

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN EVALUATION OF THE OKLAHOMA STATUTORY REQUIREMENT
IN AMERICAN HISTORY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
OKLAHOMA, 1945-1955

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY
SAMUEL WOODSON EVANS
Norman, Oklahoma
1957

AN EVALUATION OF THE OKLAHOMA STATUTORY REQUIREMENT
IN AMERICAN HISTORY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
OKLAHOMA, 1945-1955

APPROVED BY

Carl Shannon

Shane Pugh

Lang P. Williams

John D. Ezell

Edwin C. McReynolds

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

To
the Memory of

Arthur T. Evans
and
Guilford E. Evans

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the chairman of his doctoral committee and director of this investigation, Dr. Gail Shannon, who gave so generously of his time, and whose interest, assistance, and guidance were so essential in the development of the study. Furthermore, the writer wishes to acknowledge the assistance and encouragement given by all members of his doctoral committee throughout his graduate study program.

The writer is sincerely grateful to the six professors of history and the graduates of the University who cooperated so graciously in giving information for the study.

The writer wishes to express his gratitude for the excellent cooperation given him by Dr. John Fellows and his staff in the Office of Admissions and Records, and Mr. Boyd Gunning and his staff in the Alumni Office in developing the graduate mailing list.

The writer would indeed be remiss if he failed to acknowledge his debt to the late Dr. M. L. Wardell who assisted through his friendly guidance in formulating the plans for the study.

Appreciation is extended to President Dan Proctor and the Administration of the Oklahoma College for Women who gave encouragement to the writer throughout the period of graduate study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Historical Background	1
The Situation in Oklahoma	10
Statement of the Problem	13
Delimitation	14
Sources of Data	14
Procedure	15
II. RELATED STUDIES	18
Kansas Study of Education for Citizenship ...	20
III. WHY AMERICAN HISTORY	25
Why Did the Oklahoma Legislature Require American History?	25
Why Is American History Taught in the Insti- tutions of Higher Education?	31
The University of Oklahoma Professors and American History	35
What the University Students Thought They Would Acquire from American History	44
Should American History Be Required?	46
IV. DID HISTORY 3 AND 4 CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOP- MENT OF DESIRABLE CITIZENSHIP CHARACTERIS- TICS IN THE GRADUATES?	53
Introduction	53
Citizenship Characteristics	57
Research Procedure	58
The Graduates' Responses	63
A Summary of Data on Citizenship Characteris- tics	96

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	105
Summary	106
Conclusions	113
Recommendations	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	116
APPENDIX	
A. HOUSE BILL NO. 62	123
B. QUESTIONNAIRES FOR GATHERING DATA FROM THE UN- IVERSITY PROFESSORS AND GRADUATES AND THE LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	125
C. LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD AMERICAN CIT- IZEN AS DEVELOPED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES, 1951	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The New York <u>Daily News</u> Survey	7
2. Objectives of Instruction in History 3 and 4 ...	38
3. The Graduates' Responses in Percentages to the Question, "Would You Have Taken History if It Had Not Been Required?"	49
4. The Graduates' Responses in Percentages to the Question, "Do You Now Think That You Should Have Taken More American History?"	50
5. The Graduates' Responses in Percentages to the Question, "Should All Students Be Required to Take American History in College?"	52
6. Per Cent of Graduates Sampled Who Responded	61
7. Per Cent of Graduates Making Passing Grades	62
8. Distribution by Occupational Categories of Respondents to the Questionnaire	63
9. Statistics on Characteristic 1: A Good Citizen Should Value, Respect, and Defend Basic Human Rights and Privileges Guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution	66
10. Statistics on Characteristic 2: A Good Citizen Should Respect and Uphold Law and Its Agencies .	68
11. Statistics on Characteristic 3: A Good Citizen Should Understand That in the Long Run, People Will Govern Themselves Better than Any Self-appointed Group Would Govern Them	70
12. Statistics on Characteristic 4: A Good Citizen Should Accept the Basic Idea That in a Democracy the Majority Has the Right to Make Decisions under the Constitution	72

Table	Page
13. Statistics on Characteristic 5: A Good Citizen Should Believe That He Has Inherited an Unfinished Experiment in Self-government Which It Is His Duty and Privilege to Carry On	75
14. Statistics on Characteristic 6: A Good Citizen Should Exercise His Right to Vote	77
15. Statistics on Characteristic 7: A Good Citizen Should Accept Civic Responsibilities and Discharge Them to the Best of His Ability	79
16. Statistics on Characteristic 8: A Good Citizen Should Respect Property Rights, Meet His Obligations in Contracts and Obey Regulations Governing the Use of Property	82
17. Statistics on Characteristic 9: A Good Citizen Should Support Fair Business Practices and Fair Relations between Employers and Employees	84
18. Statistics on Characteristic 10: A Good Citizen Should Know about, Critically Evaluate, and Support Promising Efforts to Prevent War, but Stand Ready to Defend His Country Against Tyranny and Agression	86
19. Statistics on Characteristic 11: A Good Citizen Should Understand Cultures and Ways of Life Other than His Own	88
20. Statistics on Characteristic 12: A Good Citizen Should Realize the Necessity of Free Speech and Free Press in a Democracy	90
21. Statistics on Characteristic 13: A Good Citizen Should Prefer Democracy to Any Other System of Government	92
22. Statistics on Characteristic 14: A Good Citizen Should Believe That Education of the Masses Is Necessary to the Success of a Democracy	95
23. Statistics in Per Cent for the Eleven History Majors	97
24. Summary of Data on Characteristics according to Percentage of Response	99

Table	Page
25. A Composite of Data on the Characteristics according to Percentages of Responses	103

AN EVALUATION OF THE OKLAHOMA STATUTORY REQUIREMENT
IN AMERICAN HISTORY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
OKLAHOMA, 1945-1955

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Historical Background

A natural consequence of World War II, as of every war in which the American people have participated, was an intensification of the nationalistic spirit. This was demonstrated by the discarding of instruction of German in institutions of higher education following World War I and the "red scare" after World War I and II. It was, therefore, a shock to the American people involved in the great struggle against the Axis, when the New York Times, on June 21, 1942, exposed the facts that only 18 per cent of the institutions of higher education required American history of their undergraduates and that only 28 per cent required it for admission. The lack of interest in the history of the nation and its traditions was astonishing. How could the young men become good soldiers with excellent morale if they knew little or nothing of their democratic heritage? Many believed that it

was essential, at all times but especially in the time of war, that we develop men and women with a sincere love of and devotion to democratic ideals. The problem was to find how this could be accomplished if less than 10 per cent of the undergraduates were enrolled in courses in American history.¹

The Times report was taken up by editorial writers throughout the country, stimulating a campaign to return to the teaching of Americanism in our schools. One such article stated:

The government at least has recognized that the soldier who knows for what he is fighting, what he has to preserve, and the cost at which it was acquired is the better soldier for that knowledge.² It is high time that our colleges should arrive at the same realization that their graduates will be better citizens for the same knowledge. . . . It would be a pity if our colleges lagged behind in furnishing through courses in history, the most essential basis for a successful building of the future--a knowledge of the past.³

The Times believed that the majority of the college and university leaders were aware of the need for making American history a required subject. Many of these educators had stressed its importance in developing citizenship, in creating love of country, and in building within the student

¹New York Times, June 21, 1942, p. 1.

²The Army instituted a twelve week required college course for those pursuing their educational training in the service. Provisions were also made for those at the secondary level.

³Amy Loveman, "History in Our Colleges," Saturday Review of Literature, XXV (September 5, 1942), p. 10.

civic responsibility.¹ With every American directly or indirectly a participant in a war in which words and ideas were weapons, and in which it appeared that our entire heritage of freedom was threatened, people began to take sides.

Those favoring the requirement of American history of college students held to the idea that:

If we Americans wish to remain Americans, we must know our American history . . . the story of the birth, development and maturing of this nation. Without a knowledge of the nature of our country, which is unique in all the world, we cannot preserve our country.²

and,

No wonder Alien thinking is making inroads against loyalty to our nation, good citizenship, appreciation of our heritages and the great sacrifices to establish and preserve them. The best counteroffensive to Communism or Socialism is a thorough understanding of American history, yet many Americans know little more about their country's history than if they had never gone to school or college at all.³

Many, however, looked upon the Times report as an effort to shape school curriculum.

The New York Times came to the conclusion that more school time should be spent on history and that laws should be enacted to require more study of history. . . . If this were repeated in each of the school subjects . . . the results would be a series of laws completely upsetting the balance of the curriculum and providing no opportunity for the schools to determine the most important

¹New York Times, June 21, 1942, p. 36.

²Henry J. Taylor, "What Our Colleges Don't Require," Reader's Digest, L (September, 1950), p. 58.

³Ibid., p. 57.

educational objectives it sought.¹

A law requiring any course would not only limit the student's freedom of selection but also curtail the authority of the schools. Thinking along these lines, many educators, some of whom believed that American history should be taken by all students, opposed the passage of any legislation forcing the schools to add it to their curricula or setting forth a mandatory requirement for all students.

The furor resulting from this indictment of the educational system had not subsided when the New York Times released information which set off a second and possibly more devastating explosion. On April 4, 1943, with the headline "Ignorance of U. S. History Shown by College Freshmen," the second bomb was exploded. The Times had just completed its survey of 7,000 students in 36 institutions which disclosed that the majority of this sampling of college freshmen had incorrectly answered most of the questions asked on the testing instrument prepared by the newspaper. The Times immediately reached the conclusion that this proved that the students had either not learned American history or had acquired a vast fund of "misinformation on many of the basic facts."² More impressive, if possible, than the lack of knowledge was

¹Ralph W. Tyler, "A Misguided Attack on History Teaching," School Review, LI (June, 1943), p. 320.

²New York Times, April 4, 1943, p. 1.

the incorrect information which these students possessed. Many said that Roger Williams was a movie actor. Only six per cent could name the thirteen original colonies and no more than seven per cent were able to name three prominent figures identified with the history of the railroads in the United States. Thirty-five per cent thought Alexander Hamilton had been president. The Bill of Rights, according to many of these college students, guarantees the whites of the South the right to lynch Negroes, freedom from fear and want, and the right to select one's own school, work, and recreation.¹

Thus for the second time in less than a year the New York Times was able to shock its readers with sensational news concerning American history. Again the newspaper editors, the educators, and the public at large found themselves unable to agree upon the validity of the test or the accuracy of the interpretations of the results. The New York Daily News, questioning the Times survey, proceeded to conduct its own capsule test. Setting out with ten questions, eight of them taken from the New York Times' list which had stumped the college freshmen, Rosaleen Doherty, News reporter, found

¹New York Times, April 4, 1943, p. 1.

"Doubtful Remedy," Time, XLI (April 12, 1943), p. 58, pointed out that the New York Time's test revealed that the group tested included:

- (1) many who had forgotten, mislearned, or never learned many details of U. S. history
- (2) some with a sense of humor
- (3) some with political heresies

that the men and women of the street surpassed the students by a wide margin. Of the forty-two people, selected at random, interviewed on the streets in the Bronx, Brooklyn, Manhattan, and the Queens, thirty-one made perfect scores. Nine of the interviewees missed but one question each, one missed two and the remaining person missed three, but still made a grade of 70 per cent, a passing grade in most educational institutions.¹

The questions used in the News survey, the number of correct and wrong answers for each question, and the number of college freshmen who gave incorrect answers are of interest in comparing the results of the Times and News surveys. The results of the News study are presented in Table 1.

Once again the newspapers and magazines, through their editorials and articles proceeded to present to the public various aspects of the question at hand. According to Emory Foster, statistician for the United States Office of Education, about 30 per cent of those graduating from senior or junior high school in 1942 did not have any course in American history.² Another survey the same year showed that 30 per cent of the undergraduate students in the colleges and universities were enrolled in history courses but only 9 per cent

¹Daily News (New York), April 12, 1943, p. 4.

²Hugh R. Fraser, "And This, Too, Is a Part of the Record," The Nation, LVI (May 1, 1943), p. 645.

TABLE 1

THE NEW YORK DAILY NEWS SURVEY

Questions Asked	No. giving correct answers	No. missing the question	No answer
1. Name two presidents who died in office.	41	0	1
2. Who was President of the United States during the Civil War?	41	1	0
3. Who was President during World War I?	42	0	0
4. On what body of water is Chicago located?	42	0	0
5. On what body of water is St. Louis, Mo., located?	40	2	0
6. Who was John D. Rockefeller?	41	1	0
7. Who was Alexander Hamilton?	38	4	0
8. With what invention was Robert Fulton connected?	42	0	0
9. What did Alexander Graham Bell invent?	42	0	0
10. What is the traditional American policy toward China?	37	5	0

in history of the United States.¹ There was disagreement among the educators on several points: Where should American history be taught? What should be the differences of the content in the courses taught in the elementary, high school, and college courses? Could the conflict between the historian and the educational psychologist and sociologist be resolved as to the best method of presentation?

If the situation was as deplorable as it appeared, what could be done? Senator Joseph F. Guffey, Democrat, Pennsylvania, announced that he was considering introducing a resolution demanding an inquiry to see how the Federal government could promote better instruction of history in the schools. He believed that the "future welfare of the nation is dependent upon what the children learn."² In another publication he stated that, "It is a well known fact that state legislatures have been interested in deleting chapters and statements from history books at the insistence of certain powerful groups which are unwilling to have the public know the truth."³ Senator La Follette, Progressive, Wisconsin, told the Senate that "many were unable to identify Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson.

¹Clarence P. McClelland, "Should the Study of American History in College Be Made Compulsory," School and Society, LVI (January 15, 1943), p. 64.

²Ibid.

³The Daily Oklahoman (Oklahoma City), April 7, 1943, p. 15.

This is an indictment "of the failure of our educational system to drive the subject of history home."¹ As a result of these comments it appeared that the United States Senate was being asked to write an educational prescription for educational institutions which had produced some history-deficient students.

The New York Times as early as 1942, while pointing out that only 18 per cent of the institutions of higher education required American history of their undergraduates, had stated, "Our colleges and universities are aware of this need, more than two-thirds holding that American history should be made a required subject."² Again in 1943 the Times reported that "to make United States history a compulsory college course would be one way of remedying the situation."³

Adding fuel to the fire, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University, declared that it was "perfectly outrageous that such a situation should exist."⁴ Many of the educators, while believing that the questionnaire was drawn along too narrow lines, agreed that had it been expanded, the results would probably have been the same.

¹Ibid.

²New York Times, June 21, 1942, p. 36.

³"Doubtful Remedy," op. cit., p. 58.

⁴New York Times, April 5, 1943, p. 1.

The Situation in Oklahoma

It is not surprising that with the evidence apparently proving the junior and senior high schools were unsuccessful in their efforts to teach American history and the majority of colleges and universities not requiring it of their students that in 1945 a bill to require American history for graduation from college was introduced in the Oklahoma Legislature.

The author of the bill was a schoolman, W. H. Underwood, State Representative from Bryan County. As originally written the bill required "one year" of college American history for graduation from college. As it progressed through the legislature, the proposed act was amended to read "six semester hours instruction in college American History and Government." The bill, House Bill 62, was referred to the Education Committee in each house.

Prior to introducing the bill, Mr. Underwood asked the State Attorney General's Office for an opinion as to its constitutionality. That office reminded Mr. Underwood of Article 13A of the Oklahoma Constitution, which gave the Oklahoma State Regents of Higher Education the following powers:

- (1) the prescribing of standards of higher education for each institution,
- (2) the determination of functions and courses of study therein to conform to such standards,
- and (3) the granting of degrees for the completion of such prescribed course. In order to remove any question as to the constitutionality of the bill, the Attorney

General's office inserted a severability clause.¹

The bill was signed by the Governor of Oklahoma on May 5, 1945, and read as follows:

An act requiring that before any student in any institution of higher education in the State of Oklahoma may receive a degree he shall have a credit of six semester hours of instruction in college American History and Government; authorizing and requiring the Board of Regents for Higher Education to include such a course in the curriculum and declaring an emergency.²

After the enactment of the law the State Board of Regents for Higher Education under the direction of Dr. M. A. Nash, Chancellor, established a committee to establish operational procedure for the Board of Regents and the institutions of higher education. The committee consisted of: Loren Brown, President of Northern Oklahoma Junior College, Tonkawa; A. G. Hitchcock, Registrar of Central State College, Edmond; Clinton M. Allen, Professor of Psychology, Oklahoma City University; E. D. Meacham, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Oklahoma, Norman; Schiller Scroggs, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater; Howard Taylor, Dean of the College, Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha; Adolph Lincheid, President of East Central State College, Ada; and C. C. Dunlap, President of Eastern Oklahoma Agricultural and

¹Letter from James W. Bond, Assistant Attorney General, to W. H. Underwood, January 3, 1945. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

²Oklahoma, Official Session Laws (1945), Title 70, Chapter 45b, p. 363.

Mechanical College, Wilburton. The committee met on July 23, 1945, and adopted several suggestions. The statement "American History and Government" was interpreted as "and/or"; American was defined as meaning "United States History and Government." It was further decided that the law applied to all junior and senior colleges, and the term "degree" meant "any degree granted at graduation."¹ All courses offered to meet this requirement were to be approved by the institution and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

As late as December 19, 1956, Dr. George L. Cross, President of the University of Oklahoma, wrote the State Regents of Higher Education concerning the difficulty incurred by "graduate foreign students" in meeting this requirement due to their "highly specialized and concentrated courses."² In replying, Dr. M. A. Nash, Chancellor, suggested that the University might try giving examinations or seminars to establish six semester hours of college credit in American history.³

The State Regents and the institutions of higher

¹Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education files, Report of the Committee to the Regents, July 23, 1945.

²Letter from Dr. George L. Cross to Dr. Mel A. Nash, December 19, 1956. In the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

³Letter from Dr. Mel A. Nash to Dr. George L. Cross, January 11, 1957. In the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

education are thus currently being faced with this and other problems in meeting the regulation concerning American history. A study on the subject might well reveal the effectiveness of the program in the preparation of citizens. It would undoubtedly be desirable to collect and study data from all of the institutions of higher learning in the State of Oklahoma; however, the scope of such an investigation is too extensive for this study. A careful investigation of the program at the University of Oklahoma will prove profitable to the University and make available a technique by which other institutions can appraise similar offerings.

Statement of the Problem

This study constitutes an attempt to evaluate the Oklahoma statutory requirement in American history as taught at the University of Oklahoma from 1945 to 1955.

Specifically, the problem to be studied is this: Do the University graduates who have taken History 3 (United States 1492 to 1865) and/or History 4 (United States 1865 to the Present) at the University of Oklahoma to meet the statutory requirement believe that these courses have increased in their lives selected desirable characteristics of an American citizen?

