DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF EDUCATION

BULLETIN, 1922, No. 3

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FOR THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

By

EDGAR DAWSON, PH. D.
Professor of History and Political Science in Hunter College

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
1922

ADDITIONAL COPIES
OF THIS PUBLICATION MAY BE PROCURED FROM
THE SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D. C.
AT
5 CENTS PER COPY

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., October 22, 1921.

SIR: Upon several occasions the Bureau of Education has encouraged investigations and reports in the field of the social studies in secondary schools. In 1916, for example, it published the report of the committee on the social studies in secondary education appointed by the Commission on Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association. This report has had a marked effect on the organization of this field of work in the secondary school. Later reports made by other organizations and committees have to a very considerable extent been modeled on the outline of courses suggested in that report. There is therefore an increasing tendency on the part of secondary schools to reorganize their curriculum of social studies in the light of the recommendations contained in these recent reports.

The proper development of the social studies in the secondary schools has, however, been greatly impeded by the lack of trained teachers. In order that this situation may be appreciated, I have asked Prof. Edgar Dawson, of Hunter College, New York City, who spent the year 1920 studying this problem, to prepare the accompanying manuscript, which I recommend for publication as a bulletin of the Bureau of Education.

Respectfully submitted.

JNO. J. TIGERT,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

PREPARATION OF TEACHERS OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES FOR THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

CONTENTS.—I. Introduction. II. What are the social studies? III. Failure to prepare teachers in secondary schools. IV. Training in methods of teaching. V. The blanket certificate. VI. Conclusions. Appendix: A hopeful example of teacher training.

I. INTRODUCTION.

It is no longer necessary to argue the fact that we live in a new world; it is recognized by all who have eyes to see and minds to understand. But this new world is as yet unorganized; it is not rooted in experience for the average man; it is still unstable, and its movements are uncertain. There is none of the confidence which comes from traveling beaten paths and following the precedents set by the fathers. Many of the very principles of the new world are new, and we need to be habituated to them.

Education is the process of handing down to the rising generation the wisdom and experience of the generations that have gone before, and of training the youth to walk in the paths in which the fathers have walked, in so far as these paths have seemed to serve the best purposes best. Now, as mankind is hesitatingly turning into new paths here and there, it is all the more necessary that the most careful attention be given to the points of departure and the reason for departing from the old ones. If the new generations are to think about industry, government, and society in general in terms of the new democracy, it is of the utmost importance that the definitions of this new democracy be explained to the growing youth with all the care and thoroughness of which we are capable.

However new the principles to be taught, the need of teaching the bases of the society in which one lives is certainly not new. It has been recognized by every seeing man since history began to be recorded. Aristotle says:

> But of all things which I have mentioned that which most contributes to the permanence of constitutions is the adaptation of education to the form of government, and yet in our day this principle is universally neglected: The best laws, though sanctioned by every citizen of the State, will be of no avail unless the young are trained by habit and education in the spirit of the constitution.

One might very well think it is the voice of a twentieth century leader. From the earliest writers to the most recent the demand has been reiterated that the youth be trained in order that the State may be safe; and from the earliest times to the most recent the demand has been ignored. This was true before the enormous difficulties which democracy brings became so pressing. How much more urgent is civic education now!

Education in citizenship is so universally demanded now that the reader will ask why this effort to prove the obvious. Everyone is saying that the youth must be educated in the duties and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. Like those of old who cried "Peace, Peace," when there was no peace, so our contemporaries cry for education in citizenship when there is but little

of it to be found. This may seem an unwarrantedly pessimistic statement, but the reader is asked to be patient in forming his judgment as to its truth. If it is true that there can be no education where there are no teachers; and if it is true that teachers are persons who are trained for their tasks; then the statement is not so pessimistic as it sounds. But if one concede that it is too pessimistic, and if one substitute the statement that there is need of far more attention to the serious task of training for citizenship, even then the further statement is sufficiently introduced, namely, far greater attention must be given to the preparation of those who are to train for citizenship than is now given.

President Angell, of Yale University, was recently quoted as saying to a division of the National Civic Federation:

> The most compelling needs of American education at the present moment are, first, increasing provision for teacher training, both quantitatively and qualitatively. * * * The first thing is to set up in the schools and colleges the machinery for the proper training of teachers. And this equipment must be accompanied by a change in the common public attitude toward the profession of teaching.

This is a fine and true statement, and since it comes from the head of a great university which until very recently had given little attention to this important matter, it is particularly encouraging.

It is not the purpose of this paper to outline a system of training for teachers of the social studies. Its purpose is to call attention to the main outstanding defects of the present system with sufficient definiteness to strengthen the demand that concrete changes be made in the present educational practice.

Mr. Gladstone once said that anyone in the House of Commons may become popular by demanding economy, but let some one demand some particular economy if he wishes to feel the hand of chastisement, and that promptly. So is he who advocates educational efficiency in general terms generously approved. It is decidedly unusual in our universities for definite steps to be taken jointly by the departments of economics, government, history, sociology, and the school of education, to work out a program of teacher training for the social studies. Nevertheless, it is only from the great universities that leadership in this matter may rightly be expected.

The argument of this paper is simple and elementary. It does not presume to outline courses of study. It accepts the course of study which is already backed by the support of the leading students of the problems involved in the making of curricula. The tasks of these students are already difficult enough, made so in part by the fact that specialists fail to recognize that all the various academic interests can not make separate courses of study and impose them upon the schools. All that the paper hopes to do is to play the part of the sunglass and to collect such rays of knowledge as we have and direct them with some concentrated force on one small spot. This spot is the question: *Why are the universities not training teachers of the social studies for the secondary schools?*

First is taken up the question, What are the social studies? So long as it is assumed that history is all of the social studies the elements of the others will be neglected as they are now. After an effort at definition of these studies as it is formulated in educational practice, the present neglect to present the subject matter of these studies to prospective teachers is reviewed. Then follows an examination of training in the methods of teaching. Finally, some space is given to one grave defect in the practice of the school administrators—the granting of what are called blanket certificates, which certify to little or nothing.

Some conclusions are appended, and a brief statement is offered as a concrete illustration of a well-developed system of teacher training.

II. WHAT ARE THE SOCIAL STUDIES?

It is necessary to undertake a definition of the term social studies as it is applied in secondary education, if this discussion of the training of the teacher is to be usefully definite. An able teacher of history in a large city high school was recently asked if he did not think more time should be found for the social studies in the high schools of his city. His reply was, "I don't see how we can find it without leaving out some of the history and I am opposed to reducing the amount of history offered." His error is no unusual one. The expression "history and the social studies" is so common as to be almost the usual thing where discussion in this field is popular rather than scientific. In fact the impression is common among professors and teachers of history that the other social studies are making an effort to crowd history out of its rightful heritage.

