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ABSTRACT

Social studies first appeared in the official literature of the British Columbia Department of Education in 1927 when it replaced history and geography in the curriculum of the newly established junior high schools. During the depression the "new curriculum" introduced the concept of social studies to the entire public school system.

Though the content of the social studies courses remained primarily history, with some geography in the elementary schools, the change in name to social studies allowed the goals to be oriented around behavior—rather than content. Through the goals of social studies, the concept of the 'socialization' of the individual was introduced into the public school system.

The introduction of social studies into the curriculum was without controversy despite such politically-oriented aims, for many teachers, having experienced, directly or indirectly, the effects of World War I, saw social studies as part of a child-centred curriculum which would help students find a better life. In reality, though some experimentation did take place, very little changed in the classroom and most teachers and students noticed little difference.

While there have been no fundamental changes in the content of the social studies curriculum, changes are to be found in the goals. Social studies was introduced into the curriculum to transmit citizen-
ship; to create a good Canadian citizen who would maintain British traditions. After World War II, though the goals remained citizenship transmission, the concept of a good citizen changed. A good citizen was seen as one who was not only a good Canadian citizen but also a good "world" citizen. During the 1950's the goal of formal citizenship transmission, as the "raison d'être" of social studies, gradually changed. Beginning with the revision of the elementary curriculum in 1957 a more traditional view of education held that knowledge was an important goal of social studies. The concept of social studies as a social science finally developed in the revisions for both elementary and high school which began in 1966.

As the concept of social studies as a social science developed there was a demand for the inclusion of more geography in the curriculum. This coincided with the growth of departments of geography in Canadian universities, and resulted in the inclusion of geography in the 1966-68 revisions of the social studies curriculum on a basis equal to that of history. Until this last revision, the social studies curriculum had been based almost entirely on history though the definition of social studies had always included a list of the social sciences from which social studies would be drawn. Since this list was almost entirely ignored by the teachers who drew up the course outlines, it can be said that social studies, as defined by the Programmes of Study, has not been taught in British Columbia.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The central problem in dealing with social studies is the definition of the term, "social studies." This has arisen because of the multiplicity of views of what social studies is. G. S. Tomkins points out that social studies has been and still is being used to denote "any subject, provincial courses of study or programmes in Canada focused on 'man and society'." However the relationship between man and society has not only undergone fundamental changes since the introduction of social studies into the British Columbia curriculum in 1927 but one's personal view of this relationship also colours one's view of social studies.

As the British Columbia Social Studies Assessment (1977) points out:

"Social Studies" is many things to many people. Some view it primarily as the content of the programme of studies manifested in the curriculum guides published by the Ministry of Education. Others view it primarily as classroom activities engaged in by teachers and students and the resources they use. Still others view it as meanings educators and parents give to Social Studies as they experience it within the perspective of their day-to-day world.

As a result of these many and varied views of social studies, attempts to define the term have not clarified the question—what is social studies? The reason for this problem is explained thus:

First used in the late 1800's the term "social studies" has defied definitional consensus ever since. The trouble originated over the fact that the usage of the term preceded its definition and that it was used in a variety of situations.
What has resulted from this situation is a "plethora of competing definitions" which have complicated the question. 4

Most definitions of social studies have attempted to define its content. In the following definitions which originate from a variety of sources, social studies is conceived as the subject matter of academic disciplines which has been adapted for use in schools. For example:

The Social Studies are the social sciences simplified for pedagogical purposes. 5

... social studies consist of adaptions of knowledge from the social sciences for teaching purposes at the elementary and secondary levels of education. 6

The social studies are comprised of these aspects of history, economics, political science, sociology, anthropology, psychology, geography and philosophy which in practice are selected for instructional purposes in schools and colleges. 7

The term "social studies" is used to include history, economics, sociology, civics, geography and all modifications of subjects whose content as well as aims is social. 8

Inherent in all the definitions which use content to define social studies is the question of which disciplines make up the social sciences. Furthermore, the inclusion of new or developing disciplines also raises problems. In defining social studies in terms of content, some areas of social education, e.g., analysis and decision making, are ignored.

An alternative to the method of defining the social studies by content has been suggested by J. L. Barth and S. S. Shermis. 9 They note that due to a lack of any accepted definition, "anything called 'social studies' is thereby social studies." Barth and Shermis define social studies in terms of the goals of social studies rather than the content. They define social studies "as a set of goals which describe how the content of citizenship education is to be selected, organized and taught"; citizenship being the 'raison d'etre' of social studies. They identify
three separate competing traditions or sets of goals in social studies. Each of these traditions or goals has a specific view of citizenship. The sets of goals control the selection and organization of content and teaching of social studies so that a specific type of citizen will result. The three traditions or goals are "social studies as citizenship transmission," "social studies as social science," and "social studies as reflective inquiry."

"Social studies as citizenship transmission" implies that there is content, known in advance, which should be taught to students. The purpose is to produce a citizen who conforms to an expected set of characteristics set by the community. The method by which this information is transmitted is a mixture of description and persuasion. "The teacher's function is to describe events, people, phenomena and ideas thought worthy of being learned by all future citizens." Content is selected on the basis that what was valid in the past, remains valid today and consists of "facts, principles, beliefs and theories."

"Social studies as social science" is concerned with the knowledge of the structure of the specific disciplines which comprise the social sciences. The purpose of this is to produce a citizen who is knowledgeable, such knowledge being good for its own sake. The method used is the transmission of social science concepts considered important traditionally or by a consensus of social scientists. The selection of content reflects what a consensus considers important.

"Social studies as reflective inquiry" is a process which describes decision making within the socio-political framework of the community. It is a preparation for citizenship where the student acquires "practice in making decisions which reflect significant social problems and which
presently affect them or are likely to affect them." The method used is interdisciplinary inquiry involving the methods of the social sciences; content is the data of inquiry. 10

This thesis will trace the development of social studies from its introduction into the curriculum of the public schools of British Columbia in 1927 to the last complete revision of the social studies curriculum which took place between 1966-70. In this context the thesis will examine the changing goals and character of social studies and the process of curriculum revision in relation to changes in education and society.

The Barth and Shermis model is useful to illustrate some of the changes which have taken place in the social studies curriculum in British Columbia. This has always defined social studies by its academic content. However, this method of definition provides a narrow view since the content of social studies in British Columbia has, for the most part, been built around history and, to a lesser extent, geography. If the Barth and Shermis model is used to investigate the British Columbia social studies curriculum the dynamics of change can be seen more effectively since it is the goals which show the changes. While the purpose of social studies in British Columbia has always been to teach citizenship, the set goals of social studies has changed according to the views of citizenship in vogue at various times.

It was as a component of the curriculum of the newly established junior high schools that social studies was formally introduced into British Columbia. The establishment of the junior high schools was one of the most important recommendations of the Putman-Weir Survey (1925). 11 According to Putman and Weir, these schools were to provide not only the traditional curriculum but also practical subjects which could assist students in making vocational choices. The junior high school curriculum,
which was modelled after junior high school programmes in the United States placed emphasis on the practical. As one historian, Jean S. Mann, has put it, "the criterion for the acceptance of any subject was the contribution it made to the solution of life problems of the twentieth century."  

By the end of the 1930's, with the introduction of the "new curriculum" throughout the public school system, social studies had replaced all the courses formerly designated history and geography. The replacement of these courses with social studies was a political act in the sense that it was an attempt by the political leaders of the time to inculcate what they saw as the "right" social values as a means of preserving democracy by preventing social unrest.

In the 1920's and 1930's social unrest ascribed to increased non-British immigration and economic depression was the cause of great concern to the political leaders of the time. They saw the socialization of the individual, in the British tradition of the maintenance of law and order, as a means of preventing such social unrest and decided to use the school system as the means through which this could be accomplished. In this context, social studies became the specific area of the curriculum where the indoctrination of these "right" social values or citizenship transmission, would take place.

The content of that part of the curriculum replaced by social studies did not change. By changing the title of the courses to social studies, the government was able to change the goals to specify the sort of citizen which was to be created, without altering the content. If the course titles had remained history or geography it would not have been possible to include the concept of socialization, for the goals of these disciplines are narrowly defined and organized around content rather than behavior.
Although the term, social studies, was introduced without controversy, the content of some courses did present practical problems in the secondary schools. As a result, by the early 1940's the British Columbia Teachers' Federation sought and obtained input by social studies teachers into curriculum revision. Though modifications were made to various parts, it was not until after World War II that extensive social studies curriculum revision began. In this revision teacher committees were arranged, grade by grade, to develop new courses. Citizenship transmission was still the central objective in this revision at a time when large scale immigration was taking place in Canada. World citizenship was also becoming a concern of educators in this period.

Beginning in the late 1940's and continuing through the numerous social studies curriculum revisions of the 1950's which were caused by teachers' rejection of course content, controversy became more vocal between the traditionalists, who believed that knowledge of subject matter was important and the progressives or child-centred educators who were accused of underemphasizing subject matter. The traditionalists were supported by growing numbers of teachers who had been trained in geography at the University of British Columbia and who demanded a separate status for that subject.

A royal commission was established in 1958 to examine the problems in education. The evidence, relating to social studies, collected by the royal commission, suggested that the common expectation of the main outcomes of social studies was knowledge of the traditional fields of history and geography. The commission recommended a review of social studies courses with a greater emphasis being placed on both subject matter and the separation of history and geography.
The department of education commissioned representatives from the universities and teaching profession to provide reports on the teaching of geography and history in schools. Subsequently, in 1966, the work of revising the entire social studies curriculum was begun. By 1970 the new curriculum was being implemented.

In 1963, in his unpublished thesis, "The Historical Development of the Teaching of Geography in British Columbia," W. E. Topping recorded the development of geography, both as a separate subject and as a component of the social studies curriculum. Topping described in detail the content and the teaching methods for geography. However, he did not deal with the concept of social studies in which geography was but one component part. Topping mentioned only incidentally the reasons for the inclusion of social studies in the British Columbia curriculum and omitted the changes in the goals of social studies and the process of curriculum change.

In this investigation of the development of social studies in British Columbia I have used the Programmes of Study, Annual Reports of the Department of Education, Royal Commission Reports, records and publications of the British Columbia Teachers' Federation and an extensive set of interviews with ministry officials, teachers, and university professors who were involved with curriculum revision through the period in question. While I do not intend to focus entirely on the study of social studies in the secondary field, there is more evidence available for this than for other facets of the study. In addition, many of the changes which took place in social studies had more impact on the curriculum of the secondary schools than of the elementary schools.
FOOTNOTES


2 T. Aoki et al., British Columbia Social Studies Assessment, a report to the Ministry of Education (Victoria, 1977), p. 3.


4 Ibid.


8 National Council for the Social Studies, Charter, quoted in ibid.

9 J. L. Barth, and S. S. Shermis, "Defining the Social Studies: An Exploration of Three Traditions."

10 Ibid., pp. 743-75.


CHAPTER TWO

SOCIAL STUDIES IS INTRODUCED INTO THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Social studies developed in the United States in the early years of this century. In 1905 the expression social studies was first used in connection with education. It was used as "an encyclopedic term to include civics, economics, and sociology" in an article in a magazine, Southern Workman. By 1911, social studies was used to include history, civics, commercial geography, economics, politics, and sociology. The expression 'social studies' passed into general circulation with the publication, in 1916, of the final report of the Committee of Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association, which declared "that the conscious and constant purpose of the Social Studies is the cultivation of good citizenship." A good citizen being "one who appreciates the nature and laws of social life, one who has an intelligent and genuine loyalty to high national ideals."  

The meaning of the term social studies given by the aforementioned committee permitted the individual subjects of history, civics, geography, economics, and sociology to maintain their separate identities. However, the use of the term 'social studies' to name an integrated course of study became common during the 1920's.
In recognition of the fact that under modern conditions a citizen cannot be intelligent upon the problems he is forced to meet in daily life without at least an elementary knowledge of the social sciences, the term social studies has come into use, to designate an integrated program of history, economics, and geography, which will enable pupils to comprehend life in society. 

The National Council for the Social Studies was formed on March 3rd, 1921 by a group of American educators, one of whom was Earle U. Rugg from the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. The founding of this organization reflected the growing popularity of social studies in the United States.

The progressive education movement, led by such people as John Dewey, was also developing in the United States during this time and had great influence on the social studies curriculum. The central principles of progressivism involve a child-centred programme as opposed to subject-centred and "a commitment to development of the worth of each individual child." This movement grew out of changes which had arisen in society in the last decades of the nineteenth century as a result of immigration, industrial development, the growth of cities, and resultant poverty. Schools were to improve the lives of individuals and educational reforms were seen as the panacea for many social ills. In this context social studies became an important component of curriculum reform and by the 1930's in the United States, it had "overstepped the boundary of the social sciences proper and had taken the entire curriculum for its field."

Social studies served several needs: the need to assimilate immigrant and minority groups, the need to foster patriotism and citizenship, and the need to provide a common social education for the masses.

The introduction of social studies to British Columbia follows the early development of that subject in the United States. In 1900 public school education was divided into elementary and high school sections,
each separated into junior, intermediate, and senior divisions, each division taking two years to complete. In the *Manual of School Law and School Regulations*, which introduced a revision of the curriculum to start the twentieth century, geography and history were, separately, important parts of the school curriculum. In the elementary schools general world geography and topics on British and Canadian history were introduced.