There are several peripheral questions which reveal information as background material and are related to the outcomes of these courses. Three such questions which are

included in this study are:

(1) What were the conditions which brought about the enactment of the law in question?

(2) What were the instructional objectives of the University professors teaching these courses prior to 1945 and how has the passing of this law affected these objectives?

(3) What changes in instructional methods were brought about as a result of the law?

Delimitation

This study was limited to the graduates of the University of Oklahoma who, as students, enrolled in and passed History 3 and/or 4 under one of six professors during the ten year period, 1945-1955. The six professors included were the ones who had taught these basic American history courses continuously during the time set forth in the study.

The investigation was further limited to an effort to determine the graduates' opinions as to the value of History 3 and 4 as contributors to the development of selected citizenship characteristics in the lives of students. No attempt was made to relate the information to the individual professor but rather to the program as a unit.

Sources of Data

The major portion of the data for this study was obtained by the use of such primary sources as: (1) a questionnaire mailed to a sampling of the University graduates; (2) a

questionnaire answered by the six University professors; (3) letters from and personal interviews with selected present and former Oklahoma legislators; and (4) the files of the Oklahoma State Regents of Higher Education. These data include specific information concerning the effectiveness of American history, as taught at the University of Oklahoma, in increasing in the lives of those who take it selected citizenship characteristics.

Secondary sources included articles in periodicals and newspapers published in Oklahoma and elsewhere relating to material on the need for, the objectives, and the methodology involved in teaching the basic American history courses.

Procedure

The study was predominantly of the normative-survey type and included the following steps.

The first step was to make an extensive examination of the literature to gather background material for the study. A comprehensive review of the two surveys made by the New York Times and the resultant articles in the newspapers and periodicals from 1942 to 1956 was made. Literature concerning why and how American history should be taught was included in the study.

The second step was to acquire statements from selected members of the Education Committee in each house of the 1945 legislature as to their reason for recommending passage

of the bill. After acquiring the names of the members of the committees a brief informal interview was held with those available in order to give them an insight into the problem under discussion. Each was asked to write, at his convenience, the reasons, as he remembered them, for the action taken by his committee of the legislature as a whole.

The third step was to prepare a questionnaire to be completed by the University professors. This instrument was used to obtain the professors' objectives and instructional methods for History 3 and 4 and any changes brought about as a result of the passage of the law. An informal discussion with each professor gave him a brief insight into the study and the questionnaire was left for him to answer.

The fourth step involved the reading and analyzing of material in order to determine those desirable citizenship qualities to include on the questionnaire for the graduates. It was also necessary to consider the factors which might affect the graduates' responses. With excellent cooperation from the University's Office of Admission and Records and Alumni Office a list of the available population was prepared. By the use of stratified sampling, to insure the inclusion of some of each passing grade level, and random sampling within each of these grade levels, a mailing list of 410 names was obtained. A pilot study was conducted with 20 University graduates. On the basis of the knowledge gained from this trial study minor revisions of the questionnaire

were made.

The fifth step in this investigation was to analyze, to interpret, and to summarize the data. The responses were grouped according to grades made in American history and by the professions in which the graduates were currently engaged. This material is presented in Chapters IV and V.

The final step discussed in Chapter VI, was the formulation of conclusions and recommendations concerning the value of the Statutory Requirement of American history as a contributor to developing desirable American citizens.

CHAPTER II

RELATED STUDIES

Much has been written in the newspapers and periodicals concerning instruction in history in general and with some applying more specifically to the area of American history. The materials appearing in these articles have consisted primarily of the opinions of teachers of history and of other social studies. There is a very limited amount of material concerning the teaching of history which may accurately be referred to as research.

The major portion of the research, to the present time, has concerned itself primarily with determining the objectives and instructional methods needed in teaching American history at the various levels. Some of this material, therefore, is apropos to this investigation inasmuch as objectives and methods of instruction are directly related to outcomes and must be considered in a study of the values of a course or program.

The most complete national study of objectives and instructional methods in American history as it is taught in the institutions of higher education was made by Jennings B.

Sanders, Specialist for the History Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education. A summary of the findings first appeared as Circular No. 284, December 15, 1950, with a complete report being printed in April, 1951.¹

This study was based upon the responses to a questionnaire mailed to the chairmen of the history departments of all the universities, all four-year teachers colleges, four-year technical institutions, four-year Negro institutions, and one-half of the four-year liberal arts colleges. The sample of liberal arts colleges was determined by arranging the colleges in rank order of enrollment and selecting every other institution.

The questionnaire used by Sanders was divided into parts, A and B, with part A to be filled out by the chairman of the department while three copies of part B were to be filled out by staff members who were teaching the introductory course in American history. Of the 787 institutions originally included in the study, approximately 50 per cent returned the completed questionnaire. Of these responses, which represented all 48 states, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, approximately one-third were from institutions west of the Mississippi River, and two-thirds were from institutions to the east. Four

¹Jennings B. Sanders, How the College Introductory Course in United States History Is Organized and Taught (Circular No. 288, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., April 10, 1951).

hundred thirty-two instructors responded, returning 383 responses to part A and 440 to part B.

From these returns Sanders was able to compile ten statements, which were representative of the major objectives of these teachers of history. These statements were:

1. To encourage an appreciation of the American heritage and promote good citizenship.
2. To provide a basis for understanding the present and planning for the future.
3. To develop in the student certain attitudes, qualities, and skills commonly associated with professional historianship.
4. To present United States history in its world relationship.
5. To prepare students for teaching and other professions.
6. To contribute to the students' general culture.
7. To develop tolerance toward other countries and other ways of thinking.
8. To show the place of United States history in Western culture.
9. To introduce students to important historical personalities so that they may appreciate the human factor in history.
10. To develop the habit of reading biographies, memoirs, and current periodicals.¹

Since the instructors' objectives affect the outcomes of a course, the present study concerns itself with this subject. The objectives of a selected group of legislators who enacted the law and the professors teaching the course at the University were secured in order to compare them with those of the Sanders' survey.

Kansas Study of Education for Citizenship

The Kansas study of "Education for Citizenship" is

¹Ibid., pp. 1-3.

slightly related to the present study in that it deals with citizenship education. The Kansas project was started in 1948 and was sponsored by the Institute of Citizenship of Kansas, Kansas State College at Manhattan, and the Kansas State Department of Public Instruction. The program as developed was intensive and limited to a small number of selected schools. The study was confined to the social studies curriculum for as a result of "the belief that although citizenship education is as broad as the total school program and every phase of high school life has an effect upon the development of the student as a citizen, the social studies curriculum is unique in that it is the only part of the high school program whose sole purpose is the development of individuals who are adequate to undertake their responsibilities and duties as members of society."¹

The program for all of the schools consisted of four main parts which were:

1. Determination of the proper objectives of citizenship education.
2. Evaluation of existing programs of citizenship education in terms of student progress toward the objectives.
3. Alteration and rebuilding of school programs of citizenship education in those areas where the evaluative study indicated inadequacies existed.
4. Evaluation of the altered programs for evidence of improvement.²

¹Earl E. Edgar, "Kansas Study of Education for Citizenship," Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), p. 175.

²Ibid., p. 176.

The schools adopted the following four objectives:

- A. The students should possess the knowledge necessary to good citizenship.
- B. The student should have skills necessary to do critical thinking on the problems of citizenship.
- C. The student should have socially desirable attitudes.
 - 1. He should be interested in citizenship.
 - 2. He should have respect for the rights and personality of others.
 - 3. He should be concerned about the general welfare.
 - 4. He should be willing to cooperate in solving common problems.
 - 5. He should prefer democratic processes.
- D. The student should have the habits necessary to good citizenship:
 - 1. He should keep himself regularly informed on public issues.
 - 2. He should participate in civic and social activities.
 - 3. He should observe accepted social conventions.
 - 4. He should observe laws, rules, and regulations.¹

Several theses have been written concerning evaluations of programs and courses of studies. Among these are: Shackleford's research to determine the type of social science courses of study used in the elementary schools of Oklahoma;² and Gilmore's examination of the objectives and effectiveness of the College Reading Clinic of the University of Oklahoma.³ Studies similar to Gilmore's were made at Wells College, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and the University of Iowa.

¹Ibid., p. 177.

²Thomas L. Shackleford, "An Evaluation of Social Science Courses of Study for Elementary Schools" (unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Oklahoma, 1937).

³L. D. Gilmore, "An Evaluation of the College Reading Clinic of the University of Oklahoma" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1952).

Other studies have given special attention to the measurement or inventory of attitudes toward or developed by a specific course or field of study. Thurston and Chave in The Measurement of Attitudes state that

. . . the more important concern (than the measurement of knowledge is to measure how far habits of conduct . . . have been established and how far attitudes and values . . . toward the realization of the highest good for the individuals themselves and for society of which they are members have been developed in individuals and in groups of persons.¹

A more recent doctoral dissertation, written in 1953, was an inventory of attitudes of the college women toward physical education and the services offered by the physical education department at Baylor University made by Kappes. In this study the author states that "the lack of relationship between enjoyment of specific activities and general attitude toward physical education suggest that educators may encourage the development of desirable attitudes . . . even in courses not specifically preferred by the students."² "One must have at least a rough knowledge of the students' attitudes in order to bring about any rational change or development."³ It therefore appears that the teacher would do

¹Louis L. Thurston and E. J. Chave, The Measurement of Attitudes (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929).

²Evelyn E. Kappes, "An Attitude Inventory to Determine the Attitudes of College Women toward Physical Education and the Services Offered the Students by a Physical Education Department" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1953), p. 30.

³Ibid., p. 31

well to determine what the students' attitudes are when entering the course, whether physical education or history.

A careful search of the literature produced no research which was directly related to the present study. It was believed, however, that inclusion of the studies herein contained was relevant in that they were serious efforts to: evaluate courses of studies and programs, identify objectives, and measure attitudes of students toward a specific curriculum. An examination of these surveys assisted in the development of procedures and methodology for this study.

CHAPTER III

WHY AMERICAN HISTORY

In the evaluation of a college course or program it is important that serious consideration be given to the objectives of the course: Why is it offered, and what is expected to be accomplished by and through it? This phase of the study will be divided into the following three sections: (1) Why did the Oklahoma Legislature believe it advisable to require American history for graduation from college? (2) What were the instructional objectives of The University of Oklahoma professors who have taught History 3 and 4? and (3) What did these University graduates expect to get from the course?

Why Did the Oklahoma Legislature Require American History?

W. H. Underwood, State Representative from Bryan County and a schoolman, was vitally concerned over the results of the surveys made by the New York Times and the effect of this "amazing ignorance of American history" upon the future of the nation and its new role as a world leader. He believed that one of the most important tasks of the schools

is "to provide an enlightened citizenry in order that self-government might work."¹ Realizing that the educational institutions were under severe criticism, the public schools for not instilling within their students a greater knowledge of the history of the country and the colleges and universities because the majority did not require it for entrance or graduation, he decided it was necessary for the legislature to take action to remedy the situation in Oklahoma.

On December 11, 1944, prior to the introduction of his bill, Mr. Underwood wrote the following to the President or a member of the History Department of each state institution of higher learning in Oklahoma:

As a member of the Twentieth Session of the Oklahoma Legislature, I contemplate the introduction of a bill to amend the Statutes of Oklahoma, asking the teaching of one year of college American history mandatory for all colleges and universities in the State of Oklahoma. The reasons lying behind this move are two fold.

- (1) To correct the amazing ignorance of American history as revealed by tests given to college freshmen, and the results of which were published by the New York Times under the date of April 4, 1943.
- (2) What, perhaps, is more fundamental in my bill will be to make the future citizens of Oklahoma realize the new role which the United States must assume in international cooperation if a third world war is to be averted.

If a year's work of college American history should be required, what would be your judgement as to the year in which it should be offered?

I have discussed this matter with school people, public officials, and laymen. They are highly in favor of it. I would like to have your reaction to this matter,

¹Henry S. Commager, "Our Schools Have Kept Us Free," Life, XXIX (October 16, 1950), p. 46.

and shall appreciate any other suggestions you might offer for use in the forthcoming session.

Having set forth his reasons for introducing the bill, Mr. Underwood was interested in learning the attitudes of some of the leaders of the institutions to be affected by the proposed legislation. Would these educators favor or oppose his suggested bill?

The responses he received indicated that in Oklahoma, as in the nation, there was divergence of opinion on the question.

Sabine C. Perciful, President of Northwestern State College, wrote:

I cannot agree with you. . . .

Furthermore, Mr. Underwood, every college in this state has a committee that is ardently studying a revision of the curriculum. I am wondering if it would not be better for the schools themselves to work out this problem than for the Legislature to legislate a curriculum.¹

Dr. A. K. Christian, Professor of History at the University of Oklahoma, replied in much the same vein:

The College of Arts and Sciences of the University now has under consideration the requirement of one half year of American history for all candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. . . . I do not know what action will be taken, but some opposition has been expressed by other departments to making a history course required.

As a matter of principle, I should prefer that the faculty would determine questions involved in curricula, but I am so certain that the type of course now being considered does not fill the requirement, and because of opposition from departments which feel they are being

¹Letter from Sabine C. Perciful to W. H. Underwood, December 16, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood.

discriminated against, perhaps the legislature will have to take action. . . . students in Arts and Sciences can get degrees without taking a single hour of history. If it takes a legislative act to correct that, I am for it.¹

Once again the question was being raised: Who should determine what should be included in the curricula--the legislature or the educational institution? While Dr. Christian agreed with President Perciful that "as a matter of principle" it was a question which should be decided by the college, he recognized certain difficulties. The faculties of the schools would certainly hinder, if not prevent, the American history question being solved at this level.

Agreeing with Dr. Christian, President John Vaughn, of Northeastern State College, said:

These things should be firmly implanted in the minds of all our young people while they are in touch with the school systems so that they will be able to evaluate when they reach maturity the great amount of inconsistency which comes through the press, radio, magazines, and propaganda. People should know the fundamental facts of history and how they have entered into the establishing of the American way of life. Then they will be able to think soundly and clearly on controversial issues.²

President R. R. Robinson of Central State College wrote: "Like you, I believe that all students in these institutions should be required to take these courses no matter what their intentions be. . . . It is certainly one of the

¹Letter from Asa K. Christian to W. H. Underwood, December 16, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood.

²Letter from John Vaughn to W. H. Underwood, December 16, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood.

functions of higher education to develop good citizenship.¹

Having learned the opinions of these educational leaders, Mr. Underwood decided to proceed with his plan to introduce his bill to require American history as a part of the college curriculum. On Thursday, February 8, 1945, he introduced House Bill 62. As originally written it was to require one year of instruction in American history but was amended by the Education Committee of the House of Representatives to read "six hours of instruction in American history." It was later amended to require all students to have "credit in six semester hours instruction in college American History and Government" before receiving a degree from an institution of higher education in Oklahoma.

The majority of the legislators making up the Education Committees of both Houses were interviewed and each was asked to give, to the best of his ability to remember, the reason why their committee and the legislature as a whole passed the bill. Each was given a written statement of the contents of the bill and asked, at his convenience, to put in writing the motives as he remembered them. From these statements came the following reasons which are listed in the order of frequency among the responses:

(1) To increase the students' knowledge of American history.

¹Letter from Roscoe R. Robinson to W. H. Underwood, December 15, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood.

(2) To teach or increase loyalty to the American ideals or way of life.

(3) To combat the influence of Communism and other totalitarian philosophies.

(4) To instill desirable citizenship characteristics in the college students, such as:

- a. An understanding of American opportunities
- b. Worth of American citizenship
- c. Willingness to protect the American system of government

(5) To produce more active citizens

(6) "Because of the atmosphere of patriotic criticism being leveled against the schools at that time, no one cared to vote against the bill."

The purpose of all education is to affect or influence the behavior of those with whom it comes in contact. The value of an educational program or institution is measured by the degree to which it influences the behavior of the participants. Since society has recognized forms of behavior which are desirable, education is expected to provide experiences which will assist the student in acquiring an understanding of the fields of knowledge which will aid him in securing the better forms. The problem is to determine which experiences will best develop these desirable forms of behavior and what part the several courses play in this development.

Why Is American History Taught in the
Institutions of Higher Education?

To a considerable extent everything that the teacher does in a course is determined to a great extent by what he wishes the course to accomplish. If, for example, the teacher of history organizes the course on a social and cultural basis rather than a political and military basis, employs the lecture instead of the discussion method of instruction, adopts one text in lieu of another and uses the objective test in place of some other type of test, he makes these decisions because he believes they will enable him to more nearly accomplish his objectives than would the use of other procedures open to him. The question of objectives is, therefore, important in the study of a course or program.

Sanders in his study of the college introductory course in United States History included a section on the objectives of the course as seen by the instructors. In answering a questionnaire mailed to 432 college instructors of United States History, 397 of them provided statements of objectives. After carefully weighing the returns, ten statements were formulated as being representative of the major objectives of the group.¹

The first of the scale-rated objectives was that of "encouraging an appreciation of the American heritage and promoting good citizenship." One of the respondents said,

¹Sanders, op. cit., pp. 1-3.

"The principal objective is the general preparation for better citizenship. A democracy presupposes that its citizens have been trained adequately to participate in the guidance of their destinies." First among the objectives listed by another instructor was, "To lay a firm foundation for active American citizenship." Such statements as "instill patriotism," "give the student an appreciation of his country," "make him a better citizen," and "love the liberty which he possesses and not to lose that liberty by indifference," were prevalent among the answers. The intent to teach an "unreasoning national adulation" was not to be found among the statements.¹

In answering the question, "Do you believe American history enables students to become better citizens," 88 per cent of all of the educators questioned in the Times survey answered, "yes."² And as early as 1949, Sanders had learned, through a study of the objectives of history departments as

¹Ibid.

A. V. Lockhart ∠"Compulsory American History in College," School and Society, LVII (April 17, 1943), p. 439 ∠ stated it "an appreciation of the struggle of our founding fathers and the heritage, good and bad, which we have today." Allan Nevins, the noted historian, said ∠"Why We Should Know Our History," New York Times (April 18, 1943), p. 16 ∠ "A knowledge of American history is an indispensable part of the training for the best type of American citizenship;" and ∠"American History for Americans," New York Times (May 3, 1942), p. 6 ∠ "no nation can be patriotic in the best sense . . . without a knowledge of the past."