The term civics, when used to designate one social study, is a source of much confusion and indefiniteness. At one moment one hears of "civics, economics, and history"; at the next some one uses the term civics as if it included not only the elements of government, economics, and sociology, but also a good deal of ethics, psychology, and other subjects as well. There seem to be such things as "economic civics," "vocational civics," and "community civics." This apparent confusion or contradiction of ideas among the advocates of the teaching of civics is one of the reasons why the teachers of history stand on the defensive against any surrender of time to the apostles of "social science." A teacher not long ago said, "I have been exerting every ounce of influence I have to secure the requirement of vocational civics from all first-year pupils in the city system." When asked some detailed questions he said, substantially, "No; we have no satisfactory textbooks, teachers, or methods of instruction, but if we start requiring the subject these will come." The history teacher objects to this order of procedure.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to discuss the comparative importance of history and civics or economics or any other of the subjects which are included in the social studies. Possibly the best exposition of the term civics is to be found in Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1915, No. 23. What is needed for the present discussion is such a delimitation of the content of the social studies as will make it possible to consider the preparation in subject matter to be given a teacher in this field. Such a delimitation requires that a position be taken on the question, Is history one of the social studies? It further requires a recognition of the fact that the elements of economics, government, and sociology are included under the term social studies. If it be true that the social studies consist of the elements of economics, government, history, and sociology, then the practice of training teachers for the secondary schools in history alone, or economics alone, or government alone is as wrong as it would be to train them in geometry alone, or algebra alone, or trigonometry alone, neglecting the other branches of secondary school mathematics.

How shall one determine the meaning of this educational expression "social studies"? It is necessary to appeal to usage and authority.

The National Education Association is the principal organization of American teachers and school administrators, and the usage of the National Educa-

tion Association is as nearly authoritative as can be discovered in American education.

In the field of the social studies the National Education Association speaks through its Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education. This commission is subdivided into several committees, one of which bears the title the Committee on Social Studies in Secondary Education.

From the standpoint of content, how does the Committee on the Social Studies in Secondary Education define its field? The answer to this question is to be found in the committee's report which appeared as Bureau of Education Bulletin, 1916, No. 28. This document was prepared as a preliminary report for purposes of wider discussion than could be secured without a fairly definite expression of the committee's platform. But after five years of criticism, destructive and constructive, by individuals and committees, and after experimental teaching based on the program in various parts of the country, the committee finds no reason for materially changing its recommendations. This report of 1916 may therefore be regarded as more nearly than any other document an expression of the opinion of the teachers of the country and of the school administrators.

It is not necessary to go into the details of the course of study proposed by the committee of the National Education Association. The vertebræ of the course outlined in the report of the committee are the following:

Junior high-school cycle (years 7–9):
- European history.
- American history.
- Civics.

Senior high-school cycle (years 10–12):
- European history.
- American history.
- Problems of democracy—Economic, political, social.

It would appear that history occupies two-thirds of the course, that there are four years of history out of the six; and that there are two years in which the elements of economics, government, and sociology are to be taught. From a superficial reading of the outline, one might suppose that what will be needed is a teacher of European history, one for American history, and a third for the remaining subjects. But the selection of teachers on the basis of such a supposition would defeat the purposes of the program. The expressions European and American history, with the other titles, are used for purposes of descriptive suggestions, because they are the common terms and because no more satisfactory ones are now available. They must be explained to some extent here in order that the errors of those who would keep subjects sharply separated may be avoided.

In the first place each of the three-year cycles is a unit of instruction. It is assumed that each is to be required of every pupil. The three-year course may be called history, or civics, or problems of democracy. There is no satisfactory expression for it. The basis of the arrangement is the belief that the pupil should pursue a study of what civilization is, historically considered; given an opportunity to become acquainted more intimately with civilization as it has developed in America; and made acquainted with the organization of the life in which he is now living.

There are those who would depart from what seems to be the chronological or the logical arrangement of these cycles; they would begin the study of modern problems first and work backward into the history. For the purposes of this discussion of the training of the teacher their proposal is not vital. This sec-

tion is to support the thesis that all teachers of social studies must be trained in the subject matter of economics, government, and history, at least, if not of sociology and psychology as well. The thesis rests on the fact that each of these cycles, whether taught in the order given above or not, is a unit; that it demands familiarity, on the part of the teacher, with the leading principles of sound social organization; and that, therefore, whatever is done with the social studies, the teacher must have control of these principles.

Altogether aside from the fact that in a majority of the high schools of the country one or two teachers must do all of the work in the department of the social studies, and must therefore be familiar with all of them, the very character of each of the courses out of which these cycles is made up is such that the teacher of each of the courses, if he did no other teaching, would be obliged to bring preparation in all of the social studies if he is to do his work effectively. In substantiation of this claim, let each of the courses be briefly considered.

By European history none of the committees means an intensive study of Europe as a separate exercise. Some authors speak of the study of the civilization our ancestors brought to America; some of a study of modern civilization and its background; others use other expressions; but the basic idea is a study of the origin and development of human industry and society. It might have been better to have called the two courses which introduce the two cycles "history," with no limiting adjective. There are those, whose opinion can not be ignored, who would call both the first and second year of each cycle "history." Whatever term is used for either of these courses, or for both of them, the fact should be kept clear that preparation to teach either of them is not completed when a body of specialized facts in the history of some one country in some one or more periods has been mastered.

The general character of the work had in mind by the members of the committee, and of the training in subject matter the committee would expect teachers to have, can best be illustrated by a quotation from what the report of 1916 has to say about the course for the last year of the senior high school:

> It is generally agreed that there should be a culminating course of social study in the last year of the high school, with the purpose of giving a more definite, comprehensive, and deeper knowledge of some of the vital problems of social life, and thus of securing a more intelligent and active citizenship. Like the preceding courses, it should provide for the pupils' "needs of present growth," and should be founded upon what has preceded in the pupils' education, especially through the subjects of civics and history.
>
> Conflicting claims for the twelfth year. One fact stands out clearly in the present status of the twelfth-year problem, namely, the variety of opinion as to the nature of the work that should be offered in this year. Not to mention the claims of history, the principal claimants for position are political science (government, "advanced civics"), economics, and sociology in some more or less practical form.
>
> A profitable course could be given in any one of these fields, provided only it be adapted to secondary-school purposes. Three alternatives seem to present themselves:
>
> 1. To agree upon some one of the three fields.
> 2. To suggest a type course in each of the three fields, leaving the choice optional with the local school.
> 3. To recommend a new course involving the principles and materials of all three fields, but adapted directly to the immediate needs of secondary education.

