emphasis was put upon the inclusion of community agencies in program building for local schools. It was believed that all groups, including organized special interest groups and community governmental departments, should be aware of the educational implications of the community functions and the need for cooperative planning for education.[2] Hence the concept of a State controlled instructional program had diminished to the point where conscious effort was made to embody community pressures in the programs of the local schools. The teachers and school administrators were to serve community groups by suggesting educationally sound methods of reaching local objectives.

The instructional principle which the State Department emphasized during this period was that teachers should thoroughly understand children. Much literature of a psychological nature was published. Teachers were reminded of the physical, mental, and emotional needs of children, and they were counseled to educate for democracy, the doing of which

---

[1] Ibid., appendix A.

[2] Ibid., p. 77.

would be effective only if the methods of education were sound.[1]

In 1942 Governor Murray D. Van Wagoner appointed the Michigan Public Education Study Commission to study public educational conditions and needs and make recommendations to the Governor and Legislature for improvement of the public schools.[2] Their findings had little to do with the control of instruction in the State, except insofar as they included a recommendation to enlarge the State Board of Education, to make it appointed by the Governor, and to give it general supervision over education in the State, as well as over the Normal School and State Colleges of Education.[3] The recommendation did not become law. One of the principles for educational planning which was stated by the Study Commission was as follows:

> The State legal plan for education should provide mandatory statutes and regulations for the satisfaction of socially essential minimum educational requirements and broad permissive legal powers to enable the local education authority to expand institutional effort in accordance with community needs and to conduct desirable experiments in unexplored areas. In addition, the State should plan to place in operation a continuous program of stimulation, assistance, interpretation, and evaluation.[4]

A 1945 statement of Michigan's policy of control was made by the Curriculum Planning Committee. It was reported

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Should Youth Challenge the Secondary School?, pp. 7-14.

[2] Annual Report, 1944, p. 11; Michigan Public Education Study Commission, The Improvement of Public Education in Michigan, Report No. 1, 1943.

[3] Annual Report, 1944, pp. 12-14.

[4] The Improvement of Public Education in Michigan, Report No. 1, p. 4.

that the Superintendent of Public Instruction was legally responsible for the course of study used in the schools, and that the incumbent, Dr. Elliott, elected to stimulate each school to develop its own curriculum appropriate to the community or neighborhood; that this policy emphasized local government and the basic ideals of the United States.[1]

The danger inherant in the policy was noted. Such procedure of local curriculum construction was likely to degenerate because of the difficulty of finding adequate methods by which local initiative for curriculum planning could be encouraged. It was noted also that there existed a danger during the post-war period of adjustment of not being able to enlist the help of community leadership in educational planning.[2] The other and opposite danger was that the insecurities of post-war competition might lead to a centralization of authority and a highly organized authoritarian supervision.[3] The latter idea was covered by Dr. Elliott, in his report of 1944, when he pointed out to the Legislature that the executive energies of the Federal government had been greatly increased by the war, and that the result of this was magnified Federal activity in education.

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report of the Curriculum Planning Committee, 1944-1945, p. 6.

[2] Annual Report, 1944, loc. cit.

[3] Ibid., p. 9.

Accordingly, the State must be sure not to allow the Federal government to encroach on the State's educational rights.[1]

By 1947 the efforts of the Department of Instruction had begun to turn in the direction of encouraging unity of course offerings in the schools of the State. The Curriculum Planning Committee, a large group of teachers and administrators, had evolved out of the Program Building Groups of teachers, which were active as early as 1940 in planning curricular offerings which could be used in the subject matter areas of the schools of the State.[2] The Curriculum Planning Committee was well organized into sub-committees: elementary education, secondary school program, guidance, intercultural understanding, education in rural areas, health education and safety education.[3] These sub-committees recommended (1946) 1) that each sub-committee assume leadership in conducting studies of the needs and problems in its subject matter area, preparing publications and materials, and preparing recommendations for the improvement of education at the level or in the area concerned, 2) that sub-committees report these studies to the Curriculum Planning Commission, 3) that each sub-committee assume re-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Reports of Program Building Groups, 1940.

[3] Annual Report of the Curriculum Planning Committee, 1946, p. 24.

sponsibility for creative professional planning in its defined area, 4) that each such committee submit proposed publications and projects for review by the Curriculum Planning Committee, 5) that each be responsible for implementing in its subject matter areas the recommendations of the other sub-committees.[1]

Summary. 1) During the period 1901 - 1933 authority over the curriculum of Michigan district schools exercised by the Superintendent of Public Instruction became specific and definite.

2) In 1913 the Legislature directed all schools other than those in city districts to pursue a course of study prepared by the State Superintendent.

3) This authority over instruction was extended to private, denominational, and parochial schools in 1921.

4) The approval of high schools, beginning in 1918, provided a means by which the State Superintendent could influence the courses taught in both elementary and high schools.

5) Although city districts were not legally enjoined to pursue State courses of study, Superintendents urged city boards to use the State prescriptions. Superintendent Wright (1911) sought to influence such boards to this end by send-

---

[1] Ibid.

ing supervisors to advise city officers relative to the subjects pursued in the city schools.

6) Eighth grade examinations grew to become an effective instrument for central control of subjects taught in the schools. During the 1920's and 1930's State-wide examination questions and regulations pertaining to the examinations were made by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

7) The tendency from 1901 to 1935 was toward increasing the power of the State Superintendents to regulate the standards for teacher certification. In 1935 the State Board of Education was directed to control all certification.

8) The State Superintendent maintained the right to direct the training in teacher institutes, and he was one member of a three man board which prescribed the curriculum for county normal schools.

9) In an effort more directly to influence instruction in classrooms, the Department (1928) maintained an extensive public relations program. This included the calling of conferences, the issuing of bulletins, and the using of other channels of publicity in order to influence instruction in the schools in the State.

10) Beginning in 1933 the philosophy of State control of instruction changed. Although responsibility for providing a pattern for instruction remained with the State Superintendent, specific and direct prescription of subjects was

no longer practiced. Within the framework of broad goals which were determined by a non-educational group, local communities were encouraged to form curriculums for their own schools.

The responsibility of the Superintendent of Public Instruction was conceived of as being to stimulate local curriculum construction and to guide such construction so that local courses of study would be consistent with modern educational discoveries. Even subject matter constants, desirable in all curriculums, were suggested rather than imposed upon local groups.

11) A measure of State-wide direction to instruction offered in the schools appeared beginning in 1940. This direction came from the Program Building Groups of teachers and not from the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

CHAPTER VII

PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1787 - 1860

In northeastern colonial America, the schools existed as instruments of religion and were provided for by the religious states. It is not strange, therefore, that when northeasterners migrated westward into the Michigan area of the Northwest Territory, they brought with them the concept that the aim of general education was to provide for personal salvation. This conviction changed but slowly and the objectives of education were considered to be religious in many quarters until late in the nineteenth century.

Dr. Z. Pitcher, stated in his Memoirs that due to the fact that the first Board of Regents of the University of Michigan did not include a clerical member, the University, then in the future, was stigmatized as "an infidel affair."[1] This allegation caused a bill to be presented to the Legislature asking them to provide for a sectarian college.[2]

In spite of beliefs favoring religious objectives for

---

[1] Z. Pitcher, "Memoir on the University of Michigan," accompanying Regents Report, 1852.

[2] Ibid.

education, there appeared many statements favoring civic ends. As early as 1817 the Detroit Gazette printed an article on the schools of the city. It stated that the purpose of instruction was to teach people to read and write and "to enjoy the dignified privileges which a free country affords."[1]

John D. Pierce, speaking in 1852 on the occasion of the dedication of Michigan State Normal School said the elements of education were:

> ...a knowledge of our country, of its institutions, government and laws, of its geography, its natural and political divisions, of its history and progress, its agriculture, manufacture and commerce - its relations and business with people of other nations - a general knowledge of the grand divisions of the globe, both natural and political, and its position in and relative to the great system of the universe. It implies also some acquaintance with the history of the world, with discoveries and improvements of the past, of general literature.... Hence to the usual branches, may be added history, natural and moral philosophy....[2]

Ira Mayhew, reporting the value of union schools (1857) stated that they were an outgrowth of the common or primary schools and their leading object was to furnish a systematized education "having reference to fitting pupils for the discharge of the duties of citizenship."[3] He stated in addition that the fundamental doctrine of our government,

---

[1] The Detroit Gazette, August 1, 1817.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Dedication of the Michigan State Normal School, 1852, p. 17.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1857, p. 57.

the Declaration of Independence, must be taught in the family and the school as it must be practiced in life.[1]

John M. Gregory, in his Annual Report for 1859, gave a thorough exposition of the philosophy of Michigan education. He stated that the real value of education was in helping pupils intelligently to fulfill their own proper duties as adults and as citizens.[2]

Social studies in the pre-prescription period. Instruction in geography seems to have been the single social study offered in Michigan schools before 1830. Even this subject was not regularly taught.

The Detroit Classical Academy, established under the authority of the Catholepistemead, advertised in 1819 that globes and maps were provided for students of geography.[3] However, schools which were established under the Law of 1827 were not directed by the language of the enactment to provide for geography or any other social study.[4]

Even early private schools did not always include geography in their curriculums. A school which was opened in Detroit in 1818 by a Mr. Rowe did not list it among the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Ibid., 1859, p. 63.

[3] The Detroit Gazette, Jan. 15, 1819.

[4] Supra, p.

courses taught.[1] On the other hand, a school opened by William Brookfield in 1822 advertised map geography, the tuition being $2.50 per quarter plus one dollar if the student had "matured" enough to study geography.[2]

A public school which started in Detroit in 1830 announced that the object of the school was "not the rearing of a classical seminary but the maintenance of a school in which the knowledge of everyday necessities and use might be acquired."[3] Subjects taught included geography and history.[4] A contemporary, writing about the school, stated that Tyler's History, the American Classbook, and a History of America were used as reading books.[5] Superintendent Cornelius Gower wrote that the schools throughout the Territory "sometimes taught geography..., but not often."[6] When the subject was included among those offered by schools, the textbook usually used was Reverend Jedediah Morse's Geography.[7]

---

[1] The Detroit Gazette, Oct. 17, 1818.

[2] Ibid., Jan. 18, 1822.

[3] Northwestern Journal, May 20, 1830.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Clarence M. Burton, Diary of Detroit, iv, p. 691. Quoted in Sister Mary Rosalita, I. H. A., Education in Detroit Prior to 1850, p. 218.

[6] Cornelius A. Gower, "Historical Sketches," Annual Report, 1880, p. 304.

[7] Ibid.

Evidence that an expanded social studies curriculum was sometimes taught after 1830 can be found in the list of subjects offered by the Female Academy of Detroit (1836). These studies were ancient history, ancient geography, national and state constitutions, modern geography, and modern history.[1]

It should be noted that the social studies taught in the private schools of the period were not considered basic subjects; their appearance in the curriculums could not be defended as could reading and writing. Since they were taught in private schools, geography and history had no legal basis as prescribed subjects. As for social studies, prescriptions by the Territorial government were lacking. The legislation of 1817, 1827, and 1829 did not specify that such studies should be taught. The fact that the Territorial Legislature looked with favor upon instruction in geography might be inferred from the inclusion of that subject in the list of subjects in which Detroit teachers were to be examined (1833).[2]

The State control over the social studies in the common schools during the years immediately following the first Constitution was limited to the publication by the State Superintendent of lists of suitable books. Control over the branches

---

[1] The Detroit Free Press, Feb. 17, 1836.

[2] Supra, p. 37.

of the University was more direct, however, and this fact, doubtless, influenced the instruction in the district schools. In order to enter a branch of the University, a pupil was made to pass an examination in geography.[1]

The curriculums of the branches offered three types of secondary instruction: classical, English, and teacher training.[2] The classical and teacher's departments included subjects entitled according to the textbooks used: Woodbridge and Willard's Geography, and Keith's Globes. The English department included geography and political science.[3]

The University itself provided for entrance of those persons showing themselves to be "intellectually fit" through examinations which included the subject of geography.[4] History was introduced as a University subject in 1857.[5] In 1871 President Angell said, in his inaugural address, that for twenty years there had been a "real drift" of the University towards offering larger opportunities in history.[6]

The establishment of the State Normal School at Ypsilanti

---

[1] Annual Report, 1838, p. 78.

[2] Ibid., 1839, p. 57.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 1842, Appendix 3.

[5] Ibid., 1871, p. 65.

[6] Ibid.

sheds light on the type of civic educational background the Legislature desired Michigan teachers to acquire. The enactment providing for the establishment of the institution states:

> The exclusive purposes (of the State Normal School) shall be the instruction of persons both male and female in the art of teaching, and in all the various branches that pertain to a good common school education; also to give instruction in ...the fundamental laws of the United States, and in what regards the rights and duties of citizens.[1]

That this civic aim was to be incorporated practically into the teacher training program seems clear. Honorable Ross Wilkins, Judge of the United States Court was invited to speak to the point at the dedication ceremony in 1852. He stated that suitable political and civic training was imperative in a democracy. He pointed out that unless the Constitution was better understood and, therefore, better supported by the entire population, there would "inevitably happen ...civil war."[2] This pronouncement came exactly nine years before such war actually began.

Early instruction at the Normal School was on a secondary school level. The course of studies was academic, including occasional lectures on "school keeping." The reason for this placement level lay in the fact that adequate secondary instruction could be had in relatively few places in the state in the 1850's.[3]

---

[1] Public Acts, 1849, No. 138.

[2] Dedication of the State Normal School, 1852, p. 9.

[3] Annual Report, 1880, p. 85.

An idea as to the nature of textbook suggestions, as well as the character of the history taught, may be gained from the list of preferred textbooks published by Superintendent Shearman in 1850. Texts recommended in history were "the series of Mrs. Willard," which included a school history of the United States, a larger history of the United States, a general, ancient, and modern history.[1] Superintendent Shearman appraised these books as follows:

> This series, more than any other, seems to connect chronology, geography and the physical development and growth of our country, with the rise and fall of nations and the progress of civilization. They are marked by a wide range of thought, a pure and ardent spirit, a warm patriotism and a methodical arrangement particularly adapted to instruction.[2]

There were over a dozen geography books listed, but no other social studies texts.

Prescriptions in city districts. In 1842, the curriculum prescribed by the Detroit Board of Education for the upper schools included general history, American Government and Institutions, Civics, and Citizenship and Political Economy.[3] The Board adopted Peter Parley's Histories for primary grades, and Hale's Histories for the middle grades.[4] There is some doubt as to whether this broad social studies program was actually taught, for in 1852, the clerk of the Detroit Board

---

[1] Ibid., 1850, p. 99.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Detroit Board of Education, Annual Report, 1842, p. 12.

[4] Ibid.

of Education reported to the State Superintendent that the social studies offered were only geography, ancient, and modern history.

The establishment of social studies in other union schools throughout the State was limited to geography and the various branches of history. The point is illustrated by a table which shows the social studies offerings in these union schools.

Social studies prescriptions in colleges. History and geography were generally recognized by 1860 as being proper and necessary subjects for study in the college courses. This is pertinent inasmuch as the private, incorporated colleges were one important source within the State of trained teachers. The following table shows which social studies were included in the courses offered by private colleges in 1857.

Summary. 1) For several decades after 1787 the objectives of education were in part religious, and in part civic. There is no indication,however, of a belief that the civic objectives could be realized by specific instruction in one or more courses in the curriculum. Rather, it appears that there existed a belief that any increase in knowledge increased morality and good citizenship. This belief was prevalent to 1860, the end of the period discussed in this chapter.

2) Although there were no social studies prescriptions by the Legislatures or by any central officer to whom authority

TABLE II

Social Studies Taught in Union Schools, 1852[1]

Union District	Grade	Title of Social Studies Course
Adrian	not specified	U. S. history
Ann Arbor	Intermediate	Geography
	High School	History
	Classical (college preparatory)	none
Bellevue	not reported	
Bronson	not reported	
Cassopolis	not reported	
Coldwater	Primary	Geography
	Intermediate	Geography, Higher geography, U. S. history
Detroit	Infant school	none
	Primary	Geography
	Higher Department	Geography, History, (ancient and modern)
Dexter	not reported	
Dowagiac	Primary	Oral geography, Outline maps,
	Grammar	Primary geography, School geography, Map drawing geography.
	High School (continued)	not listed

[1]From reports of clerks of the Boards of Education, Annual Report, 1852.