²Taylor, op. cit., p. 58.

a whole rather than a particular history course, that a citizenship objective ranked sixth.¹

Second in frequency and closely related to the development of good citizens was "The providing a basis for understanding the present and planning for the future." Few would disagree with the philosophy that an ability to evaluate the past would enable one to understand the present and plan a better future. Sanders quotes Lord Mansfield as saying, "No man is fit to be intrusted with the control of the present who is ignorant of the past, and no people who are indifferent to their past need hope to make their future great."¹

Third on the list of objectives was the "developing in the student certain attitudes, qualities, and skills commonly associated with professional historianship." It was not the purpose to prepare future historians. It was expected that the course would give the student "'an understanding of the nature of historical sources and interpretation;' develop 'a scientific attitude toward evidence;' cultivate 'a habit of suspended judgment;' teach the student 'to analyze critically;' and show how 'to systematize historical events into an integrated whole!'"²

The fourth in order of frequency mentioned was that "of presenting United States History in its world relation-

¹Sanders, op. cit., p. 1.

²Ibid., p. 2.

ship." This corresponds very closely to Mr. Underwood's second reason for introducing his bill to require American history for graduation from college, ". . . to make the future citizens of Oklahoma realize the new role which the United States must assume in international cooperation if a third World War is to be averted."

Fifth in number of times listed was the objective "to prepare students for teaching and for other professions." If the study of United States history does improve one's citizenship, make him more loyal through an understanding of the country's heritage and cause him to take the scientific attitude toward evidence, then the teachers who will work with the youth so much should take it.

The sixth objective was to "contribute to the student's general culture," while the seventh was to "encourage students to read history after completing the course." There were three objectives that tied for eighth place: "To develop tolerance toward other countries and other ways of thinking; to show the place of United States history in Western culture; to introduce students to important historical personalities so that they may appreciate the human factor in history." Several others, less frequently mentioned were: "Habits of reading biographies, memoirs, and current periodicals;" "the development of ethical values and desirable attitudes and habits;" "mastery of principal topics in the text books;" "teach how to think, not what to think;" and "develop

appreciation of social behaviors."

In 1950, there were fifteen "major aims" listed for teaching American history in the California High Schools. These are in harmony with those listed by the college instructors in Sanders' study. Those listed in California were:

1. An appreciation and devotion of the American way of life.
2. Knowledge of essential facts of United States History.
3. Understanding current problems via the past.
4. An understanding and using of democratic principles and practices.
5. Displaying the initiative and responsibility of good citizens.
6. A realization of the United States in world affairs.
7. Use of critical thinking.
8. Competence in social studies skill.
9. Development of worthy social attitudes and personal qualities.
10. Knowledge of and interest in governmental functions.
11. A grasp of the interrelationship of the various social studies.
12. Understanding historical trends.
13. Historical method and research.
14. Realization of cause and effect relationship.
15. Recognition of the contributions of great American leaders.¹

The University of Oklahoma Professors
and American History

In order to reach an impartial judgment concerning History 3 and 4 as taught at the University of Oklahoma from 1945-1955, it was necessary to obtain the objectives of the professors who were teaching in those courses. Since six staff members had taught the courses continuously for the

¹Richard E. Cross, "Aims for American History in an Era of Crisis," Social Education, XVII (October, 1953), p. 259.

ten year period under consideration, it was decided to use these instructors and their students as sources of data for the study.

As a means of gathering the desired data each professor was asked to complete a questionnaire containing six questions or statements concerning his objectives and methods of presentation:

(1) What were your objectives for History 3 and 4 prior to 1945?

(2) The passing of the law requiring American history for graduation from college did___ did not___ cause you to change your objectives.

(3) If it did, what were the changes?

(4) The passing of the law did___ did not___ bring about any changes in your method of presentation.

(5) If it did, what were the changes?

(6) Do you make a conscious effort to instill in your students the following fourteen selected characteristics of a good citizen? (The characteristics are listed on pages 39 and 40.)

In answering the question, "What were your objectives for History 3 and 4 prior to 1945?" one stated that he had not taught the courses prior to that date, while the other five provided statements of their objectives. Some of the statements were multiple in character which increased the difficulty of making a satisfactory compilation. There were,

however, eight statements which evolved as the professors' objectives for the courses. These objectives are presented in Table 2.

Each of the five teachers held the idea that each student should be given a background of information and experiences as a foundation for advanced courses. Since the courses were elective, except for history majors and prospective teachers, it was natural that the course be slanted to correct any erroneous or fallacious ideas concerning the history of the United States learned in the elementary or high school so that the student would be better prepared to continue his work in American history. Only one professor stated that the "primary objective" was to prepare the student for advanced work. The remaining respondents failed to give it any greater importance than other objectives.

Two objectives tied for second place in frequency. Three of the professors taught the course to enable the students to acquire a knowledge of the political, constitutional, and cultural development of the United States. It was contemplated that such knowledge would "deepen his understanding and appreciation of the orderly evolution of our civilization and institutions."

The other objective which was listed on three of the answers was: "to enable students to acquire attitudes and habits which will produce better citizenship practices." It was believed that this could be done by "teaching the

TABLE 2

OBJECTIVES OF INSTRUCTION IN HISTORY 3 AND 4

Composite Statements of Objectives of History 3 and 4 Derived from an Analysis of 5 Separate Statements	No. of Professors Indicating Objectives	Per Cent of 5 Professors Indicating Objective
To enable students to acquire a background of information and experiences as a foundation for advanced courses in American history.	5	100
To enable students to acquire a knowledge of the political, constitutional, and cultural development of the United States.	3	60
To enable students to acquire attitudes and habits which will produce better citizenship practices by teaching the responsibilities of each citizen for the preservation of our heritage of freedom and the perpetuation and improvement of the social structure.	3	60
To enable students to acquire a knowledge of the experiences of past generations that they might better understand their own intellectual background and contemporary society.	2	40
To enable the students to acquire an insight into the responsibilities of the United States in her relationship to the rest of the world.	2	40
To enable students to acquire an acquaintanceship with an appreciation of stirring events, persons who have interesting character traits, and heroic achievements.	1	20

TABLE 2--Continued

Composite Statements of Objectives of History 3 and 4 Derived from an Analysis of 5 Separate Statements	No. of Professors Indicating Objectives	Per Cent of 5 Professors Indicating Objective
To enable the students to acquire the capacity of constructive thinking through providing opportunities for the development of this ability.	1	20
To enable students to acquire certain basic concepts concerning capitalism, socialism, communism, and other isms.	1	20

responsibilities of each citizen for the preservation of our heritage of freedom and the perpetuation and improvement of the social structure." As one respondent said, "It always sounds a little 'trite' to answer this question with the old cliché about teaching for better citizenship, but after all, this is essentially what it amounts to." While only three professors listed this as an objective, all six stated that they made a conscious effort to instill the following citizenship characteristics into their students.

A Good Citizen Should:

1. Value, respect, and defend basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution.

2. Respect and uphold law and its agencies.
3. Understand that in the long run, people will govern themselves better than any self-appointed group would govern them.
4. Accept the basic idea that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution.
5. Believe that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on.
6. Exercise his right to vote.
7. Accept civic responsibilities and discharge them to the best of his ability.
8. Respect property rights, meet his obligations in contracts, and obey regulations governing the use of property.
9. Support fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees.
10. Know about, critically evaluate, and support promising efforts to prevent war, but stand ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression.
11. Understand cultures and ways of life other than his own.
12. Realize the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy.
13. Prefer democracy to any other system of government.
14. Believe that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy.

Fourth on the list of objectives was to enable students to acquire a "knowledge of the experiences of past generations that they might better understand their own intellectual background and contemporary society." A study of the history of the United States should provide a reservoir of information concerning the nation's development, and each citizen who is familiar with this development "is in a position to use the significant experiences of past generations as a part of his own intellectual background." As Patrick Henry said in a speech at the Virginia Convention,

1775, "I know of no way of judging the future but by the past."¹ Only with a knowledge of the past can one clearly understand the present and it takes both the knowledge of the past and an understanding of the present for one to be able to examine the future intelligently.

The fifth objective was to enable students to acquire an insight into the United States and her responsibilities as a world power. Although this was listed by only two of the professors, they considered it to be very important, especially in History 4. The United States, having grown from an infant nation to a world power, faces many difficult problems. It is therefore deemed advisable that the citizens know and understand her world relationships as well as the development of her foreign policy.

Three objectives were listed one time each. They were: to enable students to acquire an acquaintanceship with and an appreciation of "stirring events, persons who have interesting character traits, and heroic achievements through long continued effort or exceptional bravery"; to enable students to acquire the "capacity to do constructive thinking through providing opportunities for the development of this ability"; and to enable students to acquire certain basic concepts concerning "capitalism, socialism, communism, and other isms."

¹David J. Brewer (ed.), The Lone Star Edition of the World's Best Orations (Chicago: Fred P. Kaiser Publishing Co., 1923), p. 15.

Only one of the professors questioned believed that the passing of the law and the enrollment of students now required to take the course caused any change in his objectives for the course. He had listed as his objectives for History 3 and 4: (1) "The primary objective was to present the survey courses of American history as a foundation for further courses. . . ." and (2) "The emphasis was directed more on political history and not as much on institutional developments. . . ." He found that, with the larger classes and with most of the people taking the course because it was required, he could not present it as formerly when they elected to take it. More emphasis was placed upon the "social and intellectual, perhaps the period of the Constitution, formation of political parties, and the struggle of the farmers, laborers, and social and political reformers. . . ."

A second professor expressed the opinion that prior to 1945

. . . students were to some degree selective and I think the scholarship standards they achieved were somewhat higher. Compulsory enrollment is psychologically bad; moreover, students since 1945 have felt that they should get off their history and government at the earliest possible moment and with the least possible effort, so they enrolled for them in their freshman year, where prior to 1945 they usually took them in the sophomore year. Since most of them had had U. S. history in the senior year of high school, they came to history and U. S. Government in their first year in college somewhat stale and resentful of having to take work they had just 'finished.'

Being faced with this situation three of the six respondents stated that they had found it necessary to make

some changes in their methods of presentation. The fact that many of the students were taking the course only to satisfy the state requirement caused several of the professors to put forth a special effort to "sell" history. This was done by trying to relate it more closely to the present conditions in which the student found himself and by spending more time on the development of social, political and economic institutions and conditions. The lecture method also began to replace the class discussion and it became necessary to discontinue the special reports which had previously been required. One professor found it necessary to bring about a "simplification of exams by adding more objective questions and not using the subjective type exclusively as before."

The increase in enrollment affected instruction in other respects. The History Department found it "impractical" to continue requiring outside readings since the classes were filled with "hand-cuffed volunteers." With the number of students in the history classes rising from 20 to 30 before the war and to 40 and 50 in the years following, it became necessary to increase the number on the instructional staff. In spite of the fact that Representative Underwood told the Presidents of the University of Oklahoma and Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College that "if it takes more teachers to teach American history (after my bill is passed), we will appropriate more money to hire more teachers"¹ the

¹Personal interview with W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma, February 20, 1957.

fulfillment of this promise did not materialize. In 1946, just after World War II and when the veteran load was at its peak, the history staff was increased to approximately twenty-two professors and five graduate assistants; in 1956-57 the number of professors had dwindled to fourteen, and the graduate assistants had increased to about twelve. As a result of this change a large percentage of the History 3 and 4 classes are being taught currently by the assistants. "For this reason," stated one of the professors who had not changed his methods, "it would appear instruction has suffered somewhat."

What the University Students Thought They
Would Acquire from American History

It is an accepted fact among educators that there is little learning without interest. The students' interest may be intrinsic, extrinsic, or a combination of the two, but interest there must be. Recognizing that many of the students were taking the course "only to meet a requirement," some of the professors found it necessary to try to "sell" American history.

Educators, in general, agree that attitudes lead people to react to subsequent experiences in certain ways. Recognizing that the students' attitudes concerning taking American history directly affect their interest in the subject, the sampling of the graduates were asked, "What did you expect to get from the course?" Of the 279 graduates

who returned the questionnaires, 246 or 88 per cent answered the question; two others said they did not know. Many of the answers were multiple in character since a number of the people listed several things they expected from the course.¹

The most important reply, in the order of frequency mentioned, was to gain an understanding of the constitutional, political, economic, and social development of the United States. Although expressed in various ways, 101 of the 246 respondents believed that this, at least in part, was what they expected to gain from the study of American history at the University. When checking, one finds that this rated second in frequency among the objectives listed by the professors of the University of Oklahoma.

Second, not listed as an objective by the professors although they realized it was why many of their students enrolled in the course, was the need to "fulfill a requirement." The 82 graduates who had expected nothing more than to satisfy the requirement were almost equally divided according to percentage of those receiving grades A, B, C, and D. Several of this group were "happy" to report that they had received much more than they had expected and attributed their good fortune to having had "such an excellent professor."

Two statements were mentioned equally for third place with 19 students listing each. They were: to gain an under-

¹This resulted in the number of tabulations exceeding the number of people returning questionnaires.

standing of American heritage and cultural background, which is closely allied to numbers one and four but possesses certain connotations which necessitates its being listed separately; and to acquire a knowledge of United States history above that gained in high school. The first of these two, although not listed by the University professors, rated sixth on Sanders' list in his national study of objectives for the beginning course in United States history.

Fourth, in the order of frequency listed, was the statement that the students expected to become acquainted with the men and women who had contributed to the development of the United States. A knowledge of the interesting personalities, their heroic deeds and at times, the sacrifice of self-interest for the good of the country appealed to ten of the students as to what they hoped to get from History 3 or 4.

Other statements listed by fewer than ten people, in the order of their frequency were: (5) to satiate an interest in a special phase or period of history, (6) to obtain a foundation for advanced courses, (7) to acquire knowledge and to develop attitudes which would assist them in becoming better citizens, and (8) to enrich their understanding of the United States' place and function as a world power.

Should American History Be Required?

Many of the educators in the United States have had

the opinion that to require college students to take American history is not the most desirable solution to teaching the facts of history or desirable citizenship to American youth. There is the belief, prevalent in the minds of some, that to require history for graduation would promote antagonism within the students' minds and thus create a psychological block against the instillation and development of desirable attitudes and characteristics. If this is a correct assumption, then the outcomes of History 3 and 4 as taught at the University of Oklahoma would be affected.

Three questions were included on the questionnaire in an attempt to obtain the opinions and reactions of selected University graduates toward the requirement of history for graduation. Each person included in the sample had taken American history at the University of Oklahoma after it became a statutory requirement. If being "forced" to take the course in history was creating resentments in the minds of students to the extent that the reason for the requirement was being defeated, this group should know. To be able to have a clear picture of the data gathered from the answers to these questions, the sample was divided into eight occupational categories as well as into the two large groups of men and women.

"Would you have taken American history if it had not been required?" was the first question in this group. In answering this question the majority of five of the occupa-

tional categories--doctor, 84.21 per cent; geologist, 65.38 per cent; lawyer, 69.56 per cent; teacher, 53.21 per cent; and house-wife, 72.73 per cent--and 67.39 per cent of the women said that they would have taken history if it had not been required. On the other hand the majority of three of the occupational groups--engineer, 76.09 per cent; military, 58.82 per cent; and miscellany, 52.58 per cent--and exactly 50 per cent of the men said they would not have elected history. Of the 282 people answering the question, 50.71 per cent said "yes," 46.81 per cent said "no," and 2.48 per cent did not know. The data on this question are presented in Table 3.

The second question was, "Do you now think that you should have taken more American history?" The majority of each of the categories with the exception of the geologists, who were equally divided, thought that they should have had more American history. Of the total sampling 60.28 per cent said they thought they should have taken more history, 36.53 per cent said "no" and 3.19 per cent "did not know." The percentages are set forth in Table 4.

The third question, "Should all students be required to take American history in college?" was asked to determine their attitudes toward a mandatory requirement. The response unmistakably favored the requirement. With the doctors leading the way--100 per cent--the majority of each group said that the history should be required. Of the total 282

TABLE 3

THE GRADUATES' RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGES TO THE
QUESTION, "WOULD YOU HAVE TAKEN HISTORY
IF IT HAD NOT BEEN REQUIRED?"

Category	Responses		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Occupations			
Doctor	84.21	15.79	0.0
Engineer	23.09	76.09	0.0
Geologist	65.38	30.77	3.84
Lawyer	69.56	26.09	4.34
Military	35.29	58.82	5.88
Teacher	53.12	43.75	3.12
House-wife	72.73	22.72	4.54
Miscellany	45.36	52.58	2.06
Letter Grade Received			
A	68.29	29.26	2.44
B	65.93	32.97	1.10
C	37.17	59.29	2.70
D	35.13	62.16	2.70
Sex			
Men	47.46	50.00	2.54
Women	67.39	30.43	2.17
Total	50.71	46.81	2.48

TABLE 4

THE GRADUATES' RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGES TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU NOW THINK THAT YOU SHOULD HAVE TAKEN MORE AMERICAN HISTORY?"

Category	Responses		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Occupation			
Doctor	57.89	42.10	0.0
Engineer	58.70	41.30	0.0
Geologist	50.00	50.00	0.0
Lawyer	65.22	34.78	0.0
Military	64.71	35.29	0.0
Teacher	62.50	34.37	3.12
House-wife	50.00	22.72	27.27
Miscellany	62.89	35.05	2.06
Letter Grade Received			
A	58.54	39.02	2.44
B	61.54	34.07	4.40
C	68.14	30.09	1.77
D	35.13	59.45	5.41
Sex			
Men	60.17	38.98	.85
Women	60.87	23.91	15.22
Total	60.28	36.53	3.19

graduates, 84.04 per cent thought American history should be required in college, 14.18 per cent thought it should not, and 1.77 per cent did not know. A point of interest is that half of those saying it should be required gave one of two qualifying statements, "not if taken in high school" or "not of graduate or foreign students." The data for this question are found in Table 5.

Of the groups in which the majority did not think they would have taken American history had it not been required, engineers, military, miscellany, and men, a majority did believe that they should have taken more history. There also was a decided increase in the number checking the "yes" column for the third question over each of the first two. A comparison of these percentages shows 50.71 per cent on question one, 80.28 per cent on question two, and 84.04 per cent on number three in the "yes" columns. It therefore becomes evident that the majority of these graduates of the University of Oklahoma agree with the 1945 Oklahoma Legislature that American history should be required in college.

TABLE 5

THE GRADUATES' RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGES TO THE
QUESTION, "SHOULD ALL STUDENTS BE REQUIRED
TO TAKE AMERICAN HISTORY IN COLLEGE?"

Category	Responses		
	Yes	No	Don't Know
Occupation			
Doctor	100.0	0.0	0.0
Engineer	71.74	26.09	2.17
Geologist	96.15	3.84	0.0
Lawyer	86.96	13.04	0.0
Military	82.35	17.65	0.0
Teacher	84.37	9.37	6.25
House-wife	86.36	9.09	4.54
Miscellany	82.47	16.50	1.03
Letter Grade Received			
A	92.68	7.32	0.0
B	84.61	14.29	1.10
C	83.19	13.27	3.54
D	75.67	24.32	0.0
Sex			
Men	82.20	16.10	1.70
Women	93.48	4.35	2.17
Total	84.04	14.18	1.77

CHAPTER IV

DID HISTORY 3 AND 4 CONTRIBUTE TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF DESIRABLE CITIZENSHIP CHARACTERISTICS IN THE GRADUATES?