The traditional courses in civil government are almost as inadequate for the last as for the first year of the high school. Efforts to improve them have usually consisted of only slight modifications of the traditional course or of

an attempted simplification of political science. The results have not met the needs of high-school pupils nor satisfied the demands of economists and sociologists.

A justifiable opinion prevails that the principles of economics are of such fundamental importance that they should find a more definite place in high-school instruction than is customary. Courses in economics are accordingly appearing in the high-school curriculums with increasing frequency. To a somewhat less degree, and with even less unanimity as to nature of content, the claims of sociology are being pressed. A practical difficulty is presented by the resulting complexity of the course of study. The advocates of none of the social sciences are willing to yield wholly to the others; nor is it justifiable from the standpoint of the pupil's education to limit his instruction to one field of social science to the exclusion of others. The most serious difficulty, however, is that none of the social sciences, as developed and organized by the specialists, is adapted to the requirements of secondary education, and all attempts to adapt them to such requirements have been obstructed by tradition, as in the case of history.

Is it not time, in this field as in history, to take up the whole problem afresh, freed * * * from the impressions of "the traditional social sciences"?

The emphasis laid here on the fact that each of the 3-year cycles is one continuous course may lead one to fear that the contributions of some one of the subjects included in the social studies will be ignored or may be in danger of being ignored. This danger can, of course, be avoided only if the teacher is trained in economics, government, history, and sociology, whatever the course of study may be. The teacher who is trained only in historical research will not teach government or economics to his pupils.

However often the word "history" may be entered in the program, the teacher who has studied only govern. nt will not give the pupil the contribution which the historically trained teacher would give. Our economic organization will be neglected inevitably unless those who administer the social studies are trained in the universities in economics. The fact should be emphasized, therefore, that there is being organized for the schools a course of study which is not exclusively history or government or economics, but all of them together; that in most schools this course will almost certainly be administered and taught by one teacher, or a very small group of teachers; that this course is our reliance if we would train for citizenship in a democracy; and that it will be a failure and a disgrace to our educational system unless a serious effort is made to prepare teachers for it.

Among associations of university scholars and departmental teachers interested in the social studies, no body has worked more constructively than has the American Historical Association. The reports of the several committees which have appeared in the past few decades have largely determined the development of the teaching of history in the secondary schools, and there has been until very recently but little done with the other social studies. The great body of effective teachers of the social studies in the high schools are history teachers, and it is from them that the demand comes for a further development of the teaching of economics and government.

The most recent committee of the American Historical Association worked under the chairmanship of Prof. Joseph Schafer, with Dr. D. C. Knowlton as secretary. After several years of study, correspondence, travel, and discussion in all parts of the country, this committee expressed itself as substantially in accord with the report of 1916. This does not mean that these two committees were in entire accord in all their recommendations. It does not mean even that the members of either of the committees are all in accord in all of the recommendations of either committee. It means merely that the

recommendations of the report of 1916 seem to have larger support than any other single body of recommendations; and that, until some other set of proposals replaces them, they may be considered the standard. It should be kept in mind, however, that while the movement is away from a program made up exclusively of history, the recommendations of the committee of seven of the American Historical Association are in use probably in more schools than any other course of study.

III. FAILURE TO PREPARE TEACHERS IN SUBJECT MATTER.

In order to ascertain what is the prevailing practice in those institutions of higher learning which undertake to train teachers for the secondary schools, a questionnaire was sent by the Bureau of Education to a large number of colleges and universities. With the inquiry blanks, the Commissioner of Education sent the following note:

> Through the efforts of various agencies a general agreement as to what work in history and the social sciences should be required of students in the secondary schools has been reached. Before any program for the teaching of history and the social sciences in secondary schools can actually be carried out, however, it will be necessary for the normal schools, colleges, and universities to provide adequate training for prospective teachers of these subjects * * *. With the purpose of obtaining information concerning the character of the training given, the appended questionnaire has been prepared. Will you kindly have it filled out and returned to me.

From the replies received, 100 of the fullest and most definite were selected for statistical examination. Many of those which were discarded came from institutions which are frankly doing nothing for the prospective teacher.

It is no secret that effective secondary-school teachers are trained chiefly in the colleges and universities; yet the great majority of such institutions are making no serious effort to perform their duty in contributing to a better state of affairs. It is not intended to single out the colleges for special criticism, as if they were sinners above their fellow public servants, but secondary-school teachers must be drawn chiefly from among college graduates; if the present sad conditions are to be changed, the practice of colleges must in many cases be changed. What are these conditions?

What courses in the subject matter of the social studies—economics, government, history, sociology—do the colleges and universities offer to the prospective secondary-school teacher?

More than a fourth of the 100 selected replies left this question unanswered. Among those which did answer it there is so wide a variety of replies that no prevailing practice can be discovered. We have no standardized preparation on which the schoolmen may depend. One institution thinks the prospective teacher should take the regular introductory courses in economics, government, and history. Another says he should include 36 units of history and 36 units of the other social studies in meeting the requirement of 120 units for the bachelor's degree. Five think he should complete four years of history (presumably three hours a week, totaling 24 units) and two years of the other subjects (12 units). Some say he should take "as much history and government as possible," but fail to mention economics or sociology. One thinks the candidate's whole time for three years should be devoted to training in the subject matter of his chosen field, but among the social studies this reply includes psychology, ethics, and literature. It would be useless to list here a series of replies in which no agreement or principle of action is discoverable.

The colleges and universities were asked what work is *required* in the subject matter of the social studies from those who are to be recommended as secondary-school teachers?[1]

About half of the 100 selected replies left this question blank. Among those which replied, one-third require *only history*. At these institutions the requirement varies from 6 to 36 units. These make no mention of the other subjects, and offer no explanation of the narrow and specialized requirement. Several others require a little economics *or* government. Two require economics *and* government.

It is perfectly clear that the college career of prospective teachers of the social studies is not directed. Those who are to enter the medical, legal, or engineering profession are fully advised as to what they should do; but those who are to undertake the teaching profession are left, in nearly all cases, to drift forward toward a bachelor's degree electing at random on the basis of personal fondness for teachers, the reputation of courses as easy or difficult, and the other elements which it is well known determine the choice of students who have no curriculum laid out for them.

