

BOOKS

This essay reviews the major developments in Canadian social studies education in the past decade by a critical examination of the published literature. Social studies education has been characterized by the dominance of American models, interest in Canadian Studies and moral development, and the pursuit of a variety of loosely related issues. Although identifying a variety of issues and problems, social studies educators seem to lack the commitment and resources necessary for serious or purposeful investigation of them.

Geoffrey Milburn*

The Social Studies Curriculum in Canada: A Survey of the Published Literature in the Last Decade

This essay attempts to review the major developments in social studies education in the last decade. Based almost entirely on a study of published articles and monographs rather than empirical research, the comments herein are selective and subjective, and no claim is made that every important issue has been examined. Some of the principal features of social studies education will be outlined, changes in programming will be discussed and some of the assumptions underlying current practice will be considered. Given the restrictions upon space in this journal, the arguments are presented in summary form. Finally, the reader may be reminded that social studies education is examined in this article through the inevitably jaundiced eye of an observer in central Canada.

The literature upon which such a survey may be based is fairly scattered, but by no means large. A number of teacher-training texts (either pre-service or in-service) appeared during the period, two of which were original monographs,¹ and the others collections of readings.² More specialized volumes were devoted to such topics as "inquiry" in the social studies,³ "values,"⁴ local history⁵ and textbook

*Geoffrey Milburn is Professor in Education (History) in the Faculty of Education, University of Western Ontario.

¹E. Moore and E. Owen, *Teaching the Subjects in the Social Studies* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1966), and Lillian M. Logan and Gerald T. Rimmington, *Social Studies: A Creative Direction* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1969).

²John Lewis (ed.), *Teaching for Tomorrow: A Symposium on the Social Studies in Canada* (Toronto: Nelson, 1969), and G. Milburn, *Teaching History in Canada* (Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1972).

³F. Simon, *A Reconstructive Approach to Problem Solving in the Social Studies* (Calgary: University of Calgary, 1970), and J. M. Clemens et al., *Inquiry and Canadian Studies* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., typescript 1973).

⁴John P. Miller, *Humanizing the Classroom: Models of Teaching in Affective Education* (New York, Praeger, 1976).

⁵H. A. Stevenson and F. H. Armstrong, *Approaches to Teaching Local History Using Upper Canadian and Ontario Examples* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1969); Mai-Liis Gerling and Michael Katz, *A Guide to the Study of Family and Class in Ontario's Past* (Toronto: O.I.S.E. 1973), and William B. Hamilton, *Local History in Atlantic Canada* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1974).

analysis.⁶ The research and comments of A. B. Hodgetts⁷ spawned a small shelf of publications related to Canadian studies in schools.⁸ Much useful material also appeared in national and provincial journals, including *The Quarterly of Canadian Studies for the Secondary School*, *The History and Social Science Teacher*, *The Monograph*, *Social Studies Review*, *Exploration*, *One World*, *Perspectives* and *Lighthouse*, some of which have originated (and died) during the last decade. Almost every province in the country has either revised its guidelines on the teaching of social studies in the last ten years, or made important additions to the existing canon.⁹ A number of articles written by Canadians have also appeared in foreign journals, particularly those published in the United States and Canada.

In reviewing this literature, a critic may be forgiven for concluding that social studies education in Canada is not bursting with creative energy. On many issues, including some of the most important, Canadian educators seem to be reacting to the work of others rather than assuming a leadership role. Despite evidence in some quarters of important new work (and some note will be made of these activities in subsequent paragraphs), the entire field of social studies in Canada appears to follow patterns established in other disciplines or in other countries. At the risk of some oversimplification, the conclusion seems inescapable that trends in Canadian social studies over the last decade could largely be accounted for in evidence uncovered in writings other than those of Canadian social studies educators. Among the reasons for these phenomena may be listed inadequate facilities for graduate study, the scattered nature (and small numbers) of researchers in the field, the low priority given to innovative work by provincial governments and local boards, and the reluctance of many professional associations in the country to make a significant commitment to curriculum alternatives in the social studies. Whatever the reasons, a review of a decade of literature in social studies reveals a noticeable lack of coherent research and comment, particularly at the theoretical level, into Canadian issues, despite the interesting work accomplished by individuals and groups in scattered locations across the country.

A major determinant of social studies programs in Canada remains the influence of research conducted in the United States. During the late sixties and early seventies, Canadian educators took great interest in publications of comparatively well-funded social studies research projects that became prominent in American

⁶Marcel Trudel and Genevieve Jain, *Canadian History Textbooks: A Comparative Study* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970), and Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt, *Teaching Prejudice: A Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks Authorized for Use in Ontario* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1971).