Introduction

Modern education has concerned itself with the total individual. No longer are the schools interested only in teaching the mastery of books but also with all of the student's talents and learnings, not the least of which are attitudes. Educators agree that attitudes are important outcomes of education and result from personal experiences. George Hartman, recognizing this, states that "an attitude is normally a by-product of other activities and is rarely made, although it ought to be made the center of attention in school affairs."¹

Schools--colleges and universities cannot be excepted--have the responsibility of providing the students with meaningful experiences which will be of value in the development of desirable attitudes. Since thought habits are

¹George W. Hartman, Educational Psychology (New York: American Book Company, 1941), p. 389.

concomitant learnings of the complete educational program, each facet of the curriculum must accept its portion of responsibility for developing the proper attitudes. In the modern social order the obligations of the educational institutions to the students and society have greatly increased. The school finds itself faced with the problem of bearing "a major part of the responsibility in developing people who are competent to meet life adequately, since it is the one institution which gets an opportunity to influence all people."¹ It was the opinion of many educators that institutions of higher education should not be excepted from this responsibility. Clarence McClelland, President of McMurray College, Jacksonville, Illinois, believed that the fundamental purpose of higher education was to "develop free men and women who have learned to think straight and speak the truth. The broader the understanding, the freer they will be and the more competent to make a valuable contribution to the solution of present day problems, even war problems."²

Principles and attitudes are not suspended in air; they are grounded in historical facts and developments. It is important that the students acquire an understanding of these historical facts and developments in order to understand and appreciate their American heritage. The history

¹Earl C. Kelly, Education for What Is Real (New York: Harper Brothers, 1947), p. 14.

²McClelland, op. cit., p. 67.

departments, therefore, as a part of the educational institutions, must recognize and accept their share of the responsibility of shaping the attitudes of those students who enroll in the history courses. During the 1940's many of the newspaper writers, realizing that attitudes directly affect the behavior of people, proceeded to demand that American history be required of all college students as it is "essential that we develop men and women with love and devotion to our democratic ideals."¹

If it is correct that the purposes of all education are: "to train youths to make a living; to make them good citizens of the American Republic; and to give them a high moral character, an elevated sense of what national honor and personal honor demand of them,"² then surely a knowledge of American history is important. Such knowledge "is indispensable training for the best type of American citizenship; while a reverence for the American past, a due regard for our fundamental ideas and the leaders who have embodied them, are equally important for the right training of young people."³

History and literature have given America avenues through which to voice a people's common heritage. Such

¹New York Times, June 21, 1942, p. 1. Chicago Tribune, June 25, 1942 p. 1.

²Allan Nevins, "Why We Should Know Our History," New York Times, April 18, 1943, p. 16.

³Ibid.

statements as:

As for me, give me liberty or give me death.
 Damn the torpedoes, full steam ahead.
 I have just begun to fight.
 I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my
 country.
 Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute.
 Government of the people, by the people and for the peo-
 ple.
 With malice toward none; with charity for all.

should influence the attitudes of the students and assist in bringing unity out of diversity and nationalism out of particularism.

Some history teachers have taken the job of preparing citizens for democratic statesmanship with complete seriousness. They have not been ashamed of the rather dogmatic statement that history is "past politics," nor have they been afraid to assert that the importance of past politics is its relation to present political alternatives. They have made an effort to "analyze the full background of our current political problems and have concentrated much of their attention on these major decisions of our past which illuminate not only our national experience but the whole nature of political choice."¹

If the history teachers are accepting the responsibility of sharing in the formulating of the students' attitudes, which in turn will affect their responses and behavior, the professors need to know if their present efforts are being

¹Garrett Mattingly, "The Use of History," The Atlantic Monthly, CLXXVIII (July, 1946), p. 126.

successful. This study has been made in order to learn whether the graduates of the University of Oklahoma believe that the required course, History 3 or 4, has effectively contributed in the development of desirable citizenship characteristics.

While there is no guarantee that the well informed person will be either an active or a productive citizen, his interest in the civic life of his community, state, and nation and his view of his place in them are as important as the knowledge he has mastered. It is, therefore, important to determine not only what knowledge he may possess but also what attitudes he has acquired. What will he do with the facts he has garnered from books and courses? How will he react to the people and conditions he meets as a citizen? The basic question, at this time, is thus: Has the student developed the attitudes which will cause him to accept his responsibilities as a citizen and effectively put his knowledge to work in upholding and perpetuating democratic ideals?

Citizenship Characteristics

In order to learn whether or not the University graduates believed that the study of History 3 and/or 4 had contributed to the development of desirable characteristics of a citizen within their lives, it was first necessary to determine what these characteristics must be. In 1949 the Armed Forces Information and Education Division of the

Department of Defense asked the executive secretary of the National Council for the Social Studies for a description of the "good democratic citizen." The secretary proceeded to organize a committee to answer this inquiry.

The first step taken by the committee on the project was to write to leading authorities in the field of civic education, requesting that they make a list of characteristics which were believed to be essential to effective democratic citizenship. In the interim the committee compiled its own list. The two lists were then combined into a questionnaire, which was mailed to more than 300 citizens representing a large portion of the populace. Many professions were included on this mailing list, such as educators, physicians, lawyers, ministers, leaders in labor and management, and other lay and professional groups. From the answers to this questionnaire, "the response was amazing, and the agreement on essentials was gratifying," the committee then formulated a list of 24 "Characteristics of the Good Democratic Citizen."¹ (see Appendix C).

Research Procedure

Thirteen of these twenty-four characteristics developed

¹Ryland W. Crary et al., "Characteristics of the Good Democratic Citizen," Education for Democratic Citizenship, Twenty-second Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies (Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1951), pp. 154-160.

by Crary et al.¹ were selected to be included on the questionnaire to be answered by the University of Oklahoma graduates. The use of these characteristics together with the elimination of the eleven was arrived at on the basis of the considerate judgement of selected faculty personnel in the Departments of History and Education and the judgements of a pilot group of graduate students. The fourteenth point, constituting the total used in this study--a good citizen should "prefer democracy to any other system of government"--was included because it was either specifically stated or inferred as an objective by the Oklahoma legislators who passed the bill and the University professors who taught the course. It is also implied in the title of the study and throughout the list of characteristics made by the National Council for the Social Studies. Such noted historians as Henry Steel Commager, who said that the first and greatest specific task imposed upon our schools is "to provide an enlightened citizenry in order that self-government might work,"² and Allen Nevins, who lists one of the three purposes of education as "to make them (the youths) good citizens of the American Republic," have suggested that the schools share in the responsibility of establishing within the American youth a

¹Ibid.

²Commager, op. cit., p. 47.

³Nevins, op. cit., p. 6.

preference for the democratic way of life.

In order to make the instrument as complete as possible and to make sure that all of the needed data were gathered on the first questionnaire several questions, which it was believed might prove enlightening, were included. Some of the information requested was: the present profession; sex; veteran or non-veteran, when enrolled in History 3 and/or 4; and did the graduate take History 3 and/or 4 and other courses in United States history? (Questionnaire and letter of transmittal appear in Appendix B). This information proved helpful in grouping the data for the study.

The list of students who had been enrolled in History 3 and/or 4 with one of these six professors from 1945-1955 was greatly reduced by two factors. Many of the students had either transferred to another institution or had failed to complete their education for a degree. The second factor was that, due to the "Korean Action," accident or natural causes, many were deceased. After comparing the class rolls, as recorded in the University's Office of Admissions and Records with the files of the Alumni Office a list of 4,115 graduates was compiled. Of this group 410 men and women were selected for the sampling. Of the 410 graduates to whom questionnaires were mailed, 282 or 68.79 per cent responded. It is of interest to note the similarity of the percentages of the respondents who had made grades of "A," 71.93 per cent, to those who had made "D," 71.15 per cent, and of those who

had made "B," 68.93 per cent, to those who had made "C," 66.86 per cent. The number of graduates on the mailing list making each passing grade and the number and percentage of respondents is given in Table 6.

TABLE 6
PER CENT OF GRADUATES SAMPLED WHO RESPONDED

Grade	No. of Graduates to Whom Questionnaire Was Mailed	No. of Graduates Who Responded to Questionnaire	Per Cent of Questionnaires Returned
A	57	41	71.93
B	132	91	68.93
C	169	113	66.86
D	52	37	71.15
Total	410	282	68.79

In order to be sure that each grade level was fairly represented on the mailing list, it was necessary to ascertain the percentage of "A's," "B's," "C's," and "D's" given by the six University professors during the ten year period being studied. The percentage of each grade level included in the mailing list and in the questionnaires returned was also prepared. This information is set forth in Table 7.

Upon a comparison of these figures it was found that there was only slight disagreement between the groups in each

grade level. A study of the grade point average of each group presents further evidence that there is a close relationship between them. The original population made a grade point average in history of 2.406; the selected sample averaged 2.473; and the respondents' average was 2.482.

TABLE 7
PER CENT OF GRADUATES MAKING PASSING GRADES

Grade	Students Making Passing Grades		Students to Whom Questionnaires Were Mailed		Respondents Making Grade Levels	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
A	557	13.53	57	13.47	41	14.54
B	1280	31.10	132	32.63	91	32.27
C	1555	37.79	169	41.89	113	40.07
D	723	17.57	52	12.00	37	13.12
Total	4115	99.99	410	99.99	282	100.00

In tabulating the data on the questionnaires returned by the University graduates the information was sorted into several categories. The grouping was made according to sex, present occupation, and the letter grade received in History 3 or 4. The occupations, such as farmers, secretaries, salesmen, and writers, also returned the questionnaires but were placed in the group "Miscellany" as not more than five of

TABLE 8

DISTRIBUTION BY OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES
OF RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Respondents by Categories	Number	Per Cent of Total (282)
Doctor	19	6.74
Engineer	46	16.31
Geologist	26	9.22
Lawyer	23	8.15
Military	17	6.03
Teacher	32	11.35
House-wife	22	7.80
Miscellany	97	34.39

any one of the categories responded. Table 8 presents the number and percentage of respondents in each of the nine categories. As no difference was observed in the answers given by those who were veterans at the time they took history and the non-veterans, these classifications were not included in the study.

The Graduates' Responses

The basic problem with which this study is concerned is as follows: "Do the graduates who have taken History 3 or 4 at the University of Oklahoma to meet the statutory

requirement believe that these courses increased in their lives selected desirable characteristics of an American citizen?" In order to obtain an answer to this question the sampling of graduates of the University was asked to "please indicate whether having had History 3 and/or 4 at the University of Oklahoma increased, decreased, or made no appreciable difference with regard to these characteristics as an active part of your life." The respondents were also given an opportunity to indicate that they did not know the answer to the question. The results of this and other questions are presented in percentages to provide a basis for comparing the results.

Characteristic 1. A good citizen should value, respect, and defend basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

The responses made by the graduates concerning the first citizenship characteristic show that more than 50 per cent, 52.84 per cent, of the people sampled believe that History 3 or 4 increased this trait in their lives. The women, 60.87 per cent, were more enthusiastic about the effectiveness of the courses than were the men, 51.27 per cent. The teachers, 46.87 per cent, and those who had received the letter grade of "B," 46.15 per cent, were evenly divided on indicating an "increase" and "no appreciable difference." The only groups in which the majority did not indicate an increase were the engineers, with 47.83 per cent saying no

difference had been made as compared to 45.65 per cent checking the "increased" column; and those in the military service, with 52.94 per cent stating that no difference had been made as compared to 47.06 per cent indicating an increase. Only two groups--the engineers, 2.17 per cent, and the ones who had made "D" in history, 2.70 per cent--indicated that this item had been decreased in their lives by History 3 or 4. A point of interest is that in both categories men were the ones who indicated that there had been a decrease. The per cent of the 282 respondents signifying a lessening of the characteristic was .35, which is so small it is negligible. Some of the graduates in four of the occupations--engineers, 4.35 per cent; teachers, 6.25 per cent; wives, 4.54 per cent; and miscellany, 4.12 per cent--and two of the letter grade groups--"B," 7.69 per cent and "D," 5.41 per cent--indicated that they did not know the results of having had the course in American history. More men, 3.39 per cent, than women, 2.17 per cent, did not know what effect, if any, history had had upon this quality in their lives. Data regarding Characteristic 1 are presented in Table 9.

Characteristic 2. A good citizen should respect and uphold law and its agencies.

The rating of History 3 and 4 was not as favorable on the second trait as on the first. Only three groups--doctors, 57.89 per cent; geologists, 57.69 per cent; and lawyers, 56.52 per cent--said that they believed this characteristic

TABLE 9

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 1: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
VALUE, RESPECT, AND DEFEND BASIC HUMAN RIGHTS AND
PRIVILEGES GUARANTEED BY THE U. S. CONSTITUTION.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	57.89	0.0	42.10	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	45.65	2.17	47.83	4.35
Geologist (N=26)	69.23	0.0	30.77	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	56.52	0.0	43.48	0.0
Military (N=17)	47.06	0.0	52.94	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	46.87	0.0	46.87	6.25
House-wife (N=22)	54.54	0.0	40.91	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	52.58	0.0	43.30	4.12
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	56.10	0.0	43.90	0.0
B (N=91)	46.15	0.0	46.15	7.69
C (N=113)	55.75	0.0	44.25	0.0
D (N=37)	56.76	2.70	35.15	5.41
Sex				
Men (N=236)	51.27	.42	44.92	3.39
Women (N=46)	60.87	0.0	36.97	2.17
Total (N=282)	52.84	.35	43.62	3.19

had been increased in their lives by having taken American history. All of the other groups indicated that they believed that the course had made no appreciable difference in this respect. The engineers were the least favorable with their replies showing: "increased," 17.39 per cent; "decreased," 2.17 per cent; "no difference," 78.26 per cent; and "don't know," 2.17 per cent. Again the engineers and those who had made a "D" in history were the only ones who said they thought that the characteristic had been decreased by their experiences in History 3 or 4. The percentage of those who indicated a decrease, .35, was not significant. Several respondents in six of the categories--engineers, 2.17 per cent; teachers, 6.25 per cent; miscellany, 6.18 per cent; and those who had made the letter grades of "A," 4.88 per cent; "B," 6.59 per cent; and "D," 2.70 per cent--indicated that they did not know the answer to the question as related to this trait. The complete percentage figures on item 2 are arranged in Table 10.

Characteristic 3. A good citizen should
understand that in the long run, people
will govern themselves better than
any self-appointed group
would govern them.

The majority of the graduates sampled, 58.16 per cent, believed that the third characteristic was increased in their lives by having had American history at the University of Oklahoma. The doctors' responses to the first three

TABLE 10

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 2: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
RESPECT AND UPHOLD LAW AND ITS AGENCIES

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	57.89	0.0	42.10	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	17.39	2.17	78.26	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	57.69	0.0	42.31	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	56.52	0.0	43.48	0.0
Military (N=17)	35.29	0.0	64.71	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	21.87	0.0	71.87	6.25
House-wife (N=22)	40.91	0.0	59.09	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	34.02	0.0	59.79	6.18
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	29.26	0.0	65.85	4.88
B (N=91)	43.96	0.0	49.45	6.59
C (N=113)	33.63	0.0	66.37	0.0
D (N=37)	32.43	2.70	62.16	2.70
Sex				
Men (N=236)	35.59	.42	60.59	3.39
Women (N=46)	39.13	0.0	58.70	2.17
Total (N=282)	36.17	.35	60.28	3.19

items were identical--"increased," 57.89 per cent, and "no difference," 42.10 per cent. For the first time a majority of the engineers, 58.70 per cent, indicated that a trait had been increased in their lives. Larger percentages of the geologists, 73.08 per cent, and lawyers, 73.91 per cent, than that of any other group checked the increased column. A plurality, 47.08 per cent of the military believed that the study of history had made no difference in their lives while 41.18 per cent stated that it had resulted in an increase of the trait. The house-wives were almost equally divided with 40.92 per cent saying that the history increased the characteristic in their lives, while 40.91 per cent stated that it made no difference. A greater per cent of the men, 59.32, than women, 52.17, expressed the opinion that History 3 or 4 increased the item in their lives. For the first time, however, the women took the lead in indicating that having taken American history had resulted in a decrease of one of the characteristics in their lives. As surprising as it may be, a larger per cent of teachers, 9.37, indicated a decrease than any other category. In second place was the military, 5.88 per cent, with those who had made a "D" in history, 5.41 per cent, running a close third. A few of the lawyers, miscellany, and those making "A" and "B" also believed that this idea was a less active part in their lives after having taken the history course at the University. For the first time several of the categories showed a marked increase in the number

TABLE 11

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 3: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD UNDER-
STAND THAT IN THE LONG RUN, PEOPLE WILL GOVERN THEMSELVES
BETTER THAN ANY SELF-APPOINTED GROUP WOULD GOVERN THEM

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	57.89	0.0	42.10	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	58.70	0.0	39.13	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	73.08	0.0	23.08	3.84
Lawyer (N=23)	73.91	4.34	17.39	4.34
Military (N=17)	41.18	5.88	47.06	5.88
Teacher (N=32)	40.62	9.37	43.75	6.25
House-wife (N=22)	40.92	0.0	40.91	18.18
Miscellany (N=97)	62.89	1.03	30.93	5.15
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	58.54	2.44	36.59	2.44
B (N=91)	53.85	3.30	35.17	7.69
C (N=113)	59.29	0.0	36.28	4.42
D (N=37)	64.87	5.41	24.32	5.41
Sex				
Men (N=236)	59.32	1.68	34.75	4.24
Women (N=46)	52.17	4.35	32.61	10.87
Total (N=282)	58.16	2.13	34.40	5.32

of respondents who checked that they did not know the effect the course had produced. The house-wives, with 18.18 per cent, led this group with 10.87 per cent of the women, 7.69 per cent of those who made "B," 6.25 per cent of the teachers, 5.88 per cent of the military, 5.41 per cent of those who made "D," 4.42 per cent of the "C's," 4.34 per cent of the lawyers, 3.84 per cent of the geologists, 2.44 per cent of those who had made "A," 2.17 per cent of the engineers, and 5.32 per cent of the total sampling in agreement. The doctors were the only ones who failed to have a check in the "decreased" or "don't know" columns. The data for this characteristic are in Table 11, page 70.