Some quotations from the answers may be as useful as statistics to indicate the general attitude of the institutions from which they come.

A Middle Western State university says:

> We follow the requirements of the State examining board—3 majors of not less than 18 semester hours each in three high-school subjects or groups of related subjects. However, the scarcity of teachers makes this requirement purely ideal. In practice we have to throw many requirements to the winds.

A New England university expects prospective teachers to have completed two or three years in the university, if they are to be recommended by the university, but the work to be done in these two or three years is not specifically determined.

One New England college for women views with alarm the encroachment of civics on history—ancient, medieval, and modern. The person who replies does not say that economics and government should be left out of the secondary school program, but it is evident that she looks upon history as *the* social study.

Another New England college for women, from which a large number of

---

[1] In order to estimate the correctness of his opinions that the university should require that those who are to be recommended as teachers of the social studies should be prepared in all three elements of this field, the writer addressed inquiries to school superintendents, principals, teachers, professors of history, of economics, of government, and of education in all parts of the country asking the following question:

"Should those who are granted the certificate to teach any of the social studies, all of which are generally handled in the high school by the same group of teachers, be required to show that they have studied the elements at least of history, economics, and government?"

At least 9 out of 10 replies were unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Some added that sociology or ethics or social psychology or other subjects should be added to the list, but only a scattering few thought that any of the three basic subjects could safely be omitted from the preparation. Some stressed the unfortunate fact that even as it is teachers can scarcely be found to work for the salaries offered; but these seem to ignore the fact that as long as communities are willing to put up with untrained teachers the salaries will stay where they are. The only way to raise the price of a commodity is to limit the supply of it, and the best way to limit the supply of teachers with a view to raising the price of them is to raise the standard of preparation. This will not only increase the demand for larger numbers of trained teachers, but it will furnish a basis for greater respect for the teaching profession and for all of those who serve in it.

Some replies called attention to the indubitable fact that to continue to crowd the social studies into the school curriculum without providing such training of teachers as will make the teaching in this field effective is almost sure to result in discrediting not only the social studies but our whole process and program of education.

graduates go directly into the secondary schools, says: "There is no normal course given here, and we have no requirements along these lines."

"Our requirements are determined by the degree for which the candidate offers himself," says a college for men. "We have no requirements based on what a student may later teach."

"A teacher who is overprepared in these subjects makes just as big a failure as one unprepared," says another. "In this time of reaction from the war, we are in danger of overstressing these subjects. Of all things in our school system to-day, we need sanity."

One college requires "a well-balanced course." Another thinks a "major covering the usual history in high schools is sufficient."

"Our experience is that students who take the courses offered by us for the usual degrees make good teachers of the subjects they have pursued."

"Colleges should not require. They should merely recommend. We would suggest two years of history and one of government."

Another example of the prevailing practice may be obtained by examining the training in subject matter of teachers now in the school system. A survey was recently made of the social studies in the high schools of one of the largest cities in the country. It is reasonable to suppose that the teachers in a large city system have more and better training than the average teacher. Therefore the facts which follow do not present a fair picture of the general situation; an inference from them alone would be too optimistic. The schools of the particular city examined give an exceptional attention to the social studies other than history; and it is, therefore, reasonable to suppose that the teachers there would have a larger proportion of training in economics and government than in history. Yet in this city system the high-school teachers who administer the social studies report only an average of one course in government in their preparation, and many of the courses reported were in summer school or extension work. In one large school, out of 9 teachers reporting, only 3 had included in their preparation any work in government. The returns show a slightly higher percentage of preparation in economics. The 72 teachers reporting show an average of one and a half courses in this subject, including extension and summer work taken after they began to teach. But 13 of them report no preparation in either economics or industrial history. All of the teachers, with a few scattering exceptions, report what seems to be a sufficient preparation in history viewed quantitatively.

This condition was unusually favorable. Everyone who has looked into the teaching of history as a separate social study knows that a common practice is to assign history classes to persons who are innocent of any pretense of preparation in either method or subject matter. The point that needs stressing here, however, is the fact that among those who have some respect for preparation and training there is a tendency to consider the study of history a sufficient preparation for the social studies as a group.

For example, in one of the largest State universities, where a really serious effort has been made to give prospective teachers adequate preparation, the secretary of the department of history was asked to collect some information about the courses taken in the college by those who had definitely signified their intention to teach the social studies, particularly history and civics. The record cards of 24 candidates were examined. Many of these candidates had already done much more work than is represented by the 120 units required for the bachelor's degree. Of these 24 candidates, 6 had studied no economics, government, or sociology; 8 had studied no government, although they were to teach civics; 13 no economics. All of these candidates had completed more

than 30 units of history, while 21 had done less than 10 units of economics. Two prospective teachers of history even went so far in their last two years in college as to confine their work to 63 units of history and 1 of literature.

The point of view of the more conservative of the history professors who are making a real effort to secure adequate preparation of the teacher of history in the secondary school is indicated by the following reply made by the head of the history department of one of the great State universities, when asked for his opinion as to whether all students who are planning to teach the social studies in the schools should be prepared in economics and government:

> Yes; I think it would be desirable. But unless the candidate is going to do more than the ordinary four years of work in his preparation, he will not have time to prepare in economics and government. You see, he may have to teach ancient, medieval, modern, English, and American history. Here are five fields in which he must be prepared. If he does this well, he has no time to study economics and government and to meet the general needs of his curriculum requirements.

To the author this position seems wholly untenable. Obviously, few if any students are able or willing to spend more than four years at college in preparation for high-school work. Moreover, as has been pointed out clearly, the usual teacher of history is compelled to teach the other social studies in the high-school curriculum. This curriculum to an increasing extent is being modeled after the recommendations of the National Education Association committee and subsequent committees in substantial agreement with it. The obvious conclusion from this situation is, therefore, that prospective teachers of the social studies in high schools should have a thorough and balanced preparation for all of the courses which they will be called on to teach; and, furthermore, that the departments of history, political science, and economics in the colleges and universities should unite on a comprehensive and balanced program of studies to be required of all students who intend to teach the social studies in the high schools.

IV. TRAINING IN METHODS OF TEACHING.

One of the outstanding difficulties in the way of preparing effective teachers of the social studies, as well as of other subjects, is the lack of cooperation between those who prepare them in subject matter and those who train them in methods. Professors of economics, government, and history do not understand, and therefore they minimize, the efforts of the members of the department of education. Those who are developing the science and art of education, in turn, treat with too little respect the scholars who are developing bodies of knowledge in the academic fields. There are, of course, many conspicuous exceptions to both of these generalizations; and the generalizations are becoming less true because the number of exceptions is increasing. But in the dozen leading universities recently visited by an observer the statement was frankly made that this lack of cooperation exists and that it weakens the efforts of each institution.