An education monograph, published in 1914, notes the increasing interest of educators in the development of Canadian history and geography at this time.

In the early stages there was comparatively little study of Canadian History either in High schools or Common schools. Nor was there any special attention to Canadian Geography. From 1890 onwards, however, those aspects of Geography and History became more important. In some respects this increasing interest is representative of the growth of local patriotism and corresponds to the growth of the Dominion and Province themselves.

British Columbia's high schools taught the histories of British Columbia, Canada, Rome, and Greece. The geography consisted of physical geography. An examination of the textbooks of that day which are still available shows that they concentrated on facts. The history texts are chronological accounts with few illustrations other than maps.

Curriculum revision took place in the elementary and high schools between 1900 and 1919 and minor changes involving textbooks and suggestions for teaching methods were made. In 1919, the junior grade of the elementary school geography was combined with nature study. In the high schools a new Canadian history and civics course was introduced into the first year of the Junior Grade in 1920. In the following year the physical geography course was deleted. This action virtually removed geography from the high school curriculum.

In 1921 the subjects for Junior Matriculation (Intermediate Grade)
included "History and Historical Geography," with the description:

The essentials of European history, ancient, medieval, and modern (to the eighteenth century) as presented by Breasted and Robinson in their Outlines of European History, Part 1 (Ginn and Co.)

The geography required will be that relating to the history prescribed.

In the subjects leading to Senior Matriculation (Senior Grade) only history was required. The course was "The evolution of Modern European Society as interpreted by Breasted and Robinson in their Outlines of European History, Part 2 (Ginn and Co.)."

An examination of the government-set examinations for high school entrance and for each grade of high school for the period 1900-1924 reveals what was either taught or expected to be taught in geography and history.

Each examination, which took from one and one-half to two hours to complete, required factual answers written in paragraphs, for example:

Urban High School Entrance Examination, 1910, Geography
1. Draw an outline map of that part of Canada lying west of Ontario and Hudson Bay and indicate on it: (a) The Provinces and Districts. (b) The river systems and the Pacific Slope and the Great Central Plain. (c) One trade route.
2. Give a brief account of the causes and work of winds.
3. (a) What is meant by latitude?
   (b) Within what limits of latitude does British Columbia lie?
   (c) Within what limits of latitude is the sun sometimes overhead?
4. (a) Make a diagram illustrating the course of the currents in the Pacific Ocean.
   (b) Distinguish between tides and ocean currents.
5. Compare British Columbia with France as to physical features, climate and occupation.
6. (a) Name two great commercial centres in each of the following countries: France, Australia, Germany, India, Russia, China, Spain and Egypt.
   (b) What natural products may be purchased at each of the following places: Halifax, Winnipeg, Victoria (B.C.), Charleston, Mauritius, Cornwall (England), Messina and Smyrna?
7. Write briefly on the characteristic plants and animals of the Cool Belts.
High School Entrance Examination, 1915, British History

1. The Roman Conquest.
   (a) Name three British leaders who fought against the Romans. Write an account of any one of these.
   (b) What changes were brought about in Britain as a result of the Roman occupation?

2. Give an account of any two of the following:
   (b) The Magna Charta.
   (c) The Declaration of Rights (1689).

3. Describe any two of the following great reforms:
   (a) The Abolition of Slavery.
   (b) The Reform Bill of 1832.
   (c) Catholic Emancipation.
   (d) Repeal of the Corn Laws.

4. Write an account of any two of the following:
   (a) Lord Roberts.
   (b) Sir Walter Raleigh.
   (c) Wycliffe.
   (d) George Stephenson.

5. (a) With whom is Britain at war at the present time? Who are the "Allies"?
   (b) Sketch a map of Europe and mark the position of each of the following: the countries at war, Seine, Rhine, Danube, Vistula, Kiel Canal, Dardanelles, Vosges, Carpathians, Caucasus, East Prussia, Galicia, Alsace, Heligoland, London, Warsaw, Paris, Petrograd, Vienna, Belgrade, Ostend, Havre.
   (c) In connection with this great war associate an event with each of the following: Marne, Falkland, Louvain.

The government examinations reveal that for a student to be successful in the public examinations, the teaching had to emphasize memorization of facts.

In his study of the development of geography teaching in British Columbia, Topping noted that the courses of study reflected both European and American trends in the teaching and relative importance of geography and history in the curriculum between 1900 and the mid 1920's. There seemed to be no specific reason for the exclusion of geography from the high school curriculum in 1921. A number of reasons have been offered to explain the general decline in the position of geography at this time. The subject was in decline in the United States and Europe due to poor textbooks and teaching. There was also a general shortage of university-
trained teachers in geography, especially in Canada. (It was not until 1922 that geography, as a formal subject, was available at the University of British Columbia. 22)

John Gibbard, a university student and later high school teacher in Vancouver during this time, recalled that Dr. S. Mack-Eastman, who was head of the History Department at the University of British Columbia, was influential in the development of British and Canadian history courses in the high school curriculum in the 1920's. 23 Dr. Eastman prepared the Canadian edition of a textbook which was used in the high schools at this time. 24

There were, however, other circumstances which help to explain the dominance of history over geography throughout the school system of British Columbia. The early years of the twentieth century saw the population of British Columbia increase quite dramatically. In 1901 the population was 178,657. By 1911, it had more than doubled to 392,480, and by 1921 it was 524,582. 25 The population increase was accompanied by increased industrialization which caused both social and economic unrest.

By the early 1900's, middle class reformers from leading business and political circles thought that the social fabric was tearing under the heavy weight of radical politics, racial riots, highly visible poverty and dramatic confrontations between capital and labour. 26 As in the United States earlier, mass public schooling was hailed as the solution for these problems. Schools were to have a socializing effect and act, among other things, as transmitters of values and attitudes which had been previously the responsibility of other institutions. 27 If traditional values and attitudes were required to be transmitted via the schools, history with its emphasis on past developments and achievements would be the natural route. 28
In 1924, the liberal government of British Columbia commissioned a survey of the province's education system. J. H. Putman, a senior inspector of the Ottawa schools and G. M. Weir, professor of education at the University of British Columbia, were chosen to conduct the survey. Both Putman and Weir were advocates of the educational concepts and trends of progressive education which were moving north from the United States. The resulting report, known as the Putman-Weir Survey, published in 1925, was decisely in favour of many of the new concepts in education.

In the Survey the authors criticized the limitations of the British Columbia curriculum with its emphasis on formal, academic discipline. "Education is life, not a mere preparation for life consisting of the memorization of facts and principles and the mastery of a formal curriculum." The authors of the Survey also pointed out that since the needs of life are constantly changing, so educational practice must "undergo a gradual process of adjustment to the ever-evolving social background." The Survey advocated a more child-centred, activity-oriented curriculum which included new subjects such as vocational/manual training and home economics.

One of the recommendations of the Putman-Weir Survey, was the establishment of a 'middle school,' or junior high school, covering grades seven, eight, and nine, where pupils who were not destined for university or normal school, could receive a 'liberal' education. The curriculum of this school was to be wide enough to allow each child to have the greatest variety of educational experiences, and to assist the child in making vocational choices.

In speaking specifically about the state of history and geography in the province in 1925, the Survey noted that the common method of
teaching facts left students without any sense of the disciplines of geography or history and that many pupils were still ignorant of fundamentals of Canada and British Columbia. As a result, another recommendation was made that a greater emphasis should be attached to the history of British Columbia and Canada, and that more stress should be placed on "civics, current events and project."\(^{31}\)

Some of the recommendations of the Putman-Weir Survey were quickly put into effect. The first junior high school opened in Penticton in 1926, followed by two in Vancouver, Templeton, and Kitsilano. (Some junior high school work was also begun at Point Grey.) New Programmes of Study were also created for elementary schools in 1925-26, junior high schools in 1927-28, and for high and technical schools in 1930.

The elementary school curriculum was the first to be reviewed after the Putman-Weir Survey. Although there is no reference to social studies, as such, in that geography and history are still listed separately, the influence of progressivism appeared in the curriculum. Citizenship and civics were included in the elementary school curriculum and the "project" or "enterprise" was to be used, though not exclusively, as a teaching method.

When the term "project" was first used in education it was used to describe manual training exercises such as "making a coaster wagon, a library table, or a footstool."\(^{32}\) Later, as the term was taken over by other disciplines, its meaning became confused. In the 1920's in the United States, the "project" was used in elementary schools to describe (experimental) inter-disciplinary learning experiences. Since the "project" was supposed to relate "to the purposes of the boys and girls in the life they were actually living," there was nothing fixed nor stereo-
Up to 1935, no course of studies based entirely on this method had appeared in the United States, but the "project" idea was used to organize units based on this method. Later in the 1920's the word "activity" was substituted for "project" and courses of study were organized in terms of children's activities. Used in connection with social studies, the "project," "activity," or "enterprise" was a teaching method which integrated the social sciences with other subjects in a central theme or unit, at the heart of which was a manual activity of some sort.

The emphasis on the teaching of history also changed. The aim of history in the elementary school is no longer considered a mere chronicle to kings and diplomacy, a list of battles and of statutes, but is becoming more and more a sociological study. The advance of civilization, the progress of the community to culture, economic freedom and the growth of democracy are the bedrock of the subject.

The teacher was to teach history so that the pupil might understand more clearly the "social system in which he lives." "Through history he will learn the significance of citizenship, its privileges and its responsibilities, and he will become acquainted with the social forces around him."

Dent's *Canadian Geography for Juniors* (B.C. edition) by G. A. Cornish (1928) stated that, "The present elementary textbook is a protest against unpedagogical, unpsychological, dry as dust methods of presenting geography to children." It goes on to assert that the author has selected topics which will be naturally interesting and that each topic will lead to problems to be solved. "The pupils attack every new problem with a zest and curiosity that compel their interest." The book does illustrate a more child-centred approach to learning.

An equally interesting book, written by Arthur Anstey, a teacher...
at the Normal School in Vancouver, is *The Romance of British Columbia*. It is a history book for the elementary schools, although not prescribed. British Columbia's history is told through heroes and heroines in story form. The hidden message is not so subtle!

Brave, determined men and women, they were not to be turned back or made afraid by dangers and difficulties. The stories of their heroic deeds and patient endurance will show how grateful we should be to them for the noble part that they played in opening up the country and making it possible for us to live here in ease, comfort and plenty.41

As far as "brave men and women" are concerned, the chapter on the construction of the C.P.R. from Vancouver does not once mention the Chinese labourers; the heroes are the surveyors, engineers, and the "hardy workmen," whoever they may be!

The term social studies appears for the first time in the official literature of the Department of Education in the *Programme of Studies 1927-28* for the new junior high schools. The stated aim of these schools was to provide a more suitable educational environment in the early adolescent period. This was to be accomplished by broadening and enriching the curriculum, integrating education, particularly "English and the Social Studies [to] give that common background of ideas and experience necessary for the attainment of social solidarity."42 Facilities for progressive discovery, provision for individual differences and increased opportunities "for both the development of leadership and for social cooperation and democratic citizenship" were also recommended.43

"Social solidarity," "social co-operation and democratic citizenship" are significant concepts. The National Council for the Social Studies in the United States, in 1921, had observed that social studies served the needs of assimilation, citizenship, and patriotism. This becomes
significant when it is noted that the two newly established junior high schools in Vancouver were situated in working class areas where most students probably would not have attended high school and many immigrants and their families, would live.

The Putman-Weir Survey stated that

the development of a united and intelligent Canadian citizenship accentuated by the highest British ideals of justice, tolerance and fairplay, should be accepted without question as the fundamental aim of the provincial school system. Such an aim has stood the test of time and its application in the daily lives of the British peoples has enhanced the good name of the British Empire.\textsuperscript{44}

The inclusion of social studies in the junior high school curriculum was a means to this end. It was described as a unified course in "geography, history and citizenship."\textsuperscript{45} It was also stated to be experimental and part of a new departure in curriculum making. There were no prescribed textbooks, though several were recommended, for it was not intended that one textbook should be used exclusively, but rather that "socialized methods and procedures should predominate."\textsuperscript{46} The teacher was reminded that "it must not be forgotten that the great purpose in all our work in social studies is to develop intelligent, responsible and socially conscious citizens."\textsuperscript{47}

There follows a list of general objectives which are to lead towards the achievement of this purpose. In addition to a list of skills and study habits, there is a section entitled "Right Ideals and Attitudes to be developed." These include "an appreciation of the necessity for government," "a willingness to submit to the rule of the majority and rights of the minority," "a respect for the rights of property of others," "an appreciation of the dignity of labour," and "recognition of the fact that British and Canadian tradition is to abide by the Law."\textsuperscript{48} In the
light of the social unrest of the time, the creators of the curriculum made a direct attempt to use the schools to instill a "right" attitude, in the minds of the young.

The content of the curriculum developed for the junior high schools included Canadian history, British history, and the geography and history of the British Empire.

Consistent with changes to the elementary and junior high schools, a new programme of studies was developed for high schools and introduced in 1930. Again, the term social studies is used, with the explanation,

The course is named social studies because several studies are involved, namely historical narrative, geography, civics, economics and sociology. It is however a unified course because knowledge of historical situations is considered essential for a proper understanding of principles and institutions.49

However, on reading the new Programme of Studies, one finds that the three years of high school social studies are dominated by history--world, British and Canadian--while geography appears as an elective, with two courses.