⁷A. B. Hodgetts, *What Culture? What Heritage?: A Study of Civic Education in Canada: Report of the National History Project* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1968). Hodgetts' findings were supplemented by Norman Massey, *Canadian Studies in Canadian Schools* (Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, 1971).

⁸Some of the more important publications include Edward H. Humphreys (ed.), *Focus on Canadian Studies* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1970), G. Milburn and J. Herbert (eds.), *National Consciousness and the Curriculum: The Canadian Case* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1974) and Ralph H. Sabey, *Project Canada West: Program Development, People, Processes, Products* (Vancouver: B.C.T.F., 1975). Additional information may be located in the Annual Reports of the Canada Studies Foundation (1971-1975) and in the reports of activities of the Foundation included in the ERIC listings.

⁹The most convenient source to provincial social studies guidelines and courses of study is *A Directory of Curriculum Guides Used in Canadian Schools* (Ottawa: Canadian Teachers' Federation, 1976).

social studies.¹⁰ The tide of American publications in this field has not abated in recent years and some Canadian educators continue to do their graduate work in the U.S. So persuasive has been the American example that commentators in Canada occasionally seem to read the Canadian social studies experience entirely in American terms, as if the image north of the border were a clear reflection of trends to the south. It is scarcely surprising that the very language of Canadian social studies in such circumstances (witness the interest in "objectives," "concepts" and "inquiry") should be the language made popular by American educators. In his general review of developments in social studies in the sixties and "the dawning of the seventies," Dhand confines his assessment almost entirely to American sources, with references to Britain and Canada limited to the last few pages.¹¹ The structure of his article, in other words, was derived from American research into social studies. Similarly, in a direct comparison of the changes that might be noticed in secondary school teaching in Montreal over the last twenty years, Smith used such concepts as "structure" (referring to Jerome Bruner), "inquiry" (Hilda Taba and Edwin Fenton) and "values" (Donald Oliver, Louis Rath and Sidney Simon) as a means of organizing his paper.¹² Both Smith and Dhand seem to regard the Canadian social studies experience as extensions of developments in the United States. Such reliance upon foreign models extends also into official government guidelines, in which major shifts in curricular emphasis may be explained in terms of American research, whether that source is openly acknowledged (as in the case of Alberta¹³) or not (Ontario¹⁴).

The second major source of outside influence is European. Interest in British curriculum work has a long tradition in Canada,¹⁵ and the products of British publishing houses continue to be popular in schools in many provinces. Contemporary evidence of that interest may be witnessed in open education patterns, particularly at the elementary school level,¹⁶ the use of documentary material,¹⁷ and the

¹⁰See Edith Deyell, "Ferment in the Social Studies: Where will it Lead?" *Canadian Education and Research Digest*, 4:1 (March, 1964), 56-69; G. Milburn, "Implications of Some Recent Research in Teaching History," *Canadian Journal of History*, 4:1 (April, 1969), 15-22, and the Editorial Note in *Exploration*, 7:2 (June, 1967), 1. In the last named the Editor writes, ". . . having the money and the enthusiasm to experiment, the United States is bound to lead in educational research. It is typical of American generosity that Canadians should be invited to learn at first hand the results of American investigations." Note also Stewart Dicks, "Current Trends in Social Science Education Applied to the Senior Years of Elementary School," *Canadian Journal of History and Social Sciences*, 8:3 (Spring, 1973), 9-19, and Harry Dhand, "Innovations in Social Studies," *Social Studies Review*, 6:2 (June, 1974), 16-47.

¹¹Harry Dhand, *ibid.*

¹²David C. Smith, "Changing Patterns in the Teaching of Secondary History: Some Perspectives and Interpretations," Unpublished paper, McGill University, 1976.

¹³*Responding to Change: A Handbook for Teachers of Secondary Social Studies* (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1972), pp. 11-12, 63, 67, 85 and 99-100.

¹⁴For example, no references are given to the ideas contained in *History: Intermediate Division* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1973), pp. 3-11, although many of the suggestions contained therein have distinctly American parentage.

¹⁵A reference to British teacher-training texts in History persists in the Quebec curriculum guide, *03 Handbook: Secondary Education (General), 1975-1976* (Quebec City: Ministry of Education, 1975), pp. 40 and 42.