A great many university professors claim, and actually believe, that if a prospective teacher learns a subject and then goes into the high school and tries diligently to imitate the teaching under which he has studied, he will be successful. The present section of this paper is addressed to such professors and to those school administrators who still undervalue training in the art of teaching.

It is often claimed that each teacher must develop his own methods and apply them. This is in the long run true. It is also true that every football player who becomes really effective must in the end develop his own method

of play; but the team does not want to sacrifice a dozen or more important games in order that the player may develop his own play wholly without guidance.

So with the science and art of teaching. Practice games are played in the high school maintained by the university. Before these games take place, the professors of education lecture to the prospective players on the best methods of getting the facts across the goal line, of breaking the formation of indifference in the mind of the child, of tackling his attention and holding it. He tells the prospective teacher how other great teachers have worked, outlining their methods. Then he sends the neophite into a class to teach, and with him he sends an older teacher as a coach to watch, correct, guide, and advise. In this way the teacher is saved from the sin of experimenting on the lives of young children, and disgusting them with what is called education. It seems almost axiomatic that young men and women should not be turned into classes to teach without such training; yet it happens in hundreds of cases every year. The prospective teacher of the social studies is probably more in need of training than the teacher of any other subject.

The work of the mathematics teacher may be tested somewhat objectively through the solution of original problems. If the pupil is fairly at home in the solution of original problems, the teacher probably has a right to feel that he has achieved some success. Even outsiders, such as school examiners and surveyors, may test the work of a teacher of mathematics through objective tests of his pupils. There may be higher faculties which the mathematics teacher must look to in the training he gives, but even these faculties seem to be mental, and may be tested by measurements now being worked out.

The teacher of English composition and speech may have the certainty that he is accomplishing something; and those who test his work may grade it through objective measurements. The same seems to be true of the sciences. Whether it is equally true of literature may be doubted, and the literature teacher may need as ample training as the social studies teacher if he is to avoid wooden and profitless drill.

If history were the only social study, it may be that objective tests could be supplied for it. The reader is here referred to Chapter XVI of Prof. Henry Johnson's "Teaching of History." One who reads this chapter and who is also familiar with the average examination of the College Entrance Examination Board or the Board of Regents of a State like New York will see at once how wide apart are the best theory and the common practice. The history teacher for even the commonly accepted history course needs a good deal of training in the methods and purposes of teaching, if he is to avoid the errors which are perpetuated by all of our leading examining authorities.

But the social studies do not consist of the commonly accepted history. While their purpose includes the purpose of scientific history teaching, which looks to an appreciation of the value of evidence and the sense of evolution, it includes much more than these things. One hesitates to say that the social studies are addressed ultimately to the will and the motive forces, for the statement is so easily misunderstood by persons who have given little attention to this field of endeavor. The purpose of the group of courses which are organized under the title "the social studies" is to make a boy or girl into a man or woman who understands his position, his duties, and his opportunities in a society which is becoming more and more democratic.

A leading economist, Prof. L. C. Marshall, chairman of the committee on economics in the schools of the American Economic Association, was recently quoted as making the following statement:

The organization of social studies in the public schools should be in terms of the purpose of introducing those studies. Their purpose is to give to our youth an awareness of what it means to live together in organized society, an appreciation of how we do live together, and an understanding of the conditions precedent to living together well, to the end that our youth may develop those ideals, abilities, and tendencies to act which are essential to effective participation in our society.

The result of teaching for such purposes can not be tested with much success. Certainty of accomplishment can be had only through the training of teachers who will make a real effort at accomplishment and who may be expected, by reason of their training, to accomplish what they are seeking. It does not seem necessary to go into a detailed exposition of this proposed training. It may be sufficient to refer to the appendix at the end of this paper, which deals with the present and proposed practice in the University of California.

The questionnaire which the Bureau of Education sent to the higher institutions in which teachers are trained for the secondary schools requested information bearing on the training of prospective teachers in the methods of their art. The question was asked, "What courses in methods of teaching history, government, civics, or citizenship, and elementary economics in secondary schools are offered in your institution?" The summary of replies which follows is based on the same selected set of 100 answers as was used for the summary of the conditions bearing on training in subject matter.

Thirteen institutions replied that training in method is given incidentally in the courses in general education.

Twenty-three give a course in the department of history on the teaching of history. In this connection the fact should be kept in mind that the courses here referred to are given by a professor of history trained in traditional and more or less specialized history teaching, and that but little if any attention is given in it to the other social studies.

Five reply that methods are taught by example in the regular history classes.

Twenty reply that no training in methods is offered.

Twelve leave the question blank. These, with the 20 which reply to the question by saying that no courses are offered, make a total of about one-third of the selected institutions which offer no training in methods whatever.

Among the scattering statements to be found among the 100 replies, one learns that in 3 of the institutions the department of education gives a course in methods of teaching history; in 3 such a course is offered in the summer session; and in 3 plans are on foot to expand the efforts to train teachers. In each case the course mentioned is in the teaching of history alone. One institution speaks of a course in the methods of teaching the social studies; one a course in teaching civics; and one says that a course in methods is occasionally offered. One says there is no demand for such a course.

Another question was, "In what department are the courses in methods taught?" Twenty-three institutions say in the department of history; 5 in the department of history and political science; 25 in the department of education; 2 say that there is a teachers' course in each department; 60 leave the question blank; and 20 say that there is no such course. The figures on the replies to this question do not exactly correspond with those on the replies to the previous one.[1]

Another question was, "What practice teaching in history, government, civics, or citizenship, and elementary economics is required of students who expect

[1] It is manifest that the total is more than 100, but this will not surprise those who read the remarkable replies elicited by questionnaires.

to teach history and the social sciences in secondary schools?" Thirty-one of the selected institutions reply that practice teaching is required. It is generally done under the direction of the department of education, and in some of the stronger State universities it is done in a high school maintained for the purpose by the university. In these institutions the time is likely to be about four or five hours a week for a half year. Brown University has an arrangement for its students to practice in the public high schools of Providence.

The remaining question on methods was, "Is practice teaching done under supervision? If so, under whose supervision?"

Thirty-three left this question blank. Twenty-eight say it is done under the supervision of the department of education, and in some cases add "with the aid of the principal of the high school." In 5 the practice is supervised by the department of history, and in 4 by the departments of history and education working jointly. In 5 the head of the department of history in the high school gives the supervision. The remainder are indefinite.