By 1930, social studies was a significant component of the public school curriculum but if one examines carefully the content of the curriculum, one finds that there has really been little change since 1900. There is still an emphasis on British, Canadian, and Commonwealth associations. The significant differences appear to be in a more child-centred approach to the teaching of geography and history in the elementary schools.

The Putman-Weir Survey has been called a 'conservative document' in spite of its progressive theories.50 John Gibbard reflected that he had always taught some geography along with history in his high school courses because it seemed more meaningful that way. It was only as he
began to read the literature describing social studies that he realized he was already teaching it. Because there was little change in the classroom there was no controversy when social studies was introduced into the curriculum in British Columbia. It was simply a new name given to the old courses. Though there is evidence from the government examinations and from the textbooks of the time to show that teaching methods were changing in the elementary school, there is no evidence that there was any change, other than in name, in the high schools. Any changes which did take place were not caused by the introduction of social studies but by the "progressive" ideas which were having some influence on educational philosophy. The introduction of social studies into the curriculum of the public schools of British Columbia cannot be considered an innovation, that is, an experimental, new departure in curriculum making. It provided the government with a reason to introduce a set of goals designed to create a specific type of citizen, a philosophy which was further developed in the curriculum changes of the 1930's as social studies came to play a central role in the "new curriculum."
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CHAPTER THREE

THE "NEW CURRICULUM"

In British Columbia in the 1930's the times seemed right for a change in the education system. There was no sign of any relief from the Depression and it seemed as if society was floundering. Education was seen as the crucial factor in the shaping of a better world and educators of all political philosophies were recommending ways in which the school system should be directed. In 1932 the conservative government of that day authorized an investigation into the financial affairs of the province. The resulting report, known as the Kidd Report, recommended, among other things, that free education should cease after a pupil's fourteenth year of age. This report was attacked by its critics, which included large numbers of the public as well as educators, as "reactionary anti-democratic, class-biased and a denial of equal opportunity."¹ Although the conservatives tried to disassociate themselves from the report, they were identified with its elitist and restrictive outlook. At the same time, from the opposite side of the political spectrum, some members of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.) declared, during the provincial election of 1933, that the schools should be used for the "indoctrination of socialist principles."² It was in these circumstances that the "new curriculum" was conceived and social studies played a central role in that new curriculum.

25
In August 1933, C. M. Weir, co-author of the Putman-Weir Survey, was nominated as a liberal candidate in the Vancouver riding of Point Grey. After the election, as a result of the liberal victory, Weir was appointed Minister of Education. Beginning in 1935, Weir turned his attention to the whole curriculum to make it the most up-to-date in Canada and,

... to make the school system meet the needs of a rapidly changing world . . . to make British Columbians more socially minded, more co-operative in their attitude to society as a whole . . . and better equipped for using their leisure.¹

In April 1935, in an article in The B.C. Teacher, Weir reflected "many improvements undoubtedly have been made in the curriculum since the report of the School Survey in 1925. Something still remains to be done."² The article explained how curriculum revision was to take place. A Central Committee was to give direction, one member of which would be the Curriculum Advisor. Under the Central Committee there were to be General Committees for the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Finally, under each General Committee would be the Subject Committees which would formulate the course of study for each subject.

The Curriculum Advisor was H. B. King, a former classics teacher, then principal of the Kitsilano Junior-Senior High School who had previously been appointed as technical advisor to a commission on School Finance set up by Weir in 1934. Dr. King had attended the University of Washington where he received his doctorate; his dissertation concerned the teaching of French by the direct method. He fought constantly with the traditionalists in education and the teachers who worked with him suggested that Dr. King should be given the credit for opening the options and loosening up the curriculum for those students who were not
academically minded. Dr. King was not liked by the teachers who had to work with him but he was respected.\(^5\)

In order to set up the various committees, Dr. King invited the British Columbia Teachers' Federation (the B.C.T.F.) to submit names for the committees. Accordingly, the General Secretary of the B.C.T.F., Harry Charlesworth, wrote to the local associations asking that names be forwarded directly to H. B. King at the Parliament Buildings in Victoria.\(^6\)

In February 1936, \textit{The B.C. Teacher} was asked to announce the names of the Subject Committees for the junior and senior high schools. The Junior High School Social Studies Committee listed the following:

- Dr. O. M. Sandford, Kitsilano High School (Chairman)
- Mr. J. R. Atkinson, Point Grey Junior High School
- Mr. K. A. Waites, King Edward High School
- Mr. F. C. Hardwick, King Edward High School
- Mr. J. N. Burnett, Aberdeen School, Vancouver
- Mr. J. Chell, Central School, New Westminster\(^7\)

The Senior High School Social Studies Committee listed:

- Mr. A. S. Matheson, University Hill (Chairman)
- Dr. H. M. Morrison, Lord Byng High School
- Mr. H. D. Dee, Victoria High School
- Mr. F. M. Painter, Magee High School
- Mr. R. Straight, Inspector, Vancouver
- Dr. W. N. Sage, University of British Columbia\(^8\)

In a speech to the members of the revision committees, Weir clearly stated the direction the new curriculum should take. Co-operation, rather than competition, should be taught in schools and the school's primary function was to be the inculcation of co-operative social attitudes.\(^9\) In the new curriculum social studies played a central role as "an instrument for the creation of a viable democratic society."\(^10\)

In an article in \textit{The B.C. Teacher} in June 1934, Dr. H. M. Morrison, who later became a member of the Senior High School Revision
Committee, stated that "the social studies may be regarded as the warp and woof of our education. Around them we should weave the other subjects of the secondary school curriculum."^11

The reason that social studies was singled out in this way was that, if true education claimed to teach children how to live, then in order to do that, children must be taught what life was all about. "Social Studies is the study of life."^12 The social studies was to occupy an important place in the new curriculum as a socializing agent.

Dr. King was responsible for the appointment of all teachers who served on the Subject Committees. Some believed that he chose those teachers he thought he could influence.\(^13\) Two of the members of the Junior High School Social Studies Committee (O. M. Sandford and F. C. Hardwick) had taught in the Kitsilano Junior High School when King was principal. The Junior High School Social Studies Committee served for about one year. The committee prepared a syllabus which ignored grades one to twelve. At the end of the year, Dr. King asked the Committee to select textbooks for Canadian and British history and geography. One of the textbooks the committee had been given was Dr. King's own book, \(A\) History of Britain.\(^14\) Dr. King had written the textbook when he was principal of Kitsilano Junior High School. Dr. King's book was not highly regarded and was rejected by the Junior High School Social Studies Committee.\(^15\) When the Department of Education took over the task of tidying up the course of studies they added Dr. King's book to the prescribed list for junior high schools.\(^16\)

The Elementary Programme of Studies was published in 1936 and the "Aims and Philosophy of Education in British Columbia," prepared by the General Elementary School Committee, stated:
From the point of view of society, the schools in any state exist to develop citizens or subjects according to the prevailing or dominating ideals of the state or society. Any state desires to transmit its culture. All states seek to ensure their safety, stability and perpetuity. The people of a democratic state such as Canada aim for more than this. They wish to have citizens able to play their part in a democratic state, but able also to make new adjustments in an evolving and progressive social order, so that social stability may be united with social progress.¹⁷

These aims were repeated in the Programmes of Study for the Junior High Schools and the Senior High Schools which appeared later, and emphasize the concern over the necessity of social stability.

The social studies for elementary schools was a combination of fused and separate courses in geography and history. While the general preamble to social studies states that it was "designed to give the pupil an understanding of his environment and control over it, and to promote his growth and self-realization,"¹⁸ the General Aims for Social Studies in Grades I, II, and III, state that a pupil is "to develop a sense of gratitude for social welfare and a consequent sense of responsibility towards others."¹⁹ But it is in the description of the history programme that the emphasis on social co-operation is noticeable. "Man does not live in isolation but in communities. This involves social regulations and institutions."²⁰

Weir's emphasis on social co-operation was not unique to him. In her thesis dealing with this period, Jean Mann quotes the deputy Minister of Education in Ontario, Duncan McArthur, in an article in The School, December 1934, as blaming "unrestrained individualism," the laissez-faire complacency, for the mess the world was in, and Mann suggests that this attitude was typical of many educators at this time.²¹ The solution McArthur gave was to place emphasis on "the development of the creative and social rather than on acquisitive impulses."²² The article
illustrates how to use social studies to create and promote right social attitudes and Mann suggests that this could have been "adopted as a manifesto regarding the place and function of social studies in the curriculum by any Department of Education in any province in Canada during the mid-depression years."

By 1937 the Programmes of Study for both the Junior and Senior High Schools were ready. The social studies in the junior high schools was a correlation of different branches of the social sciences, mainly history, geography, and civics. The objectives of the 1926-27 curriculum were repeated and the same textbooks were to be used until new books were available. The comment is made, in the 'General Statement' at the beginning of the outline for social studies, that the course may appear heavier than the former one. This was due to the addition of several new units to the curriculum. These new units, in grade VII, for example, were related to civics, i.e., "The Pupil and his Environment" and local studies, i.e., "Your Own Community."

The "suggested activities" for these new units reflect the concern over social co-operation and good citizenship. The students were to

Prepare a talk in which you explain how a good home helps to make a good community. . . . Draw up a code of good citizenship for your school. . . . Show how any one of these organizations (viz., Municipal Council, School Board, Police Dept., Fire Dept., etc.) makes your community a better place to live. . . . Show that it is necessary for the citizens to delegate authority to some central organization. . . . List the most important ties of the empire.24

The list of references for this section contains a list of ten books plus an atlas. Their titles are interesting in that they indicate the direction that citizenship lessons are to follow. One book is The British Subject by Bateson and Weston, published by Oxford University Press. Another, The Way of the Citizen is published by
McDougalls' Educational Co. in London. A third textbook is *Our Selves and the Community* by Reynolds and published by Cambridge Press.\(^{25}\) It is an interesting point to note that if American influences on teaching methods found an easy route across the Canadian border via the teachers who sought graduate studies in the United States, the British influence on the programme content, by way of the textbooks, had not diminished.

Dr. King's book, as has been mentioned previously, appeared on the prescribed textbook list for the junior high schools. It does give insight into the junior high school social studies curriculum. King says that he offers some "conservative innovations."

This book does not attempt to give a romantic view of history but rather a social view. Reference is frequent to comparable modern conditions when old evils or old problems are discussed.\(^{26}\)

The details of military campaigns have been almost entirely omitted, partly because a compressed account of a campaign gives a false picture to it lacking in social significance.\(^{27}\)

If social significance was important to King, so, too, was efficiency. King approved of the application of scientific management for schooling, a system which was promoted by Franklin Bobbitt at the University of Chicago.\(^{28}\) In his book, King repeatedly states that his innovations and planning will save time. Some of his techniques included placing questions at the beginning of chapters so that these would have a "problem raising" effect and train a child to read with a questioning attitude. King said he had removed all factual material unrelated to important dates and concepts and he said that an aim of the book had been to develop a sense of historical sequence to avoid the confusion which could take place, yet his book remained highly factual!\(^{29}\)

In the appendix at the end of the book, there is printed "A Message
to the Youth of the Empire" given by Stanley Baldwin on May 18th, 1937 at the Empire Youth Rally at the Albert Hall, at the time of the coronation of George VI. The last few lines of the speech seem to sum up the whole purpose of the social studies curriculum. "And let me say this to you. From tonight onwards and all your lives, put your duty first and think about your rights afterwards." The social studies curriculum was designed to show the duties of a citizen, duties which were to include reasoning, critical thinking, and 'right' values, shaped in the British tradition. No one seems to have questioned that these concepts are not synonymous!

The emphasis on British traditions at a time when local studies are becoming important is interesting. In the late 1930's the Public Schools Annual Reports began to print statistics of the numbers of children of foreign parentage attending the public schools in the province. In the Annual Report 1936-37, the largest group of "foreign" students in school were the Japanese (5,499), followed by Scandinavians (2,339), Germans (2,071), Italians (2,058), and Chinese (1,447), making a total of 20,435 out of a total number of 118,431. This was a large number of students, most of whom were found in the elementary schools and junior high schools in both urban and rural areas. It made sense to the curriculum developers, to stress British traditions in the elementary and junior high schools since most students did not attend high school.

The Programme of Studies for Senior High Schools, introduced two courses only. Additional courses were to be added as the programme got underway. Both these initial courses were based on history, although other subjects were acknowledged as contributing towards the subject matter of social studies. "This concentration of the social
disciplines around history as a core is logical because history is the
cement that binds the Social Studies. All the Social Studies have a
past and the past is history. High school graduation required three
courses in social studies above grade VIII. The new curriculum did
make an effort to remove the academic bias of matriculation from determin-
ing the course content. The preamble to general objectives of social
studies sets the tone.

The Social Studies are to be understood as those studies whose sub-
ject matter relates directly to the organization and the develop-
ment of human society and to man as a member of a social group. The
Social Studies are designed to train the pupil as a member of society,
and cultivate his social efficiency. . . . The Social Studies should
provide the pupil with tools and procedures which may be employed
in the solution of the practical problems of our existing and develop-
ning society.

The teacher is exhorted to provide the pupil with "material to think
about, with a method of thinking and with situations and problems which
challenge him to think." However, the content of the curriculum did
not suggest how this might be done. It was still a chronological account
of world history, the building of the colonial empires and the Industrial
Revolution to the, then, present day. The textbook, J. S. Shapiro,
R. B. Morris, and F. H. Soward, Civilization in Europe and the World,
Canadian Edition (Toronto: Cop Clark Co. Ltd., 1938), was almost iden-
tical to that it replaced (Story of World Progress). When the geography
electives were revised and introduced in 1937 there was no direct attempt
to align geography and history. Geographic skills were seen as import-
tant as well as the study of geographic problems and the acquisition
of knowledge of Canada and the British Commonwealth.