TABLE II
(continued)

Union District	Grade	Title of Social Studies Course
Grand Rapids	Primary	Geography
	Intermediate	Geography, History
	Higher Dept.	Geography, History
Jonesville	not specified	none
Niles	school not established	
Ontonagon	school not established	
Port Huron	not specified	Geography
Ypsilanti	Primary	Geography
	Secondary	Geography through North America with map drawing
	Grammar	Universal history Geography
	Acedemical	Ancient and modern history
	Classical (college preparatory)	none

TABLE III

Social Studies Taught in Private Colleges, 1857[1]

College	Social Studies Taught
Albion Female College	Universal history, Ancient history, History, History of the U. S., Political Economy
Hillsdale	History
Kalamazoo	History
Michigan Female College	Geography, History of the U. S., History of Greece and geography, Roman history and geography, Science of government
Michigan Union College	Geography, History
Olivet	History
Young Ladies Seminary at Monroe	none
Wesleyan Seminary	Universal history, Ancient history, History, History of the U. S., Political Economy.

[1]From reports of college presidents, Annual Report, 1857.

over the curriculums was delegated, both private and public schools taught some courses in the social studies.

3) Before 1830 geography seems to be the single such subject taught.

4) By 1860 both geography and history were taught in most of the union schools of the State.

5) Influences which tended to popularize the teaching of geography were the entrance requirements of the branches as well as the University. Moreover, as early as 1833 the Territorial legislature had specified that inspectors of the city of Detroit could not license teachers who had not shown proficiency in geography (Chapter III).

6) History was not as popular an early subject as was geography. One influence which caused it to increase in popularity as a school subject appears to be its inclusion in the course of studies of the University of Michigan. Another influence causing its inclusion in lower schools throughout the State probably was its popularity as a course in union schools and in private colleges. These two types of institutions furnished the majority of teachers for the district schools throughout the State.

7) There is no evidence that courses in civil government were taught in the district or union schools by 1852. However the course of study in the English department of the branches and the stated purpose of the State Normal School illustrate the desire of the Board of Regents and the Legislature to encourage such civic instruction.

CHAPTER VIII

PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1861 - 1899 (Part I)

During the period 1861 to 1899 the status of the social studies was affected by two principal influences: 1) new philosophies of education, and 2) the growing citizenship objective in education as a whole.

The first of these included influences by the European educators Johann H. Pestalozzi and Johann F. Herbart. The second of these was strengthened by the approach and beginning of the Civil War. In 1861, Superintendent John Gregory stated that education in Michigan had the objective of making "wiser and stronger patriots," of training the children of the State to be "good citizens."[1] He stated, too, that men with a love of country, "heightened by all they know about history," had "resigned the school room to fight;" that the State could not justify school taxes unless on the general grounds that school training made "better and more useful citizens."[2]

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1861, p. 6.

[2] Ibid., pp. 3-6.

Prescriptions by the superintendent of public instruction. The first complete course of studies compiled by any State Superintendent and urged upon the schools of Michigan was published by John M. Gregory in 1861. The social studies prescribed were as follows:

TABLE IV

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Graded Schools, 1861[1]

Grade		Social studies
Primary Grade		
1st year		none
2nd year		none
Intermediate Grade		
1st year		Occupations of men, Compass, Beginning maps of school, home, etc.
2nd year		Maps of fields, ponds, etc. Geography: orally with outline maps
3rd year		Cornell's Primary Geography. Maps from geography
Grammar School		
1st year	(1st term)	Geography in North America and U. S. Map drawing, History of the U.S. to the Revolution (studied with a constant reference to maps and a chronological table to be made by pupils)
	(2nd term)	Geography of U. S., completed with maps drawn by pupils, History of U. S. completed.

(continued)

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Course of Study for Michigan Schools, 1861.

TABLE IV
(continued)

Grade		Social Studies
Grammar School		
2nd year	(1st term)	Geography of South America and Europe
	(2nd term)	Geography of Asia and Africa
3rd year		none
High School		none

It is interesting to note that the objectives of "good citizenship," stressed by Superintendent Gregory as being the aims for education are not provided for directly in the social studies. There appeared no course in civil government, and the history prescribed seems to have had in view nothing more than the acquisition of knowledge.

The influence of Pestalozzian object-method can be observed in the course.[1] The introduction to geography was

[1]Pestalozzi believed that it was the work of the teacher to assist nature in securing a natural, symmetrical, and harmonious development of all the "faculties" of the child. His object method of teaching was based upon the principle that children should gain knowledge by "sense impressions." These included observation and investigation of natural objects. Pestalozzian ideas were popularized in the United States by Edward A. Sheldon of Oswego, New York during the years 1848 to 1866. Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, pp. 285 f.

oral in the first two years of the intermediate school, and emphasis was placed upon the study of known subjects: occupations of men, the school, the home, fields, ponds, etc.; "Book geography" started when children were about ten years of age. The proportion of geography to history was five years of the former to one year of the latter.

Whether or not the course would be followed in the district schools depended, to a large extent, upon the inclinations of district boards and the supervision of township officers. Accordingly, the Superintendent entreated: "I cannot too earnestly urge this (course) upon the attention of the school officers."[1]

The course of 1861 did not fulfill the needs of the great majority of Michigan schools, since it was graded.[2] As a consequence, Superintendent Gregory constructed (1862) the following course for common schools:

---

[1] Annual Report, 1861, p. 36.

[2] Ibid., 1862, p. 45.

TABLE V

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Common Schools, 1862[1]

Year of Attendance	Social studies
1, 2, and 3	None
4	preparation for Geography
5, 6, and 7	None
8	Geography (mathematical and physical)
9	Geography (local with map drawing)
	History of U. S. (which may be used as a reading lesson)
10	Geography, History

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Course of Study for Common Schools, Printed with Annual Report, 1862.

Facts concerning the social studies prescribed which are notable are: 1) less emphasis was placed upon the object-method approach to geography in the common school course than in the graded course, 2) there existed a period of three years between "preparation for geography" and the study of geography. This gap was not consistent with the theory of object lessons. 3) The course of United States history was not given the emphasis that was given geography, and 4) no specific training for citizenship appears in the program.

No evaluation of the two courses of study followed their publication and distribution to the school officers. It may be inferred from the lack of expressed opinion, as well as from Superintendent Gregory's continual requests for uniformity of textbooks within districts, that the courses did not cause any widespread curricular changes.

That the lack of uniformity of instruction given was considered detrimental appears in two resolutions of the State Teacher's Association, passed at their meeting in 1874. The first of these resolved that the State of Michigan should follow the plan of the Regents of the University of New York, whereby questions for the examination of pupils were composed by the central educational authority and administered uniformly in all schools.[1] The second was:

---

[1] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1874, p. 385.

Resolved, that a practical uniformity in courses of study and grading in public schools is a matter of great importance; and that we request State Superintendent Briggs to recommend means to the teachers of the State, whereby this uniformity may be secured.[1]

The year previously, Superintendent Briggs had requested the State Teachers Association to compose a course of study.[2] He revised their suggestions in subjects outside of the social studies and printed the State Course in 1876:[3]

TABLE VI

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Graded Schools, 1876[4]

Grade	Social studies
1	none
2	Geography oral, city.
3	Geography oral, county and state
4	Written elementary geography
5	Elementary geography, 5 months Higher geography, 5 months
6	Higher geography
7	Higher geography
8	U. S. history
High School	
9	none
10	General history
11	General history (1 term) Civil government (1 term)

[1] Ibid.

[2] Annual Report, 1877, p. xi.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Course of Study for Graded Schools, 1876

It is plain that the instruction was planned for pupils who lived in urban areas, since city geography was introduced at the second grade wherein pupils ordinarily were eight years of age. The course was consistent with the theory of object lessons, although it should be noted that the only subject wherein such theory appeared was geography. The object lesson theory was not applied to history or civil government either by Pestalozzi or his immediate followers. The study of geography remained the principal social study in the elementary grades, with U. S. history being specified for the eighth grade only.

The course included the first State prescribed social studies for high school. It is notable that three terms of general history were called for, while no United States history was suggested. The first course in civil government was prescribed for the eleventh grade.

Superintendent Briggs reported (1877) that a majority of the graded schools in the State had "found the course well adapted to the requirements of the school room."[1] The probable reason for the success of the course lay in the fact that it was constructed by teachers. They, doubtless, listed subjects which they believed to be necessary and which they were prepared to teach.

---

[1] Annual Report, 1877, p. xi.

However, the teaching of civil government and an increased amount of history was not introduced into the instructional programs of graded schools without difficulty. As early as 1870 Superintendent Hosford urged teachers to recognize the necessity of educating all future voters in the use of the ballot.[1] In 1875 the State Teacher's Association was told that the subjects necessary to be taught to accomplish national prosperity were reading, writing, practical arithmetic, and "some knowledge of history, geography, (and) political economy."[2]

Evidence that the teaching of history and civil government was not widespread in 1878 may be found in the proceedings of the State Teacher's Association for that year. The President of the body, E. A. Strong, reported that the bulk of teaching in the schools of Michigan was in reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, geography, and grammar.[3] Mr. C. B. Thomas, treasurer of the Association, in an effort to discover which of the school studies was of most value to pupils, conducted a survey among Michigan school administrators. He asked each to rate the various subjects in the curriculum in relation to one another, allowing a total point value of 100 for the entire curriculum. The judgments of

---

[1] Ibid., 1870, p. x.

[2] Charles A. Kent, Professor of Law, University of Michigan, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1875, p. 421.

[3] E. A. Strong, Ibid., 1878, p. 167.

"a large number of men having education, knowledge of affairs, and sound judgment" put the average value of English language study at 75, arithmetic at 10, geography at 10, and grammar at 5.[1]

Information gathered in 1880 by Superintendent Gower shows that common schools paid little attention to the State Course and that social studies were taught inadequately, if they were taught at all. Of the total of 6352 districts in the State, only 752 (including graded schools) reported any attempt to observe a regular course and succession of studies.[2] One-half of the districts reported uniform lists of books; in 5312 districts there were no globes; and in 4717 districts there were no maps.[3]

One of the reasons the State Course of study for common schools was not observed was that it was too complex for school conditions.[4] Accordingly, secretaries of county boards of examiners requested Superintendent Varnum B. Cochran to construct a simplified course.[5] His response was a four-page course of study arranged by sections rather than by

---

[1] Ibid., p. 168.

[2] Annual Report, 1880, pp. 13, 47.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 1881, p. 173.

[5] Ibid.

grades. The social studies occupied more of the suggested program than did the social studies in the common school course printed in 1862. The simplified course was as follows:

TABLE VII

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Common Schools, 1881[1]

Section	Extent	Social studies
1	2 years	none, or home geography
2	2 or 3 years	Geography: first book of series completed. Studies of maps and globes. Map drawing, History: anecdotes of familiar characters and events
3	2 years (a daily program of 5 classes)	Geography: second book, Map drawing, Commercial geography, U. S. history: oral or textbooks, with special attention to civil government of the U. S. and of Mich.

It is worthy of comment that one of the first requests of the county officers, whose supervisory powers had been legally established in 1881, was to have the State Course for common schools simplified in order that it might be followed more readily. As far as the social studies were

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Course of Study for Common Schools, 1881.

concerned, it appears that simplification was accomplished merely by disposing of grade levels. Geography occupied a major portion of the program. However the introduction to history by means of anecdotes and stories of familiar characters and events shows an effort to apply to history the principles of the object lessons as they had been applied in geography. More total instructional time was to be given to United States history, and civil government was to be further emphasized. It appears that the Superintendent consciously shaped the program in the light of existant theories of education and to the end of contributing to "good citizenship" of the pupils. This citizenship aim for the social studies program may be inferred from the increased amounts of United States history prescribed, the direction to teachers to instruct such history orally should no textbooks be available, and from the direction to give "special attention" to the civil government of the Nation and the State.

In 1883, although the legal authority of the Superintendent did not give him the power to make mandatory any program of studies, his instructions to county secretaries give evidence of increasing control over the social studies program. The instructions also show a desire for uniformity of teaching. Specific time was prescribed for each course as follows:

TABLE VIII

Prescription of Time to be allotted to the Social Studies in the Ungraded Schools, 1883[1]

Grade	Time allowed
I	15 minutes daily (Geography)
II	45 minutes daily (Geography)
III	45 to 65 minutes daily (Geography)
IV	10 minutes daily (Geography), 40 " " (History), 10 " " (Civil government)

In the same year (1883), specific instructions were given to county secretaries as to methods of teaching. In grade I all pupils were to be in one class for oral geography instruction. It was directed that a few things were to be taught simply and plainly: land, water, plants, animals, location, direction, and distance.[2]

Grade II directions were that pupils should sketch outline maps in not too full detail; map drawing was to be considered a means rather than an end in geographical study; occasional abstracts in writing were to be required as review exercises; maps were to be used for class concert drill;

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Directions to County Secretaries on the Course of Study, Printed with Annual Report, 1883, p. 210 f.

[2]Ibid., p. 211 f.

and the first textbook was to be started at the end of the third year.[1]

Grade III directions specified that constant use was to be made of outline and other maps; the comparative size of countries and states was to be studied, as was the relative latitude of cities. Routes of travel and commerce were to be emphasized.[2]

Grade IV directions concerning United States history were that a uniform text should be used if one was available. If uniform texts could not be obtained, the subject was to be taught topically, the pupils using such books as they had or could borrow. Civil government of the United States and Michigan was to be taught orally.[3]

Hints of tension between teacher groups and especially between city and rural teachers were becoming apparent in the 1880's. The friction throws some light upon the nature of the social studies taught at the time. In 1884 Superintendent Herschel Gass requested that a committee be formed from the State Teacher's Association, The Schoolmaster's Club, and the City Superintendents Association to formulate

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

a course which might be used in all of the graded schools and which would be suitable to the majority of teachers.[1] Agreement among the committee members was lacking, and the result was that no revised course was reported.

In 1886 S. G. Burkhead, Superintendent of Saginaw City, suggested before the State Teacher's Association that the programs of the country schools admittedly should aim to do no more than instruct in reading, writing, and geography.[2] His argument was that the subject matter taught depended upon the teachers' knowledge, and that country teachers had no knowledge of history or civil government.[3] He suggested the following program, which he claimed was designed to correspond to the courses actually taught in the "great majority" of district schools.

TABLE IX

Social Studies Claimed to be Taught in District Schools, 1886[4]

Grade	Extent	Social studies
1	2 years	none
2	2 years	none
3	2 years	Geography 3 periods daily
4	2 years	Geography 3 periods daily

[1] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1884, p. 64.

[2] Ibid., 1886, p. 215 f.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

There is no evidence that the plan was ever used as a design for instruction in district schools. It is interesting as an illustration of one man's opinion concerning the extent of social studies taught.

By 1889 county secretaries were urging the State Superintendent to make the course of study more explicit.[1] Secretary Culver, Calhoun County, stated that county boards of examiners were compiling and distributing courses of their own in view of the fact that the State Course was not definite enough to unify instruction.[2] In response to the request, State Superintendent Estabrook appointed a committee of five county secretaries to prepare a revised course of study. The county secretaries, meeting in Lansing at the time, passed a resolution favoring the construction of such a course and urging that complete unity, in conformity with the course, be achieved in all counties in the State.[3] The revised program was published in 1890. The social studies were discussed at length as to 1) subject matter objectives, 2) specific methods and materials needed, and 3) an outline of the factual matter to be taught. The instruction prescribed for the several levels of advancement, along with

---

[1] Ibid., 1889, p. 174 f.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

textbook page numbers, was arranged thus:

TABLE X

Social Studies in the Course of Study for District Schools, 1890[1]

Grade	Textbook	Page Numbers
1	none	none
2	none	none
3	none	none
4	none	none
5	Geography (1st book)	1 to 91
6	Geography (1st book) " (2nd book)	92 to 150 1 to 44
7	Geography (2nd book)	45 to 122
8	Geography (2nd book) U. S. history (civil government)	finish 1 to 150

The pages as here represented, cannot be used, because - to avoid advertising any particular publishing house - no special books are mentioned. Each Secretary should name, under the heading "textbooks" the books in use in his county, and the figures in the columns should correspond to them. When a page has been arranged and printed, it may be pasted over this.

The course was said to have been growing for years in the minds of teachers, and it was finally expressed by the secretaries of the counties.[2] It was claimed in behalf of

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Manual and Course of Study for District Schools, 1890.

[2] Ibid., foreword.

the plan that it would unify instruction in the entire State, stabilize the meaning of eighth grade diplomas, and would overcome the frequent changes of teachers and their want of interest in their work.[1]

It may be observed that the 1890 course included less of the social studies than the course printed in 1881. There is no evidence of an object lesson approach to the teaching of geography or history. The former was not to be introduced until the fifth grade, several years after it had been started in the previous course. It appears that the county secretaries compiled the course in the light of the actual teaching being done in district schools. If this is true, the social studies were not looked upon as means whereby the citizenship aims of education would be realized. The fact that United States history occupied but one-half of the eighth year and that no specific prescription was made for the teaching of civil government seems to verify this conclusion.