It should be kept in mind that in nearly every case both the course in methods and the practice teaching are in history alone. Civics must take care of itself, and economics is ignored. There is scarcely an effort to train the prospective teachers in handling the social studies as a group or a unit in the field of secondary education. In at least two large State universities the practice teaching in history and the methods course which precedes the practice is under the direction of history teachers who have no training in either government or economics and who state frankly that they know little or nothing about either field of study. Therefore even in the larger cities where teachers of considerable training in the subject matter of history are employed it is the exceptional teacher who has had instruction in methods and practice teaching in any of the social studies.

One school in a large city system shows 9 teachers of the social studies, with only 2 trained in methods. In the same city another school reports 10 teachers, not one of whom has had any training whatever in methods.

V. THE BLANKET CERTIFICATE.

A questionnaire was also sent to representative educators in various parts of the country containing the following statements and questions:

In most of our States it is now customary to issue to those who wish to teach in the secondary schools *a blanket certificate*. Under such certificates teachers are assigned to the teaching of any subject at the discretion of the principal. Consequently, it often happens that the social studies are assigned to teachers but slightly prepared to teach them; and in far more cases the teaching of civics, for example, is assigned to teachers who have been trained only in history. It is now proposed in many quarters that two things be done: First, that those who teach or prepare to teach any of the social studies be trained in a group of subjects; and, second, that the school administration issue certificates of preparation to teach groups of subjects rather than to teach at large.

Are blanket certificates issued in your State?

Does this practice result in the assignment of classes to teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are required to teach?

Is there a movement in your State toward the certification of teachers in subjects or groups of subjects? How far has it progressed? Do you think it a wise movement? What are the obstacles in its way?

What is your opinion of the desirability of such a movement?

It is manifest that specific certification would reduce the supply of teachers temporarily, but the only means of securing proper salaries for teachers is to show the public that trained and efficient teachers can not be had without a living wage. If the standards of preparation are not made sufficient, we shall continue to get teachers insufficient in quality, and the public will become less

and less satisfied with the schools. The salary question has to be fought out, and it might as well be fought out on a basis of sufficient training as not. A wisely organized program of training and certification will greatly aid in showing the leaders of public opinion the need of paying enough money to get real teachers.

The following statements are representative of the replies received to this inquiry. It is well within the limits of truth to say that the blanket certificate is condemned by the great majority of thoughtful students of education in the country.

Dean H. D. Sheldon, of the school of education of the University of Oregon, writes:

The real solution, in my opinion, would be for the States to grant certificates only in the subjects which the candidates are qualified to teach, instead of general blanket certificates, as is now the practice. * * * The argument against this is: Occasionally a certain man or woman is highly desirable on the staff of the school, and yet there may be no vacancy which a certificate of the sort I have in mind would enable him or her to fill. That is, it is felt that in some cases personality is more important than grasp of subject matter. Personally, I consider this position mistaken, and I believe that we shall never have a thoroughly satisfactory state of affairs until we do have definite certification by subject matter.

Dean Sheldon would, of course, associate with certification in subject matter certification in methods as well.

Asst. Supt. Allen, of Kansas, writes:

We do grant mostly blanket certificates, which practice often results in the assignment of teachers to subjects in which they are not prepared. There is only a slight movement here to correct this practice. The chief obstacle to the reform is the scarcity of teachers, even with the blanket certificate. The salaries must be materially increased, and the change must be made gradually.

The Kentucky State supervisor of high schools writes:

We are hoping to get away from the blanket certificate system in some measure. The blanket certificate results in the assignment of classes to teachers who are not trained in the subject which they are required to teach. The movement for certification of teachers in subjects has not progressed very far.

Commissioner A. B. Meredith, of Connecticut, writes:

Blanket certificates are issued in this State, and they result in the assignment of classes to teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are required to teach. There is a movement here to correct this state of affairs.

Arthur J. Jones, professor of secondary education in the University of Pennsylvania, believes the movement to do away with blanket certificates is a wise one, but thinks the lack of teachers is the main obstacle in the way.

H. M. Ivy, State supervisor of secondary schools in Mississippi, says:

Blanket certificates are issued in this State. This practice results in the assignment of classes to teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are required to teach. There is a movement in this State toward a certification of teachers by groups of subjects. A bill was introduced in the legislature of 1920 to accomplish this, but it was lost in the Senate by failure to act. It is a wise movement, and I hope we shall be able to secure the necessary legislation in 1922.

Asst. Supt. Eaton, of Utah, says that blanket certificates are issued in that State, but that superintendents and principals do not assign teachers to work for which they are not specially qualified. On the other hand, Dean Bennion, of the school of education in the University of Utah, writes:

Concerning blanket certificates, I have found that the issuance of these certificates often results in assigning high-school teachers to work for which they are poorly qualified. Thus far the State board has made no move toward correcting this difficulty, although I am hopeful that they will do something about it in the near future.

City Supt. Corson, of Newark, N. J., says that blanket certificates are not generally issued in New Jersey, but that the issuing of them results temporarily in the assignment of teachers to subjects in which they are not prepared. And he tells us that training is not the only element required for successful teaching.

J. A. Stoddard, professor of secondary education in the University of South Carolina, states that the blanket certificate, with its unfortunate consequences, has been used in South Carolina; that there is an organized movement to eliminate it; and that the movement seems to him a wise one. The scarcity of teachers is the difficulty.

L. H. King, professor of education in the University of Alabama, writes that the issuing of blanket certificates there frequently results in classes being handled without training. He thinks the movement to eliminate them should be pressed, but nothing is being done in Alabama because of the scarcity of teachers.

Prof. Earl Hudelson, of the department of education in the University of West Virginia, writes forcefully to about the same effect as does Prof. King.

C. L. Robertson, State high-school inspector in North Dakota, says:

> Blanket certificates are issued in this State permitting college graduates who have a minimum of 16 semester hours of professional training to teach any high-school subject * * *. Teachers in the small high schools have to be "utility men." The fact that we have so many small high schools in the State may account for the fact that no definite steps have been taken toward the certification of teachers in subjects or groups of subjects.

City Supt. R. E. Rawlins, Pierre, S. Dak., answers "yes" to the first two questions, and adds that the State department uses its influence to have school officials guard this weak point. He thinks that a movement to eliminate the blanket certificate a desirable one, but that it will take time and general education to make it effective. Nothing has been done there thus far.