Characteristic 4. A good citizen should accept
the basic idea that in a democracy the major-
ity has the right to make decisions
under the Constitution

An examination of the data revealed that the men and women did not agree upon the value of History 3 and 4 in increasing the fourth characteristic in their lives. Of the women, 52.17 per cent said they thought the courses had "increased" the trait in their lives, while 50.42 per cent of the men said that it "made no difference." Five categories, other than the women, indicated that they believed an increase had been made. These were: geologist, 69.23 per cent; lawyer, 60.87 per cent; teacher, 62.50 per cent; and those who made the letter grade of "B," 47.25 per cent, and "D," 51.35 per cent. The largest percentage found on any of the 14

TABLE 12

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 4: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD ACCEPT
THE BASIC IDEA THAT IN A DEMOCRACY THE MAJORITY HAS THE
RIGHT TO MAKE DECISIONS UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	26.31	10.53	63.16	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	32.61	10.87	56.52	0.0
Geologist (N=26)	69.23	0.0	23.08	7.69
Lawyer (N=23)	60.87	0.0	26.09	13.04
Military (N=17)	17.65	0.0	82.35	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	62.50	3.12	31.25	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	40.91	9.09	45.45	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	37.11	4.12	52.58	6.18
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	34.15	4.88	56.10	4.88
B (N=91)	47.25	3.30	41.76	7.69
C (N=113)	38.94	7.96	49.56	3.54
D (N=37)	51.35	0.0	48.65	0.0
Sex				
Men (N=236)	40.68	4.24	50.42	4.66
Women (N=46)	52.17	8.67	34.78	4.35
Total (N=282)	42.55	4.96	47.87	4.61

characteristics, 4.96 per cent of those sampled, indicated that the results of having taken History 3 or 4 had decreased this quality as an active part of their lives. A breakdown of this figure into the various groups shows that it included 10.53 per cent of the doctors, 10.87 per cent of the engineers, 9.09 per cent of the house-wives, 7.96 per cent of the "C" students, 4.88 per cent of those who made "A's," 4.12 per cent of the miscellany, 3.30 per cent of the ones who had made "B" in history, 3.12 per cent of the teachers, 4.24 per cent of the men and 8.67 per cent of the women. The people in the military service gave a definite vote with 82.35 per cent saying that the courses had made no difference, while only 17.65 per cent believed the characteristic had been increased. The statistics point out that the majority of the people in 6 of the 14 categories believed that the history made no difference in instilling this quality into their lives. In two other groups--the house-wives, 45.45 per cent, and those who received the letter grade of "C," 49.56 per cent--a plurality checked that it made no difference. The 47.87 per cent of the total 282 people sampled was large enough to place this characteristic in the "no difference" column. The figures in the "don't know" column show that percentage wise the geologists and those who made a "B" in history tied with a 7.79 per cent. The per cent of men, 4.66, and women, 4.35, who did not know was very close. The information on Characteristic 4 is presented in Table 12.

Characteristic 5. A good citizen should believe that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on.

On the fifth characteristic more than 50 per cent of the graduates in each of 10 of the categories checked the column indicating their belief that History 3 or 4 had increased this trait in their lives. Of the 10, the group that showed the largest percentage was the doctors with 89.47 per cent. The majority, 51.77 per cent, of the 282 graduates returning the questionnaire said that taking American history at the University of Oklahoma had resulted in the belief of this inheritance and their duty toward its becoming a more active part of their lives. Of the occupational groups only the miscellany, 3.09 per cent, said there had been a decrease. In the letter grades received in history, the "B's," 3.30 per cent, alone show a decrease. The percentage of the total, 1.06 per cent, was so small it was not a significant factor. Of the four groups which indicated that the courses made no appreciable difference, two--the military, 47.06 per cent, and those who made a grade of "D," 48.65 per cent--had 17.65 per cent and 13.51 per cent, respectively, indicating they did not know. The remaining two categories were the engineers with 52.17 per cent and the teachers with an even 50 per cent. The per cent stating that they did not know was the largest--6.74 of the total--for the 14 citizenship characteristics. Only three groups, the doctors, geologists and house

TABLE 13

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 5: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD BELIEVE THAT HE HAS INHERITED AN UNFINISHED EXPERIMENT IN SELF-GOVERNMENT WHICH IT IS HIS DUTY AND PRIVILEGE TO CARRY ON.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	89.47	0.0	10.53	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	34.78	0.0	52.17	13.04
Geologist (N=26)	61.54	0.0	38.46	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	56.52	0.0	30.43	13.04
Military (N=17)	35.29	0.0	47.06	17.65
Teacher (N=32)	46.87	0.0	50.00	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	54.54	0.0	45.45	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	52.58	3.09	38.15	6.18
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	58.54	0.0	36.59	4.88
B (N=91)	53.85	3.30	36.26	6.59
C (N=113)	52.21	0.0	42.48	5.31
D (N=37)	37.84	0.0	48.65	13.51
Sex				
Men (N=236)	51.27	1.27	39.83	7.63
Women (N=46)	54.35	0.0	43.48	2.17
Total (N=282)	51.77	1.06	40.43	6.74

wives failed to indicate that any did not know. The occupational groups and the per cent of each saying they did not know are: engineer, 13.04 per cent; lawyer, 13.04 per cent; military, 17.65 per cent; teacher, 3.12 per cent; miscellany, 6.8 per cent; those making "A," 4.88 per cent; "B," 6.59 per cent; "C," 5.31 per cent; "D," 13.51 per cent; men, 7.63 per cent; and the women, 2.17 per cent. The figures on this characteristic are presented in Table 13.

Characteristic 6. A good citizen should exercise his right to vote.

Of the 14 categories into which the graduates were divided there was only one, the military, in which the majority failed to say that American history increased within their lives the sixth citizenship characteristic. The percentages indicating an increase ranged from the military with a low of 35.29 per cent through the teachers with an even 50 per cent to the lawyers with the high of 69.56 per cent. Although so many of the groups indicated an increase, only 55.67 per cent of the total sampling believed that they were more active voters for having had the history. This was one of the two traits for which no one checked the decreased column. The lawyers, 30.43 per cent, and the doctors, 36.84 per cent, had the lowest per cent of their group which believed that the courses had made no difference; while the teachers, 46.34 per cent, and the military, 64.71 per cent, were at the other end of the scale. Only the men, 2.91 per cent, did not think

TABLE 14

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 6: A GOOD CITIZEN
SHOULD EXERCISE HIS RIGHT TO VOTE.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	63.16	0.0	36.84	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	54.35	0.0	43.48	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	57.69	0.0	42.31	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	69.56	0.0	30.43	0.0
Military (N=17)	35.29	0.0	64.71	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	50.00	0.0	46.87	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	63.64	0.0	36.36	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	54.64	0.0	40.21	5.15
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	51.22	0.0	46.34	2.44
B (N=91)	54.95	0.0	40.66	4.40
C (N=113)	57.52	0.0	41.59	.88
D (N=37)	56.76	0.0	40.54	2.70
Sex				
Men (N=236)	53.81	0.0	43.22	2.91
Women (N=46)	65.22	0.0	34.78	0.0
Total (N=282)	55.67	0.0	41.84	2.48

they knew the answer. The groups in which the largest percentages checked that they did not know were the miscellany, 5.15 per cent, and those making a grade of "B," 4.40 per cent. In five of the occupational categories--doctor, geologist, lawyer, military, and house-wife--all of the people believed they knew the results. The 2.48 per cent of the total was the fourth lowest percentage recorded in the "don't know" column by the 14 characteristics. The data for this characteristic are presented in Table 14.

Characteristic 7. A good citizen should accept
civic responsibilities and discharge them
to the best of his ability.

The graduates did not respond so favorably concerning the effectiveness of History 3 and 4 in increasing their willingness to accept civic responsibilities and discharge them to the best of their ability. In only two groups, the doctors, 57.89 per cent, and the lawyers, 52.17 per cent, did more than 50 per cent indicate an increase. Of those receiving a grade of "D," 45.95 per cent said that they believed this quality had been increased, 43.24 per cent thought that no difference had been made while 10.81 per cent did not know the results of having had the history courses. The percentage of people believing the characteristic had been decreased remained low--1.42 per cent--with a few in two of the occupational categories, the geologist, 3.84 per cent, and miscellany, 3.09 per cent, checking this column. In two of the

TABLE 15

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 7: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
ACCEPT CIVIC RESPONSIBILITIES AND DISCHARGE
THEM TO THE BEST OF HIS ABILITY

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	57.89	0.0	26.31	15.79
Engineer (N=46)	41.30	0.0	56.52	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	23.08	3.84	73.08	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	52.17	0.0	39.13	8.70
Military (N=17)	35.29	0.0	64.71	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	25.00	0.0	65.62	9.37
House-wife (N=22)	27.27	0.0	59.09	13.64
Miscellany (N=97)	38.14	3.09	52.58	6.18
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	31.71	0.0	58.54	9.76
B (N=91)	30.77	1.10	57.14	10.99
C (N=113)	41.59	2.65	55.75	0.0
D (N=37)	45.95	0.0	43.24	10.81
Sex				
Men (N=236)	38.14	.42	55.93	5.51
Women (N=46)	32.61	6.52	50.00	10.87
Total (N=282)	37.23	1.42	55.96	6.38

grade groups, "B," 1.10 per cent, and "C," 2.65 per cent, some also believed that they were less willing to accept and discharge civic responsibilities than they were before taking American history. Led by 73.08 per cent of the geologists, the majority in each of 11 of the 14 categories said they believed that history had no effect upon this quality. More than 60 per cent of the military and teachers said that they believed that no difference had been made in their lives. Close behind these groups were house-wives, 59.09 per cent, those who had made "A," 58.54 per cent, and the ones who had received a grade of "B," 57.14 per cent. The 55.96 per cent of the entire sampling which marked "made no difference" gave this item the third highest percentage in this rating. The percentage, 6.38 per cent, of the total sampling which indicated that they did not know the results was the second highest of the study. The categories and the percentage of each which said that they did not know were: doctor, 15.79 per cent; engineer, 2.17 per cent; lawyer, 8.70 per cent; teacher, 9.37 per cent; house-wife, 13.64 per cent; miscellany, 6.18 per cent; "A," 9.76 per cent; "B," 10.99 per cent; "D," 10.81 per cent; the men, 5.51 per cent; and the women, 10.87 per cent. The statistics for this trait are arranged in Table 15.

Characteristic 8. A good citizen should respect property rights, meet his obligations in contracts, and obey regulations governing the use of property.

According to the responses fewer of the graduates believed that the study of American history at the University had been successful in increasing trait number 8 than any of the other characteristics. In not one category did the majority believe that the courses had increased their respect for property rights. The percentages in the increased column ranged from a low of 14.63 per cent of the people who had received "A," with the doctors, 15.79 per cent, a close second, to a high of 39.13 per cent of the lawyers. Only 26.95 per cent, or slightly more than one of every four, believed that the instruction in history had benefited them in this respect. Including men and women, several respondents in each of eight of the categories said the courses had decreased this quality in their lives. Of these groups the largest percentage was among the doctors with 10.53 per cent. Not far behind were those who had made "A" in history with a percentage of 9.76 per cent. Scattered further in descending order were: miscellany, 5.15 per cent; lawyer, 4.34 per cent; "B," 1.10 per cent; "C," 2.65 per cent; men, 2.12 per cent; and women, 6.52 per cent. The two groups with the two highest percentages having checked that no difference had been made in their lives were the engineers, 78.26 per cent, and the military, 76.47 per cent. In one category alone did fewer than half of the group indicate that no difference was made in their lives and that was the geologist. While only 42.31 per cent of them said that no difference had been made, 38.46 per cent

TABLE 16

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 8: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD RESPECT PROPERTY RIGHTS, MEET HIS OBLIGATIONS IN CONTRACTS AND OBEY REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE USE OF PROPERTY.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	15.79	10.53	68.42	5.26
Engineer (N=46)	17.39	0.0	78.26	4.35
Geologist (N=26)	38.46	0.0	42.31	19.23
Lawyer (N=23)	39.13	4.34	56.52	0.0
Military (N=17)	23.53	0.0	76.47	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	25.00	0.0	68.75	6.25
House-wife (N=22)	31.82	0.0	63.64	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	27.84	5.15	62.89	4.12
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	14.63	9.76	68.29	7.32
B (N=91)	27.47	1.10	63.74	7.69
C (N=113)	28.32	2.65	65.49	3.54
D (N=37)	35.13	0.0	62.16	2.70
Sex				
Men (N=236)	25.42	2.12	66.95	5.51
Women (N=46)	34.78	6.52	54.35	4.35
Total (N=282)	26.95	2.84	64.89	5.32

said that their study had resulted in an increase, and 19.23 per cent said they did not know. In only two groups, lawyer and military, did no one say he did not know. A mere 5.33 per cent of the total signified they did not have an answer. The figures for this characteristic are arranged in Table 16.

Characteristic 9. A good citizen should support fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees.

The majority of the University graduates did not believe that History 3 and 4 caused them to be more active in the "support of fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees." The geologists were alone in saying that this, the ninth, characteristic was increased in 50 per cent of their membership. They were evenly divided, 50 per cent saying that the trait was increased and 50 per cent that no difference had been made. The engineers, with 8.70 per cent, had the smallest percentage believing that their having had history had resulted in an increase of this quality. A larger per cent of the house-wives, 9.09 per cent, than of any other group indicated that they believed that they supported fair business practices less because they had taken history. Although 5.88 per cent of the military indicated a decrease of the trait in their lives, less than one per cent of the men so stated, and only 1.42 per cent of the total population checked the decreased column. More of the engineers, 82.61 per cent, than any other group believed

TABLE 17

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 9: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
SUPPORT FAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES AND FAIR RELATIONS
BETWEEN EMPLOYERS AND EMPLOYEES

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	42.10	0.0	52.64	5.26
Engineer (N=46)	8.70	2.17	82.61	6.52
Geologist (N=26)	50.00	0.0	50.00	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	39.13	0.0	60.87	0.0
Military (N=17)	23.53	5.88	64.71	5.88
Teacher (N=32)	25.00	0.0	65.62	9.37
House-wife (N=22)	27.27	9.09	63.64	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	36.08	0.0	55.67	8.24
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	36.59	0.0	60.98	2.44
B (N=91)	28.57	1.10	62.64	7.69
C (N=113)	28.32	1.77	67.26	2.65
D (N=37)	37.84	2.70	45.95	13.51
Sex				
Men (N=236)	31.36	.85	61.86	5.93
Women (N=46)	28.26	4.35	63.04	4.35
Total (N=282)	30.85	1.42	62.06	5.67

that the study of American history had made no difference in their lives. Of the 282 respondents, 62.06 per cent believed the courses had made no difference while 30.85 per cent thought there had been an increase of the trait as an active part of their lives. All except three of the categories-- the geologist, lawyer, and house-wife--had a few who said they did not know the answer. The graduates who had received a grade of "D" were the only ones to have a large enough percentage who said they did not know that it might affect the outcome within their group. Of this group 37.84 per cent indicated that an increase had been made and 45.95 per cent did not believe the study of history had made any difference. If the 13.51 per cent who didn't know had believed an increase had been effected, it would have placed the majority of checks in the "increase" column. This, however, would not have significantly affected the percentages for the total population as only 5.67 per cent of the total said they did not know. The statistics for Characteristic 9 are presented in Table 17.

Characteristic 10. A good citizen should know about, critically evaluate, and support promising efforts to prevent war, but stand ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression.

The responses show a majority, 54.26 per cent, of the graduates believed that the study of History 3 and 4 had increased this citizenship trait in their lives. A majority

TABLE 18

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 10: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD KNOW ABOUT, CRITICALLY EVALUATE, AND SUPPORT PROMISING EFFORTS TO PREVENT WAR, BUT STAND READY TO DEFEND HIS COUNTRY AGAINST TYRANNY AND AGRESSION.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	78.95	0.0	21.05	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	47.83	2.17	50.00	0.0
Geologist (N=26)	80.77	0.0	19.23	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	65.22	0.0	34.78	0.0
Military (N=17)	17.65	0.0	82.35	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	40.62	0.0	56.25	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	50.00	0.0	50.00	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	54.64	1.03	40.21	4.12
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	65.85	2.44	31.71	0.0
B (N=91)	60.43	1.10	34.07	4.40
C (N=113)	47.79	0.0	52.21	0.0
D (N=37)	45.95	0.0	51.35	2.70
Sex				
Men (N=236)	55.93	.85	41.10	2.12
Women (N=46)	45.65	0.0	54.35	0.0
Total (N=282)	54.26	.71	43.26	1.77

of seven of the groups--doctor, 78.95 per cent; geologist, 80.77 per cent; lawyer, 65.22 per cent; miscellany, 54.64 per cent; "A," 65.85 per cent; "B," 60.43 per cent; and men, 55.93 per cent--said they thought this characteristic of a good citizen had been increased in their lives by having studied American history. Half of the house-wives believed there had been an increase, while the other half thought no appreciable difference had been made. Less than one per cent of the graduates returning the questionnaire believed that the courses had decreased this quality in their lives. The largest percentage in the "no difference" column was that of the military, 82.35 per cent, which is almost twice that of the entire group, 43.26 per cent. People in only two of the occupational groups, teacher, 3.12 per cent, and miscellany, 4.12 per cent; two of the letter grade groups, "B," 4.40 per cent and "D," 2.70 per cent; and the men, 2.12 per cent, did not know the answer. Again the percentage of the total, 1.77, was so small that it was not significant. The data for this characteristic are given in Table 18.

Characteristic 11. A good citizen should
understand cultures and ways of life
other than his own.

Although the majority of 8 of the groups and the plurality of 2 additional ones believed that history had increased this trait in their lives, a very small majority, 50.71 per cent, of the entire sampling checked this column.

TABLE 19

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 11: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
UNDERSTAND CULTURES AND WAYS OF LIFE
OTHER THAN HIS OWN.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	42.10	0.0	57.89	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	36.96	0.0	60.87	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	46.15	0.0	53.82	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	52.17	0.0	47.83	0.0
Military (N=17)	64.71	0.0	35.29	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	53.12	0.0	43.75	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	50.00	0.0	45.45	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	56.70	0.0	37.11	6.18
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	41.46	0.0	58.54	0.0
B (N=91)	52.75	0.0	40.66	6.59
C (N=113)	52.21	0.0	46.02	1.77
D (N=37)	51.35	0.0	45.95	2.70
Sex				
Men (N=236)	49.15	0.0	47.46	3.39
Women (N=46)	58.70	0.0	39.13	2.17
Total (N=282)	50.71	0.0	46.10	3.19

This is the second characteristic which no one believed had been decreased by the study of American history. A majority of four of the groups--the doctors, 57.89 per cent; the lawyers, 60.87 per cent; the geologists, 53.82 per cent; and those who had received an "A" in history, 58.54 per cent--said that they believed the courses had not affected their understanding of cultures and ways of life other than their own. A few in each of nine of the groups did not know how to answer. These categories are: engineer, 2.17 per cent; teacher, 3.12 per cent; house-wife, 4.54 per cent; miscellany, 6.18 per cent; "B," 6.59 per cent; "C," 1.77 per cent; "D," 2.70 per cent; men, 3.59 per cent; and women, 2.17 per cent. The data for this classification are presented in Table 19.