¹⁶See *Living and Learning: Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario* (Toronto: Department of Education, 1968), p. 84; Pat Duffy Hutcheon, "Informal Education: Fad or Experiment?" *Perspectives*, 8:1 (Fall, 1972), 38-42, and "What We Learned," *Open Education: Lighthouse Learning Project* (Halifax: Atlantic Institute of Education, 1973), pp. 85-93.

¹⁷It is interesting to note that the *Jackdaw* series of documentary portfolios, first published in Britain, became the model for a Canadian series.

turn to local or community studies,¹⁸ all of which have been explored in depth in recent years in Britain. Perhaps of greater significance in the long-term are the initial adventures into the application to the social studies curriculum of concepts taken from Continental social philosophy, with its emphasis upon humanistic forms of inquiry on the one hand, and critical theory on the other, both areas of investigation that are relatively uncharacteristic of American social science.¹⁹

While the extent of such influences upon Canadian social studies has yet to be carefully measured, an examination of the literature of the last ten years suggests that it is very great indeed. In that respect the schools appear to have followed the example set by social science departments in many Canadian universities.²⁰ Whether such conditions ought to continue is a matter for governments, universities, school boards and the publishing industry to decide. In making such decisions, they will not lack advice, either from those who advocate greater Canadian role in curriculum design,²¹ or from those who fear the rise of an unthinking or repressive nationalism.²² Until those decisions are made, it seems likely that social studies educators will continue to consume foreign research and use foreign models in curriculum design.

Despite this continued reliance on foreign (and largely American) research, the last ten years also witnessed a growing interest in Canada in the social studies. In this development, historians have yet to tell us the extent to which social studies educators were swept along by changes in the social, economic and cultural relationships between Canada and the United States. Undoubtedly the publication of A. B. Hodgetts, *What Culture? What Heritage?* (the most popular book on Canadian education since *So Little for the Mind*)²³ did much to hasten and encourage the debate among Canadian educators. Sponsored, it should be noted, by an exclusive private school, written in brilliant and persuasive prose, and based on highly suspect methodology, Hodgetts' book chastised educators, particularly history teachers, for their failure to give adequate treatment to Canadian issues in schools. Among many failings he noted the poor academic background of many teachers, omission of essential topics within the curriculum, and dull and lifeless teachings. Greeted by immediate and almost universal applause, his short and readable pamphlet signalled a rush towards Canadian studies in schools.²⁴ By 1972 the Canada Studies Foundation, itself an offspring of *What Change?*

¹⁸H. A. Stevenson and F. H. Armstrong, *op. cit.*, p. 5.

¹⁹M. J. M. van Manen, "Some Search Orientations for Research in Social Studies Education," Paper presented at NCSS, Chicago, 1974, and T. Aoki and W. Werner, "An Analysis of the 1971 Secondary Social Studies Curriculum," in L. W. Downey Research Associates, *Report of An Assessment: The Social Studies in Alberta, 1975* (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1975), pp. 66-87.

²⁰T. H. B. Symons, *To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies* (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975).

²¹See, for example, Hodgetts, *op. cit.*, pp. 115-122, and R. J. Clark, "Response," in Milburn and Herbert (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 67-70.

²²Mordecai Richler, "Nationalism and Literature in Canada," and Douglas Ray, "Canadian Studies are Overrated," in Milburn and Herbert (eds.), *op. cit.*, pp. 105-117, 33-36.

²³J. L. Granatstein labelled Hodgetts' book a "most devastating attack on the teaching of Canadian history in primary and secondary schools," in *The Canadian Forum*, 48 (March, 1969), 283. Hilda Neatby, *So Little For The Mind* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1953, reprinted, 1967).

²⁴See, for example, John Patton, "The Canada Studies Foundation: A Progress Report," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 10:1 (Fall, 1974), 28-40, and Robert Page, "Canadian Studies in the 1970's: Life after Birth," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 11:4 (Summer, 1976), 2-10.

What Heritage?, with Hodgetts as first Director, had thirty inter-provincial teams at work across the country.²⁵ Departments and Ministries of Education began to demand a larger component of Canadian studies within the curriculum.²⁶ In their turn, publishers produced a wider variety of curriculum materials to satisfy a growing demand among teachers. A few privately sponsored research teams, particularly at universities, investigated alternative methods of teaching Canadian issues, and occasionally produced curriculum packages that soon found their way into elementary and secondary schools.²⁷ At the official level, social studies teachers have been required by provincial authorities to assume greater responsibility for developing their own programs within official guidelines,²⁸ and many Boards of Education across the country possess detailed courses or units of study developed in this way, although no systematic review of these materials has yet been undertaken.²⁹ In most provinces students are required to take some form of "Canadian Studies" in both their elementary and secondary school careers.³⁰