The introduction of the new curriculum between 1935–39 brought
little controversy. In an editorial in The B.C. Teacher, the editor
suggests that public education had to take some blame for the ills of
the world and that the basic error in education had been a matter of
educational objectives, but that this was now being corrected. "... and an outstanding feature of the curricular studies now engrossing the
attention of the teaching body is the central and basic position given
to educational principles and objectives." While the editor refers
to the fact that all teachers do not give these aims "unreserved
approval," he considers them in error. "All will agree that education
is individual but that any individual development opposed to the social
good is essentially undesirable."  

The new social studies curriculum was the topic of a critical arti-
cle by F. A. Armstrong, a teacher, at a later date in The B.C. Teacher. The author states that while there appears to be general agreement that
the new social studies curriculum is "greatly superior: there are im-
perfections." One of the criticisms was the "undue" amount of time
spent on the British Empire, especially in elementary and junior high
school. The author suggests that students who do not go to high school
leave school with "an unbalanced picture of the world, and its affairs,
and our place in it."  
Greater correlation of the courses in history
and geography was needed in the elementary school, so that children would
have the opportunity to study ancient and modern life.  

A newspaper editorial deplored the lack of Canadian history in
the new curriculum. A reply by Dr. King absolutely refuted the criti-
cism.  

Even a casual examination of the programmes of study for the public
schools of the Province will reveal the inaccuracy of these state-
ments. It may be observed however, that history is included under
the accepted modern caption, social studies.  

There appears to have been some confusion in the mind of the general
public over the use of the term social studies!
In the Annual Report 1939-40, Dr. King, then the Chief Inspector of Schools, said that British Columbia "has received much praise" for its curricular reforms but that the curriculum reforms of British Columbia are similar in philosophy to those appearing across Canada and elsewhere. "The development of our own curriculum is simply a British Columbia expression of educational philosophy and psychology as these have been developing in the English-speaking world."

During the latter half of the 1930's many provinces became involved in curriculum change, however only in the four western provinces did social studies become a "subject" from grade one to matriculation. Elsewhere in Canada it is restricted to elementary and junior high schools.

The introduction of social studies in the British Columbia curriculum in the late 1920's and its establishment in a central role in the 1930's was at a time when the whole world was in turmoil. Social studies was one of the means used to transmit and inculcate the "right" social values. In this way it was thought that the smooth running of the state could be ensured. That the "right" values were those of the middle classes, who generally ran the schools and the government, did not seem to be a problem to most people, hence the lack of protest when the new curriculum appeared. That the social studies curriculum seemed to be one of indoctrination would not be shocking in those times. Fascism and communism both used indoctrination in education as a legitimate means of propagating their views. All the British Columbia curriculum did was to use the rhetoric of the time.

In the 1930's during the depression, there was the idea among teachers in the school system that things would get better.
"proud tower" had been struck down in World War I. If only the masses were taught the right things, the world would improve. Most teachers were idealists. The intentions of the majority were altruistic. There was no direct indoctrination such as that implied by the words of the social studies curriculum, although one could argue that the content of the curriculum was indoctrination enough. The intention of the teachers was to improve the lives of their students, though the intention of the government was the preservation of the state. In actual fact, there was very little change. As the teachers of the time stated, most of the rhetoric was theory and not practice. Government examinations still had to be passed and it was these which directed the "what" and "how" of teaching.45

The goals of social studies from the time of its inclusion in the British Columbia curriculum in 1927 to the new curriculum, fit into the definition of social studies Barth and Shermis call citizenship transmission.46 Citizenship is identified with traits and values such as law and order and adherence to community norms.

A good citizen is one who has internalized the "right" values, conforms at least outwardly to what is expected of him, votes regularly, joins certain community organizations and, in general, "accepts" the local community's concepts of democracy.47

This is exactly the purpose of social studies as given in the Programmes of Study. The content of this position according to Barth and Shermis rests on three extremely shaky assumptions: that citizenship is best achieved by storing up facts, principles, beliefs, and theories; that what was valid in the past is valid today; and that what is considered important by a consensus is sufficient for selecting curriculum for the schools.48 British Columbia's social studies curriculum fits these three assumptions. The textbooks are full of facts; the content of
the curriculum shows little change from 1900 and the curriculum revision took place through several committees.

The only area where the British Columbia curriculum may not conform to the Barth and Shermis model of citizenship transmission is in the method of transmission. This is stated as a "mixture of description and persuasion." The teacher's function is to describe all that which is thought should be learned by students. Barth and Shermis assume that the teacher will transmit this knowledge unbiased and without interpretation, and regardless of personal feelings "should persuade students of the rightness or wrongness of certain values." The responsibility for the production of good citizens was certainly given to social studies teachers in particular. As the Programme of Studies stated, "because the Social Studies are peculiarly adapted to this end, teachers of Social Studies must assume a large share of the responsibility for the realization of these essentials of good citizenship." The teacher of social studies was also reminded that "to take advantage of his position to propagandize his own views—or the view of any party or group to which he may belong or with which he may sympathize, violates the objectives of Social Studies."

The introduction of social studies into the British Columbia curriculum between 1927-1937 cannot be considered innovative. The goals of social studies were directly related to the preservation of the state and as far as course content was concerned there was little change. The lack of controversy concerning the introduction of social studies can be explained by the fact that both progressives and traditionalists saw social studies from their own perspectives and neither group perceived a threat to their ideas. The traditionalists saw little change in the
status quo while the progressives saw the chance to put new ideas into practice. In reality, there was very little change in the classroom.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE FORTIES AND FIFTIES

The period between the end of World War II and 1960 saw extensive revision of social studies courses in which several interesting developments are noted. Course revision, in the secondary area in particular, saw the involvement of an increasing number of social studies teachers. Similarly, as teachers became more involved with curriculum revision, teacher criticism of social studies courses also became more vocal. This is not to suggest that social studies teachers were more critical of their colleagues' work but rather illustrates that there was a great diversity of opinion amongst social studies teachers as to what should constitute the courses.

In the social studies curriculum revisions after World War II the concept of 'citizenship' developed from the narrow base of nationalism to the broader base of world citizenship, and the responsibility for citizenship education was shared among all teachers. A most significant development was the increased amount of geography at all levels of the social studies curriculum. This was not the old 'capes and bays' geography but the teaching of geographic skills, and the recognition that geography did have an important contribution to play in the social studies curriculum.

The shortage of teachers in the 1950's made teaching difficult
at all levels and social studies teachers were criticized for following the textbooks rather than the course outlines or teaching towards examinations. However, the confidence of social studies teachers is reflected in the formation, within the B.C.T.F., of the British Columbia Social Studies Teachers Association (B.C.S.S.T.A.) during 1958-59.

When the new curriculum was introduced into the public school system during 1936 and 1937 there was great interest by education officials as to how effectively the implementation was progressing. This interest was seen in a meeting held on October 22nd, 1937 in Victoria. The Minister of Education, Dr. Weir, called a meeting of school inspectors to discuss this matter. Dr. Weir reported that there was great interest among the general public and it was important that it should get off to a good start. The agenda for the meeting included such topics as whether teachers were doing much professional reading, whether teachers were able to teach the "new curriculum" and whether schools were equipped for the new programme of studies.

The general consensus among the inspectors was that teachers were organizing study groups and doing a great deal of reading in connection with the new courses especially social studies. One inspector noted, "there is a vast amount of reading in that, in all grades." It was also noted that many teachers were attending summer school.

One problem which gave rise to considerable discussion was the lack of well-equipped school libraries in some areas of the province. As Dr. Weir noted, "the curriculum is not going to function unless we have the function's centre--the school library." But the school districts were poor and did not have funds to equip school libraries. School inspectors throughout British Columbia complained about the lack of
equipment in schools into the early 1940's. In 1942 one inspector, H. H. Mackenzie, wrote, "in any modern high school professing to carry out a progressive system of education a reasonably equipped library is the sine qua non of any real progress. There is immediate need of equipment in the Maple Ridge High School." In regard to social studies and general science, another inspector, J. F. K. English, said in 1944, "there is not enough [material] available to permit the employment of effective research methods."

The inspectors' reports for this period often list individual teachers and the courses each taught. In the Maple Ridge High School, the teachers are listed as each teaching between three to six different courses in three to six different subject areas. One teacher taught social studies, health, guidance, physical training, and remedial English. Another teacher taught senior matriculation history, two social studies courses, English, and boys' counselling. With such diverse and heavy workloads, one wonders how teachers were able to cope with both teaching and preparing the new courses. It certainly does not seem likely that there would be great innovation in the classroom even if the teachers themselves were academically capable of teaching all they were required to do. There would not be time!

In 1937, however, the effect of the new curriculum on teachers is reported to have been very positive. Inspector H. H. Mackenzie, for example, said,

I would like to say that looking back over a period of thirty years' experience, I have never experienced anything like the effect of the new revised curriculum on the attitude of teachers and the people generally in British Columbia. The stimulus given to educational thought and educational enterprise in that area has been simply remarkable not only on the part of the teacher but on the part of the general public and the trustees. On the older teachers, some of them teaching thirtyfive-forty years, it simply revitalized these people.
Interest in curriculum revision was high. The B.C.T.F. had established a Federation Curriculum Revision Committee early in 1937 to consider communications from the Department of Education's Central Revision Committee.\(^\text{11}\) A year after the introduction of the high school courses, teachers presented a series of resolutions to the Curriculum Revision Committee of the B.C.T.F. The resolutions did not question the philosophy of social studies but rather commented on the practical difficulties involved in teaching social studies. The two main problems were the length of Social Studies V (the final social studies course in the high school programme), and the difficulties experienced in teaching social studies in rural schools. These difficulties included a lack of equipment for teaching social studies and the practical difficulties involved in teaching separate social studies courses to small groups of students.\(^\text{12}\)

In June 1940, a brief submitted by a Committee of the Social Studies Section of the B.C. Secondary Teachers Association, on the subject of modifications to Social Studies V, was forwarded to the Department of Education.\(^\text{13}\) The brief, which suggested that the course was too long and that some of the units were either inappropriate or duplicated each other, was submitted to a special committee selected by the Department of Education for its consideration. The special committee was of the opinion that the problems were the fault of the teachers who were not selecting the appropriate sections of each unit.\(^\text{14}\)

In his reply to the report from the Superintendent of Education, J. S. Willis, the general secretary of the B.C.T.F. pointed out that the teachers who had drawn up the brief were experienced social studies teachers and that since four of the special committee members were on the original committee which drew up the Social Studies V course, they
had a vested interest in it. As a result of the general secretary's letter, a meeting was arranged between members of the Central Revision Committee and a delegation from the B.C.T.F. The meeting took place on 26th September, 1941, in the Hotel Vancouver. The Central Revision Committee assured the delegation that social studies courses would be subject to revision from time to time and that revised units from teachers would be welcomed. The Central Revision Committee accused teachers of following the course of studies too slavishly for examination purposes and pointed out that the teachers were not acquainted with the aims of education as written in the Programmes of Study.

During the war years there was very little change to the social studies curriculum. An article in The B.C. Teacher stated that the fact of war had changed the classroom conditions for every subject but this was especially true for social studies. The article listed the gains and the losses; among the gains were included increased interest in current affairs and geography, more thoughtful attention to forms of government, and a desire to know more about the conditions of the world. Included in the losses were the effect of the war on the older boys, who were unable to settle down to do steady work, and their cynical or fatalistic attitudes.

With the end of the war and the gradual resumption of normal life, education came under public scrutiny with the publishing of the Cameron Report concerned with the financing of education in British Columbia. The report itself made no recommendations regarding curriculum but extensive changes were recommended in educational administration. However, the public school curriculum was being viewed very critically from many perspectives. While some educators criticized the high school social
studies course because they said, its purpose was to prepare for matriculation rather than citizenship, other educators attacked the curriculum as being too progressive. In an article in The B.C. Teacher, principal of Victoria College, Dr. John M. Ewing, said, "we stand, as it were, between two mutually antagonistic modes of thought and have not succeeded in achieving harmony between them." Dr. Ewing was not a supporter of progressive education. He described it as "a contempt for drill, a scorn of discipline, a suspicion of personal scholarship, a firm belief that all unpleasant tasks must be avoided and a consequent watering down of individual responsibility."

The Annual Report for 1945-46 announced a new Central Curriculum Committee together with plans to revise the social studies courses from grades one to six. The following year the Annual Report announced the establishment of the Curriculum Division of the Department of Education charged with the responsibility of continuing revision and development of courses of study for all schools. It was also announced that gradual reorganization of the secondary curriculum would take place.

There were no specific reasons given for the need for curriculum change at this time other than the on-going need for curriculum revision. There were however several factors which would have influenced the decision to revise the social studies curriculum at this time. It had been ten years since the last social studies revision had occurred for both the elementary and secondary schools and the experience of World War II had broadened the concept of citizenship. As the Assistant Superintendent of Education, H. L. Campbell, commented in a speech to a Women's Institute Convention,
Consider for a few moments the subject of education and citizenship in general. Critical periods in history have always seen men evaluate their institutions. We are in such a period today. Momentous events have transpired and are transpiring. A terrible war has just been concluded. A new World Power, Russia has arisen. China is on her way to national status. India is beginning her career as a self-governing nation. In the realm of science, the fabulous power of the atom has been harnessed. And humanity, is still hoping for the 'brave new world' of its dreams. In this critical period, Society is evaluating institutions such as education and citizenship as it has never done before. 24

Citizenship education was seen not only as a means of passing on traditional values but also as a means of coping with a changing and complex world.