Apparently Superintendent Ferris Fitch was not entirely satisfied with the 1890 course for he stated (1892) that district teachers should "emphasize the teachable points in American history" and that they should prepare themselves better to teach civil government.[2]

---

[1] Orr Schurtz, Sec., Eaton County, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1890, p. 176.

[2] Annual Report, 1892, p. 39.

In 1895 the State Teacher's Association passed a resolution requesting a revised course of instruction which could be used in all schools, both city and rural.[1] Superintendent Henry Pattengill started constructing such a course, and his successor in office, Jason Hammond, completed the task. Both men agreed that the social studies should be emphasized. Superintendent Hammond stated that the civic ideals of education should be realized through courses in history and civil government.[2] The product of their combined effort is shown by this table:

TABLE XI

Social Studies in the Course of Study, 1897[3]

Grade	Social Studies
Primary division	
1 and 2	Geography
Intermediate division	
3 and 4	Geography
5	none
6	Geography, State history and government
7	Geography, History, Civil government
8	History, Civil government
9	Review of the 8th grade
10	General history

[1] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1895, p. 85.

[2] Annual Report, 1897, p. 4.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manual and Course of Study, 1897.

As compared with the 1881 and 1890 prescribed courses, social studies were allotted a considerably larger share of the curriculum. History was introduced two years earlier than in the previous course, and State history and government as well as civil government were prescribed. The course shows the effects of educational thought of the day, expressed by the State Superintendents. Apparently the area of the social studies was thought to be the appropriate division of the curriculum in which to concentrate instruction which would lead to "better citizenship." Testifying to this was the increased stress upon State and national history and civil government.

The Manual was accepted by the State Teacher's Association, which passed a resolution "heartily endorsing" it and thanking the State Superintendent.[1] Thirty thousand copies were printed and distributed, and it was used in many city and village systems as far as the eighth grade.[2]

Superintendent Hammond followed the precedent of Joseph Estabrook and directed county secretaries to base eighth grade examination questions upon the State course.[3]

Criticisms against the course were voiced in 1898. At that time it was claimed that not enough time was given

---

[1] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1897, p. 28.

[2] Annual Report, 1897, p. 5.

[3] Ibid.

to history and civil government, since the "prime responsibility of the schools (was) to develop citizenship in the great mass of the people."[1] The course was criticized also as lacking usefulness in the schools of the sparsely settled rural areas of the Upper Peninsula.[2] In 1899, however, the State Superintendent reported that the general response to the course was favorable.[3]

Interest in emphasizing the citizenship aim in the schools caused Superintendent Hammond to initiate the practice of holding special day observances.[4] These involved cutting across all subject matter boundaries in order to concentrate the school program upon an area of civic importance. The Superintendent claimed the practice would 1) bring parents and schools closer together, 2) interpret the work of the schools, 3) unify the efforts of all Michigan schools, and 4) inculcate patriotism.[5]

He requested certain teachers to plan programs for arbor day, Washington's birthday and Lincoln's birthday, had

---

[1] A. S. Whitney, "Flexibility of High School Courses," Annual Report, Address to State Teachers Association, 1898, p. 186.

[2] E. W. Baker, Cheyboygan County, Ibid., Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1898, p. 287.

[3] Annual Report, 1899, p. 151.

[4] Ibid., 1897, p. 5.

[5] Ibid.

these plans printed, and distributed them to all school authorities.[1]

The Superintendent stated that, "It is my desire that the pamphlet issued by this department for special day exercises be secured by all teachers and used."[2]

Jason Hammond was the first of Michigan State Superintendents to rely to a large extent upon exhortation by means of circulars and pamphlets to accomplish his instructional purposes. Though the average number of teachers in the State was 13,267, he published and distributed the following from the years 1897 to 1901:

TABLE XII

Circulars Affecting the Social Studies Distributed From 1897 to 1901[3]

Circular or Pamphlet	No. Distributed
State Manual and Course of Study	30,000
Special Day Pamphlets	25,000
Memorial Day Pamphlet	10,000
Outlines for Teachers Institutes	20,000

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Special Day Exercises, 1897.

[2]Italics in original. Special Day Exercises, 1897, foreword.

[3]Annual Report, 1900, p. 10.

Summary. 1) The approach and beginning of the Civil War caused the State Superintendent to express the importance of the citizenship aims of education.

2) Social studies prescriptions by Superintendent Gregory in 1861 and 1862 stressed geography. It is evident that he desired the subject to be taught in a manner consistent with Pestalozzian theories of object lessons.

3) Superintendent Gregory's directions did not give evidence of any belief that the citizenship aims for education as a whole could be realized particularly in the social studies. The history prescribed seems to show a knowledge objective for the subject.

4) The State course of 1876 included the first social studies prescribed for high schools. Therein was specified that $3\frac{1}{2}$ terms of general history and $\frac{1}{2}$ term of civil government should be taught. In the lower schools geography was emphasized from the second grade upward, and the object lesson approach to the subject was suggested.

5) It is apparent that during the 1870's and 1880's the district schools did not follow the State courses of study, and that there was difficulty in convincing such schools to teach history and civil government.

6) The extent to which country schools deviated from State suggestions was clearly indicated by county secretaries. Their desire for a simplified State course of studies and a report made before the State Teacher's Association

(1886) shows that little if any history or civil government was actually taught in these schools.

7) Although the legal authority of the State Superintendent to enforce any of his curricular suggestions had not increased, he was able, because of county supervision to specify the amounts of time which district schools should allow for each social study. (1883). His specifications show that geography was given by far the largest amount of school time, history was given 40 minutes daily for one or two years, and civil government was allotted 10 minutes daily for one or possibly two years.

8) Authority of the State Superintendent had increased in practice (1890) to the extent that the Course of Study published in that year directed county secretaries to name the pages which should be studied in each social study textbook. The State plan did not include provision for teaching geography by means of object lessons. One book was specified as constituting the entire United States history course, and no specific provision was made for the study of civil government.

9) Not until 1897 did State prescription allow history and civil government a major portion of the school program. In the course suggested that year it seems evident that the Superintendent of Public Instruction sought to have pupils realize the citizenship aims of education in the courses embodied in social studies.

10) The accomplishment of citizenship aims was also sought by Superintendent Hammond (beginning 1897) through the urging of schools to cooperate in observing special days.

11) It is apparent that teachers, county officers, and Superintendents of Public Instruction wanted unity of instruction in all of the schools of the State.

12) Though no legislative mandates directed schools to teach any of the social studies during the period 1861 - 1899, it may be inferred that the Legislature wished certain social studies to be included in the course of study. In 1867 the enactment which gave county superintendents the authority to license teachers specified that all teachers certificated must pass an examination in geography. Twenty years later county secretaries were directed to license teachers only after the teacher candidates had shown proficiency in geography, United States history, and civil government.

CHAPTER IX

PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1861 - 1899 (Part II)

Influences were prevalent during the latter half of the nineteenth century which caused changes in the natures of the several social studies. In many cases the legal bases of these studies were affected as a consequence.

Influences of geographical concepts upon prescription. The influence of Pestalozzian object lessons in the Michigan courses in geography have been noted in connection with geography course titles which deviated significantly from those of earlier courses.[1] John M. Gregory was the first Michigan Superintendent to bring his authority to bear against the study of geography as a book subject. He claimed geography had been introduced into the curriculum by accident and was maintained by the aid of bookmakers.[2] He stated, "no reason can be given for its introduction except the ambituous desire for a new and unusual study."[3] The courses of study he constructed stressed the oral

---

[1] Supra, p. 119.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1862, p. 27.

[3] Ibid., p. 18.

approach with instruction taking place on the level of pupil experience. The standards set in the subject by Superintendant Gregory were maintained in State courses of study and in teacher instruction given in teacher's institutes until 1890.

By 1890 the nature of instruction in geography was affected by the theories of the German educator, Johann F. Herbart. He had suggested type studies, such as coal mining, a seaport, shipping, the interdependence of people, etc., as a means of correlating geography with other studies and making it more meaningful to pupils.[1] The theories reached the United States between 1885 and 1890, with the return to this country of a number of American school teachers who had studied in Germany.[2]

The effects of Herbartian ideas upon the status of geography in Michigan can be seen in the report of State Superintendent Pattengill (1893) in which he stated that the State was "endeavoring to assure modern teaching of geography" by appropriate control of the examinations for teacher's certificates.[3] He pointed out that it was thought

---

[1] Ellwood P. Cubberley, Public Education in the United States, pp. 444-445.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Annual Report, 1893, p. 2.

best to treat the earth as a home for man and to bring to the aid of geography all allied branches, including botany, meteorology, numerology, and history in arranging type studies.[1]

Influences which affected history in the curriculum. It has been seen in the State courses of study that history was not emphasized before 1897 and that it was not considered the principal subject through which to instruct pupils in citizenship. Nevertheless, the idea that history should be stressed and that it should lead pupils toward civic understanding was first voiced by Superintendent Gregory. In 1862 he stated that the schools were the channels by which the state transmitted its civilization; that in a pupil's life as a citizen history was the principal guide to his social and political duties.[2] The Superintendent wished history to be stressed in the schools because its facts were comprehensible to children, it stimulated thought, and it conveyed "the most important civic information."[3]

There developed considerable pressure, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, to increase the instruction of history in Michigan schools. In 1875, Governor Badgley expressed such a wish to the State Teacher's Association, stating, "...possibly, eventually, the subject of history

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., 1862, pp. 3, 62.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

may be taught in our schools and our children know something about their own country."[1] Three years later the same body was told by the preceptress of Niles High School that students enrolling in high schools of the State had acquired little, if any, history.[2] In the same year, Horace S. Tarbell, State Superintendent, recommended to the Michigan State Normal School that it so change the curriculum that history be given more attention.[3] Joseph Estabrook, then Principal of the school, reported in 1879 that the work provided in the department of history had been increased so as to occupy a greater proportion of the curriculum.[4]

The subject of history was emphasized at the 1880 meeting of the State Teacher's Association. Ruth Hoppin, teacher of history at the State Normal School, read a paper in which she endeavored to prove that "true" history could not be taught in elementary and secondary schools.[5] She held, and was generally supported by discussion, that history as a branch of instruction had failed because teachers had endeavored to instruct, if at all, upon a level too high to

---

[1] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1875, p. 412.

[2] Florence E. Cushman, Ibid., 1878, p. 140.

[3] Annual Report, 1898, p. xxxiii.

[4] Michigan State Normal School, Annual Report, 1879, p. 2.

[5] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1880, p. 263 f.

be meaningful to children. It seemed to be agreed that pupils had not the necessary maturity or "mental discipline" for "grappling with the great problems of national life."[1]

Miss Hoppin said that the teaching of history in Michigan schools could be defended in two important ways: 1) on the basis of teaching broad and interesting knowledge which would lead to good citizenship; and 2) on the basis of benefits resulting from such teaching. By the latter, she undoubtedly referred to skills of research and investigation which were said to result from historical study.

It was suggested that the knowledge of history be taught by means of the study of particular events which had happened close at hand.[2] Such particulars would be the history of a community and a locality. It was suggested, also, that the history of the State be pursued.[3]

Two National committee reports were given which strengthened the opinion that history should be allowed a larger place in the curriculum. One was made in 1893 and the other in 1899. The latter, the Report of the Committee of Seven, was of extreme importance to schools in the State. However, its effects were felt after 1900, so discussion of this report

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

will be found in the following chapter.

The Committee of Ten of the National Education Association, reporting in 1893, made specific recommendations relating to the place of history in the curriculum, and Superintendent Pattengill carried these suggestions to Michigan teachers and administrators. He emphasized the suggestion that history should begin as early as the tenth year of age (normally grade five).[1] The first two years of study were to be devoted to mythology and to biography for the illustrations of general as well as American history.[2] He reported that the Committee agreed that all subjects should be correlated.[3] The effects of the report may be observed in the increased amount of history prescribed in the 1897 course of study, as well as in the allocation of the beginning of the study of the subject at the sixth grade level instead of the eighth.

Superintendent Pattengill sought to improve the methods of history instruction by urging teachers to instruct in "causes and effects of history and not in dates" and to use current events material of historical importance.[4] In 1897

---

[1] Annual Report, 1893, pp. 19-20.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 1895, p. 10.

he urged that Michigan history and geography be taught.[1] In order to facilitate this latter instruction, he issued a booklet containing bits of State history and distributed 5000 copies to school administrators.[2]

Influences which affected civil government in the curriculum. The civil war and early era of reconstruction were periods of intense interest in the national government and in Constitutional questions. Superintendent Gregory recognized this and commented (1862) that the Michigan schools did little to inspire the youth of the State with pure patriotic sentiment.[3] He suggested overcoming the negligence, urging teachers to stress the government of the United States when they instructed pupils in history.[4]

After Superintendent Gregory's statements, little attention was paid to the teaching of civil government until more than two decades later. At that time (1886) the attention of teachers at the State Teacher's Association was turned to the growing problem of immigration. The teachers were told that increased immigration caused problems in citizenship resulting from ignorance of American customs, American theory of government, the English language, and, most serious, a proper appreciation of citizen-

---

[1] Ibid., 1897, p. 3.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michigan Souvenir, 1897.

[3] Annual Report, 1861, p. 10.

[4] Ibid., 1862, p. 2.

ship.[1] The duty of the school was conceived as being "to convert (the) heterogeneous mass of discordant elements into a homogeneous people possessed with intelligence, moral character, and a high appreciation of the duties of citizenship."[2]

Part of the 1889 meeting of the State Teachers Association was also addressed to the problem. It was pointed out that the "foreigners" were living in patterns of their former culture and were unable or unwilling to develop patriotic attitudes towards the United States.[3]

It was stated in discussion that the study of civil government must be directed toward the more practical and observable attitudes which signify a love of country and away from the "old time" textbook memorization of facts about the government.[4] Methods suggested for accomplishing this change were to 1) hold practical discussions in order that the thought involved would stimulate patriotism, 2) teach beyond the textbooks by showing the activities of government on the local level, 3) show the forms and purposes of legal documents, and 4) discuss, as well as memorize, various important parts of the Constitution.[5] The unifying of history,

---

[1] David Howell, President State Teachers Association, Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1886, p. 205.

[2] Ibid.

[3] D. A. Hammond, Superintendent, Charlotte, Ibid., 1889, p. 58.

[4] Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[5] Ibid.

biography, and civil government was also said to be an effective way of inculcating patriotism.[1]

Apparently the educational leaders in the State were endeavoring to define the meaning of citizenship, a term which up to that time had been used rather loosely to signify a desired end of general education. With the appearance of the problem of Americanizing immigrants, the meaning of citizenship broadened to include "patriotism." The fact that specific ends were sought in citizenship training - namely of increasing the love of the country and of teaching knowledge about government - probably accounts for the placing of such instruction in the course of civil government.

Other influences tending to specify the aims of the course in civil government included a resolution by the Grand Army of the Republic. In 1889 Superintendent J. W. Cox of Hancock read the resolution to the State Teachers Association. It was as follows:

> Resolved, that as the public school is established chiefly in the interest of national preservation and prosperity, its teachers should, in all their teaching, emphasize and magnify whatever tends to make our youth appreciate the privileges and intelligently discharge the duties of American citizenship; that the history of the nation and the principles of civil government and law should be taught in all public schools, and that loyalty, patriotism, and obedience to constituted law should be diligently impressed upon the minds of our children.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 65.

Mr. Cox also stated that too little time was spent studying government in Michigan schools.[1] He urged that such instruction should be started at a lower level in school in order that pupils who would leave school before graduating would have the benefit of civic instruction.[2]

Influences which were said to affect the subject matter and aims of courses in civil government were listed as being: 1) increased corruption in city governments, 3) modern crime, and 4) local government.[3]

The initial results of the influences mentioned can be observed in the increased civil government prescriptions in the 1897 State Course as compared with the Course of 1890. Whereas the latter did not specify any definite time nor pages to be studied in connection with the subject, the 1897 Course directed that government instruction should begin at the sixth grade level, and that it should be continued in the seventh and eighth grades.[4]

Flag display as a method of teaching patriotism. Henry R. Pattengill was the first Superintendent to suggest that

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Supra, p. 135.

the display of flags would increase patriotic feelings in children. In 1893 he suggested that each school fly a large flag and hang small ones in the various school rooms.[1] Instruction related to the flag was said to "lead pupils to the love of the flag for what it signifies, for the protection it affords the citizen fortunate enough to be born under (it).."[2] Pattengill suggested that every pupil should learn the "Star Spangled Banner," "America" and the "Red, White, and Blue."[3]

In 1894 and 1895 the State Superintendent urged the Legislature to enact a law compelling schools to display flags.[4] In the latter year such an act was passed.[5] It provided that each district must purchase a United States flag of a size not less than four feet two inches by eight feet. The flag was to be displayed in a conspicuous place on the school building or grounds.