The road to Canadian studies has not, however, been an easy one to follow. Scholars seem deeply divided on the nature of Canadian studies, and its relationship with disciplines seems very unclear.³¹ At best, the subject of study seems to be an amalgamation of various kinds of content, with no clear definition yet possible of its interdisciplinary (or multidisciplinary) nature. The Canada Studies Foundation has insisted on a careful distinction between *Canada* studies and *Canadian* studies, to make sure that both the English and French "facts" appear in any curriculum.³² In addition, some provincial authorities may well be nervous

²⁵George S. Tomkins, "National Consciousness, the Curriculum and Canadian Studies," in Terence Morrison and Anthony Burton, *Options: Reforms and Alternatives for Canadian Education* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973), p. 215.

²⁶The provisional guideline in History, for example, introduced by the Ontario government in 1973, was much more committed to Canadian studies than its predecessor. *History: Intermediate Division, 1973* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1973) p. 3.

²⁷For example, the Atlantic Institute of Education has sponsored various types of curriculum projects in the Maritimes, and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education has supported the Canadian Public Issues Project.

²⁸See, for example, George Munro, "Four Years and Still Running: The Autobiography of a Curriculum Committee," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 9:4 (Summer, 1974), 25-32, and Tom Miller and Harry Dhand, "The Origin and Development of Project Canada West," *Perspectives*, 9:1 (Winter, 1974), 16-23.

²⁹One of the few attempts to examine teacher-produced Canadian curriculum publications is outlined in the theme issue of *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 10:4 (Summer, 1975), entitled "Canadian Curriculum Projects."

³⁰Ontario Ministry of Education *Memorandum 1973-74:12* demanded that each student obtain at least 2 credits in Canadian studies. Alberta has recently designed "optional Social Studies 6-week units, all specifically Canadian content, for Grades 1 through 12." In New Brunswick, a "national history program is anticipated for implementation in French-language schools as a required course in 1976-1977 at the Grade 10 level . . . "These examples are taken from "Civic Education in Canada: A Survey of Opportunities to Learn about Canada in the Schools of Canada," Unpublished paper, Canada Studies Foundation, 1976.

³¹Diverse points of view are presented in articles by Kenneth McNaught, Edward E. Owen and R. M. Laxer in Edward H. Humphreys (ed.), *Focus on Canadian Studies* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1970) and in "The Controversy," in *Canadian Studies '73: A Resource Booklet* (Toronto: O.S.S.T.F., 1973), pp. 3-4.

³²Hodgetts and his colleagues require that a "clear distinction" should be made between "Canadian Studies" and "Canada Studies". "This position is taken because the normal social process, including schools, by which young people develop their values and attitudes through strong regional and ethnic forces, needs to be balanced by studies which examine Canada as a totality, in country-wide, interlocking perspectives shared by all Canadians wherever they may live." A. B. Hodgetts *et al.*, "Civic Education: A Resource Guide for Canada Studies," Unpublished paper, 1976, pp. 4-5. See also Paul Gallagher, "Canadian Studies — or Canada Studies," *On World*, 14:2 (Spring, 1976), 9-11.

of the close ties between some of those who advocate emphasis upon Canadian studies, and those who argue left-wing political platforms.³³ The notion that teachers ought to be able to devise their own units of study assumes a certain ability in curricular design and writing, neither of which are part and parcel of the usual skills associated with good teaching. In consequence, some teachers have become anxious in situations that require new skills and different sorts of commitments.³⁴ After reading many of the locally produced materials, the impression is left with some observers that the author's good intentions are not realized in defensible curriculum packages.³⁵

On the more general question of how social studies teachers design their courses, there seems little doubt that many of them subscribe to curricular principles usually associated with Tyler, to which has been added a considerable dose of behaviourism. The assumption that curriculum consists of "units of study" in which "objectives," "learning activities," "teaching strategies," and "evaluation methods" are clearly identified, is very widespread. Some official guidelines published by Departments of Education consist of "objectives" and little else.³⁶ Although there are indications that there is a fairly wide gap between aspiration and outcome, some designers have demanded that objectives in such schemas be written in performance terms. This stress upon a form of behaviourism has caused concern to those educators who are wedded to more humanistic or interpretive approaches to social studies.³⁷ Nevertheless, as far as an observer can tell from very scattered data, the Tyler approach to curriculum and evaluation³⁸ remains dominant in contemporary social studies.