During the ten years since the previous curriculum revision there had been a substantial increase in the total enrollment of students along with an increase in the percentage of students who had foreign parents. In 1936-37 the total enrollment was 118,431, 20,435 (17%) of whom had foreign parents. 25 In 1944-45 the total enrollment had increased to 125,136, 29,191 (21%) of whom had foreign parents. 26 By 1946-47 the total enrollment had increased again to 137,827 of whom 34,446 (25%) had foreign parents. 27

The increases in enrollment between 1936-37 and 1946-47 were not gradual increases nor were they for the same reasons. There was very little increase in total enrollment between 1936-37 and 1942-43. However, between 1942-43 and 1944-45 the total public school enrollment jumped from 119,043 to 125,136. 28 The development of wartime industries in British Columbia, after Pearl Harbour, explains this increase. 29 To accommodate this increase, 18 new elementary schools were built in British Columbia. 30 The year following the end of the war, 1945-46, saw the total enrollment increase by 4,869 to 130,605. Of this increase 4,540 were students with foreign parents. 31

The broadening of the concept of citizenship and the increase in
the total enrollment with its increasing percentage of foreign students

certainly justified social studies curriculum revision at this time but

there were other reasons which might explain why the elementary social

studies revision was the first to be revised, and completed within a

year. The elementary social studies curriculum revision was announced

in the Annual Report 1945-46, this was H. B. King's last year as Chief

Inspector of Schools and G. H. Weir was, once again, the Minister of

Education. (Dr. Weir lost his seat in the election of 1941 and was

re-elected in the 1945 provincial election.) It does not seem unlikely

that these two people, who were responsible for the initial revision

in 1935, would wish to revise their original work to bring it up to date.

The Elementary Social Studies Committee members were:

    Mr. H. C. Gilliland, Vice-principal, Provincial Normal School, Victoria (Editor)
    Mr. John Gough, Inspector of Schools, Victoria
    Dr. H. M. Morrison, Chief Personnel Officer, Civil Service Commission, formerly Inspector of Schools
    Dr. Wm. Plenderleith, Inspector of Schools, Nanaimo
    Mr. B. Thorsteinsson, Inspector of Schools, Duncan

The fact that this committee was composed of highly placed government

officials located in, or near Victoria provides evidence of the haste

with which the revision of the elementary social studies curriculum took

place.

    Social studies was described in the curriculum guide as,

    . . . subjects which are concerned with the interrelationships of
    people in groups and with the interaction between those groups and
    their physical environment. Some of these subjects are history,
    geography, civics, economics and sociology. In the elementary school,
    material is drawn from all of these subjects to form the basis for
    experiences that will explain to the child his social and physical
    environment, and will afford such practice in wholesome living in
    that environment as will help him to achieve socially competent self-
    realization.
This very broad, child-centred outlook was reflected in the aims of social studies.

The aim of the school is to make good citizens—of our community, of our nation, of our world. The overriding aim of Social Studies is to provide children with those rich experiences in group activities of a co-operative nature that will help each child to grow towards a self-realization in harmony with the progress of society.34

The emphasis, in the elementary courses, was to be on process, though facts were acknowledged as being necessary. Instructions on the use of geographic tools and visual aids were also given. The content of the elementary social studies courses followed a pattern that began in the home, spread to the community then to the world, with an emphasis on specific experiences and colourful stories. Teachers were warned to avoid details which involved long lists of names and explanations. 35

The elementary curriculum, with its emphasis on process, was an example of the interest-centred curricula of progressive education. The use of a prescribed textbooks was played down. It was not to be used to indicate the content of courses but to be used for enrichment and freetime reading. 36 At the back of the 1950 Programme of Studies were extensive lists of supplementary readers for both students and teachers, but one wonders where the school boards were to find the money to provide these resources in the light of the inspectors' comments earlier in the decade. If the supplementary material was not available, the teacher would be forced to rely on the textbooks.

Two geography textbooks were prescribed, New World Horizons and Old World Horizons. 37 The subject matter was presented in a sample study method, that is, the use of one example to represent a general pattern. Topping, in his thesis on the teaching of geography in British Columbia, said that in order to maintain a high interest level in these
books, factual material was avoided.38

Despite the progressive approach given in the directions to teachers through the published curriculum, the content remained generally the same. As mentioned previously, the primary grades looked at their home, then their community and then their extended community. In the intermediate grades, the content was selected from history and geography. However the titles of the grade four and grade six geography courses were significant. These were "World Folk" and "World Neighbours," and reflected the extended sense of world citizenship.39

When the Social Studies for the Elementary Schools was published in its final form in 1950, it contained explicit instructions for organizing units with time allotments and visual aids which could be used. Dr. H. B. King started the elementary social studies curriculum revision but it was completed in its final form by the Elementary Social Studies Revision Committee.

The social studies revision for the secondary schools was part of a total reorganization of the secondary curriculum which began the year after the administrative changes, recommended by the Cameron Report, became effective. The principles underlying this reorganization included a reduction in the number of courses necessary for university entrance, the lowering of the standard required in certain subjects, and the provision of advanced elective courses in the major subject fields so "that students might pursue their intellectual interest further in high school than is now possible."40 These principles showed a fundamental change in education and opened the high schools and university to growing numbers of students.

The secondary social studies revision was far more a committee
process than that of the elementary; it also took much longer to complete. Even the general public was invited to take part. The Annual Report (1946-47) announced that Dr. Weir had held public meetings in Vancouver and Victoria at which the public had been invited to offer suggestions as to what should constitute the content and method of the social studies courses "to train young people for effective citizenship."41

In Vancouver, the meeting attracted about 200 members of the general public, including trades unionists, churchmen, and teachers.42 Suggestions to the Minister, varied from the study of trades unionism to the inclusion of large prints of the Ten Commandments in every classroom. A teacher who was the president of the United Nations' Society, Vancouver Branch, urged the subordination of "Canadianism" to the concept of one world.43 Another teacher warned that social studies teachers tended to lose a sense of proportion in the subject with the result that it became too difficult and parents were being forced to do their children's homework. As a result of the meetings, "it was decided that the basic course in social studies should consist of a fusion of history, geography, economics and sociology."44

The high school social studies courses were developed by separate committees of teachers between 1946-1949. It is interesting to look at the list of teachers involved in the revision of the high school courses.45
BRITISH COLUMBIA SOCIAL STUDIES REVISION COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr. Harold L. Campbell, Chairman Division of Curriculum, Department of Education, Victoria, B.C.

General Coordinator: Dr. K. F. Argue, Department of Education, University of British Columbia

Secretary: Mrs. Muriel Scace, Director of Educational Reference and School Service

The Social Studies Revision Committee as divided into sub-committees:

Social Studies 30:
(Social Studies V)
Dr. R. F. Sharp, Chairman, Magee High School, Vancouver
Mr. Kenneth A. Waites, King Edward High School, Vancouver
Mr. A. W. Hyndman, King Edward High School, Vancouver
Mr. Stephen T. Moodie, Duke of Connaught High School, New Westminster

Social Studies 20:
(Social Studies IV)
Mr. W. M. Armstrong, King Edward High School, Vancouver, Chairman
Mr. F. H. Pratt, Burnaby South High School
Mr. I. R. Miller, North Vancouver High School
Mr. Arnold Webster, Grandview High School

Social Studies 10:
(Social Studies III)
Mr. R. C. Harris, Chairman, John Oliver High School, Vancouver
Mr. C. D. Smith, King George High School, Vancouver
Mr. E. L. Yeo, Britannia High School, Vancouver
Mr. W. A. Willander, Vancouver

Social Studies 8:
(Social Studies II)
Mr. John E. Gibbard, Magee High School, Vancouver, Chairman
Mr. Louis Grant, Templeton Junior High School, Vancouver
Miss Lillian Cope, Kitsilano High School, Vancouver
Mr. Clyde McK. Smith, Lister Junior High School, New Westminster
Mr. Bert M. Cooper, John Robson Junior High School, New Westminster
Social Studies 7:
(Social Studies I)
Mr. Harold Northrop, Chairman, Lord Byng High School, Vancouver
Mr. Sydney Taylor, Vancouver Technical High School
Mr. P. J. Sanderson, Capital Hill Junior High School, New Westminster
Mr. E. J. Irwin, Templeton Junior High School

Consultants:  Professor A. C. Cooke, Department of History, University of British Columbia
Dr. J. L. Robinson, Department of Geology and Geography, University of British Columbia
Professor H. F. Angus, Department of Economics, University of British Columbia

Of the 21 teachers listed, 14 are from the Vancouver School District, and the remaining 7 from adjacent school districts. The influence of Vancouver teachers in the field of social studies in British Columbia has been significant, both in actual curriculum development and in the role they played within the B.C.T.F. during the early days of social studies. Since Vancouver has always had the greatest number of teachers, easily accessible to each other, this influence is not so surprising. The location of the University of British Columbia, which produced consultants for the revision committees, also enhanced Vancouver's position.

However, social studies teachers in secondary schools in the rest of the province were not neglected. A questionnaire prepared by the B.C.T.F. was distributed province-wide, in 1945 because "the entire social studies course is about to be revised. We are anxious to have a consensus of opinions." The questions concerned suggestions for all courses, asking what was good or bad about present courses, and for suggestions for new courses and electives. The questionnaires were to be returned to the B.C.T.F. Unfortunately there is no information as to the results of the questionnaire nor to what use was made of the information gathered.
The Deputy Minister of Education, Harold Campbell, convened a meeting in Vancouver for the teachers appointed to the revision committees. They were given a free hand to draw up the whole social studies curriculum including the choice of textbooks. The courses were to be based on a social studies idea with an historic sequence since no radical changes were wanted.

While the social studies curriculum was being revised a disagreement between the B.C.T.F. and the Department of Education developed. Although teachers were the members of the curriculum revision committees there was no teacher representative on the Central Curriculum Revision Committee. The Superintendent of Education's point of view was that having a teacher on the Central Curriculum Revision Committee would be like having a representative from the Department of Education in the B.C.T.F.

As the disagreement continued, an editorial was published in The B.C. Teacher entitled "Who Should Make the Curriculum?" The B.C.T.F. maintained that curriculum development should be completely in the hands of teachers and not subject to a committee of non-teachers for approval. "Curriculum education is teacher education at its best and no one should be denied the privileges and responsibilities inherent in this particular phase of the teaching profession." By November 1948 another editorial states that direct representation on the Central Curriculum Revision Committee was a major Federation objective. However, the B.C.T.F. did not get its representative on that committee.

In the Introduction to the Programme of Studies 1950, social studies is defined as, "the Social Sciences, history, geography, sociology, economics, political science, and psychology when these sciences are
functionally organized to facilitate related and meaningful presentation to students."\textsuperscript{52} Citizenship was still the central objective of social studies instruction.

Stated in briefest fashion the central objective of Social Studies instruction is the promotion of better citizenship. The pursuit of this objective begins in elementary school Social Studies with special attention to the home, the school, the community and heresay communities. In the Junior and Senior High Schools quality citizenship in home, school, and local community, is still of major concern; but with increased maturity, increased competence for a higher quality of citizenship in the Province, in the nation and the community of nations, is also sought. The end objective is good world citizenship. Obviously this objective is not achieved without patient study and active, thoughtful participation in a social environment. Probably the fact that the central objective of Social Studies is quality citizenship cannot be stressed too frequently provided that this insistence does not add converts to the illusory and socially dangerous notion that teachers, especially Social Studies teachers, are solely or even mainly, responsible for the quality of the citizenship of our oncoming generations. Nevertheless Social Studies teachers must, it is thought, pay special attention to the development of better citizens, even though the business of building quality citizens is a shared responsibility which they carry along with other teachers and many other social agents and agencies.\textsuperscript{53}

Two important concepts are noted here. As in the \textit{Programme of Studies for Elementary Schools}, a concept of world citizenship was developed. Secondly, the onus for citizenship education while not being removed from social studies teachers, was now seen as a shared responsibility.

The resulting courses, having been drawn up by separate committees, show a wide variety of approach. Rather than follow the definition of social studies, the committees produced courses that were either geography or history or separate units of both. Social studies 7, 8 and 20 were mainly history courses. Social studies 10 was a geography course, the first time that geography had been extensively taught in high schools since 1927.\textsuperscript{54}
Initially, the social studies revision committee developed Social Studies 30 as a course in world problems. When the course was finally introduced in 1952 it had become the "Geography, History, Culture and International Relations of Canada." The reason for the change in courses is not evident. There was no mention of the controversy in the Annual Reports for this period and the idea of ending the social studies courses with a course on world problems certainly fitted in with the concept of world citizenship. Mr. J. R. Meredith, the deputy Director of Curriculum during the period in question recalled that the senior staff in the Department of Education considered the proposed course too broad and too difficult to suit the needs and interests of the general population of students who were now entering the secondary school and for whom the curriculum reorganization had been provided. Mr. Meredith also recollected that representation had been made to the government over the years, by such organizations as the Parent-Teachers Association, B.C.T.F., and the B.C. Federation of Labour. These representations had often included references concerning the need for a course about Canada at the senior level. Mr. Meredith considered it likely that the senior staff of the department, in consultation with the Curriculum Advisory Board, discussed the problem and came to the conclusion that in view of the anticipated difficulties with the original course and the need to do a more effective study of Canada, a new course should be designed. The new course, on Canada, contained about equal amounts of geography, history, economics, and sociology and it was probably the one course which came closest to the definition of social studies given in the programme guides.