R. H. Jordan, of the department of education in Dartmouth College, is doubtful about the desirability of doing away with the blanket certificate, because he fears that it might result, in the very small high schools, in the social studies being neglected, since teachers would not be prepared for them.

The office of the commissioner of education in Rhode Island calls attention to the greatly increased expense which might result from placing the certification of teachers on a new basis.

State Supt. T. E. Johnson, of Michigan, declares:

> Our State issues a blanket certificate, and I favor this, because I am not desirous of having the certification situation mixed up more than is absolutely essential. Superintendents and high-school principals are thoroughly alive to the necessity of having properly trained teachers for their work, and I think our present plan is working out in an entirely satisfactory manner. Our salary schedule is, on the whole, probably better than any other State in the Union, and we do not find much to worry about in getting properly trained teachers for our secondary schools.

L. V. Koos, professor of secondary education, University of Minnesota, says:

> I regard your contentions concerning certification of high-school teachers as valid. The campaign should be made for more extended preparation in all teaching subjects and not for the social studies only. * * * What we need is a nation-wide study of this whole problem of extent of preparation, and of combinations of subjects in which teachers are to be prepared.

He adds:

> I have, in combination with Dr. Clifford Woody, of the University of Washington, intimated as much in the conclusions of an investigation made by us of the training of high-school teachers in the State of Washington.

George R. Twiss, State high-school inspector and professor of education in the Ohio State University, answers "yes" to both of the first questions, and adds that there is no definitely organized movement for the correction of the unfortunate condition. The reasons are, he thinks, inertia and indisposition to tamper with the certificate laws and the school code in general. The State department of public instruction is more concerned at present in holding the somewhat advanced ground already gained than with making immediate advances which may complicate the situation and endanger the whole line. "I think it highly desirable that this principle be vigorously argued and urged." He thinks the efforts of the North Central Association in this direction are doing a great deal of good.

Prof. Paul C. Phillips, of the University of Montana, says:

We use the system of giving blanket certificates in this State. It is generally agreed among the teachers and examining office that the system is bad, but it seems to be a very difficult matter to change the law. The practice, as I have already stated, frequently results in giving classes to teachers for which they are unprepared. I have talked to the State superintendent about this evil. She agrees that it is a serious matter and expressed to me the hope that it could be changed at the next session of the legislature, which meets in January.

Prof. W. C. Cook, of the department of education in the University of South Dakota, answers "yes" to both of the first questions, but says he knows of no movement to correct the evil. He states:

I favor such a movement. Schools employing only specifically certified teachers should be separately accredited or given some special recognition.

Prof Alexander Inglis, of Harvard University, replies: "There is no question that certification should be by subjects." He thinks the main obstacle in the way is the fear on the part of some religious denominations of centralized control.

The following incident in one of the leading States of the Middle West merely illustrates a common practice. A young woman prepared herself thoroughly to teach English. She then applied to the principal of a high school for a position. The principal knew, or could easily have discovered, that she was prepared especially for English teaching. She was appointed; found on reaching the school that there were already abundant teachers for all the English work; and was assigned to the teaching of physiography and physiology, neither of which subjects she had studied since she left high school, more than four years previously. It would be unnecessary to illustrate the well-known practice of assigning civics and history to teachers prepared in mathematics, Latin, science, or any other subject. Any observer in any city can give illustrations of it offhand. Illustrations can be given of persons trained to teach history and civics and assigned, for example, to commercial arithmetic, while teachers untrained in the social studies are assigned to history and civics in the same school.

University authorities use such incidents as these to excuse their failure to urge prospective teachers to prepare themselves thoroughly in groups of subjects; and their arguments are difficult to answer.

VI. CONCLUSIONS.

The responsibility for effective teaching of the social studies and for training in citizenship is divided between the universities and the school administrators.

On the universities rests the responsibility for leadership in giving currency to right thinking, and on the school administrators rests the duty to see that persons are not employed to teach subjects for which they are not prepared.

In the universities useful work is seriously hampered by the failure of cooperation, first, among the academic departments, and, second, between the academic departments as a group and the schools of education.

Since high-school teachers in the field of the social studies have so long been catalogued as history teachers, the departments of history are conspicuously responsible for not humanizing their work and admitting the departments of economics, government, and sociology into cooperation with them in the preparation of teachers.

The tendency is for the university professors of history and government to push narrow specialization down into the secondary schools, making of prospective teachers of the social studies imitations of university professors—research workers—in history and government. Therefore the young teacher is likely to try to reproduce in the high school the type of teaching under which he has studied in the university.

It is of first importance for the university departments of economics, government, history, and sociology to unite, under the guidance of the experts in education, in the formulation of a group course of training in these fields in order that it may be possible for the prospective teacher to cover a reasonable amount of the various elementary or introductory courses in subject matter.

The universities should *require*, not recommend, that those who are to be indorsed as teachers of the social studies shall have completed this group training before they receive an indorsement. This is done in the preparation of persons for other professions, and there is no reason why the teaching profession should not have as respectable treatment.

It is necessary for some schools of education to reduce the amount of their requirement of educational theory in order that it may be brought into due relation to the amount of time given to training in subject matter. About 10 or 12 per cent of the requirements for the bachelor's degree seems to be a sufficient requirement in the theory and practice of teaching.

This requirement of 10 or 12 per cent, under the immediate direction of the department of education, should be insisted upon in every case before the university gives the prospective teacher its indorsement. If the candidate postpones his decision to teach, it is his own fault, and he should be required to complete his preparation before he is recommended as a teacher.

School administrators should cease to grant meaningless blanket certificates; and they should cease to assign classes to persons who can not show that they are prepared for the work assigned to them. It is better for pupils to take only such work as teachers are prepared to teach.

To make this possible, school administrators should group the subjects in the secondary schools with proper respect for their coordination in order that they may not be tempted to assign teachers outside of their certificated preparation. If the subjects of the school are grouped into about six departments, and if universities train teachers with these groupings in view, it will not be necessary for teachers training in mathematics and science to be assigned left-over groups in history or the other social studies about which they are conscious of knowing nothing.

Decent salaries must, of course, be offered if persons are to be persuaded to prepare themselves for the teaching profession. But the best way of securing such salaries is to lay down definite specifications for those who are to be employed. The law of supply and demand will then tend to place salaries where they should be. So long as teachers are assigned to work in which they are not properly prepared, it is only reasonable to suppose that school administrators will be hampered in their plea that higher salaries must be paid in order to fill positions properly.

APPENDIX.

A HOPEFUL EXAMPLE OF TEACHER TRAINING.