Social studies educators in Canada over the last decade also appear to have been influenced significantly by the developmental and structural arguments most conveniently located in the theoretical writings of Jerome Bruner on the one hand,

³³Note, for example, Godfrey's review of the Symons Report in *The Canadian Forum*, 61:662 (June-July, 1976), 18-23, and the contributions to Ian Lumsden, *Close the 49th Parallel Etc.* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970).

³⁴Dan McDevitt, "Skills, Attitudes and Content: The Confused Teacher," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 11:2 (Winter, 1975), 27-32.

³⁵See, for example, David M. Williams and Caroline Langford, "Case Study of a Teacher-Developed Curriculum: Westminster Project Social Studies," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 10:4, (Summer, 1975) 24-26.

³⁶The role of Tyler (and others) in forming or shaping curriculum patterns in Canada is discussed in T. Aoki, "Curriculum and Instructional Design," in R. Sabey (ed.) *Project Canada West: Program Development, People, Processes, Products* (Vancouver, B.C.T.F., 1975), pp. 50-69. Some estimate of the interest in behavioural objectives may be obtained from D. Allan Swan, "Behavioural Objectives," *Social Studies Review*, 2:8 (September, 1972), 9-14 and John S. Church, "The Objective is to have Pupil Objectives and Goal Oriented Education," *Exploration*, 14:2 (September, 1974), 45-48. The Ministry guideline that relies almost exclusively on listings of objectives is *Social Studies in the Elementary School: A Working Paper* (Halifax: Department of Education, 1975) pp. 13-54.

³⁷Robert Wilson, "Behavioural Objectives: What's the Use?" *History and Social Science Teacher*, 9:4 (Summer, 1974), 16-24, and David Pratt, "Humanistic Goals and Behavioural Objectives: Towards a Synthesis," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 8:4 (May, 1976), 15-25.

³⁸In government social studies guidelines, the dominant mode of curriculum construction is based on such concepts as "objectives," "learning activities," "teaching strategies," and "evaluation." See, for example, *History: Intermediate Division, 1973* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1973), pp. 8-9. Few attempts appear to have been made to evaluate curriculum units or courses, at least within the public domain. Alternative approaches to curriculum evaluation are illustrated in Tom Maguire, "An Example of the Application of Stake's Model", Unpublished paper, University of Alberta, 1973, and R. J. Clark, et. al., "A Case-study in Curriculum Materials Analysis," *Canadian Journal of Education* (in press).

and in the social studies investigations of Hilda Taba and her colleagues.³⁹ As a consequence, the design of courses of study stressed the importance of essential concepts and methods of inquiry in the social studies. At the official guideline level, such concepts as "change, diversity, order, individualism, the common good, worth of the individual, concern for others, dignity of labour, tradition, (and) culture" were considered "fundamental" and "central to the human experience."⁴⁰ On comparatively rare occasions these concepts became part of a "spiral" curriculum, in which a concept such as "cooperation" might be considered at a "simple, specific [or] concrete" level in the lower grades, and at a "complex, general or abstract" level in the upper grades of secondary school.⁴¹ The notion of "inquiry" or "discovery" (however these terms may be defined) attracted a similar degree of attention in the period under review. In a possible reaction against the type of rote learning that was seen to characterize teaching across the country, students in social studies were henceforth to be invited to think for themselves, and work out solutions for their own problems.⁴²

Many of these so-called modes of inquiry were based on patterns established in the empirical social sciences. In most cases students were required to learn a sequence of processes: identify a problem, consider possible solutions or hypotheses, collect data, test hypotheses and finally form a generalization.⁴³ A recent Quebec guideline, for example, asks teachers to follow a sequence of activities that "tends to appear naturally":

First of all, there is a *research* step where information and materials related to the topic are collected. A step for criticism follows enabling the child to examine his materials and explore their content. Finally, there is the synthesis that allows the child to express some of his conclusions.⁴⁴

This pedagogical advice, it should be noted, is based on a definition of human sciences that assumes "facts based on verifiable objective relations," ". . . specific methods of investigation and analysis," and ". . . universal applicability."⁴⁵ Other authorities, particularly in those provinces in which history is more firmly entrenched as a separate discipline (Ontario, for example) have discussed methods of inquiry that are tied more firmly to the peculiar nature of that discipline.⁴⁶

³⁹See, in particular, *Experiences in Decision Making Elementary Social Studies Handbook* (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1971) and C. A. Hou, "Teaching the Structure of History," *Exploration*, 10:1 (November, 1969), 5-6.