When the revised social studies courses were implemented in the
secondary schools, they were still in experimental form and teachers were invited to criticize them, which they did! A meeting of social studies teachers held on March 10th, 1953 in Vancouver, with Mollie Cottingham as chairman, decided that the social studies courses should be rearranged through the grades. The teachers wanted "World Problems" reintroduced with a Canadian history course as an elective.  

Though the Department of Education refused to rearrange the social studies courses, two courses were eventually revised as a result of teacher protest. These were Social Studies 20 in 1956 and Social Studies 10 in 1958. Social Studies 20 was criticized for its content, which was a world history course organized by themes rather than chronologically, and its textbook (Louis Capon, Across the Ages, Toronto: Gage, no date) followed this pattern. After revision the course was a study of history from the Renaissance to the present.

The Social Studies 10 course changed very little but the original textbook was revised to provide a Canadian edition. The textbook, World Geography, was used in American high schools and had been adapted only slightly for use in Canadian schools. Mr. Eric Kelly was asked by the Department of Education to take the chairmanship of the revision. Having consulted the B.C.T.F. Social Studies Committee, he, with the department, selected the committee of teachers. After a lengthy search no suitable Canadian or other textbook was found and the original textbook was re-introduced with a more adequate revision for Canadian schools.

As a result of the process of social studies revision, two resolutions were proposed at a Social Studies Workshop held in Victoria, July 4th 1955. The first resolution requested the Department of Education
to implement a system where curriculum revision could be done during the summer holidays. The second resolution requested that the Department of Education consult with the B.C.T.F. on the selection of candidates to participate in curriculum revision. As far as the first resolution was concerned there was no extensive secondary social studies curriculum revision until the revisions of 1966-68 when meetings were held throughout the period. No written evidence appeared in the records at the B.C.T.F. to confirm that the second resolution was successful. The teachers who took part in the curriculum revision at the secondary level thought that they had been suggested for the social studies revision because of their work with the B.C.T.F.

In 1954 a new social studies course was introduced. This was Social Studies 32, the geography of British Columbia. The course studied the physical, economic, and regional geography of the province. To accompany the course the Department of Education prepared a British Columbia Geography Manual with the help of Dr. J. Lewis Robinson and Dr. John D. Chapman of the geography department at the University of British Columbia. The introduction of such a course illustrates two important developments for social studies. In spite of the extension of the concept of citizenship from a narrow to a broader interpretation, nationalism still remained important. The insistence that Social Studies 30 have a Canadian content follows this idea, and the addition of a course with a provincial emphasis supports it. The second important development was that it was a geography course, and geography came to have increasing importance in the social studies programmes of British Columbia in the 1950's as that subject had a world-wide increase in popularity.

History dominated the secondary social studies curriculum from
its inception in 1927 until the 1960's but curriculum revision in the 1950's showed that there had been considerable increase in the geography content. If good citizenship was the transmission of traditional values, history was the most practical means of promoting it. However, circumstances were changing. World War II and its aftermath had helped to broaden the concept of citizenship, and television was becoming popular, bringing political affairs from all over the world into Canadian living rooms. Questions such as "Why?" or "Where?" were now being asked and geography was seen as the foundation which would provide these answers. Efforts to increase the size and importance of the geography department included the sending of members of the department to teachers' conventions to provide workshops and address teachers.

In The B.C. Teacher in 1954, Dr. J. Lewis Robinson noted that every historical event is also geographical, and he made a plea for the inclusion of geography along with history in social studies.63

Every historical event takes place in a place. That event is geographical as well as historical. Often it is the very character of that place that makes the event possible. It is said that "history repeats itself," and we sometimes forget that the unchanging geography of that place is the reason for the repetition.64

Dr. Robinson concluded his paper, which was based on his address to the Okanagan Valley Teachers' Convention, October 1953, by saying, "there is no excuse for Social Studies teachers not knowing something about the contribution that geographical teaching can make to an interesting class and towards better understanding."65

The arrival of Dean Neville Scarfe to head the newly formed College of Education at the University of British Columbia, in 1956, coincided with the efforts of the geography department to increase its size. Dean Scarfe came to the College of Education with an international reputation
in the teaching of geography. He had been Dean of Education at the University of Manitoba since 1951 and previous to that had worked at the London Institute of Education in England. He had been chosen as chairman of the 1950 UNESCO Conference on Geography Teaching, held in Montreal, and had published a book on geography teaching for the UNESCO organization which had been translated into many languages. The combined efforts of the College of Education and the geography department resulted in the latter having the largest undergraduate intake in Canada. In 1967, Robinson wrote,

Large undergraduate enrollments have been a characteristic of the University of British Columbia for a decade—more than twice that of any other Canadian university prior to 1964 and equal to the combined totals reported from McGill, Toronto and Western Ontario in the early 1960's.

The 1950's saw the beginning of a movement towards the inclusion of geography as a component of the social studies curriculum equal to that of history. Though this did not happen until the social studies revisions in the 1960's, the foundation for its change in status was laid in the 1950's.

While the joint efforts of the College of Education and the geography department were publicizing geography, social studies teachers were considering the establishment of a Provincial Specialists' Association. The topic had been raised at the 1958 Easter Convention and the Social Studies Section chairmen were asked to determine the wishes of the teachers. Accordingly, on September 22nd, 1959 an invitation was extended to all teachers of social studies to join the Social Studies Teachers Association. The aims of the Association were to function as a medium of exchange (of ideas), to stimulate local efforts, to coordinate a consensus of opinion through the province and, as an expediting
committee, to push for adoption of ideas which gained general acceptance among social studies teachers. The first officers elected were B. Holt of West Vancouver as president and R. Kaser of Vancouver as vice-president. Membership was open to any person who was an active or associate member of the B.C.T.F.

The emergence of an official association of social studies teachers was the inevitable product of circumstances. Social studies teachers had had great experience working together on revision committees. They had also worked together while criticizing the revised courses of the 1950's. It was also a time of change. The Royal Commission on Education, which is discussed in the next chapter, had already been established to investigate education in British Columbia and social studies teachers felt that one collective voice would carry more weight. The British Columbia Social Studies Teachers Association (B.C.S.S.T.A.) was to play an active part in the development of social studies in the next decade.

Social studies in the period between World War II and the Royal Commission on Education was still seen as citizenship transmission, as defined by Barth and Shermis. Its purpose was still to produce good citizens who conformed to a preconceived set of expectations. As the concept of the type of citizens which should emerge from the schools broadened, the method used to create such a citizen and content of the courses also broadened. There was still a mixture of description and persuasion but rather than a focus on facts, the social studies curriculum attempted to focus on process and skills. It was no longer important just to produce a citizen who knew, rather it was important that the citizen knew how.

Where content is concerned, a consensus of teachers and other
curriculum developers still produced the curriculum, but there was also an attempt, in the secondary curriculum, to avoid the chronological history of the past and focus on themes. This was not well received by teachers as we know from the fate of Social Studies 20 in 1956.

Finally, the idea printed in the revised courses from 1950 onwards, that the responsibility for citizenship lay not only with social studies teachers, but with all teachers, weakens the whole concept of social studies as citizenship transmission. Although the aim of social studies in this period remained citizenship as the Programmes of Study said, the method and content of the courses did not follow the Barth and Shermis definition as closely as the social studies curriculum revisions of 1935-37.71
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CHAPTER FIVE

A TIME OF CHANGE: 1957-1970

The process of change within society as a whole eventually causes changes in education. The elementary and secondary curriculum revisions in British Columbia in the 1960's were the result of changes in education which began earlier. These changes, in turn, reflected a general swing towards a more traditional approach to educational philosophy and resulted in increasing criticism of progressive education.

In the years since the Putman-Weir Survey progressive influences had generally shaped the direction of educational philosophy in British Columbia. That the progressives did not have it all their own way however, is illustrated by the number of articles for and against progressive education printed in The B.C. Teacher during the 1940's. This criticism of progressive education was not merely a provincial concern but in time reflected growing criticism throughout the rest of Canada and in the United States. In Canada the publication in 1953 of So Little for the Mind, a searing indictment of progressive education by the historian, Hilda Neatby, caused education to become a topic of widespread debate.

Professor Neatby attacked both the goals and the methods of progressive education. "'Education is life' has been translated for the school to take over 'every part of the child's life' and every function of society." "Progressive education in Canada is not liberation, it is
indoctrination both intellectual and moral.\textsuperscript{5} Social studies was singled out for special condemnation. "The social studies are the truly typical part of the progressive curriculum with its obsession for indoctrination."\textsuperscript{6} British Columbia's Social Studies Programme was criticized for a perceived inconsistency.

... it is startling to find that B.C. which also shows itself most pessimistic about the ability of Junior high school students to read their social studies material demands that they develop the "ability" to discriminate as to the varying reliability of sources, an ability to which eminent historians rather wish than claim, to possess.\textsuperscript{7}

Professor Neatby was accused by her critics of "armchair investigation" because her sources were the Programme Guides of the provincial Departments of Education, rather than actual observation of classroom teaching. However, she does describe accurately the weaknesses of the extremes of both the progressive and traditional perspectives of education when she concludes,

In essence, unit, enterprise and activity are a proper protest against a very common traditional vice. If progressives play down subject matter, traditionalists too often left it so bound and gagged that only the most perceptive students could distinguish signs of life.\textsuperscript{8}

The degree to which the ideas of progressive education were actually practised by the average teacher in British Columbia is difficult to say. The evidence available indicates that the extremes of progressivism, as described by Professor Neatby, were avoided. In the \textit{Annual Report 1953-54} J. F. K. English, Assistant Deputy Minister of Education and Director of Curriculum, noted,

The curriculum for the schools of British Columbia is designed to secure the best possible education for each child. ... Throughout the process care is taken to avoid undue influence from any group or from particular educational theories, progressive or traditional. The resulting curriculum is actually somewhat traditional in comparison with that in force in other places.\textsuperscript{9}
The first Social Credit government was elected in 1953 in British Columbia and the trend towards a more traditional view of education was noticeable when the "Aims of Education" appeared in Dr. English's report for 1954-55.

The people of the Province have established schools for the principal purposes of developing the character of our young people, training them to be good citizens and teaching them the fundamental skills of learning necessary for further education.\textsuperscript{10} The point was made that the school was not the only agency for education in its broadest sense and that home, church, community, and school should work together for the total education of the child.\textsuperscript{11} In the list of objectives which follows the general explanation of the "Aims of Education," the first objective was "To ensure that all pupils master the fundamental skills of learning to the limit of their abilities."\textsuperscript{12}

The official "Aims of Education" were prepared with the advice of a newly appointed Provincial Curriculum Advisory Board, a group of (unnamed) handpicked personnel.\textsuperscript{13} In 1955 this committee was restructured and renamed the Professional Committee on Curriculum Development, whose "function is primarily to advise on technical problems connected with the improving and administration of the curriculum."\textsuperscript{14} Members of this committee consisted of staff from the Department of Education, members of the B.C.T.F., and Department of Education appointees.\textsuperscript{15}

Social studies curriculum revision took place during these years when the focus of education was changing. The trend towards a more traditional view was not too evident in the revision of the two secondary courses, Social Studies 10 and Social Studies 20 (already dealt with in the previous chapter) since the revision of these courses was restricted to the content, not the goals of the courses. In the Annual Report (1953-54) the revision of social studies courses for grades one to six
was announced, and this revision does indicate a more traditional view of education. The teachers who assisted in the preparation of the programme were Mr. B. B. Crawford, Mr. S. Bragagnola, Miss Lila R. Dicken, Mrs. E. Kettlewell, Mr. A. J. Longmore, Mrs. F. E. Leitner, Mr. Monty Morley, Mrs. Brenda Rauch, and Mr. E. G. Taylor. There is no information given as to the teachers' schools or the amount or kind of assistance they provided.

The social studies revision was the result of an appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of the previous programme by the Department of Education. The following recommendations were made in the curriculum guide.

1. More specific assistance should be given, particularly to beginning and inexperienced teachers concerning this programme.
2. More definite indication should be given concerning the standards of attainment which should be expected from pupils at various levels.
3. There should be an adjustment of content presently prescribed for the various grade levels with particular reference to eliminating undue repetition at some grade levels and reducing the amount of content in others.
4. Due emphasis should be given to inductive-deductive thinking; i.e., developing important major concepts from a study of specific details and applying previously learned knowledge to the solution of new problems.
5. Due attention should be given to the history and geography of Canada in order that pupils may have a better understanding of their own country and traditions.

These recommendations indicate a definite trend towards the importance of course content and standards of attainment.

While social studies was still concerned with the study of peoples and countries, the subject disciplines were restricted to "history, geography and civics." This was a much narrower interpretation of social studies than had been given in the previous revision, that is "history, geography, civics, economics and sociology." The curriculum guide acknowledged that "because of its scope, Social Studies is a difficult
subject to teach" and the teacher is told to make "judicious decisions" between the demands of the subject matter and the method of teaching. \(^{21}\)

The aim of social studies was now quite specific.