The enactment met determined opposition within many districts wherein teachers would not comply with the mandate or school boards would not make the necessary purchase.[6] It was

---

[1] Annual Report, 1893, p. 20.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 1895, p. 12.

[5] Public Acts, 1895, No. 56.

[6] Annual Report, Ibid.

believed by these people that the law was passed to satisfy the selfish interests of the flag manufacturers and distributors.[1] The Superintendent informed all administrators that the purpose of the act was "entirely patriotic" and he issued a request that each district report to the State Department of Education the purchase of all flags.[2] In 1896, of the total 7151 districts in the State, 5613 reported the purchase and display of flags; in 1897, 5872 districts reported complying with the law.[3]

Influences to include economics in the curriculum. No evidence has been found to support the idea that political economy was taught in more than an occasional school in Michigan before 1875.[4] At that time, Professor Charles A. Kent, of the University of Michigan, appeared before the State Teacher's Association to urge the inclusion of the subject in the regular school program.[5]

His stated reason for enlarging the curriculum to such extent was that laboring classes had "lost their old

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., 1896, p. 42.

[3] Ibid., 1897, p. 165.

[4] Ibid., 1875, p. 111. In 1875 Grand Rapids High School was the only city school teaching the subject.

[5] Annual Report, Proceedings of the State Teachers Association, 1875, p. 422.

reverence and fear for those above them."[1] He said that school children must be taught to reconcile the conflicting demands of capital and labor, and that this reconciliation could be accomplished only by means of diffusing knowledge through all classes of the population.[2]

L. R. Fiske, President of Albion College told the Teacher's Association in 1886 that the teaching of political economy was imperative if the problem of "the increasing conflict between capital and labor" was ever to be solved.[3]

Two years later, E. P. Church, President of the Association, told teachers that they must instruct children to the effect that strikes would not adjust the problems of labor.[4]

A slightly more liberal point of view was expressed in 1889 when D. A. Hammond, Superintendent of Charlotte, told teachers that courses in political economy should be established so that children could be taught to appreciate labor.[5]

Irrespective of these statements favoring the inclusion of political economy in the curriculum of Michigan schools,

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., 1886, p. 259.

[4] Ibid., 1888, p. 150.

[5] Ibid., 1889, p. 61.

the course did not appear in the State program until after the beginning of the twentieth century.

Summary. 1) The influence of the theory of object lessons can be seen in the prescriptions for geography in Michigan State courses of study from 1861 to 1890.

2) In 1893 specifications for geography showed an attempt to incorporate in the study the theories of Herbart. These included correlation of geography and type studies.

3) Attempts to apply the theory of object lessons to history can be seen in the State course of 1881.

4) During the latter half of the nineteenth century there were increasing pressures to emphasize history in the State courses. However, history was not stressed in any course before 1897.

The pressures to emphasize the study came from State Superintendents, from the State Teachers Association, and from the report of the Committee of Ten.

Although the citizenship goal for the study of United States history was stated as early as 1862, it was not until 1880 that the State Teachers Association discussed such a goal for the subject, and it was not until 1897 that the State Superintendent obviously prescribed history for the purpose of helping pupils realize the civic aim.

5) The desirability of endeavoring to increase pupil's civic knowledge and patriotism through the study of civil government was recognized by Superintendent Gregory during the early days of the Civil War. Not until the 1880's however

was instruction in civil government emphasized. At that time the growing problem of immigration caused educators to look to the course in civil government to "Americanize" immigrant children.

The function of inculcating patriotism in children was described as part of the aim of courses in civil government. It was suggested that this could be accomplished by teaching functions of government rather than structure, giving increased time to the study of civil government, and beginning the study at a lower school grade.

6) Flag display, as an activity which would increase patriotic feelings in children, was made mandatory by the Legislature in 1895.

7) Schools were urged (beginning 1875) to include courses in political economy in their curriculums. However such instruction was not made part of the State Course of Study until after the start of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER X

PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1900 - 1930

"Society centered," citizenship goals for modern education were defined in the nineteenth century by Johann F. Herbart. These goals were given emphasis in the twentieth century by the educational philosopher John Dewey. The latter believed that the responsibility for good government and social insight on the part of individuals should be assumed by the schools of the country.[1] This new philosophy demanded that schools train pupils to meet responsibilities, develop initiative, and cause each child to learn to shoulder a fair share of the work of government.[2]

In Michigan these ideas were given voice by many educators, one of whom was Professor Stuart A. Courtis, who rewrote the philosophy of education for the Detroit schools (1918) under the dual topics: 1) the needs of society, and 2) the needs of the individual.[3] He said education was to

---

[1] John and Evelyn Dewey, Schools of Tomorrow, Chap. XI.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Detroit Board of Education, Annual Report, 1918-19, p. 85 f.

be conceived of as a process of social heredity which results in the integration of personality and the maintenance of a progressive social order.[1] In general, he wrote, democracy demanded methods which yield a maximum of self direction, self appraisal and self control.[2]

The activities of national education groups also influenced the general aims of Michigan schools. The National Education Association, the Department of Superintendence, and the United States Study of Education all defined new educational objectives for the schools. The Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education appointed by the National Education Association in 1916 formulated the Cardinal Principles of Education which were widely distributed and were an effective influence upon all educational thought. The Principles were published by the United States Bureau of Education and sent throughout the country. The Commission stated that education in this country should be guided by a clear and distinct conception of the meaning of democracy.[3] Such education should develop in each individual the knowledge, interests, ideals, and powers whereby he would find his place

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Cardinal Principles of Education, U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 35, p. 9.

and use that place to shape both himself and society towards ever nobler ends.[1]

The Federal government also influenced education within Michigan schools. During World War I the schools of the State cooperated with the national war effort. After the War, the words of President Warren G. Harding were directed to the attention of Michigan teachers:

> ...We have to face the fact that...in the teaching of American civil government and American history, and the principles of Americanism and Americanization we have been deplorably delinquent.[2]

Superintendent's prescriptions applying to the social studies. The 1897 Course of Study continued in use in Michigan schools, particularly in rural schools, for nearly a decade after its compilation.[3] Farmers meetings and agricultural groups were reported to have discussed the course and favored its use in the rural schools.[4] Superintendent Delos Fall continually urged all schools to follow the course, pointing out in 1901 that although the State Course had not been legally adopted in a few districts, "nearly all the schools" used it as the basis for subjects taught.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Moderator Topics, March 24, 1921, p. 449.

[3] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1908, p. 35.

[4] Ibid., 1900, p. 8.

[5] Ibid., 1901, pp. 35-36.

By 1904 the important effects of the report of the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association were felt in the State. The report dealt primarily with the social studies in secondary schools, however elementary courses were suggested by Professor L. M. Salmon, a member of the committee. The program for history suggested by the Committee was as follows:

TABLE XIII

History Program Suggested by the Committee of Seven, 1898[1]

Grade	History to be taught
1 and 2	none
3 and 4	Biographies of great men
5	Ancient History
6	Medieval and modern history
7	English history
8	American history
9	Ancient history to 800 A.D. emphasizing Greece, Rome, and early Middle Ages
10	Medieval and Modern history
11	English history
12	American history and Civil government

[1]Edgar Dawson, "The History Inquiry, Report of the Director," The Historical Outlook, XV, No. 6 (June, 1924), 244-245.

It may be noted that the program was planned in two cycles, one beginning in the fifth grade, the other in the ninth grade. The subjects were arranged in "their natural chronological order."[1] Any ommission or change was regarded as unfortunate.[2] The committee was specific in condemnation of courses in general history, the one year course which included some ancient, medieval, modern and English history.[3]

A high school course of studies was made for Michigan in 1905 and the influence of the Committee of Seven can plainly be seen. Superintendent Delos Fall, acting upon a resolution passed by the State Teacher's Association in 1905, appointed a committee of administrators and teachers to construct the course.[4] The social studies in the new

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 242.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Annual Report, 1905, p. 67.

State Course were as follows:

TABLE XIV

Social Studies in the Course of Study for High Schools, 1905[1]

Grade	Social studies
9	Ancient history
10	Medieval and modern history (emphasis should be put on English history)
11	Institutional - for schools desiring a four year course in history, otherwise omit
12	American history and civics

No State high school course of study had been compiled for work beyond the tenth grade in twenty-nine years. The 1876 course had specified that general history should be taught in the tenth and eleventh grades and that civil government should be taught in the last half of the eleventh year. There was no provision for American history beyond that specified for the eighth grade. The 1897 course had prescribed social studies instruction for ten grades. However, general history at the tenth grade level was the only such

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Manual and Course of Studies for High Schools, 1905.

study provided for high schools.

The new course emphasized history to the exclusion of geography and political economy. It was not consistent with the 1897 course which had stressed, at a slightly lower grade level, courses in civics and State history.

The State Superintendent, Luther L. Wright, did not follow the suggestions of the Committee of Seven as faithfully as had the committee of the State Teachers Association when he specified the high school social studies curriculum for rural high schools (1907). Such schools had been legalized in 1901 and the State Superintendent was given power by the act to regulate the curriculums in the schools.[1] Superintendent Wright prescribed the following social studies courses:

TABLE XV

Social Studies in the Course of Studies for Rural High Schools, 1907[2]

Grade	Social studies
9	none
10	American history
11	English history ½ year Civics ½ year
12	Political economy and General history

[1] Public Acts, 1901, No. 144.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Manual and Course of Studies for Rural High Schools, 1907.

It may be observed that the Superintendent prescribed the general history course which had been part of the Michigan courses of study prior to 1905. American history was specified for one year, double the time given the course in the general State Manual of 1905. Political economy made its appearance for the first time as a mandatory study, and civics was specified for one term. The Superintendent seems to have intended to prescribe courses which would be of value to the rural population, many of whom would not be preparing for college work. It may be assumed that the rural high school course represented what was thought to be an ideal sequence of courses which would lead rural students to realize the citizenship aims of education.

With the passage of Act 323, 1913, which made the use of the State Course of Study mandatory in all but city schools, State Superintendent Keeler constructed a revised course of study for high schools. Such schools were defined as including grades seven through twelve. Attention was focused upon agriculture and the household arts, for Superintendent Keeler described the State as "primarily agricultural."[1] The course was to be used in all high schools, however, and provision was made for three sequences

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Manual and Course of Study, Bulletin 14, 1914, foreword.

of studies.[1] All communities were urged to adopt the State Course, allowing the needs of particular communities to determine which sequences would be taught.[2] In each of the three sequences, Literary, Agriculture, and Household Arts and Commercial, identical requirements in the social studies were specified. The new course did not follow the suggestions of the Committee of Seven as closely as the course of 1905, a fact brought out in the table below:

TABLE XVI

Social Studies in the Course of Study for High Schools, 1914[3]
(prescribed for Literary, Agricultural, and Household Arts and Commercial sequences of Study)

Grade	Required social studies	Elective social studies
7	U. S. history, Geography	
8	U. S. history, Civics	
9		Ancient history
10		Modern history
11	none	none
12	U. S. history, Civics	

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

The emphasis upon United States history and civics is apparent when this Course is compared to the earlier course of 1905; time given to instruction in United States history was tripled and time given to instruction in civics was doubled. General history was not provided, however ancient and modern history, allowed on an elective basis, shows the continuing influence of the Committee of Seven.

Two years after the publication of the high school course, Superintendent Keeler constructed a course for the elementary schools in the State. This course was designed for six grades, though schools employing more than one teacher were allowed to apply to the Department of Public Instruction for permission to use the course for four added grades. The course was as follows:

TABLE XVII

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Elementary Schools, 1916[1]

Grade	Social studies
1 and 2	none
3	Oral geography
4	Geography
5	Geography
6	Geography
7	Geography, History
8	History, Civil government
9	Ancient history
10	Physical geography

In comparison with the previous State Course for elementary schools (1897), it is notable that no provision is made for State history or State civics. The history was not defined, although it may be assumed that United States history was called for, since it had appeared previously as seventh and eighth grade courses. The appearance of ancient history in the ninth grade, being followed neither by general, medieval, or modern history is difficult to explain on

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manual and Course of Study for Elementary Schools, 1916.

any basis other than that the subject was specified to conform with part of the program outlined by the Committee of Seven. It is difficult to find any evidence in this course that the social studies were considered a means of instructing pupils in citizenship.

The coming of World War I, however, caused considerable changes in the social studies, both on the elementary and secondary levels. In 1918 Superintendent Keeler directed teachers to instruct pupils about the causes of the war and to develop increased patriotism.[1] He reported to the Legislature that the war was going to be won by the side with the deepest convictions, and that

> The schools have, therefore, given much time to the establishing of the true understanding of what the war issues are. It is not sufficient to recite patriotic selections or sing national songs. The schools have therefore studied in serious and thorough fashion the causes which set the world ablaze....[2]

Efforts to increase patriotism during the war period and immediately after exceeded the efforts to accomplish a like end which were made in the 1890's by Superintendents Pattengill and Hammond. One of the influences which increased the post war emphasis upon citizenship and patriotic teaching was the American Legion. This organization, in cooperation with the National Education Association, urged

---

[1] Annual Report, 1918, pp. 10-11.

[2] Ibid.

all schools in the country to adopt the American Education Week, a period during which patriotism was to be stressed. Superintendent Johnson cooperated with the program, writing to Michigan teachers that Monday, December 5th the "Flag" was to be studied, Tuesday "American Ideals" were to be stressed, Wednesday was to emphasize "Our Language," Thursday, "Immigration," and Friday, "Naturalization."[1]

Public opinion in Detroit at the time expressed itself as favoring more patriotism in schools. Certain history teachers were accused of indoctrinating pupils with "non-acceptable political theories."[2] Superintendent Frank Cody informed the teachers of the city that they "must teach democratic principles...and...teach about government but not make (the pupil) either a socialist or a conservative."[3]

The increased patriotic emphasis can plainly be observed in the State Course of Study issued in 1922. The Course was designed for elementary schools. The social studies prescribed were as follows:

---

[1] Moderator Topics, "Department of Education," Dec. 1, 1921, p. 233.

[2] The Detroit Free Press, Dec. 5, 1921, p. 6.

[3] Ibid.

TABLE XVIII

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Elementary Schools, 1922[1]

Grade	Social studies
1	History stories
2	History stories
3	Citizenship, History stories, Geography
4	Citizenship, History stories, Geography
5	Citizenship, History stories, Geography
6	History, Citizenship, Geography
7	History, Citzenship, Geography
8	History, Civics
9	European History or Community civics
10	European History (modern)

Compared with the State course for elementary schools prescribed six years previously, time to be devoted to American history increased threefold and provision was made for twice the former amount given to civics. Thus the citizenship ends of education were to be fulfilled in this plan for the social studies.

The first two years a child attended school, he was

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manual and State Course of Study, 1922.

to be told stories of history, and teachers were enjoined to teach citizenship directly from grade three through grade seven.

European history was specified in a course which appears analagous to early general history. There was no mention of ancient, medieval, modern, or English history. In respect to this latter, English history, Superintendent Johnson directed teachers not to teach the subject nor to give United States history a pro-English bias.[1] Teachers were told, however, to celebrate the "birthday of the Magna Carta, June 15th, because British customs are ours."[2] A few months earlier an editorial in the Detroit Free Press stated that the schools in the State were showing "an excess of approval" for "Englishmen" and that America was not being glorified enough.[3]

No English history was prescribed in the State Course for small high schools (1923). On the other hand, it is apparent that one object of the course was to develop American citizenship in pupils. This course is given here:

---

[1] Moderator Topics, March 16, 1922, p. 481.

[2] Ibid.

[3] The Detroit Free Press, Dec. 18, part 5, p. 5.

TABLE XIX

Social Studies in the Course of Study for Small High Schools, 1923[1]

Grade	Required social studies	Elective social studies
7	History, Citizenship	Geography
8	History	Civics, Current Events
9	Community civics or European history	
10	European History modern or world	
11	American history	
12	Economics, Civics	

It is interesting to note the appearance of world history as a one year high school course. Provision was also made for a two year elective course in European history. Economics was specified for the first time in a regular high school course; previously, it was included in the course for rural high schools. The seventh, eighth, and ninth grade programs, along with eleventh grade American

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Course of Study for Small High Schools, 1923.

history and twelfth grade civics were prescribed in order that the State Course would be consistent with the legislative enactment which made certain instruction mandatory in all schools.