⁴⁰*History: Intermediate Division* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1973), p. 5. See also Douglas Gray, "Concepts and Curriculum Building for the Junior Grades," *Canadian Journal of History and Social Science*, 9:4 (Summer, 1974), 33-40. Some of the dangers of this approach have been highlighted in Allan Cunningham, "The Vivisection of the Curriculum," *Exploration*, 14:2 (September, 1974), 53-54.

⁴¹*Experiences in Decision Making: Elementary Social Studies Handbook* (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1971), p. 16.

⁴²Discussed, for example, in Gerald Small, "Emphasizing Critical Thinking in Social Studies," *Perspectives*, 8:3 (Winter, 1973), 27-34, and D. A. MacIver, "Progressive Education and the New Social Studies," *Teacher Education* (Spring, 1969), 44-45.

⁴³See, for example, *History '70: Resource Booklet* (Toronto: O.S.S.T.F., 1970), pp. 21-26, and J. M. Clemens *et al.*, *op. cit.*

⁴⁴*The Human Sciences in Elementary School: Booklet #3: Methodological Guide* (Quebec: Ministry of Education, 1974), p. 8.

⁴⁵*The Human Sciences in Elementary School: Booklet #2: Human Sciences! What's That?* (Quebec: Ministry of Education, 1973), p. 8.

⁴⁶*History: Senior Division 1970* (Toronto: Department of Education, 1975), p. 11. Note also the appearance of such texts as J. Trueman, *The Anatomy of History* (Toronto: Dent, 1967).

Whatever the philosophic base, the use of inquiry methods is characteristic of the period.

A very wide range of school books were written on what were regarded as inquiry principles. The notion of the one standard text virtually collapsed (at least in official eyes) across the nation in the face of a variety of new types of materials. Many of these products were rather dull collections of documents, barely warmed over for student consumption, but others genuinely attempted new patterns for the presentation of data.⁴⁷ Inspired by notions borrowed from structuralism many new techniques thought to represent the social sciences (simulations⁴⁸ and computer analysis of data,⁴⁹ to take two more advanced examples) were now considered fit for school use. Students who acted as sociologists should therefore be expected to learn the sampling techniques of the discipline,⁵⁰ and those who wished to be historians ought to study from "original" documents, even if all the resources of modern photography had to be called into action to make the action seem real.⁵¹ A number of critics, of course, opposed this new bandwagon, but it remained in vogue for several years before it was replaced by an emphasis on values in the social studies.⁵² On the key question of how many classrooms were affected in any significant way by these new approaches to inquiry, the literature does not speak with any authoritative voice.

Another persistent theme in social studies in Canada in the last decade was the attempt to use the subject to correct what were perceived as weaknesses in society. Much greater attention, if one can judge from the spate of articles and books, was paid to the question of minority groups, especially the role of native peoples within Canadian society.⁵³ In more recent years, the question of a multicultural Canada has emerged as a central issue in Canadian social studies,⁵⁴ and the Ontario guidelines in particular have required units that give due treatment to many ethnic groups throughout the country.⁵⁵ A number of educators, especially A. B. Hodgetts, have continued to stress the role of social studies in the study of English-French relations in Canada, although no systematic study

⁴⁷For example, a theory of historical causation provides the organizing theme for a section of Dean Fink, *Life in Upper Canada 1781-1841: An Inquiry Approach* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), pp. 78-115, methods of sociological and psychological investigation are featured in Alan J. C. King and Walter W. Coulthard, *A Social View of Man: Canadian Perspectives* (Toronto: Wiley, 1972), pp. 249-274.

⁴⁸E. L. Koch, "Gaming and Simulation in the Social Studies," *Canadian Journal of History and Social Science* 6:1 (September/October, 1970), 63-71, and John C. Attig, "Simulation: More than Just a Game," *Exploration* 13:1 (February, 1973), 3-6.

⁴⁹Pene Davey, "Quantitative Methods in the Study of Local History," *The History and Social Science Teacher* 10:2 (Winter, 1974), 9-16.

⁵⁰Richard Carlton, *Student Research in "Man in Society": Notes for teachers on the design and implementation of student research projects* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1970) and A. J. C. King, "The Use of the Laboratory Method in High School Social Sciences," in *The Quarterly of Canadian Studies for the Secondary School*, 2:3 (Winter, 1973), 179-187.

⁵¹See, for example, the *Jackdaw* series of portfolios (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin).

⁵²David C. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 7. See the criticism in John T. Trueman, "End of an Era: History in Canadian Secondary Schools," *The History Teacher*, 2:1 (November, 1968), 29-32.