The primary aim of Social Studies is to help children to gain the knowledge and develop those understandings, attitudes, habits and skills that will enable them to become well-adjusted, well-informed and socially responsible citizens. \(^{22}\)

As far as the prescribed content is concerned, the elementary school curriculum in 1957 was not so different from the previous revision. At the primary level the student still progressed from the home to the community and then the world, though more formal geography was introduced earlier in the 1957 revision. In the intermediate grades, the content was divided between geography and history with some of each in every grade and with a greater emphasis on Canadian topics.

The year that the new elementary curriculum was introduced also signalled the birth of the space age when the Soviet Union launched the Sputnik in October 1957. In the United States this event was seen as humiliation, and doubt about the achievements of public education intensified public debate. In British Columbia, the trend in education towards a more traditional approach was given added incentive.

In the Annual Report for 1957-58, the Director of Curriculum, J. R. Meredith, stated,

There is no value in changing simply for the sake of change. Revisions must be preceded by a thorough analysis of existing courses and textbooks. What are the aims and purposes? Are these significant in the light of present day demands? Are their content, skills and knowledge educationally valuable to pupils and society? Is it accurate, comprehensive and challenging? Are these courses and texts well-organized for teaching and learning? Such questions as these must be studied carefully and thoroughly in order that a sound basis can be established for making improvements in the future. \(^{23}\)
The "sound basis" referred to were the findings of the Royal Commission on Education, appointed by Order in Council, January 17th, 1958. Three commissioners, S. N. F. Chant (the chairman), J. E. Liersch, and R. P. Walrod, were appointed to inquire into and report on the state of education in British Columbia. The Report of the Royal Commission on Education was published in 1960 and has become known as the Chant Report. The Commission was empowered to investigate and assess the provincial school system, to identify weaknesses, and make recommendations. The Commission conducted hearings throughout the province. It heard many briefs from both professional and lay people.

While the B.C.T.F. prepared a formal brief, a separate brief prepared by the B.C.T.F. Social Studies Section concerned high school social studies in particular. The brief stated that after five years of social studies in high school, a student should have the following: an appreciation and understanding of the legacy of past civilizations, a knowledge of the geography of the world and its resources, a detailed knowledge of the geography, history, civics, and economics of Canada and an understanding of the background factors relating to the development of the modern world. Most of the briefs given by citizens concerning social studies questioned the usefulness and appropriateness of the subject and suggested, "that the term 'social studies' has outlived its usefulness. Social Studies courses should be called what they are: history or geography." These briefs recommended that the social studies courses be reorganized into geography and history.

In its Report, the Commission recommended that the primary aim of education in British Columbia should be "THAT OF PROMOTING INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT." This should be the emphasis on the whole school
programme, the rationale being that intellectual development was essential for human survival. To this end, the Commission considered that the "word and number subjects" had to be at the very centre of the public school curriculum and that "outside this core but still within an inner zone are the subjects that deal with the ways of man and the world in which he lives--History, Geography, Science and languages." Where social studies was concerned, the Commission noted that there was a difference in the general aims of social studies and the meaning given to social studies by those who submitted briefs to the commissioners. "From the sources of information available to the Commission, it was obvious that parents and others expected that the main outcome of social studies courses would be knowledge of the traditional fields of history and geography." The Commission recommended a complete review of the social studies curriculum, "WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SUBJECT MATTER AND THE MANNER IN WHICH THE UNITS OF THE COURSES ARE KNIT TOGETHER TO PROVIDE COHERENT AND CONSECUTIVE COURSES OF STUDY." The Commission considered that the merger of geography and history had not been successful and recommended a greater differentiation between them in the design of the curriculum, "so that more stress may be placed upon the mastery of factual knowledge in the study of these subjects."

The question of the content of the social studies had been causing strong feelings among teachers for some time. At the Annual General Meeting of the B.C.T.F. in 1959, the Fraser Valley District put forward the resolution, "Be it resolved that the Department of Education make necessary changes to provide that history and geography be taught as two separate subjects." The resolution was not endorsed by the Social
Studies Committee at the Annual General Meeting but the executive of
the B.C.S.S.T.A. arranged a meeting of social studies teachers in Van-
couver on November 10th, 1959, where the proponents were allowed to pre-
sent their case. The speakers were Dr. Robinson and Mr. J. Gibbard
(University of British Columbia), Mr. Many (Chilliwack), and Mr. J. Church
(Gladstone Secondary School, Vancouver).34 The following arguments
were put forward in favour of separation:

1. It was difficult to train teachers in the techniques and phil-
osopies of both history and geography.
2. The viewpoint of geography was so different from that of history
that a teacher cannot hold and present both adequately.
3. There was an increasing trend towards the separation of these
subjects in Canada. Ontario had already separated the two
subjects.
4. History was the dominant subject in practically every social
studies programme. To give full benefit to geography there
would have to be separation.

The arguments against the separation of the two subjects were:

1. It was not the task of the high schools to create historians
or geographers, this was the task of the University.
2. Interest should be concentrated on the pupil not on the sub-
ject since the aim should be to produce a well-informed citizen
capable of selecting appropriate material from any subject.
It was felt that social studies was more likely to produce such
a citizen than geography and history taken separately.
3. The current curriculum was already too subject centred and
since studies indicated that there was little retention of
factual material, there should be a concentration on teaching
pupils to think.35

No vote was taken at the meeting since it was not considered a group
representative of the whole province but the meeting did indicate that
there were two diametrically opposed groups of social studies teachers.

The arguments of those who favoured the separation of history and
geography were advanced with the publication of Jerome Bruner's The Pro-
cess of Education (1960).36 Bruner, a Harvard psychologist, advanced
the theory that any subject may be taught to anyone at any age, in some
form, with scrupulous intellectual honesty.
The early teaching of science, mathematics, social studies and literature should be designed to teach these subjects with scrupulous intellectual honesty, but with an emphasis upon the intuitive grasp of ideas and upon the use of these basic ideas.37

In the United States the outcome of Bruner's ideas was an unprecedented participation in curriculum development by university scholars and scientists who prepared courses which were up-to-date with advances in science and scholarship and which were implemented on a national scale. Some of these programmes made their way into some Canadian provinces. As far as social studies in British Columbia was concerned, the most important effects were on the support given to geography, a neglected academic discipline, and the influence that the universities came to have on curriculum development.

The Department of Education stepped into the impasse in social studies. Separate geography and history advisory committees were formed on which both teachers and university representatives were invited to sit. The advisory committees were asked "to consider the question of revisions in the present programme of Social Studies courses for secondary schools" and "to study and make recommendations concerning the place of history in the future programme."38 The members of the History Advisory Committee were B. Holt, R. Simms, D. Sage, Miss H. Boutilier, Dr. A. B. Neatby, Dr. J. H. Winter, Miss E. Deyell, L. Grant, and N. Sutherland. J. R. Meredith and R. B. Knowles represented the Department of Education on the Committee. The members of the Geography Advisory Committee were A. Gunn, R. Elliott, O. M. Sanford, W. Topping, F. Hardwick, G. Tomkins, Dr. J. Chapman, Dr. A. Farley, and Dr. J. L. Robinson.

The make up of these committees showed the influence of the University; one half of the representatives on each committee was university faculty. The teachers on the History Advisory Committee felt that
there was often conflict in the respective viewpoints of the classroom teachers and the university faculty concerning the curriculum. However this feeling is not reflected in the Minutes of the Meetings.

The Report of the Geography Advisory Committee was ready by March, 1962. It included a general statement and suggested programmes for elementary and secondary schools. The Report of the History Advisory Committee was completed in June, 1963. Both reports emphasized the uniqueness and separateness of each discipline.

Throughout the secondary school years, geography must be taught so that it reveals the structure of the discipline as it is understood by professional geographers themselves.

History is one approach to the study of society but it is a distinct discipline. . . . When history is merged with related disciplines into a single course of studies students at the secondary school level cannot be expected to understand its unique nature.

In an editorial in a special social studies issue of The B.C. Teacher, R. I. Simms, the president of the B.C.S.S.T.A. pointed out that the History and Geography Reports were not revision committees. "The Committees were instructed to outline the scope and sequence of what they thought students should master in geography and history in the Secondary Schools." The editorial further noted that there were "strong feelings about geography and history being treated as separate disciplines."43

In March 1964, a letter from J. R. Meredith, Director of Curriculum to the B.C.T.F., was printed in the B.C.S.S.T.A. Newsletter. The letter invited suggestions for the names of qualified people who would be appointed to the Social Studies Revision Committee.

The controversial nature of certain aspects of this revision is such that formation of a representative committee of qualified and experienced persons is particularly important. Any assistance the Federation can provide will be greatly appreciated.
The letter suggested that a balanced committee of both teachers and university representatives, representing both history and geography interests would be formed.

While the Social Studies Revision Committee was being formed in the late spring of 1964, the B.C.S.S.T.A. arranged a panel discussion on the topic of Social Studies Curriculum Revision "to spark and direct discussion." The four members of the panel were J. Church, representing the Department of Education; A. Welsh, speaking for the geography oriented; B. Holt, speaking for the history oriented; and J. Gibbard, speaking for the social studies oriented. Each speaker presented a particular point of view. A. Welsh and B. Holt spoke on the value of their respective disciplines and advocated separate treatment within the curriculum. John Church, a Vancouver teacher on leave of absence to the Department of Education as Secondary Curriculum Consultant, suggested the position of the department. One of Mr. Church's main points was that the differences which existed evolved from different points of view.

The Department suggests that in any curriculum development, the needs of the subject, the needs of society and the needs of the pupil must be considered. Sometimes, as we know, compromise is essential to attain a consensus in meeting the three needs.

In making a plea for social studies, John Gibbard spoke to the idea that a knowledge of geography and history, though valuable in itself, would not solve the problems of the world.

Social problems need to be studied and thought through with hardheads and soft hearts, with knowledge and logic, but with understanding and sympathy too. Geographers want to teach some people to think like geographers, historians want them to think and learn as historians but social studies teachers are concerned that they should all, as citizens of the community, the nation and the world, learn to think like concerned and involved members of society—concerned for its future and involved in its processes.
In the social studies issue of *The B.C. Teacher*, John Meredith, the Director of Curriculum, gave some idea of the problems awaiting those involved in the revision of social studies.

What shall the social studies teach? What shall be the content? How shall it be taught? Possibly no other single area of the secondary curriculum presents as many complexities and difficult problems as does the area called the social studies. Possibly in no other curriculum area have both the general public and members of the profession expressed a more sustained interest and offered a wider divergence of possible solutions. Both public and profession have recognised not only a need for revision of the present social studies but also the fact that the revision will have a profound and far-reaching significance.

The general announcement of the establishment of the Social Studies Revision Committee was made in *Explorer*, in December 1964. The committee consisted of social studies teachers at elementary, junior high, and senior levels as well as administrators and representatives from the universities and the Department of Education.

The Revision Committee had the authority to make recommendations concerning the functions and goals of the social studies programme in secondary schools, to review carefully the recommendations of the Geography and History Advisory Committees, to recommend a programme of courses for the secondary school curriculum with the necessary curriculum guides and textbooks. The members of the Revision Committee were not to be publicly announced. "This policy, based on experience has been established to protect the individual members from undue pressure." The Secondary Revision Committee members were J. S. Church, C. W. Dick, D. F. Forman, Dr. C. F. Goulson, P. Harper, B. G. Holt, Miss M. E. Pedley, D. P. Reimer, D. S. Steinson, Dr. G. S. Tomkins, and A. J. Welsh. The Elementary Revision Committee members were Mrs. E. S. Buhles, S. S. Galbraith, G. Halkett, R. Hamelin, E. Lighbody, Dr. D. H. Mitchell, Miss J. F. Proctor, Mrs. H. Sloan, K. S. Thibodeau, and
Miss F. M. Worledge. Inspector C. T. Rendle chaired both the secondary and elementary committees. These committee members were far more representative of the province than those on earlier social studies committees, though most members still represented the Lower Mainland, Fraser Valley, and Vancouver Island.

The Secondary Revision Committee began its work before the Elementary Revision Committee. At the first meeting on September 30th, 1966, at the B.C.T.F. Building in Vancouver, the instructions for the revision were given by the Department of Education. The Social Studies Programme from grade eight to eleven was to consist of two years of geography and two years of history. These two main disciplines were to be taught each year. The revision committee later divided into subject committees to "discuss broad principles and concepts of each discipline and to produce a plan for social studies." Both the geography and history subject committees made an attempt to integrate the two subjects within each grade by providing a common theme as far as possible. At a workshop held on January 30th, 1967, the committee divided into sub-committees to complete rough outlines for each grade. By February 20th, 1967, the rough outlines, which included topics for in-depth study, were presented to the whole Revision Committee.

The rough outlines were not entirely accepted by the whole Revision Committee. There was debate on the continuity of the themes from grade to grade and the level of sophistication required for each grade. The main difficulty pertained to the question of whether to use a problem approach or a chronological approach to the themes. Neither the geography courses nor the history courses met with the approval of the universities. The minutes of the meetings record that the university
departments pressed hard for the new approaches to geography and history, such as the use in the new courses of documents, maps, and air photographs. The outlines for each grade had been drawn up by the teachers on the revision committee and the universities felt that the new approaches had been neglected. The teachers on the Revision Committee were unhappy with the interference from the universities and felt that this influence was out of all proportion to the number of university representatives on the Curriculum Revision Committee. While the minutes do not show that changes were made as a result of this "interference" the secondary social studies curriculum 1968, does include some of these new approaches.