Legislative prescriptions in the social studies. The 1895 law which required all school districts to provide and display United States flags has been discussed. The interest of the Department of Public Instruction in this project continued unabated. Superintendent Luther Wright (1912) exhorted city schools to observe this legislation.[1] In 1914 Superintendent Keeler issued a circular to all administrators and teachers directing them to observe the centenary of the writing of the "Star Spangled Banner."[2] Schools were urged to join in one of the patriotic programs included in the circular. By 1918 there were 8027 flags displayed in the 7333 school districts of the State.[3]

Following the War the United States Flag Association sought to consolidate the efforts of all patriotic organizations which advocated the use of the flag as an instrument

---

[1] Biennial Report, 1911-12, pp. 204-207.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, The Flag, 1914.

[3] Biennial Report, Ibid., p. 109.

of civic instruction.[1] In behalf of such consolidation, the organization started (1927) to urge schools to adopt a "Flag Week" rather than the customary Flag Day.[2] The effect of their pressure may be observed in a resolution passed by the State Teachers Association in 1929. It was as follows:

> Resolved: that the Michigan Education Association hereby endorses the annual Flag project of the United States Flag Association as a patriotic youth educational movement deserving the encouragement and support of all teachers, principals, superintendents and other school authorities in the State of Michigan.[3]

Efforts on the part of State Superintendents to increase civic appreciations continued along other lines begun in the late 1890's. Special day observances were emphasized. Superintendent Fall (1902) distributed pamphlets containing material to be used during the observance of Pioneer Day.[4] In these, various programs were outlined whereby teachers could instruct pupils in early Michigan history. In 1908 Superintendent Wright suggested that all schools observe certain holidays by holding commemorative exercises which would "improve knowledge of history and

---

[1] Bessie Pierce, Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth, p. 4 f.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Michigan Education Journal, Proceedings of the Michigan Education Association, VI, (May, 1929), 547-548.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Pioneer Day Program, July 1, 1902.

increase good citizenship."[1] To aid in carrying out his suggestion he issued a booklet containing essays, poems, songs, and suggestions for observing Labor day, Pioneer day, Thanksgiving day, Christmas, Lincoln day, Washington and Lowell day, Arbor day, and Memorial day.[2]

In 1911 the Michigan Legislature gave support to the program by enacting that Lincoln's birthday, Washington's birthday and Columbus day were to be observed in the schools by proper and appropriate commemorative exercises.[3]

State Superintendent Keeler used the occasion of Lincoln's birthday, 1915, to distribute to all teachers a booklet containing the Gettysburg Address. Its stated purpose was to "impress them (pupils) as to what a privilege it is to be an American citizen."[4] In the same year the Legislature provided that it was the duty of every teacher in the public schools to cause the Declaration of Independence to be read to all pupils who were above the fifth grade.[5] This was to be done the twelfth of February, the twenty-second of February, and the twelfth of October.[6] Failure to comply

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Special Day Programs and Selections for the Schools of Michigan, Bulletin No. 31, 1908.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Public Acts, 1911, No. 11.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Bulletin No. 55, 1915, foreword.

[5] Public Acts, 1915, No. 223.

[6] Ibid.

with the act would lead to revocation of the teacher's certificate.[1] In the second section of the enactment it was provided that part of all eighth grade examinations would thereafter be the writing from memory the first verse of the Star Spangled Banner and the words of America.[2]

The revision of the General School Laws in 1927 illustrates the desire of the Legislature to continue and increase such methods of citizenship training. It was enacted that all teachers must arrange their work so that they could teach the significance of Lincoln's birthday, Washington's birthday, the seventeenth of September, date of adoption of the Federal Constitution, Columbus Day, Carleton's birthday, Theodore Roosevelt's birthday, and Liberty day.[3] The law is in effect in 1948.[4]

Direct legislative prescription of courses to be taught in the social studies was also made during this period. It is probable that such legislation came as the result of pressure on the schools and on the Legislature of a non-professional nature. Beginning in 1919 the Americanism Commission of the American Legion undertook to "secure the

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., sec. 2.

[3] Public Acts, 1927, No. 319.

[4] G.S.L., 1946, (15.397) sec. 24.

passage of laws requiring the teaching of Americanism in the schools...."[1] At its first convention in 1919, the Legion adopted a resolution recommending that "a course in citizenship constitute a part of the curriculum of every school in the country."[2] The second convention reaffirmed the stand taken by the Legion in 1919 and urged members to work in their respective states for the enactment of laws requiring not only the teaching of American history and civil government, but also that these subjects be required for graduation from all high schools.[3] In 1921 a resolution was passed which recommended to every state that "at least one year of American history and civil government be taught" and that all pupils attending schools should attend upon these studies.[4]

In this same year (1921) the Legislature enacted the

---

[1] Marquis James, A History of the American Legion, p. 80.

[2] Committee Reports and Resolutions adopted at the First National Convention of the American Legion, November 10, 11, and 12, 1919. Quoted in Pierce, op. cit., p. 35.

[3] Summary of the Proceedings of the Second National Convention of the American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio, September 27, 28, and 29, 1920. Quoted in Pierce, op. cit., pp. 54-55.

[4] The American Legion Weekly, "Americanism Body Asks Better Schools," III, (Feb. 4, 1921), 11. Quoted in Pierce, op. cit., p. 36.

following law:

> In all public, private, parochial, and denominational schools within the State of Michigan, there shall be given regular courses of instruction in the Constitution of the United States, in the Constitution of the State of Michigan, and in the history and present form of civil government of the United States, the State of Michigan, and the political subdivisions and municipalities of the State of Michigan. Such instruction in the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Michigan, and in civil government, shall begin not later than the opening of the eighth grade except in schools maintaining a junior high school in which case it may begin in the ninth grade and continue in the high school course to an extent to be determined by the Superintendent of Public Instruction.[1]

Changes in prescriptions for geography. By 1900 the Superintendents of Public Instruction had prescribed elementary geography courses which conformed both to the principles of object lessons and to Herbart's theories of correlation. In 1926, Superintendent Johnson wrote in the foreword of a special course of study for geography that earlier geography had been "dull."[2] He stated that the War had changed the emphasis teachers should give the subject, and henceforth, geography was to be an "instrument of socialization." It was to make pupils sympathetically understanding of people in all parts of the earth and should "lead to internationalism."[3] Three years later Superintendent Pearce said that geography should function as a socializing agency

---

[1] Public Acts, 1921, No. 12.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Geography in The Grades, 1926, foreword.

[3] Ibid.

because it stimulated "better and wider thinking."[1] He went on to state, in agreement with Superintendent Johnson, that the aim for pupils in geography courses was to be a sympathetic understanding of people all over the world.[2]

Superintendent Pearce engaged Miss Anna Hanratta, a graduate student in the School of Geography at Clark University to draw up the geography course for Michigan schools. The course included the following provisions:

TABLE XX

State Course of Study in Geography, 1929[3]

Grade	Geography
3	Oral geography based on out of doors observations
4B	Life in distant lands. Human geography
4A - 5B	North America
5A - 6B	Europe and possessions
6A	Asia
7B	Latin America and general geography
7A	U. S. and its world relations

[1] Ibid., 1929, foreword.

[2] Ibid., 1929, p. 3.

[3] Ibid.

Included in the course was a detailed subject matter outline, teaching suggestions, and suitable test and review questions covering the material. The course gives evidence of the three principle influences which affected geography in Michigan schools: 1) the object lesson approach is apparent in third grade oral geography, 2) correlation can be observed in the 7A course wherein history and geography were combined. Moreover the subject matter outline for grades six and seven consisted of type studies. 3) The influence of the more recent desire to give the study additional social and human values may be seen in the 4B course in human geography and in the 7A course in United States and its world relations.

Summary. 1) In the twentieth century the goals for education were "society centered" and described good citizenship in a democracy as a principal end worthy of pupil attainment. These goals were shaped by educational philosophers and by national educational groups.

2) The Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association formulated a course of study in history (1898) which set a pattern followed by several Michigan Superintendents. The Michigan high school course (1905) paralleled the Committee course in all but one year. Succeeding State courses gradually broke away from the pattern, until 1922, at which time there was no evidence of the influence of the Committee.

3) Courses in general history and political economy were prescribed for rural high schools in 1907.

4) At the time it was made mandatory that all schools other than those in city districts pursue the course of study prescribed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction (1913), Superintendent Keeler specified a six year secondary school course for the schools in the State. This course included two years of civics, three years of United States history, and one year each of ancient and modern history.

5) An emphasis upon the social studies - particularly in respect to their increasing good citizenship and patriotic feelings - was caused by World War I. This emphasis was continued after the war due to the influence of the American Legion, the United States Flag Association, and public opinion in general.

6) The State Course of Study for elementary schools (1922) and the Course of Study for Small High Schools (1923) plainly show the belief that good citizenship could be attained by pupils as a result of proper training in the social studies. In the 1922 course, citizenship or civics were specified as mandatory subjects in seven of the first ten grades in school. Moreover the total time given to the social studies was more than double the time so specified in the previous course (1916).

7) Flag display and programs built around the flag increased after 1900.

8) The State Superintendent increased the number of special day observances schools should allow. In 1911 the Legislature gave support to the program, and it increased such support in 1915 and again in 1927.

9) In 1921 the Legislature passed a law which provided that the State and Federal Constitutions and the State and Federal histories should be taught in all schools. It is highly probable that the law was passed as a result of the influence of the American Legion.

CHAPTER XI

PRESCRIPTIONS PERTAINING TO THE SOCIAL STUDIES 1931 - 1948

Influences which affected social studies objectives. The teaching of patriotism and citizenship was given greater emphasis in Michigan schools after 1930. This appears to be one of the results of the depression of the 1930's. Superintendent Pearce wrote to Michigan teachers (1931) that "it behooves us...as teachers of patriotism to lead each and every school child to know and to feel his personal responsibility to his country, especially in this trying hour."[1] A few months later he stated that teachers in the State should revive the type of patriotism instruction that was done during the war.[2]

After the goals of education had been reformulated (1933) by the Michigan Educational Planning Commission, the Curriculum Steering Committee decided to revise the Michigan State Course of Study in two respects: 1) to reconstruct the entire curriculum over a long period of time; and 2) to prepare

---

[1] Michigan Education Journal, "Letter to Teachers," Vol. 9, (Oct. 1931), p. 752.

[2] Ibid., Vol. 9, (Jan. 1932), p. 892.

immediately a number of curriculum bulletins and an instructional guide for elementary schools.[1] These latter materials were not to make up a course of study, rather they were described as a "tentative course...presenting good current practice."[2] The social studies were emphasized in these materials. The Committee stated that the syllabus was organized by separate subjects under the heading "social studies," however it was hoped that teachers would use every opportunity to weave together the contributions of the fields that deal with human relations and the factors that influence those relations.[3] Teachers were informed that "the trend throughout the country (was) to unify the social studies and to make them the core of the curriculum as a whole."[4]

Before a general revision of the entire curriculum could be made, Superintendent Elliott sought to make known to Michigan teachers the findings of current curriculum research.[5] Private grants of funds as well as a legislative appropriation financed the gathering of data concerning curriculums.[6]

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, A Program for Public Education in Michigan, Bulletin No. 402, 1936, p. 4.

[2]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools, Bulletin No. 30, 1936, p. 77.

[3]Ibid., p. 79.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Annual Report, 1939, p. 19.

[6]Ibid.; Public Acts, 1937, No. 65.

In 1937 the results of the survey were published in the pamphlet entitled What Does Research Say?[1] It was stated in this pamphlet that social studies programs in Michigan schools should be revised by local groups.[2] Moreover, it was pointed out that the programs should be reconstructed in order to be consistent with the social trends of the State.[3] These trends were listed as: 1) a widening gap between the wants and needs of the population and its ability to satisfy such needs, 2) the concentration of economic control without a corresponding acceptance of social responsibility, 3) a weakening of the controls for the integration of personality exercised by religion and the home, 4) the increasing complexity and strain of modern life, 5) the shifting population, 6) the struggle for international cooperation, 7) the clash of world political ideals, with its threat to American democracy, 8) the influence of machines and scientific techniques on the number and types of occupations, 9) the widening gap between "the expert" and "the masses," 10) the growing conviction of the masses concerning the desirability of education, and 11) the dis-

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, What Does Research Say?, Bulletin No. 308, 1937.

[2]Ibid., p. 123.

[3]Ibid.

covery of the public school by numerous pressure groups as an instrument for the control of the ideas of children.[1]

Michigan teachers were also told that the major objective of the social studies should be the development of good citizenship.[2] The Department of Public Instruction defined good citizenship as being the expression of certain fundamental social attitudes. These were listed as being: tolerance, honesty, consideration of others, obedience to standards of virtue, self control, initiative, large-group consciousness, knowledge of, interest and participation in national, state, and local affairs, ability to meet all types of persons graciously, ability to work with people harmoniously, ability to present a pleasing personality, ability to use proper table manners, posture and speech, willingness to assume family responsibility, and the ability to maintain a good home and promote pleasant home relationships.[3]

It seems evident that these many aims delegated to the area of the social studies defined desirable outcomes for education in general and not for the social studies alone. In recognition of this, the State Department noted

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 123-129.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

that objectives for the social studies did not apply exclusively to the social studies field.[1]

Teachers were informed, moreover, that factual subject matter should be minimized to include only those items which were "most important."[2] In 1939, Superintendent Elliott informed the Legislature that conditions in Michigan necessitated a "vastly extended" program to strengthen citizenship education within the schools.[3]

In spite of the policy of local regulation of school curriculums, the State Department of Public Instruction endeavored to guarantee (1939) enlarged citizenship programs in all schools.[4] The reason for this was stated as being the "needs of the times," which called for the schools to assist in maintaining public morale, conserving natural resources, and "preserving our American heritage."[5]

During the early years of World War II the major emphasis of the State Department was the urging of local groups to increase still further the citizenship and patriotic teaching in the schools.[6] The rationale for such pressure,

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Annual Report, 1939, p. 36

[4] Ibid., pp. 11, 31, 36.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Anmual Report, 1941, pp. 11-36.

made by Superintendent Elliott in 1941, was not unlike that made by Superintendent Keeler in 1918. Dr. Elliott's statement was that the object of the schools was to help children understand war aims and American ideals.[1] Such understanding was said to enable Michigan to make a maximum contribution to the war effort.[2]

In order to achieve accelerated citizenship programs in all schools in a manner consistent with the policy of local control over curriculums, a sub-committee of the Michigan Advisory Commission was formed. The purpose of the Committee was to coordinate the citizenship activities of all interested groups within communities.[3] Represented on the body were the Michigan State Grange, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Michigan Council of Churches, State Federation of Women's Clubs, League of Women Voters, American Legion Auxilliary, Daughters of the American Revolution, American Legion, Department of Public Instruction, Michigan Education Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars Auxilliary, American Association of University Women and the Michigan Congress of Parents and Teachers.[4]

In a bulletin distributed to teachers in 1942, the State

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Adult Education Laboratory, Citizenship Training Activities of Lay Organizations in Michigan, Bulletin 1004, 1941, foreword.

[4] Ibid.

Superintendent again defined the object of social studies training as being the achievement of social stability and the understanding of the war aims.[1] It was suggested that instruction about the war be included in courses in geography, history, and current affairs.[2]

As the war drew to a close, the State Department counseled Michigan teachers to develop instruction within the social studies which would help overcome social problems created or itensified by the war. The sub-committee on Intercultural Understanding, a division of the Curriculum Planning Committee, issued the pamphlet, Understanding Others, a Handbook on Intercultural Education.[3] This handbook presented to teachers the philosophy of social equality and the purposes of intercultural education.