⁵³See, for example, *People of Native Ancestry: A Resource Guide for the Primary and Junior Divisions* (Toronto: Ministry of Education, 1975), *Native Studies: Amerind History* (Winnipeg: Department of Education, 1971), and William Blackbird *et al.*, "Native Perspectives on Native Education," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 10:4 (Summer, 1975), 31-38.

⁵⁴*Final Report of the Work Group on Multicultural Programs* (Toronto: Board of Education, 1975).

⁵⁵Harold Troper, "Multiculturalism in the Classroom: Pitfalls and Options," and Elizabeth D. Wangenheim, "Multiculturalism and the Curriculum: Official Policy and Local Implementation," in *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 12:1 (Fall, 1976), in press.

has yet been taken of the effects of such an emphasis. In more recent years attention has also turned to the question of sex-role stereotyping in schools, and the study of the contribution of women to society.⁵⁶ Some of the interest in the treatment of minorities in Canada was undoubtedly stimulated by the publication of *Teaching Prejudice*.⁵⁷

As part of a swing from what were considered "value free" bases for the social studies in Canadian schools, educators began to study the application of concepts drawn from moral philosophy and religious thought to their own subject.⁵⁸ The "values clarification" movement became very popular in some jurisdictions, and was extraordinarily influential in the redesigning of the Alberta curriculum.⁵⁹ Other scholars became interested in the alternative approaches developed by Oliver, Kohlberg, McPhail and Wilson.⁶⁰ Many local Boards of Education have encouraged professional groups to develop new programs for moral education in schools, in which social studies educators have played a leading role.⁶¹ Formal research projects have been funded in a number of centres (especially Toronto, Oakville, and Vancouver)⁶² to study the development of new approaches to moral and social education, and the resulting studies, especially those by Levin, Eisenberg and Beck have been widely read.⁶³ From the point of view of the teacher, however, the implementation of many of these new curricular concepts in moral education is hampered by the number of competing claims in the field, the difficulty of many of the concepts being discussed, and the need for systematic and lengthy re-training before they can be fully implemented.⁶⁴

Some critics may argue that such innovations in moral education serve a largely cosmetic purpose, to preserve the *status quo* rather than redress severe inequalities and injustices within Canadian society.⁶⁵ Given the reluctance of governments to fund projects that may oppose their political interests or offend powerful groups within society, few attempts have been made within the period to adapt the

⁵⁶Elaine Batcher *et al.*, . . . *And Then There Were None* (Toronto: FWTAO, 1975) make comments in fields closely related to social studies.

⁵⁷Garnet McDiarmid and David Pratt, *op. cit.*

⁵⁸David C. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 7. The best introduction to alternative "value" models is John P. Miller, *op. cit.*

⁵⁹See the criticism of *Experiences in Decision Making: Elementary Social Studies Handbook* (Edmonton: Alberta Education, 1971) in L. B. Daniels and Murray Elliott, "Alberta in Wonderland: Some Comments on a Curriculum Rationale," *Journal of Education of the Faculty of Education, Vancouver*, 20 (Spring, 1974), 63-80.

⁶⁰David M. Williams, "Curricular Materials for Values and Moral Education: An Overview," *The History and Social Science Teacher*, 11:1 (Fall, 1975), 57-59.

⁶¹Doug Fairbairn, "An Approach to Moral Education," *The History and Social Science Teacher* 11:1 (Fall, 1975), 4-14.

⁶²See, for example, Nancy Porter and Nancy Taylor, *How to Assess the Moral Reasoning of Students* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1972), John Meyer, *et. al.*, (eds.), *Values Education: Theory/Practice/Problems/Prospects* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1975) and *Report No. 5 Interim Report of a Study in Moral Education at Surrey, British Columbia* (Vancouver: Association for Values Education and Research, 1972).

⁶³M. A. Levin and J. A. Eisenberg, *Dilemma 1, 2, 3 and 4* (Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), M. A. Levin and J. A. Eisenberg, "Canadian Critical Issues" series (Toronto: O.I.S.E.), Clive Beck, *Moral Education in the Schools: Some Practical Suggestions* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1971) and Clive Beck, "The Reflective, Ultimate Life Goals' Approach to Values Education," in John R. Meyer (ed.), *Reflections on Values Education* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1976), pp. 149-161.

⁶⁴L. W. Downey Research Associates, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-30.