Characteristic 12. A good citizen should
realize the necessity of free speech
and free press in a democracy

The majority in each of 13 of the 14 categories into which the graduates had been divided expressed the belief that History 3 or 4 had increased within their lives the realization of "the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy." The military was alone in having the majority of its group, 58.82 per cent, say that these courses had made no difference in causing this characteristic to become a more active part of their lives. With 67.83 per cent, the largest per cent of the total received by any trait in any rating, of the respondents indicating it had been increased, a break

TABLE 20

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 12: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD
REALIZE THE NECESSITY OF FREE SPEECH AND
FREE PRESS IN A DEMOCRACY

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	63.16	0.0	36.84	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	71.74	0.0	28.26	0.0
Geologist (N=26)	73.08	0.0	26.92	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	56.52	0.0	43.48	0.0
Military (N=17)	41.18	0.0	58.82	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	59.37	3.12	34.37	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	68.18	0.0	31.82	0.0
Miscellany (N=97)	73.20	0.0	25.77	1.03
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	63.41	0.0	36.59	0.0
B (N=91)	69.23	0.0	28.57	2.19
C (N=113)	65.49	0.0	34.51	0.0
D (N=37)	70.27	2.70	27.03	0.0
Sex				
Men (N=236)	66.10	.42	32.63	.85
Women (N=46)	71.74	0.0	28.26	0.0
Total (N=282)	67.83	.35	31.91	.71

down by groups and their percentages are worthy of note. These are: doctor, 63.16 per cent; engineers, 71.74 per cent; geologist, 73.08 per cent; lawyer, 56.25 per cent; teacher, 59.37 per cent; house-wife, 68.18 per cent; miscellany, 72.30 per cent; "A," 63.41 per cent; "B," 69.23 per cent; "C," 65.49 per cent; "D," 70.27 per cent; men, 66.10 per cent; and women, 71.74 per cent. Several of the respondents in the teaching profession, 3.12 per cent, and in the group who had received a grade of "D" in history, 2.70 per cent, were the only ones who thought their belief in free speech and free press in a democracy had been decreased by the courses. As a result of these small percentages, only .35 per cent of the 282 graduates indicated a decrease. Again individuals in three categories: teacher, 3.12 per cent; miscellany, 1.03 per cent; and those who had made "B," 2.19 per cent did not know how the study of American history had affected this characteristic as a part of their lives. The percentages of this trait are given in Table 20.

Characteristic 13. A good citizen should prefer democracy to any other system of government.

According to the returns made by the graduates the majority of 13 of the groups believed that taking American history at the University has increased the thirteenth characteristic, "prefer democracy to any other system of government," as an active part of their lives. With 43.48 per cent checking increased, 54.35 per cent believing that it had made

TABLE 21

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 13: A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD PREFER DEMOCRACY TO ANY OTHER SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	78.95	0.0	21.05	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	43.48	0.0	54.35	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	88.46	0.0	11.54	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	60.87	0.0	39.13	0.0
Military (N=17)	58.82	0.0	41.18	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	62.50	3.12	31.25	3.12
House-wife (N=22)	59.09	0.0	36.36	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	67.01	2.06	27.84	3.09
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	68.29	2.44	29.26	0.0
B (N=91)	68.13	0.0	27.47	4.40
C (N=113)	56.64	.88	40.71	1.77
D (N=37)	70.27	2.70	27.03	0.0
Sex				
Men (N=236)	63.14	1.27	33.47	2.12
Women (N=46)	67.39	0.0	30.43	2.17
Total (N=282)	63.83	1.06	32.98	2.13

no difference, and 2.17 per cent saying they did not know, the engineers were the only dissenting group. With 78.95 per cent of the doctors, 88.46 per cent of the geologists, 60.87 per cent of the lawyers, 58.82 per cent of the military, 62.50 per cent of the teachers, 59.09 per cent of the housewives, 67.01 per cent of the miscellaneous group, 68.29 per cent of the A's, 68.13 per cent of the B's, 65.64 per cent of the C's, and 70.27 per cent of the D's, there were 63.83 per cent of the total who believed their preference for democracy had been increased. Some of the respondents in five of the groups; teachers, 3.12 per cent; miscellany, 2.06 per cent; and those who received the grades in history of "A," 2.44 per cent, "C," .88 per cent, and "D," 2.70 per cent, believed that there had been a decrease in their preference of democracy as a result of having taken the courses. Only 32.98 per cent of those sampled believed that their preference of a system of government had not been affected. There were a few in four of the occupational categories: engineers, 2.17 per cent; teacher, 3.12 per cent; house-wife, 4.54 per cent; and miscellany, 3.09 per cent; and two of the letter grade groups, "B," 4.40 per cent, and "C," 1.77 per cent, who said that they did not know how, if it did, American history had affected their preference. The statistics for this trait are presented in Table 21.

Characteristic 14. A good citizen should believe that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy.

A majority of each of 13 of the categories and the plurality of the remaining one said they believed that the study of American history had increased their belief "that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy." The largest per cent in the increase column, 92.31 per cent, was indicated by the geologists. The doctors with 78.95 per cent were in second place. The percentages of the men, 64.83, and women, 67.39, who said they thought their belief had been strengthened and 28.81 per cent of the men and 28.26 per cent of the women who thought no difference had been made show that on this the last of the characteristics there was little disagreement between the sexes. As surprising as it may appear, of the six groups in which there were some who said that History 3 or 4 had decreased their belief in the necessity of education, the largest percentages were among the people who had made "A," 9.76, and the teachers with 6.25. Each category with the exception of these--doctor, geologist, and military--had a few who did not know what effect history had produced upon this trait in their lives. The teachers with a percentage of 12.50 had the largest portion of this group who did not know. Of the 282 respondents only 3.54 per cent checked the "do not know" column. The statistics on this characteristic are arranged in Table 22.

The responses made by the 11 history majors returning

TABLE 22

STATISTICS ON CHARACTERISTIC 14: A GOOD CITIZEN
SHOULD BELIEVE THAT EDUCATION OF THE MASSES IS
NECESSARY TO THE SUCCESS OF A DEMOCRACY.

Category	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
Occupation				
Doctor (N=19)	78.95	0.0	21.05	0.0
Engineer (N=46)	56.52	2.17	39.13	2.17
Geologist (N=26)	92.31	0.0	7.69	0.0
Lawyer (N=23)	56.52	0.0	39.13	4.34
Military (N=17)	52.94	0.0	47.06	0.0
Teacher (N=32)	50.00	6.25	31.25	12.50
House-wife (N=22)	68.18	0.0	27.27	4.54
Miscellany (N=97)	68.04	4.12	24.74	3.09
Letter Grade Received				
A (N=41)	65.85	9.76	21.95	2.44
B (N=91)	68.13	2.20	24.18	5.49
C (N=113)	63.72	0.0	34.51	1.77
D (N=37)	62.16	2.70	29.73	5.41
Sex				
Men (N=236)	64.83	2.97	28.81	3.39
Women (N=46)	67.39	0.0	28.26	4.35
Total (N=282)	65.25	2.48	28.72	3.54

the questionnaire is of interest. The majority believed that 11 of the citizenship characteristics had been increased in their lives. It is of interest to note that one or 9.09 per cent thought three of the traits had been decreased. The same per cent checked the "do not know" column for two of the characteristics. The percentages for the history majors is presented in Table 23.

A Summary of Data on Citizenship Characteristics

The major portion of each of the four letter grade groups believed that the study of American history at the University of Oklahoma increased five of the citizenship characteristics--numbers 3, 6, 12, 13, and 14--and made no appreciable difference in three of the traits--numbers 2, 8, and 9. The majority of three of the groups thought numbers 1, 5, and 11 had been increased while three thought the courses had made no difference in number 7.

Most of the doctors thought 10 of the characteristics had been increased while no difference had been made with regard to the other four numbers--4, 8, 9, and 11. A small percentage of the doctors thought that traits 4 and 8 had been decreased as a result of their educational experiences in History 3 or 4.

The majority of the engineers thought four of the characteristics had been increased (numbers 3, 6, 12, and 14) while the military gave a majority vote to only three (numbers

TABLE 23

STATISTICS IN PER CENT FOR THE
ELEVEN HISTORY MAJORS

Trait	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
1	63.64	0.0	36.36	0.0
2	54.55	0.0	45.45	0.0
3	72.73	9.09	18.18	0.0
4	36.36	9.09	45.45	9.09
5	63.64	0.0	36.36	0.0
6	90.91	0.0	9.09	0.0
7	54.55	0.0	45.45	0.0
8	18.18	0.0	81.81	0.0
9	45.45	0.0	54.55	0.0
10	90.91	0.0	9.09	0.0
11	90.91	0.0	9.09	0.0
12	81.81	0.0	18.18	0.0
13	81.81	0.0	18.18	0.0
14	72.73	9.09	0.0	9.09

11, 13, and 14). The other categories and the number of characteristics in which the majority believed there had been an increase are: teachers, 6; house-wife, 7; miscellany, 9; geologist, 11; and lawyer, 12. In the case of the house-wives, they were equally divided on characteristic number 3

and 10, and the teachers on number 1. A summary of the data on the characteristics by categories is given in Table 24.

The percentages for the total sampling, 282, show that more than 50 per cent of the graduates believed that nine of the characteristics had been increased. The numbers of these traits and the percentage checking the increased column in rank order of ascension are: No. 11, 50.71 per cent; No. 5, 51.77 per cent; No. 1, 52.84 per cent; No. 10, 54.26 per cent; No. 6, 55.67 per cent; No. 3, 58.16 per cent; No. 13, 63.83 per cent; No. 14, 65.25 per cent; and No. 12, 67.83 per cent. None of the graduates thought numbers 6 and 11 had been decreased. The highest per cent, 4.96, of decrease was on trait No. 4 while only .35 per cent thought qualities No. 1, 2, and 12 had been decreased in their lives.

The majority of the graduates also believed that History 3 and 4 had made no difference in their lives where four of the characteristics are concerned. These four are: No. 6, 55.96 per cent; No. 2, 60.28 per cent; No. 9, 62.06 per cent; and No. 8, 64.89 per cent. A plurality, 47.87 per cent, checked this column for trait No. 4. There were a few in each category who did not know how the history courses had affected the characteristics in their lives. The highest percentage, 6.74, appeared beside quality No. 5 and the lowest, .71, by No. 12. A composite of the statistics on the 14 citizenship characteristics is presented in Table 25.

TABLE 24

SUMMARY OF DATA ON CHARACTERISTICS ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSE

Response	Categories												Men	Women	Total
	Doctor N=19	Engineer N=46	Geologist N=26	Lawyer N=23	Military N=17	Teacher N=32	House-wife N=22	Miscellany N=97	Letter Grade Received						
									A N=41	B N=91	C N=113	D N=37			
Trait 1															
Increased	57.89	45.65	69.23	56.52	47.06	46.87	54.54	52.58	56.10	46.15	55.75	56.76	51.27	60.87	52.84
Decreased	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.70	.42	0.0	.35
No Difference	42.10	47.83	30.77	43.48	52.94	46.87	40.91	43.30	43.90	46.15	44.25	35.15	44.92	36.97	43.62
Don't Know	0.0	4.35	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.25	4.54	4.12	0.0	7.69	0.0	5.41	3.39	2.17	3.19
Trait 2															
Increased	57.89	17.39	57.69	56.52	35.29	21.87	40.91	34.02	29.26	43.96	33.63	32.43	35.59	39.13	36.17
Decreased	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.70	.42	0.0	.35
No Difference	42.10	78.26	42.31	43.48	64.71	71.87	59.09	59.79	65.85	49.45	66.37	62.16	60.59	58.70	60.28
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.25	0.0	6.18	4.88	6.59	0.0	2.70	3.39	2.17	3.19
Trait 3															
Increased	57.89	58.70	73.08	73.91	41.18	40.62	40.92	62.89	58.54	53.85	59.29	64.87	59.32	52.17	58.16
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.34	5.88	9.37	0.0	1.03	2.44	3.30	0.0	5.41	1.68	4.35	2.13
No Difference	42.10	39.13	23.08	17.39	47.06	43.75	40.91	30.93	36.59	35.17	36.28	24.32	34.75	32.61	34.40
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	3.84	4.34	5.88	6.25	18.18	5.15	2.44	7.69	4.42	5.41	4.24	10.87	5.32
Trait 4															
Increased	26.31	32.61	69.23	60.87	17.65	62.50	40.91	37.11	34.15	47.25	38.94	51.35	40.68	52.17	42.55
Decreased	10.53	10.87	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	9.09	4.12	4.88	3.30	7.96	0.0	4.24	8.67	4.96
No Difference	63.16	56.52	23.08	26.09	82.35	31.25	45.45	52.58	56.10	41.76	49.56	48.65	50.42	34.78	47.87
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	7.69	13.04	0.0	3.12	4.54	6.18	4.88	7.69	3.54	0.0	4.66	4.35	4.61

TABLE 24--Continued

Response	Categories												Men	Women	Total
	Doctor N=19	Engineer N=46	Geologist N=26	Lawyer N=23	Military N=17	Teacher N=32	House-wife N=22	Miscellany N=97	Letter Grade Received						
									A N=41	B N=91	C N=113	D N=37			
Trait 5															
Increased	89.47	34.78	61.54	56.52	35.29	46.87	54.54	52.58	58.54	53.85	52.21	37.84	51.27	54.35	51.77
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.09	0.0	3.30	0.0	0.0	1.27	0.0	1.06
No Difference	10.53	52.17	38.46	30.43	47.06	50.00	45.45	38.15	36.59	36.26	42.48	48.65	39.83	43.48	40.43
Don't Know	0.0	13.04	0.0	13.04	17.65	3.12	0.0	6.18	4.88	6.59	5.31	13.51	7.63	2.17	6.74
Trait 6															
Increased	63.16	54.35	57.69	69.56	35.29	50.00	63.64	54.64	51.22	54.95	57.52	56.76	53.81	65.22	55.67
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Difference	36.84	43.48	42.31	30.43	64.71	46.87	36.36	40.21	46.34	40.66	41.59	40.54	43.22	34.78	41.84
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	0.0	5.15	2.44	4.40	.88	2.70	2.91	0.0	2.48
Trait 7															
Increased	57.89	41.30	23.08	52.17	35.29	25.00	27.27	38.14	31.71	30.77	41.59	45.95	38.14	32.61	37.23
Decreased	0.0	0.0	3.84	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.09	0.0	1.10	2.65	0.0	.42	6.52	1.42
No Difference	26.31	56.52	73.08	39.13	64.71	65.62	59.09	52.58	58.54	57.14	55.75	43.24	55.93	50.00	55.96
Don't Know	15.79	2.17	0.0	8.70	0.0	9.37	13.64	6.18	9.76	10.99	0.0	10.81	5.51	10.87	6.38
Trait 8															
Increased	15.79	17.39	38.46	39.13	23.53	25.00	31.82	27.84	14.63	27.47	28.32	35.13	25.42	34.78	26.95
Decreased	10.53	0.0	0.0	4.34	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.15	9.76	1.10	2.65	0.0	2.12	6.52	2.84
No Difference	68.42	78.26	42.31	56.52	76.47	68.75	63.64	62.89	68.29	63.74	65.49	62.16	66.95	54.35	64.89
Don't Know	5.26	4.35	19.23	0.0	0.0	6.25	4.54	4.12	7.32	7.69	3.54	2.70	5.51	4.35	5.32

TABLE 24--Continued

Response	Categories												Men	Women	Total
	Doctor N=19	Engineer N=46	Geologist N=26	Lawyer N=23	Military N=17	Teacher N=32	House-wife N=22	Miscellany N=97	Letter Grade Received						
									A N=41	B N=91	C N=113	D N=37			
Trait 9															
Increased	42.10	8.70	50.00	39.13	23.53	25.00	27.27	36.08	36.59	28.57	28.32	37.84	31.36	28.26	30.85
Decreased	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	5.88	0.0	9.09	0.0	0.0	1.10	1.77	2.70	.85	4.35	1.42
No Difference	52.64	82.61	50.00	60.87	64.71	65.62	63.64	55.67	60.98	62.64	67.26	45.95	61.86	63.04	62.06
Don't Know	5.26	6.52	0.0	0.0	5.88	9.37	0.0	8.24	2.44	7.69	2.65	13.51	5.93	4.35	5.67
Trait 10															
Increased	78.95	47.83	80.77	65.22	17.65	40.62	50.00	54.64	65.85	60.43	47.79	45.95	55.93	45.65	54.26
Decreased	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.03	2.44	1.10	0.0	0.0	.85	0.0	.71
No Difference	21.05	50.00	19.23	34.78	82.35	56.25	50.00	40.21	31.71	34.07	52.21	51.35	41.10	54.35	43.26
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	0.0	4.12	0.0	4.40	0.0	2.70	2.12	0.0	1.77
Trait 11															
Increased	42.10	36.96	46.15	52.17	64.71	53.12	50.00	56.70	41.46	52.75	52.21	51.35	49.15	58.70	50.71
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
No Difference	57.89	60.87	53.82	47.83	35.29	43.75	45.45	37.11	58.54	40.66	46.02	45.95	47.46	39.13	46.10
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	4.54	6.18	0.0	6.59	1.77	2.70	3.39	2.17	3.19
Trait 12															
Increased	63.16	71.74	73.08	56.52	41.18	59.37	68.18	73.20	63.41	69.23	65.49	70.27	66.10	71.74	67.83
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.70	.42	0.0	.35
No Difference	36.84	28.26	26.92	43.48	58.82	34.37	31.82	25.77	36.59	28.57	34.51	27.03	32.63	28.26	31.91
Don't Know	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	0.0	1.03	0.0	2.19	0.0	0.0	.85	0.0	.71

TABLE 24--Continued

Response	Categories												Men	Women	Total
	Doctor N=19	Engineer N=46	Geologist N=26	Lawyer N=23	Military N=17	Teacher N=32	House-wife N=22	Miscellany N=97	Letter Grade Received						
									A N=41	B N=91	C N=113	D N=37			
Trait 13															
Increased	78.95	43.48	88.46	60.87	58.82	62.50	59.09	67.01	68.29	68.13	56.64	70.27	63.14	67.39	63.83
Decreased	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	0.0	2.06	2.44	0.0	.88	2.70	1.27	0.0	1.06
No Difference	21.05	54.35	11.54	39.13	41.18	31.25	36.36	27.84	29.26	27.47	40.71	27.03	33.47	30.43	32.98
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.12	4.54	3.09	0.0	4.40	1.77	0.0	2.12	2.17	2.13
Trait 14															
Increased	78.95	56.52	92.31	56.52	52.94	50.00	68.18	68.04	65.85	68.13	63.72	62.16	64.83	67.39	65.25
Decreased	0.0	2.17	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.25	0.0	4.12	9.76	2.20	0.0	2.70	2.97	0.0	2.48
No Difference	21.05	39.13	7.69	39.13	47.06	31.25	27.27	24.74	21.95	24.18	34.51	29.73	28.81	28.26	28.72
Don't Know	0.0	2.17	0.0	4.34	0.0	12.50	4.54	3.09	2.44	5.49	1.77	5.41	3.39	4.35	3.54

TABLE 25

A COMPOSITE OF DATA ON THE CHARACTERISTICS
ACCORDING TO PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES

Characteristic	Response			
	Increased	Decreased	No Difference	Don't Know
1	58.84	.35	43.62	3.19
2	36.17	.35	60.28	3.19
3	58.16	2.13	34.40	5.32
4	42.55	4.96	47.87	4.61
5	51.77	1.06	40.43	6.74
6	55.67	0.0	41.84	2.48
7	37.23	1.42	55.96	6.38
8	26.95	2.84	64.69	5.32
9	30.85	1.42	62.06	5.67
10	54.26	.71	43.26	1.77
11	50.71	0.0	46.10	3.19
12	67.83	.85	31.91	.71
13	63.83	1.06	32.98	2.13
14	65.25	2.48	28.72	3.54

The questionnaire also included the item, "As a result of having taken History 3 and/or 4 at the University of Oklahoma, do you think that you are: (1) a more active citizen, (2) a less active citizen, (3) made no appreciable difference, (4) don't know?" In comparing the answers to

this question with the percentages in each rating made by the total sampling on the 14 characteristics, it is seen that there is very little difference. Of the 3,948 possible answers relative to characteristics, 49.52 per cent of them were in the increase column compared to 49.29 per cent of the 282 graduates who said History 3 or 4 had made them a more active citizen. Of the possible answers 45.23 per cent indicated no difference had been made while in answering the above question 42.20 per cent of the graduates said history had made no difference.