In the absence of any prescriptions or suggestions made by the State Superintendent in the area of economics, the Conference of City Superintendents, meeting in Lansing in 1947, arrived at the following conclusions concerning the teaching of that subject: 1) that the facts of free enterprise should be taught in the ninth and twelfth grades, 2) that leaders from both labor and management should advise local curriculum building groups, 3) that such leaders

---

[1]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Wartime Action for Michigan Schools, Bulletin No. 3050, 1942, pp. 5-7.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Superintendent of Public Instruction, Understanding Others, a Handbook on Intercultural Education, Bulletin No. 344, 1946.

should be used in the social studies instructional programs, and 4) that students should study existing labor-management problems.[1]

Suggestions applying to the social studies. The Courses of Study issued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1922 and 1923 were the last direct prescriptions issued by that office which applied to the entire area of the social studies. The Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools (1936) included a statement of the new philosophy of curriculum construction, suggestions to teachers which pertained to educational psychology and child nature, suggestions as to means of using the community for building curriculums, and a grade by grade syllabus which listed desirable specific objectives and activities which might accomplish them.[2] First grade social studies, for example, were to accomplish the following objectives: 1) establish habits of courtesy, neatness and helpfulness, 2) increase interest in home life, 3) offer a better opportunity for the child to understand activities of the community, and 4) give opportunity for participation in group activities. Activities suggested were 1) help care for pets, 2) make models of farm and home, 3) tell stories about

---

[1] Michigan Education Journal, XXV, (Nov. 1947), 221

[2] Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools, 1936.

the life of people in the home, etc.[1]

Geography as a separate subject was introduced in the fourth grade, as was a beginning study of the history of Michigan. In the fifth grade the principal objectives related to the development of desirable civic attitudes. It was stated: "If the United States forms a part of the subject matter content in geography for this grade, Michigan geography and history should be integrated...."[2] The suggestions for the seventh and eighth grades included United States history and civics.[3]

The Department of Public Instruction seemed to depend more upon the influence of its bulletins as guides in specific areas of the social studies than upon the syllabus. In 1936 the Superintendent published Geography for the Grades, Methods and Materials for Use with the Michigan State Course of Study in Geography, Michigan the Peninsular State, and Training for Character and Citizenship.[4]

In 1937 the Instructional Service Series was started. This series was made up of a number of mimeographed bulletins which included suggestions for the development of teaching

---

[1] Ibid., p. 87.

[2] Ibid., p. 116.

[3] Ibid., p. 142.

[4] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Geography in the Grades, Bulletin No. 47, 1936; Michigan the Peninsular State, 1936; Training for Character and Citizenship, Bulletin No. 33, 1936.

units and statements of the philosophy of local curriculum construction. A bulletin of the series which related to the social studies was A Cooperative Program of Citizenship Education.[1]

Michigan Today (1938) was a publication directed toward increasing teachers' knowledge of the State.[2] Thereafter, during the decade 1938 - 1948, the Department sought to influence the various local curriculum building groups by the continuing publication of many bulletins relating to the social studies. Consistent with State policy, however, none of the bulletins made instruction in any of these studies mandatory.

Legislative prescription in the social studies. During the period 1931 - 1947 the Michigan Legislature enacted one prescription in the field of the social studies. This made mandatory in all high schools the teaching of a one semester course in civics (1931).[3] A recommendation for such a required course had been made prior to 1931 by such non-professional patriotic groups as the Daughters of the American Revolution and the American Legion.[4] The American

---

[1] Superintendent of Public Instruction, A Cooperative Program of Citizenship Education, Bulletin No. 3033, 1941.

[2] Superintendent of Public Instruction, Michigan Today, Bulletin No. 307, 1938.

[3] Public Acts, 1931, No. 205.

[4] Michigan Education Journal, Vol. 9, (May, 1932), 1105; Bessie L. Pierce, Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth, p. 46.

Bar Association also urged the requirement.[1] In 1926 these groups coordinated their efforts in order to promote the instruction of civics in all schools in the country.[2]

In Michigan the efforts of the American Legion apparently exceeded the efforts of the other groups, for the principal of a city high school who was a member of the Legion carried to the Michigan High School Principal's Association the proposition that such a civics course should be made legally mandatory.[3] The influence of the Principal's Association in addition to the pressure exerted by the Legion was said to have caused the bill to pass through the Legislature.[4] The enactment as passed provided:

> In all Michigan high schools, offering 12 grades of work, a 1 semester course of study of 5 recitation periods per week shall be given in civics, said course covering the form and functions of our federal and state governments and of counties, cities and villages. Throughout the course the rights and responsibilities of citizens shall be stressed. No diploma shall be issued by any high school after the first semester of 1933 to any student unless such student shall have successfully completed said course....[5]

Section two of the law provided that a course in civics should be taught in all county normal schools and in all

---

[1]Pierce, loc. cit.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Statement by G. Robert Koopman, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, personal interview, June 18, 1948.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Public Acts, 1931, No. 205.

colleges which received public money.[1]

In 1945, on the recommendation of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the act was amended to the effect that the civics course should not be a prerequisite to graduation for any high school student enlisted or inducted into the armed services during World War II, nor for any county normal or college student honorably discharged from the armed services after three or more months of military service.[2]

Summary. 1) During the period 1931 - 1948 citizenship and patriotic goals for education continued to be emphasized in Michigan. The depression of the 1930's caused Superintendent Pearce to stress these objectives. During the later 1930's, citizenship objectives were formulated in order to help children deal successfully with the social problems of the times. With the advent of World War II the State Department of Public Instruction sought to influence community program building groups to set citizenship objectives in order to provide understanding of the war effort. The post war emphasis upon the goals was occasioned by the desire of the Department to help pupils solve the social and political problems arising as a result of the war.

2) After 1933 no direct prescriptions were made by

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Public Acts, 1945, No. 203.

the Superintendent of Public Instruction in the area of the social studies. However local program building groups were advised to make the social studies the core of their school curriculums.

3) The State Department advised Michigan schools (1937) to revise their social studies programs in order that such programs would be consistent with social changes in the State. However no specific suggestions relative to instruction in the studies were made.

4) The State Department defined the meaning of good citizenship (1937). The definition, in terms of desirable individual attitudes and personality traits, was such that it was a worthy goal for education in general. Accordingly, teachers were informed that the objective did not apply exclusively to the social studies area of the curriculum. It appears that the State Department did expect that the social studies curriculums primarily would include experiences for pupils which would lead to the realization of the citizenship goal.

5) It is evident that the State Department did not suggest to schools that pupils' acquisition of knowledge in the fields of geography, history, civics, economics, and sociology should be the primary purpose of instruction in such subjects.

6) In a manner consistent with the philosophy of curriculum revision, the Michigan Advisory Commission sought

to insure the inclusion of civic objectives in all local curriculums by means of coordinating the citizenship activities of all interested groups in each community.

7) The Department of Public Instruction sought to influence the teaching of the social studies by the publication of many bulletins and booklets. These contained suggestions relative to social studies objectives, methods, and some subject matter content directed to teachers.

8) The last legislative prescription in the area of the social studies was in 1931 at which time was enacted a law directing all high schools to teach a one semester course in civics. Pressure favoring the passage of such a law emanated from several non-professional sources. However, it is likely that the American Legion had the most influence in securing the passage of the law in Michigan.

CHAPTER XII

CONCLUSIONS

I

The evidence which has been presented in the preceeding pages permits certain conclusions to be drawn concerning the development and exercise of State control of the social studies in Michigan. It has been pointed out that in the United States the authority over schools and the subjects taught in schools resides in the several states. Since 1835 this responsibility of directing education within the State of Michigan has been recognized and executed by means of Constitutional provisions and legislative enactments. The courts of Michigan have been consistent in defining education as a function of the State. However, in the absence of legislative directions specifying the courses of study which the schools should teach, the courts have allowed school districts practically plenary power in defining the instruction which should be included in the curriculums.

During that part of the pre-State period, 1787 to 1834, control over the courses of study was exercised in part by the central Territorial authority, and in part it was dele-

gated to local officers. The period of extreme centralization lasted from 1817 to 1829. During this period instruction in schools established under the Catholepistemiad and University of Michigan was determined by these central bodies. The law of 1827, which provided for the establishment of schools in townships, specified which subjects the schools should offer. Territorial supervision over this instruction was provided for in the offices of township trustees. These officers were to examine teachers and inspect schools.

However in 1829, a Territorial statute legalized the district system. Control over curriculums was passed from central to local authorities. The only inference of legislative interest in the nature of subject matter presented in schools can be seen in a law of 1833 which specified the subjects in which teacher candidates needed to show proficiency in order to be qualified to teach in the schools of Detroit.

After Michigan became a State there were no direct legislative prescriptions in the area of the social studies until near the start of the twentieth century. However, beginning in 1835, power over courses of study was delegated to several different agencies. The Superintendent of Public Instruction was given broad power to send to local school officers such directions concerning the course of study as he deemed proper. There was no corresponding obligation of

the districts to follow the Superintendent's suggestions. School boards of the city of Detroit, of contiguous districts which combined to establish a school, and of districts which had the right to establish high schools were given specific authority to determine the courses of study to be pursued in their several schools.

A measure of direction over the instruction offered in the schools of the State was exercised by the State Superintendent (1835 - 1860) by means of his right to inspect the branches of the University, through his compilation of a preferred list of textbooks which district authorities were urged to follow, and because of his control over the training of teachers in institutes and in the State Normal School. In respect to this latter, the Superintendent was made a member of the State Board of Education which determined the curriculum for the Normal School.

Beginning in 1861 Superintendent Gregory described the courses which all schools should teach and urged that local administrators provide the courses suggested. Efforts to insure the inclusion of State prescriptions in all courses of study led to many suggestions which were aimed at making supervision of the local schools more effective. Successive Superintendents, the State Teachers Association, and county authorities all urged that some means of efficient county supervision of schools be provided. Factors which militated against such supervision were the desire for complete local

control of school matters and the disorganized programs of many of the schools during the period. County supervision was provided legally, however, beginning in 1867. Thereafter such supervision was improved by enactments in 1887 and in 1891.

State Superintendents worked through the county authorities to unify instruction in all of the district schools of the State. Methods for accomplishing such uniformity included directing county officers to encourage use of the same textbooks, directing them to encourage the use of State courses by means of naming textbook pages which embodied material pupils should study, requesting the administration of county-wide eighth grade examinations, and exercising control over the certificating examinations of teacher candidates.

Evidence of a legislative intent to have certain social studies taught in schools may be found in the law of 1867, which created the office of county superintendent, and the law of 1887 which augmented the powers of county secretaries. The first of these enactments provided that county superintendents could not license any person to teach school who had not passed a satisfactory examination in geography. The second law provided that all teachers licensed by county secretaries had to show proficiency in geography, United States history, and civil government.

During the entire nineteenth century Superintendents

of Public Instruction had no authority over courses taught in city districts. Various Superintendents did try to influence city boards of education and city superintendents to follow the State courses of study. Methods used by the State officers to accomplish this end included exhortation and several requests for city teachers and administrators to aid in the construction of State courses.

In 1913 the authority of the Superintendent of Public Instruction over courses of study in all but city schools became specific. It was made the duty of schools to follow the instructional prescriptions of the State officer. In administering the State programs of instruction, Superintendents worked through county commissioners. Eighth grade examinations were prepared by the central office and were based upon prescribed subject matter; increasing power to specify requirements for teachers' certificates (to 1935) made it possible for the Superintendent to determine the subject matter proficiency which teachers had to attain; authority over instruction given in all teacher institutes and over the one year course of study in county normal schools gave the Superintendent power to direct some of the teacher training in the State.

In 1933, apparently as a result of changing conceptions of the function of the curriculum, because of the history of strong local authority exercised over instruction, because of new theories of the nature of the educative pro-

cess, and due to the depression of the early 1930's, the methods of expressing State control over the course of study changed.

There had been a trend, noticeable as early as 1862, which defined the objectives of education as being the development in pupils of worthy citizenship. During the 1880's and 1890's this trend became more pronounced, and during the twentieth century it was emphasized by educational philosophers and by national educational committees. One of the reasons for the change of curriculum control in Michigan seems to have been the desire on the part of members of the State Department of Public Instruction to provide more adequately for the realization in pupils of this "society centered," citizenship goal of public education.

Moreover Superintendent Elliott believed (1935) that the change to local curriculum control was consistent with the desires and practices of many school districts. The tradition of local control over courses of study, in the absence of Constitutional or legislative prescriptions, was legalized by the famous Kalamazoo case in 1874. The practice of many school districts, as indicated by many nearly futile attempts of the Superintendents of Public Instruction to unify instruction throughout the State, was to exercise local discretion in defining curriculums.

Another reason for the change seems to have been a conviction held by State officers that realization of

socially acceptable goals of education was not guaranteed in pupils by having them acquire given amounts of subject matter knowledge.

The final reason for the change was described as the necessary curtailment of many activities of the State Department of Public Instruction caused by the depression.

The nature of the change, as stated, was to give education back to the localities. The Superintendents no longer prescribed courses of study. Rather, they endeavored to encourage local communities to construct curriculums. The function of the State Department was conceived of as being to stimulate such local curriculum construction, to guide and advise, and to help evaluate the results of co-operative community construction of courses. Schools were encouraged to formulate their own patterns of instruction within the broad framework of State goals which had been determined by a non-professional group.

II

None of the social studies were prescribed as school subjects prior to 1861. The Territorial and State Legislatures did not mention the subjects directly, although, as noted, the Territorial Legislature directed that Detroit teachers should know the subject of geography in order to qualify for a license to teach.

Nevertheless the social studies appeared as part of the

courses of study in early schools. Before 1830 geography was an accepted, though not a basic, subject offered in schools. Influences which tended to popularize the study during the early years of Statehood were the entrance requirements of the branches and of the University.

History appeared in a school curriculum as early as 1830. However, it seems that the subject was not widely popular as a school course until about 1860. Influences which caused it to increase in popularity were its inclusion in the course of studies of the University of Michigan and the fact that it was taught in private colleges and union schools, thereby giving historical knowledge to teachers receiving training in those higher institutions.

There is no evidence that civil government was taught in the common schools in the State before 1860, notwithstanding the fact that the course was part of the curriculum for the University branches and that the Legislature of the State emphasized the importance of civic instruction in the enactment which established the State Normal School.

The approach and beginning of the Civil War caused the State Superintendent to express the importance of citizenship aims for all of education. In the courses of study specified in 1861 and 1862, however, there was no evidence that the social studies should help pupils to realize these expressed aims for education.

Beginning with social studies courses defined during the

time of the Civil war and lasting until 1890 it was directed that geography be taught in a manner consistent with the prevalent theories of object lessons. In 1893 the effects of Herbartian theories of correlation and type-studies can be seen in the specifications for the course.

It was not until 1897 that history occupied a major part of the State Course of Study. It is evident that at that time the State Superintendent sought to help pupils attain the citizenship aims for education through the prescribed courses in history.

Civil government courses prescribed during the 1880's and 1890's, give evidence of a growing intent on the part of State authorities to inculcate patriotism and to "Americanize" school children. Forces which caused the subject to be directed toward such ends were immigration and the desire of State Superintendents to increase in pupils feelings of patriotism.

Political economy was urged as a necessary school subject prior to 1900, however the great majority of the schools of the State did not offer the course.

During the entire latter half of the nineteenth century it is apparent that district schools deviated considerably from the specified State courses of study. It appears also that State Superintendents tried consistently to convince them to follow the State courses.

Specifications within the area of the social studies

from 1900 to 1930 were influenced by several forces. The Legislature encouraged the practice of special day observations (1911), and it enacted a law which made mandatory the teaching of the State and the Federal Constitutions and the State and Federal histories (1921). Provision that flags should be displayed in schools was enacted in 1895. All of these legal directions seem to have come as the result of an increasing desire to realize through education in general and the social studies in particular certain patriotic and citizenship objectives.

Prescriptions made by the State Superintendents during this period (1900 - 1930) were influenced significantly in favor of the inclusion of European history courses because of the report of the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association. World War I caused an obvious attempt to increase the emphasis on patriotic and citizenship objectives within the social studies. The courses of 1922 and 1923 included more of these subjects than any previous State course. Teachers were directed to stress instruction in citizenship and in civics.

The State courses of 1922 and 1923 contained the last State Department prescriptions in the field of the social studies. With the changed philosophy of curriculum construction which made itself felt in 1933, the Superintendent of Public Instruction sought only to encourage local groups to provide satisfactory training in the social studies

by advising them to make such studies the core of their curriculums.

The only direct prescription during the period 1931 to 1948 was made by the Legislature and provided that all high schools of the State should offer a one semester course in civics. It seems apparent that this enactment came as the result of pressures brought by non-professional interest groups, and that the principal force came from the American Legion.

The Superintendent of Public Instruction endeavored to encourage the inclusion of certain civic constants in the courses of study formulated by localities. These constants were in the nature of objectives which provided that citizenship be emphasized, that pupils be prepared to solve social problems of the times, and that patriotism be inculcated. Suggestions as to methods by which such objectives could be attained by the school population did not include the necessity of mastering subject matter within the area of the social studies. The suggestions were that teachers endeavor better to understand the needs and interests of children in order that activities could be engaged in which would lead to the formation of socially acceptable habits and attitudes, and that all community organizations cooperate with the community schools in defining specific curricular objectives. Such local cooperation in the defining of instructional aims, it was believed, would of necessity

cause the inclusion of all worthy State and national goals in the objectives for local schools.