⁶⁵Max van Manen, "Critical-practical thinking in social studies education," Unpublished paper, O.I.S.E., 1974.

emancipatory concepts (most commonly associated with Freire) to the social studies curriculum although the intellectual base for such concepts is receiving some scrutiny.⁶⁶ However, the "Women's Kit" may be offered as one example of such an approach,⁶⁷ and social studies teachers in Quebec have participated in "First of May" ventures that attempt a critical analysis of the nature of Canadian capitalism within a school context.⁶⁸

Finally, some attempts have been made by social studies teachers to explore the means by which social studies may encourage students to "develop personally," to use relevant jargon. Supported by notions in such documents as *Living and Learning*,⁶⁹ students have been encouraged to express their creative talents in schools, particularly at the elementary level. This type of movement has had the effect of encouraging teachers to abandon a reliance upon a single text, use a variety of media, and search for ways of achieving personal goals in the social studies curriculum. To that end, students have been encouraged to take an interest in their own community, and study a wider range of human experience in past and contemporary cultures.⁷⁰ Particularly influential examples of curriculum projects using these theoretical props have been "The Thirties Box"⁷¹ and the "Jackdaw" kits, which themselves have served as models for local curriculum ventures by teachers. Despite the good intentions of such approaches to curriculum, critics have expressed concern that they significantly reduce student performance measured in more traditional terms, and fail to develop in students certain skills that are vital in future programs, both at school and post-secondary levels.⁷²

In summary, then, the social studies in the curriculum, as least as far as the published literature informs us, does not encourage those who look for creative and scholarly debate on important questions. The characteristics of the last decade are the dominance of American models, the interest in Canadian studies and moral development, and the pursuit of a great variety of other issues, many of which may be grouped under such concepts as structuralism, inquiry, and reconstructionism. A number of significant ventures have no doubt taken place, of which a

⁶⁶T. Aoki and W. Werner, "An Analysis of the 1971 Secondary Social Studies Curriculum," in L. W. Downey Research Associates, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-87. In addition, scholars are probing the relationship between social studies education and state authority. See, for example, David Pratt, "The Social Role of School Textbooks in Canada," in Elia Zureik and Robert M. Pike (eds.), *Socialization and Values in Canadian Society* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975), Vol. I, pp. 100-126.

⁶⁷Pamela Harris *et al.*, *Women's Kit* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1973). Reviewed in Max van Manen *et al.*, "Content and Form of a Curriculum for Women's Studies: The Women's Kit," *The History and Social Science Teacher* 10:4 (Summer, 1975), 12-19.

⁶⁸"Manuel du 1er Mai": pour une journée d'école au service de la classe ouvrière (Quebec: Central de l'enseignement du Québec, 1975).

⁶⁹*Living and Learning: The Report of the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives in the Schools of Ontario* (Toronto: Department of Education, 1968).

⁷⁰See, for example, *Huronian: A Unit in Experience* (Metropolitan Separate School Board, 1968), the activities sponsored by the Atlantic Institute of Education described in *Times Five* (Halifax: Atlantic Institute of Education, 1975), pp. 16-20 and the articles published in *Lighthouse* (from 1973).

⁷¹Anthony Barton, "Soft Boxes in Hard Schools," *This Magazine is About Schools*, 3:1 (Winter 1969), 43-50; David Stansfield, *The 1930's Multi-Media Kit: A Report on its Use in Schools* (Toronto: O.I.S.E., 1971), and D. E. Hunt, "Evaluation of 'Ten Years in a Box' Used in an Open Concept Secondary School," in Brian Burnham (ed.), *Growth Points 70* (Aurora: York County Board of Education, 1970), pp. 50-52.

⁷²See, for example, The Provincial Research Committee, *At What Cost?: A Study of the Role of the Secondary School in Ontario* (Toronto: O.S.S.T.F., 1976) which recommends, *inter alia*, that students "should know how each level of government works and how they, as citizens, make it work" (p. 49).

small number of important monographs and the publications of teams of curriculum designers are some evidence. But much of the comment in social studies publications is relatively elementary. The brightest note in this survey of the state of social studies is the variety of issues and problems that have been identified by social studies educators in the last ten years. What seems to be lacking is the commitment and the resources to investigate them in any serious or purposeful manner.

RESUME

Cet article résume les progrès et les principaux événements des dix dernières années dans l'enseignement au Canada de "social studies" à travers une critique de la littérature publiée. L'enseignement dans ce domaine a été caractérisé par la prédominance des modèles américains, l'intérêt dans les études canadiennes et l'évolution morale, et la recherche d'une solution à diverses questions légèrement apparentées. Quoique les éducateurs aient identifié un certain nombre de questions et de problèmes relatifs à l'enseignement de "social studies," ils n'ont pas, paraît-il, l'engagement et les ressources nécessaires à une étude sérieuse et utile.