Despite the fact that several years had elapsed since many of the graduates had completed History 3 or 4 and the difficulty of relating the activities of life to a specific course, very few of the respondents said that they did not know the effect the study of American history had upon the various characteristics in their lives. Of the 644 possible answers in the women's category only 3.57 per cent were "do not know," of the 3,304 possible answers in the men's group only 3.94 per cent were in the "do not know" column, and of the 3,948 possible answers in all of the traits only 3.88 per cent were "do not know." The smallness of these percentages indicates that they are not significant.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study constitutes an attempt to evaluate the Oklahoma Statutory Requirement in American history at the University of Oklahoma during the period from September, 1945 to September, 1955. The primary purpose of the study was to reveal information which would assist in determining whether the required experiences in American history have contributed toward the instilling of desirable characteristics in the enrolees.

Specifically, the problem involved the collection and study of the opinions of a random sampling of the University graduates, concerning the effectiveness of these courses (History 3 and 4) in increasing in their lives certain selected desirable characteristics of an American citizen. The mailing list, selected from a population of 4,115 graduates of the University of Oklahoma, included the names of 410 people of which 282 or 68.79 per cent responded. These individuals were selected from the students who had taken American history under one of the six professors who had taught these courses continuously throughout the ten year

period.

Two questionnaires were prepared to be used in the collection of data for the study. The first was used to ascertain the instructional objectives of the six professors teaching the courses and how these objectives had been affected by the passage of the law requiring American history in college. The second questionnaire was mailed to the sampling of graduates in order to obtain their opinions of and reactions to the history requirement as a contributing factor in developing the fourteen citizenship characteristics. Through careful examination of the literature on citizenship education, fourteen citizenship characteristics were selected to be the basis around which the questionnaire was constructed.

Questionnaire data were catalogued by occupations, by letter grades received in history, and by sex. This provided an opportunity to compare the responses made by those pursuing various occupations, those who had received the several grades, or by men and women. In order to make possible a fairer comparison, results are presented in percentages.

Summary

American History a Mandatory Requirement

The educators in Oklahoma, as in the nation, were divided as to the advisability of requiring American history of all college students. Even the professors who taught the

courses were not in agreement on this issue. The files of Mr. Underwood, author of the bill, reveal the divergency of thought among those with whom he corresponded concerning the matter.

In order to learn the attitudes of those who had been required to take the history, the University graduates were asked, "Should all students be required to take American history in college?" The response showed unquestionably that the majority thought American history should be required. Of the 282 graduates returning the questionnaire, 84.04 per cent thought it should be required, 14.18 per cent thought that it should not, and 1.77 per cent did not know. According to categories the answers to the question were: doctor, 100 per cent "yes"; engineer, 71.74 per cent "yes," 26.09 per cent "no," and 2.17 per cent "don't know"; geologist, 96.15 per cent "yes" and 3.84 per cent "no"; lawyer, 86.96 per cent "yes" and 13.04 per cent "no"; military, 82.35 per cent "yes" and 17.65 per cent "no"; teacher, 84.37 per cent "yes," 9.37 per cent "no," and 6.25 per cent "don't know"; house-wife, 86.36 per cent "yes," 9.09 per cent "no," and 4.54 per cent "don't know"; miscellany, 82.47 per cent "yes," 16.50 per cent "no," and 1.03 per cent "don't know"; men, 82.20 per cent "yes," 16.10 per cent "no," and 1.70 per cent "don't know"; and the women, 93.48 per cent "yes," 4.35 per cent "no," and 2.17 per cent "don't know." There can be no doubt that those who have taken American history to meet the

statutory requirement believe that it should be required of college students.

The University Professors' Responses

Upon investigation it was determined that six of the university professors had taught History 3 (United States, 1492 to 1865) and History 4 (United States, 1865 to the Present) continuously from 1945 to 1955. After an interview in which the professor was given a brief resume of the study, he was asked to complete a questionnaire of six questions and statements concerning his objectives and instructional methods for these courses. These questions were: (1) "What were your objectives for History 3 and 4 prior to 1945?"; (2) "The passing of the law requiring American history for graduation from college did (did not) cause you to change your objectives"; (3) "If it did, what were the changes?"; (4) "The passing of the law did (did not) bring about any changes in your method of presentation"; (5) "If it did, what were the changes?"; and (6) "Do you make a conscious effort to instill in your students the following fourteen selected characteristics of a good citizen?"

After a careful analysis of the objectives listed by the professors, eight composite statements were formulated as follows:

(1) To enable students to acquire a background of information and experiences as a foundation for advanced

courses in American history.

(2) To enable students to acquire a knowledge of the political, constitutional, and cultural development of the United States.

(3) To enable students to acquire attitudes and habits which will produce better citizens in practice by teaching the responsibilities of each citizen for the preservation of our heritage of freedom and the perpetuation and improvement of the social structure.

(4) To enable students to acquire a knowledge of the experiences of past generations that they might better understand their own intellectual background and contemporary society.

(5) To enable the students to acquire an insight into the responsibilities of the United States in her relationship to the rest of the world.

(6) To enable students to acquire an acquaintance-ship with and appreciation of stirring events, persons who have interesting character traits, and heroic achievements.

(7) To enable the students to acquire the capacity of constructive thinking through providing opportunities for the development of this ability.

(8) To enable students to acquire certain basic concepts concerning capitalism, socialism, communism, and other isms.

The modifications in instructional methods were basic

but not numerous. Due to the increased enrollment, the lecture method began to supplant the class discussion, examinations changed to include objective questions rather than using the subjective type exclusively as before, and it became necessary to discontinue the special reports and outside readings which had previously been required.

While only three of the professors questioned said they were teaching for better citizenship, all six stated that they made a conscious effort to instill in their students the characteristics listed on the questionnaire. It can, therefore, be readily assumed that directly or indirectly History 3 and 4 were being used to improve the citizenship characteristics within the students.

Graduates' Responses on the Citizenship Characteristics

More than 50 per cent of the 282 graduates sampled said that they believed nine of the fourteen characteristics had been increased in their lives as a result of having studied American history at the University of Oklahoma. The number of characteristics that increased as designated by the majority of each of the occupational groups in rank order of ascension is: military, 3; engineer, 4; teacher, 6; house-wife, 7; miscellany, 9; doctor, 10; geologist, 11; and lawyer, 12. Those receiving the letter grades of "A" and "C" said that eight of the characteristics were increased while the majority of "B" and "D" indicated an increase in

nine traits.

The nine characteristics which the majority of the graduates thought had been increased in their lives are as follows:

(1) To value, respect, and defend basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the United States Constitution (52.48 per cent).

(2) To understand that in the long run, people will govern themselves better than any self-appointed group will govern them (58.16 per cent).

(3) To believe that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on (51.77 per cent).

(4) To exercise his right to vote (55.67 per cent).

(5) To know about, critically evaluate, and support promising efforts to prevent war, but stand ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression (54.26 per cent).

(6) To understand cultures and ways of life other than his own (50.71 per cent).

(7) To realize the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy (67.83 per cent).

(8) To prefer democracy to any other system of government (63.83 per cent).

(9) To believe that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy (65.25).

The majority of the sampling indicated their belief

that the study of American history had made no difference in their lives in the following five characteristics:

(1) To respect and uphold the law and its agencies (60.28 per cent).

(2) To accept the basic idea that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution (plurality, 47.87 per cent).

(3) To accept civic responsibilities and discharge them to the best of his ability (55.96 per cent).

(4) To respect property rights, meet his obligations in contracts, and obey regulations governing the use of property (64.89 per cent).

(5) To support fair business practices and fair relations between employer and employees (62.06 per cent).

The characteristic which received the largest percentages indicating an increase was number twelve, "a good citizen should realize the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy." Of the 282 graduates returning the questionnaire 67.83 per cent said they believed this trait had been increased in their lives, .35 per cent thought it had been decreased, 31.91 per cent checked that no appreciable difference had been made, and .71 per cent did not know what difference, if any, had been made.

The fourth characteristic, "a good citizen should accept the fact that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution," had the

largest percentage indicating a decrease. Although small, 4.96 per cent of the 282 respondents, it is larger than the 1.37 per cent of the total possible answers which were in the decreased column.

In spite of the years which had elapsed since many of the graduates had taken American history at the University and the difficulty of associating attitudes learned to a specific course, very few of the graduates said that they did not know what effect the study of History 3 or 4 had upon increasing or decreasing citizenship characteristics in their lives. Of the 3,948 possible answers in all of the traits, only 3.83 per cent were "don't know."

Conclusions

The conclusions resulting from this study are:

(1) Instruction in the basic courses in American history at the University of Oklahoma is designed to provide the students with the background information they need as a foundation for advanced courses in history, although most of those enrolled in the courses are not history majors.

(2) The instructional staff exerts serious effort to fulfill additional objectives which closely parallel those held by the students.

(3) The instructional methods have been modified by two factors: (a) enrollment of those who take the course primarily to meet the statutory requirement for graduation;

and (b) the excessive number of students enrolled, which greatly increased the teacher load.

(4) The professors make a conscious effort to instill in their students attitudes and habits which contribute to the development of desirable citizens.

(5) The graduates believe that History 3 and 4, as taught by the University professors, contribute to the development of desirable citizens.

(6) The student's rating of the course was not appreciably affected by the letter grade he had received.

(7) The women were more favorable than the men concerning the results of having had history.

(8) The lawyers, of the occupational groups, were the most impressed with history's contribution toward developing desirable citizens.

(9) The lapse of time had little, if any, effect upon the graduates' responses.

(10) College credit in American history should continue to be a requirement for graduation from an institution of higher education.

Recommendations

As a result of the study it is recommended that:

(1) A sampling of later classes be studied to learn if the philosophy of the graduates has been modified by the changing conditions.

(2) A larger percentage of women be included in the study.

(3) A study be made to determine the success of instruction and retention of specific facts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Public Documents

Oklahoma. Official Session Laws. Title 70, Chapter 45b (1945).

Books

Brewer, David J. (ed.). The Lone Star Edition of the World's Best Orations. Chicago: Fred P. Kaiser Publishing Co., 1923.

Fine, Benjamin. Our Children Are Cheated. New York: Henry Holt Co., 1947.

Garrett, Henry E. Statistics in Psychology and Education. 4th ed. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1953.

Hartman, George W. Educational Psychology. New York: American Book Co., 1941.

Kelly, Earl C. Education for What Is Real. New York: Harper Brothers, 1947.

Thurston, Louis L., and Chave, E. J. The Measurement of Attitudes. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Articles and Periodicals

Albright, Preston B. "College Freshmen's Ignorance of American History," School and Society, LXXXII (November 12, 1955), pp. 147-149.

Andrews, Mathew P. "American History," New York Times, May 3, 1942 (Magazine Section).

"Another Alleged Educational Weakness Is 'Viewed with Alarm,'" School and Society, LV (June 27, 1942), pp. 715-716.

- Bendix, R. "Education and the Teaching of History," School Review, LIII (January, 1945), pp. 15-24.
- Boyd, James A. "Objectives and Methods in Teaching American History," School Review, LVIII (November, 1950), pp. 483-488.
- Chicago Tribune. June 21, 1942.
- Cochran, William G. "Modern Methods in the Sampling of Human Populations," American Journal of Public Health, XLI (June, 1951), pp. 647-649.
- Commager, Henry S. "Our Schools Have Kept Us Free," Life XXIX (October 16, 1950), pp. 46-47.
- Cordier, R. W. "American History in Schools and Colleges," Education, LXIV (April, 1944), pp. 465-469.
- Cornfield, Jerome. "Modern Methods in the Sampling of Human Populations," American Journal of Public Health, XLI (June, 1951), pp. 654-661.
- Cross, Richard E. "Aims for American History in an Era of Crisis," Social Education, XVII (October, 1953) pp. 257-260.
- Covey, Lola B. "Teaching American History," Social Education, XIX (February, 1955), pp. 60-64.
- Daily News (New York). April 12, 1943.
- Dante, Harris L. "Objectives in Teaching American History," Social Education, XIX (February, 1953), pp. 73-74.
- Diedrick, Paul B. "An Ethical Basis for Educational Objectives," School Review, LIX (February, 1951), pp. 78-86.
- Diedrick, Paul B. "Design for a Comprehensive Evaluation Program," School Review, LVIII (April, 1950), pp. 225-232.
- Diedrick, Paul B. "General Objectives of Education," Elementary School Journal, XLV (April, 1945), pp. 436-443.
- Dimond, Stanley E. "The Democratic Citizenship Study," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 172-174.
- "Doubtful Remedy," Time, XLI (April 12, 1943), p. 53.

- "Doubtful Remedy Continued," Time XLI (April 19, 1943), p. 62.
- Edgar, Earl E. "Kansas Study of Education for Citizenship," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 175-178.
- Fraser, Hugh R. "And This, Too, Is a Part of the Record," The Nation, LVI (May 1, 1943), pp. 643-646.
- Gilmore, Allen A. "Methods and Concepts of History," Journal of General Education, VI (January, 1952), pp. 113-121.
- Griffin, Willis, and Felix, Allen. "Citizenship Project," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 165-167.
- Hansen, Morris H., and Hurwitz, William N. "Modern Methods in the Sampling of Human Populations," American Journal of Public Health, XLI (June, 1951), pp. 662-688.
- "History Begins at Home," News Week, XIX (June 29, 1942), p. 66.
- Jones, Vernon. "Character and Citizenship Education," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 190-192.
- Lockhart, A. V. "Compulsory American History in Colleges," School and Society, LVII (April 17, 1943), pp. 439-440.
- Loveman, Amy. "History in Our Colleges," Saturday Review of Literature, XXV (September 5, 1942), pp. 10-11.
- McClelland, Clarence P. "Should the Study of American History in College Be Made Compulsory," School and Society, LVI (January 15, 1943), pp. 64-68.
- McDonald, William A. "American History Must Be Better Taught," Saturday Evening Post, CCXVI (October 9, 1943), p. 112.
- Mattingly, Garrett. "The Use of History," The Atlantic Monthly, CLXXVIII (July, 1946), pp. 124-128.
- Myers, John A. "Proper Perspectives in American History," Social Studies, XLVI (October, 1955), pp. 231-232.
- Nevins, Allan. "American History for Americans," New York Times, May 3, 1942 (Magazine Section), pp. 6, 27.

Nevins, Allan. "Why We Should Know Our History," New York Times, April 18, 1943 (Magazine Section), pp. 16, 28.

New York Times. May 3, June 21, 1942; April 4, April 5, April 18, 1943.

Pearson, Gaynor. "Nationalism in the College Curriculum," School and Society, LXV (January 11, 1947), pp. 19-20.

Penrose, William O. "The Citizen's Rights and Duties," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 187-189.

Price, Roy A. "Citizenship Studies in Syracuse," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 179-181.

Pringle, Henry G. "Why Not Teach American History?" Saturday Evening Post, CCXVII (January 20, 1945), pp. 14-15.

Russel, William F. "Better Education for Citizenship," The Phi Delta Kappan, XXXIII (December, 1951), pp. 161-164.

"Should Courses in American History Be Required in College?" School and Society, LVI (August 15, 1942), pp. 125-126.

Taylor, Henry J. "What Our Colleges Don't Require," Reader's Digest, L (September, 1950), pp. 56-58.

The Daily Oklahoman (Oklahoma City). April 7, 1943.

Tyler, Ralph W. "A Misguided Attack on History Teaching," School Review, LI (June, 1943), pp. 319-322.

Yott, D. H. "Modern Trends in Teaching History," School Activities, XXIV (May, 1953), pp. 285-287.

Reports

Crary, Ryland W., et al. "Characteristics of the Good Democratic Citizen," Education for Democratic Citizenship. Twenty-second Yearbook of the National Council for the Social Studies. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1951.

Unpublished Material

Gilmore, L. D. "An Evaluation of the College Reading Clinic of the University of Oklahoma." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1952.

Kappes, Evelyn E. "An Attitude Inventory to Determine the Attitudes of College Women toward Physical Education and the Service Offered the Students by a Physical Education Department." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1953.

Shackleford, Thomas L. "An Evaluation of Social Science Courses of Study for Elementary Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, The University of Oklahoma, 1937.