From the foregoing it appears that certain judicial decisions, certain legislative enactments, and certain prescriptions by Superintendents of Public Instruction, to whom was delegated authority over courses of study, have had definite effects upon the social studies in the schools of the State. On the basis of what has happened, therefore, it is fair to conclude that further decisions, other legislation, and future directions by Superintendents of Public Instruction will affect them in the years to come.

Cases Cited

Attorney General ex rel Kies et al. v. Lowrey et al., 131 Mich. 539; 92 N.W. 289.

Attorney General v. Preston, 56 Mich. 177; 22 N.W. 261.

Belles v. Burr, 76 Mich. 1.

Child Welfare Society of Flint v. Kennedy School District, 220 Mich. 290; 189 N.W. 1002.

Collins v. Detroit, 195 Mich. 330; 161 N.W. 905.

Common Council of Detroit v. Engel, 202 Mich. 536; 168 N.W. 462.

Dasziewicz v. Board of Education of Detroit, 301 Mich. 212; 3 N.W. 2nd. 71.

In re School District No. 6, Paris and Wyoming Townships, Kent County, 284 Mich. 132.

Knabe et al. v. Board of Education of West Bay City, 67 Mich. 262; 34 N.W. 568.

MacQueen v. Port Huron City Commission, 194 Mich. 328; 160 N.W. 627.

Minersville School District v. Gobitis, 310 U.S. 586; 60 S. Ct. 1010.

People v. Stanley, 81 Colo. 276; 255 Pac. 610.

Public Schools of the City of Battle Creek v. Kennedy, 245 Mich. 585.

Robinson v. Washtenaw Circuit Judge, 228 Mich. 225.

Stuart v. School District No. 1 of Kalamazoo, 30 Mich. 69.

Van Fleet v. Oltman, 224 Mich. 241.

West Virginia State Board of Education et al. v. Barnette et al. 319 U.S. 624; 63 S. Ct. 1178.

Zacharias v. Board of Education of the City of Detroit, 154 Mich. 584; 118 N.W. 606.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Acts of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, 1835-1837.

Adult Education Laboratory. Citizenship Training Activities of Lay Organizations in Michigan. Lansing: Department of Public Instruction, Bulletin No. 1004, 1941.

Cardinal Principles of Education. Washington D.C.: U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin 35, 1918.

Common Council of Detroit. Report, 1813.

Constitution of the State of Michigan. 1835, 1850, 1908.

Detroit Board of Education. Annual Report. 1842, 1918-1919.

Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan. 1838, 1848, 1863, 1871.

Journal of the Legislative Council. 1824, 1826, 1832.

Laws of the Territory of the United States Northwest of the Ohio.

Michigan Historical Collection. Lansing: Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society, Wynkoop, Hallenbeck, Crawford Co. I, XXXVI.

Report of the Committee on Secondary School Studies. Washington D.C.: Bureau of Education, 1893.

Proceedings of the State Teachers Association. Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Lansing, 1852-1897; Michigan Education Journal, 1897-1948.

School Laws of Michigan. Lansing, 1864, 1876, 1898, 1921, 1946.

Session Laws of the State of Michigan. 1837-1948.

State Board of Education. Annual Report. 1890.

Superintendent of Public Instruction. A Cooperative Program of Citizenship Education. Bulletin No. 3033, 1941.

A Partial Appraisal of the Michigan Curriculum Program. Bulletin No. 3007, 1938.

A Program for Public Education in Michigan. Bulletin No. 402, 1936.

Annual Report. 1837-1945.

Annual Report of the Curriculum Planning Committee. Bulletin No. 340, 1944-1945.

County Normal School Course of Study. Bulletin No. 601, 1935.

County Teachers' Examinations and Eighth Grade Examinations. Bulletin No. 16, 1911.

Course of Study for Common Schools. 1862.

Course of Study for Common Schools. 1881.

Course of Study for County Normal Institutes. Bulletin No. 18, 1908.

Course of Study for Graded Schools. 1876.

Course of Study for High Schools of Michigan. Bulletin No. 12, 1914.

Course of Study for Michigan Schools. 1861.

Course of Study for Small High Schools. 1923.

Democracy and the Great War. Bulletin No. 20, 1918.

Directions to County Secretaries on the Course of Study. 1883.

Examination Form No. 8. 1909.

Examination Questions for State and County Certificates and Eighth Grade Diplomas. 1908.

Geography in the Grades; State Course of Study in Geography. Bulletin No. 47, 1926.

Helping Uncle Sam, Lessons in Patriotic Service. Bulletin No. 24, 1918.

High School Manual and Course of Study. Bulletin No. 12, 1928.

Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools. Bulletin No. 301, 1936.

Instructional Practices in Elementary Schools. Bulletin No. 306, 1938.

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. Bulletin No. 55, 1915.

Manual and Course of Study. 1897.

Manual and Course of Study. 1922.

Manual and Course of Study. Bulletin No. 12, 1928.

Manual and Course of Study for Elementary Schools. 1916.

Michigan Souvenir. 1897.

Michigan the Peninsular State. 1936.

Michigan Today. Bulletin No. 307, 1938.

Michigan's Future Citizens. 1937.

Michigan Territorial Laws. I, II, III.

Pioneer Day Program. 1902.

School Officers' Handbook on Finance - Transportation - New Legislation. Bulletin No. 343, 1945.

Should Youth Challenge the Secondary School? Bulletin No. 318, 1941.

Sketch of the Life of President Wilson. 1918.

Special Day Exercises. 1897.

Special Day Programs and Selections for the Schools of Michigan. Bulletin No. 31, 1908.

State Manual and Course of Study. Bulletin No. 14, 1914.

State Manual and Course of Study for District Schools. 1890.

State Manual and Course of Study for High Schools. 1905.

State Manual and Course of Study for Rural Schools. 1907.

The Flag. 1914.

The Michigan Program of Curriculum Revision. Bulletin No. 305, 1935.

The War Message. Bulletin No. 14, 1917.

Training for Character and Citizenship. Bulletin No. 33, 1936.

Understanding Others, a Handbook on Intercultural Education. Bulletin 344, 1946.

Wartime Action for Michigan Schools. Bulletin No. 3050, 1942.

What Does Research Say? Bulletin No. 308, 1937.

Secondary Sources

Books

Brudney, Victor. "Legislative Regulation of the Social Studies in Secondary Schools," in Ninth Yearbook of School Law. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1941. Pp. 140-176.

Coe, George A. Educating for Citizenship. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. Pp. 205.

Cooley, Thomas McIntyre. Michigan. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1899. Pp. 376.

Cox, William J. Primer of Michigan History. Lansing: Henry R. Pattengill, Publisher, 1886. Pp. 102.

Cubberley, Ellwood P. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1919. Pp. 519.

Dewey, John and Evelyn. Schools of Tomorrow. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1915. Pp. 316.

Edwards, Newton. The Courts and the Public Schools. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1933. Pp. 591.

Garber, Lee O. Education as a Function of the State: Its Legal Implications. Educational Monograph No. 3. Minneapolis: Educational Test Bureau, 1934. Pp. 99.

Hamilton, Otto Templar. The Courts and the Curriculum. Contributions to Education, No. 255. New York: Bureau of Publications Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1927. Pp. 168.

Hamilton, Robert R. and Mort, Paul R. The Law and Public Education. Chicago: The Foundation Press, 1941. Pp. 579.

Jackson, George L. The Development of State Control of Public Instruction in Michigan. Lansing: Michigan Historical Commission, 1926. Pp. 376.

James, Marquis. A History of the American Legion. New York: William Green and Co., 1923. P. 80.

Johnson, Henry. Teaching of History. New York: Macmillan Company, 1940. Pp. 467.

McLaughlin, Andrew C. History of Higher Education in Michigan. Washington D.C.; Government Printing Office, 1891. Pp. 179.

Koehlman, Arthur B. Public Education in Detroit. Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co., 1925. Pp. 263.

Pierce, Bessie L. Citizens' Organizations and the Civic Training of Youth. Report of the Commission on the Social Studies, Part III. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933. Pp. 428.

Rosalita, Sister Mary, I.H.A. Education in Detroit Prior to 1850. Lansing: Michigan Historical Commission, 1928. Pp. 364.

Smith, W. L. Education in Michigan. Lansing: W. S. George and Co., 1881. Pp. 157.

Ten Brook, Andrew. American State Universities. Cincinnati: Robert Clark, 1875, P. 98.

Wesley, Edgar Bruce. Teaching the Social Studies. Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1942. Pp. 652.

Magazines

Dawson, Edgar. "The History Inquiry, Report of the Director," The Historical Outlook, XV (June, 1924), 237-276.

Michigan Education Journal, IV (1855), 366; III (1859), 284; VI (Oct., 1928), 117; VI (Nov., 1928), 185; VI (May, 1929), 547-548; Vol. 9 (Oct., 1931), 752; Vol. 9 (Jan., 1932), 892; Vol. 9 (May, 1932), 1005; XXV (Nov., 1947), 221.

Moderator Topics, (March 24, 1921), 449; (Dec., 1, 1921), 233; (March 16, 1922), 481.

Newspapers

Detroit Free Press, Feb. 17, 1836; Dec. 5, 1921, p. 6; Dec. 18, 1921, part 5, p. 5.

Detroit Gazette, Aug. 1, 1817; Oct. 17, 1818; Jan. 15, 1819; Feb. 26, 1819; Jan. 18, 1822.

Northwestern Journal, May 20, 1830.

APPENDIX

Act for the Establishment of Common Schools[1]
April 12, 1827

Be it enacted by the Legislative Council of the Territory of Michigan, that every township within this territory, containing fifty families or householders, shall be provided with a good schoolmaster or schoolmasters, of good morals, to teach children to read and write, and to instruct them in the English or French language, as well as in arithmetic, orthography, and decent behavior, for such term of time, as shall be equivalent to six months for one school in each year.

Sec. 4 That the inhabitants of said townships respectively, shall choose a suitable number of persons within their respective townships, not exceeding five, who shall be inspectors of schools in said townships respectively; which inspectors shall examine the teachers, and approve or disapprove of the same, and also shall visit the several schools within their respective townships, quarterly or oftener, if they deem it necessary; three or more of said inspectors shall be competent, both to examine the teachers and the respective schools, and no person shall be employed as a teacher in any one of the schools, in any of the townships or districts in the territory, who shall not have been previouslv examined by the inspectors aforesaid, and have received a certificate, signed by at least two of said inspectors, importing that he is duly qualified to teach the school for which he may be an applicant, and is of good moral character; and it shall be the further duty of the inspectors to examine into the state of schools in their respective townships, both as it respects the proficiency of the scholars, and the good order and regularity of the schools; and from time to time to give their advice; and if any person shall presume to keep such school, without a certificate as aforesaid, he or she shall forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding two hundred dollars, to be recovered in any court having jurisdiction thereof, one moiety thereof to the informer, and the other moiety to the use of the poor of the township where such school may be kept.

---

[1] Territorial Laws of Michigan, 1827, pp. 472-477.

Sec. 11 That nothing in this act contained shall be so construed as to make it obligatory on any township of this territory, to employ teachers as provided by this act: Provided, that the electors at the annual township meeting by a vote of two-thirds of all the electors present at such meeting, shall determine that they will not comply with the provisions of this act for that year.

An Act to provide for Common Schools in the City of Detroit[1]
April 30, 1833

Be it enacted by the Legislative Council of the Territory of Michigan, That at a special meeting of qualified voters of the city of Detroit, on such day as the common council shall appoint, in the month of May next, of which due notice shall be given, there be chosen six persons to be commissioners of common schools, six persons to be directors of common schools, and six persons to be inspectors of common schools in Detroit, who shall continue in office until their offices shall be vacated as hereinafter provided....

Sec. 9 It shall be the duty of the directors of schools in Detroit, to employ a suitable and competent person who shall have obtained a certificate as hereinafter prescribed, to teach the schools hereby established in the respective districts, at such pay per month, or for each quarter, or per annum for each scholar, and for such terms of time as they shall judge requisite;.....

Sec. 13 The inspectors of common schools in Detroit shall examine the person or persons who propose to teach any common school established as aforesaid, and if they deem him or her entitled to it, may give him or her a certificate in the following form, to wit: 'The undersigned, inspectors of common schools in Detroit, have, at his request, examined (naming him or her) of the _____ of _____, in the county _____, M.T., and find him (or her) competent to teach spelling, reading, writing, common arithmetic, English Grammar, geography, and book-keeping, and we do allow him (or her) to become a teacher in any common school in Detroit, on such terms as may be agreed upon by him, (or her) and the directors of the common schools in Detroit.' This certificate to remain in force two years and no longer; any three

---

[1] Territorial Laws of Michigan, III, 1283.

of said inspectors may grant the certificate.

Sec. 14 The Commissioners, directors, and inspectors aforesaid, shall together form a school committee, whose duty it shall be quarterly to visit said common school, to advise and counsel the teacher in case of difficulty of the welfare of the schools, and to enquire into and adjust all complaints, either by the teacher or scholar; and said committee, or a majority thereof, may make such general rules and regulations respecting the hours for teaching, and the books to be used, as they may deem wise and prudent, not being inconsistent with the laws of the U. S. of this Territory, and any member of said committee may visit said schools as often as he may deem proper.

The Number of Districts in which social studies instruction was given[1]

Date	No. of districts reporting	No. teaching geography	No. teaching U. S. History	No. teaching Civil Government	No. teaching General History
1883	6226	6063	5088	1884	-
1884	6375	6345	5431	2176	-
1885	6521	6456	5716	2711	-
1886	6897	6531	5871	3333	-
1887	6686	6644	6066	3444	-
1888	6953	6947	6294	3704	-
1889	7050	7050	5971	3795	-
1890	7111	7111	6151	3959	-
1891	6945	6859	6369	4336	-
1892	7133	7052	6440	4370	-
1893	6786	6644	6240	4417	-
1895	6857	6687	6407	5135	-
1897	6847	6870	6631	5527	-
1898	6937	6788	6639	5444	-
1899	7041	6795	6648	5673	-
1900	6933	6841	6719	5758	-
1901	6797	6623	6473	5495	1930
1902	6966	6926	6631	5472	1702
1903	7035	6950	6694	5701	1717
1904	6966	6948	6701	5492	1520
1905	7046	6911	6667	5608	1435
1906	7059	6795	6665	5558	1435

[1] These figures appear in the Annual Reports of the Superintendents of Public Instruction for the years listed.

The Number of Districts in which social studies instruction was given (continued)

Date	No. of districts reporting	No. teaching geography	No. teaching U. S. History	No. teaching Civil Government	No. teaching General History
1907	7184	7093	6835	5849	1494
1908	7138	7083	6742	5914	1371
1909	7140	7023	6809	5959	1409
1910-11	7102	7084	6910	6180	no longer reported
1912	7165	7111	6911	6494	-
1913	7176	7172	6999	6606	-
1914-15	7070	7052	6851	6317	-
1916	7142	7121	6950	6435	-
1917	Reports discontinued				

Specimen Daily Programme for Country Schools, 1879[1]

Begin A.M.	Time Minutes	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V
9:00	5	Opening				
9:05	10	Reading	Reading	Arith.	Arith.	Arith.
9:15	15	Printing	Reading	Arith.	Arith.	Arith.
9:30	20	Printing	Slate Writing	Arith.	Arith.	Arith.
9:50	20	Numbers	Numbers	Arith.	Arith.	Arith
10:10	20	Numbers	Numbers	Geography	Geography	Arith.
10:30	15	Recess				
10:45	15	Numbers	Numbers	Geography	Geography	Geography
11:00	20	Drawing	Drawing	Geography	Geography	Geography
11:20	20	Writing	Drawing	Geography	Geography	Geography
11:40	20	Spelling	Reading	Arith.	Arith.	Geography
P.M.						
1:00	20	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	History
1:20	20	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Grammar
1:40	10	Reading	Reading	Reading	Reading	Grammar
1:50	10	Printing	Reading	Reading	Grammar	Grammar
2:00	15	Reading	Reading	Reading	Grammar	Grammar
2:15	15		Writing			
2:30	15	Recess				

[1] From "Outline of Institute Work," 1879, published as part of the Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1879, p. 77.