Concreteness may probably be best given to this discussion of the training of teachers through a description of the practice and program at one of the leading institutions of higher learning. The conditions for the proper training of teachers in the State of California are excellent. The State University of California is conscious of its responsibilities in this direction and is moving along wise lines of progress. It is the most influential institution of higher learning in the State, with the possible exception of Leland Stanford University. The State department of education is endowed with large powers and is headed by a group of officials who are able, aggressive, energetic, and inspired with high ideals of service. The teachers in the State are paid such salaries as will draw into the school system men and women of real ability, and will encourage them to prepare themselves thoroughly for their profession. The present law is already fairly well matured to insure efficiency, and the people of the State, as well as the personnel of the school system in general, seem really to believe in public education.

The following description of teacher training in that State is in general a description of the present practice, though some items are now only in the initial stage, and in one or two cases the proposals are only definitely made, not yet authorized. Furthermore, there are provisions for some exceptions to the law, such as those in favor of experienced teachers from other States who apply for certificates.

The State law requires that candidates for the teacher's certificate in secondary education shall present (1) the bachelor's degree from a standard college requiring four years of high school and four years of college work; (2) a year of graduate study in 1 of about 25 approved graduate schools, which number includes only universities of recognized standing; (3) 15 units of work in courses listed in the department of education, consisting in general of the following: (*a*) A unit in school and classroom management, (*b*) 4 units in the actual practice of teaching, (*c*) 3 units in a teacher's course in the organization of the subject matter of the department in which the candidate expects to teach, (*d*) 2 units of work in the purpose and attainable goals of secondary education, (*e*) 5 units selected somewhat freely in the field of educational theory, function, organization, method, and administration.

The practice in the University of California requires the candidate to do his practice teaching in an excellent high school maintained by the university and the city of Oakland under the direction and supervision of the department of education in the university. In the field of the social studies this practice teaching is done under the direction of a trained teacher of the social studies who gives a course in the university in the methods of teaching the social studies.

The ideal toward which the school of education in the University of California is moving is that the department of education shall be the nucleus of the school and shall supply professional scholarship and stimulus in the science of education. Around this nucleus is grouped in the school of education a body of scholars representing the various fields of art and science, members of the various departments of the university, but interested primarily or extensively in the propagation of these arts or sciences through teaching in the schools. In the field of the social studies, the plan is for one member of one of the departments of economics, government, or history, to offer a course for teachers in the subject matter of the social studies through which the prospective teacher may be introduced to the general outlines, goals, and philosophy of the work. Within the department of education is a teacher's course in the method of handling this material in the school. The former is in one sense a philosophical course; the latter, a course in technique.

The plan at the University of California is to present the subject matter of the social studies to the prospective teacher through cooperation among the departments of economics, government, and history, requiring such other courses as these departments and the school of education deem advisable in view of the current equipment of the university. The basic principle is that, when a man or woman enters the school of education, it is assumed that he has offered himself for training in a *profession*, just as the prospective engineer or lawyer would, and that it is the duty of the university to give all the guidance and stimulus that it is able to give.

The general plan for subject-matter courses outlined at the University of California, and to be followed in so far as the dean of the school of education finds it possible in the light of the present equipment of the several departments, is as follows:

Twelve units of introductory work, prerequisite to advanced work in the field, consisting of 6 units of economics and 6 of either history or political science.

Eighteen units of upper division or senior college work, 6 in history, 6 in economics, and 6 in political science, and 6 additional units selected by the candidate from one of the foregoing subjects.

It is assumed that the candidate will take additional work in the social studies beyond this minimum, and that his interest in this profession will dispose him to include in his work for the bachelor's degree some study of group psychology, ethics, anthropology, or social institutions. It is also assumed that the school of education will direct that the candidate include in the 36 units of the minimum at least a course in the history of the United States and one in general history, and one in comparative government. It is further assumed that he will pursue a graduate course based on the principles which underlie the organization of a proper course for teachers. This means that some professor in one of the social studies shall introduce him to the methods and aims of the study of man in society, to grasp the meaning of history, political science, and of economics as useful fields of thought and research.

Given such control of subject matter as the foregoing preparation makes reasonably certain, let attention be turned to the art of teaching. The candidate has given a tithe of his time to the theory and practice of teaching (a tithe, because five years of study is represented by about 150 units, of which 15 units are under the immediate direction of the department of education). As has been stated, two of these units represent a course in the methods of handling the social studies in the secondary school. Four of them represent actual practice in teaching.

The candidate who offers himself for practice teaching is already more or less familiar with the subject he is to teach. He is required to direct the work of a high-school class for 90 hours in the university high school, under supervision and direction. If he does not seem to progress, he is taken out of the work and told that the profession of teaching is not his calling. The director of practice teaching introduces the candidate through several hours of demonstration teaching in the class which the candidate is to handle, and then turns the pupils over to him. But since the school is conducted at least as much in the interest of the pupils as of the candidate, the teaching of the latter is a matter of constant care on the part of the director of practice teaching.

The candidates in the social studies meet singly or in groups with the director of practice teaching at regular hours each week for conference, stimulation, encouragement, and correction. At the end of the period of practice teaching, each candidate presents a paper on the objects to be attained through the teaching of the social studies in the secondary schools, and the methods and devices to be used. The candidate is further expected to show some ability to cooperate in the democratic organization of the school, and to lead the pupils in the development of character without allowing the hand of direction to rest in too paternalistic a way on the progress of pupil participation.

The license to teach in secondary schools in the State of California is granted under the authority of the State department of education only on the recommendation of certain educational institutions which are definitely admitted to this privilege because of their equipment and standing. The recommendation of weaker colleges is not accepted and can not be under the law. The recommendation must be forwarded to the State authorities by the school of education of the institution in which the candidate has met the requirements, not by the general administration of the university; and it is within the power of the school of education to influence, in a large degree, the selection of courses pursued by the candidate as he is taking his preparation.

The blanket certificate to teach at large without specific recommendation is not approved in California. Arrangements are under way to organize the high-school courses of study in groups, such as modern languages, mathematics, science, and so on. This will make it possible for the principal to select teachers for groups of subjects. It makes it possible for a prospective teacher to prepare himself in two groups, such as English and the social studies, during his five years in such an institution as the University of California.

A number of other institutions of higher learning are evolving their work in lines essentially parallel to those of California, but with greater difficulty and with less present hope of rapid progress. They are delayed in their evolution either by the failure of State departments to cooperate with them, or by the failure of academic departments of study to understand the problem of teacher training, or by departments of education which demand an unreasonable proportion of the student's time, or by other impediments well known to students of educational development.