Other Sources

Letter from James W. Bond, Assistant Attorney General, to W. H. Underwood, January 3, 1945. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Letter from Asa K. Christian to W. H. Underwood, December, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Letter from Dr. George L. Cross to Dr. Mel A. Nash, December 19, 1956. In the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Letter from Dr. Mel A. Nash to Dr. George L. Cross, January 11, 1957. In the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Letter from Sabine C. Perciful to W. H. Underwood, December 16, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Letter from Roscoe R. Robinson to W. H. Underwood, December 15, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Letter from W. H. Underwood to Presidents of several of the Oklahoma State Colleges, December 11, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Letter from John Vaughn to W. H. Underwood, December 16, 1944. In the files of W. H. Underwood, Durant, Oklahoma.

Personal interview with W. H. Underwood at Southeastern State College, Durant, Oklahoma. February 20, 1957.

Questionnaire completed by six members of The University of Oklahoma History Department. In the files of Samuel W. Evans, Chickasha, Oklahoma.

Questionnaire returned by 282 graduates of The University of Oklahoma. In the files of Samuel W. Evans, Chickasha, Oklahoma.

Report of Special Committee to the Regents, July 23, 1945. In the files of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

Sanders, Jennings B. How the College Introductory Course in United States History Is Organized and Taught (Circular No. 288, Federal Security Agency, Office of Education). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April 10, 1951.

Statements from fifteen of the members of the Education Committees of the 1945 Oklahoma Senate and House of Representatives. In the files of Samuel W. Evans, Chickasha, Oklahoma.

APPENDIX A

HOUSE BILL NO. 62

HOUSE BILL NO. 62

LAW REQUIRING AMERICAN HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT

AN ACT requiring that before any student in any institution of higher education in the State of Oklahoma may receive a degree he shall have a credit of six semester hours instruction in College American History and Government; authorizing and requiring the Board of Regents for Higher Education to include such a course in the curriculum; and declaring an emergency.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA:

Degrees-Credit of Six Semester Hours in American History and Government.

Section 1. Before any student matriculated in an institution of higher education in the State of Oklahoma after September 1, 1945, is entitled to receive a degree, he shall have a credit of not less than six semester hours instruction in college American history and government.

Board of Regents-Courses Included in Curriculum.

Section 2. The board of Regents for Higher Education of Oklahoma is hereby authorized and required to include such courses of college American history and government as a part of the curriculum of such institution, if the same already is not a part of such curriculum.

Constitutionality of Sections.

Section 3. If any section or part of any section Act is declared to be unconstitutional, the remainder of the Act shall not thereby be invalidated. All provisions of the law inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

Approved: May 5, 1945. Emergency.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR GATHERING DATA FROM THE
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS AND GRADUATES
AND THE LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
PROFESSORS OF HISTORY 3 AND 4

1. What were your objectives for History 3 and 4 prior to 1945?
2. The passing of the law requiring American History for graduation from college did _____ did not _____ cause you to change your objectives.
3. If it did, what were the changes?
4. The passing of the law did _____ did not _____ bring about any changes in your methods of presentation.
5. If it did, what were the changes?

6. Do you make a conscious effort to instill in your students the following:

A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD:	Yes	No
1. Value, respect, and defend basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution.		
2. Respect and uphold law and its agencies.		
3. Understand that in the long run, people will govern themselves better than any self-appointed group would govern them.		
4. Accept the basic idea that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution.		
5. Believe that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on.		
6. Exercise his right to vote.		
7. Accept civic responsibilities and discharge them to the best of his ability.		
8. Respect property rights, meet his obligations in contracts, and obey regulations governing the use of property.		
9. Support fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees.		
10. Know about, critically evaluate, and support promising efforts to prevent war, but stand ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression.		
11. Understand cultures and ways of life other than his own.		
12. Realize the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy.		
13. Prefer democracy to any other system of government.		
14. Believe that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy.		

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR UNIVERSITY GRADUATES

Present Profession _____ Major _____
 Year Graduated _____ Male _____ Female _____
 Were you a veteran when you took History 3 (U. S. 1492 to 1865) and/or History 4 (U. S. 1865 to Present)? Yes ___ No ___
 Did you take History 3 ___ History 4 ___ Other U.S. History ___?
 What did you expect to get from the course?

The following is a list of some characteristics of a good citizen. Please indicate whether having taken History 3 and/or 4 at the University of Oklahoma increased, decreased, or made no appreciable difference with regard to these characteristics as an active part of your life.

Characteristics	Increased	Decreased	Made no Appreciable Difference	Do not Know
A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD:				
1. Value, respect, and defend basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution.				
2. Respect and uphold law and its agencies.				
3. Understand that in the long run, people will govern themselves better than any self-appointed group would govern them.				
4. Accept the basic idea that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution.				
5. Believe that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on.				
6. Exercise his right to vote.				

Characteristics	Increased	Decreased	Made no Appreciable Difference	Do not Know
A GOOD CITIZEN SHOULD:				
7. Accept civic responsibilities and discharge them to the best of his ability.				
8. Respect property rights, meet his obligations in contracts, and obey regulations governing the use of property.				
9. Support fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees.				
10. Know about, critically evaluate and support promising efforts to prevent war, but stand ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression.				
11. Understand cultures and ways of life other than his own.				
12. Realize the necessity of free speech and free press in a democracy.				
13. Prefer democracy to any other system of government.				
14. Believe that education of the masses is necessary to the success of a democracy.				

OKLAHOMA
STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

March 1, 1957

Dear

An Oklahoma law requires that each person receiving a degree from a college in the state complete six semester hours of American History and Government. The University of Oklahoma, through its Education and History Departments, is undertaking a graduate thesis study of the University of Oklahoma's offering in American History to meet this state requirement.

You, as a graduate of the University, can be of great assistance by completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it as soon as possible.

The questions have been arranged so that they will require a minimum of writing on your part. The material you furnish will be used as statistical data and will be used in a manner which will prevent anyone from connecting it to you or your professor. You will notice it is not necessary that you sign your name to the questionnaire.

Your help in making this study complete will be greatly appreciated.

A self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Nash
ChancellorRe: University of Oklahoma
History Study
Norman, Oklahoma

Enclosures

APPENDIX C

LIST OF CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD AMERICAN CITIZEN
AS DEVELOPED BY THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR
THE SOCIAL STUDIES, 1951

THE GOOD CITIZEN

1. Believes in equality of opportunity for all people:
 - a. Treats all men with respect, regardless of their station in life;
 - b. Rejects distinctions based on race, creed, or class;
 - c. Exerts his influence to secure equal opportunity for all, in accordance with ability;
 - d. Upholds the principle that all men are equal before the law and entitled to the equal protection of the law;
 - e. Believes that the right to vote should not be denied on the basis of race, sex, creed, or economic status.

2. Values, respects, and defends basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution:
 - a. Knows the provisions of the Bill of Rights.
 - b. Upholds freedom of speech for ideas he doesn't like;
 - c. Goes beyond legal requirements by observing the spirit of the Bill of Rights in situations not covered by law.

3. Respects and upholds the law and its agencies:
 - a. Upholds the idea of government by law;
 - b. Insists upon equality before the law and equal protection of the law for all;
 - c. Insists upon the use of due process in all legal action;
 - d. Obeys the law, condemns lawbreaking and supports officials in their work of law enforcement;
 - e. Willingly performs jury service, regarding it as one of his contributions toward law enforcement;
 - f. Respects and supports officers who enforce the law but does not permit his zeal for law enforcement to encourage officials to infringe upon guaranteed civil rights;
 - g. Understands what perjury means and testifies honestly.

4. Understands and accepts the following democratic principles as guides in evaluating his own behavior and the policies and practices of other persons and groups, and judges his own behavior and the behavior of others by them:
 - a. That each individual possesses dignity and worth as a person and is entitled to consideration as a person;

- b. That governments exist by the consent of the governed;
 - c. That each citizen has certain civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution;
 - d. That government is by law, not by men;
 - e. That in a large nation with diverse social and economic groups compromise is frequently necessary;
 - f. That since the people are intelligent enough to govern themselves, they do not need protection by censorship--hence free speech, a free press, and academic freedom are necessary.
5. Understands that in the long run people will govern themselves better than any self-appointed group would govern them:
- a. Rejects all group claims to special privilege based on birth, wealth, place of origin, or place of residence;
 - b. Consults the advice of experts within their field of competence by considering their recommendations within a framework of total needs;
 - c. Expands his range of interests to gain some basic knowledge in many fields where his vote may help make a decision;
 - d. Favors better and more education as a means for improving the quality of government;
 - e. Realizes that democracy is, and has been, challenged by ideologies which reject its principles and base the claim of a small group to hold all power on the assumption that the people are unable to govern themselves.
6. Puts the general welfare above his own whenever a choice between them is necessary:
- a. Avoids the abuse of public benefits, e. g., the misuse of unemployment compensation by a process of malingering;
 - b. Devotes time to community organizations and services without pay;
 - c. Has enough insight to realize that in the general welfare may be his own long-term welfare.
7. Feels that he has inherited an unfinished experiment in self-government which it is his duty and privilege to carry on:
- a. Realizes the dangers to democracy from internal pressures arising from bigotry and prejudice;
 - b. Realizes that methods for meeting current economic problems such as labor-management relations and boom-depression cycles can be improved;

- c. Denies to any group the right to use illegal or extra-legal methods of installing or enforcing its program;
 - d. Recognizes the dangers to democracy of a totalitarian philosophy based on fascism, communism, or excessive nationalism;
 - e. Is critically aware of differences between democratic ideals and accomplishments, but works to improve accomplishment and refuses to become cynical about the differences. Recognizes that one function of idealism is to achieve a better reality.
8. Exercises his right to vote:
- a. Rejects emotional appeals when such appeals have little relation to the issues discussed;
 - b. Realizes that in a community where voters are apathetic a small minority may hold the power to govern;
 - c. Will find out how, when, where to register in order to be qualified to vote;
 - d. Votes habitually in primaries, recognizing the importance of the primary in selecting candidates;
 - e. Avoids narrow advantages based on parochialism and provincialism in consideration of candidates and issues;
 - f. Studies the main issue in each bond issue, referendum on public questions, and other issues to be decided by the electorate at the polls.
9. Accepts civic responsibilities and discharges them to the best of his ability:
- a. Regards a public office as a public trust;
 - b. Gives the holding of public office a high priority among the obligations he owes to society;
 - c. Refuses to act arbitrarily or approve of arbitrary official action even when his own party or faction stands to gain from it;
 - d. Recognizes his obligation to render military service or other appropriate service in time of war.
10. Knows techniques of social action (e.g., how to win support for desirable legislation) and can cooperate with others in achieving such action:
- a. Relies upon persuasion within a framework of fair play for gaining adherents to his cause;
 - b. Avoids exaggerated claims for his program which may encourage a reaction when the promised benefits fail to appear;
 - c. Does not allow his enthusiasm for the success of his project to lead him to accept compromises which are prejudicial to the general welfare;

- d. Accepts the necessity for honest compromise as a part of the democratic process;
 - e. Realizes that the best opportunity for a single individual to influence public decision is through cooperation;
 - f. Participates in organizational activity at the neighborhood level and knows how to relate this activity to larger social units;
 - g. Attends meetings, uses forums, letters to the papers, and petitions to contribute to plans and programs that lead to public action.
11. Accepts the basic idea that in a democracy the majority has the right to make decisions under the Constitution:
- a. Acts on the basis that as a member of the minority he is free to speak, write and work for a reversal of the majority decision; does not, as a member of a minority, ignore or sabotage a decision which the majority has legally made;
 - b. Relies upon the courts to decide questions of law and fact and does not take the law into his own hands;
 - c. Understands the device of divide and rule practiced by unscrupulous minorities to make a majority impotent, and guards against it.
12. Assumes a personal responsibility to contribute toward a well-informed climate of opinion on current social, economic, and political problems or issues:
- a. Knows and practices the basic skills of critical thinking: (a) locates and evaluates evidence relevant to the issues at hand, (b) analyzes the elements of a controversial issue and weighs the motives of interested parties, (c) understands the methods and devices of the propagandist, (d) reserves his reasoned decision until considerable evidence has been weighed, then takes a working hypothesis which he acts upon if action is necessary, and (e) subjects this working hypothesis to future modification if new evidence warrants it;
 - b. Cultivates the habit of keeping well informed on current affairs, preferably through diverse sources of information whose interests and biases he has made some effort to ascertain;
 - c. Discusses public issues with others, reflecting and learning from their views, and exerting the force of his own reasoned opinions;
 - d. Knows how to use available channels of communication, such as forums, clubs, letters, petitions, speeches, etc., in co-operation with others of like views to influence public decisions for social action;

- e. Learns to express effectively the judgments at which he has arrived;
 - f. Before expressing any judgment he tests it for consistency with democratic assumptions;
 - g. Respects the honestly held views of others and minimizes personalities and loyalties to groups in considering ideas.
13. Realizes the necessary connection of education with democracy:
- a. Realizes need for academic freedom if education is to make its full contribution to democracy;
 - b. Accepts the proposition that if the people are to rule, then the people must be enlightened;
 - c. Upholds the principle of a career open to talents through free education as an alternative to any scheme for aristocratic leadership.
14. Respects property rights, meets his obligations in contracts, and obeys regulations governing the use of property:
- a. Refrains from wilfully damaging the property of others, exercises care against accidental damage, and repairs any damage he has caused;
 - b. Does not enter into a contract unless he is reasonably sure of his ability to meet his obligations;
 - c. Recognizes that some controls on the use of property are necessary for the general welfare, such as building regulations, zoning ordinances, etc.
15. Supports fair business practices and fair relations between employers and employees:
- a. Opposes false and misleading advertising as a form of fraud;
 - b. Recognizes the right of workers to form unions for the purpose of collective bargaining;
 - c. Condemns the use of violence as a means for settling economic issues;
 - d. Regards it as a civic duty to get a job and to do it well;
 - e. Recognizes that he has a stake as a citizen and consumer in disputes between economic groups, particularly if essential services are involved.
16. Assumes a personal responsibility for the wise use of natural resources:
- a. Avoids habits of waste or carelessness which consume or destroy natural resources without raising the standard of living;

- b. Supports public measures for the preservation of such natural resources as topsoil, irreplaceable minerals, and forests.
17. Accepts responsibility for the maintenance and improvement of a competitive economic system assisted and regulated when necessary by governmental action:
- a. Understands and values what a competitive economic system has already accomplished and its future possibilities;
 - b. Understands that the competitive economic system has relied upon private initiative to release creative and productive energy;
 - c. Understands that the growing interdependence of society has created needs for regulation in the public interest;
 - d. Favors the use of public funds for research and technological development of long-range programs which may add to the nation's wealth in fields where private enterprise has not produced adequate development and in those where private development would be incompatible with the public interest;
 - e. Is aware of the unsolved problems of our economy, e.g., the business cycle, the social and economic consequences of distribution;
 - f. Is aware that economic monopoly carries with it economic power and potentially political power.
18. Knows in general how other economic systems operate, including their political and social consequences:
- a. Knows that communism as an economic system reduces private property to a minimum.
 - b. Knows that socialism as an economic system provides for public ownership and operation of public utilities, public services, and basic processing industries as public concerns;
 - c. In studying other economic systems, he gives full consideration to the possible losses to the individual in terms of freedom and to the community in terms of incentive;
 - d. Balances these possible losses against possible gains in security in studying other economic systems.
19. Knows about, critically evaluates, and supports promising efforts to prevent war, but stands ready to defend his country against tyranny and aggression:
- a. Recognizes the factors in international relations which lead to armed conflict, such as armament races, a chauvinistic press, economic rivalry, power politics, and ideological differences;

- b. Recognizes achievements made by international organizations in the interest of peace, order, and human welfare;
 - c. Has enough perspective to see in events in other countries threats to peace and freedom in his own;
 - d. Studies proposals for preventing future wars and avoids feelings of unjustified optimism or irrational despondency;
 - e. Is willing to consider modifying national policies, when democratic values are not at stake, in the interest of international peace;
 - f. Looks with favor upon effective international controls over special phases of technology to prevent war or limit its destructiveness;
 - g. Does not allow his love for peace, or his dread of war, to lead him to abandon democratic values or submit to unilateral pressure from an aggressor;
 - h. Appreciates the role of the armed services (under civilian control) of his country and supports measures to keep them as strong and effective as necessary.
20. Is deeply aware of the interdependence of people and realizes that a good life can be attained only by the organized cooperation of millions of people all over the world:
- a. Supports the maximum use of scientific research for improving human living and human relations;
 - b. Supports all measures for better and more accurate communication among classes and nations;
 - c. Understands the organization and functions of the United Nations and its specialized agencies.
21. Understands cultures and ways of life other than his own:
- a. Recognizes that other cultures have made contributions to our own;
 - b. Realizes that attempts to impose our way of life on others may bring resentment;
 - c. Conducts himself as a worthy representative of his country in his personal and public relations with people he meets at home and abroad.
22. Cultivates qualities of character and personality that have a high value in his culture:
- a. Is honest in his relationships with others;
 - b. Plays fair, follows the rules of the game, asks for no personal advantage, and refuses to cheat;
 - c. Cultivates physical and moral courage;
 - d. Is loyal to his ideals;

- e. Is courteous and considerate of the rights and feelings of other people;
 - f. Is industrious in his work and respects the time of others;
 - g. Protects his health and safety and is concerned for the health and safety of others.
23. Is a responsible family member and assumes his full responsibilities for maintaining the civic standards of his neighborhood and community:
- a. Does his part to make his family a competent social and economic unit;
 - b. Maintains family property, works out plans and acts with his family to build neighborhood attitudes of friendliness and cooperation;
 - c. Takes a deep interest in questions of general concern to the neighborhood;
 - d. Has the courage to report any unlawful activity in his neighborhood and insist on police and court action for its removal.
24. Recognizes taxes as payment for community services and pays them promptly:
- a. Reviews the services provided by the community and evaluates them against his tax bill;
 - b. In considering all proposals for spending public money he considers ability to pay, public needs, and other relevant factors before voting;
 - c. Opposes proposals for lower taxes if they mean inadequate services.

THE COMMITTEE

Representing the National Council for the Social Studies:

Ryland W. Crary, Associate Professor of History, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Paul B. Diederich, Research Associate, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey.

Merrill F. Hartshorn, Executive Secretary, National Council for the Social Studies.

Roy A. Price, Professor of Citizenship and Education, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship, Syracuse University.

Lewis Paul Todd, Editor, Social Education, National Council for the Social Studies.

Howard Cummings, Specialist in Government and Economics,
Office of Education, Federal Security Agency.

Representing the Armed Forces Information and Education
Division, Office of the Secretary of Defense:

Jack Elinson, Acting Chief, Professional Staff, Attitude
Research Branch.

Commander Frank L. Fullaway, USN, Chief, Editorial Section,
Information Branch.

Edwin H. Miner, Educational Director, Education Branch.