Specimen Daily Programme for Country Schools, 1879
(continued)

Begin	Time	Class I	Class II	Class III	Class IV	Class V
P.M.						
2:45	20	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling	Grammar	**Grammar**
3:05	20	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling	**Grammar**	Spelling
3:25	5	**Spelling**	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling	Spelling
3:30	10	Copying	**Spelling**	**Spelling**	Spelling	Spelling
3:40	10	Copying	Copying	Copying	**Spelling**	**Spelling**
3:50	10		Oral Lessons			

The heavy faced type (here underlined) indicates recitations, the common type, the time when classes should study particular subjects. The Study Programme is of as much importance as the recitation. Teach children to study.

OUTLINE OF INSTITUTE WORK, 1879[1]

UNITED STATES HISTORY

I Outline Map of North America.
Coasts, mountains, rivers, West Indies.

II Aborigines.
1. Prehistoric.
2. Indians - color, size, occupation, dwellings, implements, weapons, money, language, picture-writing, government, religion, ceremonies, etc.

III Discoveries.
1. Northmen.
2. Columbus - theories, voyages.
3. The Cabots.
4. Vespucci.

IV Explorations.
1. Spanish - results:
   a. Ponce de Leon;
   b. Balboa;
   c. de Soto.
2. French - results:
   a. Verazzani;
   b. Cartier;
   c. Champlain;
   d. Jesuits;
   e. Marquette;
   f. La Salle.
3. English - results:
   a. Drake;
   b. Raleigh;
   c. London Company;
   d. Plymouth Company.
4. Dutch - Hudson - results.

V Settlements and Colonies.
1. Virginia - name, John Smith, charter.
2. Massachusetts:
   a. Plymouth colony - settlement, religion;
   b. Bay colony - religious troubles, Roger Williams, Quakers.
3. New Hampshire - early name.
4. Connecticut - charter.
5. Rhode Island - religious freedom.
6. New York - Dutch governors, English governors.

---

[1]Published by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1879, unpaged.

7. New Jersey.
8. Pennsylvania - William Penn, etc.
9. Delaware.
10. Maryland - name, Catholic and Protestant.
11. Carolinas - Hugenots.
12. Division of Carolinas.
13. Georgia - character of settlers.

VI Revolutionary War
1. Condition of the colonies at origin.
2. Causes.
3. Political results.

VII U. S. Civil and Political History
1. National:
   a. Declaration of Independence;
   b. Constitution - origin, amendments, etc.
   c. Administrations in order;
   d. Political parties;
   e. U. S. bank trouble;
   f. Admission of States;
   g. Reconstruction.
2. International:
   a. Treaties - Indian, foreign;
   b. Monroe doctrine, etc.

VIII Slavery.
Introduction, spread, agitation, Missouri compromise, fugitive slave law, Kansas-Nebraska bill, Dred Scott decision, John Brown, emancipation.

IX Growth and Development.
1. Territory:
   a. Thirteen colonies, and N. W. and S. W. territories;
   b. Oregon and Louisiana;
   c. Florida;
   d. Texas;
   e. California, etc. Gadsden purchase;
   f. Alaska.
2. Population:
   a. At time of revolution;
   b. 1800 - 10-20-30, etc.
3. Agriculture, commerce, manufactures and the arts, literature, education, etc.

X Wars.
1. Indian - Virginia, King Philip, Pequod, Miamis, Creed, Black Hawk, Florida, West, and North-West.
2. Foreign - King William's, Queen Anne's, King George's, French and Indian, The Revolution, Tripolitan, 1812, Algiers, Mexican.

3. Civil - Bacon's rebellion, Clayborne's rebellion, Protestant and Catholic, whisky insurrection, Dorr rebellion, anti-rent, Mormon, secession.
Note - Causes, conduct, and result, according to the capacity of the school, and the time at command.

XI Anecdotes,
under all the above heads at the time of their consideration, in all cases to be verified by authorities.

XII Chronological Chart,
from 1475 to date, arranged somewhat after the style of Adams' historical chart. The heavy vertical lines should be so placed as to inclose what are orginarily called "Epochs" of our history, with the name of each period written at the top; thus the whole subject will be presented to the eye, arranged by both the "Topical" and the "Epoch" methods, according as we read from left to right, or from top to bottom.

XIII Books.
1. To be read;
2. For reference.

GEOGRAPHY

I The Nature of Geographical Science.
1. The unit to be studied and comprehended is the globe, considered with reference to its surface.
2. As only the merest fraction of this unit can come under the observation of the pupil, his knowledge of it must be derived chiefly from books.
3. The comprehensive study of geography involves a large and constant exercise of the imagination.
4. Geographical knowledge consists
   a. of mere facts, and
   b. of facts that can be explained by known causes.

II The Ends of Geographical Study.
1. The acquisition of clearly defined notions, constituting what is known as useful knowledge.
2. Through the acquisition of this knowledge, the development of the intelligence.
3. Nothing contributes so powerfully towards broadening man's sympathies and making him cosmopolitan and catholic, as geographical knowledge.
4. In this day of universal reading, geography should be one of the chief topics of instruction.

III Method of Instruction.

1. The formal study of geography should be preceded by a short preparatory (oral)course of instruction, the purposes of which should be
   a. To teach the nomenclature of geography
   b. To teach the art of reading maps.
2. The formal study of geography should consist of three stages, corresponding to the three successive stages of intellectual development:
   a. The perceptive;
   b. The analytic; and
   c. The synthetic.
3. The point of departure, in the study of geographical science, is the globe. A subdivision of this unit should quickly bring the pupil to his own country, and when this has been thoroughly studied, other portions of the earth's surface should be surveyed.
4. Maps should be regarded as representing detached portions of the surface of the globe.
5. The following will thus be the pupil's order of progress:
   a. The obscure whole of perception;
   b. Analysis;
   c. Syntheses;
   d. The clear whole of comprehension.

Note: 1. It is suggested that instructors emphasize the study of local or home geography, of the spelling of geographical names, of the productions of the United States, the influence of climate and of surface on production, and the teaching of an intelligent use of maps and globes.
Note: 2. Map-drawing should begin with platting the schoolroom, grounds, and neighborhood. Uniform methods of representing land and water, coast lines, and mountains should prevail in the same school.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT

I Governments.

1. Definition and object.
2. Kinds:
   a. Patriarchal;
   b. Theocratic;
   c. Monarchical;
   d. Aristocratic;
   e. Democratic;
   f. Republican.
3. Political maxims.

II Government of the United States.
- 1. Periods:
  - a. Colonial;
  - b. Under articles of confederation - insufficiency of;
  - c. Under constitution - origin and preamble.
- 2. Branches:
  - a. Legislative - law making, congress:
    - 1. Senate - eligibility, number of members;
    - 2. House of representatives - eligibility, number of members.
  - b. Executive - law enforcing:
    - 1. Election of president and vice-president;
    - 2. Powers and duties;
    - 3. Cabinet - how constituted, duties.
  - c. Judiciary - law interpreting:
    - 1. Courts - supreme, circuit, district;
    - 2. Judges.
- 3. Special constitutional provisions:
  - a. Prohibitions on U. S., habeas corpus, ex post facto, etc.;
  - b. Personal rights.

III State Governments as Represented by Michigan.
- 1. Relation to general government;
  - a. Rights of states;
  - b. State prohibitions.
- 2. Branches of state government;
  - a. Legislative - branches, powers, number members, eligibility, term;
  - b. Executive - state officers, powers and duties, term, eligibility;
  - c. Judiciary:
    - 1. Justice courts - jurisdiction, functions;
    - 2. Circuit courts - jurisdiction, officers;
    - 3. Supreme court - how constituted, where held.
- 3. County government.
- 4. Township government.
- 5. Municipal government.

IV Territorial Governments.
- 1. Relation to general government.
- 2. Differ from state governments.

CHAPTER I

The Goals of Public Education in Michigan, 1936[1]

The "Goals of Public Education" express the thought of many people as to the trends which should characterize educational progress in Michigan. They are not to be considered as philosophical truisms but as guides of practical significance to the classroom teacher. It is the task of the classroom teacher to plan experiences for the boys and girls of the class through which these goals can be achieved. Not all the goals are of equal significance to the elementary school but each has its contribution to make to the planning of instruction.

> Goal One. To cultivate a deep regard for democracy and an intelligent appreciation of democratic institutions. This goal implies that effective democratic institutions constitute the best means for insuring justice and liberty; for maintaining the equality of political, social, and economic opportunities; for fostering growth and progress; and for furthering truth and honesty.

The teacher who believes sincerely in the values of democracy attempts to make the school itself a democracy. Boys and girls may learn to appreciate the values of democratic living by actual participation in a small group that functions democratically. Such experience will be more effective in giving a 'deep regard for democracy' than any teaching that is not based upon the pupil's experience. It will help pupils see the added values for each individual in a group which is trying to insure justice and liberty, to provide equality of opportunity, and to foster growth and progress for every member of the group.

> Goal Two. To develop those qualities of character which are of special significance in a democracy. This goal implies that citizens in a democracy must possess certain qualities of character that are not required in other forms of society. The preparation requires the development of a personality that will find expression in responsible self-direction, self-control, and self-appraisal in both individual and cooperative endeavor. This goal implies emphasis (a) on understanding and appreciate instead of blind obedience; (b) on fair and honest dealings instead

---

[1]The "Goals" were formulated by the Michigan Educational Planning Commission in cooperation with many lay and educational groups in the state. They were officially approved by the Commission on June 22, 1934, and, since that time, by the State Board of Education and other educational groups.
Eugene B. Elliott, Instructional Guide for Elementary Schools, Bulletin No. 30, 1936, pp. 9-13.

of exploitation; (c) on investigation instead of thoughtless acceptance; (d) on open-mindedness instead of prejudice; and (e) on the promotion of the common good instead of selfish advancement of the individual.

The essential qualities of character for those living in a democracy must be learned. Just as the boy or girl learns to appreciate the values of democracy through experience, so must he learn the skills of democratic participation through experience. This is the reason why autocratic domination of the classroom by the teacher has been replaced in large measure by more democratic forms of teaching.

Teachers are seeking to give experience in self-direction to their pupils. Children are encouraged to make decisions for themselves, to cooperate with other children in planning activities and in carrying out these plans, and to gain skill in the solution of the problems that arise in the routine of school life. In these experiences of self-direction, under guidance of the teacher, the child learns to control himself and to appraise his own behavior. He learns to approach new problems intelligently and with a view to the facts involved. He learns how to cooperate with other people. He learns to respect the rights of others and to act in every situation for the best interests of all concerned. The teacher does not say, 'I can not let my children participate in planning class activities. They are not able to make decisions and to direct their own activities as well as I can plan for them.' She says, 'As children grow up it becomes absolutely necessary for them to direct their own activities to an increasing degree. They are not now very skillful in self-direction so opportunities must be provided that will make it possible for them to become more skillful.'

Goal Three. To develop the willingness and the ability to cooperate effectively in a democratic society. Democracy succeeds in proportion to the capacity of the people to solve their problems through voluntary self-directed cooperation. This goal requires a system of education in organization, method of instruction, and materials, which will provide in the school an environment that will most nearly approximate an ideal democratic society. In such a school pupils and students may participate actively in the life of the school, molding it to their needs and aspirations and adjusting themselves to it.

The success of a democratic school, or of a larger social group that wishes to be democratic, depends upon two characteristics of its citizens. These citizens must have a <u>desire</u> to cooperate. They must also <u>have acquired certain skills</u> which are essential to group living. In this field, as in others,

the best way to learn is to 'learn by doing.' They must have practice in the methods by which groups of individuals with differing opinions do group planning, in the grades of group discussion by which people learn to get along with those they disagree with, and with those they may even dislike, in the methods by which members of a group may contribute what each knows to the solution of a problem which perhaps no one individual alone could have solved.

> Goal Four. To develop the ability to use the most effective and reliable methods in searching for truth as a basis for the discovery and solution of problems. In a democracy, new generations should be prepared to discover new truths and to revise their practices accordingly. The training proposed in this goal will furnish necessary preparation for the cooperative discovery and solution of the problems created by the complexity and interdependence of our social, political, and economic relationships, It will also increase the power of citizens to cooperate successfully in creating the best conditions of living for all.

The practice of encouraging children to search for facts, and to make decisions upon the basis of these facts, can begin with young children in very simple situations. Even though children are doing nothing more fundamental than making a search for what health authorities say are the values of orange juice in the diet, or for what the encyclopedia gives as the origin of St. Valentine's Day, they are learning to discover the facts as the basis for answering questions and the solving of problems. At an early age they will be able to take an experimental attitude and to find by research methods the difference between one part of the school garden that is fertilized and one that is not, or by a simple experiment with globe and candle discover the reason it is night in China while it is noon in Michigan.

> Goal Five. To develop the effective use of the fundamental knowledge and skills required by all. This goal demands effective training in the arts of reading, writing, spelling, language, and arithmetic. Such arts are essential tools of common understanding and communication.

Much time during the years of elementary instruction is devoted to so-called 'fundamentals.' These fundamentals are not the same as they were in earlier days when society made different demands. We frequently hear the questions asked: 'What arithmetic will the child really use?' 'How can the child learn not only to read efficiently, but to choose wisely among the variety of available reading materials?' 'Can we relate his training in writing, spelling, and language, so that there may be more effective carry-over into everyday

use?' Such considerations as these are leading teachers to give more careful attention to the selection of teaching materials and to the methods by which life-like situations may be provided as learning experiences for the child.

> Goal Six. To insure an abundant social and individual life in accordance with each individual's capacity and ambition. This goal involves provision for proper and adequate training in problems of health, in desirable home membership, and in the worthy and constructive use of leisure time. It also calls for the general and specific vocational training required for economic sufficiency.

When we begin to think of education as participation in desirable daily living, we begin to stress such factors as will increase the child's ability to participate in home life, in vocational endeavors, in use of leisure, and in such other personal relationships as those that relate to health. Homemaking projects, physical activities and the cultivation of hobbies, health education in all grades and many of those instructional plans which we classify under the broad term 'activity teaching,' can provide an enriched social and individual life for children who differ in background and ability. Although specific vocational training is not considered as an aim of elementary education, it is desirable through field trips and exploratory experiences to give an introduction to vocational life.

> Goal Seven. To provide training in the specialized and professional services which are requisite for society. Society must have the services of persons specially equipped in the preservation and further development of the knowledge, skills, and techniques vital to the advancement of society as a whole. This goal recognizes that the valuable and useful accumulation described as 'the social inheritance' must be preserved and transmitted from generation to generation. Through research and experimentation this inheritance should be increased.

Such education is the function primarily of the college and professional school. The elementary school should, however, contribute an appreciation for the importance of the many occupations to modern life. It should also encourage among children an admiration for those men and women who have rendered noteworthy service to society in science, scholarship, and in other fields not always recognized in the traditional study of history. Babcock and McCormick, Florence Nightingale and Mary Lyon, Pasteur and Reed, Edison and Steinmetz, Horace Mann and John Dewey, and dozens of others make up a long list of those who have done much to enrich the social inheritance.

Goal Eight. To provide for the enrichment of adult life. This goal is receiving attention because our increased leisure demands provision for continued education for adults, and the changing social and economic conditions require the provision for retraining for both the vocational and the avocational aspects of life.

The elementary school makes its chief contribution to the enrichment of adult life by preparing the child for continuing growth and development when he is not supervised in the classroom. If the teacher can help the child to achieve such skills and interests as will make possible the continuation of education throughout life, this will be more important than the limited body of knowledge and experience which the boy or girl can accumulate while in school. The teacher also has another opportunity to contribute to the enrichment of adult life. He is a member of the community in which he lives. He may make his contribution to the enrichment of adult life by cooperation with adult groups in their activities for community improvement. He may also contribute as an interpreter of education to fellow citizens. If progress in education is to be accelerated it will be because parents and other citizens have had an opportunity to appreciate the goals of education and the social changes that make educational progress possible and necessary.

Goal Nine. To plan for the continuous appraisal and readjustment of the educational program to fit changing conditions. When scientific discoveries and inventions force us to set aside old ways of living, the schools should provide new activities which give definite practice in making adjustments to new situations in order that society may be modified through the process of orderly change rather than through revolution. This goal is important in a democracy because social and economic conditions change and education must also change accordingly in order to make its contribution at each stage of social progress.

If education is to progress, pupils and teachers alike must develop an attitude that is favorable to change and improvement. Boys and girls must learn to expect that society will continue to find better solutions for old problems, and the teacher must keep in touch with new trends and modes of thinking. He may not always be able to apply all his new ideas in the classroom until other faculty members and citizens are ready for the next steps, but the teacher must always have progressed far enough in his own professional training and understanding to be able to take his part in the stimulation of progress.