Between 1967 and 1968 work began on the selection of textbooks needed for each course. The original idea of the Revision Committee was to provide a number of source books for different levels of ability. In the end however, a basic book, the "A" issue, was provided for all students in each course and a separate list of books, the "B" issue, was provided, in smaller numbers, for in-depth studies. A memo to all members of the Secondary Revision Committee from the Department of Education dated May 6th, 1969, and found among the correspondence concerning the search for textbooks in the Department of Education records, indicates that budget considerations were responsible for this decision.

In spite of all the time spent on curriculum revision by the Secondary Committee, the courses of study ended up a product of compromise. There was compromise in the achievement of an equal balance of history and geography, each subject occupying half of the school year, rather than being offered simultaneously as independent subjects. There was compromise in the integration of the two subjects in each grade. Though the history and geography sections of the Secondary Revision
Committee worked separately they did try to integrate the two disciplines in each grade as far as they were able. In grade eight, the "Developing Tropical World" is linked to "Renaissance, Evolution and Revolution." The grade nine "Industrial-Urban Relations" geography course is linked to "Nineteenth Century Europe and the Contemporary World." In grade ten and grade eleven, the emphasis is on Canada. In grade ten both history and geography courses are entitled "Canada in its North American Setting," while in grade eleven the emphasis in history is "Canada in Her World Setting," and in geography, it is "The Geography of World Problems."59

There was compromise between the interests of the university and the teachers. The teachers felt that they knew what should be taught in the classroom. At the same time the university teachers felt it their duty to see that there was scholarship in the new curriculum. Lastly, there was compromise in the selection of textbooks in that only one book was prescribed for all levels of ability in each grade.

The Elementary Social Studies Revision Committee began its work after the Secondary Revision Committee. They began on October 4th, 1966. This committee was given instructions for the revision by the Department of Education.60 As in the case of the secondary curriculum, geography and history were to be given equal time. The Elementary Committee was also told that its work had to accommodate the work of the secondary curriculum. To make sure that the "fit" was there, the grade seven course was prescribed by the Department of Education and was "Man in the Mediterranean."61 The committee set to work and produced a curriculum which had a more cultural approach than the previous revision. In grades one through three, students were to learn about "The Immediate
Environment," the "Total Community," and "People Around the World." In grade four the course was "The World as the Home of Man" and in grade five it was "The Development of Man in North America." In grade six "The United States and Latin America." 62

The outline was intended to be a blueprint that teachers could use but as in the case of the secondary textbooks, budget limitations restricted the provision of instructional materials. Some of the elementary materials were specially written for this curriculum. For example, for grade five, a special series of booklets, the Growth of a Nation Series was produced. 63

Both the Elementary and Secondary Revision Committees requested that the new courses be field-tested before being authorized but the Department of Education would not arrange this. The committees also wanted inservice training provided by the department but all that was provided was at the local school board level by other teachers. 64

The new revised social studies courses were introduced into the classroom in 1968 with Social Studies eight, other grades following year by year. The Elementary Programme was implemented between 1971-1972.

The specific objectives of social studies were given as:

1. KNOWLEDGE
   To cause students to acquire a body of knowledge (comprised mainly of basic concepts or principles and generalizations) about the functioning of human societies—both past and present, both at home and throughout the world.

2. METHODS OF ACQUIRING KNOWLEDGE
   To cause students to develop some facility in using the methods of Inquiry through which knowledge in the social domain is discovered and acquired.

3. THE USE OF KNOWLEDGE AND A SPIRIT OF INQUIRY
   To cause students to develop the capacity for the sorts of speculative and creative thought which enable one to think hypothetically, to hold tentative conclusions, and to reconstruct the knowledge already in one's possession.

4. VALUE QUESTIONS
   To provide a forum in which students may learn to deal with value questions in an intellectually and ethically honest way. 65
The Elementary social studies objectives follow along the same lines, "a) Basic Knowledge, b) Skills, c) Critical Thinking, and d) Feelings, Attitudes, and Values."\(^{66}\)

The concentration of the curriculum on the acquisition of knowledge follows the curriculum developments of the 1960's. Knowledge here does not refer to the old concept of storing up useless facts but rather the knowledge of a discipline, in this case geography and history. To this end the Secondary Curriculum Guide includes separate statements to describe the function and concepts of geography and history.\(^{67}\)

In neither the Secondary nor Elementary Curriculum Guides does a definition of social studies appear, except to comment that "this subject deals with human beings—in the past, in the present, in the immediate community and in various parts of the world."\(^{68}\) This illustrates yet another compromise. Although the new curriculum in the secondary schools could more accurately be called "geography and history" or "social science," the Department of Education responded to those who still advocated "social studies" by allowing the new courses to stand under the old name.

One complete departure from past traditions is the lack of any direct mention of citizenship. The word itself is not mentioned! Before the actual process of curriculum revision began, teachers in the province were asked to make submissions to the curriculum committees on the basis of a published "Progress Report" which described the types of courses to be written and some of the parameters which were to be used. The lack of emphasis on citizenship in the "Progress Report" was a recurring criticism by teachers.\(^{69}\) The reply to the criticism came from B. Holt a member of the Secondary Revision Committee who
pointed out:

The point is emphasized that no one becomes a good citizen because he is told to be a good citizen. A teacher can, and should, set an example of good citizenship but it is what he does, not what he says, that matters. In this respect, the social studies teacher has no greater responsibility than any other teacher, or, for that matter than any other parent or adult. . . . What concerned the committee about a precise recommendation suggesting that the social studies teacher should produce good citizens was the possibility that outright indoctrination could result. Canadians shudder at the consequences of such complete surrender of one's right to think.  

This is the complete reversal of the purpose of social studies as it was first introduced into the British Columbia curriculum. A good citizen is now seen as one who thinks for himself/herself, having been trained to think by a school curriculum designed to show the structure of knowledge.

In the Barth and Shermis definition of the goals of social studies, "Social Studies as a Social Science" has, as its purpose, the acquisition of knowledge in the social science disciplines for its own sake.  

As a teacher, the social scientist transmits certain selected concepts, the products of the teacher's own research or that of others. Both concepts and content are selected on the basis of a consensus of suggestions received from any interested parties. The Social Studies Curriculum in British Columbia follows this definition of social studies.

The idea of social studies as a vehicle for citizenship transmission was gone, at least as far as the curriculum was defined. Not all teachers recognised this fact, though all noticed the structural differences.

This autumn, in most B.C. secondary schools the new social studies curriculum made its first appearance. Content, organization and teaching materials have all been radically changed from the pattern with which over the years we have all become very familiar.
In an editorial in *Explorer*, the writer, a member of the Secondary Revision Committee said:

For teachers of social studies, therefore, the new curriculum means "challenge." We are challenged to reconsider our whole philosophy of education to reevaluate our techniques, to reassess our attitude towards students. We are challenged to make our work more difficult but in the long run more rewarding.73

The Social Studies Curriculum Revision of the late 1960's was more innovative than the much "celebrated" curriculum of 1935-37. It changed the goals and content of social studies; it introduced geography on an equal basis with history and attempted to introduce new approaches to teaching the content. The final decisions on the curriculum were reached through compromise, a process which invites criticism. The revision was an attempt to make deliberate changes in the social studies curriculum, a change which began with the Elementary Revision in 1957.

In the conclusion of the British Columbia Social Studies Assessment (1977) the Social Studies Programme is criticized thus:

The British Columbia Social Studies Program approaches the study of man-in-his-world from these three perspectives: scientific, situational, and critically reflective knowing. Through each of these, students are exposed to various interpretations of how the social world has been constructed. The program, however, does not provide a balance between these perspectives; rather it emphasizes scientific knowledge.74

What was perceived as a criticism in 1977 would have been regarded as a compliment by the Secondary Social Studies Revision Committee 1966-68 for this was what they set out to do, a fact which is stated distinctly in the goals of the programme.

In the historical development of the social studies curriculum in British Columbia, the 1966-68 curriculum revision was the only one in which the goals and the content correspond. This was because the Social Studies Revision Committees wrote the goals.
The criticism of the British Columbia Social Studies Assessment (1977) illustrates the transient nature of curriculum design. In the 1970's there have been a number of developments in society which have, in turn, been reflected in attitudes to education. The Canadian Studies Foundation is one example of a movement which focused concern on the lack of Canadian content in the public school curriculum and has resulted in the inclusion of more "Canadiiana" in many subject disciplines including social studies. The social studies curriculum, since it deals with people and events, past and present, is particularly vulnerable to the changes in attitudes. If the 1966-68 Social Studies Curriculum seems to be lacking when compared to present day needs this does not detract from the fact that when it was written, it was the most innovative social studies curriculum British Columbia had had.
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CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

This thesis has been concerned with the reasons for replacing the traditional courses of history and geography with social studies in British Columbia and with the historical development of social studies up to 1970. Two major conclusions flow out of this research. First, that the introduction of social studies into the curriculum and its subsequent development were the results of political acts by those in authority in education. Second, despite the goals of social studies, the content of the curriculum has varied very little over the years.

When the goals of social studies are viewed in historical perspective, they are seen to change in relation to changes in the prevailing mood of public opinion. Since the goals of social studies (except for the revisions between 1966-68), were written by the Department of Education, the broad assumption is made that they represent the prevailing political views of the time.

Social studies was deliberately introduced into the British Columbia curriculum to transmit citizenship, when the threat of civil unrest provided the excuse for socializing the school population by attempting to inculcate the 'right' attitudes deemed necessary, by those in authority to preserve the state. As times have changed the goals of social studies have been changed by the Department of Education to reflect these changes.
If the social studies rhetoric has been political has it been followed through in the classroom? The evidence collected from the interviews conducted during 1981-82 with the teachers named at the end of this thesis, provides a negative answer. When social studies was introduced in the 1920's and 1930's many teachers were enthusiastic with the new approach. Having been affected directly or indirectly by World War I and later by the depression, they saw social studies as a way to make things better. They saw it as an aspect of child-centred education which would help their students find a better life.¹ This is quite the opposite idea from that of the government instructions in the Programmes of Study. Though there was some experimentation in teaching social studies by a few teachers in the early days there was not much change in the high school classroom. One reason for this was the reality of the matriculation exams. Until 1965 the demands of the government examinations in grade twelve and the year end examinations for the other high school grades controlled the subject matter and the methods used to teach social studies in high schools.

Notwithstanding the broad definition of social studies which appears at the beginning of each Programme of Studies and which lists the disciplines from which the content of social studies may be drawn, until the last revision (1966-68), social studies was dominated by history, especially in high school. In fact an examination of both the content of social studies from its inception up to 1968, and of those courses which were replaced by social studies, shows that there have been no fundamental changes in the content of the social studies curriculum, nor was there any fundamental change when social studies was introduced into the curriculum. This is not so surprising when one considers that
teacher committees were responsible for the content of the social studies curriculum and drew on the material with which they were familiar.

To develop this point, there is no evidence to suggest that social studies as defined by the Programmes of Study has ever been taught in British Columbia. The content of the courses has never followed the definition, except in the last revision. By following the content, or even using it as a guide, social history would be the closest one came to social studies. In elementary schools the course content followed the definition of social studies more closely in the primary years but once the intermediate grades were reached the courses were generally restricted to history and geography. Since the content of social studies had not fundamentally changed over the years most teachers continued to teach as they had always done.

A. B. Hodgetts described in What Culture? What Heritage? the abysmal state of history teaching in Canada. This is the report of a two year study of history in both elementary and secondary classrooms throughout Canada and since history formed the basis of social studies courses in nine out of the ten provinces, the indictment is against the teaching of social studies. The report considered that "Canadian history is rendered almost useless as a stimulating school subject." In spite of all efforts made to the contrary, the report found that "three out of four Canadian history classes were engaged in the mechanical memorization of historical fact." The report concluded, "that the deficiencies of the past—deficiencies that have prompted so much futile study and comment for more than thirty years—are being perpetuated with varying degrees of intensity in all parts of Canada." For all the talk of innovation, for all the enthusiasm shown by some teachers, very
little change had taken place over the years in the classroom.

The teaching of "true" social studies, that is, a fusion or integration of those disciplines as defined in all the Programmes of Study since 1935 (except that for 1968), would require an exceptional educational background not available to most teachers. While this has always been true it would be very difficult for anyone today to have sufficient technical knowledge of all these disciplines to provide a balanced social studies course. The curriculum and teacher training programmes in British Columbia, since the last revision, have encouraged specialization in either history and/or geography. Since the adoption of social studies as a replacement for history and geography from 1927 on, it has not been possible to construct a course with a "true" social studies content for British Columbia nor has anything like social studies appeared in British Columbia classrooms.

Social studies was accepted without controversy in the 1920's and 1930's because it brought little change to most teachers and pupils. It may well be that the Ministry of Education has yet to experience the real test of the concept of social studies, fifty years after its introduction.
FOOTNOTES

1. Interviews with Mr. E. Kelly, Mr. L. Grant, Mr. J. Gibbard, Mr. F. Hardwick.


3. Ibid., p. 18.
4. Ibid., p. 21.
5. Ibid., p. 27.
6. Ibid., p. 115.
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